J11
.R5
2dset
U. S. Congress

Appendix

Cordell Hull Award Presented to Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege along with many Members of the Congress to attend the recent banquet of the Committee for a National Trade Policy at which our distinguished, able, and beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, was presented the Cordell Hull Award.

This was an occasion of particular pleasure to me because both Speaker RAYBURN and the late great Secretary of State Cordell Hull are Tennesseans. Both of these great Americans stand with our greatest sons in service to the Nation and in the love, respect, and admiration by which they are held by our citizens. Mr. RAYBURN was born in Roane County, adjoining the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and Mr. Hull was born in Pickett County, one of the fine counties of the great Fourth District of Tennessee which I represent. Judge Hull preceded me in representing the people of that area in the Congress and I indeed counted it an honor to be able to number him as one of my constituents.

Secretary of State Herter, in presenting the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to Speaker RAYBURN, said that the award is bestowed upon Speaker RAYBURN for his vision and statesmanship in furthering the internal trade policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Secretary of State.

Speaker RAYBURN in his speech of response and acceptance said that "this is a particularly appropriate time" to recall the life, deeds, and ideals of Cordell Hull in promoting two-way friendship and free flow of trade between friendly nations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the address of Secretary of State Herter, and the text of your address on this occasion.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT A DINNER HONORING THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, GIVEN BY THE COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 28, 1960

I am honored to have been selected by this outstanding and highly commendable organization, the Committee for a National Trade Policy, to present the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to your distinguished guest. The interest that your group manifests in seeking solutions to our trade problems is most sincerely welcomed by your Government.

It is particularly appropriate that tonight your gathering will honor one who has helped to solve so many problems in the field of interstate and foreign commerce, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of the great State of Texas.

When Texas was admitted as a State in 1845, there were many who regarded it as one of the most underdeveloped regions in the world, and some who thought it would always remain so. But as we all know, in the years which have intervened, Texas has done a remarkable job of belying that thought.

I say we all know this, and I can see no imminent danger that Texans will let us soon forget it.

In trade, Texas is justly famous as an exporter of oil, cotton, cattle, minerals, lumber, and pretty girls. The State imports a wide variety of consumer goods, machinery, finished textiles, and of course they still buy U.S. postage stamps from outside the State.

In 1887 Texas imported SAM RAYBURN from Tennessee, and it has had reason to be very proud of this importation ever since. The balance of payments position as between Texas and Tennessee was markedly changed as a result of this move.

No one has ever claimed that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a compilation of the world's greatest literature, but it is often fascinating reading. I have had a small job of research done in the pages of the RECORD of the 63d Congress which reveals that SAM RAYBURN delivered his first speech in the Halls of Congress on May 6, 1913. And the pages of the proceedings on that day uncover some remarkable facts which may or may not be dismissed as sheer coincidence. For on that day, although several other hotly contested issues were debated on the floor, including the question of whether women should be given the right to vote, SAM RAYBURN addressed himself to the pending tariff bill, making an eloquent plea in favor of tariff reductions. And on that same day, another Member of the House spoke on another section of the tariff bill—a section which incorporated the novel idea of a Federal tax on personal income. The Member explaining various features of this section was the Honorable Cordell Hull, Member of Congress from Tennessee. On that night of May 6, 1913, I daresay that no one could have forseeen that on the night of January 28, 1960, an award honoring the memory of Mr. Cordell Hull would be presented to Mr. SAM RAYBURN, both natives of Tennessee, both renowned in the annals of the Nation, both able statesmen, and both distinguished Democrats. And that differences of view as between the two major political parties at least on the subjects of the tariff and foreign policy have with the passage of the years become sufficiently bettered as to make seemly the presentation of this award by a Republican Secretary of State.

From my own experience as a Member of the House of Representatives, I can testify that "Mr. SAM" has developed a patient and understanding tolerance for Republicans. He has a keen eye for those situations which call for the partisan approach and those which call for the bypartisan or nonpartisan. Cordell Hull also possessed this virtue, and in his memoirs he refers to his friendship with Congressman E. J. Hill of Connecticut. Of Congressman Hill he says:

"From 1907 forward Mr. Hill, a Republican, and I sat for hours at a time of Sundays and evenings discussing tariff, trade, and other business conditions * * * I owe much to him for the inspiration that drove me to study the interrelation of trade throughout the world."

Now I must concede that the choice of words here and the quick identification of Mr. Hill as a Republican might be taken to mean that Cordell Hull found it quite remarkable to have discovered a Republican who knew anything about world trade, but the noble sentiment is really not thereby impaired.

Returning to Mr. SAM's first speech in Congress on that memorable day in 1913, it is remarkable how early it became clear that devotion to country is his guiding star, transcending all others. Proof of this I believe is found in his initial address. If you will indulge me for a further minute, I should like to read to you a couple of brief excerpts from his message that day. He began by saying this:

"Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this great body, I, of course, feel that I should have regard for the long-established custom of the House, which in a measure demands that discussions of questions shall be left to the more mature Members * * * but I feel that as a representative of more than 200,000 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, I should be allowed to break in a measure whatever of this custom remains, and exercise my constitutional right to speak my sentiments on this floor and refuse to be relegated to that lockjawed ostracism typical of the dead past."

Now, from that day to this night, so far as I am aware, Mr. SAM has not had reason to complain of "lockjawed ostracism." Even so, he chooses to speak only when he has something to say, and then he speaks sparingly.

After making a well-reasoned plea for tariff reductions, "Mr. SAM" closed with these words:

"I came to this body a few weeks ago with childlike enthusiasm and confidence. It has always been my ambition to live such a life that one day my fellow citizens would call me to membership in this popular branch of the greatest lawmaking body in the world. Out of their confidence and partiality they have done this. It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be and will be, one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to human kind yet unborn."

These words, spoken 47 years ago, are the words of a great man. They have been followed by deeds which testify to his greatness. All Americans are ever grateful that SAM RAYBURN has served this Nation these many years. As a close friend and long-time ad-

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

mirer of his, I am very proud to present the Cordell Hull Memorial Award to this distinguished gentleman.

REMARKS OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN ACCEPTING THE CORDELL HULL AWARD AT A BANQUET OF THE COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY, INC., MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1960

This is a happy occasion for me.

In the first place, it is a high privilege to be presented to you by my fine friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives, Secretary of State Christian Herter, who in my judgment is a worthy successor to the man in whose memory we gather tonight.

Any citizen of this country or any other would feel deeply honored to be the recipient of the Cordell Hull Award. Coming as it does from an organization dedicated to carrying on the great work to which Cordell Hull gave the tremendous energies of his mind and body, this award symbolizes America in her finest role—that of the good neighbor.

For 42 years—a goodly portion of any man's life—my life was warmed by the close friendship, the wise counsel and the stirring example of Cordell Hull. I never cease to be inspired when I think of that good man's love of his country, his dedication to peace in all its aspects, and his record of matchless public service.

From the days of his humble childhood in a Cumberland Mountain log cabin, Cordell Hull had only one ambition and one aspiration—to serve mankind and to help men everywhere to live together in unity.

History now records how close he came to the fulfillment of that boyhood dream.

Not long before his death he is supposed to have told a friend that out of his long adventurous career he was proudest of four things.

First, that he had helped in the shaping of the United Nations. His role in this effort was so great that Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to him as "the Father of the United Nations."

Second, he had initiated the policy of nonpartisanship in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Third, he had put into practice the good neighbor policy in cooperation with the other American nations.

And fourth, he had headed up the drive toward a more liberal trade policy through the reciprocal trade program.

Any one of these accomplishments would be the mark of a distinguished career in American politics, but here are four mighty undertakings.

He might easily have mentioned many other things out of his busy and fruitful lifetime.

From humble beginnings he rose to a member of the Tennessee Legislature, a Tennessee circuit judge, a captain in the Spanish-American War, and he served 24 years in the Congress of the United States—22 years in the House of Representatives and 2 years in the Senate. After that he served nearly 12 years as Secretary of State under Franklin Roosevelt, the longest time one man ever held that high office. In an office once occupied by such towering figures as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Daniel Webster, John Marshall, John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, John Hay, and Charles Evans Hughes, he established himself as one of the truly great Secretaries of State.

This modest man might have recalled that he had the high honor of leading the American delegation to the London Monetary and Economic Conference, to four Inter-American Conferences and to the Moscow Conference in 1943. He was much too humble to have mentioned that public opinion polls year after year found him to be the most popular member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet.

Many people now have forgotten that from 1921 to 1924 in the period of greatest Republican ascendancy in this century, Cordell Hull as chairman of the Democratic National Committee helped to rebuild a defeated and discouraged Democratic Party giving not alone of his energy but also lending substantial amounts of his own money as well.

It was altogether fitting that the world paid homage to this man of peace in 1945 when he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

I want to reminisce a few moments about Cordell Hull, the human being. He was one of the first close friends I made after I came to Congress on March 4, 1913, the day Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States.

I lived in the old Cochran Hotel as did many other Members of Congress including Cordell Hull. Each night after supper most of these men would pull their chairs together at the end of the big old lobby and for several hours they would explore together in serious candor the great issues of the hour. As a freshman Congressman I listened with rapt attention, and I have often thought that this was the best school of political science I ever attended.

Perhaps because we both had been born in Tennessee or perhaps because we held very similar views on political issues, Cordell Hull and myself became warm personal friends. As the junior member of that partnership, I was the great gainer profiting from his experience and wisdom.

When the Underwood Tariff bill was taken up by the House of Representatives in 1913, it included the first constitutional income tax. Cordell Hull was the author of this tax plan. During that debate, I made my maiden speech in Congress in support of the bill. This tax plan has been the cornerstone of our fiscal policy from that day to this.

Before World War I, Cordell Hull became convinced that "unhampered trade dovetailed with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers, and unfair economic competition with war * * * I reasoned that, if we could get a freer flow of trade—freer in the sense of fewer discriminations and obstructions—so that one country would not be deadly jealous of another and the living standards of all countries might rise, thereby eliminating the economic dissatisfaction that breeds war, we might have a reasonable chance for lasting peace."

He also opposed high tariffs because "I believe (they) meant a higher cost of living for American citizens. They assisted in building trusts and monopolies. By cutting down the sales by other countries to us, they also cut down the purchases by other countries from us."

Cordell held the doctrine that other countries could not continue to buy from us unless they could continue to sell to us. He knew that other people could build walls against our products as easily as we could build walls against theirs, and that they had done so with a vengeance in times past.

In his momoirs he told the story of how a simple incident in the Tennessee mountains impressed the importance of trade upon his youthful mind.

"When I was a boy on the farm in Tennessee," he recalled, "we had two neighbors—I'll call them Jenkins and Jones—who were enemies of each other. For many years there had been bad feeling between them—I don't know why—and when they met on the road or in town or at church, they stared at each other coldly and didn't speak.

"Then one of Jenkins' mules went lame in the spring just when Jenkins needed him most for plowing. At the same time Jones ran short of corn for his hogs. Now it so happened that Jones was through with his own plowing and had a mule to spare, and Jenkins had a bin filled with corn. A friendly third party brought the two men together, and Jones let Jenkins use his mule in exchange for corn for the hogs.

"As a result, it wasn't long before the two old enemies were the best of friends. A commonsense trade and ordinary neighborliness had made them aware of their economic need for each other and brought them peace."

He carried this faith in liberal trade into action throughout the rest of his life.

Someone once said that "the only monument in life that Cordell Hull ever wanted was a deep nick in a tariff wall."

Cordell Hull had an almost religious belief in what came to be known as the good neighbor policy. He believed that we could not look for closer cooperation throughout the world unless we first showed that cooperation could work in the Western Hemisphere.

Friendship, he knew, is a two-way street. To have friends, we must be a friend. Patiently, tirelessly through the years Cordell Hull labored with great success to make one free neighborly community of all the American nations. Out of this concept of the good neighbor policy grew our point 4 program and eventually our continuing determination to help the underdeveloped nations of the world to a better way of life.

I loved and followed Cordell Hull as a statesman, but my fondest memories concern his qualities as a human being. I don't think he ever knew what it was to be afraid. When he believed something to be right and true, he never ceased to battle for it. He had a deep yearning to make the path a little smoother and the burden a little lighter for all people wherever they lived. He never sought credit for anything that he accomplished. The only reward he wanted was the accomplishment of his purposes. In his personal life as well as in his political philosophy he embodied the concept of the good neighbor.

He had that rare combination of gentle humility and rugged strength which were also Lincoln's qualities.

I think this is a particularly appropriate time for us to remember Cordell Hull and the great political ideals for which he stood.

In a time when our relations with our sister American Republics are troubled, when our own Vice President is insulted in a neighboring country, when American property is being expropriated almost daily, it might pay us to try to envision how Cordell Hull would have treated this situation.

The same is true of the increasingly competitive trade situation in the world. As nations recover from the devastation of war and competition for markets becomes fiercer, we hear new demands from every side for higher trade barriers. Now let us think—how would Cordell Hull have met this situation?

In closing, let me say again how deeply touched I am by this honor which you have paid me in the memory of one of the giants whom I was privileged to call my friend.

In the beautiful library which I have built in my home town as a gift to all the people, I have many treasured mementos. The Cordell Hull Award which you have so kindly given me tonight will have an honored place among them and will rest there forever for people to see.

It might have been of Cordell Hull that the poet Shelley wrote, " 'Til the future dares forget the past, his fate and fame shall be an echo and a light unto eternity."

And I think one may fairly say of him as once was said of Thomas Jefferson: "The honors which other men had given him were unimportant; the opportunities he had given to other men to become free were all that really counted."

Governor Brown Makes Eloquent Case for Proposed National Resources and Conservation Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am proud to be a coauthor with the eminent and respected senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY, of his proposed Resources and Conservation Act of 1960, S. 2549, which I hope and believe will be adopted by this Congress. I am pleased that the State of California, through our distinguished Governor, has lined up actively in support of this important legislation. Governor Brown's statement on S. 2549, which he presented in person on January 26 before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is clear and convincing testimony. I hereby offer it for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING S. 3549, BY HON. EDMUND G. BROWN, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1960

I wish to express my sincere thanks to your committee for this opportunity to appear before you. I especially am grateful for the honor and courtesy you have bestowed upon me by convening at this time to hear my statement.

The members of this committee are keenly aware of the importance of full resource development to the welfare of our Nation. An inventory and program for national resource development becomes increasingly necessary with the addition of our two newest States and their different types and abundance of natural resources.

This bill provides the method for coordinating information and policies which can lead to a sound and positive approach to the development of our natural resources. As I have already written Senator MURRAY, population is multiplying beyond any earlier estimates, our needs for food, water and other natural resources are spiraling. Nothing on the domestic scene is of greater importance to future generations of Americans than sound policies and effective programs to make use of our multitudinous natural resources, land, water, energy, air, minerals, forests and fisheries.

To illustrate by 1950 in comparison to 1900 the American people were taking from the earth: 2½ times more bituminous coal; 3½ times more iron ore; 4 times more zinc; 26 times more natural gas; 30 times more crude oil. Since 1900, the total withdrawal of water has doubled about every 25 years.

Perhaps it will be helpful if I defer for a few minutes some comments on the importance of this legislation to the people of the entire Nation and speak more specifically about the West and the West's role in the future of our country. This is the geographic area that offers the elbowroom for population and economic expansion. Its proper development is vital to our survival as a world power.

I have spent my entire life in the West and I have witnessed what has been, and still continues to be, perhaps the greatest mass migration of human beings in history. The West has been able to absorb this tremendous influx of new residents, not only because of its vast expanse of virgin lands, but also because of enlightened Federal investment in its natural resources during the thirties and forties.

However, especially in the years since 1952, the Federal administration's perspective of the national necessity for westward expansion appears to have become dim and distorted. Preoccupation with budget-balancing and an almost servile eagerness to bend to the will of selfish interests has been substituted for vision and courage. The pioneer has been replaced by the budgeteer. High interest rates have become more important than high dams.

The development of the West—a great storehouse of natural resources—is a challenge and opportunity for the entire Nation. America's booming population demands more space for economic expansion, for living area, and for recreation. Just space itself is an increasingly precious and scarce resource for human existence in this age of mounting urban density, air pollution, and traffic congestion.

Already the country's expanding population is spreading over the wide reach of the West. The census of our 11 Western States is growing at almost twice the rate of that of the rest of the country. And this is just the beginning.

Failure by the Federal Government to recognize and prepare more fully for this irrepressible westward movement could have disastrous economic and social effects on every section of the Nation. Preparing the West for the vast new populace certain to rise there is essential for a nation whose population is expected to soar to 370 million within just 50 years. There can be no relief from that situation if the basic development of the West is allowed to stagnate for lack of resource programs. In the East, the South, and Midwest, it would mean increasingly overcrowded urban areas and an ultimate ceiling on national development.

Fortunately, this need not happen. Federal investment in the water resources of the 11 Western States will pay huge dividends in terms of ample living space, agricultural land, and industrial expansion capable of sustaining an ever-growing citizenry. All of that will help provide and spread the revenue base, for the public services necessary for our increasingly complex society. Federal investment in the development of our water resources will also pay off by providing flood control which would save countless lives and prevent untold millions of dollars in property damage. Finally, it will stimulate to a tremendous degree a booming recreation industry that is contributing substantially to our national economy, and can do so far more in the age of shorter working hours which lies ahead.

It is simply good business for the Federal Government to recognize and invest in the vast potential of the West in the interest of the entire national economy. A study based on Federal Internal Revenue collections reveals that farmers and townspeople on and in the vicinity of western reclamation projects paid $340 million in income taxes during the 1958 fiscal year. A very sizeable share of those payments came from non-farm residents whose occupations stemmed from irrigation farming activities. Federal taxes from those areas alone have totalled $3½ billion since 1940, 11 percent more than was spent for project construction since the start of the reclamation program in 1902. These tax payments are in addition to regular project repayments which return, in the form of water and power revenues, 92 percent of the funds expended for reclamation projects.

The benefits of western development are manifest for the entire nation in private as well as public ways. Thus, a growing and prosperous West provides a constantly expanding and more lucrative market for eastern industries. The $53 billion market of the Western States was three times the export market of the United States in 1956.

For example, the turbines, the generators, the complex electrical equipment necessary for western water power projects spell jobs, prosperity and a broader tax base in Schenectady, N.Y.; Gary, Ind.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and other eastern and midwestern manufacturing centers.

Similar benefits also will accrue to the entire Nation as a result of informed and intelligent development of fish and wildlife programs, the proper use of our vast forests and rangelands and national and regional parks, throughout America.

Important as this legislation is to the West, it is even more important to the entire Nation. It is essential if we are to meet the needs of our people during the next 50 years. They will not be met by the shortsighted policies of the past 7 years. Full employment of our people in the years ahead demands full employment of our natural resources.

And may I at this point commend your committee, Senator MURRAY, for the farsighted attitude you have taken not only toward the development of our own Nation's natural resources, but also in studying the relative rate of progress of the United States and other countries in resource development.

I have in mind particularly the recent intensive study made by your committee and the Public Works Committee of the Senate of the water resource development programs of the Soviet Union. I would venture the prediction that, in the long run, the rate of development of our natural resources and of our productive capacity could have more effect on the standing of the United States among the nations of the world than our progress in missile development, for our storehouse of natural resources and our ability to use these resources wisely provide the real foundation for the strength and continued vigor of our Nation.

We should bear in mind, too, that the so-called undeveloped nations of the world—nations which in most cases are not yet committed to the East or the West—may be more impressed by the manner and rate of development of our natural resources than our armed might.

So, I commend your committee and the Public Works Committee for your study of the Russian program of water resource development. I have read your subcommittee's report with great interest, yet also with great concern. It is most disturbing and disheartening to learn that the Russians' present rate of growth in electric power capacity is faster than that of the United States. It is deplorable, too, to learn that the Russians have built bigger dams, bigger turbines, and longer and higher voltage transmission lines than we have.

For many years we took pride in the fact that Grand Coulee was the world's largest dam. Today, a Russian dam already in operation has relegated Grand Coulee to the No. 2 position, and soon another Russian dam will lower Grand Coulee to the third position.

It is significant that much of the Russians' progress and the slippage in our program have taken place during the period when our administration has expounded the backward looking, unproductive, no new starts policy—a policy which the administration has seen fit to reverse only this year as the elections approach. While the Russians, on their side of the Bering Sea, have proceeded with vigor

in building massive dams and water resource projects, we have just begun, under the prodding of a Democratic Congress, to plan the giant Rampart Canyon project on our side of the Bering Sea, in Alaska.

In the past we have not needed the example of the Russians or any other nation to think in big terms and act in big terms. I do not believe we need such examples today. The challenge is clearly here, if we but face up to it. In our great and expansive West, different time zones and different river flow conditions make obvious the need for interconnections of our regional power systems. We need extra high voltage transmission systems which will be operated on a common carrier principle to transmit power generated by both public and private power utilities. Such long distance transmission lines would not only make possible more effective utilization of our water resources, but also would provide for the best development and use of our fossil fuels. Yet, in the face of this crying need for giant transmission facilities, a recent report of the Bonneville Power Administration calls for a completely inadequate interconnection between the great Northwest and northern California systems.

I am convinced that the people of the West and the people of the Nation will not be satisfied with such myopic planning—planning that does not show faith in our future. This week, therefore, I am ordering the employment by the State of California of a consulting engineering firm to make a study of plans for a truly adequate extra high voltage transmission interconnection between the Bonneville Power and Central Valley systems. I am hopeful that other affected States will join in such a study. I want to emphasize that I am in complete agreement with our neighbors in the Pacific Northwest that in building any tie line between our regions, first rights to any usable power should remain in the region of origin for use by both public and private agencies.

The need for planning and building high voltage regional interconnections in the West—and, in fact, the entire country—is but one example of the need for the bill which is being discussed before your committee today.

To summarize, Senate bill 2549 gives promise that future Federal resource programs will receive the national attention they deserve and it holds out the promise that resource development programs will be devised on a scale and scope that the Nation's welfare demands.

In closing I call your attention to this advice inscribed on the wall behind the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives:

"Let us develop the resources of this land; call forth its power; build up its institutions; promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

MacArthur Is Authentic American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News in praise of the outstanding services to the Nation of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

MACARTHUR IS AUTHENTIC AMERICAN HERO

General MacArthur's 80th birthday was an opportunity for the Nation to express again its appreciation of the immense services he has rendered it. The general has always been a controversial figure. His personality has little of the charm and warmth that made President Eisenhower a hero with the general public. But there have been few, if any, substantial criticisms of MacArthur as a general. He has been a military man, first and last, and it is as a great general that he will be remembered long after the political controversies in which he was involved have been forgotten.

He was the architect of the strategy which led to the successful conclusion of the war in the Pacific. He dominated that sector of World War II as the European theater was never dominated by any one man. In war victory is all-important. General MacArthur won. Furthermore, he won against great odds. His achievement cannot be exaggerated. It is as great in its field as any achievement of this warlike century.

Beyond that, however, General MacArthur displayed a remarkable capacity as the American administrator of Japan when the United States entered that conquered country. It had been supposed that MacArthur would be arrogant and dictatorial, and that he would make American-Japanese relations worse instead of better. Nothing of the sort happened. He showed a real flair for handling the extremely delicate relations between the occupation forces and the Japanese. He was conciliatory and friendly. As much as to anyone, the present accord between the United States and Japan is due to him.

MacArthur is one of the Nation's great heroes, and Americans everywhere will hope that he will have many years more to enjoy the continued respect and gratitude of his countrymen.

Texas Banker Heads Commission To Plan Banking Centennial in 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in 1963, when the banks of America observe the centennial of commercial banking, they will have had the benefit of several years of intensive work by a committee headed by a Texas banker, Mr. Ben Wooten, of the First National Bank of Dallas.

It is wholly fitting that American bankers should have tapped Ben Wooten for this important job. He is a man to whom important jobs naturally gravitate, as those who know him best long ago learned. In addition to being a genius in the field of finance, Mr. Wooten is a grand human being, a citizen deeply devoted to the cause of good government, and one who has made vast contributions to the advancement of his city and his State.

The Dallas Morning News recently published an article telling some of the goals Mr. Wooten hopes to see attained in the centennial observance of American banking. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 10, 1959]

WOOTEN HEADS BANKING'S 1963 CENTENNIAL

(By Al Altwegg)

Headed by Dallas banker Ben Wooten, American banking is currently girding itself for its biggest effort.

In 1963, the banks of America will observe their centennial under the slogan "100 Years of Commercial Banking." Already a full year of planning work has gone into the programs.

Heading the planning is a special commission set up by the American Bankers Association which Mr. Wooten calls "the heaviest banker committee that's ever been appointed."

Too modestly, he adds, "Of course, the chairman—he's a lightweight."

But he proves the importance that the Nation's bankers are attaching to the centennial by pointing out that he has on his committee real heavyweights like the president of the Bank of America in San Francisco, the Nation's biggest bank, and the president of New York's Chase-Manhattan Bank, the second biggest.

Entirely independent of the centennial celebration, Mr. Wooten will also head the ABA's World Monetary Conference in Harriman, N.Y., next March.

Mr. Wooten outlined plans for American banking's centennial in a speech at the ABA convention in Miami Beach the end of October.

"Few people consider the fact that consumer credit, granted directly and indirectly by banks, keeps the levers clacking, the wheels whirring, and the goods rolling off the assembly line," he said.

Discussing his point Wednesday, he said he thought the big thing Russia's Khrushchev learned on his recent U.S. visit was the importance of consumer credit.

Mr. Wooten noted that just 2 weeks after Khrushchev returned to Russia, a system of consumer credit was started in the Communist U.S.S.R.

What the banks of the Nation hope to do in 1963 is bring home that same lesson to the people of the United States.

The occasion being observed will be the 100th anniversary of the signing of President Abraham Lincoln of the National Banking Act of the United States, which created the Office of Comptroller of the Curernncy and provided for chartering commercial national banks.

The observance will be sparked locally by banks in almost every metropolis and hamlet in the country, with talks before service clubs, essay contests, commemorative stamps and coins, proclamations, and a factual history of banking to be written by experts starting in the near future.

"What we want is for people other than bankers to put banking under the microscope and tell folks what they find," Mr. Wooten said.

He believes that banking can stand such close scrutiny by outsiders and come out looking like the constructive force in the economy that it is.

Mr. Wooten says that U.S. banking was until very recently the only system in the world where the individual can walk in and do business directly with the banks.

"Nowhere else in the world is the bank so close to the individual and the individual

so close to the bank as in the United States," he says.

And he emphasizes that it was only last year that banks in England began making consumer loans for the purchase of automobiles and other goods to individuals.

In this country, on the other hand, banks do much such financing.

In his own bank, Mr. Wooten said he found that 56,310 individuals had consumer loans last Thursday.

One think Mr. Wooten would like to see changed, as a result of the centennial celebration in 1963, is the "prejudiced folklore" about banks that is reflected in those western movies in which the banker is so often a villain.

He might even hope to see the day when Hollywood produces adult westerns in which a banker rides up in the last scene on the white horse of the hero and wearing a white hat.

Lester S. Moody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Lester S. Moody, executive secretary of the Augusta, Ga., Chamber of Commerce, received one of the U.S. Army's highest awards, the Decoration for Outstanding Civilian Service, at the chamber of commerce banquet held last Thursday night in the Bon Air Hotel at Augusta. Mr. Moody is the first resident of the Southeast to be chosen for this honor which he richly deserves.

The engraved medal was accompanied by the following citation:

For outstanding service to the Department of the Army in connection with the Corps of Engineers civil works activities in the southeastern section of the United States and the Army's military mission in the State of Georgia. From 1926 to 1959, as secretary of the Augusta Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Moody has successfully promoted broader knowledge and deeper interest in the water resources in the Southeast.

His eminent record of civil and patriotic service, his sterling character, and long-standing relationships with the military service place him in a position of such stature that his influence is widely known and felt.

In this connection, the Augusta Chronicle of January 30 had a splendid editorial, "Deserved Recognition," which I wish to include at this point under leave to extend my remarks:

DESERVED RECOGNITION

Few people in any community are more deserving of recognition and honor for public service than is Lester S. Moody, the able and indefatigable secretary of the Augusta Chamber of Commerce. His friends, therefore, and the city at large are pleased that the U.S. Army has given to him its highest award for outstanding civilian service.

The medal and citation for this service was presented to him Thursday night at the annual dinner of the chamber of commerce by Maj. Gen. F. M. Albrecht, division engineer for the South Atlantic division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who praised Mr. Moody in the highest terms possible for the contribution he has made to the area.

Not only in his unflagging efforts to promote development of the Savannah River and the water resources of the area has Mr. Moody rendered conspicuous service to the community. He has devoted time and energy to all plans for Augusta's progress and as a man, a citizen, and a friend to many has earned the admiration and affection of Augustans familiar with his tireless efforts.

The Chronicle joins the Army in saluting this outstanding citizen of Augusta.

Tribute to John W. Kemp, Recipient of Annual Award to Outstanding Physically Handicapped Person in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year the President of the United States awards a trophy as a special honor to a physically handicapped American who has surmounted his or her own handicap to become a useful American citizen; who has also helped to encourage, inspire, or facilitate the employment of other handicapped Americans.

The President's trophy—a beautiful sterling silver plaque, mounted on a mahogany base—is the handiwork of the students of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, New York City.

Regardless of sex, age, race, creed, or formal education, any such physically disabled American citizen is eligible for nomination as the Handicapped American of the Year.

Today I would like to pay tribute to the individual, Mr. John W. Kemp—a candidate for the President's trophy—who received the award for the outstanding physically handicapped person in Wisconsin. By grit, courage, and spirit, Mr. Kemp has done a splendid job not only in achieving a personal triumph over a handicap—multiple sclerosis—but also in making a constructive contribution to the life of his community.

I ask unanimous consent to have a brief résumé of Mr. Kemp's triumphant battle printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN W. KEMP, ASSISTANT CASHIER AND DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL, MARINE NATIONAL BANK, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. Kemp has been afflicted with multiple sclerosis for the past 22 years and has been confined to a wheel chair for approximately 9 years.

He has been employed at the Marine National Bank for the past 25 years, starting as a clerk, but in spite of his affliction, he has risen to his present position. His influence has been felt by many individuals, who have contacted him. He possesses a wonderful personality and radiates confidence to others who are handicapped.

Mr. Kemp is a happily married man and the father of one daughter, who is a freshman at Marquette University.

He has been a director of the Multiple Sclerosis Society for the past 4 years and a vice president for the past year. He has also been active in work for the community chest and other charitable affairs.

Walter Trohan's "Report From Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau, on the launching of his new column "Report From Washington," which will appear in the Chicago Tribune 3 days a week starting today.

I am indeed very happy to learn that Mr. Trohan, who has observed the Federal Government in Washington and followed the activities of the leaders of our Government throughout the world, has agreed to prepare such a column for his newspaper.

There are very few men in the journalistic fraternity who have had as much experience and knowledge about the functions of our Federal Government as has Mr. Trohan. Mr. Trohan's penetrating articles have brought to the people of the Midwest a better understanding of their Government for well over a quarter of a century.

In the United States we have the most complicated form of government ever devised by man; these complexities are a natural phenomenon of a nation which attempts, above all, to preserve the individual freedoms and liberties of its people. But, we, as Americans, can appreciate and respect these complexities only as long as the individual American has a thorough understanding of their significance. Throughout the years Mr. Trohan has fearlessly interpreted our intricate structure of government for his readers, and I am sure that because of his efforts the people of my own community will be better able to understand their obligations as citizens.

I wish Mr. Trohan many years of success in his new venture, and it gives me great pleasure to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his first column:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—With this effort a reporter for more than three decades unwillingly makes his bow as a columnist. More than a year of resistance to editorial reason ends herewith in acceptance of the terrifying prospect of trying to fill yawning columns every Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday with informative and, if possible, entertaining observations on the Washington and world scenes.

There is no joy or woe of the political animal that I do not know. Please bear with the personal pronoun in this initial column, because an explanation would seem to be in order. I have lived among politicians in this and other capitals continuously for more than a quarter of a century. I have eaten their bread and salt and drunk their water and wine. I have deathwatched elections and danced at the joyous nuptials of inaugurals. I have shared thousands of confidences and listened to millions of words.

I have been guilty of stringing lofty platitudes and pious incantations together for politicians so that they might shine before their fellow men. What is worse, I have had

to listen without protest while they boastfully claimed what I put together as their own. Not only have I nursed their minds, but I have also nursed their egos, which has made me something of an expert on travel in outer space. I have written their lives, chronicling their most shining deeds and their darkest hours.

LIKES POLITICIANS BUT RESPECTS FEW

Let me make it clear that I like politicians, but I can respect very few. It is difficult to take many politicians seriously and impossible to take them as seriously as they would like. Every politician likes to regard himself as the irresistible charmer, a dragon-slaying hero after the manner of St. George, and the immovable man of principle. All too often they are all too ordinary, even as you and I. We should not glorify their shenanigans even though we must suffer them in the hope that some day the ideal leader will spring from their number.

The pace on national and international sciences has become so hectic and the tempo of modern life so demanding that it would seem columns of comment and interpretation are necessary. This is in itself a tremendous responsibility because the longer I live the more I have come to believe that the most sacred and solemn act that can be performed by one who assumes the role of interpreter is to say, "I believe this to be true" or "I believe that to be false."

For many years I have served joyously, and not without profit, as your eyes and ears. I have been present where you could not be and reported on what you wanted to know. Now, I undertake to instruct. All the greatest rewards of teaching and all the dire penalties of misinformation hang about the act of passing judgment on matters which are far easier merely to relate.

FINDS JUDGMENT OF TRUTH IS NOT EASY

It is not easy to sit in judgment on truth. Pontius Pilate jested and washed his hands, because he could not recognize truth. Truth is difficult to recognize, which is why some enterpreters differ, although others refuse truth recognition for reasons best known to themselves.

Truth should never be betrayed by those charged with the duty to inform or interpret. Truth is our most important possession. A few weeks ago I heard Pope John XXIII express the wish, in a Vatican audience, that when newspaper men come to the end of their lives and are about to face God in judgment they will be able to look back and say in fulfilling their mission they faithfully served the cause of truth.

This service to truth is no easy obligation. It is something to be assumed with awe and reverence. In my case the prospect is not a little frightening. Writing a column is a challenge of itself because it involves mastery of a new technique—in my case at a comparatively late date. But, difficult as it is to write, it is far, far more difficult to think. If I fail, and well I might, it will not be for lack of trying, but more importantly it will not be because of deliberate outrage of truth.

Tribute to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, Missourians are justly proud of their many fine newspapers and, of course, of their internationally famous School of Journalism at the University of Missouri.

One of the outstanding Missouri newspapers is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, winner of many journalistic prizes and known over the Nation as a fearless, honest, objective newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Mexico, Mo., Evening Ledger be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Evening Ledger, Nov. 24, 1959]

A GREAT NEWSPAPER IS A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

The importance of a great newspaper not only to its community and State but to the Nation should never be discounted.

You may not agree with the editorial policies of such a publication. You may not agree with its political attitude, but to be a great newspaper it must be honest in its policy, objective in its presentation of the news. It must have integrity in its editorial thinking.

But it must also be fearless in its defense of the public's interest, unswayed by pressure groups, or personal considerations. Nothing will cause it to deviate from its responsible and constructive activities.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch fulfills the category adequately in every way. Alert in defense of the public's interest in all fields. Its activities in safeguarding Government from the infestation or control by hoodlums and racketeers has been marked over the years. It had much to do with cleaning up the Pendergast situation, which was a serious threat to this State not so many years ago. It has made it too hot for the hoodlums to take over Missouri's largest metropolis. It watches the public's interest at the State capital with alert attention.

There are other great papers, but just now we are talking about our St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of which as a Missourian we are justly proud. A great public servant.

John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the death of John J. O'Connor removed one of the colorful and dynamic figures who served in Congress in the early days of the New Deal. He was a man of great ability, a powerful orator and persuasive in debate. No "rubber stamp" was John. He disliked many of the Roosevelt proposals and never hesitated to express himself forcefully. He made a great contribution to the useful role of Congress by discussing fully all questions in the days when the Republicans were so weak in numbers. His independence and frankness brought down upon him the wrath of F.D.R., and he was singled out to be purged together with Senator Millard Tydings and Senator George, of Georgia. John was the only successful purge of that year and that by a very small margin.

John was chairman of the "fighting Rules Committee" of that time of which I was privileged to be a member. That fact as well as the fact that he was born in Raynham, a town in my district, brought us into close friendship. I knew well his brother Basil, a law partner of President Roosevelt, as well as the other members of his fine family. Ardent Democrats but they always voted for me for Congress. His good mother, when over 80, hired a taxi to go to the polls to help me in one of my more exciting campaigns.

When I last saw him a year ago I realized he appeared to be not as well as he was in the old days but nothing of an alarming nature.

John J. O'Connor was an outstanding Congressman and a great American. He served his country with great ability during a tempestuous period. Those of us who knew him regret keenly his passing. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Claims Court No Place for Mr. Durfee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend to the careful attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in Nashville Tennessean, a newspaper with an outstanding national reputation, on January 30, 1960. This editorial opposes the nomination of James Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the U.S. Court of Claims on the ground that he is not qualified for the position, which requires a highly technical and specialized background.

The Nashville Tennessean's interest in this judgeship is particularly pertinent, because the man whom Durfee would succeed on the court if his nomination is confirmed by the Senate is retired Judge Benjamin H. Littleton, a Tennessean. Judge Littleton, as the editorial points out, was exceptionally well-qualified to serve on the Court of Claims.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAIM COURT NO PLACE FOR MR. DURFEE

The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee is weighing the nomination of Mr. James Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to the U.S. Court of Claims, and thanks to Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, there are heavy opposition arguments to weigh.

Senator PROXMIRE has raised questions about Mr. Durfee, both on the grounds of qualifications and violations of the code of ethics of the agency he heads. And the Wisconsin Senator has documented instances in which Mr. Durfee accepted the hospitality of airlines which has cases pending before his board for weekend golfing trips and airlines flights to Mexico, Rome and elsewhere.

Senator PROXMIRE has further argued that Mr. Durfee's, a native of his own State, lacks the technical training and experience required. This is a point Mr. Durfee and his supporters can't challenge very well.

Mr. Durfee would succeed Judge Benjamin H. Littleton, who served as assistant U.S. attorney for middle Tennessee, special attorney for the Treasury Department, a member of the board, and later chairman of the tax court of the United States before joining the claims court. In contrast, Mr. Durfee has no tax or government claim experience, no actual judicial experience, or any substantial background in claims matters.

A court in which the largest and most technical civil cases in America are decided is no place for one lacking a high degree of experience and legal skill. The judiciary subcommittee thus cannot escape the obvious: Mr. Durfee won't do.

Representative Olin E. Teague Honored by Paralyzed Veterans of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERWIN MITCHELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the real pleasures I have had in serving in the House of Representatives is the privilege of being associated with, and serving under the chairmanship of the very able and distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As we know, his combat record with the Army during World War II was outstanding. His reputation for courage, ability, dedication, and just plain hard work is both well known and well deserved. Through my close association with him, I have come to admire and respect him and to consider him a warm personal friend. During his career, OLIN TEAGUE has had many high honors bestowed upon him. He is now the recipient of another, which I am sure will give him more genuine satisfaction than any of the many awards that he has earned.

For his fine work in the field of veteran's affairs and more particularly for his efforts on behalf of a small group of veterans most deserving of the Nation's gratitude, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, have presented to our colleague from Texas a beautiful bronze plaque, inscribed as follows:

Presented to OLIN E. TEAGUE in recognition of his most significant contribution to the field of paraplegia, Paralyzed Veterans of America, 1959.

I request unanimous consent also to include as a part of the extension of my remarks the full text of the letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., to our esteemed colleague, extending the award to him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Franklin Park, Ill.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The 13th national convention of the PVA, held in New York City in July of 1959, unanimously endorsed a resolution to present our national award to you in recognition of your tireless efforts on behalf of veterans.

The name "Speedy" may seem an insignificant title to give to our national award, but the attitude of our happy-go-lucky man in the wheelchair is truly significant to us. Beneath his carefree exterior lies the deadly serious business of living which he goes about every day of his life. Yet, in spite of the difficulties which beset him, his attitude betrays the fact that he can still enjoy those parts of life and society which are still open to him.

People like you, Mr. TEAGUE, have enabled him to develop this attitude by helping him overcome obstacles which proved too big for the individual and his small organization. Each and every member of the PVA wants you to know their deep gratitude and hope you will accept this small token of their appreciation.

Ours is a debt of everlasting gratitude.

Very sincerely yours,
DWIGHT D. GUILFOIL, Jr.,
President.
HARRY A. SCHWEIKERT, Jr.,
Legislative Director.

A Lesson in Utility Budgeting—Expenditures Up, Rates Down, Taxes Nil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Congress, and to our various budget officials in the executive branch, the sound financial operating record of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in California.

This public district, popularly known as SMUD, is not afraid of capital expansion nor of the high budget that steady growth requires. The board of directors of SMUD recently approved a 1960 budget of more than $53 million, which is about $10 million more than it ever spent in 1 year before; yet at the same time it expects that its average charge for electric power will go down to 1.37 cents per kilowatt-hour, one of the lowest retail rates in the country. The actual rate structure is unchanged; the decrease in the average charge will be due to increased power usage in 1960.

Furthermore, SMUD is able to do this without collecting any taxes. It finances its large construction program, as well as all its current operations and maintenance work, entirely from revenues. This includes the issuance of revenue bonds specifically authorized by the voters of the district. Some of the details of how this is being done are told in a news article in the Sacramento Bee of December 20, 1959, which I would like to offer for the RECORD. This accomplishment certainly reflects the able management of SMUD by its board of directors headed by Chairman Royal Miller as well as its operating officials headed by Paul E. Shaad, general manager and chief engineer, and James K. Carr, assistant general manager.

I know that some critics of public power will hasten to note that although SMUD does not rely on taxes for its support, neither does it pay taxes to any other agencies of government. That is true. But the taxpayers of the community still are better off because, as the article points out, the net savings to the community due to SMUD's low electric rates are about double the tax benefits that property owners of the district would receive if the electric utility system were privately owned and operated.

I ask that the news article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT SETS RECORD 1960 BUDGET BUT ELECTRIC RATES WILL BE UNCHANGED

(By Tom Arden)

While the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in 1960 will operate with its highest budget ever, users of the district's electricity will continue to enjoy one of the lowest power rates in the Nation.

Paul E. Shaad, general manager and chief engineer of SMUD, assured directors there will be no need for a change in the rate structure to finance next year's expenditure program of $53,491,000, up $10 million from 1959.

SMUD is the only major agency in Sacramento County which does not rely on taxes for support. It gets its revenue solely from its power system. Electric energy sales in 1960 are expected to bring in $19,442,161, an increase of $2,047,000. Operating expenses for the year are estimated at $10,860,000.

A large chunk of the new budget—$24,306,000—will be used for continuation of construction on SMUD Upper American River power and water project.

BOND SALE SET

SMUD will sell a second block of revenue bonds in 1960 to finance much of the work. Work underway is financed from the first $25 million block sale from a $85 million bond issue authorized by the voters in the district several years ago. Here again there are no taxes involved. Revenue from power sales will pay off the bonds.

According to general manager Shaad, the key to any successful electric system is high power usage.

In this, he noted, SMUD rates among the leaders in the Nation. In 1960, Shaad said, SMUD customers are expected to use an average of 9,037 kilowatt-hours of electric energy compared to 8,433 in 1959.

The per capita power use, Shaad added, for SMUD customers has more than doubled since January 1, 1947, when the Sacramento area electrical distribution system was taken over by the public utility from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

RATES GO DOWN

SMUD over the years actually has reduced power rates and some residential electricity rates are as much as 40 percent lower than customers would have to pay if they were served by the PGE.

While SMUD does not pay taxes, the net savings to the community because of low electric rates is said to be more than double any tax benefit property owners of the district would receive under a privately owned utility.

Because of the greater use of electricity, SMUD customers in 1960 will pay an average of 1.37 cents per kilowatt-hour for power compare to 1.42 cents in 1959.

SMUD's present source of power is entirely from the Federal Government's Central Val-

ley project. However, Shaad's budget message indicates the district will have to begin buying from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., also in 1960.

The SMUD–CVP contract provides for a maximum demand of 290,000 kilowatts. The 1960 summer peak and SMUD is estimated at 317,800 kilowatts and next December's peak is expected to be 327,100 kilowatts.

The district will pay the Federal Bureau of Reclamation about $6,180,000 for Central Valley project power in 1960 and about $260,000 to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

BIG POWER USER

It is expected the Central Valley project will provide the district 1,514 million kilowatt-hours of energy and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. another 30,300,000. Toward the end of the year the SMUD's Upper American River hydroelectric plants will get going and 23,500,000 kilowatt-hours is expected from this source in 1960.

Total power usage of 1,568,200,000 will be about 200 million kilowatt-hours higher than the amount used in 1959.

The 1960 budget contemplates payment of 4.08 mills per kilowatt-hour for Central Valley project power from the Government and 8.68 mills for power from Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Shaad explained, however, the high cost per kilowatt-hour from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. reflects the fact monthly demand payments of $34,220 are budgeted from February through June with no delivery of power during these months.

The SMUD budget reflects the growth of a district which is fast becoming one of the major utilities in the Nation.

The district expects to add 98 employees during the year to bring its total to 850.

MORE WORKERS

Shaad said 27 new workers will be needed to meet distribution system construction and maintenance requirements forecast for 1960. SMUD customers are expected to grow to 161,000, an increase of 9,000 for the year.

Eleven employees will be required late in the year for operation and maintenance of the district's hydroelectric generation facilities in El Dorado County; 16 more workers will be needed for general services; 13 for the engineering department, and 31 for the increased workload.

Recent U.S. Trade Mission to Italy Termed a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most gratifying letter from Mr. William Sword, of Wilkes-Barre, in which he sets forth his impression of the recent U.S. trade mission to Italy, of which he was a member. Mr. Sword speaks from a position of wide and varied experience in his capacity, for many years, as chairman and director of Wilkes-Barre's Committee of 100, an organization that has been very successful in encouraging new industries to locate in my congressional district of Luzerne County. It is, indeed, comforting to know that this mission to Italy was a satisfactory and constructive one.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *January 9, 1960.*
The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: First, I don't think I have officially thanked you, and of course Gene, which I hereby do, for the help that you were in having me assigned to the recent trade mission.

Officially, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I think you should know that whatever money you Members of Congress appropriate for this particular work, I believe is money very, very well spent. Excluding myself, the other three members of the trade mission, I am sure, did an outstanding job in promoting American ideals and ideas, and I am sure that the people whom we had the pleasure and honor of talking to in Italy have a better understanding of how American business operates and that the pure food laws of America apply just as well to American businessmen as to exporters from Italy. I am sure in a half dozen instances this was a very touchy subject, but when our boys finished, I am sure there was a better understanding.

I hope, in some small way, I was able to make clear to the leadership of southern Italy that it is possible for a distressed community to do something for itself rather than be completely dependent upon the Government for every improvement.

I think it is a program that could very well be expanded if possible, for it is "people to people" on a very common ground. The question and answer periods which were held on every possible occasion, I am sure clarified very much in the minds of southern Italian leadership how they might go about improving the economic conditions in their areas by some initiative on their part.

Again, I think that this program is very worthwhile and should be given every encouragement by the Congress. I would further like to spell out to you the very efficient way in which this thing was handled by the Department both in Washington and in the field. I assure you that it was a revelation to me to see the devotion that was given to this program by the interested people from the director down, and I think they should be commended for a job well done.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O. SWORD.

Progress in Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the Nation enters the decade of the 1960's, we look forward to 10 years of challenge and progress.

Across the country, forward-looking communities are laying constructive plans to take advantage of the opportunities of the future. Today, I should like to pay tribute to one such community—Superior, Wis. Possessing a deep, natural harbor, Superior is looking forward to new economic life, particularly resulting from the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. As a result of the opening of the seaway in 1959, this outstanding port has already experienced a doubling of traffic in foreign vessels, stepped-up grain and ore shipment, and extensive construction.

However, the splendid community is not putting all its eggs in one basket. As it looks ahead, plans are underway to promote progress in all aspects of complex economic life of the community.

This requires planning in a great many fields, including finance, services, construction, education, health, transportation, manufacturing, and others. In addition, they are designing and undertaking realistic plans for beautifying the community and making it a better place in which to live for its citizens.

Recently the Superior Telegram published a special progress edition, entitled "Superior—Opportunity Unlimited,' containing numerous constructive articles reviewing the way in which a community can take hold of the challenges confronting it and move ahead.

Reflecting the kind of forward-looking attitude that is the backbone of progress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful, constructive article by Mayor L. M. Hagen, entitled "City's Future Success Dependent on All," on the need for community cooperation to promote progress.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have a splendid article from the special progress edition of the Evening Telegram, outlining the specific ways in which the fine citizens of Superior are undertaking programs to pave the way for an ever-brighter future for this splendid city, also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY'S FUTURE SUCCESS DEPENDENT ON ALL

"Looking forward, the atmosphere in which we expect to produce future community success should never be taken for granted or overlooked. Every living and growing thing does best where the climate, soil, and atmospheric conditions are most suited to its needs. This truth also applies in the field of human and community accomplishments."

That's the comment of Mayor Lawrence M. Hagen, who issued the following statement for the Evening Telegram progress edition:

"All community and group success requires a mutuality of understanding. There should be common objectives and cooperative effort, where all are working together with mutual respect and common interests. Because people have various degrees of progressiveness and understanding, it is certain that there will be differences in their ideas, diligence, and methods. This points out the need for coordination and guidance. Certainly, there will be mistakes and errors in judgment. And, while errors cannot be permitted to go unnoticed, there are ways by which they can be handled without the kind of condemnation that leads to friction, lack of confidence, or loss of prestige which result in unfavorable community climate.

"The technical part of community problems may be difficult, but the real important part of our job, or any job, is usually our morale or group attitude.

"Failure almost always begins with an unfavorable atmosphere, and that has to do primarily with a community failing to work effectively and agreeably together. Fairness, understanding, integrity, and tact in people of a community are just as necessary in qualifying us for success as are technical ability and skill of your public servants.

"A governing body which truly concerns itself with society as a whole will have as its allies, the whole society. We in the city administration have endeavored to reach this goal through good solid administrative programs, accomplishments, and business conduct that is in concert with and not opposed to public good.

DECISIONS

"There is more than sentimental relationship between the city administration and citizens. It is a bone-sinew and perspiring brow relationship that all the presently intangible but very real challenges lie, to impel the community to join with its government to preserve the value of our city and help solve the unprecedented problems of the times.

"The time is practically upon us when public officials and civic minded citizens must abandon hesitant school boy fears, as the decisions which are going to have to be made in the future are almost terrifying.

"There must be boldness in imagination and design in our city. There should be a start made toward constructive citizen support toward downtown business district and north end urban renewal. These areas must be made presentable with the opening of the Superior-Duluth High Bridge in about 2 years.

"Superior, like every other city in America, is undergoing what might be called an agonizing reappraisal of its assets.

"One of a community's principal assets are its people. Their morale, pride, and enthusiasm fit into the future plans for Superior. Henry Ford once said that, 'There are not big problems. There are just a lot of small problems, and the difference between the old Model T and the new Lincoln was planning.'

"Our harbor potential is the envy of the civilized world.

"With natural gas brought into our city we have another asset toward economic growth and greater impetus. This versatile, new energy source has already been put to work at hundreds of new and branch manufacturing jobs where it has reached other communities and will do much for us in reduced and stabilized fuel costs.

"With our strategic location for land and water shipment, abundant manpower, healthful climate, harbor and industrial sites, beautiful residential areas and recreational opportunities beyond compare, and with citizens of civic-minded substance having the mental flexibility to adjust to the needs of the future, we will not fail to grasp this great challenge.

"The future success of Superior and its people must be an inside job—that is, the heartfelt support and cooperation of everyone."

LARGE GAINS SEEN IN CITY'S ECONOMIC FORECAST

Growth by land, lake, and sea keynotes Superior's progress story for 1960 with the St. Lawrence Seaway in a leading role, supported by a doubled foreign vessel traffic, stepped-up grain and ore shipments, and extensive construction.

This significant economic forecast means heavy gains in manufacturing, in retail and wholesale trade, broadened school and religious facilities, as well as more jobs for local workers.

Port executives estimate that the Twin Ports' foreign vessel trade will be at least doubled in 1960 in addition to the regular lake traffic. The Twin Ports has already exceeded some of the most optimistic expectations in seaway transportation. The seaway so far has brought an estimated $2 million expenditure to the Twin Ports in the way of tugboat service, labor, lumber, and fitting boats for grain loading, supplies, and purchases by seamen. Next year is expected to bring improved operations and tonnage increases.

The Wisconsin Grain and Warehouse Commission has increased its working force by 12 year-round men because of the vast grain movement brought about during the 1959 navigation season by the opening of the seaway. Local elevators currently, because of this steady flow of grain, now have storage space to accommodate the grain which will be brought into the city during the winter by train and truck.

Officials of the Twin Ports U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service anticipate a greatly stepped-up foreign-vessel traffic for the Superior-Duluth harbor in the 1960 navigation season which they feel will call for an increase next year in their Twin Ports staff. During 1959 the I. & N.S. officials inspected 154 oversea vessels on which were 5,277 crewmen. In addition the office inspected 145 Canadian and American Great Lake vessels on arrival from Canadian ports. These vessels were manned by a total of 6,795 crewmen.

The Great Lakes Storage & Contracting Co. which began its operations in Superior in 1950 is prepared to move ahead as the seaway develops. Since the firm started operations here, it has improved its property continuously and in 1959 constructed a steel building which was filled with 930,000 bushels of wheat. The Conner's Point dock includes 17 acres, all under concrete.

The Great Northern Railway sees favorable business conditions generally for 1960 and anticipates a considerably heavier ore movement when the Great Lakes shipping season opens in the spring. Although the steel strike seriously interrupted the ore movement this season, it failed to alter the 1959 track improvement and maintenance program to any extent.

The selection of an architect for the Superior Memorial Hospital will be made in early 1960 and construction is expected to start later in the year. The hospital will be built on a 40-acre tract on Tower Avenue, between 28th Street and South Superior, at an estimated cost of $1,800,000 to $2 million.

Architectural plans are complete for a new cathedral convent to house the 30 sisters of the Cathedral School. Also being planned for possible 1960 construction is the Newman Club Center at Superior State College.

Amundson Products will enlarge their plant this year for expansion of glass bow operations and two additions will be built on the Stockade Motel.

In the area construction picture are a new elementary school at Clear Lake—bids to be invited soon—a new wing on the Birchwood School, and a manufacturing plant for the Hiabob Hydraulic Loaders, of Ely, Minn., at Ashland.

More jobs for more local workers because of the local economic progress is the outlook of the Superior office of the Wisconsin State Employment Service. The WSES bases its forecast on the employment progress the area has made in the past year as a result of the seaway. Heaviest gains are anticipated in manufacturing and wholesale trade.

The Lakehead Pipe Line Co., of Superior, will have a $4 million allotment in a $9,300,000 expansion program announced recently by the Interprovincial Pipe Line Co., of Canada. Interprovincial's program for 1960 calls for enlargement of existing buildings at the diesel-driven pumping units at Superior and Saxon, construction of two pumping stations in Minnesota, and additional tankage at Clearbrook, Minn.

The Superior parochial schools are keeping abreast of the needs of students by introducing into the system in 1959 and 1960 various innovations and educational experiments. New courses have been added this year and new equipment provided. This progress in education will continue in 1960.

The Northern Pacific Railway expects to spend $38 million in improvements and construction in 1960 with $1¼ million allocated for the Lake Superior division. This means new rails, bridge and culvert repairs and replacements, as well as new buildings and improvements to various facilities.

Central Cooperatives, Inc., will continue its goal in 1960 of combining all of its Superior operations under one roof. They have now completed basic architectural plans for a large, modern single-story distribution center on a 40-acre plot between 28th Street and South Superior where in 1959 a modern shopping center was opened. The 1960 sales goal has been set at $18,648,000, which is a 9-percent increase over 1959.

The Superior Vocational School, one of the city's greatest assets in the educational field, continues each year to introduce new courses for the benefit of both youths and adults. During the year 1958–59, there were 1,907 people enrolled in the training program.

The Superior-Lidgerwood-Mundy Corp., one of the city's most important industrial plants, whose products are internationally known, installed a new department in the plant in 1959. The plant now manufactures bakery equipment in addition to its other products. The expansion added some 30 men to the corporation's payroll.

Carl Hanson, owner and operator of the Stockade Motel on East Second Street, will build an addition on his motel.

Holzberg's Cleaners is building an addition to the plant at 1402–1406 Belknap Street. The addition will consist of office and storage space at an estimated cost of $8,000.

The Huron Portland Cement Co., doubled its production in 1959 by constructing a clinker grinding mill at an estimated cost of $25,000. The new mill brought the total capacity of the plant to 5,000 barrels of cement per day. The cement clinkers are being transported here from the company's cement clinker mill at Alpena, Mich., the world's largest single cement mill.

A new beauty salon, modern in appointments to a high degree, was opened this year in Superior. The House of Charm is conveniently located.

The Harry Swansons opened their new pet shop at 1327 Banks Avenue, which contains an outstanding variety of tropical fish from many countries of the world, together with many types of pets.

Next door to the Swanson's shop is the new Carroll Hobby Shop, operated by Jim and Rachael Carroll and containing a complete line of hobbies, games, toys, and gifts.

Better mail delivery for Superior resulted when the Post Office Department put into service 12 new three-wheel "mailster" vehicles. Each vehicle can carry up to 500 pounds of mail. The vehicles are especially adaptable for use in cities that cover a large area.

The Superior Savings & Loan Association has moved into its new home at 12th and Tower Avenue and marked its great progress event with a 3-day open house, December 15 to 17. The new one-story building is modern in detail and designed with provisions for expansion within the present unit and provision for future enlargement as business requires. The rapid growth of the association and future projects called for the new and expanded space.

A new radio station, WQMN, owned by Quality Radio, Inc., went on the air during the summer of 1959 with the studio located at 1320 Tower Avenue, and a 186-foot tower on Maryland Avenue. The daytime station covers Wisconsin and Minnesota and features music and news.

Radio-television station WDSM; Superior-Duluth, remodeled its Superior studio at 921 Tower Avenue, during the late summer.

The YMCA camp at Lake Nebagamon will have a new craft cabin through a gift of $1,500 from the Superior Rotary Club. The cabin which will bear a Rotary sponsorship plaque, will house craft activities, office and canteen quarters for the camp.

The Soo Line Railroad conducted the impact which resulted from the long steel strike by making improvements in its service, its staff and managerial techniques, which, President G. A. MacNamara declared, are "difficult to measure in terms of dollars, but are every bit as important as improvements in equipment and fixed facilities." The company plans in 1960 to complete its central traffic control installations started this year and extend its mechanized car reporting system to embrace the entire system.

A new telephone, called the Princess, and a new piece of telephone equipment known as the Rapidial will be available to telephone users in 1960. The new telephone is the answer to many requests for a smaller telephone. The Rapidial speeds up automatic dialing. In 1959 the Wisconsin Telephone Co. hit a new high with 15,464 telephones in service in Superior, an increase of 350 over the previous year.

Link Bros., Inc., of Minong, has leased the Bensen Motors Building here and after remodeling will carry a complete line of appliances, furniture, outboard motors, boats, and other items. The firm will use the adjoining lot for expansion of the Link Ford agency used-car display.

The 1960 summer season will find Superior's parks and waysides in top shape for the comfort and pleasure of an expected influx of tourists, as well as for local residents. Pattison Park, which attracted an estimated 225,500 persons last season, will provide extended bathing facilities in the way of lockers for the bathhouse, supplemented camping facilities, and excellent roads and parking lots which will all be resurfaced.

Plans for future progress at Superior State College were accelerated this year by the realization of a long-range expansion goal. Four new buildings at a total cost of $3 million have been completed in the last 16 months. The 98-student increase over last year, previous top enrollment year, represents a percentagewise increase second largest among the Wisconsin State colleges. Besides acquisition of the new buildings and peak enrollments, Superior State College has a larger faculty and expanded curriculum.

St. Joseph Hospital has made long strides toward improved patient care in the way of additional equipment, redecoration, and air conditioning. Outstanding among these improvements is the new auxiliary-sponsored coffee shop which provides a place of relaxation for relatives and friends of patients.

Since Wisconsin legislation enacted this year provides that all territory in the State must be within a high school district by July 1, 1962, an expansion of local services to include surrounding country area is seen in the near future. This expansion could mean construction of one senior high school building, and housing all the seventh, eighth, and ninth grade students in the present two high schools.

Superior will be the center for the 1960 census in district 10, which takes in 14 counties. The local office at 928 Tower Avenue will hire 213 enumerators who will take the count in their own areas. The canvass will be on population and housing.

Superior and northern Wisconsin should benefit substantially through a recent move which calls for trucking reciprocity with Canadian Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta when the present agreement expires in July. Present agreements provide that Canadian truckers pay one-fifth of the normal license fee, and that Wisconsin truckers are granted full reciprocity in Canadian Provinces. Granting reciprocity is expected to increase the use of Wisconsin's northern highways by Canadian truckers.

A Canadian trucking firm has already informed the mayor that it will be ready to send 100 units along Highway 2 as the need requires when the new reciprocity goes into effect. The Gill-Pix Transportation Ltd., of Calgary, stated it will need 10,000 gallons of fuel oil per month on the Wisconsin route.

Building permits issued since May in the city assessor's office point to a large future construction program on residential properties. During 1959 there were 238 new units in residential ratings valued at $1,063,270, plus alterations totaling $84,605. Mercantile new construction and alterations totaled $1,147,875.

In view of a greatly advanced grain movement in 1960, encouraged by a highly successful first season for the seaway, elevator operators at the Twin Ports are now in the process of improving their grain handling facilities to accommodate the 1960 season. Improvements include dock and elevator modernization and deeper channeling of the elevator slips.

A bill for deepening 17 miles of local harbor channels, which will involve the removal of 5,500,000 cubic yards of material at an estimated cost of $5 million, has now reached Congress. The Senate Public Works Committee will hold a hearing soon to consider the deepening project. As soon as an appropriation is available the Army Corps of Engineers will let contracts in order that local and area industries may capitalize on the harbor investment as early as possible.

Port officials are making every effort possible to encourage foreign ship owners and shippers to route their vessels and cargoes through the Twin Ports during the 1960 navigation season at a subtantial savings in transportation costs. Traffic surveys and pilot shipments this year indicate a greatly broadened distribution in the future.

The Northwestern Refining Co., of St. Paul, has purchased waterfront property with plans for large storage facilities and a bulk depot with an outlet on the Great Lakes.

The Donovan Construction Co., of St. Paul has purchased land on Connor's Point for a proposed $5 million elevator.

The Fraser-Nelson shipyard is now in the heaviest winter season in its history, with 26 lake freighters winter berthed at Superior and Duluth this year. Largest project for this winter is the conversion of the bulk freighter *D. O. Mills* to a conveyor type, self-unloader which involves an expenditure of well over a million dollars.

Officials of the Lake Superior refinery, one of Superior's leading industries, are currently studying plans to double the plant's capacity. Presently the firm is engaged in an asphalt expansion program which will provide the plant with the most modern facilities for asphalt production.

The Superior Water Light & Power Co.'s $2 million gas expansion program with the arrival of natural gas in Superior, is evidence of the power company's confidence in Superior's future. The natural gas program provided additional employment in Superior and as the gas program expands through increased sales of natural gas service, further employment and job opportunities will result, the company stated.

John Lynch, chairman of the Douglas County Board of Supervisors, has outlined a three-fold plan for a strong county industrial development program and land management policy to protect the uses of county land as important county projects for 1960.

Two mining companies, the Bear Creek Mining Co. and Cerro de Pasco are testing for mineral deposits in upstate counties. Although results are not yet determined, reports appear encouraging.

The Douglas County extension office is bringing its services to more people each year with 638 families contacted this year through farm and home visits and 1,104 people calling at the office for advice on agricultural and home economics problems.

The Wisconsin Conservation Department is developing its wildlife projects in northern Wisconsin. Over 3,500 acres of land were purchased in 1959 by the game management division for wildlife projects, 2,300 feet of level ditches dug in dry marshes, three flowages constructed involving 2,469 feet of dike, and numerous other activities.

State and county highway officials are ever mindful of the important part well-groomed highways have in the development of an industrial area. Superior will take a $1-million share in the State highway program for 1960 in the way of construction of a route on U.S. 53 to connect the highway with the interchange of the Superior-Duluth high bridge. Considerable improvements in highways in district 8, including those leading into Superior, are already underway and are expected to be completed in the coming year. These include grading, structures, sand subbase course, gravel base course, curb and gutter construction, surfacing and resurfacing.

The new year will bring a number of improvements to Douglas County highways with resurfacing and bridgebuilding already planned for various areas. The projects governing chemical weed and brush control will be continued as well as the centerlining work. The year 1959 was a very successful one because of favorable weather conditions.

In turn, conservation and highway beautification experts and garden club members watch all angles associated with roadside beautification in an effort to promote neatness, provide comfortable waysides, and an attractive view of the countryside.

Force of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the present crisis in France on the Algerian problem is a matter of great concern of a worldwide nature. Its successful solution is not only vital to France, but to the free world.

In my remarks, I include an excellent editorial, "Force of Principle," appearing in the January 29, 1960, issue of the Catholic Standard of Washington, D.C.

In my remarks, I also include an article, "De Gaulle Rates Allies' Support," written by William S. White, and appearing in January 29, 1960, issue of the Washington Star, of Washington, D.C.

The articles follow:

FORCE OF PRINCIPLE

De Gaulle's hour of trial is fateful for the free world. If he and the best interests of France prevail there are sound hopes for stability in north Africa and Western Europe.

The policy under trial is not merely a test of strength with some hot-headed colonials. It is a trial of the force of principle.

De Gaulle came to power promising a reign of principle consonant with the glorious history and honor of France. Many observers thought that calling him to power was like inviting a dreamer to run an electronics plant. The problems he faced were fantastically complex, and had resisted all the solutions and compromises of the practical politicians. Despite these misgivings De Gaulle proclaimed that he would run his government on principle. Everyone who knew De Gaulle and his life knew what he meant.

De Gaulle's attempt, therefore, is a test of the force of principle applied to the most complex political situation today. To put it more precisely, it is a test of whether the principles enunciated by De Gaulle can evoke enough support among the citizens of France to succeed. It is a test of whether these citizens can bridle their natural resentment against the FLN rebels and pledge their support to a magnanimous and enlightened project that is worthy of a Christian nation. This is not to say that everything that De Gaulle and his government have done or will do is infallibly correct. But they have based their appeal on the force of principle as the correct governmental policy.

If France and De Gaulle meet this test they will deserve a unique position in the leadership of the world. They will have demonstrated that the force of principle can succeed where no other force can.

DE GAULLE RATES ALLIES' SUPPORT—FRENCH LEADER DESCRIBED AS DEFENDING FREE SOCIETY AGAINST COMMON ENEMY

(By William S. White)

For the second time in his long career, Charles de Gaulle of France is a figure of heroic resistance in a Western World that already owes him much. And that world is now refusing to give him one-fifth of the support he deserves.

Half a generation ago, this man of great haughtiness—but of great honor—staked his life and his country on a seemingly hopeless fight against the Nazi occupation of France. Raising the Cross of Lorraine as his banner, he reclaimed France's integrity and her will to resist and live.

At last, after bitter years, he was able to sit, ramrod stiff, in the cathedral of Notre Dame at a mass said on a memorable summer day in thanksgiving for the liberation of Paris.

This correspondent remembers that day, for he was present in the cathedral. And he recalls, too, the cold, total unapproachability of that remote figure in the uniform of a general of the French Armies—the personality which was then, as now, making it humanly difficult for many to pay him his due.

Perhaps Charles de Gaulle is too right, too consciously, to be liked too much.

But today De Gaulle is still standing strongly (and all but alone, too, this time, among the statesmen of the West) against the common enemy of the free society. This enemy has many faces, for different times. Some of them, like the Nazi face, are more evil than others, and so openly evil as to leave no room for argument. But all of them are destructive faces. And all of them can be spelled with the single word extremism.

Alone among the free world's leaders, De Gaulle has fully understood the true challenge of this century. Everywhere the contest at bottom is between those who wish to find imperfect, but workable, solutions and those who violently and on principle reject all solutions except the one that is quite impossible to obtain. This is the solution af absolute perfection—in their eyes.

The tragedy of Algeria lies in this. De Gaulle has worked with devotion to find a middle way. He has on the one side the Arab Algerian independence extremists who demand everything all at once. And he as the French settler extremists who really would refuse to give a single inch to the independence movement.

He is the head of a country that is an irreplaceable ally of the United States and Britain. But when all the ifs and ands and buts and maybes are stripped away, it comes to this: We and the British have hemmed and hawed with him. Why? Because we dared not be called "colonialists," even where the epithet would have been nonsense.

President Eisenhower, for example, long since publicly indorsed the moderate De Gaulle formula for Algeria. But in a subsequent showdown in the United Nations, on an extremist motion calling for support of the Algerian rebels instead, the United States said neither yea nor nay. We "abstained."

This sort of thing has made it far more difficult for De Gaulle to vindicate his middle course. He desperately needed our all-out backing, for the man in the middle is always the special target of the crackpots on both extremes of an issue.

The British have given De Gaulle even less help. And to now the thing in Algeria seems really to have got out of hand, whereas firm Allied support for the De Gaulle plan would surely have given some pause to both sets of extremists.

We and the British were afraid of this and and of that—most of all that we might offend the world's emotionalists who demand total "independence" for everybody, everywhere, by tomorrow morning. Maybe this tender regard for them is fine, in theory. But a terrible fact remains.

It is France, it is De Gaulle, who is our ally. It is not the emotional extremists, or even "the Afro-Asian bloc." And if De Gaulle falls now, France falls with him into a chaotic vacuum which will never be filled in our interests by all the "Afro-Asian blocs" and all the "independence" extremists in all the world.

Letter from Taiwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have read with great interest an article from the editorial column of the Iola Register. The article is in the form of a letter written by a former citizen of Iola, Kans., who is in the Orient with a Fulbright Scholarship Commission to teach chemistry at Tunghai University, Taichung, Taiwan (Formoa).

This letter is particularly interesting in view of the information it contains regarding the attitude of the citizens of Taiwan, their economy, and their determination to preserve the freedoms they enjoy under a democratic government.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS FROM TAIWAN

You asked about the people here. This letter is in answer to that question.

The first impression we got, and one that has been continually strengthened, is that the people are happy, contented, cheerful, and friendly. They are at work at all conceivable hours, and you see women doing construction work and men doing draft animals' work, but they take it easy. They are frequently sitting where we would be standing, laughing and chatting, taking their time between strokes of the mattock or trips with baskets of dirt on the ends of a carrying pole.

There are practically no fat ones, but on the other hand there are no children who show the spindle legs and potbellies of semi-starvation. I have seen only one beggar; Peking used to swarm with them.

Chiang Kai-shek's government is pretty good. It suffers from having no long tradition of self-government behind it, and from the feeling that still persists to a considerable extent from the days of the emperors that public office is the opportunity for private profit. But who are we to say that there is none of that in the United States? The situation here is more like that in American politics a hundred years ago, and progress is made more difficult by the absence of a foundation of Judeo-Christian morality.

But Chiang has invented a system for improving things which I believe is working. There is a department of the government the sole business of which is to investigate the workings of the rest of the government, checking for honesty, efficiency, good judgment, and obedience to the constitution. Scandals are discovered, and government officials are found to have taken bribes, but the misdemeanors are discovered and punished, instead of being S.O.P. the way they used to be when I was in China before.

I believe that the people are thoroughly behind this government, and that the government is continually improving. The flood relief and restoration have been handled very well.

The situation of the people here has been immensely improved since Chiang Kai-shek came over from the mainland. The death rate has been cut in two. Malaria used to affect 2 million people; now there is a reward offered for the reporting of any case.

An underfed population has been more than doubled in number, and is now well fed and exporting rice, sugar, hogs, pineapples, etc. Industrialization is proceeding at a reasonable rate in a sound manner. In principle, private enterprise is favored; they are working at the problem of reducing currency restriction and government ownership.

Don't let anyone talk to you about Chiang's "aging army," as though it was composed of the personnel he brought over with him. They have universal military service here, and the average age of the soldiers remains constant.

We are continually seeing training maneuvers, and the men are strong young fellows. They appear to be in good humor and are well behaved. They get lots of training. I can hear target practice every morning beginning at dawn.

People here understand the Chinese Communists better than anyone else. In the first place, they are Chinese. In the second place they are in personal contact with the people who are continually escaping, penniless and at the risk of their lives, from the Red hell on the mainland.

These refugees are the people who really know how things are under the Communists, not those who pay a visit to Peiping and are shown what the Communists want them to see, and certainly not those who swallow any of the fine words about accomplishments and intentions which Peiping puts out.

They remember what many in the West seem to have forgotten, that Peiping is responsible for civil wars in Korea, the Philip-

pines, Vietnam, Quemoy and Laos; that they invaded Tibet in cynical disregard of treaty and are busily engaged in wiping out all the tribesmen there who object to having their culture extirpated.

They know that the violent encroachments against India's frontier are completely in line with the Reds' announced and steadily maintained adherence to the use of war as an instrument of national policy, and that the Red goal is the complete dominance of Asia.

But they also know that the Peiping regime has almost completely lost the support of the Chinese people (who credulously welcomed them at the end of the Japanese occupation) and is meeting with one rebellion after another.

These have, so far, been ruthlessly and bloodily suppressed, but the army comes from the people and its allegiance to the regime is becoming less certain. A large-scale Hungary may erupt at any time.

Everybody here, including me, believes that the United States should be unremitting in its hostility to the wicked crew in Peiping. We should do nothing to increase its prestige (recognition, admission to the U.N. or to summit conferences) and anything that is possible to weaken it.

Worst of all would be to follow the stupid Conlon Report and try to recognize two Chinas, the mainland and a "Republic of Taiwan." This would be equally resented by both sides, and would sound the death knell of hope for half a billion people. All the uncommitted peoples of Asia (and probably Africa) would take it as a signal to get onto the Communist bandwagon.

I fervently hope that if and when chaos does boil up on the mainland, we will give the green light to Free China and Korea to go in and clean things up, providing all needed material and sea and air support.

EWING C. SCOTT.

Will E. Neal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Will E. Neal symbolized an unselfishness that needs to be popularized and perpetuated if America is to reap the full advantage of her human potential. Dr. Neal practiced medicine for 45 years before becoming a Member of the House of Representatives. Rather than turn to an easy life of retirement, he chose to serve where his experience and aptitude might be of further value to his community, his district, and his country.

Dr. Neal's terms of office were in the highest tradition of one who devotes his life to the brotherhood of man. His mature thought, careful deliberation, and independent conclusions produced a record of outstanding contributions in Congress. I often talked with him about matters before the House which he insisted upon considering from all perspectives, with careful study and hours of pondering constitutional implications, so that his final decision would be certain to be in the interest of the general welfare. He did not respond to hard sell approaches to issues because he felt that careful diagnosis of every problem was a prerequisite to proper voting on all legislation.

Our departed colleague was a gentleman, a scholar, and a patriot. His equanimity, judgment, and sincerity were respected by everyone regardless of party affiliation.

The thought occurs to me that Dr. Neal's life needs to be portrayed more thoroughly among our peoples, if only to dispense with the notion that a person's active participation in business, government, and the sciences should normally cease when he reaches the twilight of his career on earth. Here was a man who had passed the three-quarter-century mark before his election to Congress the first time. His keen intellect and quick step belied those years, while, unfortunately a vast majority in our midst resign themselves to a life of inactivity long before they approach that age level. By assuming Dr. Neal's vigorous attitude and optimistic temperament, countless others might find far more enjoyment and opportunity for accomplishment in their upper years.

With the passing of Dr. Neal we have lost a firm friend, a solid Christian, and a dedicated patriot. He will be mourned far and wide, not only by the multitude of men, women, and children whom he attended in his extensive medical practice, but by every American who appreciates his devotion to duty while a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Lack of Facilities for Training Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the crisis in America's program of medical education is described in some detail in a series of articles by Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance. His findings demonstrate that there is a growing reliance upon foreign trained physicians. This critical shortage of doctors is caused in part by the fact that existing medical schools do not have the facilities to admit enough students to solve this problem. With the growth of America's population, and the increase in the number of older people, many more physicians are needed to take care of the health needs of people than our schools can presently produce.

In this connection, I have proposed that a Health Services Study Commission be established to look into all aspects of the health problems and needs which our country faces. This was incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 43, introduced by me, and cosponsored by several of my colleagues. Right now, for instance, we are confronted with alarming statistics indicating that the proportion of doctors and hospital beds avaliable for our growing population is steadily declining. We had 9.7 hospital beds per 1,000 population in 1948 while in 1958 the figure had dropped to 9.1 per 1,000, despite the fact that our supply of hospital facilities has grown more than 10 percent in the last decade. Meanwhile, from 1949 to 1959 the supply of doctor of medicine physicians has dropped from 135 to 132.7 per 100,000 population and the Public Health Service has estimated that it will continue falling to 130.5 by 1970, and to 125.9 per 100,000 by 1975, which was about the ratio we had back in 1930. Therefore, appeals for increased Federal participation in the construction of hospitals and medical training facilities, and in providing scholarship aid in the form of loans or grants to medical trainees are clearly indicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles under the general heading "Our Doctor Crisis" by Benjamin Fine, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, on January 4, 5, and 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR DOCTOR CRISIS—BRIGHTEST STUDENTS BOYCOTT MEDICINE

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK, January 4.—The Nation's brightest college students are boycotting the medical profession. They are not applying for admission to medical schools.

Fewer talented students enter the schools of medicine each year. In some cases, medical schools have to scrape the bottom of the barrel to get enough students to fill their classes.

A serious shortage of doctors confronts the Nation. With the population increasing rapidly, and the number of new doctors entering the profession leveling off, the shortage will become increasingly severe. Moreover, many physicians now enter upon specialized fields of medicine, with the result that the traditional family physician is getting scarcer each year.

DANGERS CITED

The recent report of the Surgeon General's consultant group on medical education, consisting of 22 prominent educators and doctors, brought out the dangers that confront this country unless immediate action is taken. Studies made by the education research service of the Association of American Medical Colleges, and by other agencies, point to the serious crisis that is developing in medical school education.

The total number of medical school applicants is decreasing in the face of increased enrollments and graduates from colleges. In 1950, for example, 2,296,592 students enrolled in the Nation's colleges. That year 22,279 students applied to medical schools. But, with 3,258,556 students in college in 1958, only 15,172 men and women sought admission to schools of medicine.

Ironically, many students do not apply because they have heard how difficult it is to get into a medical school. Many apply to 10, 20, or even 30 schools. Actually, the total number that apply, while going down, does not tell the full story. More than half the medical schools have residence requirements—they admit students only from their own State, or from the immediate region.

Accordingly, some State medical schools have very few students from which to choose, while others, particularly the private col-

leges in the East, may have 20 or 30 applications for each vacancy.

"A" STUDENTS FEWER

The percentage of students entering medical schools with an average grade of A has been decreasing.

College grade average for first-year medical students:

	Percentage	
	1950–51	1957–58
A	40	18
B	43	66
C	17	16

Moreover, the Journal of Medical Education reports that the scores of all first-time applicants for each of the years from 1952 to 1957 show that a decline has occurred, as measured by the medical college admission test. Another indication of lowered quality: The percentage of students withdrawing during their freshman year in medical schools increased from 5.5 percent in 1954–55 to 7.8 percent in 1957–58. Fewer students were available for the second year from the 1957–58 class than from the 1956–57 class.

Why, in the face of a grave need, has the number of students, and the academic quality of these students, decreased?

Various reasons are offered by authorities. The competition from other professions is increasing. During the last decade the number of persons who have gone for the Ph. D. degree has grown more rapidly than the number entering the medical profession.

TIME IS A HANDICAP

The length of time it takes to complete a medical education has become a serious handicap to many. The would-be doctor must go 3 or 4 years to an undergraduate college, 4 years to the medical school, and from 1 to 6 years in internship and residency or fellowship training. It is not unusual for a medical student to train for 10 or 12 years before he can open his own office.

Cost is an important factor, too. A recent study shows that the average annual cost is $2,386 for unmarried medical college students and $3,271 for married ones. Sixty percent of the graduating students are married. And it appears likely that another round of tuition raises is about to take place.

Medical school tuition is higher than other tuition fees in the same university. And when he has completed his 4 years, the student must accept an internship or residency which will pay him little more than a subsistence wage.

The Journal of the American Medical Association warns that medicine must make active efforts to inform young people of the challenges this profession offers or it will suffer a serious loss of the best young talent.

The Surgeon General's report makes a number of specific suggestions. It urges that medical students be helped through State and Federal scholarships and loans. It urges that States that do not offer medical facilities to their students take steps to remedy this situation.

OUR DOCTOR CRISIS—8,400 ALIENS IN UNITED STATES HELP BRIDGE SHORTAGE

(By Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK, January 5.—On last November 7, Martyn Green, celebrated English Gilbert and Sullivan star, parked his car on an automobile elevator in a private garage here.

As the elevator started to rise, Mr. Green stepped out of the car to check a knocking he had heard in the engine. Somehow, his foot slipped from the elevator. It was crushed between the rising platform and the wall.

More than half an hour later, using a policeman's penknife, Dr. P. Shamsuddin, a 25-year-old Knickerbocker Hospital intern from Madras, India, amputated the badly crushed left leg of the actor at the scene.

At a press conference later, Dr. Shamsuddin criticized the hospital. The ambulance which brought him to Mr. Green, he said, did not contain proper equipment. The hospital in turn, while praising the intern's surgical skill, produced statements that he had to be called three times before he responded to the emergency case.

Dr. Shamsuddin left the country a week later. The story, including his charge that New York hospitals were less adequate in training facilities than those in his native land, soon dropped from the headlines.

EIGHT THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED ALIEN DOCTORS

But perhaps its most significant aspect was not noticed. For Dr. Shamsuddin was but 1 of 8,400 physicians from 91 countries serving in 846 U.S. hospitals last year. In 1951 only 2,100 aliens were serving as interns and residents in America.

Comments the recent report of the U.S. Surgeon General's consultant group on medical education: "These figures raise the question of whether this country, with its wealth, should be dependent on other nations for a net inflow of physicians to serve our people, when there are so many urgent needs for medical service in other parts of the world.

"In no other field of education is there a situation in which the United States draws to the same extent on persons educated in other nations to maintain its high level of service."

NEED GROWS GREATER

Medical education simply is not keeping pace with this Nation's health needs.

A gap exists, and is growing wider, between the country's need for physicians and its capacity to produce them. At present the 85 medical schools graduate about 7,400 doctors a year. But by 1975, the authorities say, the Nation will need at least 11,000, an increase 3,600 graduates.

And this will mean, according to the Surgeon General's group, between 20 and 24 new medical schools, at tremendous cost. The report recommends that the Nation launch a billion-dollar program to expand and strengthen the existing medical schools and construct two dozen new ones.

The Federal Government would be called on for half this amount—about $500 million spread over 10 years. The rest would come from foundations, corporations, philanthropists and industries. Medical education is mighty expensive. Many believe private sources alone cannot carry the financial load.

MANY TRAINED ABROAD

Many of the 249,000 physicians practicing in the United States have been educated in other countries. In 1958 a total of 7,809 physicians were licensed to practice for the first time in this country. Of this number, 150 were graduates of Canadian schools and 1,166 of other foreign schools. Four hundred American students who had gone abroad to study medicine were in this group.

So 17 percent of the physicians who entered practice last year received their medical education in countries other than the United States. The report of the Surgeon General shows that the number of foreign graduates admitted to practice in this country has increased greatly in recent years. In 1950 only 458 doctors from outside the United States were licensed to practice medicine here. In 8 years the number has just about tripled.

In New York, typical of other large cities, foreign medical school graduates comprise nearly half of the interns and residents at the hospitals. The national average is 33 percent.

TO RAISE QUALIFICATIONS

Although the foreign students fill an important need for interns, they are for the most part unfamiliar with the English language or with the American standards of clinical practice, according to the Hospital Council of Greater New York. Many hospitals look on foreign interns as a cheap form of labor.

Stiffer qualifications for the foreign trained interns is in prospect. Next summer the Education Council for Foreign Medical Graduates will begin testing foreign doctors' knowledge of English and professional training before permitting them to be employed in the United States.

Of the 5,200 doctors in the New York City hospitals, 2,700 are graduates of United States and Canadian medical schools. About 500 more are American citizens trained abroad. The rest are aliens. The new tests are expected to result in a 30 percent failure rate for the foreign interns. This will still further aggravate the serious shortages that now exist.

The proportion of physicians engaged in the private practice of medicine has decreased from 86 percent in 1931 to 69 percent in 1957. What is even more significant, the proportion serving as family physicians has declined over this same period from 75 to 45 percent.

ENTER OTHER FIELDS

Physicians are now employed in hospital service, teaching, research, industry, administration, and other types of institutional practice. This may help modern medicine reach new heights. But it also reduces the proportion of physicians in private practice.

Actually, the ratio of physicians in private practice to population has dropped from 108 per 100,000 in 1931 to 91 per 100,000 today. The Surgeon General's report predicts that if present trends continue, the ratio will drop to 85 per 100,000 by 1975.

The number of physicians engaged in full-time teaching, research, public health, industrial medicine, military service and all other activities except private practice has quadrupled in the last 30 years.

More than 25,000 physicians are spending all or part of their time in teaching or research. Another 10,000 physicians are in military service. State and local health departments employed 2,300, while the same number were found in industrial medicine.

BECOME SPECIALISTS

To add to the shortage of family doctors, many physicians now become specialists. In 1931 only one private practitioner in six considered himself a specialist; by 1940, one in four. And today, half of all physicians in private practice limit themselves to specialty practice. The number of family physicians has decreased from 117,444 in 1931 to 102,000 in 1957.

"If the minimum goal of maintaining present ratios of physicians is to be met," the Surgeon General's report concludes, "the present medical school facilities must be increased substantially and new schools must be established."

OUR DOCTOR CRISIS—BIG MEDICAL SCHOOLS PROGRAM URGED IN UNITED STATES

(By Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK, January 6.—A billion-dollar program to strengthen medical education in the United States is needed at once if we are to meet the growing shortage of physicians.

Today the United States has 85 medical schools and 6 schools of osteopathy. Forty-five of these schools are privately endowed. Since 1940, three new private and five public medical schools have been established. Medical schools are most heavily concentrated in the Northeastern United States. Nine States have no medical school.

But medical schools have not kept pace with the population growth in this country. A study recently completed by the consultant group on medical education, appointed

by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, reports that this Nation faces a critical shortage of doctors. The existing medical schools cannot possibly admit enough students to solve the problem. Even if they receive more funds, the existing schools could expand only to a slight degree.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS NEEDED

Those who have studied the situation propose a vast system of new medical schools for the country. The Surgeon General's report recommends from 20 to 24 new schools, to be located in various parts of the United States.

A growing America will need more physicians, the report stresses.

But it will be costly to add 20 or more new medical schools. Few private universities will be willing to undertake this gigantic task. The budgets for the medical schools are usually much higher than for the rest of the college. The report of the Surgeon General estimates that the average medical school, with an enrollment of 400, has an operating budget of $1.5 million annually. This is supplemented with Federal research funds.

EINSTEIN COLLEGE CITED

One of the newest medical schools in the country, under private auspices, is the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, in New York. This medical school graduated its first class last June. It now admits 100 students a year. The total cost of the medical building together with the two hospitals that are part of the medical center, will be close to $100 million.

The university embarked on this project 5 years ago under the direction of its president, Dr. Samuel Belkin. Despite the tremendous drain on the university budget, the medical school has become a vital part of the institution. The newest aspects of medical training have been introduced.

"I believe that higher education should assume some of the responsibilities of providing trained medical men for this country," Dr. Belkin observed, in explaining why the Albert Einstein College of Medicine was founded. "It is essential that additional facilities be offered for the welfare of our Nation."

MANY SOURCES MUST HELP

The greatest obstacle to expansion of the Nation's medical schools and construction of new schools is money. To secure the $30 million that was needed to found the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Dr. Belkin served as consultant and adviser to the board of trustees and covered literally every part of the United States during the development campaign.

But private funds alone will not be sufficient to build new medical schools. Few private institutions will be willing to undertake the tremendous task of getting the $50 million or so that is necessary to launch a new grade A medical school. The support must come from many sources: State and local appropriations, endowments, gifts, and grants, and from the Federal Government.

"The Federal Government over a period of the next 10 years should appropriate funds on a matching basis to meet construction needs for medical education," the Surgeon General's report declared. "When Federal funds become available to aid medical education, a National committee should be established to advise the Surgeon General on the administration of such funds."

STRONG FACULTY STRESSED

The importance of a strong faculty must not be overlooked. There is a growing shortage of competent faculty members. Among medical schools today the variation in faculty size is great. The number of faculty members ranges from fewer than 100 to more than 300. Schools with large programs for research, medical care and training of residents and Ph.D.s have relatively large faculties.

The ratio of faculty to students is high. A third of the schools of the United States have an average of seven equivalent full-time faculty members to 10 students—280 for a school with 400 students. For the middle third of the schools, the average is four faculty for 10 students, or 160 for the 400-student school. The low third averages three faculty to 10 students, or 120 full-time faculty members in a 400-student school.

The consultation group feels this average for the bottom third of the schools can be considered a minimum acceptable level if it includes a balance of full-time and part-time teachers. A faculty of at least this size is necessary to insure the minimal research and medical service which the proper medical educational environment requires.

Medical education faces a serious challenge in getting an adequate number of faculty members. In recent years some medical schools have been unable to get the faculty they needed, even though the positions were in the budget.

HIGH QUALITY VITAL

A warning is issued by the Surgeon General's committee that expansion must not proceed at the expense of quality. Back in 1910 the late Abraham Flexner made a study of the 150 medical schools that existed at that time. More than half were found to be completely inadequate, and doing a poor job. The resulting uproar forced them to close, and indeed, brought about a revolution in medical education.

The medical profession and the public would not permit such conditions to return. However, this country can have both quality medical education and quantity. It seems absurd to have to depend in large part for our medical staff upon foreign countries. Our standards, by and large, are higher than those found in any other country of the world.

PROPOSALS

These recommendations are made by the Surgeon General:

New medical schools should be established only with the type of faculty, facilities, financing, and university affiliation that will allow them to carry out a satisfactory educational program for a well-qualified student body.

Greater attention must be given to the problems of existing schools whose educational plants or programs are now inadequately financed.

Schools should consider the effect of unreasonably restrictive admission policies on the quality of their students and the need for a student body with diversified interests and background.

There must be continuing appraisal of the length and content of the medical curriculum, including evaluation of experiments being made to shorten the period of training.

The shortage of doctors in this country is serious. As our population grows, the shortage will become more pronounced. Everything must be done to prevent the medical profession from deteriorating. The time has come as the Surgeon General points out, for action.

Excerpts From an Address by Senator Joseph S. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to place in the RECORD excerpts from the speech of Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, made on Friday, January 29, 1960, at the Roosevelt Day luncheon of the Allegheny County Democratic Committee, Pittsburgh:

"I am confident," said Senator CLARK, "that we will elect a Democrat President and win for our party control of the State senate while we are about it. There are four reasons for this belief:

"First, we are the majority party in both Pennsylvania and the Nation. The 1958 and 1959 elections proved that.

"Second, this year we will be running against real Republicans, not a national military hero. The issue between the parties will be clearly drawn. Simply stated, it is democracy against plutocracy. The choice is clear.

"Third, our candidate for the Presidency will be running against RICHARD NIXON. The people of this country have too much commonsense to elect as their President either the old NIXON or the new NIXON.

"Fourth, Mr. NIXON must run on the Eisenhower record. In Walter Lippmann's trenchant phrase, the Eisenhower administration has put 'private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race [with international communism] because we are not allowed to run.'"

Senator CLARK deplored the emphasis given to what he called "popularity polls."

"The partisan press," he said, "is already consigning us to defeat—but elections are not won on Gallup polls in January. It is the official count at the ballot box in November which determines who wins.

"We all remember 1948. Let us also observe how close the parallel is between Mr. NIXON and Mr. Dewey."

CLARK stated that the Republican issues of "peace, prosperity, and progress" would break down under Democratic attack. "It is we, not they," he said, "who are taking the lead for peace through disarmament and a revision of the United Nations Charter.

"It is we, not they, who are advocating the governmental policies necessary to achieve lasting prosperity: an end to tight money and high interest rates, a first-class educational program, adequate aid for depressed areas, and an equitable tax system which will give us the revenues to reduce our national debt and still meet our responsibilities at home and abroad. It is we, not they, who understand the need for strong governmental action to assure progress through sustained economic growth and a rededication to the spiritual principles which made our country great."

Senator CLARK cited an editorial reprinted by the Washington Post from the New Republic which, he said, well described the Eisenhower thesis. The President's message, the editorial said, is "save now, be strong later; save now, educate later; save now, cure unemployment later; save now, reclaim our towns and cities later; save now, research later the cause and remedy for mortal disease; save now, build housing later; save now, clear the air later; save now, purge our streams later; save now, nourish later the people—and the hopes—of new nations."

"The American people," the Senator continued, "are getting ready for the coming political breakthrough. We can achieve it by sending a Democrat to the White House supported by a Democratic Congress next year. Our only danger lies in apathy and a failure to take the initiative. We must stick to our party platform, pass the bills we said we would, let the vetoes fall where they may, and carry the issues to the country. I refuse to believe that the American dream has become so faded that we will continue to

shut our eyes to overcrowded schools, underpaid teachers, inadequate colleges, hospital shortages, old people without medical care, men and women working at poverty wages, polluted streams, slums in our cities, a stagnant economy and unemployment areas shifting for themselves, and all this for the purpose of providing another tax cut for the rich and well-to-do.

"Only under our party can our country redeem itself and move forward to national well-being at home, national security abroad, and that sound and idealistic world leadership to which our destiny calls us."

Charles H. Perkins Is Honored by All-America Rose Selections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. Charles H. Perkins of Newark, N.Y., was recently honored by the rose industry of America when All-America Rose Selections, Inc., presented him with a plaque in recognition of his long service to the gardening public. It is fitting that this organization, which includes the Nation's leading growers and introducers, should honor this important person in the rose industry.

Mr. Perkins has been a leading figure on rose matters for 60 years. He is a founder, charter member, past president, and for many years was chairman of the publicity committee of All-America Rose Selections. He has been president of Jackson & Perkins Co. of Newark, the world's largest rose growers, for many years.

His activities have not been limited to the rose field. He is widely known as an outstanding citizen and fine gentleman whose friends are legion. Mr. Perkins has been especially interested in the selection of the rose as our national flower, a goal which I share with him, and which has recently been given great impetus as the result of a national poll showing the rose is by far the favorite bloom of the American people.

As a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 63, to designate the rose as our national floral symbol, I hope the results of this nationwide balloting will spur favorable action. As a Senator from the State where the finest roses are grown, approval of this resolution would give me special pride.

In the meantime, I have noted with great interest the recent honor bestowed on my good friend, Charlie Perkins. A fine editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently called him a most estimable gentleman. I agree wholeheartedly with that, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WELL-DESERVED HONOR

It may mean nothing to a lot of people to learn that Charles H. Perkins of Newark, N.Y., has received the All-America Rose Selections, Inc., plaque for long service to the rose and gardening public. But to those who, even now, are poring over catalogs, and who later will labor, lovingly, with roses, it means a very great deal.

Mr. Perkins, president of the Jackson & Perkins Co., has been in the rose industry for 60 years. He was one of the founders of All-America Rose Selections, which tests new roses, and which has had much to do with improving this beautiful flower.

We—who hold the rose in the highest esteem—congratulate Mr. Perkins on his well-merited honor, and we wish we knew one ten-thousandth as much about roses as this most estimable gentleman.

The least the rose bloc in Congress could do, it seems to us, is to have the event noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gen. Mark W. Clark, U.S. Army, retired, as it appeared in This Week magazine of January 31, 1960.

General Clark is now president of The Citadel, Military College of South Carolina. He fought in two world wars. In 1943–45 he led the victorious Allied armies in driving the Germans out of Italy. After serving as U.S. High Commissioner for Austria and Deputy Secretary of State, he succeeded General Ridgway as Allied commander in Korea. What we need today is more honor in every field of endeavor.

His article follows:

HONOR

(By Gen. Mark W. Clark)

I have always believed that everyone needs to impose upon himself some rigid code of personal ethics. The Ten Commandments are probably the most perfect example of such a code.

But it seems to me that young people, who perhaps need rules of conduct the most, tend to shy away from long complex lists of "do's" and "don'ts." That is why we at The Citadel have established our honor code which consists of just one rule expressed in nine words: "A cadet does not lie, or cheat, or steal."

Just nine words. But what important words they are, for without them none can hope to build a decent or a happy life.

Of course, The Citadel's honor code is only a beginning. Of course, our 2,000 cadets know that there is more to character than merely not lying, cheating, or stealing. But these negatives are important as a starting point. A man can then go on from these "don'ts" to more positive rules of life. If as a boy, he learns what not to do, then as he matures the positive values will slowly move into place. "Do unto others * * *." "Love thy neighbor"—these "do's" are the true capstones of a moral code. But the "don'ts," learned in childhood, are its foundation.

Employment of Negro Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a particularly serious example of the denial of equal employment opportunity because of color, occurring in the Nation's Capital, has been eliminated by the agreement of the Reinforced Rodmen's Union to make possible the employment of qualified Negro workers. This is a small but important victory which makes jobs on Federal construction projects in the Nation's Capital available to all workers on an equal basis, and it is hoped that it will spark the elimination of discriminatory practices which have involved contractors, trade unions and the President's Committee on Government Contracts in lengthy negotiations.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Patience and Pressure," which appeared in the Washington Post on January 29, 1960, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATIENCE AND PRESSURE

District Commissioner McLaughlin was able to report last week a significant step toward breaking down racial discrimination in Federal construction projects in Washington. The Reinforced Rodmen's Union has finally agreed to hiring practices which will insure referral and employment for a limited number of qualified Negro rodmen. This bit of progress was brought about by a combination of patience and pressure. Victor Daly of the Council on Human Relations and Irving Ferman, executive vice chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, share credit with the Commissioner for the achievement. We hope that they will now move forward with equal resolution to end racial discrimination by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers which nakedly excludes Negroes from membership, and thus from jobs on major Federal construction projects.

Although the source of discrimination in hiring undoubtedly lies in the practices of some of the building trade unions, it is impossible to absolve contractors from a major measure of responsibility. Every Government contract has a nondiscrimination clause requiring the contractor to hire on merit. That clause has gone unenforced for far too long. The President's Committee on Government Contracts has rendered a most useful public service in bringing this situation to light and in urging contract compliance; it has no enforcement power, however.

The General Services Administration, which lets contracts for Federal office buildings, and Congress itself, which lets contracts for construction on the Capitol and on congressional office buildings, have direct responsibility for seeing to it that nondiscrimination is made a reality. Denial of jobs because of race is ugly business in any area. It is especially obnoxious when the Government of the United States is involved.

Garrison Diversion Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise my colleagues that the North Dakota County Commissioners Association has gone on record supporting the early development of the Garrison Diversion Unit. Resolution adopted at their recent convention follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTING THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT—ADOPTED AT CONVENTION AT WILLISTON, N. DAK., JANUARY 12–14, 1960

Whereas the development of the Garrison diversion unit in North Dakota will provide the citizens of North Dakota an opportunity to beneficially use their fair share of the water from the Missouri River for irrigation, municipal water, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, lake restoration and other multiple uses and will replace, in part, the lost land resource resulting from the contribution of the State of 548,000 acres of Missouri River bottomland for use of Missouri River mainstem reservoirs; and

Whereas the new opportunities that will be provided through the development of the project, particularly in the project area, will increase and stabilize the agriculture, business, and industrial income in the State and will be the basis for more jobs, more business establishments and more people, thus reversing the trend of a static or declining growth in the State; and

Whereas the development of the Garrison diversion unit will benefit all sections of the State of North Dakota through a broadened tax base, new industrial development and a readily available stable and bountiful feed supply for nonirrigated areas of the State during periods of drought; and

Whereas irrigation development as will be provided in the project area will permit the establishment of an expanded livestock enterprise in the State, enhancing the welfare of the agricultural economy of the entire State and at the same time permitting North Dakota farmers to direct their production of food to meat products and reduce their contribution to the surplus problem resulting from the production of wheat and other cereal grains; and

Whereas the farmers and others in the project area have demonstrated their enthusiastic support of the Garrison diversion unit and for its early development through the organization of irrigation districts and continued efforts to obtain the approval of the project by Congress and the agencies of the Federal Government concerned; and

Whereas bills have been introduced in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives of the 86th Congress that propose certain modifications to the authorization of the Garrison diversion unit and it appears that hearings by the appropriate committees of Congress on these bills can be scheduled if the project report is transmitted to Congress at an early date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota County Commissioners Association at their convention duly assembled at Williston, N. Dak., January 12–14, 1960, That this association wholeheartedly endorses the early construction and development of the Garrison diversion unit and urges the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior to transmit the report on the Garrison diversion unit to Congress at an early date and further urges the Congress of the United States to approve the project and the modifications to its authorization as proposed in bills now pending before it, and appropriate adequate funds to initiate construction of the project works without delay; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and NORMAN BRUNSDALE; Congressmen DON L. SHORT and QUENTIN N. BURDICK; the Secretary of Interior; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Commissioner of Reclamation; Gov. John E. Davis of North Dakota; the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission and the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District.

Our Next President—Roy Roberts Wants Eisenhower Qualities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in this political year, most everyone is thinking and talking politics. One of the keenest observers in the Nation in regard to political trends and the thinking of the people is Roy Roberts, president and general manager of the Kansas City Star.

Mr. Roberts started his early career as a newspaper reporter under the tutelage and guidance of William Allen White. In his early newspaper training, as a member of the Kansas City Star staff, Mr. Roberts spent many years in the Senate Press Gallery, prior to returning to Kansas. On his return to Kansas, he held many important positions in the Star office; and he is recognized as the outstanding newspaperman in the Middle West.

In an interview with Frank K. Kelly, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, Mr. Roberts discussed our next President. The article on the qualities he stresses for our next President should be read by everyone.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the interview with Mr. Roberts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1960]

OUR NEXT PRESIDENT—ROY ROBERTS WANTS EISENHOWER QUALITIES

(By Frank K. Kelly)

Published in Missouri but widely circulated in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa and other farm States, the Kansas City Star has reported on "the bread basket" center of the country for more than 70 years. During much of that time, Roy Roberts has been the paper's most active man—as a reporter, as an editor, as a political figure. He is now president and general manager of the Star.

A huge man with a hearty, happy face, a booming voice and a ready laugh, Mr. Roberts approaches the future with exuberance. Age hasn't dulled his interest in the Nation's course.

"Our problems may get tougher, but our opportunities become greater with the years," Mr. Roberts said, when I sat down to talk with him. "The years ahead are going to be exciting. We have a marvelous world, growing and changing all around us."

What would it take to make a man a successful President in the 1960s? Mr. Roberts didn't pause.

LIKES EISENHOWER QUALITIES

"Some of the qualities Ike is now showing," he said. "Tackling the big problems in a big way Ike's always had the stuff. The new Ike is simply the old Ike gone to work harder than ever. The departure of Sherman Adams was a great thing for Ike personally. He wasn't meeting enough people, talking to enough people. Now he's doing it. He's showing what he's capable of. He's in there swinging."

True enough, Mr. Eisenhower seemed to be swinging hard at the international problems—the cold war, the Berlin crisis, disarmament, and other foreign policy issues. But about our problems here in the United States—the farm problem, for example—what could Mr. Eisenhower or the next President do about that? I told him that most midwesterners seemed to believe the problem is very hard to solve.

PROBLEM SEEMS TOUGHER

Mr. Roberts looked baffled. "The farm problem seems tougher every year," he said. "I used to think I knew what we could do about it, but I don't anymore. The farmers are moderately well off, but they're not happy. They don't think they're getting a fair share of the national income."

I recalled that the price indexes in recent months had shown the price of farm products at about 89 percent of the 1947–49 level, while the price of finished goods was around 128 percent.

"No President can cure all the farmer's ills," Mr. Roberts said. "Any candidate who promised to do that would be lying."

I urged him to outline for me his ideas on the personal qualities the White House occupant of the 1960's should have.

"The basic things are trite," Mr. Roberts said. "The man must have commonsense—enough to cut through to the heart of very complex questions without getting confused by the ramifications. He must have impeccable integrity—so that the people believe in him and trust him. He must rely on solid ability—not on glamour or big promises. He must know the world picture and understand it thoroughly."

Mr. Roberts paused, his round face taking on lines of solemnity. "And he must have an endless amount of patience. He can't get mad at people. He can't let his emotions throw us into war."

He thought that national problems were now so complicated that we had to depend on the President to make major decisions which might have been subjected to popular debates in other periods of our history.

CAN'T AFFORD MEDIOCRITY

"That's why we can't afford a mediocre President anymore," Mr. Roberts said. "We're fortunate in having a number of highly intelligent men available. Just to name two of them, I'd cite LYNDON JOHNSON and DICK NIXON. JOHNSON is one of the ablest men I've seen in the last 30 years. NIXON as Vice President has been trained for the top job. NIXON has grown a great deal, learned a lot.

After my talk with Mr. Roberts, I drove north and west to Lincoln, Nebr. As I traveled I raised the questions I had put to other people in other States. I found the Nebraskans, like the people of the East and South, more concerned about the preservation of peace than anything else.

Some of them were far from being enthusiastic about the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, but very few attached any blame for the defects of the farm program to the President. The President, they felt, was

struggling to save the world from the catastrophe of an atomic war—and this was his primary job: To be a world leader.

Let's Put Our Ex-Presidents in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable James A. Farley which will appear in the February 7, 1960 issue of This Week magazine:

LET'S PUT OUR EX-PRESIDENTS IN THE SENATE

(By James A. Farley with Jack Harrison Pollack)

At the dedication of the Truman Library in Independence, Mo., a few years ago two former Presidents of the United States met. Half ruefully, half jokingly, Harry S. Truman asked Herbert Hoover:

"Just what is the role of a former President?"

After a thoughtful pause, Mr. Hoover answered: "The only thing for an ex-President to do is to take pills and dedicate libraries."

Yes, our former Presidents have kept their senses of humor. But what they were talking about is no laughing matter. It's a tragedy—not so much for the ex-Presidents themselves as for our country.

We have often been guilty of wasting our national resources. Right now we are wasting a supremely invaluable one: the wisdom and experience of our former Chief Executives. We have two, now. Next January 20 we will have another: Dwight D. Eisenhower. His experience, both as general and President, and his firsthand acquaintance with world leaders, will make him extraordinarily valuable—provided we don't push him off into the sidelines and forget him.

But that's exactly what we're going to do unless we take a simple but highly important step: pass a statutory law making all former Presidents lifetime, nonvoting Senators at large. I am convinced that this is the best possible way to keep and use the wisdom and abilities of our Presidents after they leave the White House.

In the Senate a former President would be constantly available to Congressmen needing his help and advice. Any former President, whatever his party and whatever his record as President, acquires a vast amount of information and insight that Members of Congress and the general public can never have. This is the priceless experience that we are wasting.

WHERE EX-PRESIDENTS COULD HELP MOST

Further, a former President would find the Senate an excellent forum in which to speak out on major policy questions. This would be especially important in foreign and military affairs, areas where a retired Chief Executive would have substantial special knowledge. Since he would not represent any State or section, and would not have to worry about reelection, he could speak with exceptional force and freedom.

Bills to make ex-President Members of the Senate have been introduced in Congress. Most of these bills would grant all senatorial privileges except the right to vote, which would require a constitutional amendment. I hope one of these bills is passed during the present session, because this reform, long overdue, is more important today than ever.

One reason is that we may now anticipate that future Presidents, including the one to be elected this year, will leave the White House with many years of service still before them. Most of the present leading candidates for nomination are comparatively young men: Vice President Nixon is 47, Senator Kennedy is 42, Senator Humphrey 48, Senator Symington 58, Governor Brown 54. And no matter who is elected he will not serve more than 8 years because there is now a two-term limitation on the Presidency.

For that matter, even in the past most Presidents had many years still before them when they left the White House. You may be surprised to learn, as I was, that 25 of our Presidents before Eisenhower lived an average of 11 years in retirement. That's 275 years of potentially valuable service wasted.

There is a human side to the question, too. In the past a former President has often been in actual financial need. In 1958 Congress finally gave every former President a pension and funds for a staff and office to handle his enormous correspondence.

But from the human point of view, that isn't much. A man who has held the greatest office in the world is bound to feel neglected and left out of things when he is suddenly retired with nothing to do. In many cases, this has led to bitterness and tragedy in a President's final years.

There have been some happy cases of an incumbent President wisely using the services of a predecessor on a special assignment.

During the Truman administration, former President Hoover directed the highly successful Hoover Commission which helped reduce Government inefficiency. Similarly, back in 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt made Grover Cleveland chairman of an effective body which investigated the bitter anthracite coal strike.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S WASTED YEARS

But these cases are rare. More typical of what happens to a President after leaving office is the case of Theodore Roosevelt. This dynamic man who was barely 50 when he finished his second term, wanted to run again but refrained because of his 1904 pledge that he wouldn't be a candidate in 1908. So instead he went big game hunting in Africa for a year. But in 1912 when the Republicans renominated Taft, Roosevelt bolted the party to run for President again himself as a Progressive, or "Bull Moose." Democrat Woodrow Wilson easily won in this three cornered election, and because I strongly believe in America's two party system, I don't think that Theodore Roosevelt added to his glory by becoming identified with this short-lived third party.

During the 10 years after he left the White House, restless Teddy Roosevelt dissipated his energies in so many directions that in 1919 he died an unhappy, embittered man. What a pity that this brilliant ex-President wasn't given a dignified, constructive job in the U.S. Senate where his versatile and inexhaustible vitality would have aided the country.

CONGRESSMEN FAVOR IT 4 TO 1

In spite of such conspicuous examples of waste of executive ability, whenever bills have come up in Congress to provide more useful occupations for our ex-Presidents after they have left office, these bills have been quietly pigeonholed. Yet few legislators I've talked to oppose the idea in principle. Representative FRANK CHELF, Kentucky, author of one of the recent bills to put ex-Presidents in Congress, reports that four out of five of his colleagues favor it overwhelmingly.

The late Senator Robert A. Taft, among others, agreed that it would be a fine thing. Most lawmakers—like most Americans—are just indifferent to the idea of making ex-Presidents Members of the Senate. But if the idea could ever be debated openly and brought to a vote, I think it would be adopted.

The idea isn't new. Back in 1889, it was mentioned in Congress. James Bryce, the distinguished English historian—one of the shrewdest observers of the American political scene—commented on our strange failure to take advantage of our ex-Presidents' abilities. In his famous book, "The American Commonwealth," he wrote, "They managed things better at Rome, gathering into their Senate all the fame and experience, all the wisdom and skill of those who had ruled and fought as consuls and praetors at home and abroad."

In 1906 historian Charles Francis Adams also urged putting our ex-Presidents in the Senate, warning, "We have lost absolutely the value of their ripe experience and great abilities * * * these eminent citizens were cut off from public utility at the maturity of their powers and during the best years of their lives as counselors. * * *"

In England, the Prime Minister is selected from the majority party in the House of Commons. A Prime Minister may lose his position in a national election, but the chances of his losing his seat in the House of Commons are small. Thus Winston Churchill went on serving his country after he ceased to be Prime Minister. And some former Prime Ministers, like Clement Attlee, take seats in the House of Lords.

It's high time we adapted the British system to our own needs and stopped treating our ex-Presidents as unemployed has-beens. Wasting their experience and abilities has always been wrong. Today, when we need their wise counsels as never before, the problem is urgent. Let's put them in the Senate where they belong.

I was in favor of giving former Presidents a seat in the Senate until I passed 75 years. Since then I have less taste for sitting on hard-bottomed chairs during long addresses.

Even so, I believe that former Presidents should be given a seat in the Senate but without a vote.

Their long memories, their hard knocks, and their ample experience could aid many committees and could shorten up a lot of tangled debates.

HERBERT HOOVER.

DECEMBER 22, 1959.

AFTER THE WHITE HOUSE: THE YEARS FAMOUS PRESIDENTS WASTED

George Washington, 2 years: After leaving the Presidency, he farmed and invested in real estate, became a leading land speculator.

John Adams, 25 years: Although he lived to be 90, he did little but follow the career of his son, John Quincy Adams.

Thomas Jefferson, 16 years: He occupied himself with architecture and writing until his death at 83, founded the University of Virginia.

Andrew Jackson, 9 years: He left the White House with $90 in his pocket, sold lumber as fuel to steamboat captains.

Ulysses S. Grant, 5 years: He invested in a Wall Street banking house. Crooked partners drove the firm into bankruptcy, leaving Grant penniless.

Grover Cleveland, 12 years: He resumed law practice. Many Americans were shocked that an ex-President should argue in court for a living.

Theodore Roosevelt, 9 years: Only 50 when he left the White House, he hunted big game, organized an unsuccessful third party.

Nation Prosperous, Democrats Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Nation Prosperous, Democrats Learn," written by the celebrated and much respected columnist, John M. Cummings, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 31, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION PROSPEROUS, DEMOCRATS LEARN
(By John M. Cummings)

Considering the number and the conspicuousness of Democratic targets, President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON and other Republican orators manifested commendable restraint in the "dinner with Ike" program across the Nation last Wednesday.

There was none of the personal vituperation of the sort leveled at Vice President NIXON, the lone candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, at the Democratic dinner in Washington a few days earlier.

The President himself, speaking from Los Angeles in a closed circuit television program heard in 82 other cities, gave to the country assurance that we are the strongest in the world economically and militarily. He stressed the peace and prosperity slogan which the Republicans will rely on to bring home the bacon in next November's election.

To this not a few speakers added the word "progress." What you will hear, then, is peace, prosperity, and progress as the Republicans fare forth to the political wars after the two major party conventions have chosen their candidates.

Pennsylvania Democrats gave concrete evidence of the prosperous state of the Nation as they met in Harrisburg last week to select delegates-at-large to the party's national convention in Los Angeles. So many Democrats are anxious to go to the west coast meeting that two delegates will be present for every vote allotted to Pennsylvania. In other words the 81 votes will be cast by 162 delegates, including those to be elected in the congressional districts.

Alternates, party functionaries, camp followers and the like will swell the Pennsylvania army moving westward to something like 300 persons.

Governor Lawrence and other Easterners protested against the choice of Los Angeles as the convention city. They listed a number of reasons for their opposition, among them the cost of the transcontinental journey.

The cost, from all accounts, was not considered in picking the delegates-at-large. Indeed, there was quite a scramble for designation by the State committee, all of which indicated Eisenhower prosperity is no idle phrase in Democratic ears.

There is prosperity. There is more employment than at any other time in the history of the country, as Secretary of Labor Mitchell, who spoke at Philadelphia's $100 dinner, testifies. Democratic candidates for the Presidency are acquainted with the futility of railing against a condition that is gratifyingly felt by so many of our people.

Nor can they denounce peace. This would be a violation of a fundamental rule of conduct for political orators regardless of party.

There remains, then, the old standby—personal abuse, vilification, denunciation.

This seems to be the one phase of the preconvention Democratic campaign in which all the candidates are in agreement. For this day and for every day until the election, the target of the choice of the Los Angeles convention and others on the stump, will be Vice President NIXON.

NIXON's ability to stand up under fire has been amply demonstrated. Thoroughly demonstrated, too, is his facility for returning shot for shot. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, seems to feel the best way to get at NIXON is to accuse him of hard, vigorous—and successful—campaigning in his California fights, first for a seat in the House and later for a place in the Senate.

Governor Lawrence journeyed to Missouri Saturday to speak at a fundraising dinner. He is going into the State of Harry Truman and Senator SYMINGTON not because he is interested in the Senator's unannounced candidacy for the Presidency, but because, in his own words, "I'm a helluva orator."

It has been reported from time to time that Lawrence and other influential Pennsylvania Democrats are interested in the prospects of SYMINGTON. They feel he has fewer liabilities than Kennedy or Humphrey, Johnson or Stevenson. It is for this reason so many politicos are interested in the Governor's interpretation of the "Missouri Waltz" in the home State of Harry Truman.

It is accepted in many quarters that Senator SYMINGTON, a Cabinet officer under President Truman, is the personal candidate of the former President. This may be so and on the other hand, his effort at President making left a lot to be desired at the Democratic convention 4 years ago. He backed the then Governor Harriman, who was defeated by Stevenson. By the way, where is Harriman these days? Has anyone here seen Stevenson?

A New York Newspaper on Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON recently visited New York where he addressed the Cathedral Club in Brooklyn.

In keeping with the course he has followed in Congress, his address was constructive and forward looking. He called upon Americans for unity rather than division.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON was well received in New York. Americans there who met him found out the same thing that Americans have found out everywhere—that he is a responsible, able national leader.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Mirror of January 23, on his visit.

CLOSER LOOK AT LYNDON

The tall Texan who is not (as yet, at least) a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the presidency has visited our city, met many of our distinguished citizens, and left the impression that he is of presidential stature whether or not he decides to enter the party sweepstakes.

We refer, of course, to LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, whose record has been one of statesmanship rather than partisanship despite the fact that he is outstandingly skillful as a party chieftain.

Whatever his future fortunes, it was good to have a closer look at an eminent Senator who is first and foremost an American.

Tribute to Warren Hicks, Pioneer in Preservation of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the question of just what additional action can and should be taken to protect the civil rights of all citizens is one of the major, but most controversial, issues before Congress.

Respecting the rights and opinions on both sides of the question, I find myself on the side of those who would—in proper, constructive, logical, practical ways—attempt to assure that the constitutional privileges of all who qualify as citizens should be fully protected and preserved.

We realize, of course, that the situation is accompanied by long-established modes of thinking patterns, economic problems, and other factors. These are not conditions that can be changed overnight, either by the waving of a magic wand—or even by the enactment of legislation.

Neither can we ignore them.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee considering legislation on the subject, I feel a particular responsibility to the people of the country to assure that the rights of minorities—and if only certain selected criteria are established, each of us belongs to such a group—are faithfully and zealously protected.

We recognize, of course, that the cooperation of individuals, community and State governments, as well as appropriate action by the Federal Government, are necessary if we are to be successful in this field.

I believe the Congress, for example, has a great responsibility for reexamining the situation and taking the necessary steps to further strengthen our laws.

At this time, I would like to pay tribute to an individual who, at the age of 94, has made a significant contribution in this field, Mr. Warren Hicks, of Madison, Wis.

During his lifetime, Mr. Hicks has served as a pioneer not only in civil rights, but in education and vocational education on the State and National level.

Today I received a letter from Rebecca C. Barton, director of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights of the State of Wisconsin, containing a résumé of the splendid work by Mr. Hicks. As a fine example of individual action, I

ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS,
Madison, Wis., January 26, 1960.

When Mr. Warren E. Hicks, at the age of 91, received a civic service award in Milwaukee on June 6, 1957, he was participating in a series of honors bestowed on him during a long, useful and distinguished career. Now that he is 94, and as keen in mind and generous in spirit as ever, we who constitute his host of friends and admirers hope that he will recognize our feeling that here is one "prophet with honor in his own country."

We honor him for many things. He is acclaimed as a pioneer in education and in vocational education both on the State and National level. He showed that good teaching and good administration were possible and desirable combined in one individual. Practical yet imaginative, he paved the way for new ideas and for the blueprints necessary to achieve them. Through his varied experiences in various States as an educator, he advanced sound and workable programs while always keeping to the courage of his convictions.

The secret of his success in life would seem to lie much deeper than his professional skills. People cannot talk to Mr. Hicks even briefly without becoming aware of his great interest in them as individuals. He likes people, he respects them and he is conscious both of their infinite variations and of their common humanity.

As director of the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights since its inception in 1949 I have had occasion to become aware of this deeper aspect of Mr. Hicks' contribution. Our commission was set up by statute to "disseminate information and to attempt by means of discussion as well as other proper means to educate the people of the State to a greater understanding, appreciation and practice of human rights for all people, of whatever race, creed, color or national origin, to the end that Wisconsin will be a better place in which to live." Without the groundwork in public opinion which leaders such as Mr. Hicks established, a commission such as ours would never have come into existence and could never function effectively. Warren E. Hicks was a pioneer in education but he was also a pioneer in matters pertaining to the aspiration of the human spirit. Because he believed what he taught and practiced what he preached about the worth and potential of each individual in a democracy, he has served as an inspiration to thousands of citizens in this country and many more thousands around the world. Thus we honor him as a king among public-spirited citizens.

The famous story of his spelling contest in Cleveland as assistant superintendent of schools in 1908 has now achieved the status of a legend. It was certainly a historical landmark for the advance of human rights. Today we might take a similar accomplishment as a matter of course, but back in 1908 leadership was needed. Mr. Hicks led the way and kept to his convictions about equal opportunity for all children, of whatever race, creed, or color, in such a manner as to appeal to the conscience and decency of a whole Nation.

It all began when Mr. Hicks decided to stage a spelling match not just for Cleveland pupils but for other cities and States. Newspapers ran a headline: "Hicks Challenges the Nation to a Spelling Contest." Such interest was aroused that the National Education Association took charge of arrangements. Thirty-four cities sent teams and 510 eighth graders participated. Children came 2 weeks in advance to drill.

So far so good. But a snag developed. The New Orleans Board of Education appropriated $1,500 to pay expenses of their team but ordered its return on discovering that Cleveland had a Negro contestant, Helen Bolden. However, Warren E. Hicks would not compromise. Cleveland refused to remove Helen and New Orleans decided to remain in the contest anyway.

When the great day came, 10,000 teachers at the National Education Convention in Cleveland attended the contest in the Hippodrome. Each of the 510 contestants spelled 100 words in writing and 4 words orally. The young Negro girl, Helen Bolden, was the only one not to miss a single word. The entire audience rose spontaneously in tribute.

The dramatic climax to Mr. Hicks' belief in equal opportunity was somewhat "like a shot heard round the world." Negroes and whites all over the country rejoiced in the establishment of principle. Audiences and radio stations everywhere began to ask for the story. In the intervening years radio stations have worn out their original recordings and asked for more. The true story has been broadcast repeatedly to Europe and other countries as an example of the best in American democracy. The incident itself is long since history, but it lives in the hearts of all of us who share these values, who strive toward these goals and who are eternally thankful for Warren E. Hicks as a leader and friend of man.

Sincerely yours,

REBECCA C. BARTON,
Director.

Centenary of the First Jewish Prayer in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was 100 years ago today that the Congress of the United States first gave full and formal recognition to the Jewish religion, and to the position of the rabbi as preacher and religious teacher, by selecting a rabbi, Morris Jacob Raphall, of New York, to open a session of the House of Representative with prayer. This 100th anniversary of the occasion is suitably observed by the invocation offered in our behalf today, but there is the happy difference that there is today nothing to surprise anyone in the presence of a Jewish rabbi in this post of honor, and nothing unusual in the event when the Members of our National Legislature bow their heads humbly as a Jewish religious leader speaks for them to the Lord and Master of us all.

Well may our hearts echo today those holy words, spoken in Hebrew and in English by Rabbi Raphall a hundred years ago and prized in Christian as in Hebrew tradition:

The Lord bless thee and keep thee. The Lord show His face to thee and have mercy on thee. The Lord turn His countenance to thee and give thee peace.

I am particularly gratified that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States has paused long enough today to reflect on this 100th anniversary of the first Jewish prayer offered in Congress. It is significant that we, as Members of Congress, should pay tribute to this momentous occasion because it indeed reflects that in this country we Americans have respected the rights of equality and freedom of religion since the very founding of our country.

Today's observance is particularly significant when we reflect that in many corners of the world and, unfortunately, even in some isolated areas of our own country, the evil specter of religious bigotry is again being manifested.

By paying tribute to this 100th anniversary today, we in Congress unequivocally state that the legislative branch of our Government shall never condone such bigoted conduct. I trust that the example we have set here today will be an inspiration to all men of good will and, in its own way, contribute to a halt in these outrageous attacks on religious institutions throughout the world. By this tribute today, we have again demonstrated that we recognize religious freedom and tolerance as the very cornerstone of our democracy.

I wish to add my own note of congratulations to Rabbi Israel Goldstein, who delivered this morning's opening prayer, for his inspiring words. Rabbi Goldstein is the spiritual leader of the Congregation B'Nai Jeshuran, in New York City. It is significant that Rabbi Raphall was the spiritual leader of this same synagogue 100 years ago when he opened the session of the House of Representatives with a prayer. Rabbi Goldstein's inspirational message today reconfirms the deep dedication of the Jewish people to the institutions of freedom and liberty and tolerance throughout the world.

I should also like to congratulate Dr. Abraham G. Ducker, president, Chicago's College of Jewish Studies, for calling this very significant anniversary to my attention. It was indeed through Dr. Ducker's suggestion that we have been able to arrange today's tribute to the 100th anniversary of the first invocation delivered by a rabbi in the House of Representatives.

Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been a steadily growing public awareness of the need for Federal aid to schools primarily for the construction of classrooms. The shortage at the present time has been estimated to be almost 140,000 classrooms. The Senate will soon be discussing the entire question of Federal aid to education, including, I trust, the proposal sponsored by Senator COOPER and myself. This proposal would

provide a 4-year, $4 billion program on a matching basis for the construction of 100,000 classrooms, and it would also include a provision to encourage and stimulate increases in teachers' salaries.

The Committee for Economic Development, which is composed of some of our leading businessmen and educators, has just issued a report urging prompt large-scale Federal aid to schools in low-income States. A summary of that report entitled, "We Can Have Better Schools," has been published by the New York Times of February 1, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS UNIT ASKS U.S. AID FOR SCHOOLS

(By Fred M. Hechninger)

Large-scale Federal aid to public schools in low-income States was recommended by the Committee for Economic Development yesterday.

The proposal for an annual Federal expenditure of about $600 million was accompanied by a call for drastic "mandatory" reorganization of the public schools in order to assure greater efficiency and economy.

The proposals represent the first major endorsement of Federal aid to education by a national organization representing business and industry as well as academic leadership.

The committee is composed of 180 leading businessmen and educators. Its support of Federal aid can be expected to be highly influential in the current debate over such legislation in Washington. While it did go as far as recent recommendations by the Democratic Advisory Council, it considerably exceeded the administration's proposals.

"The national interest in good schools everywhere and the national interest in a decentralized school system are not irreconcilable," the 90-page report, "Paying for Better Public Schools," said. The solution calls "for the assumption of an important but limited responsibility by the Federal Government," it said.

But while supporting the idea of decentralized schools, generally known as local control, the report urged a "fresh attack" on a system that it feels is broken up into too many self-contained small parts.

It said that a large proportion of the present 45,000 local school districts were "much too small to provide good schools at all or to provide any kind of schools effectively." The committee demanded State action to reduce the total to less than 10,000 school districts.

The statement called a 2,000-student school system the minimum size at which "a complete school program" could be conducted. It said that "substantial educational advantages continue to accrue until a school system has perhaps 25,000 students."

SUMMARY IS ISSUED

The statement was issued by the group's Research and Policy Committee under the chairmanship of T. V. Houser, former board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co. A 22-page summary and action program entitled "We Can Have Better Schools," was prepared by Ralph Lazarus, chairman of the subcommittee on education and president of Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati.

Other recommendations were:

Assumption of a larger share of the financial burden for the schools by the States, with distribution of State funds through "foundation programs." A foundation program provides for special distribution of funds, in addition to the regular State aid allowance, to help needy districts to offer a minimum, or foundation, level of education.

Federal grants "to support public schools in those States where income per public school child is substantially below the national average."

More effective organization of citizens on the local, State and Federal level who appreciate the need for improved education.

The committee's stand on Federal aid contrasts sharply with the view of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which in recent weeks has reiterated its opposition to such expenditures.

Even in the committee report, the Federal aid issue met with some dissent. Of the 51 committee members who voted, 3 said the CED proposals did not go far enough. They want a broader program of Federal support to schools in all States. Nine members indicated that they did not support, or had reservations about, the recommended aid program.

EIGHTY PERCENT GOAL SET

The report considers any State that falls below 80 percent of the national average of expenditure per pupil as being "a reasonable standard below which school expenditures are unacceptably low."

But by also using a yardstick the State's average income per student, the plan would prevent States from collecting Federal aid by permitting their own effort to support their schools from dropping below their ability to pay.

Using 1957–58 statistics, the committee estimated that the total cost to the Federal Government would have been $556 million. However, four States would have had to provide a total of $51million out of their own resources in order to qualify for Federal aid under the proposed scheme.

CURB ON STATES

No State would be permitted to fall below its own efforts, made prior to the start of Federal aid.

The committee warned that no Federal controls or conditions must be associated with the proposed grants.

"We stress in the strongest possible terms that the program should include no Federal requirements for loyalty oaths, and no control of subject matter, teaching methods, teacher qualifications, or any other aspects of the educational process," the report stated. The funds could be used either for capital plant or current operating expenditures.

Trade Agreement Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in support of the resolution proposed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. While it is the duty of Congress to reverse as quickly as possible some of the illogical trade policies that are directly responsible for so much unemployment in this country, the resolution will meanwhile serve notice that Congress will not tolerate further international agreements handing over domestic markets to foreign producers.

The headlong drive for free exchange of goods in international commerce has caught up with us with a vengeance. Time was when a comparatively few of us stood up here on the House floor to appeal for relief from unfair foreign competition. Now that the grave perils of the free-trade theory are beginning to divulge themselves in a multitude of industries and communities of the land, the demand for corrective measures is becoming increasingly more audible.

Those of us whose constituencies depend heavily upon coal and the railroads for a healthy economy are particularly pleased to note the growing ranks of opposition to policies that subordinate the interest of American labor and industry to diplomatic motives. For years we were practically alone in our crusade for a limitation on the imported residual oil that has created such havoc in the economy of mining regions in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, and eastern Kentucky.

Time was when the term "selfish interest" was applied in the case of anyone who sought tariff or quota protection to give American miners and railroaders a chance to reclaim their jobs. The free trade army—commanded by leftover State Department leftwingers—insisted that everyone would ultimately benefit by opening the doors of this country to any and all alien commodities. Down and down went U.S. tariffs, setting us up for today's serious predicament that becomes more critical as the inflow of foreign products and the outgo of gold continue almost unchecked. The resolution under consideration here today can be an important means of getting us back in the proper direction. Actually, it should be welcomed by the diplomats who have been representing us at meetings of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, because this action by Congress would provide a medium of getting themselves off the hook which they assisted in setting up and which is now being used to strangle American labor and industry. Once the resolution is adopted, our generous "GATTeers" need only explain to their suave friends at the international roundtable that it is the sense of Congress that no further trade concessions be made in the next 2 years. Sorry, but our orders are to "stand pat" before we sacrifice any more industries. That is all that need be said when the boys gather at Geneva or wherever else the good fellows who trade off domestic markets without semblance of a quid pro quo plan to meet their foreign friends this year and next.

Meanwhile, back at the legislative branch, perhaps we will be able to plan for a showdown on the entire foreign trade program. Perhaps we can get an answer to the question of whether we are willing to permit our own factories and plants to shut down in order to please people elsewhere in the world. There is a possibility, too, that by now we can even convince the policymakers in the State Department of the fallacious reasoning behind the free trade doctrine. Somehow those credulous functionaries were unable to comprehend that the manufacturing facilities erected at various points around the globe at the expense of the American taxpayer would

produce materials directly competitive with our own products. Now the picture becomes more vivid with the rush of American dollars into alien areas where labor and materials are cheap. When the average hourly earnings in industrial occupations amount to more than $2 in the United States, slightly more than 60 cents in the United Kingdom, and less than 25 cents in Japan, there is no doubt about why we are being undersold all along the line. And behind the products made abroad—in addition to the reputations of leading foreign companies—are such labels as National Cash Register, Remington Rand, Hamilton, Singer, Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, General Tire & Rubber, and scores of other established brand names.

Since the end of World War II American business has invested more than $27 billion in factories, oil wells, mines, and other enterprises in foreign lands. One large manufacturer cut employment from 9,000 to less than 5,000 in a factory here after opening a similar plant in Europe. A steel processor laid off his 1,000 employees in New York State to set up shop in Japan and take advantage of cheap labor there and low tariffs here. Indeed, transferring job opportunities to Europe, South America, and Asia has become a principal export activity of the United States.

Speaking for the congressional district which I represent, I can testify that our coal, railroad, pottery, ceramics, glass, machine tools, and other industries have suffered constant oppression from imported materials. Now our steel industry has become a target of shippers from countries where labor is cheap and standards of living far below ours. Unless we take action, not a single area of the country—whether it be industrial or agricultural—will escape similar fate. Now is the time to transmit our views to the State Department. Let us give this resolution the support it needs and thus get started on the way back to a sane foreign trade program.

Surrender to Whom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently broadcast on a program referred to as "Life Line."

"Life Line" is a patriotic and religious educational movement.

One of its activities is production of a daily radio program conducted by Mr. Wayne Poucher, radio minister for "Life Line." This program consists of a public affairs commentary and a short sermonette. Originating in Washington, this program is broadcast over more than a hundred stations throughout the Nation.

Mr. Poucher has been acclaimed by listeners as one of the more powerful profreedom voices speaking in America today. I feel members of Congress will benefit from reading one of his latest broadcasts entitled, "Surrender to Whom?"

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURRENDER TO WHOM?

Right is not a fortress in which the patriot can sit safely protected from the rest of the world. Rather, the cause of freedom is one which must be brought boldly out into the world. We must be ready to defend it and diligent in advocating it. Only in this way can we turn back the mistaken hordes, who are continually intensifying the propaganda for their ideas.

Patriots too frequently talk only to one another. Thus they sometimes find that they comprise a narrowing, rather than a widening, circle of influence. We must guard against this tendency. The mistaken are well aware that the constant hammering home of their ideas is essential to their success. Patriots cannot afford, in this time of grave peril, to be any less zealous on behalf of freedom.

If you should tire of the struggle to maintain freedom in America and become inclined to give up, to whom would you surrender except to someone who would cut your throat during the ceremony of yielding? The advocates of freedom can expect no mercy from the mistaken. They will not give quarter.

Authorities who have studied the methods of communism in nations where its adherents have seized power solemnly state that one-third of the population of the United States is marked for liquidation if the anti-freedom forces take over. How could anyone consider surrender?

While blatantly repeating the big lie of peaceful coexistence, the international mistaken, aided by followers working from within, already have subjugated 17 countries with a population of over 900 million people—about one-third of all the humans on earth.

As the No. 1 target of the conspiracy, the United States is the prime objective of anti-freedom espionage. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover declares that between 70 and 80 percent of Russian officials in the United States are members of the Communist intelligent services. The number of such personnel assigned to the United States has sharply increased—by nearly 50 percent in the last 5 years.

These espionage activities expose the utter fallacy of so-called peaceful coexistence. In recent years pseudo appeals for peace by the leaders of the worldwide conspiracy have been more than matched by intensified espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, these agents of the mistaken, many with diplomatic immunity, are stepping up their efforts to obtain our military, scientific, and industrial secrets for use against us.

If we should weaken and consider surrender, let us remind ourselves that we would be surrendering to persons who have an utter contempt for individual freedom and for the true principles of citizenship as expressed in a society based on law and order. This contempt is fed in America by the moral and physical weakness of some of our citizens. There are too many among us who are willing to surrender a principle of morality to the illusions of expediency. Where weakness prevails, fear takes over—and fear can cause a citizen to evade his duty and even to give up his birthright of freedom.

The rule of fear is the rule of tyrants. It is the seed of fear that Nikita Khrushchev hopes to plant in our minds when he threatens to unleash on us what he terms "the most devastating war ever known by mankind." In a criminal sense, this is blackmail—ballistic blackmail. It is the same seed of fear the hoodlum strives to plant in the minds of prospective victims of a protection racket.

The end results of the mistaken's complete contempt for the rights of others are tragic in nature. Today, in Communist China more than 500 million persons have been herded into communes. In this completely regimented existence, families have been broken up, private property confiscated, work militarized, and the individual robbed of all freedom of choice in his personal life.

Nor let us forget the Soviet brutalities in Hungary; the rape of Tibet; the imprisonment and degradation of the consecrated men whose only crime was teaching the word of God.

All the activities of the mistaken everywhere in the world should strengthen the determination of patriots not to yield their freedom. There must be no thought of surrender. There must be thought only of ways and means of saving our precious freedom.

Agreement on Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many Congressmen and Senators are concerned about the plight of the Nation's railroads. As a Representative from Omaha, one of the Nation's major rail terminals and headquarters of the Union Pacific Railroad, I of course share this concern wholeheartedly.

Congress has as recently as 1958 recognized the need for corrective legislative action with the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958. Much more remains to be done, not only at the Federal level but by the States and other subdivisions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 30, which contains an outstanding review of the problems of this vital industry. There is one line of the editorial which we must never forget: "Whatever the result, the railroads have one sound premise; namely, that the Nation needs them."

The editorial follows:

AGREEMENT ON NEED

President Eisenhower was echoing some often emotionally expressed appeals of the railroad industry when he told his news conference that there should be "a real overhaul of all the regulations and controls" as a step toward giving the carriers "a chance to be prosperous." It is doubtful if any railroader would differ with the President's opinion that they are governed "by antiquated laws and regulations" and they have, in fact, pinpointed 1887 as the birth year for today's regulatory antiquities. Modifications in the years since have fallen far short, in the industry's view, of giving it a fair

deal in the mid-20th-century transportation economy.

The railroads' complaints are many, and all are not directed exclusively at the Federal Government. They do blame Uncle Sam primarily, however, for placing them at a competitive disadvantage by granting direct or indirect subsidies to other systems of public transportation—highway, air, water, and pipeline. Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, recently estimated Federal aid to competitive transport at $17 billion in less than 15 years since World War II. In the same period, he said, the rails spent $14 billion in private capital for their own modernization. They complain, also, of Federal restrictions against diversification—letting the railroads themselves engage in other forms of transportation—of the difficulty in getting approval of mergers which would improve service and utilization of facilities, and prohibitions against more competitive ratemaking.

Many State authorities likewise are villains in the railroad books, because of reluctance to permit local rate changes or to approve abandonment of unprofitable services. Most of all, the States and even local communities are assailed for their heavy tax take. The levy per mile of road in New Jersey, highest in the country, is estimated at five times the national average. Even the featherbedding problem, which the industry claims cost it $500 million yearly for work not done, is blamed in part on State safety laws as well as upon union demands.

Obviously, some of the railroads' problems are of their own making—as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out. Furthermore, the Transportation Act of 1958 dealt favorably with some of the industry's grievances against Federal policy—including ratemaking. Both the Department of Commerce and the Senate Commerce Committee currently are engaged in transportation studies which may lead to further corrective legislation. Whatever the result, the railroads have one sound premise, namely, that the Nation needs them. As basic freight carriers, their service cannot be transferred entirely to any combination of competing systems. If their economic health is not preserved, as a private-enterprise industry, it is not an exaggeration for railroad spokesmen to point to nationalization as the undesirable alternative.

Anti-Semitic Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, all of us have read about the outbreak of desecrations of houses of worship in this country, in Germany, and in other lands. Some of us have seen these expressions of hate. Occasionally we have rationalized that these have been the work of youngsters, mere juvenile pranks.

Some of us have had the opportunity to deplore these incidents while we were out in our constituencies. Some of us have not. Few of us have brought them to official attention through the RECORD.

I for one, Mr. President, hesitated stating my own anger on this floor until the proper time arose. For one thing, I think we all recognize that there are, indeed, publicity seekers who would seize upon the additional notoriety of official Senate cognizance in order to further their own psychopathic tendencies to desecrate houses of God.

The other day I received in the mail a very excellent presentation of official German positions in this matter. I was impressed.

It is very important, it seems to me, that responsible governments not condone such lawlessness. It is important that responsible governments which do not condone anti-Semitism or other hate take steps to halt any manifestation of such hate. This is why we applaud the German Government. This is why, Mr. President, I believe it is important that we implement what our Constitution states about the sanctity of the individual and his beliefs. This is one reason why I favor strong legislation to halt those who would bomb or desecrate a house of God, a cemetery or any other building, or who would stop an individual from voting because of the color of his skin or the church he attends, or who would do bodily harm to an American for some such reason.

Millions died because of a madman who killed and made war in the name of a symbol—the swastika. To condone desecrations of any kind would be to condone evil. But to condone desecrations by swastikas or to make light of them is an evil in itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement to the West German Bundestag, other statements of the Embassy of that country, and the statement of Willy Brandt, mayor of West Berlin.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DISGRACE—BUNDESTAG CONDEMNS ANTI-SEMITIC INCIDENTS

Anti-Semitic incidents in the Federal Republic during recent weeks have produced protests from every quarter, both official and public, as well as countermeasures designed to curb National Socialist or anti-Semitic attitudes. The position of the German Federal Government on this question is well known and has been frequently cited in the press. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has made his own position amply clear on more than one occasion; and recently, during a radio and television address, he stated: "The unaminity of the entire German people in condemning anti-Semitism and national socialism has been demonstrated in the strongest possible way." On January 20, Prof. Carlo Schmid, Vice President of the Bundestag, made the following statement to the Bundestag, endorsed by the four parties represented in that house. The declaration was received with loud and prolonged applause.

"On Christmas Eve ruffians daubed swastikas and anti-Semitic abuse on a house of God belonging to the Jewish congregation in Cologne. Since then, there have been other similar occurrences in the Federal Republic involving filthy scribblings of anti-Semitic or Nazi sentiments.

"It is a disgrace that this could happen in our country. This disgrace is not mitigated by the fact that in other countries, too, walls have been smeared with swastikas and abuse of the Jewish people. We Germans have no right to point our fingers at others. It is true that in other countries there has been ruffianism under the sign of the swastika; but in our country 6 million Jews were murdered in the name of this symbol. For this reason, what has happened in Germany during these weeks is a greater disgrace than it would be elsewhere. And for the same reason, our reaction against it must be stronger and must proceed from greater introspection.

"It seems certain that the excesses, which are shameful to us, have quite different causes and agents. In several cases destructive self-aggrandizement, the desire to appear in the newsreels and papers, may have played a role. In several cases political sectarianism was involved, which, moreover, may have been planned in some place or another. In several cases it was a show of juvenile delinquency. We must not be content with these conclusions. Most of these juvenile delinquents were scarcely 10 years old in 1945 and had never met a Jew face to face. That they give vent to their emotions by scrawling anti-Semitic slogans, instead of overturning automobiles and breaking windows, indicates that many of them still have, below the threshold of consciousness, recesses which have not been cleared of rubbish. Parents may be to blame for this; teachers may be to blame for it; feelings of inferiority may be at the bottom of it; and perhaps in some places there is still a psychological climate which calls up such phantoms.

"That this is the case is of concern to all of us. To all of us it poses a task which we will have to manage. We Germans shall have failed as long as anyone can say without fear of being ostracized: The attitude of the Third Reich toward the Jews was disagreeable foolishness, because it made the whole world our enemy. We shall fail as long as there can be any discussion—intended to exculpate us—about whether there were 6 million or only 3 million Jews murdered. We shall fail as long as every child is not taught, and does not understand, that the problem is not whether 6 or 3 million, but rather whether none or one was murdered. But above all, we shall fail as long as we regard what has happened to the synagogues not as a question of morality but from the point of view of the possible damage which the Federal Republic may have suffered as a result.

"Many have expressed regret, foremost among them the representatives of the Jewish congregations, that the press has made so much fuss about this filthy business. Certainly a dozen juvenile delinquents were incited by such fuss. But perhaps this is good: For there are situations in which the sleeping hounds of hell must be awakened so that their barking will bring us to the realization of how close we are to hell.

"Only if we uncover the evil still at work here and there among the German people shall we be able to exorcise it. And in doing so, of course, we should have help from abroad. People in other countries should see not only the dirty work, but they should also see the reaction of countless men and women, especially of countless young people, among us. These young people should not be permitted to feel that they are alone, or that they too are counted among the outlaws. They should be given brotherly encouragement. If this is done, these hateful phantoms from our past will vanish."

WIDESPREAD POPULAR REACTION AGAINST ANTI-SEMITIC DEMONSTRATIONS

TRADE UNIONS, YOUTH, CHURCH, AND UNIVERSITY GROUPS PROTEST

Following the desecration of the Cologne synagogue, the directorate of the German Federation of Trade Unions passed a resolution condemning these anti-Semitic demonstrations. It stated, in part: "The directorate of the German Federation of Trade Unions, as the representative of the workers,

employees, and officials of the Federal Republic, is profoundly shocked by the desecration of synagogues, churches, and memorials to the victims of national socialism. In accord with honest and decent men everywhere it severely condemns these horrible deeds." The federation demanded that all parties in the Federal Government and in the State governments take immediate action to combat the pernicous activity of right-wing radical and anti-Semitic groups.

YOUTH GROUPS

On behalf of 6 million young Germans, united in the German Federal Youth Council, the council's chairman issued the following declaration condemning actions of anti-Semitic and Nazi nature: "The 6 million young Germans who belong to the 14 large democratic youth organizations united in the nonpartisan and interdenominational German Youth Council have categorically dissociated themselves from these irresponsible activities. The German Youth Council protests against the identification of the young generation of Germany with such elements and declares: German youth has nothing in common with those individual offenders. In recent years German youth has often given proof of the fact that to them mutual esteem is the natural prerequisite for living together in a democratic form of society. These young people have shown that they are seriously endeavoring to overcome the Nazi past. Prompted by the recent incidents, the German Federal Youth Council appeals to all young Germans: Make use of every opportunity to prevent incidents of this kind! Prove by word and deed that German youth refuses to have anything to do with racial hatred or political instigation."

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH

The directorate of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany, in Hanover, also issued a condemnation of these anti-Semitic demonstrations, and appealed to the older generation to assist young people in clearly forming their own judgments about the history of the Hitler period and the times leading up to it. The reaction of the German public should not confine itself to declarations of sympathy for Jewish citizens, it said, but should bring about a realization on the part of the public of its own culpable negligence.

THE UNIVERSITIES

In West Berlin more than 2,000 professors and students of the Free University signed a declaration of the German-Israeli study group protesting against anti-Semitic incidents. At the University of Mainz the general student council and the student parliament demanded the exclusion of all so-called neo-Nazis from study at German universities.

These popular protests bear witness to Chancellor Adenauer's statement that the unanimous and spontaneous condemnation of anti-Semitism and of national socialism by the German people is the one hopeful aspect of these terrible events.

THE GOVERNMENT'S INVESTIGATION

The Federal Ministry of the Interior has conducted an investigation into the number and the background of recent anti-Semitic incidents in the Federal Republic. This investigation, though not yet complete, provides sufficient material to allow certain conclusions to be drawn about the nature of these incidents; and in the light of this material they may be placed in the proper perspective. For example, it is apparent that the majority of these acts were committed anonymously. The persons involved did not wish to be identified. It is also apparent on the basis of the information available that most of these persons do not have any political affiliation and have not been involved previously in any kind of political activity.

From December 24 to January 14, 93 persons were arrested for complicity in anti-Semitic or Nazi activities; and, almost without exception, all confessed to their involvment. It is significant to note that 16 of the 93 were intoxicated when they committed the acts. The investigation established that 17 were under 14 years of age; 37 were between 14 and 21; 22 between 21 and 30; and 17 were over 30 years of age. Only 3 were members of the rightwing German Reich Party; 10 acknowledged sympathy for the party's program; and the remaining 80 had no radical political interests of any kind. On the other hand, 17 of the 93 admitted that their actions were motivated by anti-Semitic or Nazi sentiments. The investigation also indicated that 39 had no political motives whatever, but acted solely out of a desire for publicity, encouraged by press, radio, and television reports, or could be classed as juvenile delinquents.

Court action against those arrested has been swift. As of January 14, judgment had been passed on 11 of the accused. Verdicts so far range from 4 weeks to 17 months, with some lesser terms for juveniles. None of the convicted have been given the possibility of parole.

It is noteworthy that reports on these incidents have caused large-scale resignations from the German Reich Party as well as cancellations of subscriptions to right-wing publications. All evidence proves that there is no truth in the allegation that German youth is anti-Semitic or in any way organized in Nazi or neo-Nazi units. There are approximately 15 rightwing youth organizations in the Federal Republic which have a total of only 3,000 members. They are carefully watched, and any of their activities which violate the constitution are promptly and severely punished.

Though there is no evidence available that anti-Semitic literature has been mailed from the Federal Republic, German authorities have asked Jewish congregations all over the world to cooperate by informing them of the titles, authors, and publishers of any such literature that may appear.

ANTI-SEMITIC DEMONSTRATIONS

RIAS, BERLIN

"It is regretable that the scribblings of Nazi and anti-Semitic slogans is still headline news everywhere in the world—particularly so, because such worldwide publicity encourages the continuation and spread of this cowardly and primitive behavior carried on under the cover of night. Beyond that, however, it would be equally regretable, if the public and the authorities, especially in Germany, would believe that everything is in order again as soon as this pathological political pornography disappears. In having the right to organize, radical groups also have the opportunity to influence our young people—even if relatively only a small portion of them—before they have a chance to develop defenses against the poison of radicalism. And this points up the most neglected aspect of postwar life in our country: namely, the inadequate teaching of youth about the shameful events of the past and about the conditions which produced them."

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, FRANKFURT (SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC)

"It would be foolish to deny that there is uneasiness in Great Britain about Germany and that this has been intensified by the scribbling of some political fools. Now that the ice of the cold war is melting, the old rubble comes to the surface again. We talk much about our unconquered past. We are now being made aware of the fact that it also stands between the Federal Republic and her allies."

SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, MUNICH (INDEPENDENT)

"What have we done wrong during the past 10 years? Not only the teachers, who must be forced to teach current history; not only the parents, who take part in the secret conspiracy of silence about the past of who, by snide remarks, dispell the effect of the school's teachings; but all of us who live complacently, as if we had not started the Second World War and, indeed, almost won it. In an atmosphere of prosperity, which we heedlessly enjoy, the burden of unacknowledged guilt, or guilt borne without understanding, causes a politically fatal disease. Our standards are, for the most part, materialistic ones; our indifference toward the probationary period given us is immoral; and that we are successful for the time being blinds us to the realization of our situation and deafens us to our inner voice. No success, however, is ever so great that it will counterbalance the lack of human kindness and political wisdom."

RHEINISCHER MERKUR, KOBLENZ (INDEPENDENT)

"The unanimous surge of abhorrence which swept over the Federal Republic after the crime in Cologne is undeniable proof that the anti-Semitism of the Third Reich has lost its collective suggestiveness. After the horrible mistreatment of the Jews by the Hitler regime, anti-Semitic excesses cannot reckon with secret approval or quasi-tolerance, because the ruthlessly atheistic race madness of that regime, which was directed against Jews and Christians alike, has destroyed among Christians the residues of medieval prejudices. The flood of letters to the congregation of the Cologne synagogue is proof that today thousands of Germans would protect their Jewish fellow citizens with their lives if these nationalist fools would again try to harm them."

KHRUSHCHEV BEFORE THE SUPREME SOVIET

DER TAGESSPIEGEL, BERLIN (INDEPENDENT)

"The Soviet Union approaches the summit meeting with a far-reaching modernization of its armed forces; and not only in the military field does Khrushchev modernize the Soviet system. In connection with the number of reforms which he has brought about one often hears in the West talk about a liberalization of communism. This is a total misunderstanding which can only lead to dangerously false conclusions. Khrushchev modernizes communism in all areas with the single goal of getting the greatest efficiency from the system and the people."

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, FRANKFURT (INDEPENDENT)

"The Soviet Premier's announcement should be interpreted in the context of the strategic concept of the Soviets. It is part of an overall plan. The 1.2 million soldiers who can be spared will be transferred to the labor force to bolster the economy. We must understand that they are growing stronger by having less. This form of disarmament is indeed unilateral and unique, and it makes genuine disarmament even more urgent."

GOVERNING MAYOR OF BERLIN, WILLY BRANDT, COMMENTS ON ANTI-SEMITIC DEMONSTRATIONS

In the past weeks there have been a number of deeply regrettable, revolting, shocking happenings which we have to face and combat.

Unfortunately, some of them have taken place in Berlin, too.

Whoever again beats the macabre drum of racial hate, of anti-Semitism—above all in Germany—is challenging everything that basically has not been atoned for after the millions of murders in the gas chambers and extermination camps.

Whoever conjures up the evil spirit of nazism not only condemns himself morally and legally but commits the most evil outrage on his nation.

What we have experienced in the last 2 weeks must not be either minimized or exaggerated or distorted.

It is bad enough that here and there the swastika has cropped up again, that Jewish houses of worship have been besmeared and Jewish citizens been harassed.

That must not be minimized, above all in Berlin. And we have not had the slightest inclination to fool ourselves. Berlin truly has not lacked in decisiveness and determination. Here neo-Nazi groups will not be allowed to operate. We will crush them wherever possible because that is our moral and national duty.

In Berlin we have had a happy example of the swift action of justice and police authorities. We will continue to act swiftly and vigorously because we will not allow the air we breathe to be poisoned.

There have been many spontaneous demonstrations of the feelings of our people, above all by the youth of our city.

We have proved that Berlin is a clean city, a city that has not gone through bitter experiences in vain, a city that will not allow its fight for freedom and self-determination to be endangered or distorted by a few who refuse to learn, or by a few hoodlums.

The people of the free part of Germany, above all of Berlin, will know how to prevent relapses into the evil past.

In the last few days I have had many talks with Jewish fellow citizens and they have confirmed that they know where we stand.

I have asked them not to doubt this city and its community. After all that is behind us we will not allow ourselves to be confused by propaganda drumfire.

Above all, I appeal to people in foreign nations—get exact information before you give a final verdict.

Do not confuse the overwhelming majority of Germans who have broken with the grim shame and the crimes of the past with the political hoodlums who have been in the news recently.

And last but not least, do not do Berlin an injustice.

We stand for freedom. For us, antinazism and anticommunism are one and the same.

We will not depart from this path. I therefore ask confidence in Germany—from Berlin I appeal for Germany.

Why Can't Some of Our Universities Be Fair to the U.S. Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been made a whipping boy by some of the universities and colleges of the country over the question of the loyalty oath required of those students seeking Federal loans to carry on their education. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the very thought-provoking editorial which appears in the February issue of the American Legion magazine. The editorial is as follows:

WHY CAN'T SOME OF OUR UNIVERSITIES BE FAIR TO THE U.S. CONGRESS?

If ever you want to run for Congress, make sure first that you have the hide of a rhinoceros.

Latest example is the beating Congress is taking these days from some of our university presidents. To say that Congress is being maligned by intellectual cheating is putting it mildly.

Remember when the Soviet Union sent up the first sputnik?

"How come?" everybody wanted to know. Where is the vaunted U.S. superiority in science and education, that it lets the Reds beat us into space?

Our colleges took the brunt of the early criticism. Why weren't they training more and better scientists than Russia?

The colleges said, of course, that what they needed was more money—more for themselves, more for their students. Just give us the money and away we go.

When you get to Congress you'll find that's what they all say.

Anyway, Congress stopped, looked, listened, and believed.

Somewhat over a year ago Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. It allows Federal loans for college students, in the hope that that will help some of them make a contribution some day to U.S. science in the fields in which we are competing with the Soviet Union.

Congress asked but one assurance. It asked that when a student should get one of those loans he would state that he is loyal to the United States and would have no part in overthrowing the United States by illegal and violent means.

Some 1,370 colleges and universities have accepted this, and so have 120,000 students in those 1,370 colleges.

Not so 16 other colleges, including Yale and Harvard. They are raising so much hell about it that they have refused to go along with the program.

What did Congress do to offend them?

Well, say Yale and Harvard and the 14 others, what do you mean by asking our students to say they'll be loyal to their country and wouldn't be traitors? We want this money with no strings attached or we don't want it at all, and we won't let our students make any such pledge in order to get Federal help to go through college.

This being America, of course, any objections are entitled to their day in court. Maybe Yale, Harvard et al., have some good, solid, sensible and fair arguments that Congress should listen to respectfully.

Last December 20, A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale, got the stage in the New York Times magazine to state the case of the 16 "rebels." But if you expect he was solid, sensible and fair to Congress, you're mistaken.

President Griswold set forth three main objections to his students pledging loyalty before borrowing U.S. defense funds. Let's look at his three complaints.

1. He said that Congress is just picking on students and teachers, singling them out for distrust and bad faith.

2. He said a loyalty oath and affidavit wouldn't make students loyal.

3. He said that one loyalty oath leads to another, and went to great pains to set forth that this could lead to persecutions and official inquiries into the minds of all of us.

Are these complaints fair, just and reasonable? Let's look at them one at a time.

Complaint No. 1: The Congress, says Griswold, has singled out teachers and students for "distrust" from among all others who get Federal subsidies and loans. Farmers, veterans, social security beneficiaries, for instance, don't have to take loyalty oaths to get Government checks. Even Federal officials who do take loyalty oaths don't have to sign non-Communist affidavits. So, President Griswold tells the people, the Congress is just picking on students and teachers.

Comment: Either way you look at it, President Griswold is kidney punching.

First consider whether Congress shows no faith in the colleges and students.

The whole student loan program is an act of faith in the colleges and students by the Congress.

No college is asked to guarantee that the students who get this help will ever produce the results desired. Congress took the colleges at their word, that if they and their students had more money our country might give the Soviet Union a go of it in scientific education.

Of course some of the sudents who get these loans will go into pro football, others may make a big thing of stock speculation or take over pater's delicatessen, or go into advertising—even as some of the lads the taxpayers have educated at West Point and Annapolis have done.

But Congress smiles in the face of such certain adversities for its program, and looks at the good side of the gamble. Some of those students, it has faith, will stick to their chosen field of learning and rise to eminence in it some day. Of these, some will contribute to the advancement of science in the United States.

The Federal loans will make it easier for them to carry their heavy load of studies, free them from dishwashing and waiting on tables, make them better scientists faster. Congress places faith in colleges and students alike that this will be so.

Does President Griswold come forth in the midst of his criticism, to admit that maybe Congress has shown some small faith in his team? He does not.

Second, in directly accusing Congress of "singling out" colleges and students for "distrust" Griswold is faking the facts, not playing fair with Congress, making an unjustifiable slur on the motives of Congress.

In order to assume hurt feelings—which by the way is the main complaint of the 16 colleges—Griswold has to pretend. He pretends that the difference between asking for a loyalty oath in the student loan program, and not asking for it in, say the social security program, stems from an insulting estimate by Congress of the difference between the people who may be benefited.

Yale's president has to pretend (and he does pretend) that there is no difference in the programs that could account for asking loyalty assurances in one program but not in the others.

Is there no difference between the programs, quite apart from the people?

Of course there is.

This is a defense program.

If it works at all, some of the students who are helped by it will, some day, work on the intimate secrets of science projects in which we are competing with the Soviet Union.

Any fairminded person would concede that Congress—whether or not it has the right answer—has more reason to fear national betrayal here than it does of an elderly widow who gets a social security check in the mail.

Yale's president concedes no such true motive in Congress at all. He stakes the main argument of all 16 "rebel" colleges on a nasty and unjustified accusation that Congress is just trying to insult the colleges. And this, dear reader, is what you can expect too, even from the highest seats of learning, if every you get to Congress.

Complaint No. 2: Loyalty oaths and affidavits, says Griswold, will not make the stu-

dents loyal. A disloyal person can and maybe will lie in order to reap advantage.

Comment: Of course the oath and affidavit won't make anyone become loyal to the United States. No Member of Congress has said so, nor given Griswold any reason to believe that he thinks this is the reason for the oath.

The purpose of the oath and affidavit is as clear to Griswold as it is to you.

Its purpose is (1) to prevent lending Federal defense funds to such few students who are unable to pledge loyalty to the United States, and (2) to give grounds for prosecuting any students who take the oath, accept the loans, and then use their education to serve an enemy of the United States.

Does President Griswold admit this obvious motive of the Congress and speak intelligently to the point on it? He does not. He doesn't show Congress the courtesy of mentioning the true purpose of the oath and affidavit. He talks instead about whether the oath will make students loyal all by itself, just as if this were what Congress expected.

Then he knocks that argument down, as if by so doing he were showing how stupid Congress is. The notion that the oath might create loyalty originated in the 16 colleges, not in Congress. The stupidity of discussing it at all originates in Yale, Harvard, etc. To pretend Congress is that stupid is academic cheating.

Complaint No. 3: The great danger of permitting such oaths, says Yale's president, is that they lead to political and religious test oaths, to prying into all our personal beliefs by prosecuting officials, and to inquisitions, jailings, religious persecution, findings of criminal guilt by thought-police, etc.

Comment: All of a sudden, President Griswold is talking about a completely different kind of oath from the one Congress has asked. His final main argument, like the others, beats Congress over the head for things Congress didn't do. He asks us to believe that Congress is really taking the first step toward Hitlerism, sovietism, witchhunting, religious persecution, gestapoism, Castroism.

President Griswold knows that it is not true that one oath leads to another. Oaths don't cause evils. They are tools of society and societies, not causes. Evil oaths come from evil societies. The Hitler oath (which President Griswold actually cites in his criticism of Congress) did not come from an earlier oath, but from the evil nature of Hitler.

President Griswold knows that his claim that oaths, unsupported by evil people, lead from bad to worse is pure poppycock.

On his own Yale campus there is a century of experience with college-sanctioned fraternities exacting horrendous, secret oaths amidst trappings of medieval passwords and handclasps and awful portents, which—if you were to believe Yale's president—would long before now have catapulted Yale back into the Dark Ages.

His complaint against Congress in this respect is therefore not an act of intelligence, but another accusation. It is an unspoken charge that the present Congress of the United States is evilly inclined toward political and religious persecution and thought control.

If President Griswold has a passing personal acquaintance with a cross-section of the Senate and House of Representatives, his dark charge that they would wreck American liberties is shocking beyond belief.

Suppose he speaks from ignorance of how loyal to liberty Congress is? His accusation is still a miserably unfair attack, based as it is solely upon evidence that before lending U.S. defense funds Congress wants assurances of loyalty to the United States akin to what every President from Washington to Eisenhower has given, to what every Boy Scout has voluntarily pledged for 50 years, to what 21 million living and millions of dead war veterans have given for the privilege of defending their country with their lives.

If this is all that the complaints of the 16 colleges out of 1,386 add up to, they are playing dirty pool and owe Congress an apology.

And now it's time to get back down to business. Those sputniks are still going up, and the question of the day still is: "How come our great universities aren't putting out scientists, in the midst of all their great tradition of academic freedom to equal what the regimented, thought-policed scholars of the Soviet Union are doing in space science and rocketry?"

Congress has thrown you the ball, President Griswold. How about picking it up and running with it?

Group Insurance Protection for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by my distinguished colleague from Kansas Senator FRANK CARLSON and appearing in the February issue of the Journal of American Insurance be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

My colleagues will recall the dynamic and effective leadership that Senator CARLSON provided in the enactment of the Federal Employee Health Benefits Act. He has consistently championed such legislation during his 9 years in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH BOON FOR UNCLE SAM'S STAFF

(By Senator FRANK CARLSON)

A new era of security-assured independence will open for 2,300,000 Federal Government employees and their families this year in the anniversary month of Independence Day.

On July 1 they'll come, for the first time, under the protection of a new, Government-wide group health insurance program, comparable to those already serving some 90 million workers in U.S. private industry and their dependents. This will be made possible by the Federal Employee Health Benefits Act, passed by the 86th Congress just before adjournment last summer.

Heretofore, the employees and their families, about 4½ million people in all, have had to arrange their own health plans, and many have been carrying inadequate coverage. But with the participation of such a large group, they now should be able to get broader coverage for their money. And, certainly the biggest boon to most of them, the Government will assume half the cost of their insurance.

While the Government will share the cost, just as many private employers are doing nowadays, it is notable that it did not seek to set up a big new bureaucratic branch to run its own health insurance program. In fact, such a possibility was never even considered—a tribute, I think, to the job private enterprise has done in providing health insurance benefits to 123 million Americans who are covered today.

This program is expected to cost about $214 million a year. Thus, the cost to the taxpayers will be about $107 million annually. Of this, no more than 1 percent will go for administrative expenses—again, because private insurers will be running the program.

All Federal employees are eligible to participate—public health workers, post office employees, Congressmen and their staffs, the employees of every government department, agency, bureau and office in Washington, in all 50 States, in U.S. territories, and workers stationed overseas. It has been estimated that 75 to 90 percent of them will sign up.

They'll have a choice of the following plans:

(1) A regular cash indemnity policy with an insurance company. It will reimburse the employee for hospital and medical costs incurred. The insurance carrier, chosen by the Civil Service Commission in December from about a dozen of the Nation's largest, will be Aetna Life Insurance Co. Aetna will reinsure with all other qualified companies wishing to participate:

(2) A service-type plan, such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield. It generally makes a settlement with the hospital or doctor directly.

(3) An existing group health insurance program operated by one of the national government employee organizations, such as the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, or by the agency for which the employee works. Such plans have been set up by the FBI, Central Intelligence Agency and Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, for example. Some of these plans have been in operation for a number of years, providing hospital and medical coverage for thousands of employees at cost.

(4) Comprehensive group-practice prepayment plans, such as those offered by Group Health Association in Washington, the Kaiser Foundation on the West Coast or the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, or individual-practice prepayment plans. Many thousands of Federal employees also are covered by these programs.

In every case, the principal effect of the new law will be that the Government will now pay half of each employee's insurance premiums. If an employee has been paying $10 a month for his coverage, for example, he now will have to pay only half that. Since half of our Federal employees make less than $4,800 a year, and some half a million earn less than $4,000, it's clear what a help this will be to them.

It may be that rather than continuing his present coverage at half the cost, the employee will choose to increase his protection, perhaps paying $15 a month for it. He'll improve his $10 coverage by a third, yet pay only $7.50. And many employees now facing the terrible risks of illness without any insurance at all will be able to buy group coverage at a price they can afford.

Naturally we had to set limits on the amount the Government will match under the new law. For instance, for a single employee the Government will pay $1.25 to $1.75 per pay period (biweekly). For an employee plus his family, the Government's share can range between $3 and $4.50 biweekly. That's for a policy under the cash indemnity or service benefit plans. The employee is free to choose the level of coverage he wants, and the Government, within these limits, will match his payments.

For members of employee group plans or prepayment programs with set subscription charges, the Government will pay up to $2.50 a pay period for a single person and $6 for a family as its half.

LAW TOOK YEARS OF EFFORT, COMPROMISE

The employee's half will be deducted from his paycheck. His half actually may be more than half his total premium if he chooses to buy more extensive coverage than the maximums prescribed in the new law.

It took many years of effort to achieve the passage of this legislation. Since 1947 Federal employee health insurance bills had been considered by the Congress, but they got nowhere because the groups involved could never agree on the provisions. Finally, though, agreement was reached among the employees, the administration, the insurance industry, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, the American Medical Association, American Hospital Association, and the various employee group health plans. Our subcommittee, headed by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER of Oregon, held extensive hearings last April, and in July the Senate passed the bill 81 to 4. The House then held its hearings, made some changes in the bill, and approved it 383 to 4. A conference committee ironed out the differences between the two versions, and the final bill, cut down somewhat from the original in costs, was signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 28.

Some of us in Congress and the administration tried to cut the costs still further, thinking of our already gigantic national debt and the effect of new spending on the Federal budget. We thought $80 million as the Government's share of this plan would have bought some good benefits. But with some groups asking for $145 million and more, there had to be some compromising. The administration also fought for years to hold the Government's share to one-third of the total cost, while the employees' organizations thought the United States should pay two-thirds. So the final 50–50 cost sharing was a compromise too.

PLAN COMPARABLE TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY'S

No one connected with the bill would even pretend it is perfect, or that it will work without some complaints and adjustments. But in view of the deep-rooted disagreements over a Federal employee health insurance plan during the past 12 years, I think all parties are pretty well satisfied that this is a good, workable law. At least the Government—the Nation's largest employer—has recognized its obligation to its employees, and is now offering them a health plan every bit as generous as they'd find in most private industries.

With medical and hospital costs what they are nowadays, few families feel they can be without a health plan of some sort. Along with the retirement program, the group life insurance plan adopted 4 years ago and generous sick leave provisions, this health insurance program is probably the greatest "fringe benefit" our civil servants could get. Some 27 percent of the Government's $13 billion annual payroll item already has been for fringe benefits. Financing half of this new health plan will boost those figures still higher. Nevertheless, if the Government is to compete with private business for competent, high-caliber employees, it cannot lag so far behind industry in the insurance protection it offers. This unfortunately has been true for some years. Now this new law goes far toward alleviating that situation.

This legislation does not include retired Government employees and their dependents. However, bills are being considered this session which would provide them with a health plan, too.

RESERVES NEEDED TO AVOID RATE INCREASES

There is another omission in the new law that I think will have to be watched: It does not require the accumulation of a sufficient reserve to cover the future rises that must be expected in hospital and medical costs. To keep boosting the rates for this program to cover these rising costs would be unfair both to employees and to the taxpayers who pay the Government's share. Yet that is exactly what will have to happen, if past experience is any indication.

The people taking Blue Cross in New York City, for example, had their rates boosted by a third in 1952, another 22 percent in 1958, and a whopping 26½ percent last year. Needless to say, there are a lot of unhappy Blue Cross subscribers in New York City. Other plans weren't all that bad off; nevertheless, rates have been rising constantly, and the experts say we can expect hospital costs alone to go up at least 5 to 10 percent for the next 8 or 10 years. It takes a good reserve to cover increases like that without having to ask the policyholders for higher premiums every year. Yet this law requires setting aside of 3 percent of the premiums at the most for reserves. So when these cost increases come, as they will, the only solution will be to raise the insurance premiums or cut down on benefits. Either way, our Federal employees are going to get hurt.

It is my hope that once the plan begins operating and we see how it is working out, we can hold new hearings and, if necessary, amend the present bill to fit the needs. For the time being, though, we have a program we can be proud of, and our Government employees will rest a lot easier come July 1, knowing they are protected by health benefits as generous and reasonable as they'd find anywhere. Adequate insurance means peace of mind, and it's time our Federal Government workers got their fair share of both.

The Hydrogen Bomb—Suggestions for Control of Superweapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago tomorrow, on February 2, 1950, a distinguished New Englander rose in the Senate to make an historic speech. His subject was the arms race in the hydrogen age and the major leadership required from America if the world was to avoid self-destruction. The speaker was the senior Senator from Connecticut and my good friend, the late Brien McMahon.

This was a speech on which he had labored mightily. I shall never forget the earnestness and determination with which he outlined his dramatic proposal in the Governor's office in Hartford shortly before he presented it to the Senate.

Into this effort Brien McMahon poured his whole heart and soul. The fact that he was the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, lent strength and persuasion to all that he said.

In the intervening decade this speech has become famous, and justly so. For it was not only a statesmanlike presentation of the crisis that confronted us in 1950 when we decided to produce the hydrogen bomb. The analysis and the proposal remain just as pertinent, and twice as impelling, today as they were 10 years ago.

The Senator supported the decision to proceed with the production of the hydrogen bomb; indeed he thought that any other decision would have been inexcusable.

But he was troubled to the depth of his being over "resigning ourselves to a generation of waging the cold war." "Arrayed against the choice of such a policy," he concluded, "is 5,000 years of recorded history" of the outcome of arms races, as well as the knowledge of what such a choice would do over the years to American democracy, economically, psychologically, and morally.

The alternative choice in policy, as Brien McMahon saw it, was to move "Heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race," regarding "no suggestion as to startling or unconventional for careful consideration." He thought a "fresh proposal for atomic peace" was urgently required, and went on to propose a "global Marshall plan."

In return for general acceptance of effective safeguarded nuclear disarmament, he suggested that the United States each year for 5 years commit $10 billion to the following three programs: President Truman's point 4 proposal, the peaceful development of atomic energy, and general economic aid abroad.

"I suppose that my suggestions will be termed impractical or theoretical in some quarters," Senator McMahon concluded. "Before they are condemned, however, I would ask that whoever condemns them produce a better proposal."

Mr. Speaker, who will say that in the intervening years our leaders have given us proposals on anything like this scale or scope? Brien McMahon was prophetic not only in his statement of the challenge, but in his expectation that little or nothing would be done about it commensurate with the need.

Yet the challenge and the fateful choices are with us still. Only the danger deepens. The risks have multiplied and so has the terror.

I am deeply convinced that in the very near future the historic opportunities may be gone for the kind of action Senator McMahon urged. Indeed, if before 1970 we have not brought the enormous risks we are running under better control, history itself may be behind us.

With all this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a special order today in tribute to Senator McMahon's foresight. With the forbearance of the House, I should like to read a slightly condensed version of this remarkable speech—in his words, as he gave it, 10 years ago:

THE HYDROGEN BOMB—SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTROL OF SUPERWEAPONS

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has now given orders to build the hydrogen bomb—to create, in deliverable quantities, those chunks of the sun technically known as thermonuclear weapons.

The scientists feel more confident that this most horrible of armaments can be developed successfully than they felt in 1940 when the original atomic bomb was under consideration. The hydrogen development will be cheaper than its uranium forerunner. Theoretically, it is without limit in destructive capacity. A weapon made of such material would destroy any military

or other target, including the largest city on earth.

The President's decision was dictated by the severe realities of the world which we inhabit today. He had no choice, and his decision under present circumstances is right.

American renunciation of the hydrogen bomb would mean embracing the folly of disarmament by example. Densely populated American cities are made to order for an explosive that will level hundreds of square miles. Communism suffered a defeat in prestige when our democracy completed the earliest atomic bombs, but this prestige defeat would be more than recouped, assuming that Russia were to complete hydrogen bombs soonest. Furthermore, if the Kremlin believes that it cannot outproduce us in ordinary atomic weapons—imagine calling the destroyers of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ordinary—its logical strategy is to excel in the thermonuclear field. All such factors as these serve to warn America against complacency.

Voluntary acceptance of the idea of being less well armed than other nations in this era of our greatest vulnerability runs completely counter to the traditions of our leaders—and, I might add, to good commonsense. In my judgment, a failure to press ahead with the hydrogen bomb might mean unconditional surrender—in advance—by the United States to alien forces of evil.

But please note my insistence that we possess no monopoly upon the hydrogen-bomb idea. If we win the race to build this weapon first, it will be only a matter of time—and possibly a short time—before the Kremlin achieves success also. Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it promises only the negative result of averting for a few months or years well nigh certain catastrophe. Do not for a moment overlook the obvious—that Soviet Russia broke our atomic-bomb monopoly sooner than we had expected, and she would break any hydrogen-bomb monopoly with equal or greater speed. Mr. President, I have the idea that in discussing this subject we are dealing with something which is extremely important. We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race.

What are we going to do about it?

There are really, I suggest, no more than two broad policies from which to choose. One consists in resigning ourselves to a generation of waging the cold war—that is, striving endlessly to contain Russia's outward pressure, pouring out our substance to stay ahead in the weapons competition even after the Kremlin becomes armed with hydrogen bombs, and cherishing indefinitely the hope that Soviet tyranny will somehow see the evil of its ways and reform itself from within. Arrayed against the choice of such a policy is 5,000 years of recorded history, which teaches again and again and again that armaments races lead to war—under today's conditions, hydrogen war.

But even if this policy could enable us to avoid armed conflict for a whole generation, it would undermine and corrupt that which we prize more highly even than the absence of hostilities: I refer to liberty. How is it possible for free institutions to flourish or even to maintain themselves in a situation in which defenses, civil and military, must be ceaselessly poised to meet an attack that might incinerate 50 million Americans—not in the space of an evening but in the space of minutes?

Consider what sustained fear does to the individual—especially to the individual enterpriser. It constricts his imagination, paralyzes his initiative, and even affects his personal morality. It constitutes the most subtle and potent of poisons. Consider the crushing burdens already imposed upon our private enterprise economy. Consider, too, the restrictions on freedom already brought about by the atomic bomb and by its pressures upon us to accept loyalty checks, espionage counter measures, and widening areas of official secrecy. For a preview of the future if the armaments race continues, multiply the effect of these factors by something like 1,000 times—to allow for the 1,000-times greater energy release of the hydrogen bomb—and if you are candid and realistic, I believe you will find it is difficult indeed to see a dominant role for freedom in such a picture. To stay alive we will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival.

The other broad policy which we may choose consists in moving heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race, to establish world-wide atomic peace, and to make possible atomic-created abundance among all men. In pursuing that policy we would tap to the roots the resources of our ingenuity and imagination; we would regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration; and we would be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics and democratic peace-loving decencies.

It is my intense conviction that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydrogen bomb must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun.

Mr. President, if we should fail in the business of working in a crusade for peace, we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future. The people of the United States want harmony among nations infinitely more than they want a new bomb. A fresh proposal for atomic peace, as dramatic as it is sincere, impresses me as urgently desirable.

Yet, through Bernard Baruch's immortal address of more than 3 years ago, we have already undertaken one major peace effort—and it was unsuccessful in that today we remain as far distant from atomic agreement as when we started. Why did this honest peace effort fail to impact successfully upon all mankind?

The answer is abvious and may be summarized in three words: Russia's Iron Curtain. The people of Russia, thanks to the Iron Curtain, have been prevented from knowing the true and desperate nature of the atomic crisis. They have been kept from learning, due to the Iron Curtain, how we extend toward them the hand of friendship and offer a just atomic control plan for their protection and incalculable benefit as well as our own. Any information on the subject that reaches the Russian people is first twisted and distorted into the Red focus of the Kremlin's official line.

We all know why the Soviet elite members maintain their curtain. It is because, using Churchill's phrase, "they fear our friendship more than they fear our enmity." A prison cannot be operated with too many doors and windows unguarded and unlocked. The men of the Kremlin do not want us to look in. Above all, they do not want their own people to look out. This explains not only the Soviet clinging to the curtain but also the Soviet rejection of an atomic inspectorate and other essential controls.

It is completely accurate to say that, in final analysis, Russia's Iron Curtain is responsible for our enormously reluctant decision to make hydrogen bombs, for the curtain prevents the Russian people from appreciating that we want and seek atomic peace; they, therefore, bring no effective pressure upon their rulers to accept atomic peace; the rulers maintain their absolute sway through popular ignorance; and the atomic armaments race rushes madly onward.

But though we may justly blame the Iron Curtain, we must also blame ourselves for failing to bring our message of peace and conciliation adequately to the attention even of those peoples who enjoy reasonably free access to information. Few of our own leaders have recognized that global control of atomic energy is the heart question of all foreign policy and that the German dilemma, the Austrian treaty, the status of Japan, and like matters are relatively insignficant compared to the overriding issue of whether or not more atomic weapons shall enter into existence with each month and year which passes.

If a new crusade for peace is not to miss its objective, as did the peace effort which we launched with such high hopes in 1946, we must not only crack the Iron Curtain and gain the ear of the Russian people, but we must also gain the ear of people on the near side of the barrier, including the many in our own country who do not yet grasp what is at stake.

We have spent $29 million a year on what we are pleased to call the Voice of America. It should be called the whisper of America. We spend in this country over $30 million a year to advertise cosmetics, and $29 million, I repeat, to sell the most precious commodity we have to sell—freedom, itself.

All over the world today—perhaps because listlessness and mediocrity have characterized our attempts to sell what America is, what America wants, and what America intends—there exists misunderstanding as to our attitude. The 30 years of vilification emanating from behind the Iron Curtain in Moscow have taken a toll on our reputation as a peace-loving and a peace-living nation. There are millions of people abroad who observe our armaments expenditures and fail to grasp that these are for self-defense.

They should appreciate the truth, but they do not. We assume that our actual good intentions and actual good feelings must be known to them; but they see that we devote billions to guns, tanks, planes, and atomic weapons—and day and night the Communist propaganda machine hammers into them the theme that American armaments are designed for conquest. Even worst, they do not see—at least with the same clarity—the huge resources being diverted to munitions inside Russia; for the Iron Curtain conceals such activity.

I advocate, Mr. President, a U.S. program of attention-arresting foreign broadcasts that would compare in size and scope to the Soviet effort along this line, and that would genuinely deserve the name, Voice of America. I favor exploring the efficacy of printing millions of leaflets for worldwide circulation, explaining a new U.S. proposal for atomic peace. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to make known the terms of this proposal to newspaper readers and radio listeners inside Russia. We should publicly and repeatedly challenge the Kremlin to permit a meeting of the United Nations in Moscow itself, so that the trend of international discussions and our own sincerity would be more likely to enter the mental horizon of the average Russian.

There are other possible methods of creating a window in the Iron Curtain. Some have already been made known to the Senate; others will occur to us if we give the problem sufficient thought; all should receive the most painstaking scrutiny. At almost any cost we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals, and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict covering this monumental issue.

More than ever it is true that an ineffective agreement would be worse than no agreement at all. More than ever there is no escape from strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants, and continuous inspection. We can enter into no scheme of a type which would only serve to mislead us and induce a false sense of security.

The new approach I have in mind is somewhat different. Although it flows from many weeks, and indeed months, of continuous reflection, I offer it only as an example of the bold steps which the Soviet atomic explosion, the shadow of the hydrogen bomb, and the pyramiding arms race should persuade us to consider.

We now spend about $15 billion annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or $10 billion and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual $10 billion over three programs: President Truman's point 4 proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia? Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit. In exchange for our own contribution of $10 billion annually, which we would save from the military budget, we would ask, first, general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and, second, an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual $10 billion which we offered to make available for 5 years would be carried out through the United Nations.

Such a proposal, if advanced by our Government, might vividly bring home to all the world's population—in a manner far more successful than we have so far used—the profundity of our desire for peace. It would accomplish this result even if it accomplished nothing else. If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in the history of the world; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed.

At present only one-third of the world's 2,200 million people receive enough food to sustain life on a decent basis. The other two-thirds live continuously at the margin of starvation. Mr. President, it is atomic energy that opens up the vision of expanding material decencies until there is enough to go around for all, until every last hungry mouth is filled. Perhaps, through the expenditure of a few extra tens of millions of dollars we can conquer the riddle of photosynthesis and extract from the processes of plant growth a means of multiplying many times the world's food supply. Perhaps through atomic power for industry and agriculture we can transform the deserts of Africa, Asia, and the Americas into blooming crop-producing acres, and the arid hills of the world into gardens. It is almost impossible to overestimate what all-out concentration upon atomic energy for peace might accomplish in terms of remaking and improving the physical environment of mankind.

I might point out that we have already poured billions of dollars into foreign economic aid, asking nothing in return, and still Communist propaganda has blackened our motives in the eyes of millions of men. Here, in accordance with my suggestion, we would ask effective control of the atom and substantial disarmament—which every man and woman in the world has a right to expect without any further inducement on our part. Yet we would in fact provide further inducement, in the form of $10 billion annually for 5 years, as proof of our overwhelming will to peace.

At the same time it goes without saying that we would provide no such funds unless they were associated with the measures needed to rescue humanity from hell on earth, control of the atom, and disarmament.

I suppose that my suggestions will be termed impractical or theoretical in some quarters. Before they are condemned, however, I would ask that whoever condemns them produce a better proposal.

I am willing to have my suggestions today judged against the background of Mr. Baruch's words spoken more than 3 years ago—words which I have quoted and which I now repeat:

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

"That is our business.

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

Mr. President, I would write those words upon the heart and mind of every statesman in the world in the crisis in which we find ourselves today.

This much, Mr. President, I would add: In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow, despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations, we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us.

I believe that every morning each Member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and each high official of the executive branch of this Government, should glance at the sun and reflect that what he sees there, millions of miles away, threatens to be recreated on this earth, in our own cities, in Washington, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and New Orleans. This is a time for soul-searching, for nationwide and worldwide debate, and for the launching and maintaining of that moral crusade for peace which alone can save us and lead mankind along the righteous paths of security, abundance, and liberty.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, few words uttered in the halls of Congress in our lifetimes have been more prophetic than these. Ten years have passed since they were spoken.

Pressures, crosscurrents and conflicts continue to breed confusion about American disarmament policy. The stubborn issues surrounding effective control system for the cessation of nuclear tests have hamstrung the negotiators in Geneva for months. The concept of a sliding scale, relating the number of on-site inspections to the yield of nuclear explosions, is a new and hopeful one. Perhaps our new threshold proposal embodying it will help clarify the American posture in the bomb test talks at Geneva and bring us measurably closer to an effective agreement.

Meanwhile the world remains confused about the major purposes of American policy. The President's goodwill visits have made a favorable impact, but what we now need is followthrough. More than anything else we need the dramatic and purposeful effect of a standing proposal for peace like that suggested by Brien McMahon. It is imagination like his which we have been missing and which is so essential. It is leadership of this caliber which understands the sweep of history and grasps the essential issues of our generation.

Drifting into catastrophe is always easier than building the foundations for peace. But Americans have not always chosen the easiest path. We do not need to succumb to fatalism, as tempting as that may be.

As long as there are Americans like Brien McMahon among us, we will still have the means as a Nation to inspire confidence in our purposes and to lead the world to peace. If this hope is naive, then it is naive to hope.

Importance of Training of Juveniles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, some weeks ago I learned about an unusual experiment conducted by one of my constituents in rehabilitating boys who were on their way to becoming juvenile delinquents. I believe that his brief statement which he sent to me describing his experiences and conclusion is worthy of the attention of all who are interested in ways to meet the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Sol Gelber is today at the age of 40, a successful businessman, married, with several children of his own. As the president of Daysol Metal Products Corp., of Brooklyn, N.Y., he has set an example which I hope others will study.

I ask unanimous consent to place his account of his experiences in the appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Having been brought up on the lower East Side in the midst of poverty, I therefore have witnessed boys turning to crime simply because of not getting proper guidance toward the feeling of responsibility and importance. This is my main reason for employing boys leaning toward crime and those that have had brushes with the law.

My experiences with these boys have been very satisfactory. There of these boys have become foremen in their respective departments and are doing a wonderful job. Their attendance is 100 percent, and it is very noticible that their interest in their job and responsibility is above normal. The reason I say that is because in working with them it seems to me that they want to prove to me and to themselves that confidence in them will be paid back in full.

I employ about 45 people and have had about 25 of these boys employed by me. The boys Brotherhood Republic, an organization primarily for the purpose of helping boys in trouble, recommends these boys to me. I am a graduate of the Boys Brotherhood Republic—a self-governing house that is run for boys, by boys.

SOL GELBER.

President, Daysol Metal Products Corp.

Strikes and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include for the information of my colleagues a thought-provoking article by Prof. Archibald Cox of Harvard University wherein he discusses a proposal for new labor legislation. The article was published in the February 1960 issue of the Atlantic magazine.

STRIKES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Archibald Cox)

The steel strike has precipitated a demand for new legislation providing a better solution to labor disputes which endanger the Nation. With the settlement of the steel strike, the pressure will ease, yet we should not put our heads back in the sand. Emergency disputes will continue to press upon us.

In 12 years, the emergency-disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been invoked on 16 occasions. Since World War II, there have been five major steel strikes. Two nationwide railroad strikes were averted by drastic presidential intervention after the machinery of the Railway Labor Act had been exhausted, and a more serious dispute in the railroads now looms over the horizon. East coast shipping has been tied up five times during this same period. The country has survived each apparent crisis without a catastrophe. But even in management circles, there is wide agreement that the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act are inadequate.

The boards of inquiry, which are charged with reporting the facts to the President before he seeks an injunction and again after 60 days, have sometimes engaged in useful mediation, but they can do no more. The injuction may forestall calamity by keeping the wheels of industry turning for an additional 80 days. It can take the leadership off the hook if management or union blunders into an unwanted strike, or if the rank and file compels union officials to sanction a strike against their better judgment.

In the typical case, however, the injunction simply postpones the showdown by relieving both employer and employees of the necessity to bring about a settlement. For example, the steel companies would surely have felt more pressure to make concessions if they had not known that they could renew operations under an injunction. Employees grow more obstinate when put back to work under a court decree. All the disputes handled under the Taft-Hartley procedure, except two, have been settled either at the outset or after the injunction was lifted and the renewal of the strike brought about a negotiated settlement.

It is sometimes said that the real pressure for a settlement under the Taft-Hartley Act comes from the balloting which the Government conducts upon the employer's last offer of settlement. A vote to accept the offer puts irresistible pressure upon the union leaders, but the evidence available shows that the employees almost always support their leaders and vote to strike. The political strategy of the referendum distracts both sides, but especially the union leaders, from collective bargaining, just when negotiations are most important. The future, if not the existence, of the union is at stake. The resulting emotionalism, particularly if there is a big vote against the company's offer, may make it even harder for the union leaders to make the necessary concessions.

In canvassing the alternatives to the Taft-Hartley Act we must keep in mind the dilemma which confronts us. All of us desire three things, with varying degrees of emphasis: to preserve an economic system in which wages and conditions of employment are fixed by private contract rather than Government regulation; to give employees effective bargaining power through unions of their choosing; and to avoid the interruption of operations in a business essential to the national health or safety.

It is impossible to pursue all three objectives to complete satisfaction. We can avoid Government regulation and prevent strikes—at least in theory—if we are willing to turn over to management the exclusive power to fix wages and conditions of employment. Yet a strike is the only effective way for employees to exercise bargaining power, for it is nonsense to talk about 200,000 coal miners or 300,000 steelworkers individually bargaining with their employers. Theoretically, we can eliminate strikes and safeguard the interests of both employers and employees by substituting compulsory arbitration or Government regulation, or we can have free collective bargaining and suffer the interruptions which threaten the national welfare. The legislator's task will be to find the workable accommodation which will bring the largest measure of satisfaction in terms of all three objectives, even though a bit of each must be sacrificed in order to attain the others.

UNIONS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

One rather popular solution calls for removing the immunity which labor unions enjoy under the antitrust laws. The Sherman Act was applied to unions from 1890 until 1940, but only to formulate judicial policies for preventing strikes and boycotts which the courts regarded as unjustifiable interference with an employer's business. Even in suits filed by the Department of Justice the courts were not concerned with the size of unions or their monopolistic power.

There is nothing in experience to indicate how the Sherman Act can be used effectively to prevent the growth of excessive union power or to avoid the conditions giving rise to emergency disputes. Indeed, the basic theory and concepts of the antitrust laws are inapplicable to labor unions. The antitrust laws are designed to ensure free markets by preserving and enforcing competition among a sufficient number of sellers of goods and services having such equal power as to prevent any one of them from controlling prices, supplies, or quality to the detriment of consumers. But labor unions do not compete against one another in the sale of labor.

The Hartley bill and Ball amendment of 1947 proposed to eliminate industrywide bargaining (a misnomer for industrywide unionization) by confining the bargaining rights of each union to a single employee and then forbidding the several companywide unions to combine or conspire by coordinating their negotiations either directly or through an international union. In the automobile industry, there would be one union for Ford, one for General Motors, one for Chrysler, and one for each of the smaller companies. The same pattern would be enforced throughout the economy with a possible exception for very small firms in a single industrial area, such as the garment shops in New York City.

Obviously this proposal would provide no safeguard against a national emergency dispute arising at a single plant. In 1952–53, a strike at one plant of American Locomotive Co. cut off the entire supply of nickel alloy pipe used in the gaseous diffusion plants of the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1952, North American Aviation Co. was the only producer of jet airplanes needed in the Korean conflict.

Breaking up the international unions would hardly affect the course of negotiations in the oligopolistic industries, such as the producers of steel, automobiles, and copper. One could hardly expect each companywide union to negotiate without an eye upon the others; the companies do not make prices in that fashion. The decentralized negotiations last winter between the major airlines and bargaining committees from the various International Machinists Association locals, which made their own decisions, resulted in a succession of strikes as each companywide group sought to leapfrog to a higher wage than that of the preceding settlement. The aluminum, aircraft, and lumber industries, where there have been rival unions, have felt the same wage pressures as if they were dealing with one union.

In an industry where the firms are smaller, to break the labor union into company fragments, each of which is forbidden to bargain in consultation with another fragment or a parent international, would affect the course of collective bargaining by weakening the labor unions and destroying a great many. The employees of a single company are too small a unit to support the experienced officials and professional staff required to negotiate and administer contracts effectively. But these are not the industries in which the inflationary wage pressures are serious, nor, except for coal mining, do they experience national emergency disputes. The great vice of the proposed antitrust weapon, therefore, is that it would kill and maim innocent bystanders while leaving the ostensible targets unaffected.

Even if such a program were theoretically sound, it is impractical. A program of breaking up labor organizations could not succeed without a vigorous effort to break up giant corporations too. We cannot turn back the clock.

FLEXIBILITY THROUGH CHOICE

Many students of industrial relations are now convinced that the best hope for avoiding national emergency strikes, while preserving a large measure of freedom and private responsibility for the terms of the settlement, lies in legislation which opens the door to a wide choice of procedures. I favor this method, but would divide it into two parts: industry procedures and Government procedures.

Each industry in which a labor dispute might affect the national health or safety should be admonished by law to create a standing procedure for resolving disputes which will not yield to the ordinary processes of negotiation. This procedure would include private mediation, factfinding with or without recommendations, voluntary arbitration, or reference to a permanent bipartite board with power to decide by a stipulated majority. There are endless possibilities. The essential points are: first, that it be a standing procedure which survives the termination of regular collective bargaining agreements; second, that it come into play at an early stage in negotiations before positions have hardened; and third, that it give reasonable assurance of avoiding an emergency. The Railway Labor Act should continue to provide the machinery for the railways and airlines until modified, but they should be brought under the second stage of the choice-of-procedures plan.

Experience under the Railway Labor Act, despite recent failures, and in atomic energy installations seems to show that the best settlement procedures are those devised for a particular industry by its own management and labor, taking into account its peculiar background, technology, customs, and needs. The central issues in labor relations have become too complicated to be resolved by splitting the last nickel or finding a happy formula under pressure of a crisis. Consider,

for example, the complexities of increasing industrial productivity by electronic devices or atomic energy with adequate provision for human costs and a just allocation of the monetary savings. Reaching a settlement of the work rules issue on the railroads will require complete revision of an elaborate structure, including methods of wage payment, which dates back to 1920.

The new statute should provide that, upon request of the industry or a recommendation by the Secretary of Labor, the President should appoint a board of public responsibility, chosen from men of experience and high standing in the field of industrial relations, who would serve as the occasion required. Such a board should have two duties: To assist the industry in setting up its own procedure and to serve the functions of an industry procedure whenever there is none. Except for this and the normal work of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Government should not be brought into the first stage of the procedure.

PRESIDENTIAL INTERVENTION

Notwithstanding the industry procedures, there will always be some critical disputes. There should, therefore, be established by statute a National Emergency Disputes Board, which the President would summon and consult whenever the Secretary of Labor certified the existence of an unresolved dispute which he considered an imminent threat to the national health or safety. The Board should be composed of the Secretaries of Defense, of Commerce, and of Labor, and two eminent citizens, one with a background in management and the other from labor, neither of whom is currently associated with parties to the controversy. Clinton Golden and Sidney Weinburg illustrate the type of man required.

The National Emergency Disputes Board should have three functions: First, to arrange a settlement, if possible, or a method of obtaining a settlement without the cessation of normal operations; second, to make all possible arrangements for protecting the national interest in the event of a strike or lockout; and third, to hear the parties and advise the President upon the single question of whether a strike or lockout would do immediate harm to the national health or safety. The hearing not only would deter hasty Government action but also would focus public pressure upon the parties.

If the President finds after studying the report of the Emergency Disputes Board that an emergency is imminent, he should have statutory authority to follow five courses of action, singly, consecutively, concurrently, or in any sequence:

1. He might appoint a factfinding board with power to mediate and also to make public recommendations for the settlement of the dispute.

2. A board of inquiry might be appointed for the purpose of arranging voluntary arbitration, or, if this fails, reporting to the public the blame for imperiling the national health or safety.

3. Since an injunction may be the only way to stop a strike, the statute should authorize the President to obtain an injunction for as long as 6 months. The public health and safety are more important than the rights of either party.

4. The President should also have power to seize and operate the industrial property affected by the dispute. Such a step would be as distasteful to employers as are injunctions to unions, but the very aim is to make presidential intervention objectional to both. Since strikes would be forbidden during the period of government operation, the President should be authorized, but not required, to appoint an adjustment board to recommend any changes in wages and conditions of employment for the period of government operation. The parties would be under heavy pressure to adopt these interim conditions as the terms of the final settlement in order to terminate the seizure, but the appearance and some of the reality of voluntary action would be preserved. The pressure is less than under compulsory arbitration, which I reject, even as an available procedure, upon the ground that it would too easily become the normal course.

In Massachusetts the employer may elect either to allow the Commonwealth to operate the business for his financial account or else to sue for just compensation, the measure of which would presumably include an allowance for the employer's inability to use the strike-bound property. This method of financial adjustment seems to have worked pretty well, but I am inclined to think that the Government should also have the right to elect to pay only just compensation; otherwise, seizure might become a sham, a method of breaking a strike without disturbing the management's control or the owner's profits.

The act of seizure is a drastic measure, but it is not a novel remedy. Its use by the Federal Government began in 1918. It was fairly common in World War II. Several States, notably Massachusetts and Missouri, have seizure statutes. When a business becomes financially insolvent, an equity or bankruptcy court may assume possession and operate the business for the benefit of interested persons. Seizure is little more than an executive receivership imposed because the company and union are insolvent in their labor relations.

5. Finally, the President should be given his most important power in explicit terms—the power to do nothing. Sometimes the parties negotiate agreements very promptly after they are convinced that no one else will carry the burden.

In academic discourse it is easy to argue that the country has never faced a true emergency as a result of a peacetime strike, that the President has ample constitutional authority to deal with a crisis, and that we can best preserve collective bargaining by repealing all legislation applicable to emergency disputes. In my opinion, muddling through will not meet the challenges of the atomic age and space exploration.

The flexibility of the choice-of-procedures approach is an important asset, but its chief advantage over other solutions to the problem of national emergency disputes lies in the capacity for preserving uncertainty as to the form and extent of Government intervention. Any set course of procedures enters into the calculations on both sides, with the result that their negotiations tend to run the full course before the parties buckle down to business. This weakness has frequently developed under the Railway Labor and Taft-Hartley Acts; the 1950 coal strike is a good illustration, and history may record the recent steel strike as another. In ordinary labor negotiations, the risks and costs of a strike are among the most powerful factors in bringing about an agreement. The choice-of-procedures approach creates new uncertainties. Some alternatives would be objectionable to employers, others to unions. The stage would be set for active mediation in which the President or his representative would not hesitate to influence the substance of the bargaining nor to remind both sides that his choice of a procedure in the event of continued disagreement might be influenced by his judgment that either party was unreasonable. Thus armed with a variety of weapons, the Chief Executive would probably be spared the use of any.

The policy of the Eisenhower administration has been to avoid Government interference with collective bargaining. My suggestions go so far in the other direction that some may suggest that it would be better to formalize the Government's responsibility by establishing a labor court or wage regulation board. Space prevents more than two short observations upon the point.

First, I am convinced that during the next 10 or 20 years, in an age in which international tensions, the challenge of space exploration, and an exploding population strain the productive capacity of our economy, we will be unable to ignore the public interest in the substance of collective bargaining agreements. The problems of inflation and automation are only two examples.

Second, there is a vast difference between compulsory arbitration or a labor court or a Government wage board and Government participation through mediation or factfinding. The former involve adjudication or regulation supported by legal sanctions. When the Government participates through mediation, its representatives may persuade, cajole, and even threaten, but in the end they must secure agreement without the power to command. Thus, the suggested techniques preserve the challenge to creativity presented by the necessary for securing common consent.

Progressive Development of the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished lawyers in the United States is George M. Johnson, of California, a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Last year it was my pleasure to preside over the Judiciary Subcommittee which recommended confirmation of Mr. Johnson's appointment to the Commission. At that time I was most impressed by his dedication to the principle that members of the legal profession should be more than mere drawers of papers; should be, in fact, persons taking an active part in the progressive development of the law they serve. This theme runs through an address recently delivered by Mr. Johnson to the Federal Bar Association, and it is a provocative speech which should come to the attention of the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE 1959 ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION IN WASHINGTON, D.C., BY GEORGE M. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, SEPTEMBER 25, 1959

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to address the distinguished group of professional colleagues, comprising the Federal Bar Association. I believe, it is generally agreed that, in a democratic society, members of the legal profession have a special responsibility to participate actively in the formulation and development of the law. To the extent that this is a correct appraisal, it would seem to follow that members of the Federal Bar Association, by virtue of their identification with legal problems of our National Government, should have a special interest and, perhaps, responsibility in the formulation and development of the increasingly complex areas of American public law. This assumption finds support in the im-

posing list of 32 standing committees set out on page 25 of your annual convention program. I am sure you will excuse, or at least understand, my slight disappointment that no Civil Rights Committee is listed. Perhaps this vexatious area of public law is covered by the Juvenile Delinquency Committee.

When I received the invitation to participate on this program, I was in Brazil engaged in a short and independent pilot study of the role of law in race relations in the Western Hemisphere. I had selected Brazil for the pilot study because of the multiracial composition of the population, the country's general reputation for racial tolerance, and the fact that Brazil had enacted a national civil rights law in 1951.

The subject of my independent pilot study in Brazil and the theme of this convention, "Western Hemisphere Solidarity" are sufficiently related to suggested that I might contribute to your deliberations by talking about some of my observations in Brazil. After I accepted your invitation, however, the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, of which I am a membr, was releasd to an unsuspecting public. To say that the report has been received with mixed emotions is, perhaps, an understatement. In any event, it now seems appropriate to discuss some aspects of the report which may be of special interest to lawyers with a responsibility for the formulation and development of American public law.

In creating the Commission on Civil Rights in 1957, Congress directed the Commission specifically to perform four tasks:

1. To investigate sworn complaints that certain citizens are being deprived of voting rights because of color, race, religion or national origin.

2. To collect and study information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws.

3. To appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection of the laws.

4. Submit to the President and to Congress a final report, with findings and recommendations, not later than September 9, 1959.

Thus, the Commission is an independent factfinding, study and appraisal agency and, significantly, it is given no enforcement powers or authority to correct any inequalities it may find.

It is readily apparent to lawyers that denials of equal protection of the laws because of color, race, religion or national origin have been judicially interdicted in relation to a wide range of subject areas, such as registration and voting, education, housing, employment, administration of justice, transportation and Government facilities. Had the Commission been able to begin its operations immediately after the statute creating it became law, obviously, it could not have performed its assignment with respect to all the subject areas embraced in the constitutional phrase "equal protection of the laws." Actually, and for reasons beyond its control, the Commission was unable to begin full-scale operations during the first 8 months of the maximum 2-year period provided in the statute. Under these circumstances, the Commission somewhat arbitrarily selected the subject areas of education and housing, in addition to voting, which the statute expressly required it to cover. In all candor, it should be said that, even in the three areas selected, the Commission's work was less than exhaustive for the Nation as a whole. However, the Commission faithfully reported what it did, how it did it, and what it found. In the judgment of the Commission, what it found supports the recommendations it has made.

Before discussing some of the Commission's specific recommendations, it seems appropriate to raise with this distinguished group of lawyers, an issue which needs to be given serious thought and about which more needs to be said. I refer to the role of law in race relations. Is law the proper tool or social sanction for the control of intergroup conflicts? It is often said that because prejudices are at the root of intergroup conflicts, especially interracial conflicts, the only solution is to rid people's minds and hearts of race prejudice and this cannot be accomplished by laws. Stating the issue in this manner is, in my humble judgment, inadequate for at least two reasons. First, it fails to recognize the important distinction between prejudice and discrimination; and second, it assumes that laws are powerless to change attitudes.

On the importance of distinguishing between prejudice and discrimination, Prof. Melvin Tumin, in his recent book, "Desegregation, Resistance, and Readiness," on pages 46 and 47, has this to say:

"Prejudice literally means prejudgment. But it has come to stand for a set of unfavorable beliefs about and desires for distance from certain types of persons.

"More often than not, unfavorable qualities are ascribed to whole groups of persons on the basis of limited experience with a few members of that group.

"By contrast, discrimination refers to types of actions taken to keep distance from the disfavored group."

Professor Tumin then goes on to say that:

"For some time now it has been fashionable to contend that there is an automatic connection between prejudice and discrimination. This implies that the prejudiced person naturally tends to practice discrimination. As a corollary, it is held that discrimination cannot be eliminated except as one first removes the prejudicial feelings which underlie the tendency to discriminate.

"More recent research and theory, however, have been very persuasive in demonstrating that there exists a gap between the things we call prejudice and that which we call discrimination. In this gap a variety of factors can be interposed which will either facilitate the acting out of the prejudice or inhibit the prejudiced person from discriminating."

It is submitted that laws requiring racial segregation in areas of intergroup relations, such as education, transportation, public facilities, and public accommodations, have facilitated the acting out of racial prejudices. Moreover, the enforcement of such laws has made it difficult for prejudiced persons to change their minds and hearts on rational bases of experience. Logically, antisegregation laws inhibit the acting out of prejudices and provide opportunities for prejudiced persons to have experiences which may change their minds and hearts. Those who favor legislation as an appropriate tool for the control of intergroup conflicts are concerned, primarily, with preventing discriminatory conduct and patterns of behavior. In volume 20 of the University of Chicago Law Review, pages 363 to 413, Messrs. Maslow and Robison describe, in considerable detail, the success of the legislation approach in intergroup conflicts.

The assumption that laws are powerless to change attitudes, recalls to mind one of my law school professor's description of rebuttable presumptions. He said, in substance, that they are "bats in the night that vanish in the sunlight of facts." There is considerable evidence that laws can and do change attitudes. This evidence is discussed by Professor Tumin and also Messrs. Maslow and Robison. Gordon W. Alport, in his book, "The Nature of Prejudice," objectively analyzes the pros and cons of the issue under discussion in a chapter titled "Ought There To Be a Law?" One of his conclusions is:

"Law is intended only to control the outward expression of intolerance. But outward action, psychology knows, has an eventual effect upon inner habits of thought and feeling. And for this reason we list legislative action as one of the major methods of reducing, not only public discrimination, but private prejudice as well."

There is sound reason, therefore, for the Commission decision to include legislation in its recommendations. The facts which the Commission found, put in bold relief the sobering fact that, in mid-twentieth century America, a substantial portion of our citizenry is unwilling to follow the rule of equal rights. With the facts collected, studied, and reported, pursuant to congressional direction and mandate, the President and the Congress may be aided in the formulation and development of methods for remedying the defects found to exist. The Commission gave serious thought to methods and, as directed by the Congress, has included in its report a number of recommendations for consideration by the President, the Congres, and the people. Now that Congress has approved an extension of the Commission's life for an additional 2 years, I am sure the Commission will welcome a serious and critical analysis of its first report by interested members of the Federal Bar Association.

As Hon. John A. Hannah, Chairman of the Commission, stated last week, with reference to the report: "The Commission made 14 recommendations in its report * * * 13 of the 14 were unanimous decisions, and on the 14th, there was only one formal dissent. Three additional proposals going beyond the 14 recommendations were advanced vigorously by three or less Commissioners and objected to with equal vigor."

Time does not permit a discussion of all the recommendations and proposals. However, because the thrust of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, was on denials of the right to vote, some analysis of a significant recommendation in the subject-area of voting may be appropriate.

The Commission recommended, with one formal dissent, that upon receipt by the President of the United States of sworn affidavits by nine or more individuals from any district, county, parish, or other political subdivision of a State, alleging that the affiants have unsuccessfully attempted to register with the duly constituted State registration office, and that the affiants belive themselves qualified under State law to be electors, but have been denied the right to register because of race, color, religion, or national origin, the President shall refer such affidavits to the Commission on Civil Rights if extended.

The Commission shall:

1. Investigate the validity of the allegations.

2. Dismiss such affidavits as prove, on investigation, to be unfounded.

3. Certify any and all well-founded affidavits to the President, and to such temporary registrar as he may designate.

The President upon such certification shall designate an existing Federal officer or employee in the area from which complaints are received, to act as a temporary registrar.

Such registrar-designate shall administer the State qualification laws and issue to all individuals found qualified, registration certificates which shall entitle them to vote for any candidate for the Federal offices of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Members of the Senate or Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners for the Territories or possessions, in any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate.

The registrar-designate shall certify to the responsible State registration officials the names and fact of registration of all persons registered by him. Such certification shall permit all such registrants to participate in Federal elections previously enumerated.

Jurisdiction shall be retained until such time as the President determines that the presence of the appointed registrar is no longer necessary.

As many of you are aware, this recommendation has received wide attention. It is important that it be understood exactly. The reasons for the Commission's recommending it are of consequence. Of no less consequence is the fact that five of the six Commissioners voted for this recommendation. Upon what knowledge was it made? The Commission investigated sworn complaints of denials of the right to vote by reason of color or race in eight States. In Alabama and Louisiana, where it determined to hold formal hearings, it met open resistance by State officials. Nevertheless, on the basis of testimony of witnesses, the examination of voting records and field investigations, the Commission found that "a substantial number of Negroes are being denied their right to vote."

The Commission further found that such infringement is usually accomplished through discriminatory application and administration of State registration laws. Discriminatory registration is by no means the sole problem, for where there is no registration board or none capable of functioning lawfully there can be no registration. Where the Commission found these situations, "the majority of the electorate already registered were white persons." Beyond this, and it bears emphasis, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, dealing with intimidation, threats, and coercion, have been unsuccessful. I know of no Negro being registered as a result of this provision of law. Cases in Alabama, Georgia, and now in Louisiana brought by the Attorney General have, at this time, been unsuccessful.

Let me add, that this recommendation should not be misconstrued. It does not require that the entire statewide machinery be inoperative before it takes effect. It requires only that at least nine individuals from any district, county, parish, or other political subdivision of a State submit well-founded allegations that the affiant is qualified but has been denied the right to register because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I submit that this recommendation has many distinct virtues. First, it is temporary. This means that as soon as any area complies with the law, and applies the law in a nondiscriminatory manner, the temporary registrar-designate is removed. Second, it seeks to use as registrar-designates, existing Federal officers or employees in the area from which the complaints are received. Thus, the temporary registrar will not be imported from foreign soil. Third, it does not go to the point of establishing continuing supervisors over all Federal elections, but requires only that the temporary registrar register individuals he finds qualified under applicable State laws. These individuals will then be enabled to vote in Federal elections.

I have discussed this particular recommendation, in some detail, because it has attracted nationwide attention. Other recommendations are made in the subject-areas of education, and housing, and voting as well. My failure to discuss other recommendations is due entirely to considerations of time and should not be interpreted as indicative of their relative unimportance. The Commission can be aided appreciably by your thoughtful criticisms of its efforts as it undertakes to complete its assignment.

I often wonder whether members of the legal profession in this country appreciate fully their distinctive role and concomitant responsibilities. Jerome Hall, in his book, "Living Law of Democratic Society," has this to say:

"Because a democracy is a distinctive legal organization, the issues confronting thoughtful citizens are legal problems. Serious efforts to solve legal problems are lead inevitably to relevant fundamentals. Thus, the crucial questions of the mid-20th century, whatever else they may involve, are ultimately jurisprudential ones.

"In thousands of country seats throughout the length and breadth of this continental Nation, the courthouse is the focal point of local interest as well as the symbol of law and justice. The lawyer represents this enduring aspect of the American character and it is therefore no accident that, whatever he may sometimes become in the great metropolis, he continues to be a public leader, carrying on the tradition of the Founding Fathers in a much more complex world than that in which they lived."

Commission Chairman Hannah has often voiced his conviction that the problem of civil rights transcends in importance all other domestic issues that this country faces. I am in complete agreement with him. While the problem today is, to a large extent, a race and color problem, it is by no means limited to any particular section of the Nation as the Commission's report on housing reveals. None of us has all the answers and there is a desperate need for imaginative but thoughtful leadership at National, State, and local levels. It does not seem unrealistic or unreasonable to assume that members of the Federal Bar Association should contribute substantially to such leadership and, in so doing, make a meaningful contribution to Western Hemisphere solidarity.

Augustus Owsley Stanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following tribute to the great Augustus Owsley Stanley, former Governor of Kentucky and former U.S. Senator from Kentucky. The remarks of Senator GATES YOUNG and Senate Resolution No. 5 of the Kentucky General Assembly reflect the esteem in which Augustus Owsley Stanley was held by all Kentuckians:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GATES F. YOUNG SPONSORING A RESOLUTION REVERING A. O. STANLEY

Mr. President, in the closing hours of Tuesday, August 12, 1958, the Master Architect, Creator and Builder of the Universe, in His infinite wisdom, called from His earthly associates the soul, and stilled the voice of Augustus Owsley Stanley, one of Kentucky's most illustrious sons.

In presenting this resolution I not only seek to have the memory of A. O. Stanley inscribed upon our records, but I do honor to myself and refresh the memory of this great Kentuckian in the hearts and minds of some other of "his boys."

I am one of "his boys." He had many others throughout the width and breadth of Kentucky. Among them our present highway commissioner, Senator Earle Clements; our former commissioner of economic security, V. E. Barnes; and our lovable and capable colleague, the senator from Fleming, who served as a page in the house of representatives in 1916, while the incomparable Stanley was Governor. And not the least of them, Emerson Beauchamp, our commissioner of agriculture.

Had I the vocabulary of a Webster or a Churchill my attempt to pay proper respect to the late Augustus Owsley Stanley would still be feeble and inadequate.

He was one of the great of his time.

Born in 1867, when Andrew Johnson was President, his life spanned three epochal eras. He lived through the service of 17 Presidents of the United States. Thirteen States were admitted to the Union during his lifetime. The new State of Alaska was acquired from Russia; the Southern States were readmitted to the Union. The 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th amendments to the Constitution were adopted. The east and west coasts were tied together with spans of steel by the opening of the Union Pacific Railroad.

Edison announced his phonograph and introduced the electric light.

The first telephone exchange was installed.

The French Atlantic cable was laid.

Brooklyn Bridge was opened—Statue of Liberty unveiled.

The Spanish American War was fought.

The prohibition amendment adopted and repealed.

The woman sufferage amendment adopted.

U.S. Navy fliers circled the globe, and the North Pole reached by Navy plane.

Yes, during the 91 years of his life, our country abandoned its swaddling clothes and became great, as he grew and became great.

Kentucky has had its Clays, Carlisles, Breckinridges, Bradley, and Morrow, but none excelled Stanley.

God anointed his vocal chords with the roar of thunder; the sharp, whiplike clap of lightning; the softness of the coo of contentment of a baby in its mother's arms, and the silver and golden glow of the morning and evening skies.

In public service he fought the battles of the Kentucky tobacco farmer against the tobacco trust—the battle of the American steel users against the steel trust.

The freedom of the peoples representative in these legislative halls from domination by outside influences.

Courage had no man in public or private life to a greater degree.

He forced the passage of Kentucky's anti-pass law.

He saved the life of a Negro murderer from a mob in one of our western counties with his great persuasive language, thus avoiding a stain upon the Commonwealth's name.

Like an armed warrier, like a plumed knight he marched through life and threw his shining lance full and fair against the foreheads of his adversaries.

Under the headline "Giant of the Stump," A. O. Stanley was last of the great orators of Kentucky politics.

Our own beloved Allen Trout closed his article with this moving and appropriate language:

"From the hundreds of thousands of golden words spoken by Governor Bradley, one short passage was selected to carve above his grave in Frankfort Cemetery, near the graves of Stanley and Morrow.

This passage is a tingling classic. It is his benediction upon the throng which gathered June 12, 1910, to hear him dedicate the magnificent new State Capitol, on an eminence across Kentucky River from the cemetery bluff where he and Stanley and Morrow are entombed.

May we not now, in fancy, turn it into an epitaph for the fresh-buried Stanley and his two matchless peers, already back to the dust from which they sprang? Here is Bradley's benediction:

"May the summer's sun shine brightly, and the winter's snows fall lightly as they deftly weave their white mantle above you.

May the tempests abate their fury as they sweep over you. May the springtime entwine its most beautiful garlands above you; and may each of you, reunited with your loved ones in that realm beyond the stars where summer's heat and winter's cold are unknown, where the grass never withers and the flowers never fade, abide in His presence forever."

Kentucky's beloved Stanley has crossed the river to the Celestial City. But, the life and deeds of A. O. Stanley linger in the memory and affection of a multitude of Kentuckians.

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Joint resolution honoring the memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley

Whereas Augustus Owsley Stanley, one of Kentucky's most illustrious sons, has heeded the call of his Creator ending a life of faithful service which reflected the highest honor upon him and contributed incalculably to the progress of this great State and indeed this Nation; and

Whereas the accomplishments of this statesman and incomparable orator were such that it is deemed fitting and proper that his memory be perpetuated by inscription of his biography upon the journals of the senate and house of representatives as follows:

Augustus Owsley Stanley, six times representative in Congress from the old second district, Governor of Kentucky, U.S. Senator, member and for many years chairman of the International Joint Commission, was born in Shelbyville May 21, 1867, a son of the Reverend William and Amanda (Owsley) Stanley. His father was captain of a company in the "Orphan Brigade" and also a judge advocate general in the Confederate Army, later becoming a minister of the Christian Church. After attending private schools, Augustus Owsley Stanley entered Alleghany Academy at Nicholasville, Ky., continued his studies at the University of Kentucky (then State College) from 1886 to 1888, and was graduated with the degree of bachelor of arts from Centre College at Danville in 1889. The degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon him. He was a member of Omicron Delta Kappa honorary fraternity and Sigma Alpha Epsilon social fraternity.

Upon completion of his studies at Centre College he entered upon a career of schoolteaching, including 2 years at the old Mackville Academy, studying law at night, to the practice of which he was admitted in 1894. He followed his profession in Flemingsburg until 1898, when he moved to Henderson, Ky., where he continued his practice until 1924.

He entered the political arena by being selected a Democratic presidential elector from the Second Congressional District in 1900. He was elected to the 58th Congress in 1902 and served 12 consecutive years. During his congressional service he won nationwide attention by his vigorous endeavors on behalf of the tobacco growers of Kentucky, was sponsor of the legislation which brought about the regulation of the giant tobacco trust.

His stature locally and nationally was enhanced by his selection for the chairmanship of the congressional committee investigating the monopolistic practices of the United States Steel Co. in its acquisition of large deposits of iron ore in the Northern States.

On April 29, 1903, Congressman Stanley married Miss Susan Soaper of Henderson, and to this union there were three sons born—Augustus Owsley Stanley, Jr., William Soaper Stanley, and Marion Shelby Stanley, who, while a student at the University of Kentucky lost his life in an airplane accident.

In 1915, following nomination by the Democratic Party, he was elected Governor of Kentucky and served in that office until May 18, 1919, at which time he resigned to enter the U.S. Senate, having been elected in 1918. His service in that august body which terminated on March 3, 1925, was marked by the same courage, honesty, and dedication of purpose which was characteristic of his service as a Congressman and as Governor of the Commonwealth. Upon leaving the Senate he entered the practice of law in Washington, the Capital of our Nation, in association with Joseph P. Tumulty, former secretary to President Woodrow Wilson. In May 1930 he was appointed a member of the International Joint Commission, and became Chairman of that body on March 7, 1933, in which position he served until 1954.

He was a member of the Christian Church, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks and of the Pendennis Club.

Augustus Owsley Stanley was a dedicated, unrelenting, nondeviating and most articulate champion of democracy having upon at least one occasion given voice to his philosophy in these terms:

"Democracy with me is more than a conviction—it is an abiding faith and now I reverently dedicate 'the bitter little that of life remains' to the service and the success of democracy. And when the tale is told and the journey ended, I shall not have repaid the debt to the people I devoutly love and to the cause I shall maintain until my arms are palsied and my tongue is stilled in death."

Truly, it can be said of Augustus Owsley Stanley that he was one of the—

"Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog.
In public duty, and private thinking."

And one of those—

"Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions, and a will;
Men who have honor, who will not lie."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

Section 1. That when the senate and the house of representatives do this day adjourn they do so in memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley.

Sec. 2. That the general assembly does hereby extend to the family of Augustus Owsley Stanley its profound and deepest sympathy and does commend the members thereof to Almighty God who is forever near to those who trust him for solace.

Sec. 3. That the clerk of the senate cause copies of this resolution to be transmitted to each of the Members of the Congress representing the Commonwealth of Kentucky with the request that a copy thereof be spread upon the record of proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives and made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sec. 4. That a copy of the Journals of the Senate and the House of Representatives wherein this resolution is recorded be presented to Mrs. Susan Soaper Stanley, Mr. Augustus Owsley Stanley, Jr., and to Mr. William Soaper Stanley.

Attest:

JOHN W. WILLIS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

(S. Res. 5 was signed by His Excellency, Gov. Bert Combs, on January 25, 1960.)

When the American Medical Association Disapproves: Everything's "Socialism"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News of Friday, December 11, 1959.

The chronic use of the term "socialized medicine" by the American Medical Association has been much like the bell to Pavlov's dog.

Everything that the AMA has ever opposed is now cataloged as "socialism" or "socialized medicine."

This habit of taking the easy way out and calling things the AMA opposes socialism and socialized medicine has finally attracted unfavorable attention in the press after long and excessive use by the AMA.

Occasionally the general public is impressed by this gratuitous insult to their collective intelligence. I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in one segment of the press which apparently is fed up with the misuse of the word for anything and everything in sight.

The article follows:

[From the Detroit News, Dec. 11, 1959]

WHEN THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION DISAPPROVES: EVERYTHING'S "SOCIALISM"

The genius who coined the term "socialized medicine" but neglected to define it gave the medical profession a handy brick to heave at anyone or anything that threatens to upset the status quo as set down by the American Medical Association.

The brick is now flying toward the unfortunate William S. McNary, executive vice president of Michigan Blue Cross. It seems he personally favors a partial Federal subsidy of the costs of hospital insurance for retired men and women. The subsidy would be paid from an increase in the social security tax.

The AMA is already vigorously on record as opposed to a bill now before Congress (Forand bill) which provides for a somewhat lesser form of the aid McNary suggests. That is all that some physicians need to know. The AMA has spoken, it's "socialized medicine." The profession will be run by a Government bureau within a week. Run for the hills, McNary has busted the dam.

It ought to be said that McNary developed his plan for submission to a U.S. Senate subcommittee which is surveying the problems of the aged. One of the problems is the cost of medical and hospital care of retired persons of low income. The problem is complicated because most retired people have lost the benefits of their group medical insurance. It's a matter needing solution and this is McNary's idea of how to solve it.

Since "socialized medicine" is undefined it is almost impossible for anyone to prove that anything suggested in the medical field is not, in fact, socialism or socialistic. If the AMA or any physician flings the brick there is no more defense against it than there is against the atom bomb.

It would be a difficult task no doubt, knowing doctors, to get the profession to agree on a definition of what they mean when they say "socialized medicine."

For instance, the Federal income tax laws permit the taxpayer under certain circumstances to deduct the costs of medical and dental care and the costs of drugs. Is this "socialized medicine" or isn't it? The aged blind are granted certain benefits, too. Is this socialism? The employee unable to work temporarily because of illness gets a tax break. This must smack of socialism because the patient can use the money he doesn't have to pay the Internal Revenue Service to pay his doctor. This is a subsidy, but does AMA regard it as "socialized medicine"?

And, if you're hit by a car on the streets of Detroit, you probably will be rushed unconscious to Receiving Hospital where your life may be saved by a doctor on a government payroll. For sure this is "socialism" and even violates that sacred precept of free personal choice of one's physician.

Yes; we badly need a definition. When we get one we can decide, each of us, whether we support that type of medicine or not. If we don't get one, more and more of us are going to be convinced that the term means anything the AMA happens to be against.

And meanwhile, we'll continue to wonder why doctors—so very intelligent individually—sound so inept when they speak with a collective voice.

U.S. Science Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today providing for the creation of a commission to conduct a complete investigation and study, with recommendations, relating to the establishment of a U.S. Science Academy.

My bill differs, I believe, in several important respects with many of those previously introduced. I would like to point out some basic differences to the Members.

It does not provide for the establishment of an academy, but for the establishment of a Hoover-type commission, which seems to me to be the proper approach to the problem of evaluating all of the facts that would be necessary to eventually establish such an Academy.

Again, the bill conceives that the Academy would train and assist unusually qualified students, who have completed their college training, in the fields of physical science, mathematics, or engineering, and whose services would be retained by our Government for a specified number of years after graduation.

In this atomic and space age, it should be obvious that scientific progress is essential for the future welfare and security of our country, and I believe that it is important for us to have the very best brains of our youth available to the various arms of our governmental establishment. They could assist materially in progressing toward not only a more secure life for our people, but also for one containing as many human comforts as possible.

I urge the Members of this august body to study this legislation and to join with me, on a bipartisan basis, if they choose, in introducing identical bills, so that its concept will have full support.

Paying for the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New Republic magazine, February 1, 1960, issue. No one can dispute the facts set forth in the editorial and I fail to see how anyone can disagree with the conclusions:

PAYING FOR THE PUBLIC DEBT

One of the few arguments the Treasury lost last year with a supine Congress was its effort to repeal legislation which placed a 4¼-percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. This year Secretary Anderson is back to the charge once more. In a recent speech he maintained that the burden of the national debt was heavier because the Treasury was compelled to borrow only at short term, at a time when long-term lenders could invest their funds more profitably in mortgages and other securities. Because of this limitation on the Treasury, business borrowers had to pay higher rates also, and Treasury financing needlessly cluttered the capital markets because of the constant necessity to refund maturing debt. Almost anyone might sympathize with the Secretary when it is realized that in the next 12 months more than $84 billion of Federal bonds will mature and the Treasury will be obliged to sell equivalent amounts in the open market.

How the economists of the American Economic Association, to which these remarks were addressed, responded we do not know. But in the past Secretary Anderson's position has won the support of most responsible experts in the field of debt management. The major argument is comparatively simple: the proper role of the Federal Reserve System is to make money scarce when inflation threatens and to make it plentiful when recession impends. It can scarcely operate unhampered if it must take care that Treasury bond issues find ready buyers, for it must provide the funds which enable purchases to be made. Therefore the less frequently the Treasury has to appeal to the money market, the more smoothly monetary policy will work. This is the argument for lengthening the structure of debt maturities which the Eisenhower administration has often promised and never performed.

In this specific instance, however, there are good reasons to challenge the cogency of the general analysis. Despite appearances, Congress was not succumbing to a fit of economic illiteracy when it refused to lift the interest ceiling. Instead, it was registering the only judgment that was, as a practical matter, within its political power on the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System and of the Treasury which has been working so closely with it.

Many congressional liberals are convinced that recent monetary policy has curtailed economic growth, needlessly enlarged unemployment, and missed the real causes of inflation, which have more to do with the pricing policies of our oligopolists than with the rate of interest. Representative CHESTER BOWLES expressed that sentiment last week in a letter to Speaker RAYBURN: "In my opinion the single most costly economic blunder of recent years has been this administration's success in curbing economic expansion. A key element in their program has been the raising of interest rates which has added substantially to the cost of all new business expansion, home financing, and all automobiles, furniture and consumer durables bought on time."

When Congress refused to raise long-term interest rates on Government securities, it indicated its resentment against policies which bore most heavily upon consumers, small businessmen, and local and State governments. Since the Federal Reserve System is an independent agency, Congress can affect its policies only by a major legislative battle or by such warnings as this one. In plain speech, Congress has told the administration that interest rates are too high for the health of the economy. At the same time, it has seen no reason to allow the Treasury to reward investors with artificially high interest rates over the entire life of a long-term Government bond. Congress appears to believe that when the Federal Reserve System repents of its sins, interest rates will fall enough so that the Treasury can borrow all that its heart desires at 4¼ percent or less.

No doubt this is an awkward way to make an economic point, but Congress has no other way of emphasizing a position which has a good deal more to recommend it than the cautious, restrictive timidity of the ruling monetary authorities.

Legislative Program of Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the State legislative program for 1960 of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York. This program was adopted at a meeting of the organization on December 26, 1959, in New York. My good friend Harold R. Moskovit is the State president of the organization and Richard H. Wels is the chairman of its legislative committee.

The legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York is as follows:

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1960

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State, at a meeting of their legislative committee held on December 26, 1959, at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York City, urged the State legislature to adopt the following legislation that they will recommend to their legislators for introduction this year:

"Primary elections for all State officers; right to vote at 18 years; antibias housing legislation; to enact legislation reapportion-

ing both congressional and legislative seats; Presidential preference primaries; abolition of electoral college; mandatory use of voting machines in primary elections; new State science college to meet the new advances in science; more State scholarships; court reform; recommend changes in selection of board of elections to include Bronx, Queens, and Staten Island; favor permanent spring primary and mandatory election of district leaders; selection of board of regents on nonpartisan basis; we favor one family court in New York City; more aid for State education and higher salary for teachers; urge New York City Charter Commission; continue State constitutional committee and recommend constitutional reform as needed; favor maintenance of the present 15 cents subway fare in New York City; fair Sabbath law; State aid for child care; extension of rent control; advocate printed record be published and made available to public of full proceedings of the legislature; more aid for juvenile delinquency with more State correctional institutions; record of names and salaries of all employed in the State legislature; examination every 3 years for all motorists and all funds collected from gasoline taxes and motor vehicle licenses be used for the State highway system; more money for public health; do away with special elections for State legislators; and we favor a reduction of State taxes to the greatest extent compatible with a solvent State government."

Also "urged passage of consitutional amendments to exempt $500 million in New York City school bonds."

"The above legislation will be introduced in the present State legislature by their 17 members in the State senate and 31 members in the State assembly," stated Richard H. Wels, who is chairman of the legislative committee of the organization and presided at this meeting.

Francis A. Jamieson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 1, 1960, together with an article which appeared in the Trenton Times of January 31, 1960. Frank Jamieson was a distinguished newspaperman who served as a special assistant to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller and won the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of the Lindbergh baby kidnaping story. He was also the uncle of our colleague, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1960]

FRANCIS A. JAMIESON

We join in the tribute that Governor Rockefeller paid Saturday to Francis A. Jamieson. He was indeed, as Governor Rockefeller said, "a remarkable human being with a rare combination of wisdom and humanity, intelligence, warmheartedness and love."

Frank Jamieson's career touched nothing that it did not adorn. He was one of the most capable political reporters of our time. As the wartime head of the news department of the Office of Inter-American Affairs, and later as acting director, he worked with great vigor and success to increase mutual understanding between the United States and the Latin-American countries. Since 1946 he had been public relations adviser to Governor Rockefeller and his brothers.

In all these fields he was a wise and trusted counselor. When ill health compelled him to husband his strength he remained a witty and charming companion.

As an adviser of the men who administer one of America's great fortunes, Mr. Jamieson had the rare satisfaction of knowing that he had helped good causes throughout the Nation. But his acts of kindness were not confined to humanity in the abstract. He never spared himself in his efforts to help anyone who needed it, and he has left the world a richer and friendlier place.

[From the Trenton Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

FRANK JAMIESON DIES—AID TO ROCKEFELLER—EX-TRENTON NEWSMAN WAS WINNER OF PULITZER PRIZE

Frank A. Jamieson, special assistant to New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller and winner of the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of the Lindbergh baby kidnaping story while a Trenton newspaperman, died early yesterday in New York Hospital.

He had been in poor health for about a year, but it was not until Friday that he entered the hospital. The cause of death was not disclosed.

Jamieson was a brother of Crawford Jamieson, Trenton attorney and former State senator, and an uncle of Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

WAS NATIONALLY KNOWN

He was nationally known as a newspaperman, public relations expert, political adviser, and fundraiser.

When informed of Jamieson's death yesterday, Governor Rockefeller said:

"His death is a deep personal loss to me and the entire family. He was one of the best of newspapermen. In addition, he was a remarkable human being with a rare combination of wisdom and humanity, intelligence, and warmheartedness, and love."

STARTED WITH STATE GAZETTE

Although his formal education ended while he was still in high school, Jamieson reached pinnacle after pinnacle as a writer. His first job was as a correspondent for the Trenton State Gazette in the early 1920's. His interest in newspaper work was first nourished by Frank Thompson, father of Congressman THOMPSON and husband of Jamieson's sister, Mrs. Beatrice Thompson. The elder Thompson was a political reporter for the Trenton Times.

As Jamieson became experienced in the newspaper profession, he joined the Associated Press and established the Trenton Bureau at the statehouse in the middle 1920's.

COVERED LINDBERGH KIDNAPING

It was during the Lindbergh kidnaping developments that Jamieson won national attention as a newspaperman. The first complete story of the kidnaping flashed from the Trenton Bureau. When the tragic report of the finding of the baby's body shook the world, it was Jamieson's story that was read first.

He scored one of the great news beats in history when he reported the body of Charles A. Lindberg, Jr., son of the famous flier, had been found a few yards off the road outside of Hopewell.

SCORED FULL HOUR BEAT

Jamieson had obtained advance information on the finding of the body from the Governor's office and had relayed it to New York. The Associated Press had the story on the wire a full hour before the State Police made the formal announcement.

The Pulitzer Prize of $1,000 was given Jamieson for the best reportorial work in 1932 for his coverage of the Lindbergh kidnaping case. Another $500 was given Jamieson by the Associated Press. Each award was based on his prompt, full, skillful, and prolonged coverage of the kidnaping case.

Soon after his success in Trenton, Jamieson went to New York with the Associated Press, only to leave the news service to become a public relations and fundraising consultant. He was associated with John Price Jones.

DIRECTED EDISON CAMPAIGN

When Charles Edison entered the political arena to compaign for New Jersey Governor in 1940, Jamieson took a leave of absence to direct the campaign. Edison was impressed with Jamieson's ability and offered him a post in the administration. Jamieson refused and returned to Jones.

While handling the first family welfare drive in New York City, Jamieson met Winthrop Rockefeller, the drive chairman, and the friendship that followed was to influence the rest of his life.

Through Winthrop Rockefeller, Jamieson met his brother, Nelson Rockefeller. Then, when President Roosevelt named Nelson as coordinator of the Inter American Affairs during World War II, Jamieson was invited to head the press division in Washington. The principal job was to prevent the insidious propaganda of Axis Germany from destroying the good will of Latin American countries toward the United States and her Allies.

Before he left Washington, Jamieson had succeeded Rockefeller as coordinator.

After the war, Jamieson returned to New York to become adviser in public relations and other affairs to Nelson and Winthrop Rockefeller, two other brothers, David and John D., and a sister.

Jamieson was a key figure in the political life of Nelson Rockefelelr. He directed his successful campaign for Governor of New York and put him in the national spotlight as a possible candidate for President.

One odd twist of his association with Governor Rockefeller was that Jamieson came from a family that was strongly Democratic. His father and grandfather before him were powers in Democratic politics in Mercer County. His brother, Crawford, was once Democratic county chairman.

Jamieson was the son of William M. and Mary Ellen Jamieson. Born in Trenton 55 years ago, he attended Trenton High School, but quit to enter the newspaper profession before he reached his senior year.

In addition to his brother, Crawford, and his sister, Beatrice, who is executive director of the Mercer County Tuberculosis and Health League, he is survived by another sister, Mrs. Marguerite Flanningan of Jersey City.

He also leaves his wife, Mrs. Linda Eder Jamieson, of New York City, and three daughters. They are Mrs. Joan Ellen Zucker, whose husband, Alex Zucker, is a nuclear scientist at Oak Ridge Tenn., and Misses Marguerite and Frances Jamieson. His daughter, Joan Ellen, was of his first marriage to Mrs. Charlotte Wiggin Jennings.

Services will be held tomorrow at 4 p.m. at the Funeral Church of Frank E. Campbell, 81st and Madison Avenue, New York City. Burial will be private. Friends may call at the funeral home today from 3 to 5 p.m.

Cuba: Bolder U.S. Action Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in various addresses to the House, I have emphasized that recent incidents of turmoil to the south of us should not be viewed as isolated events. Instead, they are part of a general plan of Caribbean conquest by penetration and subversion in which the Republic of Cuba has been an important target.

In addition to the strategic significance of Cuba because of its location on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, the most important U.S. naval base in the Caribbean is at Guantanamo. Its security is a matter of prime concern on the part of those responsible for the naval defense of the United States.

Thus, I read with especial interest in the January 23, 1960, issue of the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier a thoughtful editorial dealing with the Cuban situation and emphasizing the Monroe Doctrine as the Nation's basic guide for hemispheric defense.

The editorial follows:

BOLDER U.S. ACTION ON CUBA REQUIRED TO SAFEGUARD FREEDOM FROM CASTRO

In rallying the Cuban mob, Fidel Castro is goading the United States ever more surely toward decisive action. Unwilling though our Government may be, it cannot put off indefinitely adopting firmer means of curbing the bearded dictator.

If Washington continues to do nothing, a people's republic soon will be in full bloom 100 miles off the Florida coast and a new staging area for Soviet power will take shape.

Polite treatment of Castro has not made him act respectably. American property has been seized. U.S. citizens have been put in jail. Castro has rejected friendship with the country that liberated Cuba in 1898. He has joined the Communist bloc in the United Nations. The direction in which he is leading must not be misinterpreted.

The latest outrageous act, an abusive speech against the Spanish Ambassador to Cuba, was not without design. Cuban middle and upper classes have strong emotional ties to Spain. They regard Spain with the same kind of affection that many Americans feel for England. By striking at Spain, Castro would discredit moderate elements in Cuba. If he can link Spain, which is disliked by Latin America's leftwing intellectuals, with Washington, he will have gained another point in his propaganda war against the United States.

The Associated Press report that U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal now believes a new policy is needed with respect to Cuba. If he suggests a crackdown on Castro, it is unlikely the State Department will endorse his recommendations. The State Department has a long history of resisting bold measures against world communism. Such firmness as exists in U.S. policies comes from the Defense Department.

The American press has changed its tune on Castro. Influential newspapers such as the Washington Post and the Chicago Daily News, once strongly pro-Castro, now condemn him. The public is getting into a frame of mind for action against the Cuban dictatorship.

Though the State Department in 1934 signed away the specific right to intervene in Cuba, the Monroe Doctrine is still the Nation's basic guide for this hemisphere. This 137-year-old document established a permanent U.S. policy of barring European powers from taking over Latin American governments. While European Communists are not in direct control of Cuba, Castro's lieutenants are leftists who follow the international Communist line. Thus the United States has a doctrinal basis for intervention.

But what sort of action should the United States take in Cuba? The answer, in our judgment, is whatever may be necessary. If Americans will do what's necessary to hold a string of little islands 5 miles off the mainland of China, they should not lack for boldness in Cuba.

The first logical step to restore freedom in Cuba is to withhold the sugar subsidy, which Castro's government needs to prop up the economy. Next could come withdrawal of U.S. recognition, an embargo on trade, and support of a free Cuba movement in the United States.

Beyond this is the possibility of direct U.S. military intervention, should revolt occur. As in Lebanon, the United States would have to go in quickly and get out just as fast.

If the U.S. Government could act in Lebanon, which is across the world, it could act in Cuba at its own doorstep. All that's necessary is for the public to get adjusted to the idea. Military intervention may seem too drastic at the moment, but we believe the public is ready for initial steps. If these are successful, it may not be necessary to send Marines to Cuba.

One way or another, communism must be barred from the New World.

Lyndon Johnson and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I think that the majority of the American people want to make progress in the field of civil rights. I think that most Americans realize that there is a question of national unity at stake.

Recently, Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON—a man who believes in progress—visited New York. He addressed the Cathedral Club in Brooklyn and his remarks represented a stirring call to Americans to put aside prejudices and bigotry and act on adult issues.

He also forecast that Congress would pass a good civil rights bill at this session. This is very significant because it was under LYNDON JOHNSON'S leadership that the Senate of the United States passed the only civil rights bill that it has passed in 85 years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a fine editorial from the New York Journal-American of January 25 commenting on Senator JOHNSON'S statement.

A CONGRESS "MUST"

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON made a fine impression on his visit to New York by his firm and realistic stand on civil rights.

The Senate majority leader forecast that Congress would pass a good civil rights bill at this session. He pledged it would protect everyone in the full exercise of constitutional rights and he emphasized voting rights.

The Texan said if the House failed to act by February 15 the Senate would produce his own measure. He added that the legislation would embody "substantial progress."

Substantial progress in civil rights is what this Nation must have.

Failure to get a good civil rights bill out of committee cold storage is a shameful thing. If those Congressmen of both parties who favor civil rights cannot do it, the Senate must.

That is why Senator JOHNSON'S promise that a bill will be passed is heartening.

In a Free Country We Cannot Be Our Brother's Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constitutents sent me a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, admonishing the American people that "in a free country, we cannot be our brother's keeper." I believe the distinctions drawn in this editorial are worthy of the attention and thought of every Congressman and Senator in these days when our every action in Washington has far-reaching impact upon our individual citizens.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I present the following:

IN A FREE COUNTRY WE CANNOT BE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPER

A common fallacy about man's duty to man was repeated recently by a prominent layman at a religious conference. As an expression of our social responsibilities he suggested, "We are our brother's keeper."

Although this interpretation of a scriptural sentence is widely accepted, it is without foundation in ethics and can lead to more quarrels than benefits. It derives from a misreading of the passage in the fourth chapter of Genesis about the murder of Abel by his brother Cain. When the two brothers were in a field, Cain rose up against Abel and slew him. Afterward the Lord said to Cain, "Where is Abel thy brother?" Not having the benefit of our modern enlightenment, he did not take the fifth amendment. He simply told a lie, "I know not." And then he countered with an evasive question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

This was altogether irrelevant. The Lord was not demanding that he be his brother's keeper, but only that he shouldn't be his brother's murderer.

In our bill of responsibilities, the first is not, as urged by sociological busybodies, that we shall be our brother's keeper, standing watch over them and poking our noses into their private concerns. The first responsibility is that we shall not shed their blood

or do any other wrong against our fellow men.

If all the world's people were our brothers, and we were our brother's keepers, they would also be our keepers. We would be among the kept. In the slave societies of totalitarianism, from the Baltic Sea to the sad coasts of Siberia and China, everybody is required to be his brother's keeper, to maintain a sharp watch on him and to blow the whistle the minute he deviates from total obedience.

Of course, such a way of life for America is not advocated by well-meaning people who tell us that our duty is to be our brother's keeper. Generous as they are in spirit, they have failed to draw clear distinctions between proper help and perpetual meddling. We have a duty to help the sick, the incapacitated, the very weak. But what our neighbors in general need is a large amount of being let alone.

Foreign Aid Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in view of our unfavorable balance-of-payments position with the rest of the world, I think the time has come to take legislative steps to insure that at least some of the funds granted to foreign governments for capital and equipment improvements be spent in the United States.

As excellent examples of the problem, which I feel must be faced by the Congress, I include a letter from Mr. A. Ward LaFrance, chairman of the LaFrance Export Corp., Elmira, N.Y., and an article from the November 16, 1959, issue of the magazine Export Trade, by Mr. Stefan J. Rundt:

LAFRANCE EXPORT CORP.,
Elmira, N.Y., January 6, 1960.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I trust that you will be able to find time to read the enclosed article entitled "Protectionism" or "Trade, Not Aid" by Stefan J. Rundt, which was run in the November 16, 1959, issue of the magazine Export Trade.

I believe that the article speaks for itself, but can add that we have lost considerable export business of fire apparatus to foreign competition when the funds for the purchase of same were furnished by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA).

It is very difficult for our foreign distributors to understand the U.S. policy whereby an appropriation is made to a foreign country for capital improvements and, in many instances, with no restrictions as to where the purchases can be made with the funds.

The following are two recent examples as to how this policy affects our export sale of fire apparatus:

SPAIN

ICA purchase Authorization No. 152-99-928-9246, the tender specified a French fire truck model M-16 A1 TZ on a LATIL chassis, or equal, with a Guinard pump, or equal.

The award was made to the French firm SIDE, represented in Spain by Contiber, S.A., for the LATIL apparatus.

LEBANON

ICA purchase authorization No. 68-37-102-9-90004, invitation No. 20 calling for two airport crash trucks.

The award was made to the British firm Fire Armour, represented in Lebanon by Near East Resources Co.

It seems to us that this policy, on the part of our Government, of allocating funds or making loans to foreign countries without some provision that they should use the funds for purchasing American goods is a very unrealistic business arrangement.

From the American taxpayers' viewpoint, who is putting up the money, it seems almost stupid, and the writer is inclined to believe that foreign companies think likewise. I may be too pessimistic, but I am of the opinion that this country cannot continue to do this. I do not believe that any other trading country, who are giving us real strong competition, would do it.

If you agree with this and Mr. Fundt's article, we trust that you will use your influence so that Congress will tie some strings to these loans and giveaways which will help American business.

Respectfully yours,

A. WARD LAFRANCE,
Chairman.

[From Export Trade, Nov. 16, 1959]

"PROTECTIONISM" OR "TRADE, NOT AID"—THE UNITED STATES STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS

(By Stefan J. Rundt)

A major battle is raging and may approach its crisis (perhaps only one of several yet to come), as these lines are written. But even though a partial or temporary compromise or a solution may have been decided upon by the time this article is read, the basic issues are not likely to be resolved so soon.

With the continued deterioration of the U.S. external payments position and the currently light but sustained pressure upon our dollar, from within and without, will have to come an agonizing reappraisal of our stand in the world of economics. We are at the crossroads.

TWO WARRING GROUPS

Two powerful and determined groupings in Washington and throughout the Nation have locked horns over an important issue: Should more, if not all U.S. foreign grants and accommodations be tied to the purchase of American-made goods, or should, as hitherto, to a lately growing extent, be portions of such assistance abroad from the American taxpayers' till, dispensed by such agencies as the ICA but also by others, under various headings (not always clearly defined for the public, nor in all cases honestly labelled) be multilateral in their utilization by the recipient nations, so that they may buy what they need from the cheapest supplier, even if it be the keenest competitor on the world markets of American exporting industries? The implications of this specific question are much wider than appears upon cursory analysis.

At the bottom is a fundamental problem: Where does internationalism of the variety we have been preaching so vocally and practicing for so long reach absurdity, and where must national self-interest begin? Are we not perhaps righteous rather than right in striving toward the nonfeasible rather than the attainable? How realistic are we?

Up in arms (to begin with over the recent Development Loan Fund's major shift in policy, but even more in fear that similar changes will come upon the ICA and other agencies) are: the State Department (which, let us see clearly, has somehow acclimated itself to the proposition that one can buy friends or, anyway, rent them for a while); the ICA (which is an organization primarily concerned with the disbursement of public funds, whose predecessors have done a great deal better than it does itself, of which cynics have said with a measure of justification that it has been "founded to bankrupt us and is trying hard to stay in business to complete the mission"); and segments of the influential press frequently reflecting idealistic optima and/or State Department views in their lead articles, even if individual columnists on their editorial pages expound opposite opinions, and although outstanding British papers fully understand that group in our midst which would like to shift from "direct grants" (i.e. giveaways) and the support of other nations' trade, to commercial accommodations (loans and credits) and to the systematic promotion of U.S. sales abroad.

In favor of basic modifications in our foreign assistance programs (and there has always been and still is a wide and uncoordinated area between the various agencies and efforts) are the U.S. Treasury, the Development Loan Fund, probably also Eximbank (whence the Development Loan Fund's present Managing Director, Mr. Vance Brand, hails), most bankers, and in all likelihood a major segment of the international business community of this country.

Many of us who have always supported free trade (and in this writer, for his part, has surely suffered material losses because of his stand) are now being accused of having turned protectionist, simply because we want to leave no reasonable attempt bypassed to balance U.S. external payments; because we have warned for some 18 months that this Nation, too, is subject to fundamental economic laws; because we draw a line between the free flow of goods and funds, on the one hand, and the two-way nature of a lender-borrower relationship; and because we believe that, in the final analysis, international trade is a matter of highest national interest, as long as there exist sovereign nations with diverse problems. It is a bitter pill for a long-time free trade proponent to swallow such accusations, when they stem not only from quarters toward whose opinions one has been indifferent, to say the least, but when such charges, without qualifications, are leveled by circles whom one has held in high esteem. Worst of all, I for one, am unable to understand some of the semantics and of the terminology of such accusations.

The hue and cry now widely heard against anybody who hopes that more U.S. foreign outlays should be linked to sorely needed U.S. exports, and that more of what we sow should be reaped by us, too, is well worded. Among the catchy phrases unleashed are, e.g.:

(1) "As protectionist as an unreasonably high tariff."

Comments: Don't we here mix up the free flux of merchandise and of capital with the normally bilateral dealings between financier and purchaser? And are we forever to perpetuate grants rather than move on to trade instead of aid? Have the accusers never heard of trade credits? Are they unaware that all leading trading nations support their own exports (without which they would perish, or at least drag down their living standards) by governmental or for the most part publicly funded risk insurance, guarantees and financing schemes, exclusively confined to national exports? Does anybody believe that any other nation's exchequer will ever furnish such funds or props accessible to U.S. exporters or their customers abroad? Quelle naiveté. To uphold an economy within by outward quota restrictions and duty barriers is protectionism. But as the term is used by some people today, the support from public funds of our Army, our defense

industries, or foreign soil of strategic importance to us—would also merit that ugly word.

A STEP BACKWARD

(2) "A violation of our own basic foreign economic policy * * * a turning away from liberalization of world trade which we have urged for so long * * * a step backward from all past efforts to foster growth abroad of free enterprise."

Comments: Firstly, was our past policy actually a policy, and if so, was it flawless? We have turned about by 180° in the political sphere, from brinkmanship to summitry, apparently because a revision was urgently needed. (Did we foster growth abroad when our 6th Fleet played the Suez Canal into the hands of an autocrat incapable of improving the miserable lot of his people and borrowing money for inefficient use in his state-owned plants? What have we achieved toward trade liberalization in the Philippines, in Korea, or Taiwan?) Could it be that a comparable alteration in policy is now unavoidable for our economic stand? Isn't it possible that what we have urged with all our might and for so long is beyond the feasible optimum, and that it is merely an unrealizable ideal? By the way, we have also urged so many other nations to balance their budgets, to fund their debts, long-term, to lower taxes, to stop farm subsidies, to abrogate agricultural import curbs, to stop dumping their surplus goods and to get their external economics away from politics. How well did we do in these respects? Secondly, was not our policy merely based on the notion that we must spend more and more; to buy alliances and to improve some of the least equipped or prepared places in our image? Thirdly, has not our policy failed rather miserably (a) in some areas where we have helped to make the rich indecently richer, while we did not manage to lift up the pitifully poor, and (b) in that we have oversubscribed our efforts to the point where we stand endangered of giving away the strength of our dollar, if we continue in the past? May not a new step be everything but backward, and simply represent a turn (or a return) to the practicable?

BLOW TO U.S. LEADERSHIP?

(3) "A major blow to U.S. leadership in world trade."

Comments: An exciting phrase, but is it valid? The softer position of our dollar, our fiscal mismanagement, our inability to establish a clearcut policy, the lead, zinc and oil quotas, some of our Public Law 480 sales and so on, have harmed us more than would any step designed to move from gifts to sales and to a posture which is that of every trading nation in history, namely one where our funds, intended to help others, also benefit ourselves directly, rather than third nations, which by now have been fully rehabilitated—with our help.

WORLD COMPETITION

(4) "An acknowledgement that American goods can no longer compete in the world * * * a relaxation of pressure upon U.S. producers to remain competitive."

Comments: That many of our goods have, indeed, become noncompetitive throughout the world, and even right here at home, has been known and said by the unhypocritical for many a month. In part this has come to pass because our mass production and distribution structures for our huge domestic market have made us inflexible when it comes to special export efforts (e.g., special export models); in part it has come because in many instances we have relegated exports to second place; in part it is true because we here have no major export incentives and special tax supports as have others; (in Germany, for decades, there have existed export tax rebates, special insurance and financing facilities and, up to World War II, the unions had agreed to a 15-percent wage cut—all especially for exports). We are also often noncompetitive because of insane union demands, featherbedding and the lag of productivity behind wages, as well as oligopolistic practices by some basic materials' producers. All in all, we have not yet fully faced up to the fact that we, too, must export, in order to cover our growing requirements in imports. For years we have exported to help others and now we must export to help ourselves. And as to the pressure upon U.S. producers to remain competitive, let us ask: (a) Is our Government here to help or to exert pressures, when it comes to nationally vital efforts? (b) aid-supported exports could be limited to goods of fair market value and specific factory markup.

BUY AMERICAN

(5) "Buy American again * * * subsidizing exports * * * economic imperialism."

Comments: The dismal failure of buy American will be admitted by most any intelligent person and nobody in his right mind will want buy American to return. But where is the similarity between public U.S. tenders tied to the purchase of U.S. goods, and international sales linked by the seller-financier to his own merchandise? Besides, our external position today is vastly different from what it was 5 years ago. Who ever heard of Macy issuing credit cards valid at Gimbels? If the banks have special credit purchase schemes, utilizable at thousands of stores, the banks are making a neat and prompt profit from such plans. And as to subsidizing exports, we, too, dislike the idea that we may give unnecessary aid to inefficient or greedy U.S. exporting industries, or to insolent union labor. But are Hermes in Germany or Britain's Export Credits Guarantee Department stimulating U.S. exports? Economic imperialism? This is merely a devastatingly ugly phrase of no applicability here. A lender is entitled to benefits. How far can our missionary zeal lead us? Besides, do we not subsidize our farmers, so that some of them can virtually retire in Florida for growing and raising nothing? Do not our postal rates subsidize our publishers? Do not cost-plus contracts subsidize our arms makers? In fact, is there anybody left in our land who is not subsidized? (Lord Keynes must laugh himself to death in his grave.) I am not in favor of subsidies of any sort. But exports are now nationally more vital than ever; they create employment, which we urgently need; and they render revenues to Uncle Sam, which we also require, to balance the budget.

BIG HEADACHE

(6) "It (the tie-in) will have almost no effect * * * peanuts * * * prescribing a dose of aspirin for a headache that is merely the manifestation of a more deep-seated physical disorder."

Comments: Savings and curtailment (let's call it austerity, as we do when we talk of others) must start somewhere and ultimately affect every corner. The net 1950–58 capital outflow from the public till came to $65.4 billion, while private net capital outflow (which is a great deal more productive) amounted to $15.8 billion. This is in a way more interesting than the oft-repeated payments deficit of $4 to $4.5 billion expected this year, because it spells out the cause rather than the consequence. Let's cut where the slices can be thickest. Naturally, our entire foreign aid requires judicious pruning. Our military oversea spending will have to be pared. And our allies will not help us a lot to support our troops on their soil. Defense spending has lost all popularity abroad. Exactly what our assorted economic support schemes in connection with military outlays amount to—nobody seems to know. But they are huge. Our farm support at home costs annually about $3 billion. These are the fat paunches from which we will have to trim the savings to balance our books, at home and abroad. To cut imports artificially would be insane. It would mean isolationism. Admittedly, the aid-export-tie-in may be relatively small an item, but I believe that only he who is willing to save pennies will ever bank dollars. In other words, the headache's deep-down causes fully realized, all sorts of medications will be needed, aspirin not excluded.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

(7) "It will increase the cost of the mutual security program * * * and impairs the flexibility (of our grants and loans abroad) and reduces their values as instruments for rapid economic development (of other nations) * * * the psychological impact abroad can only be adverse."

Comments: Perhaps our mutual security program is over-ambitious to start with? I think that much less money could do the trick if we were not to squander or let others squander quite blatantly. Perhaps the recipients of foreign aid are overly ambitious in their drive to develop—usually too fast, with too little. And they are overheated and under-financed because local money remains in hiding. More prudent spending will be the answer rather than further aid increases. Are we not a bit too flexible in our handouts? The Soviets grant in the main low-interest loans and commercial credits. And as a rule they get a better run for their relatively few rubles than we are getting a bang out of our billions of bucks.

The overall problem of our foreign economic policy is intricate and merits more careful study than given so far. To cry "protectionist" will not do in all instances. (In my circles, this sobriquet is almost tantamount to a reference to a man's canine or illegitimate ancestry.) It is easy to polemicize, and my own comments can no doubt be rebutted, with the rebuttals no doubt also subject to further re-rebuttal. But let us see clear that the hue and cry so far comes from the professional spenders rather than the habitual earners and the squeezed taxpayers.

MULTILATERALISM

I am afraid that the word "multilateralism" has been worked to death. As I understand that noun, it refers to unhindered movement beyond borders of goods, capital, and services in many or all directions. But the connotation given to this word in recent years, by those who most often repeat their cliches, reminds me of "multisexuality." Trade transactions or series of transactions are normally two-way deals (from seller to buyer), very much as sex is usually an affair between two parties. In trade (as in sex) there can be tricornered and even multiangular arrangements, but this may tend to become an orgy of sorts, and, anyway, bilateralism is the rule for transactions. And nations have also two-way deals with specific trading partners, and calculate trade and payments balances on the basis of nation-to-nation totals or what of their own national aggregate bookkeeping. Nobody could ever figure out a single multinational, global payments balance for all the nations of the world. In other words, while huckstering the word multilateralism, we have somewhat lost track of the undeniable fact that most trade is to start with between two partners, i.e., bilateral, and not an orgy. And this will not change, ever. Multilateralism means merely free choice of one partner for one equitable transaction. The minute financing enters the picture, trade is almost invariably tied, unless third-point funding is profitable for the lender.

Uncle Sam will never convince Germany, France, or Japan to give underdeveloped nations grants or loans not somehow predicated upon acquisition of goods by the borrower from the lender. And as long as we here

support everybody's exports by unrestricted offshore financing (the very word "offshore" must have been invented in its modern meaning—in order to camouflage and to confuse), why should other trading nations bother to increase their contributions to e.g., Afro-Asian development? They will merely tell the finance minister of a nonindustrial country: "You go to Washington and get the dough, and then we'll be glad to ship you our goods."

When we say "grants" we mean gifts. When we say "off-shore" we mean "It'll help everybody but us." When we say "defense support" we mean economic aid which often has nothing to do with the military heading under which it travels. And now a "protectionist" is anybody who wants to get a little bit more for his money, or, at any rate, more than almost nothing. What a bunch of hypocrites we have become. Me, for calling a spade a shovel.

We are in trouble because we have gone too far in our unrealistic idealism. We will have to tighten our belts—to pick another cliché we are so fond of using when talking to others. Already there are loud voices of real protectionists, who clamor for such barriers as higher tariffs and more stringent quotas. Let us defeat them by taking such steps as we can without turning to real protectionism. Let us avoid extremism by well-measured remedies. The means to get straightened out are all within our national power. Or is Eximbank, which for a quarter of a century has done such a fine job, also a protectionist agency? Dollar for dollar (its limitations fully realized), Eximbank has given us taxpayers and this Nation as a whole more than all our spending agencies in recent years, for a lesser total in outlays and at smaller risks. An export credit guarantee scheme would be better than more spending. And when it comes to cutting, let's audit our expenditures and check the results achieved by our aid to such staunch free enterprisers as Messrs. Tito, Franco, Sukarno, Chiang, Rhee and Cie. Would it not be better to deal with these types by way of controllable trade credits rather than in terms of signed blank check arrangements.

We need not put ourselves (or ICA) in a strait jacket. But much less of our disbursements should be alms to others. In the long run, the giver of alms is hated. This year we'll do well if our trade surplus will come to $500 million or $1 billion. Yet our payments deficit will come close to $4.5 billion or more. Net capital outflow from the public till is close to the 8-billion level. That can not go on.

The biggest trading nations (which have received billions in United States aid in the past 12 years or more, are lending "strings-attached." Is the whole world out of step but for us?

Let's again think straight, talk plain and act logically. As things are, I am afraid Abraham Lincoln could have never been elected President. He thought different from Madison Avenue and knew not the Federalese we have adopted; his words were simple ones; and his actions were in keeping with his words as well as with reality. Until lately we have worried about the entire world—except about ourselves. Charity not only begins at home in egotistic self-interest. If Uncle Sam is sick, the entire free world will suffer. Our inconsistent, haphazard, multi-agency spending must end—in our interest and in the interest of those political, economic, social and humanitarian concepts for which we truly stand. Times have changed. We can no longer afford the rut we have been in for so long.

The Interest Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the problem posed by the present ceiling on the interest the Government can pay on intermediate and long-term bonds. In today's Washington Daily News, Mr. Peter Edson reduces this problem to its simplest terms. It is well worth reading.

The article follows:

ANDERSON TRIES AGAIN

Treasury Secretary Robert E. Anderson's second attempt to get Congress to lift the 4.25 percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is in for tough sledding again. One principal reason may be that few people and fewer Congressmen understand the issue.

It is so easy for a Congressman to brag to his constituents that he voted against raising interest rates on Government bonds. This caters to a popular belief that if Government interest rates go up, all others will follow.

It is more difficult for a Congressman to justify a vote for raising the interest rate ceiling. To do so he must get into a long and involved discourse on banking.

Thus, even the Democratic majority of the Senate-House Economic Committee, which is supposed to understand these things, has just come out with a report opposing the interest rate hike. This report maintains that the 4.25-percent ceiling should be retained until Treasury and Federal Reserve Board reform their monetary policies. This passes the buck to an even more complicated subject.

The late Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, who understood Government finance as well as anyone, opposed this ceiling when it was put on in 1918 as a World War I curb. But from then until last summer, a breakthrough was never threatened.

What Carter Glass understood, and what Treasury officials are now trying to get across is that interest rate ceilings can't be set artificially by law unless they are supplemented by Government subsidy. In the long run, interest rates are set by the supply of money and the demands for credit in the open market.

If the rates did not vary up and down this way in a free economy, Congress could pass a law fixing interest rates at, say, 2 percent or even 1 percent.

If Congress were to pass such a law now, the U.S. Government would probably not be able to borrow a dime.

Congress might pass a supporting law, requiring all banks to hold a certain amount of their reserves in these 1 or 2 percent securities. That might work in Russia. But it would not work long in any country with a free economy.

As a matter of fact, the 4.25 percent interest rate ceiling has already been broken. This was done by a congressional grant of authority for the Treasury to sell some of its securities at a discount. Oversimplified, it works like this:

A bond, note or Treasury bill worth a face value of $100 and bearing interest at 3.825 percent, is sold for $85. The yield on the $85 is 4.5 percent. The Treasury uses this authority now in some of its advance refunding operations.

For example, a bond due to mature in 7 years is exchanged for a new bond maturing in 15 years, at a fractionally higher rate of interest. The amount of the debt is not increased by this exchange. The debt is merely lengthened. But the Government's interest costs are increased, frequently over the ceiling. One recent offering went to 5.19 percent.

The Treasury is now reluctant to use this discount authority for two principal reasons. If the Treasury started selling all its $100 bonds for $85, the impression would be given that the United States was hard up. And if the bonds didn't sell, it would show that the credit of the United States was impaired, and the value of the dollar was going down.

If the Treasury is given authority to raise long-term interest rates above 4.25 percent, there is no plan to flood the market with such securities.

Cancer Kills Vet Leader McGonegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, death has taken a dedicated man who served the war veterans of his country with all his heart and soul. Charles Craig McGonegal, 64, a national vice commander of the American Legion and a double amputee, died of cancer in the Oakland Veterans Hospital on January 22, 1950.

Charlie McGonegal was known throughout veterans circles in the United States for the contribution he made to the welfare of the disabled. In spite of the grave physical handicap of the loss of both arms, he demonstrated that the spirit and will to win could overcome such handicaps.

During World War II he traveled widely to visit veterans hospitals encouraging amputees and demonstrating to them not only the dexterity they could achieve in the use of prosthetic appliances but imbuing them with his own spirit.

Charlie McGonegal was a member of Hayward Post 68 of the American Legion.

I extend an article which appeared in the Daily Review of Hayward, Calif., on January 22, 1960:

CANCER KILLS VET LEADER MCGONEGAL

Charles Craig McGonegal, 64, national vice commander of the American Legion and a man who dedicated much of his life to bringing hope to other amputees, died of cancer today at Oakland Veterans Hospital.

McGonegal, who lost both hands in a World War I grenade explosion, was active in local (Hayward Post 68), State, and National programs of the American Legion, and was a Republican candidate in 1952 for the congressional seat won by George P. Miller.

Until his health began to fail, following an operation last October, McGonegal toured hospitals throughout the Nation to help and instruct amputees.

Despite his handicap, McGonegal learned to drive a car, fly a plane, rode horses, swam, hunted, and bowled.

"A cripple is someone who has something wrong with him, but fails to do anything about it," he once said. "I have set no goals other than to live a normal, useful, and productive life."

Following World War I he became a traveling salesman, then worked as a trucker in a lumber yard, later became postmaster at Bell, in southern California.

In recent years he had been a rancher and real estate broker, operating from his Kilkare Road home in Sunol.

He was a member of Hayward Post 68, American Legion, Disabled Veterans of America, Rotary Club, Elks, and the Congregational Church.

He is survived by his wife, Pearl, and two sons, Caron, and Donald.

Services are pending from Berkeley Hills Chapel, 1600 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President, Board of Education, City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, at the Catholic teachers' breakfast held at the Waldorf Astoria on November 8, 1959. Mr. Silver for many years has been chairman of the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner and is the personification of the interested, devoted public servce rendered to the city of New York by the members of the board of education who are in the forefront on all civic matters and is an outstanding example of the broad and tolerant view that is displayed by thoughtful Americans.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT THE CATHOLIC TEACHERS BREAKFAST, WALDORF ASTORIA, NOVEMBER 8, 1959

The extremely personal nature of these gatherings always makes me feel especially privileged that you have asked me to join you. Our spiritual resources were never more needed than in these troubled hours of doubt and fear when mankind is desperately clinging to the faith that sustains us today and gives us hope for tomorrow.

We have probed the secrets of humanity's physical ailments; we have widened the scope of knowledge, and conquered the limitless vastness of space * * * human beings live longer and better than ever before, but we still have much to learn about how to live with each other. World peace remains delicately balanced on the launching pads of deadly missiles while diplomats commute and smile and talk of universal disarmament.

We have had a visit recently from an emissary from abroad who has the power to erase the past, present, and future of all people including his own.

He came on a mission whose major message expressed the hope that all nations disarm. We do not know whether it was really news or just noise.

But all people should weigh carefully any call to beat our swords into plowshares, no matter from what source it comes, for never was there greater need for genuine understanding among nations and among people than there is today.

This is a time, indeed, when it is well for men of good will to break bread together in communion with God. In bringing you the greetings of your board of education, I am only echoing the pride of our entire community in the great work you are doing to mould the minds and characters of our young people.

I know that your zeal and devotion as teachers are enhanced by faith. It is with such dedication to the cause of learning that we will realize the plans put forth only a fortnight ago, in the United Nations, for a bill of rights for youth proclaiming that "mankind owes to the child the best it has to give."

If I may make a suggestion to Mr. Khrushchev, he has an opportunity to put this principle into practice immediately. Many Hungarian children, 14, 15, and 16 years of age, were jailed following the Hungarian revolution, and are to be executed upon reaching their 18th birthday. I have urged that the young people in our secondary schools give thought to participating in the campaign of appeal to Mr. Khrushchev to release these children. I am happy to say that the student councils of our schools are presently considering the appropriate action to take.

The marshalling of the resources of the world in behalf of youth is the wish of many of our Nation's leaders.

It is wholly in keeping with the desire expressed by His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, that America take positive steps in a crusade for the inculcation in our children of higher standards of juvenile decency. They are the future brotherhood of man. Their path and the progress of civilization is largely in your hands as teachers.

There are challenges on every hand which none but you, as teachers, can meet. I am speaking not only of the immense new forces of destruction unleashed by science in appalling enormity. These manmade invaders of space must eventually crumble and fall to earth.

We must set the gaze of youth on things beyond * * * on the changing stars in a changeless space, and on the ancient but ageless teachings, the time-tested sources of all strength.

We must lift the minds of our children from the filth on sale at the corner newsstand, from the indecency of some current literature, and the boldness of many motion pictures and television shows. We must turn them toward standards of conduct that stem from the wholesome family life and a strong moral heritage.

Our public school system is joined in these efforts by many nonpublic schools in our city. One example of these is the great Catholic parochial school system of this city, which renders invaluable service in the cause of education. Its 13,000 teachers provide instruction for approximately 370,000 children. It would mean an additional cost to the city of $750 million for housing facilities, $120 million in annual operating expenses, plus many millions of dollars for teachers' salaries, if this were a muncipal obligation.

I think we can salute this tremendous contribution to the youth of our city.

Our struggle will continue to be severe, taxing every resource of your profession. The burden falls heaviest on you, the teacher, for the greatest demands are made upon our schools; but you and our schools are equal to it.

This is a responsibility which merits adequate compensation. Only a few days ago, at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner, I emphasized the need for funds to increase the rewards to teaching. I spoke in the presence of Governor Rockefeller, the mayor and other members of the board of estimate, and pointed out the dire necessity for higher salaries.

I know that I echo here the constant plea of a dedicated profession. The dignity of teaching is a potent factor in and of itself, and the justice of your cause can be reinforced by a professional approach befitting your position in the eyes of the people and our public officials.

In this age of education, we must understand your needs as we, in turn, ask you to understand the needs of our children, and to teach them to understand each other. In closing, because I have learned some of the precious maxims of your gospel from such cherished friends as my good neighbor, Owen McGivern, and the inspired leaders of your own organization, let me express the hope that the day is not far distant when we shall yet learn how to live with one another in peace, in justice, in the way of the Almighty.

And, sharing in your communion, may I join you in the hope that among the words of the great teachers that are to be embodied in the bill of rights for youth, will be these that were spoken for the ages:

"Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness.

"Blessed are the merciful.

"Blessed are the pure in heart.

"Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God."

The Numbers Racket: Resolution by Interdenominational Ministers Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and motion that was passed at the Interdenominational Ministers Meeting of Greater New York and Vicinity:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 12, 1960.*

DR. A. CLAYTON POWELL, JR.
Abyssinian Baptist Church,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. POWELL: It is with pleasure that I enclose a copy of the motion that was passed at the meeting of January 11, as a result of your presenting to us the situation and effects of the numbers racket as it is practiced in our community.

May you lead the fight to a successful conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. BAILEY,
Secretary.

MOTION PASSED BY THE INTERDENOMINATIONAL MINISTERS MEETING OF GREATER NEW YORK AND VICINITY, JANUARY 11, 1960

It was voted that:

1. As ministers we go on record as commending the Reverend Dr. A. CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., Congressman and pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, for speaking out

against the numbers racket, and maintaining his stand at the jeopardy of his life.

2. We help to sustain him in the position he has taken by a collective effort of preaching from our pulpits, thus accelerating the movement that he has initiated.

C. ASAPANSA-JOHNSON,
President.
PHILIP J. BAILEY,
Secretary.

The Estimation and Measurement of Hydro Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the development of our energy resources is a topic of vital and continuing interest to all of us. We have too frequently been unwilling to face the problems of resource development realistically and with vision. I wish to call to the attention of this House a paper recently presented by Mr. Bruce Netschert of Resources for the Future to the Electric Consumers Information Committee at their legislative workshop held here in Washington. This study points up the lack of a realistic basis for the estimation of our Nation's hydroelectric potential. It is, in my opinion, worthy of our study and that of others concerned with the development of our great natural resources to their true full potential.

The paper follows:

THE ESTIMATION AND MEASUREMENT OF HYDRO RESOURCES

(By Bruce Netschert)

My interest in the subject I am discussing this morning arose in the course of my work at Resources for the Future on the general subject of future energy supply. My specific purpose was to derive an estimate of installed hydro capacity in the United States for the year 1975. This work in turn was part of a larger project, the results of which will be published within the year under the title, "Energy in the American Economy, 1850–1975."

One of the additional and unanticipated results of my work was a finding that I have chosen as the thesis of this talk: namely, that the estimation and measurement of the hydro potential in the United States currently lacks a systematic basis and clearly defined, unambiguous terms. This finding would, however, have little interest for you and would be of no significance were it not for the results of the lack. The absence of a clear, logical basis for estimating and expressing the hydro potential has contributed to a constant, serious underestimation of the true extent of that potential.

Let me begin, in demonstrating why I believe this to be so, by examining the question of hydro resource estimation and measurement in the abstract. The logical starting point for considering the hydro potential is the definition of the term. Is it the total unutilized head and flow in the country? Is it all the capacity that could be installed at present costs? What about multiple-purposes aspects? The total unutilized head and flow is a vastly different thing from capacity installable at present costs. And, as we all know, multipurpose development may make the difference between whether a given hydro site can or cannot be developed at present costs. It is essential, therefore, that any method of estimation deal logically and consistently with considerations such as these and state clearly just how they are dealt with.

There are three elements that enter into the definition and measurement of the potential: (1) The actual head and flow in the streams of the country, (2) the technology that is available with which to capture that head and flow in the form of installed capacity, and (3) the costs of so doing. The first is, in the larger sense, fixed and immutable—it is what nature provides. The other two, technology and costs, apply not only to the first but to each other. For example, until the advent of modern earth-moving machinery the capacity represented by many potential hydro sites was so costly as to be infeasible, but with the possibility of large earthfill dams this capacity became economic. Any advance in technology, from earthmoving through dam design and construction and facility design, construction and operation, even to transmission practices, implies cost reduction. And conversely, if one wishes to allow higher costs, more expensive techniques can be considered to make a project feasible. Perhaps most important in the present context, since technology is undergoing constant progress, is the across-the-board possibility that what is uneconomic today may well be economic tomorrow. None of this can be ignored by a logical system for estimating hydro potential.

The whole purpose of estimating hydro potential is to get a measure of what is available for possible future development. Thus it is, in a sense, self defeating to estimate the potential solely on the basis of what is economic here and now. Yet as soon as one goes beyond the limit of what is presently economic there is the vexing problem of establishing a larger limit. This problem cannot really be solved satisfactorily, but at least it can be treated logically.

One way is to use whatever cost limit beyond present costs appears appropriate for the purpose in mind. One might take the limit to 10 percent higher than present costs, or 25 percent, or 50 percent, or double, and so on. The advantage is a tremendous gain in clarity and conceptual neatness. If one says the potential is X million kw, it is then understood by all who see and use this estimate exactly what the limiting criteria are. They know what the figure stands for, and what the estimate means. The trouble is, one has to know the cost of all conceivable undeveloped capacity.

Another way of establishing a limit beyond present costs is to take as the limit current technical feasibility, regardless of cost. Costs remain unspecified, but one has laid out the ball park, so to speak. This second approach toward going beyond what is currently economic has received a good deal of attention in Europe, and there exists a sizable literature on the subject under the auspices of the Economic Commission for Europe and the World Power Conference. Whether one approves or disapproves of the terminology employed, and even if one has doubts as to the practical value of the systematic basis for estimation that has been developed, this literature represents a stimulating and provocative contribution to the subject of hydro potential estimation. I confess I am baffled by the complete absence of any reference in American technical journals to this European contribution. Indeed, it appears that only the rare hydrologist or power engineer in this country is even aware that it exists.

As an enlightened audience you may well be familiar with this European approach, but it can be briefly summarized as follows: There are three levels of hydro potential. The theoretical potential is that afforded by the total head and flow of all streams in the country. The technical potential is the total capacity that could be installed, regardless of cost, with current technology. The economic potential is the total capacity that could be installed at current costs. In all three of these potentials the capacity already installed is, of course, included.

This system does not eliminate the enormous difficulties of actual measurement of hydro potential, but it has the merit of providing the appropriate perspective for estimating the hydro potential that may be relevant for the long-term future. It is, in my opinion, as important advance toward reality in assessing hydro possibilities.

So much for the abstract. Now let us turn to the specific question of the hydro potential of the United States. There is, as you all know, only one authoritative estimate, that of the FPC, which is periodically revised. The latest figure, as of January 1, 1959, is 121.8 million kilowatts, excluding Alaska and Hawaii. (I excuse the omission, but I want to make the figure consistent with later data I shall cite, and all my work was done on a 48-State basis, before those 2 States entered the Union.) The Commission labels its estimate "the hydroelectric power resources" of the United States, and earlier in its series of revisions commented on the basis of its figure as follows:

"The estimates of undeveloped waterpower include projects on which economic feasibility has been demonstrated, as well as projects at which sites where physical conditions indicate engineering feasibility and promise at some time of economic feasibility. The estimates with respect to the latter class of projects are subject to revision either by increase or decrease as additional information becomes available concerning streamflow, reservoir sites, costs, and other pertinent factors.

"The undeveloped hydroelectric power picture is constantly changing as new projects are constructed, and as continuing studies * * * uncover new potential projects, or * * * demonstrate the desirability of modifications of older plans. Hence, estimates of undeveloped hydroelectric power must be revised from time to time. * * * Although some of these potential projects may * * * be found infeasible * * * from physical, or economic, or other standpoints, the estimates taken in the aggregate serve to indicate, from a long-range view, the overall waterpower potentialities of the United States and the waterpower resources available for possible future development."[1]

This is a fine statement as far as it goes, but it fails to say that the estimate is the total of individual site estimates from various sources originally made for a variety of purposes. The basis for some site estimates is detailed; others are mere guesses. In addition, the figure excludes sites of less than 2,500 kilowatt potential.

My criticism of the FPC in this matter is on two counts. If this is what the Commission has to work with, and if in its opinion further refinement of the data or the total estimate is unnecessary or undesirable, the Commission is entitled to its judgment. But the total figure does not represent what the Commission labels it, the "hydroelectric power resources" of this country. It is merely the total of data available in the Commission files; as a measure of resources it is incomplete however they are defined. Yet—and this is the second count—why should the Commission not base its total on consistent data? It acknowledges its interest and responsibility by publishing the estimate. Why should it not assume the full responsibility and make an estimate based

[1] Federal Power Commission, "Hydroelectric Power Resources of the United States: Developed and Undeveloped, 1957," p. 19.

on a survey conducted for that purpose? Let it define hydro resources as it will, but let the estimate have a logical, consistent basis, and let it be complete.

The shortcomings of the only available estimate of this country's hydro potential are well brought out by a comparison with the European approach. Obviously, the FPC figure is not at the level of the theoretical potential, nor does it pretend to be. It goes beyond the economic potential, as the FPC states; but it does not attempt to go the technical limit, and at the indefinable level at which it rests its coverage is incomplete. That is, it does not include all capacity that could be developed economically under present conditions, nor does it include all capacity that is technically feasible to develop.

I turn now to the consequences of the Commission's estimates. In the course of my work I assembled all estimates of future installed hydro capacity for the period through 1980 that have been published since 1948. Upon analysis of these estimates I discovered a peculiar thing: throughout this period the majority of the 20 estimators were pessimistic with respect to the future rate of growth in installed hydro capacity. In almost all instances they underestimated the rate of growth that has actually occurred subsequent to the time they made their estimate. What is perhaps most remarkable is that this pessimism has persisted through to the present. Even the estimates of the past 2 years (including some made by the FPC in 1959) assume a marked reduction from current growth rates in the future. The average growth per year in installed capacity from 1946 to 1958 was 5.5 percent; the FPC's own assumed growth rates in its recent projections of installed capacity range from a high of 4.4 percent to a low of 3 percent. The inconsistency in all of this is especially marked with respect to the current growth rate as indicated by projects underway and planned through 1961. The annual rate from 1958 to 1961 is 8 percent, yet the FPC's own projections of future installed capacity assume a growth rate after 1961 of less than 3 percent.

I want to make it clear that I am not criticizing or holding up to ridicule past estimates that have since proved wrong. This is poor sport for anyone making his own projection. The point I am trying to make is that there has been a persistent tendency by the estimators to assume that there would be a sharp drop from the then current rate in the future pace of hydroinstallation. Few estimates are accompanied by statements of the reasoning behind them, but the only logical basis for believing the pace of total hydrodevelopment would decline (notice, I am not talking about the pace of public versus private development) would be the expectation that costs, in constant-dollar terms, would shortly begin to rise in the development of the remaining sites—and rise sharply enough to severely curtail the pace of development.

Such an expectation is engendered by the common generalization that in the course of exploitation of any natural resource, the richest and best resources are, by and large, developed first. In this instance it would mean the lowest cost hydro capacity. It then follows that successive additions to capacity through development of the remaining resources would be increasingly costly. And, at some point in the sequence, the rise in costs would begin to steepen as the resource dregs were approached.

Now this is all very well as a generalization, but there is no natural law or statistical relationship that enables one to predict just where on the curve of cumulative resource develpoment costs will begin to rise steeply. Nevertheless, several of the estimators cited such a steep cost rise as a reason for expecting a slower future pace of hydro development, and one can only infer that it must have been in the minds of those who did not specify the basis of their estimates.

The incomplete hydro resource figure of the FPC, as the authoritative measure, has contributed to the consistent serious underestimation of the pace of future hydro growth in the following manner. It is clear from the Commission's discussion of their figure that that agency is aware of what it means; it is quite conceivable that 100 percent of the total could be eventually developed, and I venture to say that the FPC expects that most of it will be. But the users of the figure have been misled by the term "resources," and regard it as a measure of all that exists—i.e., the potential. Some projections take the development to 60 percent or more of the FPC's current resource estimate (an estimate which was, by the way, smaller in earlier years. It has itself undergone constant growth, and between 1953 and 1959 alone grew by 12 percent). If the estimators had related their projections to the true potential, the percentage of development of the total they were projecting would have been correspondingly smaller, and the expectation of a cost rise on resource grounds correspondingly less. I don't know whether any widows or orphans got hurt by this chronic underestimating of the future growth of hydro capacity, but it has certainly been to the detriment of good planning in this field, whether by Government or by private industry.

What we really need is a comprehensive survey of the hydro resources of this country at the level of the theoretical potential. Of course we can never develop all, or even most of that potential, whatever it is; nor can we easily agree on a definition of the potential at any other level that would satisfy all concerned. On the other hand, we can benefit from knowing the true dimensions that nature has provided in the field of hydro potential. Just as the theoretical maximum efficiency in the Carnot cycle provides a measure to the mechanical engineers of where they actually stand in thermal plant efficiency, so the theoretical hydro potential fixes the outer limit and a measure of where we actually stand in the development of our hydro resources.

It is my belief that our ultimate hydro development will turn out to be far greater than any of us dream at present, and that we need to know the outer limit to get some idea of the scale of possibilities. Hydro will, of course, continue to be only a small portion of total generating capacity, but this still leaves plenty of room for further growth. I return to the technology-cost relationship to which I referred earlier. The directions of current technological progress indicate the good probability that costs can be kept down and the value of hydro capacity in systems increased.

There is one technological advance that deserves special mention—pumped storage. The recent perfection of the reversible pump-turbine for hydropowerplants is, I think, a development of the greatest significance for the future of hydropower. Under the appropriate conditions it appears that pumped storage offers attractive savings for peaking capacity, and as thermal units get larger and the capital costs of base-load capacity go up, the urgent necessity for maintaining a high plant factor should enhance that attractiveness. Already several large pumped-storage projects, such as that at Niagara, have been installed or are planned. But the truly startling implications involve the pumped-storage unit that shuttles water back and forth between two modest-sized reservoirs without using any streamflow. How many million kilowatts of economic hydro capacity are possible when such capacity can be created where it does not even exist in nature?

As I see it, the need and desirability of a comprehensive, systematic inventory of this country's natural hydro potential will become increasingly apparent. It will be interesting, when such work is finally undertaken, to see how much larger the true potential is than the elastic figure that we have had to make do with thus far. One thing is, I believe, already apparent: Resource limitations on further expansion of this country's hydro capacity are not yet in sight. When limitations do appear, they are more likely to come from competing water uses than from the lack of head and flow.

Harlem's No. 1 Sickness: The Numbers Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jackie Robinson from the New York Post of January 15, 1960:

Now that Manhattan Borough President Hulan Jack has been indicted by the grand jury investigating his dealings with realtor Sidney Ungar, there are many who consider the matter a closed chapter. Mr. Jack is as good as out of office and behind prison bars, they say. It's merely a question of time. Yet, I submit that due process of law applies to Hulan Jack as much as anyone else, and regardless of the circumstances he is entitled to his day in court.

Jack still stoutly maintains his innocence of any criminal wrongdoing, and certainly he should be allowed to defend himself against the indictment before any final verdict is rendered. He has, of course, already given public evidence of bad judgment in allowing Ungar to pay for the redecoration of his apartment, knowing Ungar was seeking a title I contract with the city. And the statement of District Attorney Hogan—that Jack admitted the falsehood of his first claim that Mrs. Jack had paid the bill—is damaging to public confidence in Jack as a public official.

But whether Jack's actions have constituted criminal acts, for which he may be liable for jail sentences and fines, is a question yet to be decided. That is now the duty of the proper courts of law. My own feeling, still, is that Jack is a man of basic integrity who has made a very serious mistake. He must now—like any other official—be prepared to face the consequences of that mistake, as determined in due course by the proper authorities.

Another public figure from Harlem has also been very much in the news these days. Say what you will about Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, he very often lands some telling blows against injustice, and the past few weeks have been no exception.

Not only has he stepped up his continuing campaign for wider political representation of minority groups in New York's governmental affairs, but he has launched a one-man campaign against the evils of what he calls Harlem's No. 1 sickness—the numbers game. Even aside from the eye-opening revelations that Negroes involved in the numbers are constantly arrested and harassed while white policy barons go free, POWELL launched an all-out war upon the numbers—no matter what race is involved—

in his sermon at Abyssinian Baptist Church last Sunday. Said Reverend POWELL:

"We need to realize that we as a community are sick. Just as narcotics becomes habit forming to the individual, so has the numbers become habit forming for about 50,000 people in this area. We need to 'kick the habit.' Instead of the old symbol of get-rich-quick, do-it-the-easy-way, we need the new symbol of 'stand together' and taking these pennies and nickels and dollars that we have been squandering, deposit them in our banks, pooling our resources and lifting ourselves up."

Dismissing reports that his actions had caused resentment among number runners and players in Harlem, POWELL declared that he is more determined than ever to pursue the matter, regardless of personal threats or political repercussions. He charged that numbers were pauperizing Harlem, and that due to the large numbers of Negroes arrested each year in connection with the racket, the community is being criminalized.

"It may take some time," he continued, "but just think that every day we keep the heat on the police department and keep the heat on the bums that infest this community—every week we do this, we are saving a million to $2 million. Just think what $50 million in 1 year could do for Harlem."

I applaud Reverend POWELL on this issue, and I hope sincerely that he does conduct a vigorous and continuing campaign to rid the community of such criminal activities, no matter who conducts them. I do not know of another Negro in public life who can arouse the support of his followers in the manner that Reverend POWELL can. I urge the Congressman to extend the responsibility of leadership that is his and forge ahead on other fronts as well, for the betterment of the Harlem community and the Nation at large.

Mileage in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appears in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald the other day.

The article follows:

MILEAGE IN REVERSE

Minority Leader HALLECK may be playing a clever political game in the House by discouraging Republican signatures on the petition to discharge the civil rights bill from the stalling Rules Committee. But it may also prove to be a dangerous game. Its obvious purpose is to embarrass the Democrats by demonstrating that, with all their numerical superiority, they do not control the House on issues of this kind. Everyone knows, however, that civil-rights questions split the Democratic Party wide open. The more significant aspect of the HALLECK maneuver is that is it lending Republican support to those Southern Democrats who want to defeat civil rights legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. HALLECK's foot-dragging is more curious because it coincides with the advancement of a new civil-rights plan by the Department of Justice. Presumably the best chance for enactment of this measure to have court referees register voters who have been victims of discrimination is to attach it to the existing House and Senate bills as an amendment. Before this can be done, however, the House bill must be rescued from the Rules Committee.

The situation is not changed by Rules Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH's belated call for a meeting of his committee on Monday. Obviously he is acting under pressure from the mounting signatures on the discharge petition. But no capitulation on his part is in sight. If the committee takes up the bill, it will doubtless be merely a delaying tactic. Surely Republicans have as great an obligation as Democrats to avoid further obstruction.

If Mr. HALLECK persists in his course, he will end by embarrassing the President and his own party much more than the Democrats. Vice President NIXON must be concerned about it, and since Mr. HALLECK is an avowed candidate for the Republican vice presidential nomination he might find it profitable to review his own standing before the public in the light of this reactionary maneuver. His support of the obstructionists is hurting the District home-rule petition as well as the civil-rights petition. If there is any political mileage in this, it is mileage in the wrong direction.

One-Hundredth Anniversary of Rabbi Morris J. Raphall's Prayer in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting when we today commemorate the 100th anniversary of the occasion of Rabbi Morris J. Raphall's delivering the first prayer by a Jewish minister in the Halls of Congress that we pause and reflect on the deep and venerable roots of the Jewish community in American society.

This moment is an especially appropriate time because of the various acts of medieval intolerance which have lately been manifested against Jewish houses of worship.

Barbaric acts of anti-Semitism strike at not a particular isolated group, but at all of us. A democracy survives not in a society of an elite self-imposed on coteries of second-class citizens, but in a society of truly equal individuals. It is sober fact that we in the United States are still striving for that great achievement of democratic equality of which our forefathers dreamed. We are on the threshold of its realization. The struggle for full equality awaits the fateful decisions to be made within these very walls shortly.

Rabbi Raphall was an especially illustrious minister of a long and distinguished line of spiritual leaders of the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of New York City.

Dr. Raphall was called in 1849 to this famous congregation in New York City from Birmingham, England, where he had become famed as the foremost exponent of the Jew to the non-Jew and had served to win for Jews the battle for equal political rights which were as yet denied them in the British Empire.

Rabbi Raphall's fame as preacher and scholar became quickly established in America too, not only among the Jewry but also among the Christian clergy so that when the invitation to open a session of the House of Representatives with a prayer came to him, he had long been acclaimed for his erudition and his oratory.

His prayer to the House of Representatives on February 1, 1860 in many respects was prophetic for a nation shortly to be torn asunder by civil war. Portions of his prayer have signifiance for our time too. He said then:

The Constitution and institutions of this Republic prove to the world, that men created in Thine image and obedient to Thy precepts are not only capable—fully capable of self-government, but that they know best how to combine civil liberty with ready obedience to the laws—religious liberty with warm zeal for religion—absolute general equality with sincere respect for individual rights.

And even more significant, he exhorted:

"Let Thy grace guide them, so that amidst the din of conflicting interests and opinions, they may each of them and all of them hold the even tenor of their way—the way of moderation and of equity—that they may speak and act and legislate for Thy glory and for the happiness of our country; so that from North and from South and from East and West, one feeling of satisfaction may attend their labors while all the people of the land joyfully repeat the words of Thy Psalmist:

"Lo! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Dr. Raphall remained the pillar of New York's Jewish community until his death on June 22, 1868 after nearly 20 years with Congregation B'nai Jeshurun.

It is good that we commemorate this occasion and in the light of this facet of history we reexamine our consciences so we might be strengthened in our resolve to be just.

On the Understanding of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to recommend the following article from the February 1 issue of the New Republic:

A PRIMER ON INFLATION
(By Robert Lekachman)

The President's sermon on the economic verities in his State of the Union message prompts me to wonder what are the economics behind the platitudes.

Let us start at the very beginning. The simplest definition I know of inflation labels it as a period in which prices continuously rise. Prices, in general, rise when the total amount people want to spend on goods and services is larger than the sum of

the price tags which sellers have placed on their merchandise and services. The response of happy sellers is to raise prices and eliminate poorer or less eager buyers from the competition for scarce goods. Thrift tends to slow or stop inflation because some of the possible buyers voluntarily remove themselves from the market. On the other hand, borrowing adds to the sums which buyers can spend and promotes price increases. What is true of individual consumers applies also to other spending units, including businessmen, farmers, private institution, and governmental agencies.

As late as the early 1930s, many economists contemplated wage reductions as a means of restraining inflation. Since the ordinary wage earner is the most prone to spend a large percentage of all of his weekly income, reductions in wages might well lead to nearly equal reductions in spending. Under the influence of Keynes, rather few conservative economists now advocate such a policy. In the world of reality, trade union resistance would be overwhelming and the danger of unemployment as a corollary of wage reduction quite considerable. There are few left to point to the economic advantages of unemployment—at least in public.

More socially acceptable as a mode of monetary limitation is credit contraction. Here the story becomes complicated. What the economists calls money falls into two major categories: paper currency and metal coins, and demand or checking deposits in commercial banks. Deposits are vastly more important than currency, comprising some four fifths of the total money supply. They are not only the largest, they are also the most volatile portion of the money supply. Although commercial bankers bristle at the imputation, it is they who have most to do with this fluctuation in the money supply. To understand their role, it is necessary to examine the manner in which loans are made. Conventionally, a commercial bank extends credit to a borrower by giving him a deposit. On this deposit, the borrower can draw by check to pay his bills. In short, the deposit is money. If the bank does not make the loan, the money is not created. If when the loan is repaid, the bank does not make another of the same size, the money supply contracts. Loans expand the money supply and repayments shrink the money supply.

These expansions and contractions are intensified by the circumstance that American banking is based on fractional reserve requirements. Commercial banks need keep no more than about $1 in cash (actually as a deposit in a Federal Reserve bank) for each $5 in deposits. Or, what is the same point, every dollar of reserve can support $5 of deposits, and deposits are money. Conservative economic policy concentrates its efforts on altering the size of these reserves on the assumption that larger or smaller reserves lead to expansion or contraction of loans and deposits.

The chosen instruments of this policy are the 12 Federal Reserve banks in the major cities and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in Washington, as coordinator of national policy. The President appoints members of the Board to 14 years, staggered terms of office. The Federal Reserve System exercises important controls over the lending activities of the commercial banks who belong to the system. Chief among them is the ability to increase or decrease reserves—the basis of the money creating capacity of commercial banks. The Federal Reserve's three classic weapons are variations in reserve requirements, alterations in rediscount rates, and open market operations. If commercial banks are directed to hold in reserve one dollar for every four instead of five dollars in deposits, they can adjust themselves to their new situation by refusing to renew loans when they fall due. This action extinguishes the deposits with which the loans are repaid and thus contracts the money supply. The commercial bank can put itself into an appropriate legal position in another way; instead of reducing the deposits against which it holds reserves, it can increase its reserves by borrowing from the Federal Reserve. But this action only delays the inevitable. When it comes time to pay the Federal Reserve, the commercial bank can do so only by reducing the loans which it makes to its own customers.

Moreover, borrowing from the Federal Reserve is expensive, for interest must be paid. Constitutionally, commercial bankers delight in interest paid to them and abominate interest paid by them. The Federal Reserve can increase this detestation by raising the charges it makes when commercial banks borrow reserves. These charges are called the rediscount rate. If the Federal Reserve increases reserve requirements and rediscount rates simultaneously, the pressure upon the commercial banks to contract credit is verly considerable. Commercial bankers transmit this pressure to their customers by raising interest rates and thus discouraging some borrowers entirely, increasing the severity of the terms upon which loans are made and reducing the size of individual loans. Businessmen in general discover that it is more difficult to borrow the funds they require to expand their inventories or even to maintain them at present levels in periods of rising prices. Small loan companies which conduct their affairs substantially on the basis of funds they borrow from commercial banks are compelled to accept smaller credits and pay higher rates for them. In turn, they reduce loans to consumers and make them more expensive. As the impact of higher interest rates widens, home buyers face harsher mortgage terms and find themselves less able to contemplate monthly payments in which interest bulks large, automobile buyers postpone purchases, and businessmen of all varieties curtail their rosier visions of expansion. In short, spending dimnishes and prices stabilize or fall.

If these weapons do not suffice, the Federal Reserve has at its disposal a still more powerful technique, open market sales of Government securities. Of the many billions of dollars of Government securities in its possession, the Federal Reserve, acting through its Open Market Committee, can sell as much as it pleases, to whoever will buy. These marketable securities—a category quite different from the savings bonds purchased by ordinary individuals—include 91-day Treasury bills, and a wide variety of bonds of various maturities. By its own self-denying ordinance, the Federal Reserve customarily deals only in the shortest term of these securities, a policy usually called "bills only." When it sells these securities, it reduces deposits in commercial banks, for the corporations, banks, life insurance companies, mutual and welfare funds, and institutions which are the largest buyers of the bonds pay for them by check. The money supply declines immediately because of this deposit contraction and the ultimate effect is still greater. The Federal Reserve can always persuade buyers to purchase by reducing the price of the securities. Since the interest payment is not curtailed when the price falls, purchasers enjoy higher effective yields—the relationship between price at purchase and annual interest payments—than before the price reduction. If rational behavior in financial markets is assumed, there will always be some yield which will induce possible purchasers to prefer Government securities to alternative uses of their funds, including personal consumption.

THE BANKERS' PREFERENCE

In general, bankers and conservative economists much prefer monetary measures of this variety to alternative forms of Government intervention. For this preference, there are several reason. Banks are conservative institutions, and bankers cast themselves as models of prudent behavior, not always with adequate justification. Conservatives are happy when prudent men, even Federal Reserve central bankers, meeting in the privacy of dignified boardrooms, are at the financial helm. The whole operation appears less like Government interference and more like an extension of normal business practice. Banking action is quick, secret, easily reversible, and free of bureaucratic complications. Finally, banking regulation at least appears to interfere least with the private decisions of individual consumers and businessmen. Banking controls apparently refrain from singling out individual industries, much less individual persons for discriminatory attention. Commercial bankers are still left with the task of allocating credit among their borrowers. They simply have less credit to allocate. If, as intelligent conservatives recognize, Government action is essential when either inflation or recession threatens, then banking policy is by all odds the least governmental of Government actions.

At about this point in the exposition, the argument between liberals and conservatives begins. The major liberal criticisms of recent monetary policy, carried out after this rationale, conveniently fall under two headings, efficacy and equity. Liberals charge that the partisans of monetary policy have not kept up with the changes in financial institutions and practices which have diminished the impact of monetary policy. Thirty years ago, perhaps even 10 years ago, Federal Reserve policy directly affected the bulk of lending activity. For a great many reasons, this is much less the case today. Since Government expenditure is much more important as a percentage of total spending than it used to be, limitation of private spending leaves untouched a major spending source. Interest costs mean much less to a businessman as a deterrent from borrowing because corporate taxes enable him to regard half the interest burden as a credit on tax payments. Commercial banks are much less important because the larger corporations tend more and more either to handle their own financing out of accumulated profits, or to borrow from life insurance companies or other institutional lenders instead of commercial banks. As the last sentence implies, other financial institutions—life insurance companies, savings and loan societies, Government lending agencies, and mutual funds—have grown more rapidly than the commercial banks. None of these lenders, it should be emphasized, is subject to the control of the Federal Reserve. Since the Federal Reserve can affect directly only a diminishing percentage of potential lending, it can contract total spending much less than it once could.

THE CASE OF THE SMALL BORROWER

Moreover—and this is the second liberal criticism—what effect it does have is only at the cost of grave inequity. For the brunt of credit limitation is suffered by the borrower who has no alternative to the loan from a commercial bank. That borrower almost inevitably is a person or an enterprise of small resources. As we have said, the large enterprise draws upon accumulated retained profits, or places its securities with some institutional investor. If, at worst, it borrows from the commercial banks, it enjoys the most favorable terms. The small borrower's case is much different. If he fails to win accommodation from a commercial bank, he must go without. Since the small borrower is likely to be a poorer risk, and he is certainly the most trouble to handle in relation to the size of the transaction, the burden of monetary contraction falls most heavily

upon him. Other sufferers are consumers with low incomes. It is the man whose income is $4,000, not his richer brother, who is denied credit upon purchases of cars, refrigerators, or living room suites. This is not the end of monetary policy's inequities. The longer the time of repayment, the larger is the percentage of the value of a loan paid in interest. Major long-term borrowing concentrates on construction. This is another way of saying that State and local authorities, with no access to Federal credit, can construct schools, hospitals, parks, and other public facilities only at sharply rising costs. When bond issues expand, more of them are rejected by voters, and the present misallocation of resources between public and private uses is aggravated.

As many critics view monetary policy, it is not as effective as it once was, and it is more and more unfair. The paradox appears to be that monetary policy has been just effective enough to hamper growth and not effective enough to contain inflationary forces.

How do recent events fit into this simplified framework? Start with the Federal budget. Although there is many a slip between the prediction and the achievement, the President forecasts a budget surplus of $4.2 billion for the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1960, and terminates June 30, 1961. Sternly and morally, he proposes to apply this sum to the reduction of our impressive $290 billion national debt. Such a reduction will save in interest some $200 million. Let us dispose first of the morality of budget reduction. In his reference to "our children's inherited mortgage," the President commits the logical fallacy of composition, of arguing that what is true of the parts of a whole must necessarily be true of the whole. For an individual an inherited debt is an ill, since when he repays it, he transfers assets which he might have enjoyed to the creditor.

But the case of an internally held Federal debt is a great deal more complicated. In the first place, it is owned by a great many individuals—directly in the shape of savings bonds, indirectly in the form of claims in institutions which themselves are owners of Federal securities, such as insurance companies, savings banks, and saving and loan associations. Not only is the debt widely held, it is widely financed, through general taxation. Therefore, who bears the burden of the debt depends upon who owns the debt and who pays the taxes which cover interest and principal. Conceivably, the owners of the debt could redeem it out of taxes they themselves pay, given the appropriate distribution of debt and taxes. It is plain that the process involves essentially internal transfers of wealth. At its end, the community is neither richer nor poorer, although some people within the country may gain and others may lose. In any event, morality is irrelevant to the issue.

Nevertheless, the size and the character of the national debt do give rise to genuine, technical problems. Here we must consider, as illustration, the President's plea for the lifting of the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds of 5 years or longer life, a restriction which he stigmatizes as an artificial barrier to proper debt management. The Treasury's troubles are related to the fact that most of the national debt is in short-term securities. Approximately $84 billion of these securities will mature in 1960. In effect, the Treasury must find $84 billion of new money to replace the sums it pays to the holders of maturing debt. As a matter of administration, this necessity is a nuisance, involving much unnecessary activity in financial markets. Worse than that, the Treasury's large refunding operations complicate the Federal Reserve's tasks of monetary management. In custom and in practice, the Federal Reserve must make money sufficiently plentiful in the community so that the Treasury can sell its new securities issue without embarrassment. But this tradition may well coincide with a time when the Federal Reserve wishes to contract credit in order to combat inflation.

What would the Treasury like to do? If the size of the national debt were reduced, the impact of Treasury operations would diminish. Even if the size of debt remained stable, improvement would occur if when short-term securities fell due, the Treasury could replace them with long-term bonds. Such a change would decrease the number of times the Treasury had to resort to refunding operations. But, asks the Secretary of the Treasury, how can this laudable goal be attained or even approached if nobody wants to buy long-term Government securities for the sound and sufficient reason that yields higher than 4¼ percent can be earned on other securities, loans, or mortgages. Because of this obsolete restriction, the Treasury must sell more and more short-term securities. When it does so, it forces short-term interest rates up both for itself and for other borrowers. As a result, long-term rates are lower and short-term rates are higher than they would be, except for the distorting effects of the Treasury's operations.

On general grounds of administrative efficiency and even economic principle the administration case is good. Those who argue with it are not so much opposed to Treasury freedom as they are eager to accomplish another purpose: a general revision of interest-rate policy. Critics of the administration are in effect proposing a trade—repeal of the interest-rate ceiling in return for looser credit policies by the Federal Reserve System. The heart of the matter is the independence of the Federal Reserve from congressional influence. Congressional Democrats are convinced, with some reason, that in recent years the Federal Reserve has forced interest rates too high, intensified the difficulties of small borrowers, and created an artificial shortage of funds for public purposes. The net impact of these policies has been inhibit growth and increase average levels of unemployment. Congressional reluctance to raise the interest ceiling is a judgment that existing rates are higher than they should be for the welfare of the society. If this is so, then allowing the Treasury to sell long-term securities is the equivalent of giving the purchasers an undeserved bonus over the lifetime of the bonds. On the other hand, if the Treasury sells short-term securities, there may come a time when it can exchange for long-term bonds, but at lower interest rates. No doubt Congress is making an economic judgment after an awkward, political fashion, but it is difficult to see what alternative it enjoys.

In his message, the President was concerned not alone with balancing the Federal budget, but also with holding down its size. Orthodox conservative ideas on this subject are simple enough. Private activity, in general, is to be preferred to public activity because private activity registers individual choices and preferences in a way that the clumsier apparatus of Government cannot match. Private activity is also more efficient because it is sensitive to the stimulus of private gain. Although in complex modern societies government intervention is frequently necessary, the necessity is a source of regret not of joy. If government must intervene, let the unit be as near the voters as possible, preferably the State or the community. In pursuit of these principles, the Eisenhower administration has proposed only timid programs of housing, school construction, and urban redevelopment. In advancing toward even puny objectives, it has displayed a weakness for complex financing devices which center in the commercial banks.

WHO PAYS THE CRIPPLING TAX?

What is a possible alternative position? It is irresponsible to take the danger of inflation lightly. But inflation is dangerous not because of the President's reason, that "every American pays its crippling tax," but precisely because so many Americans do not pay "its crippling tax." Any businessman, speculator, or worker whose remuneration advances more rapidly than prices increase enjoys a benefit, although he may inflict a penalty on others whose fortune is less good. Inflation afflicts pensioners, public employees, teachers, and rentiers. If unchecked, it cripples incentives and distorts production. But it is foolish not to realize that one reason inflation occurrs is that inflation is of immediate benefit to a great many Americans.

How does the budget affect the control of inflation? A budget surplus diminishes total spending by taking out of the income stream more money in taxes than it returns to that stream by its own expenditures. Hence a budget surplus tends to be anti-inflationary. Although liberals as well as conservatives can participate in the President's enthusiasm for a budget surplus at this time, such endorsement need not preclude support of expenditures on a wide range of neglected social objectives. Housing, schools, and medical services are essential to the rectification of the imbalance in our society between private affluence and public poverty. Since private markets fail to house us adequately, guard our health, or make our cities livable, Government action is essential.

The logic and the arithmetic of the simultaneous pursuit of price stability and social progress amount to this: the budget should be more than balanced, and the level of Federal spending on social welfare should sharply rise. The resultant of these two forces is higher taxes. At the moment, in an election year, it would take a courageous Congress to face this fact, for the feelings is still widespread that the tax reduction which former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey urged through Congress in 1954 created a sacred ceiling on the taxes that the community should pay. That assumption stands as a major barrier to social progress.

A Resolution Unanimously Adopted by the Twin Falls, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, there follows a very excellent statement in the form of a resolution adopted by the Twin Falls, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce and which I commend to the attention of the Members of Congress:

A RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the members of the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce are vitally concerned with the runaway inflation and deficit spending practices of the Federal Government, particularly in areas that are not concerned with the well-being of the citizens of the United States, and

Whereas we feel the economy of our country and the incentive of industry would be materially enhanced by a tax reduction at the earliest possible date consistent with sound budget principles; and

Whereas we believe effective annual control over Federal spending and debt is seriously hampered by inadequate congressional fiscal procedure and practice, as follows:

1. Congress annually passes many seperate appropriations bills in a piecemeal process with few being related to the cost of others, or to total expenditures, or anticipated revenues, or their effect on the national debt;

2. Congress in recent years has avoided the appropriation process by directly authorizing withdrawal of funds from the Treasury and by authorizing contracts requiring future provision of funds. This type of backdoor financing prevents adequate control of expenditures by the Federal Appropriations Committees.

3. Congress has no procedure to set annual limits on spending. Its own committee reports concede a lack of knowledge of total annual spending as a result of their authorizations until the Budget Bureau publishes its review, after Congress has adjourned.

4. Congress has made many appropriations without taking into consideration funds appropriated in prior years but unspent by certain departments, branches, bureaus, and committees;

5. Congres has apparently failed to scrutinize the needs, effectivenes, purpose, and intent of departments, bureaus, and committees which in the past have been created to answer a specific need and which need or purpose no longer exists;

6. Congress has apparently failed to completely and thoroughly analyze all departments, branches, bureaus, and committees and eliminate costly duplication of efforts.

Whereas we believe better congressional procedures are essential to any long-term and immediate Federal spending: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to act at once to accomplish the following:

1. Place all expenditure authorizations in a single all-inclusive plan and rerelate them annually to revenues for the purpose of assuring an over-all fiscal policy on spending, reduction of taxes, elimination of deficit spending and a reduction of the Federal debt.

2. End practices of back-door financing which circumvent the appropriations process.

3. Take into consideration in appropriating funds for certain departments, branches, bureaus, and committees the unspent funds from prior appropriations.

4. Eliminate the departments, bureaus, and committees which are no longer essential or productive.

5. Analyze all departments, branches, bureaus, and committees in an effort to eliminate costly duplication of efforts.

CARL BERG, *President.*

Attest:

WILLIAM GRANGE, *Secretary.*

Vandalism to Houses of Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who express shock and horror at the recent outbreak of vandalism to houses of worship and anti-Semitic feeling.

This is evidence of religious intolerance and is shocking to every thinking person, who, I feel certain, must be indignant over these shameful acts.

I sincerely hope that our citizenry has been sufficiently alerted to the serious problem of combating bigotry and will continue to be ready to join in the fight against it.

Six-Percent Differential Held Vital to West-Coast Shipbuilders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 16, 1960, issue of the Marine Digest. The editorial, entitled "The Six Percent," relates to the ship construction differential favoring west coast builders on certain Federal Maritime Board contracts. As the editorial points out, it is imperative that this differential be maintained so that the west coast shipbuilding industry, an important segment of our economy, can continue to compete with other areas. I feel confident the combined efforts of the western congressional delegations will be successful in "holding the line."

The editorial follows:

THE 6 PERCENT

All 13 Western States are being asked to join in a combined effort on a maritime matter. At stake is the 6-percent construction differential favoring west coast builders on certain Federal Maritime Board contracts.

The differential was made law in 1936 and was primarily intended to offset the higher cost of constructing ships on the west coast; costs made higher by freight and labor differentials.

It is essential that the Western States get together and fight for the preservation of the 6-percent differential. Shipyard officials have pointed out that its loss will mean the loss of millions of dollars in the next few years to the economies of Western States.

Joe Byington, of Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., has brought another point into the open in noting that the 6-percent clause applies only to ships for west coast-based steamship companies and which will be used in service from the Pacific Coast. Byington points out that of the 225 ships to be built between now and 1977, less than 40 will qualify for the 6-percent differential.

Byington has told the newly formed Western Shipbuilding Conference that holding the differential is not enough. The West should have more of the overall total.

Western congressional delegations should waste no time getting together to fight the current effort by Atlantic and Gulf interests to remove the differential, and, if possible, to expand its application to a larger area. The future of west coast shipbuilding depends on the success of such a flight.

On a long-term basis, the Western Shipbuilding Conference has the opportunity to perform a far more valuable service. One of its jobs will be to put together a graphic picture of the thousands of items that go into a ship so that congressional committees can be shown why and where western yards are at an honest disadvantage.

It is doubtful that the Government can go on and on maintaining the shipbuilding differential. There is a growing demand in America to do away with subsidies to special groups, be they farm, airlines, ships, or publishing. Business under special dispensation in the long run, is not healthy business.

The Western Shipbuilding Conference could do a great service to its members if it can pinpoint the differences and start action to eliminate them so that west coast yards can compete on an equal basis with eastern yards.

This may mean changes in freight rates and increases in labor production to offset wage increases. It very well could mean attracting supplier industries to the growing markets of the West so that parts and supplies need not be shipped long distances.

Right now, all in the West should join the fight to hold the line.

Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for an hour's time and yet I can say all that would cover the subject in a few sentences and still could not exhaust the subject if I spoke for many days. The laws of human deportment and our relationship to our Maker and our fellow man are set forth in a relatively few sentences in the Ten Commandments, but countless millions of words written and spoken in many generations have given them a richness of interpretation and of understanding adaptation to changing conditions as mankind ascends, ever higher, in the climb to the mountain's top.

And so I could say briefly that if we believe in our democracy—and with us our Constitution is a sacred document of political faith and not an instrument of mockery—we cannot hide behind a fence of excuses when the signing of a discharge petition means the opening of the way for millions of our fellow Americans to come into full enjoyment of their constitutional right of participation as electors in a government of, for, and by all the people.

Unless the discharge petition reaches the required number of signatures, civil rights legislation is doomed, and any Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, who refuses to sign the petition must individually take the responsibility of being party to a conspiracy to continue to hold in political bondage millions of his fellow Americans. It is that simple.

I seek to be charitable with all my colleagues, as I trust my colleagues will be charitable with me. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues from the North who have not as yet signed the discharge petition would counsel with their consciences. Yes, there may be a political expediency in withholding their signatures, saying the responsibility is upon the Democratic Party and the Demo-

cratic Party is in the majority in numbers in this Chamber; but to their own conscience that cannot be satisfying. They know that on the Rules Committee are all of the Republican members of that committee joined with two Democrats, two Democrats from the South, to keep bottled up the legislation that decency demands and that our security in a troubled world demands. These colleagues of mine on the other side who have not signed the petition know that that is a fact, but I suppose with a sense of political expediency, thinking that the responsibility can be thrown onto the Democratic side, they are withholding their signatures. This may be a partisan advantage, according to the reasoning of some, but in good conscience no advantage is worth the price of continuing on millions of our fellow Americans the chains of political bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I remember in the 81st Congress I was on the committee that wrote a housing bill and my heart was in the enactment of that great piece of legislation. The vote we knew would be very close, and many felt that the adoption of an antisegregation amendment would doom the measure. The leadership regarded the amendment as a device to kill the bill.

There was a teller vote. I saw some of my liberal colleagues from the North, just as sincere in their opposition to segregation as I am, line up and vote against the amendment to save as they felt the housing bill that meant so much to all our people in that period of critical housing shortage. I voted for the amendment. The amendment was defeated by one vote. Had it carried, possibly I would have borne the responsibility of having killed that great housing bill. But I could not have lived with myself unless I had done as I did. Each man must make his own decisions, and I am sure that in this body always they are honest decisions, varying with different philosophies and different approaches. I happen to believe that no material advantage is worth the abandonment of a moral principle.

I was not surprised when I heard a brilliant and distinguished colleague of mine, a Republican from Illinois, Congresswoman MARGARET STITT CHURCH, say that she had signed the discharge petition, and she did it, I know, because of her conscience. She was not thinking as a Republican when she signed the petition nor was I thinking as a Democrat when I signed the petition. You cannot duck conscience in a pool of partisan waters. You cannot play politics with morals. I hope that all my colleagues from the North on the other side of the aisle who sincerely believe in civil rights and who believe that everyone of our Americans should have an equal opportunity to vote regardless of any political expediency and regardless of any whispered counsel from their leadership will come and sign this petition.

Now I am not judging our Democrats from the South. It is not given to me to judge any of my colleagues. They at least are consistent. They realize they are standing for a dying order. An order that has gone and will never return. But they are still standing for it, on the fringe of a lost battlefield. When we had civil rights legislation before the House in the last Congress, it was late in July, I think, a beautiful summer day. Summer was in the full bloom of its enrapturement. Yet, my friends, summer than had been on the path of death for more than a month. Although everything spoke of summer, it was a dying and not a borning summer. Summer was on its way out. That is how it is with the changing order now. So my southern colleagues cannot be accused of hypocrisy or insincerity when they are fighting this legislation which will hasten the coming to the South of a new order and which, when the dread of a change from the status quo is gone, the South will find a much better order.

But what about my colleagues from the North who profess to believe in the equality of the races and who yet are taking this legislation down to certain death and because of a certain weird calculation of political expediency are withholding their names from the discharge petition? Everyone knows the condition in this House. Everyone knows that the Democratic Party elected a majority of the Members of this body, and everyone knows that the Republican leadership outnumbered, formed a coalition with certain Democrats. These Democrats from the South had something they were interested in and the Republicans of the North agreed to play in partnership with them. The price exacted from the Republican leadership was aid in defeating civil rights legislation. We know the condition here. I do not imagine anyone in the country is much fooled. Four Republican members of the Rules Committee joined up with 2 southern Democratic Members to keep civil rights legislation bottled up in the Rules Committee is so self-evident that any civics teacher in any high school would be ashamed of any pupil who missed the point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I gladly yield to my distinguished and beloved friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman, my dear friend, states that four Republican members of the Rules Committee voted to kill this legislation. I do not believe there has been a vote on it yet in the Committee on Rules; is that not so?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very sorry that my inadequacy in handling the English language caused me to be misunderstood by my distinguished colleague. Would the gentleman say there are any Republican Members on the Committee on Rules who have shown any interest at all in voting out this bill? Will he give me the name of one Member?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In answer to the gentleman, I think the only way you can know the truth is to have the majority party bring the matter up for a vote so that that could be determined. I do not believe that we, as responsible Members of this important body, can go on the basis of guesswork.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I think the gentleman is right—there should not be any guesswork about it. But where I find a great moral issue involved and find on one side four Members, and they are Republicans and they are from the North, standing up like a stone wall with two southern Democrats and not moving—I do not think I have to resort to any guesswork.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to the gentleman that it is a well-known fact that the members of the Rules Committee may request a meeting of the Rules Committee at any time. Certain Democratic Members have indicated a desire to have that meeting. They have not been able to have it, but if just one of the Republicans joined with them in that request they could have a meeting, but as long as they are not able to get one Republican, a meeting cannot go forward. If three or four Members would indicate that they would come to that meeting, the Democrat Members have already indicated that they are happy to join them. But until their Republican friends do that, there is nothing to happen in the Rules Committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield. I am looking for some logic on your side.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; and I will spell it out to you. I am looking for some logic on your side other than the political maneuvering that is going on here today. You made this statement: The Rules Committee has four Republicans voting with two Democrats, and they could get this legislation out. Earlier in your remarks, and I congratulate you for it, you said it is the responsibility of the majority party to bring about this legislation. My question is this: Do you feel that six of the Democratic members on the Rules Committee are not in favor of bringing out this legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not know that I have any feeling at all, except what one may have when he sees something just as plain as one's hand before one's eyes. I see on the Rules Committee four Republicans and two Democrats joined up against the solid northern Democratic membership of that Committee. I know that if one of the four Republicans budged we would have this legislation out.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am wondering, then, if there is involved in your comment a criticism of the other Democratic members of the Rules Committee? If the leadership is in favor of this legislation why could they not make a change in the personnel on the majority side of the Rules Committee, which is within their power to do? In other words, when

this Congress was organized in January, the members of the various committees were drafted and approved by the leaderships on both sides. If this matter is as desperate as many think it is and it is bogged down and we are having all this controversy, if the Democratic leadership is genuinely interested in getting this out without making a political football out of it, it would seem to me the Democratic leadership could make a change in the Democratic membership on the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. My friend, let me say this. I was seeking to sympathize. I do not like to see my Republican colleagues from the North put on the rack by their own leadership. It will be hard for them to explain. May I ask the gentleman, Has he signed the discharge petition?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Nebraska has signed the discharge petition as I stated before.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I congratulate the gentleman, but I am not surprised. While there is no one on his side of the aisle who is more loyal to his party, and we all recognize his ability, I have observed that on moral issues like this he votes with his conscience.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman makes the statement that he just made because that is the basis on which it ought to be determined and not on a political basis.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The last remark of the gentleman from Nebraska I think is illustrative of the type of argument which has obstructed us very much.

He knows as well as I do or anybody else in the House does that to change the members of a committee at this time in this session would be simply asking for the impossible. We also know that actually it was a question, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has said, a question of the individual. Four of them we know honestly and conscientiously do not want a civil rights bill. Four of the Democrats have said openly they want one and would vote for it. Four members on the Republican side have said they would support the civil rights legislation. It is simply a question of arithmetic then. Why will not the four Republican members who profess to be for civil rights join with the four Democratic members who are for civil rights and get the bill out? Why can we not argue it on the basis of merit rather than of partisanship? Let the four Republican members who said they are for civil rights show it by their actions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a response to the gentleman from California?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. After I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I promised him I would yield.

Mr. YATES. I have a statement to make. May I make my statement?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I will very much appreciate my friend and colleague joining me in the well.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Illinois in his excellent statement this afternoon.

The debate this afternoon is a most important one in making clear the position taken by the Democratic Party and the Republican Party in the field of human welfare and civil rights. Of late, the Republican Party has professed to be the champion of the little man and of minority groups. Its members are loud and strong in their profession of advocacy of the civil rights program; but there is little action to support their protestations. They are now continuing the record they have made over the years, and they cannot deny it.

Let us look at the record. The record shows it was the Democratic Party through the New Deal and Fair Deal which first gave impetus to the hopes of the minority groups in America. Their programs brought a social revolution which changed the people's attitude toward their government.

As explained by Republican editor William Allen White, the victory of the Democrats indicated a firm desire on the part of the American people to use government as an agency of human welfare.

Under this concept, the powers of government were used by Democratic administrations to assure the American people of the right to a useful and remunerative job; of the right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation; of the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which would give him and his family a decent living; of the right of every businessman to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies; of the right to a decent home; of the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; of the right to a good education for their children; and of the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

Taking action to achieve these goals, the Democratic Party initiated legislation for a minimum wage law; for a full employment law; for a Federal aid to education bill; for raising health standards through adequate medical care; for good housing, including public housing; for a farm bill that would permit farmers to live in decency; for unemployment compensation and for social security.

And all this time what were the Republicans doing? They were opposing every single one of the New Deal measures. The record shows that all the social reforms which are recognized today as being an essential part of our democratic way of life were enacted into law in spite of—not because of—the Republican Party.

Why did they oppose such reforms? They said they were socialistic.

Socialistic: Not to all Republicans. The Democratic program was not socialistic to Dr. Channing H. Tobias, for example, who at the time was an independent Republican. He said that he proposed to support President Roosevelt in 1944 "because his philosophy of government and the generally progressive course he has followed for the past 12 years have vested the common man of every race, creed, and color with a dignity and inspired him with a hope that he has never known before."

Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, after looking carefully at the record, was convinced "without the slightest doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more for the uplift and progress of the American Negro than any President since Abraham Lincoln."

And with respect to President Truman, Mr. Thurgood Marshall—one of the most respected attorneys in Washington—had this to say in a radio interview when he was asked about possible presidential candidates in the last presidential election:

> The candidate that gets nearest to Harry S. Truman will more than likely get the votes of the people who believe in civil rights. That's my belief.

It is to be expected that these outstanding leaders would so express themselves. The rise of the average American under the Roosevelt reforms was unbelievable. Knowing that there could be no true freedom unless there is freedom from want, the New Deal of the Democratic Party set about first the elimination of the ravaging effects of poverty, and bringing a dignity to the forgotten man that he never before enjoyed. Both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt gave him a recognition and the feeling that he was a necessary part of the community—that he belonged.

And as for Harry Truman, he became the symbol of progress in the field of human rights. It was he who established the first commission to study the complex problems of assuring every citizen's constitutional rights. It was he who fathered the greatest all-round legislative program in the field of civil and constitutional rights this country has ever known.

Yes, and it was he who stayed by that program right through the 1948 Democratic Convention and right through the election, even though he knew it might split his own party and cost him the Presidency. And year after year President Truman kept urging his program on the Congress.

Just compare President Truman's actions with those of the present administration. Under President Truman the Federal Government stood squarely behind the constitutional rights of all individuals. Shortly before he left office he stated his view of the responsibility of Federal Government in this field.

> I am not one of those—
>
> He said—
>
> who feel that we can leave these matters up to the States alone, or that we can rely solely upon the efforts of men of good will. • • • The full force and power of the Federal Government must stand behind the protection of rights guaranteed by our Federal Constitution.

I was in the 81st Congress when the civil rights bills were filed to implement

the civil rights program, as recommended by President Truman's Commission. They might have been passed if the northern Democrats had received the cooperation rather than the opposition of the northern Republicans. But because most of the members of the Republican Party chose to work with reactionary Democrats from the South, the bills were defeated.

For example, I remember very well the fight on an FEPC bill in 1950 because I was right in the middle of it. After months of maneuvering the bill finally came to the floor on Washington's birthday, February 22d. The southern Congressmen who opposed the bill fought it with the only filibuster that the House knows, quorum calls and roll calls. Even though the bill had been made the legislative business of the day, after completion of the reading of Washington's address, which is always done on his birthday, Congressman Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect to the memory of George Washington. Time after time that day I watched Republican Members of the House walk off the floor so that a quorum call could be made by a southern Member. A quorum call takes 40 minutes. There were about 10 of them.

We got a vote on FEPC at 3 o'clock the next morning. Those of us who favored the strong bill, watched with dismay when a substitute bill which took away all the enforcement powers of FEPC was offered. Was it offered by a southern Democrat? It was not. It was offered by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Republicans approved it. On that vote, a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

In all the legislative battles when southern Democrats have fought civil-rights measures, it was the northern Democrats, rather than the Republicans, who led the fight against them. A few years ago Congressman WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to the Selective Service Act which gave the right to every inductee to serve in a segregated outfit, if he chose. That amendment, which was approved by the House Armed Services Committee, was defeated on the floor of the House because of a magnificent speech by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago, delivered in support of the motion to strike it out filed by another Democrat, Congressman PRICE, of Illinois. Congressman DAWSON, a Democrat, is the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee in the history of the Nation.

Nor is Congressman DAWSON the only member of the Negro race in Congress. Three other Negro Members grace these Halls—and all are in the Democratic Party. None are from the Republican Party.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing; it has fought the minimum wage law and subsequent increases; it has fought social security and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitals; it has fought FEPC; it has fought Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation.

But now the Republicans say forget the past. We have a new Republican Party. We are now the party of Eisenhower. We are "modern Republicans." Forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power. Forget that the Republican Party fought all measures for the people. Forget that it is the party of big business. This is a new party, say the Republicans.

Well, former President Calvin Coolidge was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say a hen lays or a hen lies?" Mr. Coolidge replied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let us lift up the hen and take a look at the new Republican Party. What has the President done in the field of civil rights? In contrast to the fighting leadership given to the civil rights program by Harry Truman, President Eisenhower has done little or nothing. During the first 3 years of his administration he presented no civil rights program at all to the Congress. And when the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1954, regarding school desegregation cases, did the President hail the decision? Did he take steps to implement or encourage communities to carry it out? He did not. He has not to this day declared that he favors that decision. He has not declared at any time that he favors the elimination of segregated schools.

Did President Eisenhower include FEPC in his program? He did not. The President has stated that he is opposed to FEPC. A few years ago when Secretary of Labor Mitchell testified before a Senate committee that he favored a strong FEPC with enforcement provisions, the President declared that Secretary Mitchell was entitled to his opinion. As far as he, the President, was concerned, he did not agree with him.

A civil rights bill was passed a few years ago, the first one in 80 years. It was a democratic Congress which passed it and it is true that many Republicans helped by voting for the bill. It is also true that the bill that was passed had the support of the administration. Passage of that bill established the fact that in order to obtain passage of civil rights measures, Republicans must join with Democrats in supporting the legislation. And Republicans helped pass that bill.

Why, then, should they now refuse to take similar action on the pending bill? It is a moderate bill. They have no reason to oppose it. Why do they not join with Northern Democrats in signing the discharge petition so that the bill may be considered by the Congress? Why does the minority leader draw himself up in parliamentary dignity and declare that he favors orderly procedures for the bill and that "this is a Democratic Congress. The Democrats have the responsibility for enacting the bill." He knows very well that the Democratic Party, being a national party, and having Members from the South, will find a number of Democrats refusing to vote for the bill. That same attitude prevails among Republican Members from the South and from the border States as can clearly be disclosed by an examination of the voting records of Members from such States. But Republicans from Northern States have no reason to act like their southern brothers. The Republicans from the North are not bound by southern prejudices and customs on civil rights legislation.

In a few days the Republican Party will represent itself as the party of Abraham Lincoln in speeches and banquets all over the United States, made and held to celebrate the martyred President's birthday, but if Abraham Lincoln were to see the manner in which the members of the Republican Party were procrastinating on the civil rights bill he would abjure his party membership.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. Almost without exception, Democrats from the North have signed the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill to the floor. Almost without exception, Republicans have refused to sign it. They will make excuses, but they cannot gainsay their record. Let them, if they can, henceforth go to the people and state again that they favor civil rights legislation in the face of that record.

The point of President Coolidge's story which I related earlier becomes clear. The hen has been lifted and the results speak for themselves.

I listened to what my good friend from Illinois said a few moments ago of the time that both he and I were in the 81st Congress. We had certain legislation that we had to consider. I am sure that he recalls, as I do, the fight we had for the passage of the FEPC bill and that we learned at that time of the coalition, which is echoed today, the coalition of the reactionary or conservative Democrats from the South and the conservative Republicans from the North. I recall after months of maneuvering how the FEPC bill came to the floor. It was Calendar Wednesday. It was Washington's Birthday, as a matter of fact. I recall that immediately following the reading of Washington's farewell address, Mr. Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect for the memory of the ex-President. Of course, that was voted down. But there was quorum call after quorum call when Republican Members left the floor in order to permit the Democrats from the South to make a point of no quorum. There were 10 or 12 quorum calls that were resorted to because it is only through quorum calls that a filibuster can be carried on in the House. It was 4 o'clock in the morning that we finally got a vote on the FEPC bill.

The gentlemen will recall that one of the votes we had touched upon the question as to whether or not we should have a strong FEPC bill or whether we should have a weak FEPC bill. There was a substitute offered for that FEPC bill which pretty much weakened it. The gentleman will recall who offered that amendment. It was not a Democrat

from the South who offered that amendment. It was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor. That amendment carried because of the votes of the southern Democrats and the Republicans. On that vote a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

In all the legislative battles in which southern Democrats have fought civil rights measures, it was the northern Democrats rather than the Republicans who led the fight against their brethren from the South.

A few years ago the gentlemen will recall when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] offered an amendment in the Armed Services Committee to permit segregation in the Armed Forces because of race. When that bill came to the floor of the House one of our colleagues from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] offered an amendment to delete the Winstead proposal from the armed services bill, and it was a Member from Illinois, Mr. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, a Democrat, the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee, who made the speech that swept the House and resulted in elimination of the so-called Winstead amendment.

I think we should point out, insofar as party adherence to civil rights is concerned, and the loyalty of minority groups to either party, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] is not the only member of his race in the House of Representatives. There are other Members, but all of them without exception are in the Democratic Party. None of them is in the Republican Party.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing, it has fought the minimum wage law, it has fought social security, and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitalization; it has fought FEPC, Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation. But now the Republicans are saying this: They were saying this when they desclared that they were modern Republicans. They said, "We have a new Republican Party. We are not the party of Eisenhower. Let us forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power; forget that the Republican Party fought all the measures of the people, that the Republican Party supported all the measures of big business. This is a new party," now say the Republicans.

My colleagues will recall former President Calvin Coolidge who was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say 'A hen lays' or 'A hen lies'?" Mr. Coolidge relied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let us look at the record. Let us lift up the hen and take a look and see whether the new Republican Party is a champion of civil rights. What has the President done in the field of civil rights and what has his party done in the field of civil rights in contrast to the fighting leadership which was given to the civil rights program by President Harry Truman? President Eisenhower has done little or nothing, certainly during the first 3 years of his administration, at a time, sir, when the Republican Party was in control not only of the White House, but when the Republican Party, during the 83d Congress was in control of both Houses of Congress. Not one step was taken to implement a civil rights program. There were no Democratic chairmen of committees at that time to whom the Republicans now point to and say "Look what is happening." At that time the committee chairmen were all Republicans and yet there was no program that was given to the Congress. There was no program that emanated from the Republican Congress in support of civil rights. And, when the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1954 in the school desegregation cases, did the President hail the decision? He did not. Did he take steps to implement it? Did he take steps to encourage communities to carry it out? He did not. As far as I have been able to determine nowhere have I read that the President of the United States has declared that he favors the decision of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation cases. He has declared only that it is the law and that he proposes to carry it out. And, has President Eisenhower, since he made that statement recommending civil rights, included FEPC in the program? He has not. FEPC was last heard of by a President when Harry Truman was in the White House. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower has declared that he opposes FEPC, and this declaration of opposition came in response to a question by the press after Secretary of Labor Mitchell had declared before a Senate committee that he favored FEPC. The President was asked whether he agreed with Secretary of Labor Mitchell, and he said, "No, the Secretary is entitled to his own opinion."

A civil rights bill was passed a few years ago, the first one in 80 years. It was a Democratic Congress which passed that bill. And, it is true that the Republicans helped by voting for that bill. It is also true that the bill had the support of the administration. I suggest and urge my friend from Nebraska to listen to this, if I may, because of the interchange which occurred a few moments ago, because of the passage of that bill I think the principle was established that the Republicans, if they favor civil rights, must join with Democrats who favored civil rights in the passage of that bill, too. The Republicans helped pass that bill. Why do they not now help in passing civil rights legislation? Why do they not join with northern Democrats in signing the discharge petition so that the bill may be considered by the Congress? Why does the minority leader draw himself up in parliamentary dignity and declare that he favors orderly procedure for the bill and also states that this is a Democratic Congress and that the Democrats have the responsibility for enacting this legislation? He knows very well that the Democrats, being a national party, have members from the South who will refuse to vote for the bill. But, let me point out, too, that there are a few Members of Congress who are Republicans who come from Southern and border States, and these, too, have demonstrated, and the record is clear on this, they have demonstrated in every vote that has come up that they will vote in accordance with the same standards and in accordance with the same customs as the Democrats from the South vote. The Republicans from the North, however, are not bound by southern prejudices, they are not bound by southern customs on civil rights legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I said earlier, that is another in a series of excuses and alibis because the gentleman's party does not assert and cannot assert responsible leadership. So they alibi here. Speaker after speaker all afternoon has talked about their dear friends in the South, who have their convictions and their ties, but they cannot and do not sign the petition. That is just an excuse, an alibi.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman deny that it was a combination of Republicans and Democrats who passed the first civil rights bill in 80 years during the 84th Congress and only because there was a union of voting of Republicans and Democrats that the bill was passed? The gentleman now, after having accused us of making political capital and political maneuvering, seeks to state that we are making excuses. We are making no excuses. We are declaring that those who come from the South, whether they be Republicans or whether they be Democrats—and the record is clear to substantiate this point—if they come from the South they will vote against civil rights legislation. That is why it is essential that those who come from the North, if they favor passage of civil rights legislation, should join in support of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to make the observation in view of what has been said that it must just be a coincidence then that for the first time in 80-odd years we had a civil rights bill, and that is when we had a Republican in the White House.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary. It was a coincidence that that occurred, but it was a coincidence, too, that the Republicans joined with the Democrats. The Republicans did not join with the Democrats in earlier days. Let me point out that with respect to the other body, part of the difficulty lay in their filibuster rule, and the one who saddled that filibuster rule until the recent change, upon the other body, was not a Democrat, but the late Senator Wherry, a Republican from Nebraska, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It has been stated here—it was a surprise to me, just lately after hearing all of the other talks—that there are some northern Members of the gentleman's party who have not signed. The impression has

been given that all of the northern Members have signed, and it was just the southern Members who have not signed.

Mr. YATES. I do not know just what the situation is with respect to the signing of the petition, but I would declare without that knowledge, and I would be willing to bet upon it, that almost without exception the Democratic Members from the North have signed that petition. There are some who have not. I would be willing to declare further that almost without exception the Members from the North in the Republican Party have not signed that petition. I would be willing to place that petition in the RECORD, if it were in accordance with the rules. But I think that my assertions will be substantiated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would only suggest that with the few signatures that are still needed the responsible members of the majority party pushing this petition might want to convince their northern members that they ought to sign, and if they did that maybe they would have enough signatures.

Mr. YATES. I would suggest to the gentleman that if every Democrat from the North were to sign that petition it would still not make up the necessary number to bring the bill to the floor. But, regardless of that point, the gentleman has been very vociferous in urging that politics not be a part of this deliberation. Why should not members of the Republican Party from the North join Democrats from the North in bringing the bill to the floor and permitting us to work its will on it? Does not the gentleman favor it? Of course he does, because he signed the petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am sorry that the gentleman was not on the floor earlier when that subject was thoroughly discussed. If he had been, he would know, from having listened to the various speeches that they were loaded with political implications and the presentation this afternoon is clearly a political matter.

Mr. YATES. What is a very political matter?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That this whole afternoon was a political maneuver, a very critical series of statements that brought politics into this, directed at the minority party.

Mr. YATES. I am glad the gentleman recognizes a political maneuver, because certainly the Republican Party has been engaged in political maneuvering with the Southern members of our party for a long time. I am sure that if there is any political maneuvering going on the Republican Party is well aware of it. I think it is appropriate that we have this discussion at this time because in about 2 weeks the Republicans will go back to their districts all over the country and will attend Lincoln birthday banquets and will pose as the champions of civil rights in the name of Abraham Lincoln. I declare that if Abraham Lincoln were to see the way in which Members of the Republican Party are procrastinating now in asserting their championing of the cause of civil rights—and this is the test; this bill is the test—I feel quite sure he would abjure his party membership.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The fact remains that the Democratic Party has a 2 to 1 majority. It has a strong platform on civil rights. I presume that you speakers went up and down the country proclaiming the platform in order to secure votes. The people saw fit to give you a 2 to 1 majority here in the Congress. One of the things that you said you were going to do was to pass civil rights legislation. The simple fact is that you have not done it; you have not been able to bring civil rights legislation to the floor of this House of Representatives. The people are going to know that the responsibility rests upon your shoulders, and no amount of alibiing and excuses can change that.

Mr. YATES. I would suggest to the gentleman that the people will know where the responsibility lies. The administration has declared that it is for civil rights. The gentleman cannot tell me that if the administration wanted the members of the Rules Committee from the gentleman's department to clear the civil rights bill to the floor—and we have four Members on our side of the Rules Committee who are willing to bring the bill out—it would not do so. There has been no indication from the President or from the White House that this is what he wants.

Secondly, you cannot tell me that if the Members of the gentleman's party wanted to consider civil rights legislation, and they say they want to consider it, they could not have it by signing the discharge petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On the statement the gentleman has just presented, by the same token if the leadership on his side of the aisle, the Speaker and the majority leader, also wanted civil rights legislation passed, they certainly would have just as much influence on your eight members as the President would have on our four members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. YATES. I do not say to the gentleman that they have not used any, but I say to the gentleman he was exactly wrong because I am sure that just as he stated that members of my party went through the length and breadth of the land in the North and through our districts campaigning on a program of civil rights, so did members of my party go through their districts in the South campaigning against the program of civil rights and that those members of the Committee on Rules who voted for such a bill would be going against their pledges to their people.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would only make the observation at this point that your party evidently runs on two different platforms.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while I am very happy to yield to all my colleagues, and I believe I have been generous in yielding time, my time is running out. I am happy that the conscience of my good friend from Nebraska is clear since he signed the discharge petition. I do not want to remain in the embarrassing position of continuing to apologize for his colleagues who have not signed the petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I shall not do that, and may I say to my colleagues I have not done that. It is clear to me that all of the apology comes from the Democratic side of the aisle. Theirs must be an extremely embarrassing position. I recognize their situation. I have charity in my heart for them. I have charity in my heart for anyone that is down on his luck. So I signed the petition—I want to help them out.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the colloquy of the two gentlemen from Illinois and the gentleman from Nebraska on this subject. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that this subject should not be a subject of partisan concern. It ought to be a subject and an issue on which Americans of good will in both parties can unite. I want to express my appreciation to both of the gentlemen from Illinois, who are in the well and the other Members who have taken time this afternoon to bring this issue to the attention of the House and the American people. I would like to join with them, Mr. Speaker, particularly to appeal to my colleagues in New York State and, particularly, in the upstate area of New York, part of which I have the honor to represent, to join with me regardless of party in signing the discharge petition. It is my understanding that very few of the gentlemen from my area of the State on the other side of the aisle have signed this petition. I hope, as the result of the discussion that has been had here today, they will reconsider their decision and see fit to join us in our endeavor to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body, I was somewhat concerned as to whether one should sign a discharge petition and whether this was really a proper device to use. We have heard reference today to doing things in an orderly fashion. Well, let me say that I have examined the situation and ascertained to my satisfaction, at least, that this was the only practicable way in which adequate civil rights legislation could be brought before this body for action. Therefore, it seemed to me that anyone who is genuinely in favor of civil rights he had a personal responsibility to sign the petition which, as a practical matter, would alone make it possible for the House to take action on civil rights. We have heard references today to people in either party who may or may not be in favor of the principle of civil rights, and there are certainly many in my own party who have made it clear that they are vigorously opposed to civil rights. But just because of this fact, Mr. Speaker, there is all the more responsibility on those Members who have previously expressed themselves as being in favor of civil rights to join in taking the only step

that can be taken to get this bill out and onto the floor of the House. In fact I think there is some degree of responsibility on the part of every single Member who says he favors civil rights and yet who hesitates to sign this petition—a real responsibility that he will have to face up to later on in terms of his own conscience, and, perhaps, to the electorate if this legislation does not get onto the floor for action. Indeed, those who would suggest that the petition not be signed are suggesting that Members abdicate a responsibiliity which I believe they cannot abdicate.

May I say, having had the opportunity over the recess to visit in a number of countries abroad, I think the world is looking to us for leadership in this matter. Oftentimes we have been inclined to think of this kind of leadership just as a matter of passing out a few million or billion dollars. Here is an opportunity for us to assume real world leadership and it is not going to cost us a nickel. This legislation is a matter of moral leadership which may in the long run be even more effective than some of the money we have been spending in past years.

So I want to urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, particularly from the upstate area of New York, where we, too, are concerned with the problem of civil rights, to join with us in signing the discharge petition. I thank the gentleman for being so courteous and for yielding so that I might make this statement in support of his point of view.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. Almost without exception, as I stated before, the Democrats from the North have signed the petition, and almost without exception the Republicans have not signed the petition.

In passing, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska for having signed the petition.

I wish that his influence and his example could prevail upon his colleagues to join with him. But we will hear excuses from the Republicans. We have been accused of making excuses, but the fact is we are taking every step we can to bring the civil rights bill to the floor, and the Republicans are not joining with us. Let them, therefore, if they can, henceforth go to the people and state again that they favor civil rights legislation in the face of that record.

Mr. Speaker, the point of President Coolidge's story as I related earlier, becomes clear. The hen has been lifted, and the results speak for themselves.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his valuable and inspiring contribution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] be allowed to insert his remarks at the conclusion of those of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his stirring addresses this afternoon, and also commend the other speakers, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the others who made such fine presentations this afternoon.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue has been made clear. The Speaker of this House, and the majority leader both have encouraged Democratic Members of this body to sign the discharge petition, and that is something most unusual for the leadership. It is because of a realization on the part of the Speaker and of the majority leader that there is involved in this a great moral issue—and the strong and effective civil rights legislation—to which the Democratic Party is pledged. So they have encouraged the Democratic membership to do the unusual thing as a recommendation of the leadership, to sign the discharge petition.

As I understand it, practically all of the northern Democrats have signed the petition. I doubt that there are any northern Democrats who have not signed. Relatively few of the Republican Members have signed the petition. If more Republican Members from the North do not sign, civil rights legislation is dead.

I know that in my district I will be judged not by what my colleagues from the South might have done or anybody else might have done; I will be judged in my district by the fact that my name is on the discharge petition. I am sure that will be true of every Member of this body, Republican as well as Democrat. People are not fools. People have common sense. You cannot go in the northern districts and say: "Well, I am for civil rights but when I had the opportunity to bring about the consideration and enactment of strong civil rights legislation I held back." No, no; people do not take that sort of thing.

And I am not criticizing any of my colleagues. I know how sincere the gentleman from Nebraska was when he was standing up here making a fight, I will not say for the honor of his Republican colleagues, but certainly his conscience was bothering him for them. He had signed the petition; there was not any holding back on his part. He did not say: "Well, now, maybe there will be a party advantage in not signing this discharge petition; maybe we can put the Democrats on the spot; maybe we can say that Speaker RAYBURN and Leader MCCORMACK and the Democrats killed this"; no, he went in and signed the discharge petition. Then, I think a little bit concerned for his Republican colleagues who had not taken the same step, he stood up valiantly fighting against reason, logic, and commonsense to preserve their honor, as it were.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. He and I have a common interest. We both have signed the discharge petition.

Mr CUNNINGHAM. I want to make just a brief comment. I have always, had a clear conscience and I do not worry about the other fellow's. That is no one's business but his own.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I congratulate and commend the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OHARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In relation to the observation my friend just made, may I say that when my conscience is clear I am sometimes very much concerned about the conscience of some of my friends.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about conscience. This brings my thoughts back to World War II in Europe. At that time I was Chief of Training in ETOUSA Headquarters. We received a directive which was inspired by our great war leader, President Roosevelt. It came through Eisenhower's Headquarters directing my section to develop a policy for the integration of Negro soldiers into our white American units. As you may know, in those days we had Negro tank battalions, Infantry battalions and truck companies. I was privileged with another Member on the other side of the aisle who was then an officer in my section to write the initial policy for this integration. Later I had an opportunity to visit some of the units into which the Negro soldier had been integrated. I saw Negroes fighting and dying shoulder to shoulder with our white American citizens.

Today it would seem to me President Eisenhower might search his conscience and make an effort to assist those same Negro soldiers who fought so well in Europe to secure the right to vote. In the light of his great influence, he could do so much with a few words addressed to the right people to urge our Republican colleagues to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for his valuable contribution and his poignant suggestion of a Presidential directive to the Republican members of the House who have not signed the discharge petition. I have no doubt a word from the President, or even a quiet word from the able minority leader, would have results.

I have not any doubt that many of our Republican colleagues who have not signed the discharge petition are thoroughly sincere. I think they are just as sincere as our colleagues from the South who have not signed. They are against civil rights legislation. But I do wish they would come out and let us know. We can respect any man if we

believe he has sincerity in his convictions. But we do not like hypocrisy. We do not like them saying, "Yes, we are for civil rights," when they are not. We do not like people playing both sides of the fence.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, is crystal clear. He who signs the discharge petition is for the enactment of strong civil rights legislation. He who refuses to sign, under whatever pretext, is on the other side of the fence.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following Newsletter of January 30, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The 1961 Federal Budget is 1,030 pages, weight 4 pounds, 4 ounces, and filled with detailed expenditure figures for every branch of Government. Estimated expenditures are $79.8 billion, estimated receipts, $84 billion. The budget does not, however, cover all Federal moneys. The cash flow or cash budget (including trust funds of all kinds) is estimated at $94 billion expenditures and $102 billion receipts. The $4.2 billion debt repayment suggested by the President is recognition of the need in more prosperous times of reducing the debt, instead of constant deficit financing no matter what the shape of our economy. The latter course is the road to ruin. Here's an example of budget language:

"The budget presents a balanced program which recognizes the priorities appropriate within an aggregate of Federal expenditures that we can soundly support. I believe the American people have made their wishes clear: The Federal Government should conduct its financial affairs with a high sense of responsibility, vigorously meeting the Nation's needs and opportunities within its proper sphere while at the same time exercising a prudent discipline in matters of borrowing and spending, and in incurring liabilities for the future."

What does it mean? It is clear to me. Yet this is the kind of language that each person can bend to his own interpretation or need. Here is language more specific:

"In times of prosperity, such as we anticipate in the coming year, sound fiscal and economic policy requires a budget surplus to help counteract inflationary pressures, to ease conditions in capital and credit markets, and to increase the supply of savings available for the productive investment so essential to continued growth. * * * If expenditures are held to the levels I am proposing for 1961 and reasonable restraint is exercised in the future, higher revenues in later years will give the next administration and the next Congress the choice they should rightly have in deciding between reductions in the public debt and lightening of the tax burden, or both. Soundly conceived tax revisions can then be approached on a comprehensive and orderly basis, rather than by haphazard, piecemeal changes, and can be accomplished within a setting of economic and fiscal stability."

Now that says it. All we have to do as people and Congressmen is to believe it and practice it, not just pay lipservice. Election year forensics unfortunately may "muddy up the water" of such commonsense. For my part, I shall support these budget statements of the President, perhaps even repeating them later should I encounter differences of viewpoint—whether differing with a Democrat-led Congress or Republican administration.

The President's economic report expanded the elementary economic bases underlying the administration's analysis of the Federal role in our national economy. The President said, "A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic gorwth. * * * It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth."

I am convinced that many Members of Congress do not believe the statement above; rather, they believe that Federal law is the panacea and cure for all economic problems. In fact, though I agree with most of the President's economic message, it demonstrates to me (contrary to the language quoted) that too heavy reliance is placed on the "Full Employment Act of 1946" which places far too much responsibility in the Federal Government for providing jobs under the guise of providing the "proper climate" for business success and growth. It is not the role of Federal Government to provide jobs any more than it is to feed, clothe, house, and provide other basic necessities for our people; nor can government do these things without the tyranny of a regimented and controlled economy. Herein lies the difference between a free society and socialism.

The announced retirement from Congress of GRAHAM BARDEN, able and despected North Carolinian, serves to point up the dilemma confronting the less liberal element remaining in the Democrat Party. Of the really vital issues which may divide our people, none are more important than those which must be thrashed out before congressional committees concerned with the courts, education, labor and public works. With Mr. BARDEN'S retirement, in any democrat-controlled Congress, the House committees handling legislation in these areas will all be controlled by New York City Democrats of distinctly liberal persuasion. Charles Buckley, enthusiastically endorsed by the ADA, rules the Public Works Committee whose activities involve such a whopping proportion of government expenditures each year. EMANUEL CELLER presides over the important Judiciary Committee, and now with BARDEN'S departure, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL can expect to be elevated to the chairmanship of the key Committee on Education and Labor.

On Mount Rushmore—the Faces of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower Will Be Eternal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of adding figures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower to the present memorial. It is my hope that this bill will pave the way for including likenesses of these two Presidents alongside those of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

It would be fitting to have the figures of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower added to the panorama of other great past leaders. President Franklin D. Roosevelt stirred this Nation to cast out fear from our hearts and initiated programs which lifted our Nation from the depression and gave encouragement and strength to the youth of our country, our farmers, our workers, and all economic groups. Later he inspired the free peoples of the world to rise up and resist the spread of ruthless tyranny and tear asunder the chains of slavery imposed upon free peoples by totalitarian regimes. President Dwight D. Eisenhower led forces of the United States and our allies to military victory. He has been an inspirational figure throughout the world and carries the confidence of foreign nations and the American people by his fatherly image and trustworthiness. Each man played his part in making America fully aware of its world responsibilities and its obligations to men of good will in the task of building world peace and security.

I am delighted that my colleague and friend, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, of New York, is also introducing this bill. On the Senate side, this measure has bipartisan support in the person of my good friends, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York. A moving force behind the drafting of this measure has been the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, whose officers are as follows: Honorary advisory board; Hon. Nina Rao Cameron. Hon. George B. B. DeLuca, Hon. Ross J. Di Lorenzo, Hon. Athony Di Paola, Hon. Frank A. Emma, Hon. Enzo Gaspari, Hon. Lawrence E. Gerosa, Hon. Angelo R. Parisi, Hon. Charles Polleti, Hon. Paul P. Rao, Jr., Hon. Vincent P. Rao, Hon. Ben Scafidi, Hon. Joseph P. Vaccarella; president, Jack Ingegnieros; vice presidents, Miss Sarina D'Amato, Prof. Bartolomeo Liscio, Frank Valenti; treasurer, Mrs. Antoinette Loscuito; executive secretary, J. P. Sommer; publicity, Miss Terry Milburn.

No matter what the Republicans may think of Franklin D. Roosevelt or what the Democrats think of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, informed and impartial men of good will can agree that they have played vital roles in the story of our Nation. They deserve to be considered for their works and place in history, apart from any partisan considerations. It is in this spirit that I offer this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial is a unique, magnificent and heart-warming aspect of our national life enshrining as it does Presi-

dents who have meant much to the progress and heritage of America. I hope this bill will make possible the addition of these two towering figures to this sculpturing marvel.

High Cost of Sickness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I have received a large volume of mail—for and against—the Forand bill. I regret that much of this mail is more emotional than logical and that a great deal of the criticism of the bill is more often subjective than objective in nature.

For this reason, I was pleased to read a recent editorial in the York (Pa.) Dispatch dealing with the true issue involved in the Forand bill, "The High Cost of Sickness." I commend it to my colleagues because, in my judgment, it sets forth one of the most objective, unemotional, and truly intellectual appraisals of the real problem facing the Congress, the members of the medical profession, but, most of all, the American people. The situation of this problem is one of the real challenges of our time. It will be solved if it is approached with the forthright honesty included in this excellent editorial, which follows:

HIGH COST OF SICKNESS

Recent days have seen a flurry of news items about the rising cost of medical and hospital care which, by the way, many Yorkers can prove by their pocketbooks.

What the stories reflect is increased awareness of this critical financial problem. Each day more people are finding out that a severe illness can wipe out the savings of a lifetime.

Accordingly, the Nation is seeing a new push for compulsory health insurance in the proposal by Congressman FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, to provide hospital, nursing home, and surgical services for persons eligible for old age and survivors' benefits.

Already the American Medical Association has attacked the Forand bill, declaring it would inject the Federal Government into the physician-patient-hospital relationship and sap the quality of care rendered.

Perhaps the doctors are right. But there is difference of opinion on charges that compulsory health insurance has reduced the competence of British doctors or hospitals.

At this point we are not advocating compulsory health insurance, if for no other reason than we do not know where it would lead in already burdensome taxes. But the time may come when we may feel it would be better to pay increased taxes for medical benefits over a period of time than be floored with one whopping medical bill all at once.

Could such a time ever come? It could, we believe, when those who can afford health insurance rebel at gigantic premium hikes. Or it could come when patients feel that doctors' and surgeons' fees have gotten out of line. The public may not be far from either conclusion at this time.

However, the public itself cannot escape some responsibility for mounting costs. How many are there who, because they have insurance, insist upon hospitalization when treatment at home would suffice? Then there are doctors who know that it is far simpler—and just as good financially—to see several patients in one hospital visit than to make separate trips to homes outside.

As long as patients are willing to be hospitalized for minor ailments because they have insurance, there are always some doctors who will see that they are admitted—adding, of course, to the congestion and ultimate cost of hospital facilities. As the York Hospital contends, Blue Cross payments do not cover the actual costs of patient care.

Right now the public has no direct control over such matters as hospital rates, insurance premiums or doctors' fees. Most patients are sick people. They need care. They can't strike or organize a boycott against doctors or insurance companies.

Therefore, it is primarily up to the medical profession, insurance companies and hospitals to keep costs in line. Should they fail this trust, then the public may choose to exercise its political power by pressuring Congress for Government-supervised medical benefits.

Federal Aid to States for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, It appears that the President has abandoned the whole concept of Federal aid to States for construction of primary and secondary schools.

Can he have lost sight of the fact that we are short 140,000 classrooms needed to house our bulging school population, now some 2½ million children in excess of school capacity? Some experts even set this classroom shortage at being 500,000 classrooms short. These 140,000 classrooms would constitute a building one room wide across the United States from Atlantic to Pacific. With the tremendous population expansion anticipated during the next few years, the shortage will grow and feed upon itself with each passing year.

In order to forcibly remind the President of his orphaned and abandoned administration proposal for Federal aid to States for school construction, I am reintroducing the administration's 4-year program of Federal aid to States, introduced on January 27, 1957 as H.R. 3976 and H.R. 3986. I regard this bill as grossly inadequate to meet the need, unfair to large and prosperous States, unsuited to its purpose, and insufficient to meet the crying need of this country. This is the first, and I hope the last, time I introduce a piece of legislation with which I am not in sympathy.

I favor proposals offered by the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Michigan, the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, and the bill sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, the Honorable JAMES MURRAY, and by colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable LEE METCALF, known as the Murray-Metcalf bill. These bills offer significant advance in the field of education and would enable this country to meet its school needs in an age where education is everything to business, science, the community, to the individual, and to the United States in its competition with an atheistic, communistic dictatorship whose purpose is to rule the world by conquest, or if possible by economic and technological competition.

Inadequate though this legislation is, I introduce it with a challenge to the President of the United States and to the members of his party to at least support their own measure for school construction during this Congress. I remind the President and his partisans that 2 years ago Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that there were over 2.5 million children in excess of normal capacity of existing buildings and that the need for Federal assistance is not theory, but demonstrated fact since it cannot now be said realistically—that the States and communities will meet the need for school construction. The school needs of this country are too great, too many children are on half days, in overcrowded classrooms taught by overworked teachers, for inaction on any level of Government. Certainly the words of the President himself are conclusive of the need.

Unless something is done shortly about school construction the United States will be in danger which will exceed anything which we have met in the past, including the missile lag, the sputniks and Russian acquisition of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. The danger will be an educational lag resulting in the loss of scientific and technological lead in the world to Russia. If the present situation continues Russia and even China not too long hence will surpass the United States in scientists, technicians, and in invention and scientific effort in all fields. The point may be reached ultimately where the United States will be weakened financially and economically, so deficient in production of new scientific thoughts and new weapons as to cease to be a factor in world politics. When this has come to pass the United States will not even be a secondary power; America will simply be a thrall to Russian communism. Inadequate though this legislation is, it is the least which can be done by the Congress, and I challenge the President and the party to support their own program reminding them of their words of 2 years ago.

The bill would provide $325 million for 4 fiscal years for grants to the States and municipalities. The Federal share on a project would be not less than one-third nor more than two-thirds varying in accordance with the States relative income per child of school age.

It authorizes appropriations of $750 million for a 4-year program to enable the Federal Government to purchase obligations of local school districts issued to finance public, elementary, and secondary school construction where bonds could not be marketed at reason-

able rates of interest by the State or municipality.

It provides $150 million for a 4-year program for Federal advances to State school financing agencies for deposit in reserve funds to be used to back up issues of obligations for public, elementary, and secondary school construction purposes.

Lastly, the bill provides for miscellaneous grants of $20 million over 4 years to enable States to meet their administrative expenses for construction or development programs to increase school construction and promote greater efficiency in planning and financing such construction.

I am extremely critical of this legislation because the matching requirements place an unfair and undue burden on prosperous States like New York, Connecticut, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana. The provision for Federal purchase of State and local obligations is a pathetic effort to meet the real needs of the States which will create a bonanza for investment bankers to broker bonds from municipalities and States to the Federal Government with a large rakeoff, when the whole matter could be handled more cheaply and with less money dribbled off in sundry administrative costs through direct Federal grants. Moreover, many communities are already bonded to the limits of their financial ability to carry debt and still others have reached their statutory debt limit. To these, this provision will be an insult.

This is not an effort to put the administration or the Republican Party on the spot. America, the administration, and both political parties are on the spot and failure to act vigorously at this time may result in a situation of irreparable harm to the United States before we are aware of it.

Alvin R. Bush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if any Member of the House was more genuinely liked by his colleagues than Alvin Ray Bush, his service ended before I entered Congress.

Many, many close friendships are established here on Capitol Hill. Like shipmates in wartime, we forge innumerable and indissoluble fraternal bonds in the course of our meetings and conversations. Our debates may sometime reach a high degree of intensity, but when we recess or adjourn the combatants walk out together in much the same spirit of amity that prevails at the close of an athletic contest when victim and vanquished join arm in arm as they leave the arena.

Alvin Bush and I sat on the same side of the aisle and our political convictions were largely parallel; thus in the 9 years we served together, conflicts in our views on issues to be decided in this legislative body were infrequent. But it would have made no difference if we had never shared the same opinion. His host of friends here today whose voting records show no taint of similarity with that of our departed colleague will concur unanimously.

Alvin Bush did not think about a person's pedigree, his background, his party affiliation, or his political philosophy. As he was a good man, he enjoyed associating with good men. Of him it can be truly said "He lived by the Golden Rule." He was a deeply religious man, and his Creator's precept on love of ones fellow man was inherent in his character.

Through a geographical advantage, I was able to spend more time with Alvin Bush than most Members of the House found possible. Our families were close and I visited his home and enjoyed many an hour there with him, Mrs. Bush, and their fine children. My life has been enriched by their homelife with its warmth, enthusiasm, and sincerity.

Anyone whose accomplishments are akin to those of Alvin Bush could justly be proud of his record, but here was a modest man who discounted what he had done because his only concern was to serve his country and his fellow men so that they and their progeny might live in an atmosphere conducive to a wholesome life in the service of their God. His career bespeaks his ability, determination, and zeal. He went overseas in the defense of his country in World War I, then picked up where he had left off and went on to success as a businessman. With all these interests, he took time to participate in civic affairs and to become active in hospital work. He was a devout church member, and he accepted public service with a spirit of extreme responsibility and dedication.

Our friend has gone to his reward, but his warm personality and inspiring camaraderie will always be appreciated by everyone who ever had the pleasure of knowing him and of sitting with him in this chamber. God grant him eternal peace.

Israel's Most Popular Judge Is an Arab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Leo Heiman as it appeared in the American Zionist, January 1960 issue:

ISRAEL'S MOST POPULAR JUDGE IS AN ARAB
(By Leo Heiman)

HAIFA.—On a hot July afternoon in 1959 spectators in the crowded room of the Affulah Court in the Valley of Jezreel in northern Israel perspired as they waited for the judge to appear.

Through the open windows, jeeps and weapons-carriers of the special riot dispersal task force would be seen driving slowly along the streets of this bustling Israeli town.

The seven men on trial in the Affulah Court were not ordinary criminals, crooks, or traffic violators. They were the ringleaders of the race riots and mob violence at Migdal Ha' Emek, an agricultural township near Nazareth. The eruption of mob violence at Migdal Ha'Emek was only one of a series of Communist-incited race riots which shook Israel from the Galilee to the Negev, erupting simultaneously in 3 cities, 5 towns, and 16 villages inhabited by immigrants from north Africa.

Since the rioters claimed that they were the victims of alleged racial discrimination, spectators and guards in the jampacked Affulah courtroom were vitally interested in who was going to judge them.

If the judge were of European descent, the rioters, and their relatives would certainly claim that the trial was not fair and that the whites were again oppressing them. If the judge was going to be of Oriental descent, it would amount to tacit admission on the part of the authorities that the people of Israel are in fact divided into two races—white and oriental—and that the latter should be judged by its own judges, bossed by it own foremen and commanded by its own officers.

But when the court official barked "The Court," and everybody stood up to see the door leading to the judge's chambers opening slowly, a sigh of relief escaped from a few hundred throats as the judge's identity was communicated by those inside the courtroom to those waiting outside in the crowded corridors and halls.

The judge who entered the Affulah courtroom was no doubt the most popular Israeli judge. He was not popular with the criminals or offenders, but in any national popularity contest he would certainly be the public's top favorite.

He was neither a European Jew, nor a Jew of oriental descent, but an Arab.

If the most popular judge in the Jewish State can be an Arab, and if Jews do not object to being tried and sentenced by an Arab in their own Jewish state, it is the best proof that Jews and Arabs could easily live together under one roof, provided all Arab intellectuals and leaders were like His Honor Judge Elias Kteily. But it is difficult to find men of Judge Kteily's caliber. He is one of Israel's only two Arab judges and he has the best chances of becoming the first Arab to be nominated to Israel's august supreme court. Had he wished to enter politics, Judge Kteily could haev easily been elected to the Knesset. But he is not interested in politics.

Judge Kteily's popularity stems from his engaging personality as well as from the fact that he metes out justice, not merely the dry letter of the law.

If a man is brought in for stealing a bag of sugar, and if he confesses to having committed the theft, but explains that he had to steal the sugar for his children because he does not earn enough money to buy sugar, his wife is pregnant and the children are sick—Judge Kteily will admonish the man, fine him * * * and pay the fine himself out of his own pocket. But he would also give him a suspended jail sentence, to make sure that he never steals again.

Finally, Judge Kteily would also send a recommendation to social-welfare agencies and employment offices to make sure that the man's family, pregnant wife and children are taken care of, and that he doesn't have to steal in order to feed his children.

On the other hand, if a traffic violator or a hoodlum is brought in to be tried by Judge Kteily, he can start making reservations at the nearest penitentiary. Other judges slap ordinary fines on traffic violators or hoodlums who disturb public order. But Judge

Kteily is not lenient when it comes to protecting lives and property. He always throws the book at them, giving them maximum possible sentences, plus something additional.

The result is that serious road accidents and hooliganism are almost absent from the area under Judge Kteily's jurisdiction, despite the fact that traffic casualties and hooliganism are Israel's biggest plagues in other districts of the country.

Judge Kteily alternates between the courtrooms of Nazareth, where his "customers" are mostly Arabs, and Affulah, where he tries Jews. He speaks Arabic, Hebrew, English, French, and even some Yiddish and he never uses an interpreter. He also knows by heart the Koran, the Bible and the Gospels and quotes from them at length during the trials, citing precedents and examples from the holy books, as other judges quote precedents from English law volumes.

In May 1959, Judge Kteily tried a bus driver who was talking to a passenger while driving. Other judges prefer to reprimand talkative drivers, or fine them a few pounds if it is a second offense of this kind.

Judge Kteily said he was sick of seeing bus drivers who did not keep their eyes on the road because they had to flirt with an attractive woman passenger, or gossip with some friend of theirs. He fined the talkative bus driver 300 Israeli pounds ($150) and warned him that the next time he is going straight to jail. Again, the jampacked courtroom expressed loud approval of the sentence.

Similar penalties, such as 100 pounds for smoking in a bus, 500 pounds plus a jail term for insulting a policeman, and 50 pounds for spitting on the floor of a cinema, have made Judge Elias Kteily a talked-about man.

The daily newspaper, Davar, which reflects the views of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion and other top Israeli leaders, suggested recently that Judge Kteily should be inscribed in the golden book of the Jewish National Fund. Other Israeli newspapers also went out of their way to praise the bespectacled, dark-haired Arab judge.

Drivers and hoodlums describe him as their worst enemy. To this, Judge Kteily retorted that careless drivers are their own worst enemies, while hoodlums "are a plague like a cancer, which must not be allowed to grow."

A descendant of the Nawffal family clan of Tripoli in the Lebanon, Elias Kteily was born in Haifa in 1912. His parents were poor Arabs who embraced the Greek-Orthodox faith, and Elias had to leave school at 15 and go to work to help his father with the family of nine.

But he took correspondence courses and received a secondary school graduation certificate after studying at night, after work. He continued his studies, including Hebrew and foreign languages, while working as an apprentice clerk with the British Palestine Railways Administration.

He passed legal examinations after studying in his free time and in 1942, at the age of 30, was transferred to the Legal Administration, where he served first as an interpreter and then as Chief Clerk of the Haifa District Court.

In 1948 he refused to flee from Haifa in the mass exodus of Arabs from the strife-torn city. "Jews and Arabs can live in peace together, under the same roof," he told his friends who urged him to flee. Instead of fleeing, Elias Kteily volunteered to serve as Chief Secretary to the Israeli Military Governor of Nazareth. He studied Israeli law in his free time and was appointed judge in 1955. The only other Arab judge in Israel is Mr. Aziz Jarjoura, a close relative of the popular Arab mayor of Nazareth.

The popular Arab judge was a "natural" when it came to trying the Jewish rioters and mob leaders who set up roadblocks at Migdal Ha'Emek, attacked police cars and sent special shock gangs to Haifa to wreck the Jewish agency offices there.

"I give you the benefit of doubt and I am going to think that you really regret your outbreak of hooliganism and violence. Therefore, I am going to be lenient with you," Judge Kteily told the seven riot ringleaders handcuffed to each other on the Affulah courtroom bench, "I sentence each of you to a suspended term of 2 months in jail, conditional on your good behavior for the next 3 years. In addition, I sentence each of you to a token fine of 10 pounds. I realize that most of you cannot afford to pay even 1 pound and I rule herewith that you shall have to pay your fine in 20 monthly installments of 250 pruta (about 12 cents) each. Although nearly 2 years will pass before you have paid your fine, it will be a good lesson to you. Just like a pious Jew kisses the Mezuzzah which is fastened to his doorframe, whenever he enters or leaves his house, because the Mezuzzah contains a portion of the Holy Scroll of Law and by kissing it he protects himself from sin and promises not to stray from the path of righteousness, so the few pennies which you shall have to pay to this court each month will remind you of your guilt against society and against the state in which you live and which was so good to you. The monthly payments will also keep you on the path of righteousness and protect you from sinning against state and society.

"I know what you are thinking. You are thinking that the State of Israel was not so good to you, and that the society owes you something. You believe yourself to be discriminated against and you think you are second-class citizen because you are not of European descent. But is not this very court the best proof of Israel's democracy, freedom, equality and equal chance for all citizens?

"I know that your situation is difficult and that you have many legitimate grievances. But you arrived here from primitive and backward Arab countries, where you lived in squalor of slums and gutters. You came to this country without any skills, education, trades or professions. Because of your background and heritage, it takes you longer to learn and get integrated. The European immigrants who arrived here together with you have already settled in nice houses, have jobs and enjoy life in a country of their own. But they arrived here from civilized countries, and they have skills. They are doctors, lawyers, technicians, engineers, electricians, architects and builders. They are educated and used to discipline and efficiency.

"And you forget that the professors, doctors, engineers and lawyers who came to this country from Germany 25 years ago had to live in tents for several years and work physically as hod carriers, roadbuilders and ditch-diggers. They did not complain or demonstrate, and they had no one to help them then.

"I honestly believe that you have many legitimate grievances and that you have been neglected in some respects. But do you really believe that throwing stones, smashing windows, attacking police and engaging in rioting and arson will solve your problems? No, it will only aggravate them. You are hotheaded Orientals, and like all hotheaded Orientals you prefer the emotional approach to the logical one. But use your heads, men. The Israeli judge is not your enemy. He is your brother or father. And King Solomon's dictum—He Who Neglects Punishment Hates His Son—guides me on considering your case.

"You are not the only ones who are hungry and feel neglected. I was hungry when I was 17 years old. My late father was hungry too, and we frequently lacked bread in our house. But I did not steal or rob, did not demonstrate or brawl. I demonstrated within the depths of my own soul, and I struggled hard all my life until I achieved my present position. No one is starving to death in Israel, and no one is really hungry. But people who are able to work must be willing to work. The people who built this country toiled all day long to drain swamps, move mountains and reclaim marshes. They were paid less than you, and were frequently hungry. But they toiled by the sweat of their brows to build this State so that you shall have a quiet corner of your own, instead of some evil slum in a ghetto.

"And you come here, and instead of working hard and enjoying a life of freedom, start throwing stones and attacking police. You say life was better where you came from. But I ask you: Would you have dared to throw stones and attack police in the countries where you came from?

"I am very lenient with you because I regard you as hotheaded and misguided children, and I hope that the authorities and agencies responsible for your integration will show the same degree of understanding and help you to become good, loyal, and law-abiding citizens. * * *"

Israeli newspapers called Judge Kteily's summing up of the sentence "the best lecture on modern Zionism. * * *" "Our Arab judge analyzed the recent race riots and summed up the whole situation better than a hundred political speeches and all newspaper articles written until now on this subject," an admiring Israeli police officer declared following the trial.

Judge Kteily divides his time between his two courts and between his family and hobbies, which are gardening and collecting pipes. He has won the first prize in most Israeli gardening competitions, while his collection of pipes is second only to that of General Laskov, chief of the general staff.

His attractive wife and four children help out in the garden. "Israel is a Garden of Eden," says Judge Kteily, "but then some people did not appreciate even the original Garden of Eden. That's human nature."

The Soviet Union's Self-Sufficiency in Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include extracts from a very informative article on the Soviet Union's policy of self-sufficiency in metals.

The article, appearing in the December 1959 issue of the quarterly review, "Optima," published by Anglo-American Corp. of South Africa, was written by Jan Kowalewski, formerly managing director of TISSA, a semigovernmental company in the Soviet Union dealing with strategic raw materials, now living in London and writing extensively on Soviet strategic problems.

Mr. Kowalewski's analysis concludes that the Soviet Union is reaching its goal of self-sufficiency in nonferrous metal production. This comes at a time when the United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources for certain nonferrous ores and metals.

Statistics prepared by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, published in House Report No. 708, 86th Congress, 1st session, show the following changes in U.S. self-sufficiency of nonferrous metals from 1950 to 1958:

[In percent]

	1950	1957	1958
Aluminum ore (bauxite)	40	19	15
Antimony (primary)	20	6	7
Beryllium	19	12	8
Copper	63	89	91
Mercury	10	61	71
Platinum	8	3	3
Lead	32	30	28
Zinc	55	44	36

The extracts from the article follow:

When, in 1928, the planners of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics set out to achieve full economic and strategic self-sufficiency in nonferrous metals, they were faced with a difficult task. The Soviet Union was endowed with enormous natural resources in ores, but the nonferrous metals industry was limited in scope and the number of qualified engineers and technical experts was totally inadequate. They have finally achieved their goal, however, for the Soviet Union is now one of the leading world producers of nonferrous metals, second only to the United States of America in copper production, second to Canada in nickel, and approaching the position of the biggest world producer of aluminum.

In achieving their present position, the Russians made liberal use of the advancement in Western science and technical knowledge. The foreign capitalist interests that acquired concessions in Russia before the revolution introduced not only the necessary investment capital but also scientific and technical methods previously unkown to Russia. British, German, French, and Belgian enterprises, incorporating the latest technical advances, were established.

* * * * *

In 1928 the head of the All-Union Nonferrous Metals and Gold Trust, Mr. Serebrovskyi, visited the United States and Canada and made contracts with an engineering consulting firm in New York for about 175 American engineers to serve as consultants for the Soviet nonferrous mining and metallurgical industries. These engineers remained in the Soviet Union until 1937, during which time basic reconstruction and development were being carried out under the first and second 5-year plans.

Thanks to their cooperation, there were considerable improvements in the existing plants, and production was increased by the introduction of up-to-date methods, such as the electrolytic process in place of the distillation process in zinc production. Technical aid was extended to all metals except tin. Soviet commentators have long described Western metallurgists as secretive in their development of nickel and tin technology.

Soviet metallurgists made extensive use of the written works of American, German, French, and other metallurgists and scientists. As a result of the last war, the Soviet Union profited from the knowledge of the Germans and Japanese. For instance, the entire zinc plant at Magdeburg was transferred to Altay, in the Soviet Union, and the Russians applied the technical methods used in the North Korean magnesium plant built by Japan with American technical help before the war.

Current developments in the Western countries are studied very thoroughly, and all articles appearing in the Western press on mining and metallurgy are translated and published in Soviet information journals.

A determined effort is being made to augment the number of scientists, engineers, and technical mining experts. Under the auspices of the All-Union Science Research Institute for Nonferrous Metals, separate scientific research institutes have been established for various groups of metals, including aluminum and magnesium, copper, nickel and cobalt, tin, and the rare metals. Several specialized departments and laboratories have been opened by the Soviet Science Academy and by most Soviet universities and other technical institutions. Laboratories associated with production plants also make a material contribution to this research.

As a result of this effort, the number of trained people is now adequate for all Soviet needs, and nonferrous mining and metallurgy have not only reached the theoretical level of Western techniques but are benfiting from the fruits of Soviet research.

In practical applications, however, the Soviet nonferrous metals industry still lags behind Western standards. Its particular disadvantages include high costs of production, low productivity, and an excessive loss of metals during the whole recovery process from the treatment of ore to the production of refined metal.

During the present 7-year plan (1959–65), a great effort is being made to eliminate these defects, and of the planned increase in production during this period about half is expected to come from an improvement in the productivity of labor and in technological processes. The remainder will depend upon new investment.

Now that the capacity of the metallurgical plants has been increased so substantially, there is an urgent need for bigger supplies of ore to keep the plants working to capacity.

Domestic consumption of nonferrous metals is expected to rise considerably during the 7-year plan (1959–65), and it is estimated that in 1965 Soviet industry will need nearly twice as much copper and copper-zinc alloys as it used in 1958. This means, of course, that in 7 years, twice as much ore must be mined.

The latest complete figures show that in 1957 the total volume of nonferrous metal ores mined in the Soviet Union amounted to 192.5 million cubic meters, of which 92.5 million cubic meters were mined by open-cast methods and the remaining 100 million cubic meters were mined underground. The target for 1965 is 400 million cubic meters, of which 260 million cubic meters of ore are to be mined by open-cast methods and only 140 million cubic meters by underground operations.

* * * * *

The importance of Soviet supplies of metals to the countries of the Soviet economic bloc was noted at the second sesesion of the Council of Economic Mutual Aid, held in May 1959. At that meeting it was stated that, although the European countries represented on the council had increased their production of some nonferrous metals, deliveries of metals from the Soviet Union to those countries would be "considerably increased."

In other words, although the Soviet Union is reaching self-sufficiency in nonferrous metal production, the Soviet economic bloc, as a whole, is far from being self-sufficient. The best proof of that point was the fact that, when the embargo on copper exports to China was lifted, China began to buy large quantities of copper wire on the London market, even though the Soviet Union was exporting copper and copper wire at the same time.

So much importance is attached by the Soviet Union to the cause of becoming self-sufficient in nonferrous metal production that development of mining and metallurgy has been conducted, regardless of cost. As a result, several enterprises were established under such unfavorable conditions that they would be considered uneconomic by Western standards.

Moreover, the economic standards of Soviet mining and metallurgy are still poor, because the productivity of labor is still low and technology is, in practice, not yet equal to Western standards. Thus, there is a considerable loss of metals that could be recovered by more efficient methods.

But, for the time being, these economic considerations have been of secondary importance in the Soviet Union, and the development of the nonferrous industries has not been hampered by high costs of production. The Soviet Government, in setting the planned targets, insisted on only a gradual lowering of costs of production and improvement in the productivity of labor.

In the present 7-year plan, however, this problem has been given special emphasis, and a big reduction in production costs is expected during that period.

Bolder U.S. Action on Cuba Required To Safeguard Freedom From Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by the editor of the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., newspaper on Fidel Castro.

The editorial follows:

BOLDER U.S. ACTION ON CUBA REQUIRED TO SAFEGUARD FREEDOM FROM CASTRO

In rallying the Cuban mob, Fidel Castro is goading the United States ever more surely toward decisive action. Unwilling though our Government may be, it cannot put off indefinitely adopting firmer means of curbing the bearded dictator.

If Washington continues to do nothing, a "people's republic" soon will be in full bloom 100 miles off the Florida coast and a new staging area for Soviet power will take shape.

Polite treatment of Castro has not made him act respectably. American property has been seized. U.S. citizens have been put in jail. Castro has rejected friendship with the country that liberated Cuba in 1898. He has joined the Communist bloc in the United Nations. The direction in which he is leading must not be misinterpreted.

The latest outrageous act, an abusive speech against the Spanish Ambassador to Cuba, was not without design. Cuban middle and upper classes have strong emotional ties to Spain. They regard Spain with the same kind of affection that many Americans feel for England. By striking at Spain, Castro would discredit moderate elements in Cuba. If he can link Spain, which is disliked by Latin America's leftwing intellectuals, with Washington, he will have gained another point in his propaganda war against the United States.

The Associated Press reports that U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal now believes a new policy is needed with respect to Cuba. If he suggests a crackdown on Castro, it is unlikely the State Department will endorse his recommendations. The State Department has a long history of resisting bold measures against world communism. Such firmness

as exists in U.S. policies comes from the Defense Department.

The American press has changed its tune on Castro. Influential newspapers such as the Washington Post and the Chicago Daily News, once strongly pro-Castro, now condemn him. The public is getting into a frame of mind for action against the Cuban dictatorship.

Though the State Department in 1934 signed away the specific right to intervene in Cuba, the Monroe Doctrine is still the Nation's basic guide for this hemisphere. This 137-year-old document established a permanent U.S. policy of barring European powers from taking over Latin American governments. While European Communists are not in direct control of Cuba, Castro's lieutenants are leftists who follow the international Communist line. Thus the United States has a doctrinal basis for intervention.

But what sort of action should the United States take in Cuba? The answer, in our judgment, is whatever may be necessary. If Americans will do what's necessary to hold a string of little islands 5 miles off the mainland of China, they should not lack for boldness in Cuba.

The first logical step to restore freedom in Cuba is to withhold the sugar subsidy, which Castro's government needs to prop up the economy. Next could come withdrawal of U.S. recognition, an embargo on trade, and support of a Free Cuba movement in the United States.

Beyond this is the possibility of direct U.S. military intervention, should revolt occur. As in Lebanon, the United States would have to go in quickly and get out just as fast.

If the U.S. Government could act in Lebanon, which is across the world, it could act in Cuba at its own doorstep. All that's necessary is for the public to get adjusted to the idea. Military intervention may seem too drastic at the moment, but we believe the public is ready for initial steps. If these are successful, it may not be necessary to send marines to Cuba.

One way or another, communism must be barred from the New World.

Address by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge at the Dinner With Ike, January 27, 1960, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1960, Republicans all over our good country celebrated the seventh anniversary of the day our President, Dwight David Eisenhower, moved into the White House. This celebration was marked by 80 dinners with Ike across the Nation. The common link between these affairs, other than our good President and our party, was the closed circuit televised program from the various regional dinners, and the speech by the President from the dinner he was attending in California.

Our western Pennsylvania people held their celebration in the new Pittsburgh Hilton Hotel, and we were privileged to hear, as the main speaker, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, chief delegate and the permanent representative of the United States at the United Nations.

It was a pleasure to serve under the leadership of Cabot Lodge this past fall, when I served, on appointment by the President, as one of the U.S. delegates to the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations.

Ambassador Lodge is competent, intelligent, and one of our most outstanding U.S. statesmen. It is a pleasure, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to call the distinguished speech by Ambassador Lodge to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the people of the United States.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE DINNER WITH IKE SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, PITTSBURGH, PA., JANUARY 27

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and my fellow guests at this dinner with Ike, like many millions of Americans I often saluted General Eisenhower. Tonight many millions more salute him as our beloved President who enters his last year of service in the White House.

We salute him because we recognize that by any standard he deserves the finest tribute we can pay.

When you ask yourself what can fairly be expected of government here at home, you find that his administration meets every test: Conditions have been created which have made prosperity possible. The steel strike has been settled—with a strong helping hand from our hard working Vice President RICHARD NIXON. There is high employment and excellent prospects for future growth.

That is one test.

Then, his innate goodness and decency have raised the tone of public life in America, just as they have won increased regard and respect for us abroad.

And these things have been done without standing pat. Throughout his administration there has been a sense of change and hope and innovation in the air—and America without change is not America.

When we look abroad, we salute him because of all that he has done for peace. None of the good things of life would be possible if war were to come. We point, therefore, to many specifics: To the treaties which tie us to our allies; to our military strength without which war cannot possibly be prevented; to the economic aid which enables us to exert leadership in that whole section of the world which is less developed; to the vision which seeks to move us on to a new plateau in which peace with justice will prevail.

We honor him for refusing to let the Monroe Doctrine be subverted and Guatemala taken over by communism; for standing up for the Charter of the United Nations at the time of the Suez incident; for putting U.S. troops into Lebanon—and then withdrawing them; for taking a stand in the tense Straits of Formosa whereby we have avoided war and at the same time have given up nothing; for being steadfast in support of the rights of West Berlin; for using the Security Council of the United Nations as recently as last September to prevent the Communist absorption of Laos—in a word, for striving to live up to the United Nations Charter (the only code of behavior for governments) and to persuade others to live up to it.

Just the mention of these things reminds us of how turbulent the world is—how full of dangers—and how full of opportunities.

We know that we in America have changed much in the last few years and are still changing.

We can see that the statements of the Soviet leaders are changing, although basic policies still appear unchanged. Certainly in the tour of the United States last September which I made with a certain well-known foreign visitor I heard him say many things which no Soviet spokesman had ever said before—that he was confident the American people and the American Government were united; that a future war would devastate the Communist world as it would the free world; that he could see that the "slaves of capitalism" lived well; and even that while he had communism in his head he had San Francisco in his heart—and I might add that the word "Pittsburgh" could well have been substituted for San Francisco because his reception here was equally courteous and correct.

In a world changing so fast we must be flexible in method. We must beware of talk of a broad trend in foreign relations or of a thaw or of a freeze or of a tough policy or of a soft policy. Foreign policy can only be described in terms which are deadly to those who think only in terms of black and white. We talk about the so-called less developed countries—and I have just done so—and yet every single one of them is different. Indeed every diplomatic situation which arises between the same two countries is a different situation.

At the recently finished General Assembly of the United Nations we attacked the Soviet Union vigorously on the question of Hungary—and we were right to do so. We reached an agreement with them on setting up a committee on outer space—and we were right to do that. Our relationship with the Soviet Union is not a sporting event. We are trying to survive; we are trying to do our part as a leading nation in making a world order in which all peoples can have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We can only build such a world if we take each question on its merits—and not on the basis of some shibboleth.

Mr. Khrushchev's visit was a useful episode both because it informed him about us and because it aroused and stimulated the Americans who saw him. It must not—and will not—become a soporific which makes the American people and Congress feel that we can reduce our expenditures for the military, or that we can weaken our insistence that honest inspection be an integral part of any disarmament agreement.

We salute Dwight Eisenhower because he has this very gift of seeing things in perspective and in proportion. He can see that a thing is good and that it should be done—without yielding to the pressure which says that it should be done immediately and in a ruinous way.

He has taught us that we need a military establishment with which we can live year in and year out—not because a military establishment will bring peace, but because without it we cannot prevent war.

We salute Dwight Eisenhower because he has seen that economic aid to the less developed countries is a necessity. It can clearly be defended on moral grounds, since it is a human duty to help one's neighbor as well as a fine old generous American tradition. It can clearly be defended on political grounds for the reason that if we leave this field to others we stand a very good chance of having large areas of the world turned against us. It can, I believe, however, chiefly be argued on a business basis—that in most of these countries there are valuable resources and that if we are good bankers in the broad sense of the term we can over the years reap great economic advantages—in fact that it is hard to see how we can achieve the economic growth in this country which we want and need without the development of other lands.

We salute Dwight Eisenhower because he exemplifies the importance of taking the

diplomatic initiative—of leading men's minds—whether it be in his dramatic proposal of atoms for peace delivered at the United Nations in December of 1953—or whether it be by his recent triumphant voyage to the other side of the world.

We salute him because he has had the vision to tell us that after all the chips are down, we will win this struggle for survival on the spiritual plane—or we will not win it at all.

Indeed, we can be powerful militarily; we can conduct a mammoth economic program; we can be bold and resourceful in our diplomacy; we can be clever and artful in our propaganda activities; but none of these will avail unless we practice what we preach.

What we preach is good and what we preach is simple. Our ideals have a stronger appeal for men of all colors and races and creeds than any ideas the world has known. The Declaration of Independence which declares that all men are created equal is infinitely more compelling than the Communist Manifesto. So is the idea that man's material standard can be raised without sacrificing his civil rights.

But we must show that we believe in it ourselves. In our information work, instead of trying to promote the word "capitalism," which has been irretrievably damaged by over a hundred years of attack—and which will never be understood abroad as we understand it in this country—we should seek to promote the ideals of human equality and brotherly love. In our conduct at home we must realize that until racial discrimination has totally disappeared from this country, we can never do the job abroad for others—and for ourselves—that our own survival requires.

We are indeed in a struggle with the Soviet Union. But we must not make the mistake of thinking that our biggest struggle is with the Soviet Union. If the Soviet Union had never existed and if world communism had never existed, we would confront a challenge of unprecedented and burning pressure from the crisis in the less developed countries.

And then there is another of even greater fire, of even greater difficulty—and this too would confront us anyway, regardless of the Soviet Union. That is the challenge presented to us every day by our own ideals—the Declaration of Independence, the words of the prophet Micah to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God" and our Christian ideal of brotherly love.

By living up to these ideals we can win the contest. But the malignant fallacies of communism will win if they are actively supported with enthusiasm—and our noble ideals are allowed to gather dust on some forgotten shelf.

The Eisenhower leadership is great because it rests on the things of the spirit, on what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature, on the need to sacrifice and thus to lead.

We salute Dwight Eisenhower therefore because of his understanding head and his understanding heart, because of his tact and his kindliness and his love of his fellow man.

These are the qualities which the United States needs.

These are the Americanisms which the world likes.

These are the Republicanisms which make our party worthwhile.

Let me in conclusion turn to him and say: We salute you for what you have done. We say "Thank you, Mr. President," and we say further that the best way to show our gratitude is to give ourselves more of this kind of leadership to guide our country through the threatening dangers and to the beckoning opportunities ahead.

We salute you, Mr. President, because, like George Washington, you are first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of your countrymen, and unique in the esteem of the whole world.

President Eisenhower Emphasizes the Long-Recognized Need for a Real Overhaul of All the Regulations and Controls Imposed on the Nation's Railroad Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 30, 1960, edition of the Washington Evening Star focuses attention on the plight of the Nation's railroad industry and at the same time reveals the great interest of President Eisenhower in a real overhaul of all the regulations and controls as a step toward giving the carriers a chance to be prosperous.

The editorial follows:

AGREEMENT ON NEED

President Eisenhower was echoing some often emotionally expressed appeals of the railroad industry when he told his news conference that there should be "a real overhaul of all the regulations and controls" as a step toward giving the carriers a "chance to be prosperous." It is doubtful if any railroader would differ with the President's opinion that they are governed "by antiquated laws and regulations" and they have, in fact, pinpointed 1887 as the birth year for today's regulatory antiquities. Modifications in the years since have fallen far short, in the industry's view, of giving it a fair deal in the midtwentieth century transportation economy.

The railroads' complaints are many, and all are not directed exclusively at the Federal Government. They do blame Uncle Sam primarily, however, for placing them at a competitive disadvantage by granting direct or indirect subsidies to other systems of public transportation—highway, air, water, and pipeline. Daniel P. Loomis, president of the Association of American Railroads, recently estimated Federal aid to competitive transport at $17 billion in less than 15 years since World War II. In the same period, he said, the rails spent $14 billion in private capital for their own modernization. They complain, also, of Federal restrictions against diversification (letting the railroads themselves engage in other forms of transportation), of the difficulty in getting approval of mergers which would improve service and utilization of facilities, and prohibitions against more competitive ratemaking.

Many State authorities likewise are villains in the railroad books—because of reluctance to permit local rate changes or to approve abandonment of unprofitable services. Most of all, the States and even local communities are assailed for their heavy tax take. The levy per mile of road in New Jersey, highest in the country, is estimated at five times the national average. Even the featherbedding problem, which the industry claims costs it $500 million yearly for work not done, is blamed in part on State safety laws as well as upon union demands.

Obviously, some of the railroads' problems are of their own making—as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out. Furthermore, the Transportation Act of 1958 dealt favorably with some of the industry's grievances against Federal policy—including ratemaking. Both the Department of Commerce and the Senate Commerce Committee currently are engaged in transportation studies which may lead to further corrective legislation. Whatever the result, the railroads have one sound premise, namely, that the Nation needs them. As basic freight carriers, their service cannot be transferred entirely to any combination of competing systems. If their economic health is not preserved, as a private-enterprise industry, it is not an exaggeration for railroad spokesmen to point to nationalization as the undesirable alternative.

Can We Have Clean Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Outdoor America for January 1960.

CAN WE HAVE CLEAN WATER?—SHOULD WE ATTEMPT TO LOAD EACH STREAM TO A MAXIMUM POLLUTION LEVEL, OR ACCEPT THE GREATER CHALLENGE OF REMOVING AS MUCH POLLUTION AS ECONOMICS AND KNOW-HOW PERMIT?

(By Frank Gregg)

We are at this time losing ground on the battle for clean waters. That is the judgment, harsh but measured, of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Hundreds of millions of tax dollars have been invested in treatment facilities by cities and sanitation districts; other millions by the score have been invested in facilities to abate industrial waterborne wastes.

Pollution laws have been and are being continuously strengthened; pollution that was permissible yesterday is prosecuted today.

Researcs—long neglected—has recently been pursued more diligently, if far from adequately.

But we are still losing ground.

What can be done?

A program of speeding these present efforts is essential. One opportunity—expanding the Federal pollution control program as principally sponsored by Congressman BLATNIK—is at hand and the league endorses it, commends it to the Nation, promises to help accomplish it. But, if the lessons of 40 years of league effort are to be applied, the result may be disappointing.

Unless the conservation philosophy is applied to water pollution control, we will continue to lose ground in the battle for clean waters, and will in a fraction of another 40 years have lost the battle itself on all waters receiving any significant industrial or municipal use.

That judgment is harsh, too. It is also measured. Before it can be judged, the league's interest in water quality should be noted.

It is just 39 years since the league was formed by 54 inspired men in Chicago.

And it was in the first issue of this magazine that the league cited pollution as the most pressing conservation problem of the day.

Through volunteer leaders and former staff executives such as Seth Gordon (now a member of the President's Water Pollution

Control Advisory Board), the late Ken Reid (who did yeoman work in the 1948 Federal act), and Bill Voigt (now bossman of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission), the league has had a hand in every major national water pollution control controversy, and in thousands of State and local battles as well.

In 1957 we adjourned a national convention in Washington to help the Congress see the wisdom of reversing a vote to kill Public Law 660.

And at this moment our chapters are planning ways to improve local water quality conditions as a key part of their efforts to preserve shoreline recreation opportunities under the cooperative local-State National league "save our shorelines" program.

The years have forged an Izaak Walton conservation philosophy. It is a multiple-use philosophy, and owes a definite acknowledgment to the Forest Service and its creed of managing resources "for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."

Multiple need might mean more than multiple use, however; to talk about uses without talking about the needs those uses serve is nonsense.

For instance, it's one thing to say the public needs power. It's quite a jump from that premise to the conclusion that we must build a single-purpose dam on a unique recreational stream to get it. Other damsites, other energy sources might meet the need; but the aspiring dam builder will always base his case on multiple use. He's wise—he has no case from the standpoint of public need.

Here's an attempt, then, at defining the league's conservation philosophy in terms of needs: It is the aim of the Izaak Walton League to see our natural resources managed to serve as many legitimate needs of as many people over as long a period of time as intelligence, foresight, and a sense of responsibility to the future will permit.

And we are certain that there are ways to make certain that our water resource serves all our needs reasonably well if we can apply the conservation philosophy to its management.

There is urgent need for applying the conservation philosophy to watershed management; to water law; to pollution law and its enforcement; to research. But philosophies are not applied unless they are understood and accepted. And there is serious public confusion today about what to hope for from pollution abatement efforts, growing out of a misapplication of the multiple-use idea.

There is a persistent trend in the sanitary engineering profession among both industrial and domestic waste treatment groups to talk about the wisdom of maximum use of surface waters for carrying off wastes.

The argument begins with the statement that waste assimilation is a beneficial use of water; true conservation is maximum use for each beneficial purpose; therefore true conservation requires that we dump as much waste into our waters as they can handle without unreasonable impairment of other values.

The first flaw in this maximum multiple-use idea is fatal as far as water quality is concerned. It's true that getting its wastes disposed of is beneficial to society. But the surface waters used to assimilate wastes most assuredly are not benefited; and these waters must serve a far greater range of human needs than can be met by water loaded to what the pollution sources would be likely to consider a practical maximum.

It must be remembered that the same stream this pollution philosophy would sacrifice to maximum pollution loads may, under ideal conditions, provide a cooling draught to a thirsty farmer. It may provide a place for families to swim and wade, or a nesting or resting place for waterfowl.

If it serves a major industrial area it might do well to support a sport fishery for the thousands who live near it, and bear water skiers, sailboats, and other craft in numbers. And it may, if it is pleasant to the eye and the nose, bring charm to an otherwise drab city park.

Certainly it must provide water to drink and to bathe in (after appropirate treatment), and water to grow and fashion the products that feed and clothe and house and transport and amuse and tranquilize us.

In no case is the capacity of water to meet human needs increased by its use for waste disposal.[1] On the contrary, its capacity to serve most human needs is reduced, and its capacity to serve others may be destroyed, by its use for waste assimilation.

And it follows that the best possible use of water for waste assimilation is the least possible use; and that the theory of "maximum use" of water for waste treatment can be applied only at the expense of other legitimate needs.

The conservation philosophy insists that pollution be minimized first by efficient use of resources used in manufacture, including reuse of some materials and manufacture of byproducts from others.

Efficient treatment of the remaining wastes is the second step, with the effluent released to surface waters only after the best possible treatment.

The maximum use theory, if universally accepted, would guarantee perpetual pollution of all water receiving significant uses.

There would be no point in the theory if its advocates didn't object to the burden of treating pollution to a point that would be acceptable to other interests—to recreation interests, to cite an obvious example.

No, there can be little doubt that the range of human needs above that level of water quality which might best be described as usable filth would be found expendable under the maximum use idea.

The maximum use theory is also questionable from a standpoint of sheer practicality. It is unworkable.

The uses of surface waters change every day. New suburbs boom. New citizens are born. New processes are found. New chemicals are used. All change the amount and kind of pollution load. The receiving surface waters change, too. Flows vary from day to day, season to season, year to year. Start on any given day with a maximum load; the next day the load will exceed yesterday's neatly computed maximum.

The league has said, and repeats, that the challenge is not to see how much pollution we can dump in a stream. The challenge is to see how much we can get out of it—to provide for today's needs, to provide a margin for meeting tomorrow's.

That is the heart of the conservation philosophy.

[1] Sanitary engineers can point to cases where enrichment from organic wastes, for instance, may increase fish production. Within the context of current pollution controversy, however, the statement is valid.

American Students Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a charming and illuminating little book, "From Main Street to the Left Bank," by John A. Garraty and Walter Adams, published last December by the Michigan State University Press. The authors discuss the cultural exchange programs of American universities in Europe, and comment on the effectiveness of our academic ambassadors in communicating a favorable image of America. As a member of the House Space Committee, I was particularly interested in the comparison of the strengths and weaknesses in the American and European educational systems.

Dr. Garraty, professor of history at Columbia University, is the distinguished biographer of "Silas Wright," "Henry Cabot Lodge," and "Woodrow Wilson," as well as the author of "The Nature of Biography." Dr. Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University, has been a member of Attorney General Brownell's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws and a frequent consultant to congressional committees. His books include "The Structure of American Industry" and "Monopoly in America." The publisher of "From Mainstreet to the Left Bank" is the Michigan State University Press which, under the able direction of Mr. Lyle Blair, has achieved international note and distinction.

The following review which appeared in the New York Times on November 29, 1959, was written by Mr. Fred M. Hechinger, the Times' education editor:

THE YEAR ABROAD

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

One of the most generally accepted, though untested, theories is that any young man or young woman will learn a great deal, if given a passage to Europe and let loose to study there. The theory is no longer untested. Two academic men, with a foundation grant to boot, have tested it. As with so many educational theories, this one did not survive the test unscathed.

John A. Garrity, professor of history at Columbia, and Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University, survey the subject of American students abroad. They look at it, not wide-eyed but openminded. They don't feel obligated, as so many educators apparently do, to make foreign study a sacred cow that is desecrated by frank criticism. This book is frank and critical. It is also good reading for anyone who has the best interests of foreign studies at heart.

An important contribution of the book is its forthright discussion of differences between an American campus and European student life, both social and academic. It avoids hero-worshipping the academic pretensions of some of the European professors who look on students as a necessary evil. But it also has some caustic things to say about the unnecessary coddling of American students.

The problem is clearly one of quality, and quality in matters of the mind is not easily or automatically found anywhere—not in the United States and not in Europe either. The description of some special courses offered even by such noted institutions as the Sorbonne for the benefit of American students show up serious intellectual shoddiness. Not all foreign study is good, any more than all travel is broadening. It depends on the student as much as on the traveler.

The same can be said of the special programs, such as Junior Year Abroad, which have become part of the offering of many American colleges. Some are well adminis-

tered and well planned; others leave much to be desired. The authors have the courage, rare in academic circles, to be specific. They point out what they consider strengths and weaknesses of programs offered. They criticize freely the frequent lack of permanent leadership of some programs and charge that some colleges may refrain from appointing permanent directors for their foreign studies in order to spread the benefit of junketing. They say programs and students suffer as a result.

None of these criticisms should create the impression that this book is opposed to study abroad. On the contrary, it wants more of it; but it also wants the effort put to the best possible use. It does not have much faith in benefits "by osmosis" and would therefore prefer to have more of the stress placed on well-planned, demanding academic programs, whether at home or abroad.

At times, the authors may be a little too harsh. They may give too much credit to academic effort and too little to the power of enthusiasm. But, since most observers err in the opposite direction, this may be a good thing. And when they point to the importance of really thorough language instruction, as a prerequisite to full benefits from study in foreign countries, they are on firm ground.

For the student who plans to go abroad, there are some important hints. Should he live with a European family or in a student dormitory? Is it better to travel in groups or independently? There are no pat answers, but there are such sensible answers as the fact that some groups are "herds" and some individuals turn out to be lost and lonely. As for families, the fact that they are European does not make them automatically exciting, as documented by the lady of the house who insisted on keeping television turned on and conversation turned off during meals. The authors, however, have a tendency to be too categorical—e.g., when they put a shabby label on most of the European "bourgoisie."

As for the often unrealistic and even more often ignored rules that govern American students' social behavior, they probably put their finger on the real reason for their perpetuation: without them, American parents would not let their offspring go to Europe at all.

For those who are offended by the critical aspects of the book—admittedly a little harsh and not always "diplomatic"—there are the highly reassuring reactions on the part of serious students. "You have to defend what you believe in," says one young American, and this revelation is bound to make him a better person, a better American and probably a better scholar. "I can never be a co-ed again," says a young woman, and this is a sigh of liberation rather than of lament.

After the wounds that will be left here and there have healed, the effect of this book should be to strengthen rather than to weaken foreign studies, and the institutions engaged in them. The authors have decided that a little bloodletting will do more good than a pleasant bedside manner.

Where Do We Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Outdoor America for January 1960:

WHERE DO WE STAND

Are current municipal and industrial waste treatment efforts keeping pace with increases in pollution loads? Here are pertinent comments by two top Federal officials:

Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testifying before the House Committee on Public Works on April 8, 1959, on the Blatnik bill (H.R. 3610):

"Surely we can all agree on the increasing importance of water in our national life and economy. This matter of water, without question, is about to become, indeed if it is not already, a critically urgent national problem. During the period 1950 to 1957, while our population increased 12½ percent, the total fresh water used increased 57 percent. Where we now use 270 billion gallons of water per day, by 1980 we will need 600 billion gallons per day—more than double our present requirements. These figures illustrate our great dependence on surface streams for public water supply, for production of the things we eat and wear and use. At the same time we need to keep in mind the irreplaceable value of these waters for recreation and conservation of fish and wildlife.

"As I see it, we don't stand a chance of meeting these accelerating requirements unless we make marked progress in the direction of cleaning up our streams and keeping them clean. For 40 years we have been dumping more pollution into the surface waters of the Nation than we have been removing through waste treatment.

"Such a situation calls for a concerted attack on the part of the Federal, State, and local governments, and private groups."

Gordon McCallum, Chief, Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in response to a request for comment by the Izaak Walton League:

"Despite marked progress since Congress passed the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, we are losing ground in the battle for clean water.

"Some 3,000 communities still discharge raw domestic wastes into streams. Another 2,800 need improvements on existing sewage treatment plans. Although municipal sewage treatment works construction rose from $222 million per year in 1952–56, preceding Federal construction grants, to almost $400 million per year in 1959, cities must spend $575 million each of the next 5 to 8 years to catch up. Consequently, we are falling behind at a construction rate of over $175 million per year.

"While there is no accurate index of total industrial waste pollution or waste treatment facilities, industry's outlay of funds must be comparable to that of cities during the next few years."

Congress Should Express Its Indignation at Desecration of Places of Worship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was with shock and dismay that I and many other Americans have read during recent weeks of the anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic demonstrations in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world, including the United States.

The poisoned mercury of religious bigotry spreads rapidly and in many directions if left unchecked; its flow is not easy to arrest.

As if to emphasize the blasphemy of their acts, the persons who were responsible for touching off this wave a few weeks ago chose Christmas eve as the time for desecrating a synagogue in the city of Cologne in West Germany.

Mr. Speaker, those who say that anti-Semitism is dead and that the deeds of the Nazis should be passed by on the other side speak too soon. "Even when it is shameful and frightening," said Commonweal magazine recently, "history cannot be denied. That 5 million Jews were murdered by the government of a highly cultured European Christian people is a monstrous, hideous fact, for them and for the rest of the world. That nazism is quite dead becomes every day an increasingly dubious judgment; but, even if it were quite dead, it would still need to be referred to."

THE "HITLERIAN HERITAGE" OF THE ANTI-SEMITES

The January 23, 1960, issue of Ave Maria, a fine Catholic weekly published at Notre Dame, Ind., comments in similar vein:

Have we forgotten * * * the horror of Germany under Hitler, the murder of countless Jewish—and Christian—men, women, and children who were innocent of any crime? Hitler did not create anti-Jewish feeling; he merely systematically cultivated it and fanned it into a white heat of hatred which allowed him to perpetrate his crime against humanity in the name of justice. * * * When the parlor bigots today sit around and make their anti-Semitic remarks, do they not realize their Hitlerian heritage?

Mr. Speaker, because I feel so deeply the dangers of such acts of desecration of places of worship, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution by means of which the Congress of the United States can express to the world its profound sense of indignation and shock at this epidemic and can call on all peoples and all governments everywhere to work to the end that these shameful events shall not happen again.

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SHOCK AT DESECRATION OF PLACES OF WORSHIP

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas in recent days there has been a wave of desecration of places of worship and other sacred sites; and

Whereas this desecration has been spreading throughout the nations of Europe and other parts of the world; and

Whereas instances of desecration have occurred in this country recently; and

Whereas if left unchecked this wave can only result in grievous moral deterioration and denial of the true spirit of the brotherhood of man; and

Whereas the conscience of the world has been shocked by these events: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation and shock at this epidemic of desecration and calls upon all persons and governments throughout the world to exert their energies to the end that these shameful events shall not recur.

THE HIGH COST OF PREJUDICE

Mr. Speaker, we know from the turbulent history of our national experience in the United States the high cost of racial and religious prejudice.

We can see very clearly how the intolerance that burst forth with the desecration of a synagogue in Cologne soon spread to other West German communities; then to Vienna, London, Glasgow and finally to our own country, in New York City.

LEADERSHIP OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The month of February, Mr. Speaker, is the month during which the people of America celebrate Brotherhood Week. I am proud of the fact that in recognition of this week, the citizens of South Bend, Ind., as well as of other communities of the Nation, operating through the agency of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, have taken the leadership in combatting religious intolerance. I hope that, precisely because of the unhappy events that have taken place during recent weeks, every American community will this month dedicate itself to the erasing of religious hatred and ill will among Americans of different creeds.

For we all know that when one man or one house of worship or one religious faith is today made the object of attack, tomorrow another may feel the sharp lash of bigotry.

NO MAN IS AN ISLAND—ASK NOT FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

No man is an island, entire of itself—

Said John Donne—

Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or if thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Fine Progress of Democracy in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my congratulations to the people of the State of Israel on their approaching 12th anniversary of statehood and independence. Their history and culture go far beyond this short period, as do the histories and cultures of many of the states who have or soon will achieve independence.

The State of Israel recently held its fourth election, a model election for new democracies. It was an election which was, in many ways, similar to our own. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues and the people of our good country, a report on these elections, which shows the fine progress of democracy in Israel. The report was written by Richard C. Scammon, elections research director of the Governmental Affairs Institute, and a known authority on elections.

The report follows:

[From the America-Israel Bulletin]

ELECTION DAY, ISRAEL

(By Richard M. Scammon)

As the voters stood in line a few weeks ago for Israel's fourth postwar election an American observer could easily think he was right back home in the third ward. The moving line of chatting voters, the schoolhouse, the officials, ready to check off a name—it all looked very, very familiar. And familiar indeed it was, for democracy speaks in the same voice whether it be Haifa or Houston.

But there are differences, of course. Election day in Israel isn't exactly the same as in America, or Italy, or India. For one thing Israeli citizens vote only once every 4 years. National parliamentary elections (to choose members of Israel's Knesset) and local council municipal elections are held on the same day. This way all the campaign speeches—and the expense of elections, too—are concentrated on a single election day once every 4 years.

For another, Israeli elections are party elections rather than personality contests. The voter makes his choice among a number of competing party tickets for the national Knesset and his local municipal council. Naturally, a national personality like Ben-Gurion or Menahem Begin, leader of the Heruth Party, may persuade a man to vote for this or that party, but it is the party for whom the voter finally casts his ballot, not the individual candidate.

Campaign persuasion in Israel isn't too much different from what we know of campaigning in America. There isn't any television yet, but the state radio carries all the leading party speeches and the newspapers and billboards are filled with campaign appeals. The Israelis are a reading people, and the parties do a lot of work distributing patry handouts and party papers. Since as many as a quarter or a third of all Israelis are party members, there are plenty of men and women to do the distributing job.

But all the campaigning must stop on election eve. At 7 in the evening, 12 hours before the polls open, the official campaign comes to a close. But this doesn't mean the party workers are finished. Far from it. On election day they are busy with unofficial work—manning the precincts, handing out sample ballots and getting voters to the polls. Since all the precinct election judges are nominated by the parties, many thousands of party workers are counting ballots on election day, just as their fellow party members are out rounding up votes.

NOBODY IS CASUAL

Election day is officially a holiday in Israel, but in some parts of the country the workload seems greater than on any ordinary working day. For example, in one kibbutz over half the adults were involved in the election—as judges, as watchers, as party workers. The kibbutz members fanned out in all directions from their home base, this group being judges in one town, another being watchers at an area up the road, still others mobilizing their party supporters in a third village.

And the Israelis take their duties seriously. Since election day comes only once every 4 years no one is casual about the "coronation day" of democracy. For people who vote two or three times every year the whole process may get boring—but not in Israel. It doesn't come often enough to jade people's appetites especially a people as involved and interested in politics as are the Israelis.

A few of the ultra-orthodox refuse to vote at all, disclaiming any interest in Israel as a State. But this is a small minority—most join enthusiastically in the campaign for votes and in the election which settles the campaign. In fact, they join in so vigorously that some problems are created by zealousness. One minor problem is in the taxi business. All taxis are rented by the parties for election day, and pity the poor traveler who wants to hail a cab.

FOREIGNERS HAVE PROBLEMS

Another problem—this one for foreigners—is created by Israel's unique franchise law. Only citizens may vote for the Knesset, but all residents may vote for their local municipal council. The reasoning behind this is sound enough—you ought to be a citizen before choosing the country's lawmakers, but everybody shares an interest in municipal garbage collecting. Thus foreigners, if they be residents of an Israeli community, have the right to vote in local elections.

This is no difficulty for some. Swiss, for example, or British, may vote at their pleasure in local elections. But for Americans it is different. For an American to vote abroad—even in a local election in a friendly country which wants him to vote—means potential loss of citzenship. All day long on election day the telephone kept ringing in our Embassy in Tel-Aviv. Israeli party workers were anxious to get out the vote. Americans couldn't vote for the Knesset, of course, but why not for the town council? Often it it was only with difficulty that explanations could be made, so zealously were the party workers ringing doorbells and rounding up the voters.

This enthusiasm for getting out the vote may be seen in the services, too. Israeli troops may vote at their homes if they wish. But they can vote right at their army posts, too. Only one time, of course—and identity cards are punched to prevent any double-voting. But every effort is made to get service men and women to the polls. One interesting aspect of service voting is this: no one over the rank of sergeant can sit as an election judge. It is believed the rank-and-file might be a bit intimidated by having to face up to an election board composed of officers. So sergeant is the top rank. Actually many of the service voting places are staffed by young women, many of them just barely old enough to vote themselves.

The parties go after this service vote as they do the civilian vote: precincts stay open longer than ours. In fact, you can vote right up to midnight, though actually not many people do in the last hour or two. But no one wants to feel any potential voter has been denied the franchise, so voting goes on right up to the literal end of the day. And it goes on for all Israeli citizens—Jew, Arab, Druse, Bedouin, whoever they may be. Everyone has his secret "moment of truth" in the privacy of the polling booth. There he is the master, in Israel as in America. The secret ballot in a free election is the greatest bond of unity for democratic nations everywhere.

Address by Former Governor McKeldin at Annual Dinner of the German Society of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is because it is peculiarly applicable to the happenings in today's world that I am

impelled to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress an eloquent address delivered on January 18, 1960, by the former Governor of Maryland, the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, who has returned to the private practice of the law. This brilliant speech was made on the occasion of the annual dinner of the German Society of Maryland.

It was altogether fitting and proper that Governor McKeldin, in that address, called our attention to the great and lasting contributions of Germany in every field of human endeavor. Science, philosophy, music, and every aspect of learning have been enriched by Germans. It is important for us to remember these things in the light of recent incidents occurring throughout the world.

The State of Maryland is justly proud of its citizens who are the officers and members of the German society and I am happy to number so many of them as my valued friends. Mr. Francis W. Pramschufer, Sr., its president, and Mr. Herbert F. Kuenne, vice president, have done so much to make the society a force for civic good. Present at the dinner were some of Baltimore's truly outstanding clergymen, such as Rev. Dr. Gottlieb Siegenthaler, Pastor Fritz O. Evers, and the Reverend E. F. Engelbert. Also present was Baltimore's young and able mayor, J. Harold Grady.

Governor McKeldin's remarks on that occasion were as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GERMAN SOCIETY OF MARYLAND ANNUAL DINNER, JANUARY 18, 1960

In the year 1960 the German Society of Maryland has been given a new and increased importance by its enemies. For this society certainly counts as its enemies all persons whose acts tend to bring discredit on the German name, and in recent weeks a number of incidents have had that effect. This means that it is more than ever necessary that people who represent the great Germany shall make their voices heard.

For it is an unfortunate trait of human nature in all countries to be startled by bad news and to take good news as a matter of course. When we hear that juvenile delinquents have painted swastikas on German synagogues, we are likely to forget that it was this same country that produced and educated Albert Einstein; and it is just such forgetfulness that accounts for a great deal of the pessimism of our times.

It is the function of our organization to counteract this tendency and in the present state of the world that function is much more than merely the occasion for social gatherings. The preservation and enrichment of German cultural values is of such vast importance to the United States that it cannot be overestimated. Without the music, the literature, the philosophy, and the science that Germany has contributed, our culture would be so much poorer that it does not bear contemplation.

Yet in stressful times it is inevitable that these things should fade from memory unless wise men and women continually emphasize them, losing no opportunity to speak of them in the midst of the turmoil. Nor does this apply to Germany alone. The American people, a composite of all nations, should be more careful than any other never to allow recently developed tensions to make them forget what they owe to others.

I do not hesitate to apply it even to those countries with which we are at the moment most definitely at odds. Our dislike and distrust of the Soviet regimes in Russia and China, however amply justified, must not be allowed to blind us to the true greatness of both nations. Our indignation with Khrushchev ought to be based very largely on the fact that he is not only hostile to us, but also hostile to the spirit of Tolstoi, and Tchaikovsky, and Pavlov; and Chinese Mao defies not us alone, but Confucius, also, and all the artists and poets and sages who created Chinese civilization.

In the presence of the German Society of Maryland, therefore, it is more than a pleasure, it is a civic duty to extol those men who without ever leaving German soil have helped to make America great. How much of our freedom of worship we owe to Martin Luther is too obvious to need comment; but you have only to look into the correspondence of those two definitely non-German Americans, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, to discover how much those great political thinkers owed to the tempering and sharpening of their minds by the work of Leibnitz; and their immediate successors owed as great a debt to Immanuel Kant.

Here in Baltimore we are well aware that one of the chief ornaments and distinctions of our city, the Johns Hopkins University, was consciously designed upon the German model; and the most eminent of the group of great scholars who set the tone of the institution were almost without exception educated in part in Germany. From that day to this, German scholarship has strongly influenced the work of the university, and at this moment it is administered by a member of one of the most distinguished American families of German descent.

It is trite and hackneyed almost to the point of absurdity to speak of the influence on American life of the German masters of music. After all, Americans live in the Western Hemisphere, and the whole occidental world acknowledges musical allegiance to Bach, Beethoven and Brahms.

But precisely because music, the universal language, needs no translation we can perceive the Germanic influence on that art much more easily than its corresponding influence on literature, where the language barrier intervenes, but it is important to remember that that most typically American poet, Longfellow, took great pride in his ability to read German. In his day it was as extraordinary an accomplishment as it is today for an American to read Turkish; and through Longfellow, Goethe, and Schiller, and Heine had already influenced American literature years before the troubles of 1848 sent the first great wave of German immigration to our shores.

It is a fair claim, therefore, that the writing done in the colonial period is the only part of American literature that is not distinctly influenced by the great Germans; and I do not think that any scholar will claim seriously that the writing done in the colonial period represents the highest achievement of American literature.

It is evident, therefore, that in its political theory, in its scholarship, in its science, and in its artistic activity American culture has always drawn heavily upon the German. It is this that we should remember in such times of troubles as the world is going through at present. To a very large extent we are all German and not only those of us who trace their ancestry back to that country. Intellectually and esthetically any man who is thoroughly American is somewhat German, although he may not have a drop of German blood; for our manner of thinking we owe in part to that nation.

It behooves us then to be of all nations the most tolerant and the sympathetic to others who are going wih us through a time of troubles. American wealth, American military power, and American political influence are not the only reasons why it is appropriate that the headquarters of the United Nations should be located on American soil. There is also the immensely important fact that the American intellectual and moral heritage includes something drawn from almost every nation upon the globe. Hence the American mind ought to be the most broadly understanding in the world.

But it will not be if we concentrate our thoughts on those things that separate us, rather than on those that unite us. If we fall into that error, our understanding, far from being broad, will become the narrowest in the world; and if we allow that calamity to overtake us, we shall be the country not most, but least fitted to lead the world toward an enduring peace.

Hence I maintain that this society, to the extent that it emphasizes the precious part of our inheritance from Germany is doing far more than merely stimulating amiable social contacts. It is working toward the easing of tensions and the softening of irritations. It is working against hatred and spite and prejudice. That is more than goodfellowship. That is public service, to America, to Germany, and to the world. It deserves the warm approval of Americans, whether of German blood or not.

It is just 3 weeks since we all joined happily in exalting the most beloved German immigrant ever naturalized in the United States. I refer, of course, to Santa Claus. I claim that he is a naturalized American because, although he was born in Germany, it was an American—he who wrote, " 'Twas the Night Before Christmas"—who gave him his sleigh, his reindeer, and his ability to defy the law of gravity. It is only in America that—

"As dry leaves that before the wild hurricane fly,
When they meet with an obstacle, mount to the sky,
So up to the housetop the coursers they flew,
With the sleigh full of toys, and St. Nicholas too."

So I maintain that, regardless of his place of birth, he is today, just as much a citizen of this Republic as was George Washington himself.

But what an immigrant. What a gift from Germany to be adapted to American life—this embodiment of laughter and tenderness, of comedy and love, this banisher for even one day of wrath and hatred, this establisher for a few hours of merriment and kindness as the ruling spirits of the land. Santa Claus is above all the patron saint of childhood, and I heartily claim him as a citizen of the country that I firmly believe to be the Promised Land of childhood in the sense that its supreme greatness has not yet been achieved, but is reserved for those who are children now.

He came to us from Germany and for that every American, of whatever blood, must call down blessings on the name of Germany.

My own ancestors were Scottish on my father's side, and I confess no small pride in the contribution that Scotland has made to America, but I am bound to admit that with all it has given, Scotland never sent a gift like this. It was the ancestors of Germany, represented by your fathers and mothers and by my mother, whose name was Dorothea Greif and whose mother's name was Cunigunda Vinzel, that made this great contribution to America, which represents our best symbol of joy in innocence, of kindness, of cheer, and of hope.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate debated bill on filling vacancies in House.

House adjourned out of respect to Representative Hall.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1477–1512

Bills Introduced: 19 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2940–2958; and S. Res. 264.

Page 1482

Condolence Resolution: Senate adopted S. Res. 264, expressing condolences on the death of Representative Hall. Pages 1530–1531

House Vacancies—Constitutional Amendment: Senate continued its debate of S.J. Res. 39, to amend the Constitution so as to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, with the pending question at recess remaining the Holland amendment to add new section providing that right to vote in national elections shall not be denied because of failure to pay poll tax. Pages 1512–1519, 1531–1534

Authority To Report: By unanimous consent time was extended until March 30, 1960, for filing of reports by Committee on the Judiciary under S. Res. 52–28, 60–63, and 91, which have to do with studies of the following matters, respectively: Escapees and refugees, administration of Patent Office, juvenile delinquency, immigration and naturalization, administration of Trading With the Enemy Act, antitrust and monopoly laws, constitutional amendments, national penitentiaries, administrative practice and procedure in Federal Government, constitutional rights, revision and codification of U.S. statutes, and Federal judicial system.

Page 1489

Program for Tuesday: Senate met today at noon and recessed at 5:27 p.m. until 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, February 2, when it will continue on S.J. Res. 39, filling of temporary vacancies in the House. Page 1535

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee began hearings on fiscal 1961 budget estimates for the Department of Defense, having as its witnesses Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

Hearings continue tomorrow with testimony from Army officials.

NARBA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee, in executive session, agreed unanimously to report to the full committee the North American regional broadcasting agreement, and final protocol thereto (Ex. A, 82d Cong., 1st sess.) and an agreement between the U.S. and Mexico concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcast band (Ex. G, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION MATTERS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation ordered favorably reported to the full committee S. 68, to provide for continued delivery of water under the reclamation laws upon death of husband or wife; S. 1218, authorizing the Department of the Interior to acquire or accept land for Geological Survey activities; S. 1732, to approve repayment contract with Conejos Water Conservancy District, Colorado; H.R. 5270 (S. 1202), to restore to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City excess land previously deeded to the U.S.; and S.J. Res. 150, approving contract for minor construction work on the Talent Division, Rogue River project, Oregon.

Prior to this action, subcommittee heard testimony on these bills as follows: On S. 68, S. 1732, and S.J. Res. 150—Gilbert Stamm and Donald Mitchel, both of the Bureau of Reclamation; on S. 1218—Philip E. Lamoreaux, Geological Survey; and on H.R. 5270—Messrs. Stamm and Mitchel; and Grant Midgley, representing Senator Moss.

FEDERAL ELECTION REGISTRARS

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee resumed its hearings on pending legislation to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal election reg-

Appendix

A Charter of Independence for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the diligent senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has developed and presented a challenging program which he has entitled, "A Charter of Independence for Senior Citizens."

Our able colleague, whose record of interest and accomplishment in the field of social legislation and public service dates back a quarter of a century to the days when we were privileged to serve together in the U.S. House of Representatives, has set forth his eloquent and sincere views concerning the needs of our older citizens in a speech delivered at the West Virginia Institute on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Aging, January 25, 1960, at Institute, W. Va.

Senator RANDOLPH, as a Representative, was active and forthright in his support of the great social security program at the time of its enactment. He has consistently worked for its improvement and for many other movements and programs intended to provide aid and comfort for the blind and other handicapped persons.

During the last session he was a leader in this body in the passage of the Youth Conservation Corps measure which embraces certain features of the popular CCC program which we both supported with vigor during the early period of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal era. It was my privilege, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to have appointed the senior Senator from West Virginia to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings and prepared the majority report on the Youth Conservation Corps bill.

Knowing of our colleague's abiding interest in and sterling qualifications to perform real service in connection with studies of problems of our senior citizens, as well as our youth, I likewise was privileged to appoint him to membership on the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Senator RANDOLPH, as a member of the latter subcommittee, devoted his time to hearings during the latter part of 1959 across the country and presided over those hearings held by the subcommittee for West Virginia at Charleston. His speech before the West Virginia Institute on Vocational Rehabilitation of the Aging is particularly appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHARTER OF INDEPENDENCE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Ray Power, fellow West Virginians, and guests, the questions which you are confronting during this conference are aspects of one of the fundamental problems of modern American civilization. It is a problem which no society in history has ever before faced in such magnitude.

During the recent recess of Congress, I participated, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, in hearings conducted in representative cities throughout the Nation. Our subcommittee held hearings in Washington, Boston, Pittsburgh, Miami, San Francisco, Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Charleston, W. Va. I took part in all but those held in Pittsburgh and Michigan, and I presided over those in our State.

We received the scholarly and scientific testimony of the experts, and we received the often heart-wrenching and pathos-laden reports from the elderly folk themselves. This evening I share with you some of the findings of our subcommittee and some of my own observations drawn from these hearings.

But, first, let me sketch in the briefest detail the national scope of what my friend and colleague, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, has called the quiet revolution.

APPROXIMATELY 16 MILLION CITIZENS OVER 65 YEARS OLD

Perhaps these figures are well known to many of you, but we cannot emphasize them too frequently. In 1900 there were only 3 million Americans aged 65 or over, contrasted with approximately 16 million today, 5 million of whom are 75 or over. These 16 million, within the next decade, will swell to 20 million, of whom 7 million will be 75 or over. These figures received a dramatic expression in our Washington hearings when it was stated that of all the persons who have ever reached the age of 65, 25 percent are alive today.

In terms of West Virginia statistics, the total population of the State in 1957 was 1,962,000. Of that total, 164,000 persons were age 65 years or more, and this number constituted 8.3 percent of the West Virginia population.

Between 1950 and 1957, the number of persons 65 years and over increased by 18.7 percent, with only two other States, Mississippi and Arkansas, having experienced the same type of change.

Then, too, in West Virginia persons 45 and over amount to 28 percent of the population. I am told that each month the public employment offices in West Virginia receive an average of 1,200 new applications from older jobseekers.

During the last fiscal year, approximately 15,000 new applications were received from workers over 45 years old, and during that same year 3,710 of them were placed in nonagricultural positions, including almost 2,000 in service jobs—the bulk of them in private households.

Experts on census evaluations point out that in one important way West Virginia's population pattern differs from the normal of the country. Ours is a State predominantly rural. The latest available official census (1950) reveals that 65.4 percent of West Virginia's population was rural, and this is the fifth highest agrarian population—percentagewise—among all the States.

LIFE EXPECTANCY IS INCREASING FOR AMERICANS

A man of 65 may today expect to live another 13 years; a woman of 65 now has a life expectancy of 15½ years, with the average age at death being about 70. But, by the year 2000, it is estimated that the average will be 82; and it was not uncommon during our hearings for experts to testify that with continued progress in medical science, by the end of this century many people may expect to live to be 125.

These are but the bare outlines of the revolution—and this is not too strong a term—taking place in our population pattern. It is a revolution for which we have been inadequately prepared—psychologically, socially, economically, and medically. Although in some of the States genuine advances have been made in the fields of low-rental housing, employment counseling, and medical care, our national treatment of the problems of the aged as a whole has been marked by callous indifference and neglect. While we glorify in our claims of being the richest nation on earth and having achieved the highest standard of living in history, we allow millions of our senior citizens who have contributed so much to our national achievements now to suffer personal isolation and poverty, degraded housing conditions, and pitifully inadequate nutritional standards and medical care.

This condition is essentially the product of a default in our national attitudes and a failure to develop national planning in the light of new knowledge and new perspectives.

First, with reference to our national attitudes: As a comparatively young nation, with a history first of an expanding physical frontier and then expanding technological and economic frontiers, we have customarily placed the accent on youth and vigor and action. We have not, as a culture, given the veneration to age and wisdom and contemplation that these qualities have received in many other more traditional societies.

URBAN SOCIETY ACCENTUATES PROBLEM OF OUR AGED

Also, until the 20th century we were largely a nation of farmers and small townsmen, and the comparatively few elderly people in our society offered little welfare or maintenance problem. Normally, each family took care of its own, and on the farm and in the small town there was a role to be occupied and work to be done by the elderly. But in the urban life of today—in the project house or the three-room efficiency apartment—there is often no place for the elderly.

Thus, as a nation we have looked the other way while millions of our senior citizens have been forced upon the "tundra of neglect"—to use the graphic phrase of Gen. John F. McMahon, commander in chief of the Volunteers of America.

A second basic inadequacy in our perspective of the elderly is the arbitrary assumption that old age begins at 65—and after that the person is ready to be placed upon

the shelf. The arts of modern medicine have long since invalidated this assumption in its general application, and for disproof in particular instances we need only look at the the creative work of such leaders as our two living ex-Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman; elder statesman Bernard Baruch; world personalities Winston Churchill, Conrad Adenauer, and Eleanor Roosevelt; and great poets Carl Sandburg and Robert Frost—as well as that of some of the vital and active oldsters among my own colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

I am most happy to note the presence tonight of Dr. A. A. Shawkey. He will be "90 years young" next August. Dr. Shawkey has been an active and prominent physician during a fruitful lifetime of service.

Thus, among our 16 million senior citizens today, there is a precious store of skills and abilities, experience and wisdom, which we allow to atrophy through mere neglect and indifference. Not only do we thereby squander a critical national resource, but we also violate the cardinal principle of our own society—that is, the right of each person to a life of dignity and self-respect.

THREE-FIFTHS OF THOSE 65 RECEIVE LESS THAN $1,000

Now, to return to some of the findings of the Senate hearings: according to expert testimony presented to our subcommittee, three-fifth of the persons over 65 received an income of less than $1,000 in 1958, with half of the elderly couples receiving less than $2,000 and about 1½ million widows receiving average social security benefits of $56 a month.

Yet the last budget designed for an elderly couple by the Social Security Administration—and priced at 1950 costs—ranges between $1,600 in New Orleans and a little over $1,900 in Milwaukee. Considering that the general consumer price index has risen approximately 22 percent since that time and medical costs almost 50 percent, it is little wonder that Commissioner William C. Mitchell of the Social Security Administration declared: "* * * The cost of maintaining a healthful, self-respecting mode of living * * * is likely to be more than a sizable proportion of our senior citizens can afford."

The picture was sketched for us in more vivid terms during our hearings by the testimony of scores of elderly people who reported from their own experiences. Too frequently the term "golden years" is surrounded by bitter irony. The composite picture of our senior citizens, rather than being one of the elderly couple living in modest but graceful retirement, is all too often that of lonely men and women, marking off the days in rented rooms, in isolation from the mainstream of community life, eating in cheap cafeterias, and living in anixety under the constant spectre of a major illness which will wipe out whatever savings they may have.

As Dr. Margaret Mead observed during our Boston hearings, in some respects we treat our aged worse than the Eskimos, since they at least allowed the old people themselves to choose death if they had become a burden upon their children and grandchildren.

Throughout our hearings the most crucial area of concern, and the recurrent theme in the testimony of the elderly witnesses was that of health care. For old people spend more on health services than do the young, and this comes at a time when income has been sharply reduced. And I need hardly emphasize to you ladies and gentlemen that physical rehabilitation is the first step toward vocational rehabilitation.

In this respect I was particularly impressed by the testimony of Dr. Jack R. Ewalt, director of the Massachusetts Mental Health Center. Dr. Ewalt cited the National Health Survey which indicates that of the people aged 65 or over covered by the survey, 78 percent had some chronic illness. But, Dr. Ewalt points out, when one examines the figures on chronic illness more closely, one finds that in spite of chronic disorders only 14 percent of the older patients were unable to carry on major activity. Thirty-five percent were in no way limited in activity, an additional 8 percent not limited in any major activity, while 20 percent were in truth limited in the amount and kind of major activity they could carry on. Eighteen percent of the older people could not get around alone.

"Thus, at least 80 percent of older people insofar as their general physical and mental health is concerned, can carry on some type of useful activity."

OLDER FOLK ARE CAPABLE OF USEFUL EFFORT

This then should be the minimum goal of rehabilitation at every level of governmental activity—to assure that at least this 80 percent has the opportunity for independence and the self-respect of engaging in some constructive and useful activity.

It was pointed out also by Dr. Ewalt and other medical experts that many of the mental disorders associated with senility are more an expression of social, psychological, and economic pressures upon a person with lowered brain reserve than they are due to any change in the structure of the brain itself. Therefore, with adequate assessment and rehabilitative programs, many of the aged now simply vegetating in our institutions could be helped to rejoin the active currents of community life.

In addition, there are approximately 450,000 aged in institutions which are loosely classified as nursing homes. Yet, a study indicated that 60 percent of the homes have no registered professional nurse, and one-third have neither a registered nurse nor a licensed practical nurse. Many, if not the majority, of the patients would not need to be institutionalized if we had adequate low-rental housing planned specifically for the aged.

But to achieve our goals—to give every man and woman the will and the opportunity to use what is usable—to assure our senior citizens the right to spend their remaining years in pride and dignity rather than pity and degradation—we must take inventory now. This is not a casual situation which we may face in the luxury of our leisure, for millions of those most directly affected will not be here 5 or 10 years from now. And increasing numbers in the near future will be facing the same problems.

FOUR POINTS ARE STRESSED FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

To meet these problems, I have developed a charter of independence for senior citizens.

First, to assure such independence, hospital and medical insurance must be placed within the reach of the nonindigent aged; and social security and old-age assistance payments must be raised to a realistic level which will make possible a decent minimum standard of living.

Second, we can no longer postpone the creation and expansion of health centers dedicated to providing up-to-date restorative services for the aged who are chronically ill. Nor can we delay further the upgrading of the quality of care in nursing homes for those aged persons who definitely cannot be rehabilitated.

Third, my experience during the past several months as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging has convinced me that there are literally hundreds of thousands of older citizens who really do not belong in the institutions in which they now live. The establishment of extensive home medical care and homemaker services for such men and women is called for, as another step toward the independence of our senior Americans.

Fourth, because independence requires decent living arrangements and opportunities for meaningful activities, the elderly have every right to a greatly expanded program of low-rental housing, the establishment of community centers, and the provision of such services as counseling and adult education.

Certainly these are the minimal goals which must be realized by concerted and coordinated efforts at the local, State, and Federal levels. Needless to say, the realization of these goals will not be achieved without considerable financial outlay. But as the richest Nation in the world we cannot afford to do less.

It is worth remarking, that during recent years we have been consistently decreasing the proportion of our national income being devoted to all welfare purposes, including the aged. As Dr. Seymour Harris of the department of economics of Harvard University pointed out, "* * * despite a rise of gross national product of $124 billion in the last 6 years: that is, from 1950–51 to 1956–57, the rise in welfare expenditures by the Federal Government, exclusive of insurance was only $1.5 billion, or a little more than 1 percent." And as Dr. Harris later remarked, "The Federal Government now seems to have a horror of getting into debt, but no horror at all of getting everybody else into debt. The net result, therefore, is that State and local governments which have much more serious financial problems than Federal Government are asked by the President, for example, in his budget address of 1960, to assume a larger part of the burden of * * * taking care of the old."

NOT IN AGREEMENT WITH NARROW CONSUMER CONCEPT

This record is perfectly consistent with the aims of this administration as expressed by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers last year when he stated "As I understand an economy its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is, I suggest a shockingly gross and materialistic conception of our national destiny. If this is truly the aim—merely to produce and consume things—if this is the aim of the Nation which produced Jefferson and Lincoln, then we are already truly lost.

But I will not accept this low estimate of American aspirations. I believe our national destiny is more than this. I believe it is to continue to maintain and extend the ideals of human dignity, self-respect, and self-fulfillment for every individual. As these values bear upon the theme of this conference, I conclude by quoting an injunction left us by one with a somewhat higher vision of life than that of the bookkeepers of this administration.

In the words of John Galsworthy: "Restoration is at least as much a matter of spirit as of body, and must have as its central truth, body and spirit are inextricably conjoined. To heal the one without the other is impossible. If a man's mind, courage, and interest be enlisted in the cause of his own salvation, healing goes on apace; the sufferer is remade; if not, no mere surgical wonders, no careful nursing, will avail to make a man of him again. Therefore, I would say, from the moment he enters the hospital, look after his mind and his will; give him food; nourish him in subtle ways; increase that nourishment as his strength increases. Give him interest in his future. Light a star for him to fix his eyes on, so that when he steps out of the hospital, you shall not have to begin to train one who, for months,

perhaps years, has been living mindless and will-less, the life of a half-dead creature.

"A niche of usefulness and self-respect exists for every man, however handicapped, but that niche must be found for him. To carry the process of restoration to a point short of this is to leave the cathedral without a spire. To restore him, and with him the future of our countries, that is the sacred work."

One Step Toward the Elimination of the Hazards of Highway Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in March of last year I introduced a bill, H.R. 5436, to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which shall be listed the names of persons refused a motor vehicle operator's license or who have had such licenses revoked. Since that time there have been more than 30,000 people killed on American highways. Property damage in the same period has run well over a billion dollars. Some of those accidents would not have occurred if the drivers involved in them had been refused driver's licenses on the basis of their previous driving records.

In October 1959, an oil truck crashed into the rear of a bus load of college students near North Brunswick, N.J., killing 11 students and a professor and injuring 19 others. The driver of that truck had previously been convicted of eight moving traffic violations in three States.

In December 1959, a cattle truck smashed head-on into a Greyhound bus near Tucson, Ariz., killing nine people. I am informed that the driver of that truck had a half dozen or more traffic convictions in another State.

Mr. Speaker, no legislation can eliminate the hazards of highway driving, and my bill provides only one step. It would give us the means through which the States could limit the worst offenders. In cases like those I have cited, the drivers would not have had driver's licenses if refused or revoked by the States in which their previous offenses occurred. A Federal register would enable other States to know of such offenders, and also refuse them licenses.

In another case which happened several years ago a driver would almost certainly have been denied a driver's license if the bill I have introduced had been in effect. A truck collided head-on with a car in Washington, N.J., in 1953, killing five adults and five children. The driver of the truck, who was passing another truck on a hill, was driving with a Pennsylvania driver's license after his New Jersey license had been suspended.

I want to commend and thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] and his Subcommittee on Health and Safety for their active interest in this and other safety legislation. No one could be more keenly aware of the situation nor sincerely concerned with doing something about it than the chairman of this subcommittee.

I hope my good colleague from Alabama will be successful in his efforts for constructive legislation on this subject in this session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to study the measure I have proposed, H.R. 5436, and give it his support.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before the American National Cattlemen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a speech I made at Dallas, Tex., on January 29 before the American National Cattlemen's Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY U.S. SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, DALLAS, TEX., JANUARY 29, 1960

It is a real privilege to appear before a group of Americans who have steadfastly maintained their independence and who have resolutely refused to barter away their economic freedom.

In this age of subsidy and supports and special privilege it is a refreshing and encouraging experience to visit with men and women who have never been taken in by that beguiling promise of something for nothing—which is the universal bait employed to secure citizen consent for Federal intervention.

For 30 years we have experimented with farm programs. Supports and controls and subsidies now extend to 30 percent of our farm product and after 30 years of failure we are still experimenting.

And what have we accomplished by this 30 years of failure.

We have succeeded in making the farmer the whipping boy of our economy.

We have assessed direct and indirect penalties against the people of America—cattlemen who buy grain are forced to pay an artificial price, cotton mills must buy their raw material in an administrated market, and we have deprived the general public from the benefits which should be theirs—of our improving farm technology.

Oh, and one more thing, we have compelled the taxpayer to foot the bill for political folly.

Perhaps more damaging than all of these—we have, in some measure, created a dependent society.

We are maintaining a herd of boarder cows at public expense.

And let me emphasive here and now that the farmers are the victims and not the creators of our disastrous farm policy.

I've got a bale of figures in my briefcase covering the cost of our folly. I guess six CPA's and three Philadelphia lawyers could make real good sense out of these reports. But I can read the total, and the total "realized cost"—that's Washington language—from 1932 to 1959 has been $17,753 million.

Since 1953, the Government has disposed of some $16 billion in surplus commodities overseas, below cost. And we still have $9 million worth left. Farm surpluses today are three and a half times as large as they were at the beginning of 1953. Carrying charges, transportation, interest and the cost of storage amount to more than $1 billion a year—or $2,739,726 per day.

Well, I am sure that you are familiar with all these figures. But please let me point out that, generally speaking, producers of agricultural products—under the price support and acreage limitation program—are finding rough sledding. While producers outside the program—operating on market place values in response to the law of supply and demand—are faring much better than their subsidized brothers.

Even though this program has been a monumental failure, one thing is obvious—we can't end it overnight.

Out in Arizona, my friends in the cattle business tell me that when you suddenly take a calf away from its mother both the cow and the calf do a lot of bawling.

I suspect that if we were to end subsidies, the mother cow—in this case, the big government interventionists who administer the subsidy program—would outbawl the recipients.

You remember back in the days of the depression when Henry Wallace wanted to plow up every fourth row we had planted—creating an artificial scarcity so prices would rise—most Americans were shocked, and a lot of unkind things were said about Henry Wallace. We are more enlightened than he was—we don't plow the crops under—we just put it all in storage and call it surplus and keep on wondering what to do with it.

Democrats say the Republicans are responsible for the farm mess and the Republicans say it's the Democrats who got us into this fix. The truth is, neither one of these statements is correct. We got ourselves into this mess.

Our trouble commenced when we first accepted the notion that governmental intervention—subsidies, controls, concessions, etc.—could be substituted for the creative strength of a free people.

We forgot momentarily that liberty is indivisible.

We cannot have liberty in any realm of our personal activities unless we are willing to accept liberty in all areas. We cannot have economic freedom and political dictation, nor can we have political freedom and economic dictation.

Radical liberals in our century behave as if they believe liberty could be divided.

Economic freedom is rapidly disappearing as the result of a radical liberal attempt to create a society in which one segment of the economy is subsidized while another segment is controlled and a third segment asks to operate on the marketplace values.

The tragic thing about all of these programs of big Government intervention is that they invariably produce waste and create a dependent society. What is more destructive is the creation of a soft and weak people—conditioned to look to big government for the solution of every problem. This was the pattern which preceded the downfall of Egypt, and Rome, and Greece. Are we to sit idly by and witness the destruction of this Republic?

Sophisticated modern know-it-alls have almost succeeded in selling us the destructive maxims of the welfare state. And I would suggest now is the time to recall the truth of those copybook admonitions we cherished as children.

I would suggest that you and I remember, and probably still respect, that commonsense, colloquial admonition "Waste not, want not."

If we are to be victorious in this cold-war struggle against the alien doctrine of communism, we cannot afford to continue wasting human resources; nor can we continue to proceed on the assumption that man's creative ability can be blueprinted and pigeonholed.

Each year in Washington the statisticians with their slide rules have estimated the total wheat crop. They do this with cotton and the other control commodities. Well, let me tell you what has happened to their estimates of cotton production.

The cotton farmers in Arizona, when they found their planting limited to a certain number of acres, improved their technology. They used more fertilizer, they were more careful in their cultivation, and they succeeded in producing a greater total yield of cotton on a substantially decreased number of acres.

When you tell a free American that he can't do something, or try to fence him in, the chances are his inventive genius and tenacity of purpose will find a way to get around the fences and accomplish the thing he was told he couldn't do.

I am reliably informed, for example, that wheat farmers in the semiarid lands of eastern Washington have developed a strain of wheat which resulted in a doubling of the yield per acre.

Does it make sense that this increase of yield and improved technology should become a storage headache for all the people when it should be a blessing for all people?

We are not going to answer the problems created by our unsuccessful approach to them by imposing more limitations.

No one has yet suggested we should set up a governmental agency and put price supports under automobiles or telephones, televisions, or refrigerators, or any of the products of manufacturing.

I did read once the humorous suggestion of a professional writer who proposed that the Government establish a word bank in Washington—in order that he might have a market for his total output. He suggested the Government buy the words he couldn't sell in the open market and put them in a surplus bank. Or how about the buggy whip manufacturer who had no more markets for his product and suggested that the Government buy them at $1.25 and sell them to Europe at $1.

We accepted governmental intervention in the field of agriculture on the assurance of its sponsors that we would achieve these objectives: (1) Assure the farmer an income commensurate with that enjoyed by men in other occupations; (2) produce better food at lower costs; (3) conserve, rather than waste, our natural resources.

The difficult problem of farm surpluses was created by the radical liberal group who mistakenly believed they could apply controls and central planning to only one segment of the Nation's economic life.

Not long ago, one of the Democrat presidential hopefuls made a speech on the west coast in which he deplored the fact that Americans had gone soft.

I do not think Americans have gone soft, but if we have, I would suggest it is the direct result of the spoon-fed, administered society which the radical liberals have attempted to create here—it is the result of our failure to deal bluntly and openly with unpleasant problems and difficult situations.

You and I, as citizens of this Republic, must accept a portion of the responsibility for the present dilemma in which the farmer finds himself.

Commonsense tells us the only way to rescue the farmer and to reestablish his dignity in our economy is to get farm products back on the open market and free the farmer of governmental controls and intervention.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt has suggested the way to do this was to end all farm subsidies and payments on crops not already planted. And then to sell back to the farmers—at prices lower than the cost of production—all the surpluses now being held in Government storage.

Mr. Hazlitt pointed out that no farmer would grow crops when he could buy the crops from the Government for less than the cost of production. He suggested that most farmers would take advantage of the situation to build up the soil and adopt practices which would assure less expensive production when it became necessary to produce crops once more.

Mr. Hazlitt also pointed out the farmers would conform to market demands in the resale of the surplus commodities bought back from the Government.

Since the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, the Republican Secretary Benson has tried desperately to end the present wasteful practices and restore marketplace values in the agricultural industry.

Political pressures and the farming of the farmer for votes, rather than voting for the farmers' good, has prevented this. I would suggest the farm program is only one symptom of the distressing malady of big government intervention which threatens the economy and the future of this Nation.

You and I must decide whether we intend to continue down the road of Federal aid and Federal subsidy. Last year the Federal Congress passed the so-called Defense Education Act. This year they are being urged to pass a Federal subsidy for the constructions of schools. We have Federal aid for airports and Federal aid for highways. These programs always start small, and end big, and the bureaus administrating these programs multiply like rabbits—and and just as hard to kill off.

If we continue down this road, we will become a people who will be leaning on Uncle Sam—and the more we lean, the greater the habit becomes. And no people dependent upon the subsidies of central government can claim to be free.

The preservation of the Republic is not a partisan political issue. We are not divided as Republicans or Democrats. Indeed, had it not been for the valiant efforts of many effective and dedicated Democrats, we might be much closer to complete socializing than we now are.

Growing cattle isn't all beer and skittles. Merchants and manufacturers and doctors and dentists have their problems. But 170 years of progress should certainly convince us that free men, free from governmental interference, produce more, distribute more and contribute more to man's ultimate destiny than a race of dependent, controlled creatures.

I would suggest this Nation still has the strength and courage to face the truth—to reverse the course we have been following the past 30 years—to turn our backs on the errors we have made without indulging in the luxury of name calling and recriminations.

Washington won't do this, and no remote governmental corporation can do this. But you and I can—and must. By apathy and greed we created this situation—with courage and sacrifice we can correct it.

We can reject self-indulgence and demand self-sufficiency.

We can return to those principles of thrift, industry and person-to-person charity which conquered this hostile continent and made America the goal and the beacon light for all men, everywhere.

Declaration of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a declaration of conscience made by the three cochairmen of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Memphis, Tenn.

One of the signers of this declaration is Hon. Walter Chandler, my immediate predecessor in the Congress, who rendered distinguished service to our district and to the Nation as a senior member of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Signing this statement with him is Herbert Moriarty, Jr., a fine lawyer, who represents the Catholic faith in this roundtable. The third signer is Lester A. Rosen, a man of outstanding character, who represents the Jews in Memphis on this committee.

All of us in Memphis are extremely happy that men and women of all religious convictions have lived in a spirit of harmony, understanding, and mutual love. To me, it is one of the substantial contributions made by a united citizenship.

It is the hope of the people of my congressional district that no religious issue will be injected in this coming national election. Likewise, there should be no distinction made as to where a man be born in this great country of ours. I have long felt that what adds to the happiness and prosperity of one section of the United States increases the sum total of happiness and strength to the Nation as a whole.

This declaration of conscience is so well written and is so fundamentally sound that I invite the attention of all of my colleagues to a thoughtful reading of it, and I hope that the wide distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to people all over our country and even abroad shall bring stimulation to the people everywhere toward sober and thoughtful dedication to the ideals of true brotherhood.

DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE

The Memphis Round Table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews reaffirms its principal purpose of espousing the idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

It is our profound conviction that the sublime and sacred ideals of brotherhood must find expression in all areas of human relation. At this time in our national life when, as free Americans, we are privileged to participate in a great national election, it is our fervent hope that the ideal of brotherhood will prevail. We believe that the injection of religious issues in a political campaign is contrary to the spirit of Americanism and inimical to the best interests of our beloved Nation.

We heed and echo the warning of President Eisenhower that "in this age when so much is expected and required of America, we can ill afford to waste a single day combating bigotry or prejudice at home."

We, therefore, oppose any appeal to religious prejudice. Without expressing any partisanship in favor of, or in opposition to, any political party or candidate for public office, we call upon all American citizens to affirm, by their attitudes and actions, their belief that the members of any religious denomination shall be eligible to serve our Nation and to enjoy any honors which its people may confer.

WALTER CHANDLER,
HERBERT MORIARTY, Jr.,
LESTER A. ROSEN,
Cochairmen of the Memphis Round Table of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The New South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during those dark and bleak days after the War Between the States, the voice of a truly great spokesman of the New South was heard throughout our United States. His name was Henry W. Grady. He was editor of the Atlanta Constitution, but more than that, he was both a prophet and an architect of the future.

I was impressed by a speech made a few days ago by Mr. Grady's grandson, himself now a figure of national prominence. He is Mr. Eugene R. Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The address was made before the New York Southern Society in New York City last January 15.

In his speech, Mr. Black sums up the many accomplishments of the South since his grandfather's time. He also calls upon the present generation of Americans to conquer the many challenges facing them in the world today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Black's excellent speech be printed at this point in the RECORD for the information and inspiration of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, BEFORE THE NEW YORK SOUTHERN SOCIETY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 15, 1960

I am indeed happy to be asked to speak where my father and my grandfather appeared in their day.

I would like to recall tonight something of the vision which drove Mr. Grady up and down this country waving the banner of the new South in Boston and New York and challenging his fellow southerners to erase the stigma of defeat and humiliation through working hard and getting rich.

This vision was an all-consuming passion with him. He often quoted a conversation with his son—my uncle—which took place on the train from Washington to New York and in which his son asked, "Papa, what do you want me to do when I get grown?" "My son," Mr. Grady answered, "I want you to give your life without stint or hindrance until Georgia blooms as Pennsylvania looks today." And so did Mr. Grady, in fact, give his life.

He saw the South before the war of secession as being enslaved by slavery—white and black alike mired in poverty and the whole region in pawn to and dependent on others for much of the wherewithal necessary for modern economic life. He bridled under this dependence for he saw that what was good and unique in southern traditions could not thrive unless the region achieved a measure of self-sufficiency through keeping up with the economic development of the times.

One of his most famous stories revolved around just this point. He told of attending the funeral of a "one gallus" friend of his in Pickens County, Ga., and how the whole affair had upset him. "At that funeral," Mr. Grady said, "they cut through solid marble to make his grave, and yet the little tombstone they put above him was from Vermont. They buried him in the heart of a pine forest, and yet the pine coffin was imported from Cincinnati. They buried him with touch of an iron mine and yet the nails in his coffin and the iron shovel that dug his grave were imported from Pittsburgh. They buried him on the side of the best sheep-grazing country on earth and yet the wool in the coffin bands and the coffin bands themselves were brought in from Massachusetts. They buried him in a New York coat and a Boston pair of shoes and a pair of breeches from Chicago and a shirt from Cleveland. The South didn't furnish a thing on earth for that funeral but the corpse and the hole in the ground."

The new South was the title of Mr. Grady's speech, which Mr. Jackson referred to, before the New England Society at its annual banquet in 1866—the year the New York Southern Society was founded. Despite the profuse hospitality of his hosts, it is hard for me ont to believe that my grandfather didn't feel a bit like Daniel walking into the lion's den that evening. Mr. Grady was not then a nationally known figure; he was just a newspaper editor from Atlanta who had the gift of golden words. His speech was preceded by a long, florid—and very pious—tribute to the "glorious Union armies" by Dr. DeWitt Talmage and his dinner partner was none other than Gen. William Tecumsah Sherman.

But Mr. Grady warmed to his subject, as was his custom, spinning out colorful figures, tendering elaborate compliments—often with a sharp point nestled in the cotton of his words—and digressing for a self-deprecating joke along the way. He paid a handsome tribute to Abraham Lincoln—"that typical American, the sum of Puritan and Cavalier." He answered Dr. Talmadge's tribute with a tribute of his own to the defeated armies at Appomattox, and he topped it off with a quote from an aprocryphal soldier who was said to have remarked to his comrades, "You may leave the South if you want to, but I am going to Sandersville, kiss my wife, and raise a crop, and if the Yankees fool with me anymore I will whip 'em again."

He even tilted his lance at General Sherman who, he said, "is considered an able man in our parts, although some people think he is kind of careless with fire."

But when he reached his favorite subject—the New South—he pulled out all the stops. "We have sowed towns and cities in the place of theories and put business above politics," he said. "We have challenged your spinners in Massachusetts and your iron-makers in Pennsylvania. We have reduced the commercial rate of interest from 24 percent to 4 percent and are floating 4-percent bonds. We have established thrift in the city and country. We have fallen in love with work. We have restored comfort to homes from which culture and elegance never departed. We have let economy take root and spread among us as rank as the crabgrass which sprung from General Sherman's cavalry camps. Above all, we know that we have achieved in these piping times of peace a fuller independence for the South than that which our fathers sought to win in the forum with their eloquence or compel on the field by their swords."

Of course, Mr. Grady was a little ahead of himself. Perhaps he anticipated the great growth of the South a bit because J. Pierpont Morgan was in his audience and everybody khows that an investment banker in hand is worth several in the bush.

But Mr. Grady's prophecies have, in fact, come true. If the South is still plagued with many problems as the result of its unique heritage, it has in the last 30 years become a region of great economic strength in the strongest nation in the world. There are fewer farmers and less farmland under plow in the South now than there were, say, in 1920; but half again as much is being harvested from each acre, and the income of the South's farmer today is two-thirds higher in real purchasing power than it was in 1920. The growth of manufacturing in the New South is a very familiar story to all of you; in this past year alone 1,000 new manufacturing enterprises were established in the South. But sometimes overlooked is the growth of trade and service industries—a growth that has actually provided more new employment and new wealth in the South than has manufacturing (though much of it was, of course, dependent on manufacturing). There is a market in the South today which wasn't dreamt of even as late as 1939.

Economic development is like a breeder reactor: it produces its own fuel. This is what has been happening in the New South for three decades now.

And while the dangers of overcentralization in Washington still fire southern politicians as they did in Henry Grady's day, who's to deny that the South is much less vulnerable, much more independent today than it was then? The unique qualities, the very special traditions which make the South the most distinctive of all American regions are much better safeguarded now in the midst of relative prosperity than they were in the very dependent days of the last century.

I would speak, in conclusion, of one southern tradition which, I think, is especially important today. I refer to the South's traditional awareness of the world outside our borders. The South never succumbed to one temptation that infected most other regions of the country—the temptation to retreat from world problems into a self-righteous isolationism.

Guided by its own self-interest at the time, it is true, the South nonetheless provided the bulk of the political opposition to the sorry policies of economic and political nationalism which disfigured the American record in the 1920's and so helped to set the stage for World War II.

In the thirties it was a Tennessean, Cordell Hull, who masterminded the enlightened Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and it was southerners who piloted it through Congress; today one-third of the foreign trade of the United States passes through southern ports.

In the forties and fifties it was the Texan, Tom Connally, the Kentuckian Alben Barkley, the Georgian, Walter George, and the Carolinian, Jim Richards, among others who helped lead the small group in Congress most closely identified with policies designed to deal with the realities of a world in which the United States had grown into a position of preeminent power. All these men, and many southern leaders in Congress today, had the courage to realize early in the game that the United States, thanks to our ideas

and achievements, had to be prepared to live with the impact of its power on the world and to try to aid others struggling to make peace with the 20th century on terms compatible with the continued growth of individual freedom and well-being.

It was logical that the South should produce leaders to match today's most exacting challenge. The South was never quite so underdeveloped a country as we use the term today; even in the low days of the early 1930's, per capita incomes in the South were greater than such rich countries as France and Holland. But the South, unique even among American regions, has experienced profoundly the kind of progress that comes with falling in love with work and with placing business above politics. There is no more valuable experience I know of in dealing with the problems which our country faces today.

For today all sorts of historic political problems—problems of the relations among nations and races; of the relations between the individual and the state—have become inextricably enmeshed in the fact of widespread poverty which prevails over more than half the globe—a kind of poverty that is like nothing we have ever experienced in this country. The sources of this poverty are many and varied; it is bound up in ignorance and pride; in the contrary effects of the application of a modern science which can lower a death rate by half much quicker than it can increase the volume of food available to feed exploding populations. It comes about as a result of people clinging to old habits and attitudes toward life when these habits and attitudes have been rendered inadequate by economic development that has already taken place.

Simply put, the task the United States faces today is to preserve the balance of hope at a time when the balance of power is only precariously maintained by the production of weapons capable of destroying civilization. And unless more of the world can see hope for an escape from their poverty—an escape which does not do violence to our ideals of individual freedom and tolerance among nations—then our own hopes for a world less threatened by war and less tempted by totalitarian doctrines are bound to go aglimmering.

The people in these poor countries are searching for an escape from an agonizing human predicament—one which we must share with them since it involves our own future security and well-being. We who found an escape from our own agonizing predicament through the process of getting rich—or at least of getting less poor—have much to offer to these people by way of guidance and understanding.

I have met around the world hundreds of leaders who believe after the fashion of Henry Grady that they can, through hard work and sticking to business, achieve a much truer and fuller independence than they can ever achieve through international debate and international conflict. But these men and women are beset on all sides with frustrations and temptations to seek an escape from their poverty, not forward but backward into chaos or tyranny. They must have hope in order to have the courage of convictions that, by and large, they received from our ideas and accomplishments. We can, if we want, give them a crucial measure of hope, and we should do so, for these people are our natural allies.

Progress, perhaps, can best be defined as a series of escapes from one predicament to another, with the quality of hope sustaining more and more along the way. Nowhere in history has a society devised a way of life so spectacularly successful by this definition of progress as here in the United States. If this success is more than just an accident, brought about by favorable historic and economic conditions, then we can and will find ways of helping these far-off people to escape their present predicament into one more hopeful and more compatible with our ideals of freedom and tolerance, and of guiding their feet, and our own, into the way of peace.

Scouting's Golden Jubilee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America will observe the 50th anniversary of their founding during the week of February 7 through 13. The phenomenal growth of the Boy Scout movement in the last 50 years is indeed worthy of our attention, and I would like to take this opportunity to review briefly the many services rendered to the American people by the members of this fine organization.

A résumé of the activities, campaigns, and projects undertaken by the Boy Scouts in the past half century immediately reveals service, unselfish and unstinting, freely given with no thought of personal reward, as the outstanding characteristic possessed by all boys who have taken the Scout oath.

In 1914 Scouts started work with the National Safety Council on safety-first principles. 1915 was a year for special emphasis on the training of volunteers to properly serve American youth through Scouting, and the National Education Association endorsed the Boy Scout program. The war years of 1917 and 1918 saw Scouts all over the country cultivating home gardens, cooperating with the Red Cross through its local chapters, working with the Navy Department in organizing an Emergency Coast Patrol along the seacoast towns, and doing nationwide service in the influenza epidemic. The slogan "The War Is Over, but Our Work Is Not" was adopted in 1919 and President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed a special "Boy Scout Week" in recognition of Scouting's warwork.

Boy Scouts assist in sanitary survey of several cities; Scouts utilized as forest guides and fire wardens; a group of Scouts serve in escorting the body of the Unknown Soldier from the ship to the Capitol; War Department commends Scouts for service in connection with Knickerbocker Theater disaster in Washington, D.C.; trees planted by the Boy Scouts reach into the millions; Boy Scouts continue great forest protection work; special emergency service in connection with tornadoes, earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, and fires; Scouts build trails in national parks; Scouts serve as ushers and flagbearers at the national conventions of the leading political parties; Boy Scouts work with relief agencies toward relief of the unemployed; scouting plays an increasing part in the rehabilitation of youth in juvenile institutions; Scouts adopt slogan of "We, Too, Have a Job to Do" during World War II and prove once again their usefulness in time of war as well as peace. And so the long list of achievements is added to year after year as the Boy Scouts of America continue to serve the Nation—always ready, always willing to do a good turn, from the small, individual kindness to the nationwide campaigns. It seems to me that the record speaks for itself and it is impossible to overestimate the impact for good the scouting movement has had at all levels of our national life.

I would like now to mention two aspects of scouting which I believe are of particular significance. One is the high caliber of the men who have dedicated themselves to the Scouting movement for it is through their skills, their deep understanding of a boy's needs and their inspired leadership that boys are attracted to scouting. These volunteer leaders, who now number well over 500,000, are well trained in courses arranged by the National Council. However, it is not simply their technical ability, their patience, and their willingness to give so generously of their time and energy that makes them invaluable leaders in this organization, but also by the example they set in their personal lives which creates enthusiasm for the ideals of Scouting in the young man. We are fortunate in the Second District of Kentucky in having men who recognize the vital importance of instilling in our youngsters the ideals of honesty, patriotism, service, and Godliness. To these leaders of the Boy Scouts of America I offer my gratitude for the wonderful work they are doing with the youth of our Nation.

The other aspect of the Boy Scout program which I feel is especially pertinent at this time is its effectiveness in combating juvenile delinquency. In my section of Kentucky we have Boy Scout troops not juvenile gangs. The boy's natural desire for acceptance, competition, and association with other boys his age is fully satisfied in the Scout troop, and the bid for attention through acts of violence is not necessary. As the number of boys participating in the scouting program increases, the incidence of juvenile delinquency decreases proportionately.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the Boy Scouts of America and their leaders on the celebration of their golden jubilee year and wish them continued success in all their endeavors. The strength of America depends on the strength of the rising generation, and the Boy Scouts of America are doing more than any other organization I know to prepare our youth to meet the challenges of tomorrow with stout hearts and sound principles.

Memorial to Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson won the respect of many men in many nations dur-

ing his term as President of the United States. In seeking justice for all peoples he made it clear that this principle, which guides American democracy, should be extended to all nations.

An editorial in the Hairenik Weekly of January 28, 1960, sums up the feeling of admiration for Wilson felt by one group, the Armenian Americans.

The special interest of New Jersey in this adopted son who served as Governor before he became President is reflected in an editorial which appeared in the January 30 issue of the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N.J.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hairenik Weekly, Jan. 28, 1960]

THE WILSON MEMORIAL

The project for the erection of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial comparable in dignity and magnificence to those of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson, now being pressed by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, is a movement which is close to the heart of every Armenian American. As a matter of fact, no extraordinary effort is necessary to generate enthusiasm as far as the Armenians are concerned.

Woodrow Wilson, the great and humanitarian American President, entered into the Armenian picture during the postwar period of World War I when the warring nations, assembled at the Paris Peace Conference, were wrestling with the solution of the problems which confronted the world. There were the victors and the vanquished. There had been aggression and the repression of that aggression. Great wrongs had been committed by nation against nation.

One of the wronged nations whose status demanded immediate solution were the Armenians who, fearfully decimated by the infamous Turkish deportations, had rallied themselves, had fought last ditch battles, and in the face of annihilation, had fiercely defended themselves, had repelled their mortal enemy, and had won their independence.

In those trying days, President Wilson had posed as the greatest champion of small wronged peoples, foremost among them the Armenians, who became the object of his special concern and indefatigable labor. He it was who insisted on the complete liberation of the captive races of the former Ottoman Empire; he it was who insisted on the independence of Armenia, and he it was who eventually drew the historic boundaries of Armenia.

At that time, so great was the charm of the American President that almost all the small and oppressed peoples of the world hailed him as a veritable messiah. Most worshipful of him among these were the Armenian people who, practically, reposed all their hopes for final liberation in the authority of his word.

Even before and after the declaration of Armenia's independence, there were forces afoot to put the young Republic under the mandate of a powerful European country. This movement was advanced, not in contradiction of the desirability of absolute independence which, under normal circumstances would be the wish of every proud nation, but it was due to considerations of expediency and practicability.

It was realized that the Armenian people, although now independent, had been fearfully decimated by their mortal enemy. They were an exhausted and weakened people. They had been impoverished by the ravages of the massacres, the loot and the destruction which followed. They had no economy, no means of transportation, no communication media, no resources, no reserve supplies to tide them over. They had to start from scratch.

Furthermore, they were surrounded by neighbors who were not friendly, and who still posed a menace to the safety of the new state. They needed security and support to consolidate the nation.

Under the circumstances, the desirability was advanced, both by the Armenians themselves, and their friends the world powers, of a period of protectorate under a mandate until such time when the new state could stand on its feet, without compromising or jeopardizing the nation's independence.

Woodrow Wilson was a strong advocate of the mandate. He passionately wanted that his country would assume that mandate, he wanted to give the Armenians the security they wanted, he wanted to help the Armenians. And yet there were forces beyond his control. There were well-intentioned Americans who both wanted to help the Armenians, and yet they were opposed to the idea of a mandate. They wanted to recognize the independence of Armenia right away, and they even wanted to extend the new republic a financial loan.

Wilson's wish was rejected and the mandate failed. Yet, even this day, who knows its fateful consequences? Who knows if the West today might have profited had the American mandate gone through?

Had America assumed the mandate, Armenia would still be free today, and we venture to say, even the whole of the Caucasus might have been saved from the encroachments of the Soviet, even as Greece was saved through American intervention, and even as Persia was saved from Soviet conquest.

All the same, all of this is water over the dam. Postmortem regrets avail little in repairing the damage that has been done. And yet, the Armenians are grateful to Woodrow Wilson, the immortal President, for what he wanted, and tried to do for the Armenians.

A Woodrow Wilson memorial, no matter what the form, shall always be a sacred shrine, where the Armenians will make their pilgrimages, to offer a prayer, and to bless the memory of their incomparable friend and benefactor.

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Jan. 30, 1960]

HONORING OUR OWN MAN WHO

New Jersey has boasted many a giant in many a field, but the State has had only one native son who became President of the United States. An adopted son who also achieved that office was considerably more illustrious. That, of course, was Woodrow Wilson. He was born in Virginia. But he was Governor of New Jersey in 1912 when first elected President.

Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, has, with 41 other Senators as cosponsors, introduced a resolution to create a Wilson memorial. The bill sets up a commission to decide whether the memorial should be a functional one, such as an institution or a foundation, or should be another bronze or temple.

As to the form the memorial should take there can be some honest difference of opinion. It seems incredible any one would oppose the basic idea.

From Herbert Hoover's scholarly study of Mr. Wilson's Presidency we know it was not a wholly happy one. He was President during the first great war involving all the major nations of the world, gallantly as he tried to keep the United States out of it. He was the first authentic proponent of true international mediation in the League of Nations, only to be rebuffed in his own country. If he was almost an ascetic, he was also brilliant and wholly sincere.

Surely Mr. WILLIAM's proposal will receive the support if deserves—first, one hopes, from New Jersey.

Statement of Gov. John Patterson, of Alabama, on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT OF GOV. JOHN PATTERSON, OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE RULES AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBURARY 2, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, my name is John Patterson and I am the Governor of the State of Alabama. I am presently serving a 4-year term which began January 19, 1959. Prior to that date I served as attorney general of Alabama from January 18, 1955, to January 19, 1959. I wish to thank you for the opportunity that you have given me to testify before you on this occasion.

I wish to voice my strong opposition to bills S. 2535, S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2722, S. 2783, and S. 2814 now pending before your committee. These bills are far reaching in nature and seek to make radical changes in our basic laws. If these bills are enacted into law the implementation of such laws will lead to chaos and bitterness, and a further deterioration of the relations between the States and Federal Government. If these bills are enacted into law they could well lead to a breakdown of the election machinery in many States. I feel that I know the sentiment of the people of Alabama, and I know that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of my State are opposed to the passage of these bills. As Governor of the State, I feel it my duty to tell you the feeling of our people.

The enactment of these bills will lead to grave consequences and these bills will not succeed in doing that which the authors of the bills intend.

S. 2535 seeks to establish an agency of Congress authorized to conduct elections and register voters in certain areas under certain conditions. This bill seeks to establish a Congressional Elections Commission for this purpose. Bills S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2783 and S. 2814 are similar and provide that where a person's application to register to vote has been denied and such person believes himself to be qualified under State law, and believes that he has been denied registration because of race, religion, color, or national origin, he may file a petition with the President, requesting that a Federal registrar be appointed for the district in which such person lives.

The bills further provide that when the President receives not less than nine petitions within 1 year from persons in the same registration district, he shall refer such petitions to the Civil Rights Commission for investigation. If the Civil Rights Commission determines that such persons are being denied the right to vote solely because of

their race, religion, color, or national origin, the Commission shall certify such information to the President.

The President then, under these bills, would appoint a Federal registrar for the district involved and the registrar would accept registration applications from all persons in the district who claim that they are being denied the right to vote because of race, religion, color, or national origin. If the Federal registrar determines that the applicants are qualified under the State law he shall certify the names to the State election officials, and such persons would have the right to vote in any election where Federal officials are being elected. The bills place a fine and penitentiary sentence on any State official who does not abide by the decisions made by the Federal registrar.

S. 2535 is similar to the aforementioned bills in that it attempts to do the same thing except it provides for a Registration of Voters Commission instead of Federal registrars.

S. 2722 requires State officials to preserve all registration and voting records of all elections for a period of 5 years after the making of the record.

I know that the members of the committee are familiar with these bills; however, I have attempted to summarize them briefly for the purpose of showing that we are dealing here with something new in the way of legislation, and to further show what a radical departure this procedure is from any registration procedure that any State has ever had before.

The Constitution of the United States does not give Congress power to prescribe the qualifications of electors in the States. The Constitution leaves the setting of the qualifications of voters to the States. In my opinion these aforementioned bills now under consideration are clearly unconstitutional. They are an attempt by the Federal Government to set the qualifications of electors in the States and to put Federal officials actually in charge of elections in the States. Such action is a usurpation of the powers of the States by the Federal Government and is a clear violation of the sovereign rights of every State in the Union.

The sponsors of these bills are inferring that our State officials are violating their oaths of office. I resent this inference. I can truthfully say of my own personal knowledge that the officials of my State are obeying the law, doing a good job, and living up to their oaths of office. This type of legislation is an insult to the officials of every State in the Union and obviously is politically inspired.

The right to vote is conferred and safeguarded by each State constitution. The laws of Alabama setting out the qualifications for electors are fair, just, reasonable, and impartial.

Adequate remedies exist to protect each and every individual in his right to register and vote. No one can come before this committee and truthfully tell you that the laws of my State protecting the right to vote are not adequate. If a person in Alabama files an application with the board of registrars of his county asking that he be placed on the list of qualified voters and the board of registrars denies his application, the applicant has the right of appeal, without giving security for costs, within 30 days after such denial, by filing a petition in the circuit court at law or court of like jurisdiction held for the county in which he seeks to register. The petitioner must allege that he is a citizen of the United States, over the age of 21 years, has the qualifications as to residence prescribed in section 178 of the constitution of Alabama and is entitled to register to vote under the provisions of the constitution. The issues are tried in the court in the same manner and under the same rules as other cases are tried, and by a jury if the petitioner demands it. The circuit solicitor defends the action for the State. If the petitioner wins his case in the lower court, the State has no appeal and the petitioner's name goes on the qualified voter list forthwith.

If he loses his case in the lower court, he can appeal to the supreme court within 30 days from the date of the judgment. If the petitioner loses his appeal in the State supreme court, he can appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. A judgment in favor of the petitioner under our law entitles him to be registered as of the date of filing his original application with the board of registrars. This procedure is similar in all States and it is a proceeding whereby a person's rights are tested by the judiciary, which is as it should be. I submit to you that this is a full and adequate remedy for each and every individual who claims that he has been denied the right to register as a voter because of race, religion, color, or national origin, or for any other reasons which he might think unconstitutional.

I can truthfully say that I cannot recall a single instance where a Negro has filed an appeal under our State statutes claiming that he had been illegally denied the right to register. Furthermore, I can truthfully state that since January 18, 1955, when I took office as attorney general, not a single Negro has taken an appeal under our statutes providing for appeals where boards of registrars have turned down applications to register.

How can anyone come in here and truthfully say to you that our laws are inadequate when none of the complaining Negroes have taken advantage of our statutes. How can anyone say that the State of Alabama has denied citizens the right to vote when they have not even tried to use the remedies which the State gives them to protect their rights. The mode by which they may obtain justice is clearly marked out by the State law. It is so plain and simple that any citizen may readily avail himself of it. Yet the few complaining persons have not done so. Why?

I feel that the real reason why the agitators, who are constantly bringing up this issue, have not resorted to our courts for relief, if they are entitled to such relief, is that the Federal courts have consistently held that class actions will not lie in cases testing the qualifications of persons to vote. The courts have consistently held that each individual case and each individual's qualifications to vote must rest upon the facts in each individual case and that, of course, is as it should be. The proponents of this type of legislation under consideration by this committee are not content to seek individual redress through the courts. That's too slow for them.

What they seek is a procedure which circumvents the courts and sets up an administrative procedure whereby Negroes can be herded together and marched in battalion formation to the polling places under the watchful eyes of Federal registrars and Federal marshals to register and vote whether or not they can read and write, and whether or not they are qualified otherwise under State laws. The proponents of this legislation are not interested in a judicial determination of an individual's rights, but only in mass registration before the next election. We have not had anything in the South similar to Federal registrars as outlined in these bills since Federal troops occupied the South during reconstruction days.

I submit to you that the statutory procedures for testing a person's right to vote under our State law are full, adequate, and reasonable. This is the proper and orderly way for a person to have determined his right to vote if he feels that it has been illegally denied. Certainly, this committee, and this Congress, should require these complaining people to at least try to seek relief under the existing laws, which heretofore they have not done, before this committee or this Congress should resort to such a radical procedure as sending Federal registrars into the South to usurp the powers of our State officials and to usurp the powers of our courts. Make these complainants go to the courts for their relief. They have not done so and I submit to you if you make them, their rights will be promptly and adequately determined.

S. 2814, S. 2783, S2719, and S. 2684 provide for investigations to be made by the Civil Rights Commission in cases where individuals claim they have been denied the right to vote because of race, religion, color or national origin. I wish to voice my strong objections again to the actions of the Civil Rights Commission, and I urge you not to extend the authority of that body. The recent actions of the Civil Rights Commission damaged race relations in the South and further injured the already strained relations between the States and Federal Government. The Commission failed to do anything constructive but, on the contrary, further widened the breach existing between the races. It harassed and intimidated our State and local officials. Its actions have made it difficult for us to find responsible citizens who are willing to serve as members of the boards of registrars.

The Commission attempted to sit in judgment over the manner in which our officials conducted their offices. It interfered with the operation of our courts. The Commission attempted to arrogate unto itself powers which it did not, and could not constitutionally possess.

It claimed to be "a roving grand jury" with the powers of a common-law grand jury, a position legally untenable. The Commission attempted to go on "fishing expeditions" in the records of judicial officers. It subpenaed our State officials to hearings at distant places from their homes and put them on the witness stand under spotlights and before batteries of nationwide television cameras. No room or seats were provided for counsel of the public officials and the Commission would not allow attorneys for the officials to make objections. The State officials were in effect placed on trial by the Commission and publicly harassed and intimidated. The Commission attempted to go far beyond its factfinding powers, and hearings were conducted in a circus-like arena and no semblance of due process was accorded our State officials.

It is inconceivable that persons trained in the law would be a party to conducting such hearings as were conducted by the Civil Rights Commission. The Commission accused our public officials of violating the law, but refused to divulge the names of their accusers or to advise them of the nature of the charges against them. The Commission refused to permit the State officials' counsel to properly represent them and refused to allow them to cross-examine the witnesses who appeared against them. In fact, the actions of the Civil Rights Commission were so reprehensible that it was enjoined from conducting any further hearings by the Federal court in Shreveport, La., until the constitutionality of their procedures could be tested by higher courts. The Commission came into the South ostensibly to seek facts but in reality it was seeking publicity and notoriety.

I take issue with the report filed before Congress by the Civil Rights Commission. The information in that report is biased and prejudiced and is not based upon proper investigation. A large portion of the report of the Civil Rights Commission is in the form of editorials by the Commission's staff writers. The actions of the Civil Rights Commission in Alabama created ill will and hos-

tility between the people of my State and the Federal Government. The Commission accomplished nothing but its actions seriously injured race relations in the South. I ask you not to favorably consider any more legislation which would enlarge the powers of the Civil Rights Commission. Such action would not be in the best interest of our Nation.

No public official cares to serve in public office when he is subjected to harassment and intimidation by agents of the Civil Rights Commission, or any agency for that matter. No person likes to accept an appointment as a member of a board of registrars when he knows that he will be immediately visited by Federal investigators and run the risk of immediate suit in Federal courts seeking injunctive relief and damages. Recently President Eisenhower stated that he was having difficulty finding persons willing to accept appointment to fill the vacancy on the Civil Rights Commission for, as he said people do not like to be harassed.

The Attorney General of the United States and the Civil Rights Commission have apparently declared open war upon all members of State boards of registrars and they are making it difficult for us to find people who are willing to serve in that capacity. In most States the members of boards of registrars do not receive much pay and they agree to serve usually as a public service. They cannot afford lawyers to defend them, nor can they afford to attend court or hearings in distant places which takes them away from their work and families.

No member of a board of registrars likes to have a Federal agent peering over his shoulder, passing upon everything that he does and threatening to take him to court with every act. If the actions of the Federal Government in this regard continue and if "Federal registrars" are sent into the South along with the Civil Rights Commission investigators to carry out the provisions of the aforementioned bills, it could well lead to a breakdown of all our election machinery. It will certainly lead to bitterness and misunderstanding and hostility between the State and Federal officials. The people will suffer the consequences. I can tell you that it would be practically impossible to get people to serve as election officials if they are dictated to, threatened, and harassed by "Federal registrars" and Federal agents. It is plain to see that the so-called Federal registrar plan will result in utter failure and bring confusion and chaos to our electoral system.

Due to the action of the Civil Rights Commission, we have been unable to get responsible people to accept positions on the boards of registrars in Macon and Dallas Counties, Ala. I have appointed numerous persons to fill these positions and they have declined stating that they do not feel that they should have to subject themselves to public intimidation and harassment by Federal agents. The responsibility for the breakdown of our registration machinery in these counties rests squarely at the doorstep of the Federal Government. I feel confident that we will be able to find someone to serve on these boards soon, if we can have some assurance from the Federal Government that we will be able to carry out our duties within the framework of our laws without harassment and intimidation.

In conclusion, I want to again voice my strong opposition to all the aforementioned bills. They are clearly unconstitutional. They invade an area which has always been left exclusively to the States. The States have adequate remedies for all persons to quickly and promptly test their right to vote.

S. 2722 requiring the preservation of voting and registration records for a period of 5 years is absolutely unnecessary and an invasion of the rights of the States. Alabama law, which is similar to that in all States, provides that when an applicant is registered to vote by the board of registrars, his name is placed on the voters list and this list, along with his application, is filed with the probate judge of the county and becomes a permanent public record. Of course, after a person is registered, he should have no grounds for complaining. In cases where the application is denied by the board of registrars our laws provide that the board of registrars must keep on file the application form until the time expires for the applicant to appeal under our statutes. This procedure gives full and adequate protection to all citizens regardless of who they are, if they would just avail themselves of the remedies now available.

The sending of Federal registrars or a Registration of Voters Commission into the South, or into any State, would cause animosity and hostility among the people and would result in a breakdown of our election machinery. Such action would cause further widening of the breach between the races and would worsen Federal-State relations. The citizens of the States would look upon these Federal agents as "carpet bag registrars" and that is truly what they would be.

Any extension of the powers of the Civil Rights Commission would do nothing to help the situation and would cause a further deterioration in race and Federal-State relations. Federal registration of voters in addition to being unconstitutional and unwarranted, would not work, would lead to grave consequences, and I think would be analagous to the sending of Federal troops into Little Rock or the acts of Federal troops in marching Negroes to the polls during reconstruction days.

The views which I have expressed about the Civil Rights Commission are not mine alone but are shared by almost every citizen of my State. As further proof of the Commission's questionable conduct, one can refer to the actions in the Federal courts involving the Civil Rights Commission in Terrell County, Ga.; Montgomery, Ala.; and Shreveport, La., where the Federal courts ruled against the Civil Rights Commission in every case.

In recent days the Attorney General of the United States has expressed himself as favoring a plan whereby the Federal courts would appoint so-called "referees" to register voters. This proposal is just as shocking as the "Federal registrars" proposal and just as unconstitutional and unworkable. I am equally opposed to the plan of the Attorney General. The Federal courts have already expressed their opposition to being used as Board of Registrars. See *Darby* v. *Daniels*, decided November 6, 1958, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

I would like to point out to the committee that the number of registered Negro voters in Alabama is steadily increasing. This is not due to action by the Civil Rights Commission or the Federal Government, but it is in spite of them. At present there are more than 70,000 registered Negro voters in Alabama. The number of registered Negro voters in Alabama has more than doubled since 1956. The number has increased more than 10 percent since the primary election of 1958. The Negro is making tremendous progress in Alabama. I ask you not to enact laws which would retard his progress. These aforementioned bills now pending before your committee would retard the Negroes' progress. Matters concerning race relations will never be solved by legislation, court decrees, injunctions, Federal troops and "Federal registrars." It can only be solved through local people working together in a spirit of cooperation without outside interference and agitation.

We have on our books the necessary laws to protect every person's right to vote. They are State laws and State remedies and that is the way it should be. I ask you to leave it that way, and require these persons who complain that their rights have been violated to seek their redress in the proper and legal manner in the courts of our States. They have not done this in the past. They cannot tell you truthfully that our remedies are not full and adequate. So, before you resort to "carpet bag registrars" and Federal investigators, before you do harm to our people, before you do violence to our Federal system, before you resort to the tactics of grinding us under the heel of the Federal boot, and before you wreck our election machinery, make them at least try to test their rights in our State courts.

International Radio Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on Monday of this week a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the question of ratification of two highly important international radio agreements, the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the Broadcasting Agreement with Mexico. In this week's issue of Broadcasting magazine there appeared an editorial entitled "NARBA Now or Never." As a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I was especially interested in this editorial, and call it to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NARBA NOW OR NEVER

All but lost in the turmoil involving broadcasting is the 10-year-old treaty on AM broadcasting on the North American Continent which has languished before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Failure to ratify the NARBA treaty, and the collateral 1956 agreement with Mexico, at this session could trigger an allocations war of indiscriminate channel jumping with disastrous effects on reception.

The Daytime Broadcasters Association, which asserts representation of some 250 of the 1,700 stations now operating from sunrise to sunset, has openly lobbied against Senate ratification. Two bills are pending to instruct the FCC to authorize 6 a.m. to 6 p. m. operation. The FCC, the State Department and virtually all other entities in AM radio, have implored the Senate to ratify the agreements or invite chaos. But the daytimers have been able to muster sufficient strength to block action.

There has been one significant development, however. The regional stations, which heretofore have put up no organized resistance, have now established Regional Broadcasters for the avowed purpose of fostering Senate ratification. At long last, they real-

ized that while the daytimers have ostensibly sought fixed hours only on Mexican and U.S. clears, the legislation they espouse would strike at domestic regionals, and without directional or any other protection. The FCC has twice rejected the daytimers' proposals, so they now seek from Congress what they cannot get from the expert body charged with the responsibility of providing maximum interference-free service to the public.

The daytimers cannot be criticized for wanting to improve their lots, notably during the most lucrative radio hours. But they should not seek to do it at the expense of old-established services or through legislative pressure. The new Regional Broadcasters, organized at the call of Payson Hall, director of broadcast properties of Meredith, has no simple task, because it is easier to block legislation than to enact it. Ratification hearings begin today (January 25) before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.

Among the regionals are many of the old-established most respected stations. This is their opportunity to cite the facts. And there isn't too much time in which to do it with Congress eyeing adjournment by July.

Helping the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1960, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to liberalize the disability provisions of the Social Security Act.

In the January 29 edition of the Shelby Daily Star, Shelby, N.C., there appeared a very fine editorial in connection with my measure. With the thought that my colleagues might like to read the editorial I request unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

HELPING THE DISABLED

Congressman BASIL WHITENER's proposal to change the disability provisions of the social security law has merit.

A person now must be physically or mentally unable to do any type of work in order to receive disability benefits. WHITENER'S bill would amend the law so that benefits could be received if a person, by reason of physical or mental impairment, cannot perform the job in which he was last regularly engaged.

It makes sense. A man who has spent his adult life in one trade or occupation is usually ill-equipped to earn comparable income in some other. Nor is it easy to find someone who will hire him.

The fact that a welder or a steeplejack, injured in an accident, can still get out and sell pencils, should not disqualify him from drawing disability benefits.

Although we think Congress is sometimes incautious in liberalizing the social security program, which was never intended to be a full retirement plan, it would be justified in passing this amendment.

Reserve Officers Association "Man of the Year" Award to Bryce Nathaniel Harlow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Col. Jesse B. Stuart, which appears in the February 1960, issue of the Officer, the official publication of the Reserve Officers Association, entitled "Harlow Minuteman of 1960." This article refers to Bryce Nathaniel Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, who has been selected to receive the Reserve Officers Association "Man of the Year" award for 1960, at the midwinter conference of the ROA to be held in Washington this week.

Bryce Harlow has demonstrated outstanding intelligence, wisdom, and ability in performing his highly responsible task as Deputy Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations. He commands the liking and respect of all who know him, and I am sure that many will share my feeling of gratification at his selection to receive this distinct honor from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARLOW MINUTEMAN OF 1960—CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD GOES TO A "LITTLE GIANT" WHOSE RECOGNITION AS A PATRIOT NO LONGER CAN BE DENIED

Usually, when one considers the likely candidates for high office and high honors, the image of a giant comes into mind.

This great American weakness for glamour, this continuing invitation to delusion by idols with feet of clay, may plague us down through the future years.

But in 1960, ROA has named for its citizen of the year one who, by common standards, has claim neither to glamour, high office, nor giant physical stature.

I first met Bryce Harlow in General Marshall's office in 1943. He was—and is—a little man. But he had a great brain, and a fine hand, and everyone seemed to recognize that the little captain was a right arm and a stone wall as a cog in the great machine the Army Chief of Staff was using.

Bryce had come to Washington as assistant to a Member of the House and along the political paths bringing him to Washington he had picked up considerable moxie.

It was not until after the Army had promoted him to lieutenant colonel and awarded him the Legion of Merit that I found out his moxie had a firm foundation.

At the University of Oklahoma, he had made Phi Beta Kappa for his undergraduate work, and later he had earned his master's in political science.

After our brief acquaintance in the Pentagon, I took off on secret missions, which took me to a place called Normandy, and it was sometime later that I got out of a field hospital at Bastogne and back to Walter Reed. My first visitor was Bryce Harlow, and I'll always remember his thoughtfulness.

In 1945, "Uncle Carl" Vinson demonstrated his brilliance by bringing Bryce into the House Armed Services Committee as staff director, and Col. Bob Smart, who now holds that job and does his work brilliantly, will understand my assertion that nobody ever again will run the committee with the knowledgeable firmness of the "Little Colonel." Bryce saw the groundwork for one postwar military policy laid, including our Reserve program, and in 1951, he took off for Oklahoma City.

Life on the Potomac is exacting, and the grind is constant. Bryce simply did what everybody else talks of doing—he quit and went home.

HERE: A REAL DRAFT

In Oklahoma City, Bryce was vice president of the Harlow Publishing Corp., and was getting along fine.

But Washington was not to let him escape for long. After the 1952 elections, one of his wartime associates was preparing to move into the White House. General Eisenhower pointed at Byrce as the one man he wanted to handle congressional relations.

Wilton B. (Jerry) Persons caught a plane to Oklahoma City and stayed there until he had Bryce's promise to get ready to join the new President's staff in January 1953.

In 7 years, he again has demonstrated the gifts of which all Washington has become aware. Bryce has had several titles, including Administrative Assistant to the President, and Deputy Assistant to the President for Congressional Affairs.

Titles don't mean as much as his record of performance. Handling as tough a congressional mission as has ever been given a Capitol Hill man, Bryce has turned in a batting average that is incredible.

Brother Bryce gets the nod for the minuteman award this year over a goodly company of patriots, anyone of whom would have honored the award. They, of course, remain unrevealed.

The record of his achievements speaks rather eloquently. But the record does not sparkle as does his personality, which carried many a day for a good cause.

It is not as stout as his fine character, which is the bedrock of every good American's nature.

It does not reflect the polish and deftness of his diplomacy, which turned the tide for us many a time when the issues were shadowy, nor the clarity of his intellect which ofttimes cleared the shadows.

So, the ingredients in our minuteman winner this year include high competence, intellectual stature, diplomacy, personality, and character, and a great many other things which are rather indefinable.

And by our standards those things go into the makeup of a giant among men—the incorruptible patriot. That is ROA's minuteman of 1960.

Secretary Gates Above Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following, and very timely editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Jan. 27, 1960]

REALISM OR POLITICS

Because Defense Secretary Gates appraises our defense setup more optimistically than his predecessor, he was savagely attacked in the Senate and his confirmation held up. Is Gates' rosier view a true one or was it given, as critics say, as a matter of political expediency in election year? We believe there is more honest opinion than politics in Gates' appraisal.

It is true, the Democrats are making an election year issue of Eisenhower defense policy. It has been no secret that they intended to do it. And Ike has been unable to conceal his anger at some of the barbs they have aimed at him. In this situation, it would be natural for the President to fight back, both for political reasons and for personal ones. And an about-face appraisal of our defense position, coming just at the time we have a new man named Defense Chief, might lead to suspicion that Gates had been persuaded to deal loosely with facts.

But that view does not take the character of Mr. Gates into account. He is not a politician. He has a fine record as a public servant. He is a man of integrity. There is no reason to believe that he would give a false picture of defense for political purposes.

He could be wrong. Any man may be. But we believe his honest opinion of our defense position has been given. Maybe his predecessor was wrong.

It is much more likely that the politicians in the Senate who are making campaign material of their quarrel with Gates are dealing loosely with facts.

And we repeat what this column asserted a few days ago; namely, that making a campaign issue of defense is going to confuse many people. No one but our enemies will gain from it.

The High Cost of Medicines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the New York Times recently in an editorial discussed the hearings which the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has been conducting under the chairmanship of the Senator from Tennessee [Senator KEFAUVER]. This investigation has stirred up a great deal of interest.

The editorial points out that no industry more directly affects the public health and welfare than the drug industry. It is for this reason, the editorial states, that the task of the Kefauver subcommittee is important.

We are all, I am sure, interested in seeing that the work of the subcommittee continues so as to give all interested parties an opportunity to be heard. I am confident that the final results will be in the best interests of the drug industry and the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times of February 1, 1960, entitled "The High Cost of Medicine" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF MEDICINES

The price of medicines is high and getting higher, as almost everyone knows. So high is it, in fact, and so great is the demand for drugs that the people of the United States now pay more for them and medical appliances than they do for the services of doctors. No wonder the investigation of the drug industry by the subcommittee headed by Senator KEFAUVER has stirred up such wide interest.

The most impressive defense of high prices brought out in the hearings so far has been the high cost of the research necessary to produce the new medicines, increasingly in demand as medical science breaks ever more new ground. But less evidence had been given up to this week as to other costs, such as advertising, promotion, and sales. One of the recent hearings, however, threw sharp light on all these matters by spreading on the record the experience of one of the Nation's leading companies—especially in regard to a well-known tranquilizer.

This drug was originally produced by a French concern. The American company was given exclusive rights to its production and sale in this country. Comparative price figures given by the subcommittee staff were striking, especially in view of the fact that the American company did not finance the basic research. Fifty tablets cost the druggist in Paris 51 cents. In the United States the same tablets cost $3.03.

The company's record illuminates what the public wants to know: Why drugs cost the consumer as much as they do, whether company costs could be reduced and whether prices couldn't be much lower than they are without depriving the drug firms of a reasonable profit. Then, too, there is the question of whether some sort of Government regulation may be necessary to assure all of us who buy medicines that we can get what we need at the lowest possible price. Certainly no industry more directly affects the public health and welfare than this. The task of the Kefauver group is correspondingly important.

The Real Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks I include an analytical article: "The Real Gap," written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post on February 2, 1960.

Among other things Mr. Lippmann well said in his article:

Great peoples can be put to sleep. This can be done if the peoples' leaders tell them to go to sleep, and not listen to those disturbers of their tranquillity who tell them to turn away from the little things and to worry about the big ones.

How true.

The article follows:

THE REAL GAP

(By Walter Lippmann)

The big controversy about defense arises from the fact, which nobody denies, that the Soviet Union is several years ahead of us in the production of missiles and in the exploration of outer space. The Russians have more missiles. They have bigger missiles capable of carrying bigger loads. And judging by such fabulous exploits as directing a satellite to photograph the other side of the moon, they are far ahead in the whole art of the guidance of missiles.

The controversy in Washington is about the consequences and the remedies, given the fact that we have fallen behind in the race of armaments. In this controversy there are several points. The first, and obviously the most immediately important, is whether the Soviet Union's lead in missiles is such that the Russians are on the verge of achieving decisive military superiority. By decisive military superiority is meant the power to attack without suffering serious retaliation.

In theory, the Soviet Union will have this decisive superiority within the next 2 years—if we do nothing more to offset it than we are now planning to do—if it has 150 long-range missiles, together with another 150 medium-range missiles, in place, aimed and ready to be launched. In theory, with one salvo of such a missile force the Soviet Union could knock out and destroy all of our retaliatory forces. After that we would be helpless and at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

Those who use this theory in their argument for greater armaments are, like General Power of the Strategic Air Force, quick to add that there are several things that we could do, especially to keep a part of the Strategic Air Force in the air where it cannot be hit by a surprise attack. The existence of such an invulnerable retaliatory force will deter the Soviet Union from using its superior missile force to attempt a nuclear Pearl Harbor.

The administration case, as I understand it, starts from the proposition, which everyone agrees to, that neither side will launch a nuclear offensive if, after the offensive has been struck, the other country still possesses the power to retaliate. The heart of the administration case is that it is not necessary, though it would be desirable, to have an equal number of missiles in order to deter a Pearl Harbor attack. For the aggressor who strikes first cannot afford to attack unles he is able to knock out in one salvo about 100 comparatively small targets. As missiles are not too accurate, this requires a lot of missiles.

But the country which is attacked would not need an equal number of missiles to retaliate because it would not strike against difficult tragets like launching pads. It would strike directly at the biggest cities where, given the fearful widespread effect of the modern weapons, no great accuracy is required.

In order to retain this retaliatory capacity, a smaller striking force is required than the aggressor must have. The administration claims that before the Soviet Union can achieve the theoretical striking force which would give it supremacy over us as we are today, we can and we shall have put beyond the reach of the Soviet missiles a sufficient retaliatory force of missiles, bombers, submarines, etc.

Thanks to the agitation which has been stirred up by the critics, there is good reason to think that the precautionary measures will be taken now, and in sufficient time.

What worries me is the disposition in the administration and in Congress to act as if all would be well if by 1962 or thereabouts we began, as Secretary Gates promises, to overtake the Soviet Union in missiles. To rest on this is to misunderstand and greatly to underestimate the real peril into which we have come.

The peril is that in the race, not only in armanents but in overall national power, the

Soviet Union is moving ahead faster than we are. There is a misconception, so it seems to me, even in high and responsible quarters, that the Soviets are ahead only because they started a few years earlier, and that in a few years we shall be even with them again. The real situation, which is the source of our perils, is that because in this vast field the Soviet Union has gotten its research and development effectively organized, and because the Soviet Union is allocating to it all the resources that it requires, the gap is not becoming narrower, it is becoming wider. Not only did they have a head start but they are now running faster. The administration's specific budget for 1961 may conceivably be adequate but the philosophy behind that budget is deadly and will reduce this counntry to a second-class power.

This does not mean that the Soviet Union will soon or in the foreseeable future achieve decisive military supremacy. I am quite prepared to believe that we shall be able to do what General Power says we must do, that "once we have reached the point where a surprise attack can no longer prevent or even minimize retaliation," we shall have the security of a nuclear stalemate.

But security, though it is crucial, is not sufficient and we cannot be satisfied to accept the position of secondbest.

Perhaps that is wrong. Perhaps we can be satisfied. Perhaps we can be led to believe, what it is so little trouble to believe, that, provided the Soviet Union does not bomb us, we can go right on thinking about ourselves and our private affairs and not about the Nation and its future. Great peoples can be put to sleep. This can be done if the peoples' leaders tell them to go to sleep, and not to listen to those disturbers of their tranquility who tell them to turn away from the little things and to worry about the big ones.

Padre Island National Seashore Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is more than 500 miles from Wichita Falls, Tex., to Corpus Christi, Tex., yet recently the Wichita Falls Times published an editorial urging that the Padre Island National Seashore project be approved by Congress this year.

This editorial is an example of the widespread support—the backing from virtually all areas of the State—which is being advanced for the move to create a national seashore on this 117-mile-long beach island in the Gulf of Mexico just off the Texas coast.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Park Move Encouraged," from the January 22, 1960, issue of the Wichita Falls Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARK MOVE ENCOURAGED

Encouragement has been given to the movement which would set aside an unblemished part of the gulf coast shoreline of Texas as a national seashore park.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to let the Government establish three new seashore parks, and although he did not reveal what areas he had in mind it has been learned that the Padre Island project which south Texans have been pushing is one of the three.

Merits of the Padre Island proposal have been discussed in these columns on several occasions. The Times has favored the program and would like to see Congress give its approval this year.

A decision is needed, if not this year then in the immediate future, because commercial developments are already encroaching upon the natural area.

Senator Hennings' Service to Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from a recent issue of the Daily Dunklin Democrat, published at Kennett, Mo., which recognizes an outstanding service performed by the senior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.:

SENATOR HENNINGS' CONTRIBUTION

If suddenly it should be revealed that 59 percent of the students of a junior high school in the Dunklin County area were smoking marijuana regularly, the residents of this area would be astounded and rightfully disturbed.

If it should be revealed that narcotics arrests in Dunklin County showed a sharp increase, particularly in the 14- to 15-year-old age brackets, there would be a loud clamor for public and official action.

Yet, as startling as these disclosures would be, they are no less startling to the parents of the affected children in six major U.S. cities where these conditions actually exist today.

"I have never presided over a congressional hearing where the facts are as sad, shocking, and sickening as these." This was the statement of Missouri's senior U.S. Senator, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, who is chairman of a congressional Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee which has been hearing testimony throughout the country on facts which link juvenile delinquency to the use of narcotics by teenagers.

The subcommittee has learned, for example, that in the six metropolitan centers of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco, the use of marijuana is quite popular among both high school students and junior high school students. In Los Angeles, for example, witness after witness told Missourian HENNINGS that a very high percentage of narcotics, chiefly marijuana and heroin, arriving in southern California eventually makes its way to youths under 21 years of age.

If this seems to be a remote problem to parents in southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas, then consider for just a moment what could occur if a narcotics dealer began operations within this 150,000-population area. Although the sale of marijuana and heroin has never been carried on to any great extent in this area, there have been, from time to time, indications that at least some were being peddled in this area.

Several efforts in recent years by the Treasury Department to trace the sale of narcotics in this area have generally resulted in the cessation of these nefarious activities.

At the present time, the Hennings committee discovered that only a small percentage of the Nation's total youth population was involved in this shameful drug and delinquency problem. Yet as long as the physical and mental well-being of any of our young people is at stake, especially since it is increasing, we must work consistently and in greater numbers to control the evil.

The information revealed by the Hennings committee is especially helpful to all parents, regardless of where they live, in reminding them of the too-available narcotics evils which continue to persist and grow in virtually every section of the country. The absence of narcotics sales today does not mean that it will not begin tomorrow, particularly since the Government seems incapable of coping with the spread of narcotics distribution.

Senator HENNINGS deserves recognition for his work and service to American parents everywhere. What he has revealed has been of real service to every family in the country.

Surprises in Wisconsin Tourist Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our fast-advancing age—with ever better means of transportation, including an expanding network of highways, airways and waterways, tourism is becoming a highly significant industry.

Of the 54 million families in the United States, about 30 million take at least one vacation trip a year.

Throughout the Nation, tourists spend more than an estimated $20 billion annually.

In Wisconsin, for example, tourism is our third most important industry.

The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway is expected to bring new visitors to the Great Lakes region. Particularly, we, in Wisconsin, are anticipating an influx of visitors—via the seaway—from elsewhere in the United States, Canada, and other lands of the world, to enjoy the scenic, historical, picturesque vacationlands in Wisconsin.

Effectively utilized, vacations can prove to be not just escapism; rather they furnish the individual and the American family an opportunity for physical, mental, and spiritual revitalization.

In planning to accommodate the increasing number of vacationers in the future, the Nation, I believe, could well afford to undertake, and benefit from, imaginative efforts to make vacation time not only one of leisure, but also one of educational and inspirational value.

Recognizing the increasing economic importance of tourism, a special survey

is being conducted in my home State by the University of Wisconsin, under the direction of Dr. I. V. Fine. The purpose of the survey is to make a reevaluation of the current scope of the tourist industry, as well as to provide data upon which to build a better program for the future.

A recent edition of the Milwaukee Journal carried a detailed article on the progress of the survey. Reflecting a constructive approach to utilizing the potential of a growing industry, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 31, 1960]

SURPRISES IN WISCONSIN TOURIST SURVEY—EARLY RESULTS INDICATE OWNERS OF COTTAGES MEAN $50 MILLION TO STATE'S RECREATION INDUSTRY; AVERAGE INCOME OF CAMPERS IS $7,000 A YEAR; BETTER FACILITIES NEEDED

(By Paul M. McMahon)

MADISON, WIS.—Wisconsin has 50,000 privately owned vacation cottages which represent a $50 million segment of the State's tourist industry.

This is the most surprising of early discoveries in the $25,000 survey of the Wisconsin tourist industry ordered by the Wisconsin Legislature, according to Dr. I. V. Fine, University of Wisconsin professor. He is in charge of the survey.

Cottage owners spend an average of $1,000 a year on such items as taxes, improvements, food, gasoline, and recreation in connection with their vacation cottages, Dr. Fine said.

"We had not expected to find the cottage owner such an important part of the Wisconsin vacation picture," Dr. Fine said Saturday. "Most of the cottages are owned by Wisconsin residents, with Illinois owners second in number. Surprising is that Florida owners are the sixth largest group."

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS

Because cottage owners usually spend a longer time vacationing than do those in rental facilities, and because of the taxes they pay and purchases they make, their total contribution to the State's income is significant, Fine said.

Among other points which Fine said had developed in early phases of the survey are these:

About 24 percent of those residents of the Greater Chicago area who take a vacation spend at least part of it in Wisconsin.

Vacationists who camp in Wisconsin are not poor folks. The average income of the head of the family is about $7,000. The camper spends as much money on equipment after he gets on his trip as he does for almost any other item. There is no doubt that Wisconsin lacks facilities for adequately handling its volume of campers.

Boys and girls who attend summer camps in Wisconsin represent a $5 million business, including what parents spend visiting them. Wisconsin is a natural area for serving juvenile campers from Chicago and other nearby urban districts but inadequate rail service is a handicap.

Dr. Fine is using University of Wisconsin students in some of his survey projects. He said he took a team of 50 students in marketing research classes to Chicago where they completed 4,000 telephone calls to residents of the central city and suburban areas. The results were so satisfactory that a similar project will be carried out in Minneapolis-St. Paul.

PLAN 51,000 CONTACTS

In the course of the survey, Fine expects to make 51,000 contacts through questionnaires, telephones or personal interviews. Replies to questionnaires are running 45 percent, an exceptionally high rate for a survey, Fine said. He believes that the prestige of the University of Wisconsin is partly responsible for this cooperation.

Fine had high praise for the assistance given him by public utilities in Wisconsin. They have provided him with the names of more than 40,000 seasonal users in the State, a major contribution in determining the importance of cottage owners.

Few tabulations have been completed in the survey. Fine expects, however, that he soon can provide the first of a series of reports covering various aspects of the survey as they are finished. He hopes to have the survey completed, with results and conclusions by early 1961.

Under terms of the State legislation, the survey is being conducted by the bureau of business research of the School of Commerce of the University of Wisconsin at Madison. The survey was set in motion by Dr. Fine and Prof. Edward E. Werner, but Werner left recently on a temporary teaching assignment in Indonesia.

THEME OF SURVEY

The main concern of the project, Fine said, centers around a measurement of the economic significance of the recreational tourist industry in Wisconsin. The survey will attempt to discover the number of persons who visit the State, how much they spend, the recreational facilities in Wisconsin which attract tourists, the adequacy of vacation facilities and a comparison of Wisconsin's efforts to lure tourists with the efforts of other States.

Fine expressed a deep interest in the vacations spent by Wisconsin residents within their own State. The instate tourist potential may prove so great that more promotional effort should be directed toward it, Fine observed.

TRAVEL COURSE BEGINS AT MU

Miss Frederique Fredge, a freelance writer and native of Switzerland, will conduct a 10-week illustrated lecture series at Marquette University on the topic of Americans abroad.

Beginning February 18, the Thursday evening lectures will be offered by the Marquette department of continuing education. Classes will meet from 7 to 8:15 p.m. in Carpenter Hall, 617 N. 13th Street.

An experienced international traveler, Miss Fredge will speak on Scandinavia, Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, England, Spain, and Portugal. In her talks she hopes to provide a blueprint of what every tourist should not do in order to enjoy a European vacation.

The Dignity of Teaching: Address by Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a speech delivered on November 21, 1959, in New York City at the annual lunch of the Protestant Teachers Association by Charles H. Silver, president of the New York City Board of Education.

Mr. Silver is one of New York City's great citizens. His distinguished record of community activities has won for him nationwide renown.

In his address Mr. Silver points out the importance of protecting the dignity of teaching, increasing the salaries of teachers, and using the talents of teachers as an instrument for developing juvenile decency.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON, PROTESTANT TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 21, 1959, HOTEL ASTOR

It does not seem possible that 2 whole years have passed since I last had the privilege of appearing at your annual luncheon to bring you the greetings and good wishes of your entire board of education.

If ever a span of time spun past in a whirlwind of events, it was these last 2 years of adjustment to the quickening pace of a nuclear age. They have changed the world more thoroughly and swiftly than any other period in the stumbling cavalcade of civilization.

We will not soon forget how a little speck of matter, flung into the reaches of the firmament became an aggravating cinder in the eye of education. Today, when the whole sky seems cluttered up with these temporary stars, we still remember how the first cosmic invader shook every citadel of learning within the borders of democracy.

Our educational concept stood in doubt and our reverence for the humanities in jeopardy. We trembled in an agony of self-criticism * * * and I am sure that many students trembled even more with visions of impossible programs, all day school, and no summer vacation.

Well, the panic has passed, and we may consider the problem with concern, but with calm. As we do so, I am proud to have the privilege of breaking bread again with the officers and members of the Protestant Teachers Association, and with your distinguished guests, Dr. Peale, Dr. Potter, and my old friend, Dr. Jansen.

Because the cornerstone of your organization is the devotion you share toward a common form of worship, I feel that my mission in coming before you is not to bear a message concerning the things of the world that change. Rather, I would speak of things beyond the world and beyond change.

We have come to know that the American system of education is strong because it is unregimented and unfettered. Thus, it is flexibe enough to meet any onslaught, free enough to forge its own national destiny in any contest to determine intellectual supremacy. Now that we have had opportunity to assess our position, we know that, basically, our schools are good, and, joined together in the service of humanity, we will find the way to make them even better. Your calling as teachers is ennobled, in this effort, by the warm bond of faith which brings added zeal and dedication to the routine tasks of the classrooms.

Yours is an enormous responsibility that goes beyond the limits of a lesson plan. No text in our methods of teaching can instruct a young heart and mind in the sanctity of life or the meaning of right and wrong without the influence of the teacher as the living symbol of these noble principles.

In our homes, our schools and our places of worship, we must launch a crusade for the inculcation in our children of new standards of juvenile decency. Their path as part of the future brotherhood of man * * * indeed, the whole hope of mankind is largely in your hands as teachers.

The indecency of much current literature, the vulgarity on sale at the corner news-

stand and the boldness of some programs on radio, television, and the motion picture screen * * * these pose a challenge which you, as teachers, must meet. Ethics and character, our precious heritage of liberty under the law, justice and equality of race, color, and creed * * * none of these can be conveyed effectively, solely by text or phrase.

But they can be transmitted through a kind of spiritual osmosis in the wonderful relationship that can be created with a pupil by an understanding teacher—a teacher who not only knows and instructs—a teacher who cares, a teacher who believes in and lives by the high standards around which we have molded our educational process.

The deplorable linking of the current television quiz-show scandal with certain education idols and, indirectly, with the very ideals of education, may cast a momentary shadow, in some quarters, on the high motives of learning. But I am confident that the moral fibers of America are strong, and the love of learning for its own sake cannot be destroyed by any dishonorable dollar challenge from detractors and perverters. Those who sought to sell their wares have learned the hardest lesson of all.

All of this is part of the educator's burden in these troubled hours, and it is a burden which merits adequate compensation. Recently, at the Alfred E. Smith memorial dinner, in the presence of Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, and other members of the board of estimate, I emphasized the importance of increasing the rewards of teaching, and pointed out the dire need for higher salaries.

This subject always touches a tender nerve, but we should not permit it to become an inflamed one. I have served your cause long enough to know that the emergency treatment or temporary cure will not suffice.

I have submitted a set of proposals to the members of the board of education and to the superintendent of schools which, I hope, will provide us with a starting point for salary discussions. We need to know, not only our goals for the immediate future, but what salary patterns we can set for long-range guidance.

The dignity of teaching and the respect due your profession must not be impaired by unprofessional and indignant demonstrations each time the cost of living index takes another jump. I hope to see anything resembling recurring wrangling—yes, and any reason for it, as well—eliminated by a just and equitable long-term program of improved earnings instituted for every teacher in our public school system.

You are entitled to no less, because you are proving your worth each day in the classroom, and I am only echoing the pride of our entire city administration and every member of our community in the great work you are doing to mold the minds and moral development of our young people.

We, the community, must serve you who are the servers of youth, as this Nation, indeed the world, focuses on the men and women of tomorrow. With a Bill of Rights for Youth emerging from the United Nations and proclaiming "that mankind owes to the child the best it has to give," your daily lesson assumes its true significance in the patterns of history.

It is a lesson in which you guide the gaze of youth to dimensions beyond the shallow depth of a television screen, or the narrow pages of sordid print, or the confines of callous indifference. It is one in which you set their sights on the changeless stars and the ancient teachings which are ever new * * * on the ageless source of all strength who has fashioned us in His image as creatures who seek truth and knowledge, peace and justice * * * and the enduring blessings of wisdom and understanding, as we walk humbly in the way of the Eternal Teacher.

Military Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of great interest on the subject of the relationship between active duty pay and retired pay, which has come from Attorney Albert F. Block of Davenport, Iowa, a personal friend who holds an outstanding record as a naval officer.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVENPORT, IOWA, *January 20, 1960.*
Senator THOS. E. MARTIN,
459 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: There are several bills, now in committee as I understand the situation, to reestablish the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay. Last session Senator STENNIS spoke in opposition to these bills. I wish you would see him about this and persuade him to change his mind.

It is certain that he does not know the story or he would not think the way he does. Neither do I know the story from the Army viewpoint. I have to tell it from the Navy side. But I do not want you or him or anyone else to accept my statements of fact. Please verify them from other sources which are at your disposal.

This Nation has a historic policy that, after each war the outstanding warriors have been rewarded with something tangible. Only one of them could be president. Therefore, in 1870, Admiral Farragut was paid $10,000 and in 1872 Admiral Porter was paid $13,000. In 1920 John Soller, father of the John H. Soller who built the Masonic Temple in Davenport, told me that he well remembered the day on the first day of January, 1872, when carpenters' pay in this town was first raised to $1 a day.

By 1899 the retirement pay device had crept into military pay so that Admiral Dewey got $13,500 plus $500 allowances. For how many years did a captain in the Navy have the same basic pay as a member of the Congress, with longevity increments for the captain? And, when the armed forces asked pay increases, how many congressional denials were based on the retirement pay?

They told us that we would be retired with pay amounting to 2½ percent of the highest grade we might attain for each year of service, increased as officers of the same grade were increased and, second, that, while the Congress had the right to change this, we could have faith in them and that it would never be done. Do you know what effect that 6 percent increase had on our faith in the Congress? And their government bonds? Same as an earthquake.

Oh, I know the law that one Congress cannot bind the next and that on that account one cannot enter into a contract with the Honorable the Government of the United States but these United States teach the midshipmen and cadets that in their chosen profession as warriors they must be the soul of honor, must never distort the truth in any degree, must perform not only their contracts but also their promises to the letter and that the honor of the Nation they are engaging to defend is the example they must follow.

The simple truth is that this retirement pay got into the law as a clever device to avoid paying these officers what they were worth and now they have cut down the retirement pay. If they want to pay these officers what they are worth, they should multiply Admiral Porter's pay by 16. Or Admiral Dewey's by five. Consider today's price of what could be bought for a nickel in his day—a loaf of bread, a quart of milk, a piece of pie, a ham sandwich, a shoe shine, a streetcar ride, a ferryboat ride. Or take the title A cost of today's fleet compared with the cost of Admiral Dewey's fleet and use that for a multiplier.

It is conceded that I am one of the officers entitled to pay. What other class of people knows what has happened?

Herewith a spare copy of this letter for your convenience. You can either give it to Senator STENNIS or print it in the record.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

ALBERT F. BLOCK,
Captain, U.S. Naval Reserve, Retired.

Forand Bill, H.R. 4700, Prompts Blue Shield Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, my bill H.R. 4700, now pending in the Ways and Means Committee, has seemed to focus attention on the need for health insurance for the aged. It has not only stimulated thinking but it has also resulted in real study of the problem by groups that should long ago have taken steps to meet the grave problem that exists among the aged.

I am happy to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the January issue of the magazine New York Medicine published by the Medical Society of the County of New York.

The article is entitled "Blue Shield's Future—And Medicine" pointing out that at its meeting, now being held in Chicago, Blue Shield's goal is to explain and review the problems of the Blue Shield plans in various regions of the Nation.

The article further says that "With the Forand-type legislation in Congress the drive is on to enroll more persons over age 65 in medical care plans. All Blue Shield plans have been urged to experiment in this area—easing enrollment requirements and broadening benefits. Much has been done but progress is spotty across the Nation. In fairness be it said, it is the reluctance of lo-

cal medical societies to go along that creates the spotty picture."

The article follows:

BLUE SHIELD'S FUTURE—AND MEDICINE

On February 1–3, 1960, in Chicago the Blue Shield plans across the Nation will hold their annual meeting for physicians and the administrators of the State and local county medical societies. The goal is to explain and review the problems of the Blue Shield plans in the various regions of the Nation to bring about cooperative effort to make Blue Shield better. A second goal is to convey information to the medical societies so that relations between Blue Shield and the physicians of a community can be enhanced.

By coincidence the meetings are held at a crucial time for problems are indeed pressing.

1. With Forand-type legislation in Congress the drive is on to enroll more persons over age 65 years in medical care plans. All Blue Shield plans have been urged to experiment in this area—easing enrollment requirements and broadening benefits. Much has been done but progress is spotty across the Nation. In fairness be it said, it is the reluctance of local medical societies to go along that creates the spotty picture. One can still find some physicians arguing that there is no problem; that anyone over 65 can get medical care through welfare departments if they need it. The reality is that if local medical communities and their affiliated Blue Shield plans do not expand their over-65-year coverage then someone is going to do it for them, with Mr. Forand ready in the wings to capitalize on the inertia and see that Government does it.

2. There is a strong need for some type of nationwide Blue Shield coverage that has similar benefits and premiums in different areas. Proposals to cover Federal Government employees in Blue Shield are bottlenecked because coverage varies widely from area to area. The same applies to the large national employers among the great corporations. They need a type of Blue Shield plan that will permit their employees to be transferred or shifted from one area to another without rewriting contracts, changing rates and revising countless other variations. Such uniformity can be achieved only if local Blue Shield plans and the local area medical societies that endorse and support them can come to some understanding in these matters. The time is at hand to look beyond the boundaries of one's town or one's region to the Nation as a whole.

3. Inherent in point No. 2 above is the dilemma which faces the 70-odd Blue Shield plans in the Nation. Of necessity they have come up with 70 variations of coverage. One of the sharpest differences is that some plans have the service feature in which the coverage pays all the medical cost if the patient is under the agreed-upon income bracket for service benefits. Here in New York this means $6,000 per year for the family income. Yet in other parts of the Nation Blue Shield pays only on an indemnity basis according to the fee schedule: The physician charges what he wishes and the Blue Shield pays part of the fee. In this situation Blue Shield is no different than the commercial insurance companies which do the same thing.

This chaotic situation, one should emphasize, is not the fault of the Blue Shield plans but the decision of the doctors locally in a community as to the type of Blue Shield coverage they will support. Local autonomy is the rule and the doctors of the local medical society have the final say.

This leads on to a point which all thinking physicians should contemplate and which explains many of the headaches which the profession encounters today. It is this: Today labor, management and Government are powerful because they are national in scope. They have learned that piecemeal decisions, varying from region to region or community to community bring differences and disunity and the weakness of splinter-type thinking and action. Unfortunately medicine still is in this stage of thinking about the servicing and payment of medical care.

In a former era when labor was unorganized nationally, and manageemnt was unorganized nationally, and the government rested more on local cities and States than upon Federal Government the position of medicine in a community was very high. It was well organized at the local level (indeed better than labor and management in its community) and thus it had power, prestige and respect locally.

But the times have changed and while the local medical societies still demand this local power and autonomy the thinking of management and labor has passed them by. It is labor and management together that now control vast sums of money which are earmarked for medical care. It is management and labor which now can call the shots on how medical care is rendered and paid for. It is not the question of the quality of medical care and the clinical side of medicine—where the physician alone is rightly supreme. It is rather the socioeconomics of the matter where the physicians and the medical societies are only one of four facets (a) labor—supplying the patients, (b) management—supplying the money to finance the medical care, and (c) the public, the community (which means government) supplying the controls, if need be, to see that the job is done.

This is the problem (and this is the reason for the problem though it may not be discussed so bluntly) which faces the coming meeting of the Blue Shield plans when they gather in Chicago next month.

Every local county medical society (some 1,600 of them) and every physician member of a local medical society (some 160,000 of them) will be sitting figuratively on the sidelines at the Chicago meeting. Few societies will be represented—though their presence would be welcomed—but every medical society should know that how it reacts to Blue Shield plans affects the status of every physician across the Nation.

Banish Poverty From America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my special privilege on January 25 to address the Legislature of the State of West Virginia in their legislative chamber at Charleston, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA STATE LEGISLATURE, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 25, 1960

The fact that the West Virginia Legislature is grappling with questions of supplying food for the hungry and other welfare measures points up the bitter fact that the prosperity we hear so much about is certainly not a general prosperity.

There are to many distressed areas in this country—too many pockets of depression and despair—for any American to feel complacent about our national strength.

We have a huge unfinished job in the United States. That is the job of providing economic security for all our people.

I want to talk to you about one aspect of this general problem—the job of eliminating once and for all the disgraceful amount of actual poverty and economic stagnation that still exists in this richest land in the world.

Poverty is always a tragedy, any time and any place. But poverty in a land that is enjoying a national product close to $500 billion is more than a tragedy—it is a national scandal.

According to official government figures, there were in 1957 no less than 11 million families—families, mind you, with total family incomes of less than $3,000 a year—less than $58 a week. Six million of these families had incomes actually less than $2,000 a year—less than $39 a week. In addition, there were about 5 million persons living alone whose income were under $1,500 a year—under $29 a week.

These are the almost 50 million poor people living in America in the middle of the 20th century.

The test of our progress is not whether we provide more for those who have enough; the test of our progress is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. The existence of 50 million poor people in our midst is sad evidence that we have so much more to do.

There is no single, simple solution to the problem of poverty. Just as there is no single, simple cause of poverty. It must be attacked on every front.

What are some of these fronts?

One vital front concerns the aged. Their problems constitute one of the most crucial battlegrounds. For too many years now we have been authorizing one study after another, holding one conference after another, making one speech after another, about the problems of the aged. The time has come to act.

In addition to many other things, Congress must pass a measure which will provide hospitalization and nursing home care and other services for our elderly people as a matter of earned benefits under our social security law. We must forge ahead on medical research. The dread disease of cancer must be conquered.

What about the wage earner? After all most of the low income families are headed by wage earners. It is clear that the greatest hope for eliminating poverty is regular employment at decent wages for America's wage earners.

That means a number of things.

It means making it easier, not harder, for unions to organize the unorganized and bring them the economic benefits of collective bargaining.

It means raising the Federal minimum wage at once to at least $1.25—and, even more importantly—extending the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions not now covered.

It means at long last doing something about the 1 million migrant farm workers, who, on the average, work less than 150 days a year—and these at miserable wages and under disgraceful conditions of housing, transportation, and child labor.

It means restoring the economic health of dozens of chronically depressed areas. I am sure you share the bitter regret that the President vetoed the distressed areas bill, as well as another bill that has so much meaning for your State—the Coal Research bill.

This area redevelopment or distressed areas legislation would provide two badly needed

programs—one to retrain unemployed workers to take new kinds of jobs in industry, and the other to encourage new industry to establish itself in the distressed areas through long-term, low-interest Government financing.

There is even more that the Federal and State Governments can do together. Let me outline some of the other basic features of a program to provide for area redevelopment.

I propose that Government undertake broad programs for the restoration of basic health to the distressed areas, such as:

1. The concentration of authorized public works programs designed to lay the base for greatly expanded future productivity of the areas—to provide more efficient transportation facilities, more and cheaper power sources, better school buildings and laboratories, and greatly expanded timber management practices, in appropriate areas.

Such public works projects would also act as immediate stimulants in the area by providing additional jobs for workers and markets for businessmen in the area.

2. Intensified Government-financed research into the ways of making greater use of the raw materials and natural resources of the distressed areas, and to find additional outlets for existing industry and new outlets for the latent wealth of the area.

3. The immediate consideration by the Federal Government of an export subsidy on coal where foreign competition and cutrate prices injure American producers and shippers.

4. A determined effort to find greater uses for our vast coal resources in our foreign aid program, particularly to the underdeveloped countries that are beginning their industrialized programs.

Ending economic distress and expanding our economy also means bringing our unemployment insurance system up to date, so that wage earners do not become paupers when deprived of work through no fault of their own. More than one of every three unemployed in 1958 received no unemployment insurance, and millions exhausted the inadequate benefits to which they were entitled.

Ending economic distress means eliminating discrimination in employment which all too often keeps Negroes and other minority groups from obtaining jobs which their talent and training entitles them to.

It means improving the skills and education of workers unable to meet the needs of a rapidly changing technology.

All of these things, and more, must be done to give Americans a better chance to lead dignified lives of gainful employment.

I have spoken many times—and will again—on the plight of the American farm family. I wish today merely to place this issue in the context of the basic theme of this address. Certainly, the curse of poverty can never be eliminated from America unless we do justice to the family farmers of our Nation who have given us the tremendous abundance of food and fiber.

Through my Family Farm Program Development Act, I have proposed legislation which will provide a measure of security for our farm families and will at the same time better utilize our food and fiber products as a powerful force for peace and world economic development.

Our primary goal must be decent wages or other private income for every American family or individual. But there will always be some families without breadwinners. And there will always be individuals unable to provide for themselves.

It was Isaiah who called upon us "to do well; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow."

It saddens me to find America failing to do all it should, all it could.

Last year over 5 million Americans received some quantities of surplus food from our bulging warehouses. But under this administration, the law has been administered so that only those commodities in super-abundant supply have been made available for these direct distributions of food for the needy.

Cornmeal, dried skim milk, and flour are all wonderful commodities—but should an American child be expected to live on these alone?

As chairman of an agriculture subcommittee, I held hearings last year on measures which would have made grants to localities for distribution of these foods and many others to families and communities in need.

It distressed me, as it should all America, that the White House opposed these improvements. Why? Because it was claimed that it would unbalance the budget. But is the budget purely a matter of dollars? Is there no room on the balance scale for human needs or feelings?

Despite administration opposition, we did get through the Congress a modest food-stamp program. But already Mr. Benson has announced that he does not intend to put that program into effect.

In addition to alleviating those suffering from poverty today, we must seek to eliminate those factors that tend to perpetuate economic distress.

We must provide adequate education for every child. This means new classrooms, more and better trained and paid teachers, scholarships, and improved curriculum.

We must have a housing program big enough for a growing America—housing for all—slum clearance—clean and modern neighborhoods.

We must bring the blessings of medical progress to all our people—more and better hospitals—and adequate supply of doctors, nurses and technicians.

I have merely touched on some of the obligations of our society in this basic area in the midst of our so-called prosperous society.

We must not be fooled by slogans. We must face up to the facts of life as we find them, and then organize ourselves and all our resources for the job I have outlined today.

For I ask you: How can we bring peace to the world, how can we maintain our moral and spiritual leadership in the world, if we fail to demonstrate a capacity for taking care of our own people—their needs, their hopes, their very lives?

Norman A. Cocke, Man of the South for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Col. Hubert F. Lee of Decatur, Ga., who is well known in business circles throughout the Nation as the editor and publisher of the Dixie Business, initiated the Man of the South Award, which is bestowed each year upon the resident of the South who in the estimation of his colleagues has made the most signal contributions to the industrial, educational, and religious life of the South. This honor was bestowed upon Norman A. Cocke, the retiring president of the Duke Power Co., for the year 1959 at the meeting held in Mr. Cocke's home city, Charlotte, N.C., on the evening of December 14, 1959. The toastmaster at the meeting was John C. Whitaker, the retiring president of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., and the speakers were Mr. Louis V. Sutton, president of the Carolina Power & Light Co.; Dr. Hollis Edens, president of Duke University; Rev. Thom Blair, a distinguished clergyman of the Episcopal Church; and Mr. Reuben B. Robertson, Sr., chairman of the board of the Champion Paper & Fibre Co. I had the privilege of presenting the award to Mr. Cocke on that occasion. The speeches of Mr. Sutton, Dr. Edens, Reverend Blair, and Mr. Robertson are all worthy of preservation because they summed up varying aspects of Mr. Cocke's great contributions to the industrial, educational, and religious life of the Carolinas in particular, and the South in general. The only copy of these speeches now available to me is that delivered by Louis V. Sutton, who spoke on the contributions of Mr. Cocke as an industrialist.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORMAN COCKE, AN INDUSTRIALIST

(By Louis V. Sutton)

Mr. Chairman, Senator ERVIN, friends and admirers of Norman Atwater Cocke, it is a distinct pleasure and privilege to appear this evening to honor my very good friend and to attest to his outstanding ability as one of our great utility executives and business leaders. As a young man he grew up at Petersburg, Va. Norman's father, a distinguished lawyer, lived on a large farm in Prince George County just outside the city of Petersburg. Incidentally, some of the fiercest fighting of the Civil War occurred on this farm around the Confederate forts called Fort Hell and Fort Damnation. The armies were engaged here for some 18 months. Many of you have heard of the Battle of the Crater, which was waged nearby.

Both Norman and I attended Petersburg Academy founded by that fiery Confederate officer, Gordon McCabe, Jr., whose name the academy bore until after his death. During my last year there my deskmate was Norman's younger brother, Aleck. Many times I went hunting with Aleck on his father's farm and in addition to birds usually found many lead bullets around the old forts and breastworks on the farm.

Like his father, Norman studied law. He graduated from the New York Law School—was admitted to the New York Bar in 1906, and practiced law in New York City briefly before coming to Charlotte.

On November 12, 1906, Norman Cocke started with the Southern Power Co., predecessor of the Duke Power Co., as an attorney. Since then he has seen his company's business grow and expand until it is now 500 times as large as it was then—from a few customers including several cotton mills, to more than 700,000 customers; from a power output of 25 million kilowatt-hours per annum to 12½ billion kilowatt-hours for the past 12 months' period. The rate paid by residential and farm customers has been reduced from around 15 cents per kilowatt-hour to an average of about 2 cents per kilowatt-hour.

He also has seen his company become, under his guidance and direction, one of the great privately owned electric utilities of our country; an institution that has played a vital role in the great development of the Piedmont section of the two Carolinas.

Norman's outstanding accomplishments as an industrial and utility leader and executive cannot be told briefly and I shall men-

tion only a few high points. He started as an attorney for Southern Power Co. and for Mr. James B. Duke. He later became a vice president of Duke Power Co., a director, the general counsel, and finally the president. He was also an officer or director of 17 other companies affiliated with the Duke system as well as many industrial and textile enterprises.

It has been said that during the some 25 years that the Southern Power Co. of which Mr. J. B. Duke was president and Norman Cocke was an officer, the company never incurred any debt, never borrowed any money, and never paid any dividends. All earnings were plowed back into the company. The president, Mr. Duke, worked without pay or reimbursement of his expenses. During the more than half a century the Southern and Duke Power Cos. planned and built wisely into the present-day, magnificent company.

When the four major power companies in the two Carolinas and Virginia organized the Carolinas Virginia Nuclear Power Associates in 1956 for the purpose of constructing the first nuclear fuel generating plant in the Southeast, Norman Cocke became the first president as well as member of its board of directors. About the same time he was elected to the board of directors of the Edison Electric Institute, the trade organization of the electric utility industry whose membership includes practically every major privately owned electric utility company in the United States.

It has been my good fortune, during the past 25 years that I have been back in Carolina, to have Norman Cocke as a close friend and neighbor, whose counsel I frequently sought. Our two companies have the privilege, as well as the responsibility, of serving the major portion of the two Carolinas—a truly wonderful section of our country. It is needless for me to remind you of Norman's personal integrity and of the high esteem in which he is held by everyone, and the lovable personality which rightly qualifies him for the title of a true southern gentleman. In addition, I can bear witness to his excellent judgment, ability, soundness, and leadership. It has been a great pleasure to be associated with and to work with Norman. He has been most helpful and cooperative at all times.

In addition to our business and work, we have had a number of most pleasant sociable trips together. The last was our recent trip to Europe with the Governor, when Norman's most charming, lovely wife—whom I had the privilege of knowing in Petersburg before she became Mrs. Cocke—asked me to look after Norman and said she was entrusting him to my tender care. Needless to say I found this not too difficult but most enjoyable.

Despite his preoccupation with the management of a large, farflung business and many smaller ones, he always demonstrates a warmth of nature which is a comfort to his friends and family. As a personal salute to Norman Cocke, I would borrow from the Bard of Avon, to say:

"His life is gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: This is a man."

Policies for the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a spech I made to the National Press Club on January 5, 1960, in Washington, D.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICIES FOR THE SIXTIES

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota)

Today, I don't want to discuss politics, 1960. I wish to talk about policies for the sixties.

As we enter the 1960's, I see America adrift—with much of her enormous reservoir of energy, power, and good will untapped—unused.

There are powerful currents in the world today, but they are not currents of our making or liking. They are currents that sweep us along. We are the victim, not the shaper of events.

Just four decades ago, at the dawn of the 1920's, America entered upon the "age of normalcy."

Thirty-three years later, in 1953, America entered a new era: The "age of complacency."

A profound change came over the American Government. The decision was made to confine the solutions to the problems of the 1950's within rigid, artificial, budgetary walls.

That change did much to shape the remainder of the 50's.

It set in motion a unilateral cut-back of America's defense forces—with the result that we embark on the summit talks of the 1960's not militarily supreme, but second-best in a variety of fields.

"A bigger bang for a buck" was the slogan designed to justify the stripping of our conventional military strength. "Massive retaliation" was used to comfort Americans who sensed, but were never told, that the power of the Soviet Union was growing ever more complex and subtle.

1953 marked the beginning of an era in which programs and solutions were not measured against the size of the problems to be solved, but were tailored to fit the economic strait jacket we had designed for ourselves.

The foreign aid program fell victim to the fixed-budget philosophy as the Secretary of the Treasury became a controlling voice in the fashioning of our foreign policy. We appeared to the world to become a Nation that cared more for dollars than for human welfare.

In the name of "fiscal responsibility," an administration that knew the cost of everything and the value of nothing shattered the great pattern of American world leadership.

Here at home during the fifties, the number of school children grew faster than the classrooms, but there was no money for school rooms or teachers in the budgetary strait jacket.

Streams grew more polluted, cities more crowded, slums more squalid, but America, in her fiscal straitjacket, could at best attack these problems only half-heartedly.

The problems of automation, of urban living, and the technological revolution in agriculture were neglected and shunted aside.

The population grew, the problems multiplied, but the budget remained fixed.

Slogans were substituted for programs.

Public relations replaced public service.

And these policies of slogan and slow-down have cost us dearly. The next President of the United States is going to inherit a series of problems that have been swept under the rug—where they have been festering and intensifying. Some one—the American people ultimately—must pay the price of this ostrich-like attitude. And it will be a price that has been accumulating compound interest.

We will hear much talk about peace and prosperity in the months ahead.

We all want prosperity. But the prosperity we want must not be lopsided. It should be a prosperity that springs from an expanding economy with full shares for all—businessmen, farmers, working people, the young and the elderly. We seek a prosperity for America that insures social justice.

We all want peace; peace is no partisan issue. But the peace we want must be enduring. It must have deep roots.

Peace is not passive; it is active. Nor can peace be won by slogans.

There can be no peace in a world plagued by poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy.

There can be no genuine and lasting peace in a world plunged headlong in a reckless and unrestrained arms race.

Aristotle rightly said that poverty is "the parent of revolution and crime." Then why tolerate it—when mankind has at its hand wealth and real power of fantastic dimensions?

In America's so-called surplus food and fiber production, we possess wealth of a uniquely useful character—not a curse, but a blessing.

We can, and we must, use this enormous wealth for the benefit of all men—not only because it is the right and just thing to do, but also because it is fundamentally in our own interest. We can and we must give leadership to a worldwide cooperative attack upon poverty and ignorance—the eternal enemies of peace and freedom.

At the same time, we must explore every opportunity—relentlessly, tenaciously, patiently—to find agreement on a safeguard system of arms control.

The job of the next President of the United States is to take off the wraps—to liberate America's energies and resources—and to tell the American people the plain truth. For the critical dilemma of American leadership will be how to preserve the spirit and the letter of freedom in America, while organizing our society to compete with the monolithic, disciplined, and onrushing Communist system.

There must be democratic planning and purpose. Our national policies cannot be compartmentalized. The great decisions of war and peace are interwoven with a score of other national policy decisions. Agricultural policy and foreign policy cannot be divorced. What we do in this country to enlarge or to abridge the rights of minority groups inevitably has a direct and heavy impact on our position in the world.

No major area of American effort fails to bear directly on our relations with the rest of the world.

But, planning in America cannot be dictated. In a democracy no man can lead by ordering and directing, but only by persuasion. The next President of the United States must be more than an executive. He must in a very real sense be an educator. He will lead successfully only by building a consensus behind a total national effort—embodying the national will and expressing the Nation's priorities.

In his role of educator, he must tell the people that if the age of complacency continues, America will soon become a second-class power.

He must tell them that we have already been surpassed in a number of military and scientific fields, and that a vast effort will be needed to regain the posture of strength necessary to negotiate with the Soviets in any field including disarmament.

He must understand that science has given politics new dimensions in which to work—not just for war, but for peace.

He must tell them that America needs strengthening inside, that she has been starved for the public and social services, the research and discovery, that must undergird a growing nation and an expanding economy.

Yes, he must tell them that these programs will cost money, and will have to be paid for.

I myself am convinced that they can be paid for if we can stimulate our economy to the growth rate America achieved before the 1950's and that it can and must have in the 1960's. They can also be met, in part, by closing tax loopholes.

But if the needs should prove larger, then the American people should be asked to face up to that prospect and pay the bill. They should in any event be disabused of the notion that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is as immutable and heaven-sent as the Scriptures.

We can afford to do what needs to be done.

But there are some things America cannot afford, and the next President must make this abundantly clear.

He must tell our people that we cannot afford a second-best defense, or inadequate schools, or underpaid teachers, or second-class citizenship for anyone. We cannot afford cities clogged with traffic, cloaked in smog and riddled with slums. We cannot afford prolonged recessions and unemployment.

Above all, the next President must remind the people of a vital lesson of history: that America can do anything she wills to do.

America did not stop fighting World War II or pull out of Korea just because she couldn't balance the budget.

America has shown that when summoned to the heights, she can rise to the heights.

But she will not be summoned by men who everywhere see obstacles rather than opportunities.

She will not be summoned by men for whom good intentions are a substitute for action.

The world cries out for leaders who seek and enjoy endeavor, who will achievement and point the way to it.

The late Eugene Meyer, one of the most revered men in your profession, once told a Senate committee in a time of crisis:

"All that we value in civilization has come about through the agency of men who refused to allow nature to take its course—men of heroic hope who used the sovereignty of their spirit and the light of their reason to force the proof that the human person can make his own purposes prevail in the face of blind fortune."

Men and nations can forge their own destinies if they but will to exert the "sovereignty of their spirit and the light of their reason." But for men and nations to will this, their leaders must will it for them and with them.

The Senate in Recent Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Richard Rovere writes a provocative analysis of what has happened to the Senate in recent years in his Washington letter to the current issue of the New Yorker magazine. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his letter relating to the Senate be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Except for a brief debate among Senate Democrats over the efficacy of LYNDON JOHNSON'S leadership, the session thus far has been surpassingly dull, and no relief from the dullness is in sight. No public hearings of much interest are scheduled, and the Senate this year is unlikely to be the scene of any momentous debates. The last Senate session was hardly lively, and it is a puzzling circumstance that the Senate today, though it probably boasts more Members with first-rate intellectual equipment than it has had at any other time in this century, is a far less interesting forum than it was 10 or 15 years ago, when the caliber of its individual Members was pretty low. It is possible that there is some relationship between this and the Senate's recent importance as a breeding ground for presidential candidates. The past few years have seen the Senate pull ahead of the statehouses as a source of presidential timber. This is not because of the superior quality of its men but because national and international issues have become the crucial ones to most voters, and also because the mediums of publicity have taken on an increasingly national character. It is a rare Governor, such as New York's present one, who can make himself heard across the country on matters of interest to the entire Nation, and, as far as that is concerned, it is a rare Governor who has anything to say about them. But almost any Senator is likely to find himself tapped by a national network for an occasional panel or interview show, and sooner or later Time or Life or some other periodical gets around to telling its readers about even the more obscure Members. As Senators have been made to seem less remote, Governors have been made to seem more remote; the increased power of the Federal Government, and the accompanying nationalization of issues have made the statehouses seem more parochial than ever. The Senate, though, appears to be a less stimulating place than it was when it produced fewer national figures and potential candidates, and one reason may be that as its more prominent Members grow in stature as sages and leaders, they diminish in senatorial stature. They function on "Meet the Press" or "Face the Nation" rather than on the Senate floor or in the hearing rooms, and when they become active candidates they are hardly Senators at all. Senator KENNEDY used to make some eloquent and penetrating speeches from the floor, but for the last year or so he has been saving his fire for dentists' conventions, newspaper interviews, and televised lectures. Senator HUMPHREY last year was making some remarkably interesting talks on disarmament and was heading a serious investigation of the subject; now he is a candidate in primaries and is concerned principally with "gut" issues. The number of candidates in the Senate is, of course, small, but the fact that there are practically none anywhere else must make just about every Senator aware of the possibilities of the place, and a bit less content to look upon it as a institution where a man can find complete fulfillment. It was this feeling about the Senate that used to make it so fascinating, and it would be a most melancholy development if this feeling were to die out.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

Communist Infiltration of Latin America—Article by Constantine Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the well-known columnist, Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Tuesday, January 26, 1960. In his column, Mr. Brown discusses the dangers inherent in a policy of weakness and vacillation, insofar as Communist infiltration of Latin America is concerned. His analysis of the situation warrants careful reading, not only by Members of Congress, but by the American public as well.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION NEEDED IN HEMISPHERE—HOPE THAT PRESIDENT'S TOUR WILL ALTER PRESENT TREND CALLED WISHFUL THINKING

(By Constantine Brown)

A Soviet embassy has been established in Bolivia's capital of La Paz. An Egyptian diplomatic mission is being established in Panama City. Throughout Latin America delegations and missions of Russia and its satellites, and especially Communist China, are active in a successful anti-United States campaign.

The systematic and well-conceived propaganda is bearing fruit. Hence, the deep concern over the situation among Republican and Democratic Members of both houses of Congress as well as in the Pentagon. The State Department appears to be in a state of confusion since the death of Secretary Dulles and retirement of Undersecretary Robert Murphy. Policymakers wonder what to do over the impossible situation in Cuba. The general trend seems to be, Don't offend Castro.

Prodded by Communists—particularly the advisers sent by Peiping—Dictator Fidel Castro and his henchmen are kicking over the traces and losing no opportunity to slap Uncle Sam.

Castro's activities are not confined to Cuba alone. They extend to Panama—where he attempted a coup d'etat last November—and to a number of other countries in Central America and the Caribbean.

The State Department's diplomatic strategy seems to consist of what the French call cherchez midi a quatorze heures (look for noon at 2 p.m.). That is to say, Do tomorrow what should have been done day before yesterday. But even in this policy which may imply a show of strength, there are a number of advisers who shun taking at least some economic actions which might conceivably bring the Cuban dictator to his senses.

The fact that the Cuban people themselves are beginning to feel and resent strongly the heavy hand of Fulgencio Batista's successor even more than they felt that of the previous regime seems to be ignored by our State Department experts on Latin American affairs. They are advising President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter that any show of strength, even when the

rights of American citizens in Cuba, guaranteed by international law, are ruthlessly ignored, might play into the hands of the Communist propagandists.

Strong actions would be welcomed by our sister Republics which fear Communist intrusions. They feel themselves hopelessly handicapped because the powerful United States has adopted too literally the Christian virtue of turning the other cheek. Thus Castro and his crowd, whom we rushed to recognize despite their known Communist record and who received last year the accolade of the American newspaper editors when the "leader" was their guest of honor and featured speaker at their gathering in Washington, is waging a relentless campaign against us, not only in Cuba but in other Latin American countries.

A policy of wait and see is still being advocated by the State Department where it is felt the pending visit of President Eisenhower to a number of Latin American Republics would result in changing the present trend in our favor.

There seems to be no doubt that there will be no repetitions of the dramatic incidents experienced by Vice President and Mrs. Richard Nixon during their visit to South America. The Communists have reportedly passed the word, as they did when Mr. Eisenhower visited Rome, that there should be no hostile manifestations. But what seems to be overlooked is the fact that the Middle Eastern countries where Mr. Eisenhower was received with thundering ovations are bitterly anti-Communist. India, where the reception was even more spectacular, was feeling for the first time the hot breath of Communist aggression.

The people of Latin America do not have the same awareness as those of the Asian Continent. Hence, whatever enthusiastic reception Mr. Eisenhower man enjoy in Latin America will not necessarily have the same meaning as in the Middle East. Hence, the expectation of some superoptimistic diplomats that the present situation would change after the Chief Executive's visit next summer appears at best wishful thinking. The realists in Congress and Government agencies feel that nothing but determination by the administration could avert a Communist takeover in our hemisphere where the diplomatic experts consider the Monroe Doctrine as obsolete.

Revitalizing American Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while some of our industries are teeming with growth and progress, others, which have served us well in years past, seem somehow to be in a state of dormancy and uncertainty. With less than one-twelfth of the world's population and little more than one-third of its area, North America has nearly one-half of the world's railway mileage and far more than one-half of the aggregate railway capacity to move passengers and freight. It is the railroads that helped build the economy of this country, and it is the railroads that bridged East and West. Yet now, while the country is steaming ahead, our railroads somehow seem to be left behind.

It is a common notion among many so-called financial experts that no money can be made in railroads, and that railroads, therefore, merit little future attention. Yet it has been demonstrated, both in Europe and in this country, that when progress comes to railroads, profits also come. What is said about railroads has been long said about public and municipal transportation generally—that they are romantic but not practical remnants from an era gone by. But one needs only to look at what happened to the public transportation system in the District of Columbia over the past few years to be reassured that there is money to be made if progress is introduced.

A few months back I called upon the railroads' management and unions to discharge their public responsibility by negotiating a settlement and preventing the danger of a strike. I said at that time:

The blueprints of a strike are now being readied—and this is in face of the continuing Communist threat, the urgent needs of national security, and our steel strike damaged economy. Instead of preparing for a strike, they should be making the blueprints for railroad improvements.

Many of our railroads are now in financial difficulties. They claim that "featherbedding"—which means work paid for but not needed—is costing them nearly one half billion dollars a year. The railway unions contend that "featherbedding" does not exist. Yet, most railroad work rules and management practices were adopted after the First World War—in a day when passenger trains averaged 20 miles an hour and trains moved at about 12½ miles an hour—half of the present day speed.

It would appear that railroad management and unions have a great responsibility and challenge ahead of them. It is imperative that this great arm of American free enterprise not be permitted to remain long moribund. It is imperative that they look at the new facts of American life, that they make use of newer and better equipment, of newer methods of management and development—so that the full faith of the people and business in the American railroads may be fully restored.

I should like to have printed at this point of my remarks a letter from Mr. Joseph C. Wangen, of Superior, Wis., who traces the railroad history over the last 46 years, and concludes:

To quarrel over advancement and not accept the betterment it furnishes as a give-and-take proposition is paradoxical. The increase in intelligence is bound to bring improved achievement. Why argue against the achievements these new inventions bring? Should we go back to the days before the moldboard plow? I think not.

I ask that Mr. Wangen's entire letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MILESTONES

TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

After working for 46 years on a railroad I am naturally interested in the present railway controversy.

If one will but turn back to the turn of the century for a view of railway operations as they then were, we may get an idea of what developments have taken place.

Entering our town from the south, the railroad had a downgrade, which meant a stopping problem for freight trains in particular. We kids would watch these trains come in, for it was quite spectacular. There were no airbrakes then so the brakemen would have to run the full length of the trains on top of the cars, and with their brake clubs they would turn the brake wheel tight on each car to bring the train to a stop at the station.

We looked upon this feat with a sort of hero worship, for it was plain there was great risk involved. With the introduction of the airbrake, the most difficult and hazardous task was removed for the trainmen.

When the steam engine came into being, it was about the most outstanding development in machinery, and anyone who drove one had the high title of locomotive engineer. Academically they are not engineers, but engine drivers. The run in those days was set for 100 miles, for which the engineer, the fireman, and the trainmen received a day's pay. This is still in effect, and the railway men do not want to change it, even though the speed of trains has increased several times.

The fireman really had to work, especially if he were firing a mallet engine, which is two engines in one as they are equipped with a double set of cylinders and driving wheels. To stoke coal in one of their fireboxes was really something, for these fireboxes had almost double ordinary length. Yes, those engines could really eat up the coal, especially on a mountain run.

Later handfiring was changed by introducing the stoker, which delivered the coal into the firebox by a mere pull of a lever, for the power of the engine turned the screw conveyor. The writer recalls too well when these stokers came into use for he made up the initial order for parts to be installed. This took place in the year 1914.

The next step of improvement for steam locomotives was the conversion into oil burners. This also made the task easier for the fireman. The final change came with the diesel locomotive. These latter changes made the job of a fireman a position.

To quarrel over advancement and not accept the betterment it furnishes as a give-and-take proposition is paradoxical. The increase in intelligence is bound to bring improved achievement. Why argue against the achievements these new inventions bring? Should we go back to the days before the moldboard plow? I think not.

JOSEPH C. WANGEN.

SUPERIOR, WIS.

Necessity or Expansion and Improvement of Educational Programs in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, almost daily we are hearing more and more debate over the question of Federal assistance to public schools. As we review the great need to expand and improve our national educational program, it seems to me that the question is not

whether such assistance is needed, but rather how much is needed and what form it will take, whether of construction, or teacher pay, or other forms.

The principal concern in the minds of most Americans, it seems to me, is that we provide a program which will meet the needs of our schools for growth and improvement and at the same time assiduously retain local and State control of schools in every sense of the word.

Mr. President, recently one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my State published an excellent editorial on this subject, one which I believe reflects the thinking of many Texans on this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Aid to Education" from the January 24, 1960, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO EDUCATION

Election-year pressures are powerful for passage of a Federal aid to education bill this session, but election-year political maneuvering could stall that needed action.

The urgency is evident. State-local effort has built around 70,000 classrooms over the past 3 years, but has reduced the estimated national classroom shortage by only 17,000 to 132,400. Enrollment continues to soar. About one-fourth of the Nation's school districts have reached their legal debt limits for construction bonds. And most States are scraping the bottoms of their tax barrels for more aid.

Both major political parties, a majority of Congress, and the administration appear agreed that more Federal aid is needed. But a battle royal is building up over what kind, for how long, and how much.

Reversing his stand of a year ago, President Eisenhower threatens to veto outright grant aid and insists on credit construction with the Federal Government paying half the debt service. The National Education Association demands no-strings Federal grants for both construction and teacher pay, and threatens to fight anything else.

In between is an array of pending bills favored by various congressional factions. They differ mainly as to total amount of aid, the combinations of grant and credit, whether aid will be limited to construction, and various needs formulas for allocating the aid.

Lurking in the background is the chronic opposition involving the integration and church-state issues, fear of Federal school control, and concern over Government spending generally. With majority favor so badly split, that minority opposition could easily prevail.

The administration and Congress should seek a sensible compromise, somewhere between the Eisenhower and NEA extremes, at least a substantial beginning on construction aid. This Nation needs school classrooms far more than it needs an additional political issue for the election campaigns.

WBTV's War Upon Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the television station WBTV of Charlotte, N.C., which serves a major portion of the South Atlantic States, merits the thanks of the Nation for the war which it has been conducting against illiteracy. The census of 1950 disclosed that there were 155,000 persons of the age 15 and upward in North Carolina who were unable to read or write. This figure has been substantially reduced since that time. Any illiteracy, however, is a blot on our civilization, and those who seek to eliminate it merit the thanks of the Nation, as well as the gratitude of those whose intellectual horizons are expanded by the ability to read and write.

Harry Golden, editor and publisher of the Carolina Israelite and author of the two best sellers, "Only in America" and "For 2 Cents Plain," wrote an article in the TV Guide for December 26, 1959–January 1, 1960, in which he described in graphic fashion television station WBTV's war upon illiteracy in North Carolina and neighboring States.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY IN AMERICA—TELEVISION REACHES OUT TO 1 MILLION SOUTHERNERS WHO CAN'T READ OR WRITE

When I was graduated from the New York East Side Evening High School 42 years ago, the valedictorian was a bearded peddler, 50 years old. He was not unusual. The night schools were filled with elderly students who spent their days in squat-legged tailoring, or door-to-door peddling, or collecting junk. Even rabbis were in these classes. The immigrants who made their home on the lower East Side wanted to read and write the language of their new country. Perhaps the fact that most of these immigrants were Jews explains this, for study of the written word is an important part of the Jewish religion. That they were immigrants is also an explanation. Like all immigrants, they were possessed with that driving urge to succeed even to out-American the Americans, if possible. But the real reason why they wanted to read and write English is that the community would not tolerate illiteracy. Not to be able to read and write was too shameful an admission for a household on the lower East Side to make. The family made every sacrifice possible to educate itself and its children. And then these immigrants had the great gift of the public institutions of New York City. The city furnished us not only the schoolrooms and electricity, and maintenance, and free books, but provided us with wonderful teachers. (These teachers were our first contact with the gentile world of America and it was they who helped ease our way into the open society.)

There was total literacy on the lower East Side 40 or 50 years ago.

But in the South of 1959 illiterancy has not yet been conquered.

Thousands of adults in the Carolinas, Alabama, and eastern Tennessee are illiterate. Census figures for 1950 reveal that there are 155,000 illiterates of the age of 15 and upward in North Carolina. While this is not as serious a problem as it is in at least five other Southern States, there are thousands of other functional illiterates—people who have been taught to read and write but who have never done so.

But there is a groundswell, rapidly gaining momentum, to recapture these wasted human resources. A community endeavor is underway which may wipe out illiteracy in this generation. It is called the Literacy Movement in the Southeast by Television. A successful pilot program was launched in January 1959, over station WBTV, Charlotte. WBTV has fully exploited the vast potential of television, which transforms the living room of any Piedmont farmhouse into a classroom any and tar-paper shack into a school.

In the conquest of illiteracy, television is a tool; an animate tool, of course, but still a tool. To conquer illiteracy you need the subject matter proper, and an energetic community and an agency to coordinate the community.

The subject matter for this movement was provided by Dr. Frank Laubach, a former missionary who worked for 23 years in more than 90 countries, helping adults learn to read and write. Dr. Laubach's system uses picture-word-letter symbols and is designed specifically for adults. A cup hanking on a hook becomes in a series of pictures the letter "C" and then the word "cup"; a boy with upraised arms becomes the letter "U" and then the word "up." Dr. Laubach's illustrated system teaches by association.

The entire effort—arranging subject matter, television time, enrollment—was coordinated by the John C. Campbell Folk School in western North Carolina, under the direction of Mayes Behrman, head of the school's literacy division.

Behrman enlisted the aid of WBTV in Charlotte, which volunteered its channel for four 30-minute lectures each week, televised from 6:30 to 7 a.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays—98 lessons in all, extending over a 6-month period. Lacy Sellars, program manager of WBTV and a native North Carolinian, estimates that the cost of the program, had it been sponsored by commercial advertisers, would have been about $20,000 in time alone. Add to this the cost of hundreds of innumerable "spot" announcements which advertised the program. As it was, no time was purchased and WBTV underwrote all the travel, telephone, and printing expenses (the experiment was also helped by a grant from I. D. Blumenthal, a Charlotte industrialist).

The Charlotte Observer, a large and influential newspaper, deeply committed itself to the project. L. M. Wright, one of the paper's staff writers, devoted a comprehensive series to the aims of the project, and the Observer commended editorially time and time again on the value of the experiment. The Observer was also instrumental in interesting every paper in the area to lend its editorial support to the literacy movement.

Television dealers in Charlottee lent the necessary number of sets. The Elks, the American Legion, the ministerial brotherhoods, the church auxiliaries, women's clubs and the fraternal organizations recruited from their membership the number of volunteer "assistant teachers" needed. These assistant teachers were professional men, teachers, nurses, salesmen, all of them high school graduates, who took a brief instructing course so that they could help students each morning. These community organizations also enrolled the 1,000 adult illiterates in scores of small classes, each class supervised by an assistant teacher.

The only expense incurred by the pupil was in his book—duplicating the pictures he saw on television—sold to him at below cost for $4 and which he could keep.

The first program was beamed last January.

For these morning programs WBTV used a kinescope made from a live show on WKNO–TV in Memphis, an educational television station.

Was it a success?

It was. In this 6-month period, 1,000 adults learned how to read and write.

So successful was the program that beginning in January, eight commercial stations will offer this course in the Carolinas and Tennessee. In addition, two South Carolina stations, WCSC–TV in Charleston and WIS–TV in Columbia, will begin the series

next May. The January starters are: In North Carolina, WECT in Wilmington, WNCT in Greenville, WTVD in Durham, WFMY-TV in Greensboro and WBTV in Charlotte; in South Carolina, WBTW in Florence; in Tennessee, WRGP-TV in Chattanooga (which will offer the lessons for eastern Tennessee and extreme western counties in North Carolina), and WBIR-TV in Knoxville. Alabama's literacy movement will be carried by the State educational television network.

One cannot underestimate the tremendous role played by the John C. Campbell Folk School in initiating this program, nor of the Laubach method in effecting communication, nor the generosity of WBTV, nor the prestige lent the experiment by the Charlotte Observer. But the Literacy Movement of the Southeast by Television will succeed because the entire community works in its behalf—actively, responsibly, and personally. Illiteracy cannot fight against genuine community concern. As this movement gains impetus throughout the South, illiteracy will become obsolete. Perhaps, in fact, the Literacy Movement in the Southeast will rival the great public-school effort of the eastern cities which turned the immigrant children of Russia, Rumania, Hungary, and Italy into citizens within a generation. Soon thousands of southerners will know the joy of reading about their ancestors who helped create this Nation at Kings Mountain, Guilford Courthouse, and Yorktown.

The Forgotten Man: The American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on the date of December 4 to address the Texas Farmers Union at Fort Worth, Tex. The Farmers Union in Texas has been growing steadily, solidly, and is gaining ever wider and stronger support. This is a splendid organization of dedicated and patriotic Americans who are justly proud of their activity. It was a real privilege to address this splendid gathering.

The distinguished junior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH, introduced me to his fellow Texans. He was received with great enthusiasm and is justly known as the champion of the farmers of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that my address before the Texas Farmers Union convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRAT, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE TEXAS FARMERS UNION BANQUET, FORT WORTH, TEX., DECEMBER 4, 1959

Some years ago, Franklin D. Roosevelt made famous the phrase, "the forgotten man."

Today, there is definitely a forgotten man in the eyes of the present administration—the American farmer.

I don't need to remind any of you that the American economy has had its ups and downs since this administration took office. But it has always worked out so that the farmer shared in all the downs but was left out in the cold during the ups.

Let me give you some examples of how the farmer has been left out in the cold—down and out.

SLIDING DOWN THE SLIDING SCALE

During the first 5 years of this administration, net farm income declined by about 2 percent a year—while nonfarm net income rose by 2 percent a year.

And in 1958, the income per person on the farm was just about half the income per person off the farm. And I'm not just talking about cash income—I'm talking about total income.

This year, according to the Republican hucksters, we're supposed to be in a boom. If you don't believe me, why just ask the Republican National Committee. They'll tell you how rosy everything is supposed to be.

Well, before these Republican propagandists write up their press releases, they must throw away all the figures they get about the American farmer. Because during this so-called Republican boom things certainly aren't rosy down on the farm.

Sure, during the first 9 months of this year, the income of the American people as a whole went up $9 billion.

But what happened to farm income?

You know—it went down by more than $2 billion.

Net farm income during this so-called boom year has gone down nearly 24 percent.

In terms of dollars with the same buying power, the net income of agriculture this year is the lowest in 19 years.

The parity ratio is lower today than at any time since 1940.

Is it any wonder I say that the American farmer is today's forgotten man?

Now, of course, the Republicans would like to have you forget that you're the forgotten man. And they've adopted a new technique for doing that. They've appointed a special committee of experts to tell you how great things are going to be for you 17 years from now—in 1976.

You know, it's an amazing thing. The Republican Party has been in business for over 100 years now—and it has to organize a committee to tell it what it stands for.

Well, this committee had a lot of high-sounding phrases to solve the farm problem. But when you cut through them and boil them down to simple English, they say simply, "We Republicans like Ezra."

So if you want to know where you'll be in 1976 under the Republicans' long-range program, just try to imagine going through 17 more years just like the past 6—of falling prices, falling parity, falling income—and falling farms.

I know you can't afford many more years like the past six—and I don't think America can either.

THE WRONG ANSWERS TO THE WRONG QUESTION

I've been doing a lot of thinking about the current plight of the American farmer, and also about the great depression of 1929—at the end of another Republican administration. And I've come to the conclusion that there's a frightening similarity between the two.

Thirty years ago, as the businessmen of that other Republican administration surveyed the phony boom of the late 1920's, they concluded that the country was suffering from one thing: overproduction.

Well, the Republican farm program of the 1950's starts from the same basic premise: that the basic farm problem is overproduction.

And having drawn that conclusion, they pick the most inhuman solution to it: lower prices and break the farmer's back—then, according to Republican doctrine there won't be so many farmers—and maybe they won't produce so much.

This is the most inhuman solution, and it is also the most ineffective. We've all learned that over the past 6 years. Any solution to the farm program that flies in the face of human nature—and of humaneness—is bound to fail.

What has been the result of this deliberate Republican policy of farm deflation? Who has benefitted?

Not the consumer—for while the prices received by farmers have dropped severely since 1952, the price of food to the consumer has gone up sharply.

Not the worker—for the worker is basically a consumer.

Not the businessman—for if farm income hadn't dropped off by billions and billions of dollars, farmers would have much more money to buy the products of business.

Nor have the surpluses been reduced. Quite the contrary—today, they are several times what they were when this deliberate farm deflation policy was started.

And if the Republicans in Washington knew anything about human nature, they would have known from the beginning that increased production—yes surpluses—would result from deliberately depressing farm prices. As long as the American farmer is a free and independent man, he will try to make up for lower prices by planting more. It's just plain commonsense and economic necessity.

THE TRUE SURPLUS—HUNGER

The result of the current farm policy has been a great deal of suffering. The farmers have suffered, the consumers have suffered, business has suffered—but there's another group of people who have suffered, too.

I'm talking about the millions of people who go to bed hungry every night, simply because they can't get the food to feed themselves or their families.

Many of those people are right here in the United States.

Millions more are abroad.

How shameful that America's granaries should be bulging at their seams while there remains a mouth unfed.

How shameful that the American taxpayer should be paying a million dollars a day to store our mounting surpluses—instead of devoting that money to help feed the hungry and clothe the needy.

I am not talking about dumping our products abroad and destroying world markets.

I am talking about reaching out with a humane, helping hand to nations who cannot buy foodstuffs in the world market, but who need our help desperately.

Why don't the Republicans give their enthusiastic support to a Food for Peace plan such as I have proposed?

I'll tell you why: because the Republican spokesmen are afraid it will cost too much money. But they ignore the cost of doing nothing—or too little.

Let me tell you something about the image of America abroad. I have had the good fortune to travel quite a bit in recent years, and I have seen what the world thinks of America.

Do you remember that Franklin Roosevelt used to talk about the good neighbor policy? Well, everyone in the world believed he meant just that, because Franklin Roosevelt was a good neighbor right in his own country. Everybody knew that Franklin Roosevelt loved people and believed in "Love Thy Neighbor."

And when President Truman inaugurated the point 4 program to help the down-

trodden countries of the world, that rang true, too, because the world knew that Harry Truman was the friend of the downtrodden here at home.

But America doesn't enjoy that same image today. And do you know why? Because when the world looks at Uncle GOP today, it sees dollar signs in his eyes. They are the eyes of a moneylender or a rich relative, not the eyes of a humanitarian who believes in people and in sharing good fortune to relieve misfortune.

Besides using food for peace, there are other great things that this country could do. We could put our young men to work in his forests and parks, conserving and building our great national wealth. I have proposed such a program—a Youth Conservation Corps—but Uncle GOP say "No."

We could have a food stamp plan in order to supplement the diets of our needy—but Uncle GOP says "No."

And if Uncle GOP were truly thrifty—and smart—we could have a farm policy that would strengthen the farm economy, the national economy, and the economy of the free world—and it would cost a lot less tax money than the present Republican mess.

A POLICY OF DESPAIR

The Republicans have not offered us a farm program—not last week, nor last year, nor any of the 7 years they have been in power. The farm policies they have followed have weakened the ability of the Government to aid farmers, have driven the young people from the land, have stifled the rural business communities.

And the Republican policies have not resulted in benefit to the cities either. When the young men and women turn from the land, go to the cities to seek their fortunes and new ways of life, they find no opportunities awaiting them. There has been no program to prepare the cities for the people, or the people for the cities. The Republican farm policies are matched by their bankrupt policies in regard to labor, education, health, and urban development.

Present farm policies have brought us to the place where farmers and their children feel there is no hope in the land, they are met with discouragement on every side.

Present farm policies have paved the way for the seizure of America's vast acres of agricultural land by corporate interests, by corporate powers. The people in the cities are being softened up for this seizure by the Madison Avenue boys who control the channels of communication. That is why every other slick magazine you pick up has another article that makes the farmer the whipping boy for the extravagant, wasteful, eroding farm policies. Divide and conquer in the name of the corporate interests.

You know and I know that unrestricted corporate economic power over our land and our people spells exploitation—heartless use of human resources and soil resources and water resources—that does not take into account the present and future needs of the people in our own country or of the people of the world.

A CHARTER OF HOPE FOR FARMERS

What do I think we should do about a farm policy?

I believe that Congress should set forth goals for American agriculture, and then give the President and the Secretary of Agriculture a wide variety of tools for the attainment of those goals, and broad discretion in the choice of those tools. And I believe farmers themselves should have a voice in this matter that concerns them so vitally.

I spelled out these ideas in the Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act which I introduced last August. This is a charter of hope.

What are the goals?

The first is a determination of a fair price for farm commodities and a fair income standard for farmers. Income per farm person is only about half the income per nonfarm person. This lop-sided situation can't be changed overnight, but it can be gradually changed if pricing policies are geared to the attainment of a fair income for farmers—and this can be accomplished in a way that lessens the tax burden, instead of piling it higher and higher.

The second objective is a production goal. This goal should be determined by what is needed to satisfy the true needs of the American people, the commercial export market, necessary reserves, and foreign policy purposes.

And this goal should not be met by a deliberate policy of farm deflation, of breaking the farmer's back to reduce production. There are more humane and more effective ways of achieving production goals in agriculture, and they should be used.

Third, we need an agricultural resources conservation program. This is an integral part of any comprehensive farm program. Any land adjustment program must take into account our present needs—needs of farmers, needs of consumers, needs of rural communities, and needs of generations to come. Every American has a stake in the present and future productivity of our land. Our growing population makes this so.

The time when a frontier farmer could "mine" his land and move on to another farm—leaving behind him starved, treeless, eroded land—is far in our past. Soil and water resources are vital to national well-being—and to international well-being.

Therefore, a comprehensive land use program must be based on the facts of both present and potential consumption needs. It must safeguard the well-being of the family farmer. An agricultural resources conservation program is the heart of a sound, forward-looking farm program.

Fourth, we should have employment goals for American agriculture. These goals should envisage a farm population, and especially farm families, which have adequate opportunity to be fully and usefully employed on our farms. They should include proper credit facilities to strengthen the operation of the family type farm. They should also include employment opportunities for those within the farm population who may wish to transfer to other occupations.

Undoubtedly, there would be some mistakes and some difficulties, even under this kind of program. But such a program, being based upon sound and worthy objectives, would be self-repairing instead of self-defeating.

It would bring bring supply and demand into balance at the highest possible levels, instead of trying to bring them into balance at depressed levels.

It would use income progress, rather than income deflation, as a tool for farm production adjustment.

It would, in the long run, reduce public costs by substituting sanity for confusion.

It would unite instead of dividing the worker and the farmer, the producer and the consumer, by using a full prosperity program for agriculture as a reinforcement to a full prosperity program for all, and by promoting the full prosperity of others as a reinforcement to the full prosperity of farmers.

It would help us to advance the American economy as a whole by seeing it as a whole, instead of mistreating the economy by breaking it down into arbitrary bits and pieces.

It would bring our agricultural efforts into the further service of free world humanity and world peace. It would make us look at our so-called wheat surplus in terms of national and worldwide needs. When you do that it becomes a strategic and vital reserve that lends strength and security to the free world. Instead of considering our store of wheat as only a burdensome problem, a weight upon the farmer and a drag on the economy, it should be treated as the source of moral, political, and economic strength.

We should look at the quantities of food held in reserve, and the productive capacity of our land just as we look at money in the bank—this is our capital goods, our capital treasure. Money is worthless piled up in a bank. Only when it is put to use does it have true worth, true value, true meaning to people.

From Biblical times, down through the centuries, wheat has been a symbol of life and hope to all mankind. A kernel of wheat is indeed a spark of life. All over the world people pray: "Give us this day our daily bread."

A CHARTER OF HOPE FOR ALL

I have spoken of the kind of goals which should be part of our farm policy—goals I have incorporated in the Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act. I see an America in which we can and should attain such goals, not only for agriculture, but also for the Nation at large. We need to set goals for social security expansion, for wage expansion, for business expansion, for education and health improvement—all reinforcing one another, all consistent strains in the symphony of American effort, and all responsive to the new pace of our technology and science and invention.

Then, and then only, will we be able to lead the world to rising standards of living and to peace.

Hypocrisy of Northern Charges Against Southern Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the January 28, 1960, issue of the Williston Way, of Williston, S.C., contains a very timely and appropriate editorial which points up the hypocrisy of northern charges against southern justice. The editorial is entitled "Rape Isn't Rape Up North."

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAPE ISN'T RAPE UP NORTH

Last year, when four young white men were charged with the criminal assault of a young Negress in Tallahassee, Fla., there was much hue and cry by the liberal northern press and agitators and the NAACP that the death penalty be given the group. Millions of words of copy were written before, during, and after the trial by special writers sent to Florida to cover the trial and when the quartet received only a life imprisonment sentence there were threats of carrying it to other courts in an effort to get the death sentence.

Along about the time that the trial was in the news four teenage Negro boys in New

York raped a young white girl. This did not bring near the lineage in the news that the Florida affair had and a NAACP official tried to get a court order barring newspapermen from even covering the hearing. None of the hue and cry for the death penalty was raised in any quarter.

Then, in November, the group was allowed to plead guilty to a charge of felonious assault with intent to commit rape (the fact that rape had been committed was overlooked), thus assuring themselves of a sentence no longer than 5 years.

In recommending that this plea be accepted, the assistant district attorney in charge of the case said: "This was not a typical vicious attack. The victim was on a social basis with the defendant before the attack."

If the fact that social integration of the races makes rape a less heinous crime, then that is just another reason why we prefer the maintenance of segregation of the races. Or is it that rape just isn't rape up north?

The Quiet Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recently read a most interesting and thoughtful article by Mr. Harry Pollak, of the AFL–CIO, on his visit to India during the course of the U.S. Small-Scale Industries Exhibition held there by the United States. The article, "The Quiet Russians," appears in the January issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist. It discusses the Russian-sponsored project of setting up the great new Indian steel mill at Bhilai, and the impact of the friendly, competent Russian technicians who are supervising the construction of the mill and training the Indian workers who will take over.

The contrast to the Indians of Russian and American aid is forcefully brought out in the article. I should like to underline Mr. Pollak's conclusion:

We came away from Bhilai with a strong feeling that our country needs not only to reevaluate some of its aid projects abroad, but that it must pay extremely close attention to the nature of its personnel and their relationships with the peoples of other societies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUIET RUSSIANS—A NEW BREED—INDIAN STYLE

(By Harry H. Pollak)

(Bhilai engineers' pledge, Raipur, January 10—Over 1,300 engineers and all the officials working on the Bhilai steel project have decided not to take any leave until the first blast furnace goes into operation. They include 626 Russian engineers who are helping in the construction of the project.—Excerpt from the Sunday Standard of India, issue of January 11, 1959.)

For years now, Americans have been assailed by the bombast and strident diplomacy of Soviet officials from Stalin to Khrushchev—and on down.

Some of us, meeting during the annual conferences of the International Labor Organization, have been faced with stiff-necked, unrepentant, confident Soviet crusaders who would brook no differences of opinion and were always, always right.

It therefore came as a surprise to see another kind of Soviet representative—the men the Kremlin is sending to the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa. In India we saw nearly a thousand Russian technicians helping the Indian Government erect a gigantic steel mill as Bhilai in the District of Durg in Madhya Pradesh.

Where once there was only hot, red wasteland, there is now springing up a new "Pittsburgh," and, manifestly, the Russians who financed the construction of the project with a credit of nearly $133 million, at about a 2½ percent interest rate, are making diplomatic "hay." This is true despite the far greater United States contributions to all forms of technical assistance in India, and despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. was not involved in any significant aid until after the highly touted Khrushchev-Bulganin triumphal tour of India in 1955.

First of all, to the Indian people a steel mill is the archsymbol of their efforts to lift themselves up into the major industrial nation category. In the key race that India is running—obviously against Communist China—steel is a vital index to development. The Chinese Communist slogan of "a blast furnace in every backyard" is a measure of that country's interest. Many an Indian may owe his life to the grain and milk that came from America, but the concrete visualization of the future—even when dimly seen by the lowliest peasant—may be in the hot glare of coke ovens and the flow of molten steel.

But, one may answer, there are other gigantic steel mills springing up. At Durgapur there is an excellent British mill. At Rourkela there is a German plant under construction. At Jamshedpur, which the writer also visited, there is the pioneer Tata plant that is being expanded with American technical assistance from Kaiser. But each of these operations suffers from a special defect in the view of at least some key Indians.

At the British project the complaint runs that the British are aloof and that they treat their Indian counterparts with cool reserve. At the German plant relations between local people and some of the resident German engineers have been poor. At the Tata plant the operation is in the private sector, and as one Bhilai official explained, Russia has extended hands of friendship to the public sector.

Many of these charges are exaggerated, but for this writer, who visited India twice during the last year, a tour of Bhilai in late September brought out something new about the nature of Russian technical assistance which bears even closer examination.

L. N. Misra, superintendent of mechanical maintenance, personally escorted us around the giant works. There was a blaze of activity everywhere. Bulldozers were clearing ground and cutting through roads. New homes and schools were going up all round us. The atmosphere was a combination of Eastern boomtown and the pioneering of the old West. The giant earthmovers contrasted sharply with the half-naked male and female laborers working on construction.

Misra, we learned, was a former Tata chief engineer who, like several others now in key positions at Bhilai, had been persuaded to come into the new program. He struck us as being an eager, dynamic and straightforward individual. As he showed us the coke oven, battery No. 1, in operation, and white hot pig iron flowing out of the blast furnace, he explained that Bhilai in its first stage expected to produce 1 million tons of steel when it reached capacity. (First steel flowed in October.) When the first stage of Bhilai is completed, 4½ million tons will be available in India from all the mills in the country.

As we moved on to the electrical motor shop and construction area for the open hearth furnace, Misra tendered an invitation to a special ceremony that evening when the first "loco" was to go into the open hearth. Ceremony and ritual, we were to learn later, played an important part in the morale-building activities at Bhilai.

We were anxious to know how Misra felt about the differences in the Soviet and American approaches, since he had been at Tata's. He thought for a while and then said:

"In the U.S.A. everyone is allowed to think, while in the U.S.S.R. there is one man who thinks or oders and others execute. One orders; others carry through blindly. While in practice confusion was sometimes created, most of the time it works all right."

As he took us through the operation, he indicated where Russians had been able to solve simple but vital problems—in comparison to what he considered the American approach at his former alma mater—such as self-sustaining repair shops where repairs were made right in the area of breakdown.

The Russians, Misra said, had produced better screening for the coke ovens. There was better access at the many points of the coal chutes. They used bigger brakes. Being a genial and basically friendly man, he added, somewhat as a consolation:

"Outside of Russia, nobody can beat America in steel."

There seems a will to believe in Russian technical superiority that is alarming and annoying to the casual American visitor. There is a tendency to ignore the fact that the Russians have had their share of difficulties and that, in fact, the Bhilai plant is behind schedule.

We returned to our apartment nearby and met a representative of the Bhilai public relations staff—a man with a soft sell and very unlike our Madison Avenue types. He told us that when construction was completed it would take 7,000 to 8,000 employees to operate Bhilai. At present there were 54,000 employees, but 32,000 of them were on construction. A total of 950 Russians were at Bhilai and were steadily being replaced.

(We later learned that there are plans to double the capacity of the mill, which would mean that the Russian technical advisers would probably remain for some time.)

What about the Russians? The public relations man responded:

"They are not dictators here. * * * They advise and guide."

The technique, he added, was equal Russian and Indian responsibility.

The writer noted that the Russian senior officials were housed in apartments similar to ours, in extremely comfortable modern buildings, with a large dining room, living room, large bedrooms, and well-tended gardens outside. Moreover, all contained air conditioning, refrigeration, carpeted floors. An excellent restaurant, catered by one of India's leading restaurateurs, Gaylord's, provided fine food. Most of the Russians had less sumptuous but very adequate quarters and their own cafeterias with their own cooks where they could obtain borscht and other familiar staples.

What about the language barrier? While the Russians have many interpreters, the public relations man said they were teaching Russian to a thousand Indians at the project.

That evening we went to the area where the locomotive was to make its initial run into the plant and saw that there was a considerable air of hustle and bustle. Even though it was long after sundown, a great number of construction workers were on the job outside. Inside, there were a number of Russian officials with their wives greeting workers, together with the Indian dignitaries and their families.

Suddenly a cry went up and the whistle blew as locomotive T3B13 slowly rolled into the mill. It was gaily decorated, and a number of workers were on the top and hanging over the sides. There was an air of genuine excitement, and we saw broad grins on the faces of the Russian and Indian officials. Here we met the Russian chief engineer, N. K. Goldin, and other Soviet representatives who were beaming broadly. We also met one of the chief Indian technicians, Suku Sen, who honored the occasion with a big red flower in his buttonhole.

"We will have ingot steel in 8 to 10 days," he told us. He said that the ceremony sparked the workers with inspiration. We asked him how he got on with the Russians, and he responded: "Excellent. They are not our bosses. They work side by side with us in a partnership arrangement, and when an Indian learns the job we tell the Russians to get out."

The next day we had a long discussion with another leading official who compared his experiences with American technicians in India and with the Russians. One of the great problems, he said, was that Americans, with a much higher standard of living, tend to raise prices in the marketplace. The Russians, whose standards are closer to the Indian, tend to "blend" into the local economy.

"Socially and culturally, we are closer to the Americans," the official said. "There is little contact with the Russians on a social basis. They stay to themselves, and on rare occasions when Indians come to their homes, conversations are limited. Their behavior is impeccable, correct. They do not get into trouble, as nationals from other countries have on occasion."

From several sources we learned that the Russians tend to refrain from open political discussions. They play their roles as technicians to the hilt. There appear to be no serious efforts to involve themselves with local Communist Party activities. And as long as the foreign technicians are at Bhilai and it is considered a "Russian" steel mill, there is little likelihood that there will be any serious Communist efforts to organize the workers.

In the pioneering haze which envelops Bhilai—by comparison with the long-established Tata Iron & Steel Co. works at Jamshedpur—there is a dark side. Beneath the level of top and secondary management and selected "permanent" personnel is a vast mass of temporary workers—primarily construction workers—who live under primitive conditions, who have no strong union to protect them and who have hazardous working conditions. A doctor at a Bhilai field dispensary told us there are so many sick and injured workers that the health facilities are overburdened and many have to be turned away without care.

Conversely, at Jamshedpur, we were impressed with housing, health and safety emphasis, and many other advantages, including what appeared to be a higher wage pattern.

Ironically, the Communists at the Tata works not long ago engaged in a violent and bloody strike, whose consequences are still being felt.

From all of our conversations with Indians and from our observations at the plant level, we got the impression that this new kind of Russian "Point Four" is making an enormous impact. The tensions with Communist China over the border incursions do not seem to affect the attitude of the Indians toward Russia. They look at the U.S.S.R. with rose-colored glasses.

Soviet communism's "top-down" discipline and inculcation of total obedience to the leader principle make it easier, paradoxically, to send such silent missionaries to underdeveloped countries to work on heavy industrial programs. Democracy's representatives by their very nature, on the other hand, are individuals who do not conform to any rigid pattern or ironclad rules of behavior set up by a foreign office.

The brilliant editor of "Thought," Ram Singh, whom we saw again in New Delhi in September, has described the very special advantages which Russia has in such "peaceful competition."

"Russia," Ram Singh writes, "has the singular advantage of its permanent public relations office in the agency of the Communist Party of India. Do what America will, there will always be some people in this country, or in any democratic country for that matter, who would make it their business to decry America and lionize Russia."

His suggestion to the democratic friends of India is simple:

"Let the words be few but action abundant to demonstrate the undoubted excellence of their technique and humanity."

We came away from Bhilai and its sprawling township, Bhilainagar, with a strong feeling that our country needs not only to reevaluate some of its aid projects abroad, but that it must pay extremely close attention to the nature of its personnel and their relationships with the peoples of other societies.

As my friend Ram Singh said:

"More than a change in the pattern of aid, what is indicated is a change in outlook, approach, and perspective."

Cuba and Extension of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant talk dealing with the Sugar Act extension, soon to come before this Congress.

I have introduced an amendment which would make a permanent transfer of a portion of the Cuban sugar quota to domestic producers. This amendment I believe is long overdue.

The article to which I refer expresses the views of Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel of the United States Beet Sugar Association, an organization of American beet growers and processors. I believe Mr. Shields maintains a temperate view and an overall objectivity in viewing the economic and social effects of an amendment to the Sugar Act. I would recommend that my colleagues read carefully the outline of our current sugar situation contained in this speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AND EXTENSION OF THE SUGAR ACT

(Remarks of Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel, United States Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D.C., at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich., on Sugar Beet Day Program, February 2, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, I am very glad to have this opportunity to be here again on Sugar Beet Day of your Farmer's Week. I am pleased especially because this enables me to renew my acquaintance with the sugar beet growers and processors, and other agricultural leaders, here in your great State of Michigan.

An occasion like this demonstrates eloquently the intelligent and cooperative relationship which obtains between the sugar beet industry and the agricultural universities and colleges of our Nation in the 22 States in which sugar beets are grown.

Cooperation between growers and processors in the beet sugar industry, and between those groups and the State agricultural colleges and the Federal Department of Agriculture, has been responsible for much of the progress this industry has made. In the talks this morning by Grant Nichol, Maury Frakes and Mr. Davis, you heard reports of progress being made in mechanization, in planting of that truly remarkable monogerm seed, in general improvement of farm practices.

Mr. Coryell—C. A.—has reminded me that that the 1959 sugar beet crop in Michigan was, in terms of sugar beet tonnage, the highest ever achieved in the long and distinguished record of the Michigan industry. Hugh Eldred told me that the yield per acre also set a new record. I understand the sugar content of your beets left something to be desired. But don't let that discourage you. Other areas, too, have occasionally had a year of low sugar content—and then have bounced back to new highs.

You had company in your record tonnages. Sugar beet growers for the Nation as a whole in 1959 established new high figures both for total production and yields per acre. We recognize that the benevolence of good weather had something to do with this bounty, but far from everything. For even with the best growing conditions in the world, the crop would not have been so large without the good cultural practices, without the higher-yielding seed, without the cooperation among the various segments of the industry.

In your Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, you have demonstrated the effectiveness of cooperation in sugar beet production technology. I understand that in this audience are farmers who grow beets for all or most of the companies who have joined with you in this endeavor—Michigan Sugar, Monitor, Buckeye, Northern Ohio, Canada-Dominion, and Menominee—and I see representatives of most of the companies as well. I should like to pay tribute to your officers and staff who add their labors to your zeal in order to make this project work: your president, C. A. Coryell, who helped found the organization; Elmer Haines, who as vice president represents growers in policy decisions; Perc Reeve, your executive secretary; Loren Armbruster, your growers field secretary; Mark Berrett, your director of research; Jack Brock, your treasurer; and Art Schupp, now in semiretirement after so many years as your executive secretary.

I refer to the value of united effort in the permissible fields of endeavor in which the Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association is engaged because there is a parallel in the field of sugar legislation, which I have been asked to discuss. Sugar laws are, in the final analysis, formulated by the Congress, and are of course primarily the responsibility of the Congress. However, congressional leaders have on many oc-

casions told us that it is extremely helpful to them and also contributes to sound and effective legislation for all the various interested groups—including, of course, the executive departments of the Government—to try to reconcile their separate views in a united recommendation for the congressional leaders to review.

Developing a recommendation on which all can agree is not simple, because many divergent and competitive interests are involved in the Sugar Act. And of course all sugar legislation must be designed so it will equitably serve the interests of American consumers, both as to supply and price. I don't have to tell you that the administration of the act has been at least fair to consumers.

All of you know that the present Sugar Act expires at the end of this year. You will recall that we in the sugar beet industry, in cooperation with other segments of the domestic producing industry, had hoped for renewal last year, during the last session of Congress. The industry sought extension of the law last year, a year before expiration, so all could plan ahead with assurance and so the dangers of ill-considered action inherent in hammering out legislation at the 11th hour, on the eve of an expiration date, could be avoided.

In this connection, early in the last session—in fact, on January 12, only 5 days after the 1959 session began—your two Michigan Senators, Senators HART and MCNAMARA, together with Senators YOUNG and LAUSCHE from Ohio and PROXMIRE and WILEY from Wisconsin, joined with 41 other Members of the U.S. Senate in introducing a bill to extend the Sugar Act. Several bills were also introduced in the House.

But our legislative effort came to naught last year primarily for one dramatic reason—or perhaps I should say because of one man. You will recall that a year ago at New Year's time, the man with a beard came triumphantly out of the Sierra Maestra Mountains down in Cuba and took over the Cuban Government. This man told the Cuban people and the world that he was going to drive out of Cuba "the tyrants and the dictators," and establish a "real democracy" for our Cuban friends.

At the beginning there was a great deal of popular sympathy in the United States for this man. His announced intent to benefit the underprivileged of Cuba, a policy which we assumed would be instituted democratically and enforced equitably, appealed to the general liberalism of the great mass of the people of this country.

To begin with, I believe, many of us were tolerant of the flamboyant statements he made; we charged them off as boasts made in the first flush of victory. After all, in the course of a few hours his position had changed from that of a hunted man in the mountains to unquestioned master of his own country. The new leader of Cuba, we thought, would settle down and bring order out of the chaos that immediately followed the revolution. We hoped he would establish a sound political and economic democracy—which all the good people of Cuba want and deserve—a constitutional government of law and order; of freedom, not of military prisons; of respect for individual rights, not fear of another dictator's mailed fist.

But we all remember what happened in the next few weeks. We remember the bloodletting. We remember the tirades against the United States when some persons here dared to protest that the firing squad was not an instrument of democracy. Along in the spring of last year it became only too plain that affairs in Cuba were not settling down.

Accordingly, at the request of the Government and on the advice of Members of Congress, the domestic sugar industry abandoned any effort to bring about consideration of the Sugar Act in the last session. It was then hoped that before the next session—the now current session—the Cuban situation would have clarified. It was hoped that economic and political stability would prevail in the Pearl of the Antilles. It was hoped that by now the atmosphere would be such that normal friendly relationships between the United States and the Cuban people would again be possible.

Well, as you know, the climate has not improved. The unfortunate situation in Cuba today is much more discouraging than it was in the spring of 1959. Our high hopes for an early restoration of normal relations with a friendly Cuba have been smothered by the torrent of abusive, anti-American statements—and by overt acts against American citizens, including representatives of the free American press who have been thrown into jail and expelled from the country for seeking and writing the truth about the Castro regime.

The present situation in Cuba makes it difficult to know how the provisions of law affecting Cuba should be treated in any extension of the Sugar Act. The Cuban situation also colors the consideration of a change which should be made in the law with respect to the manner of reallocation of Puerto Rican deficits. The Cuban situation did not bring about the need for this change, but conditions in Cuba make the change more imperative.

In the last 3 years Puerto Rican deficits have totaled almost 800,000 tons, an average of 264,000 tons a year. Although a spokesman for the Puerto Rican sugar industry has recently explained that it is possible for the Island's production to make a dramatic comeback, most students of the situation anticipate that substantial deficits will continue to occur in Puerto Rico. Almost two-thirds of the recent 800,000 tons of Puerto Rican deficits have gone to the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas. Under terms of the present law an increasing proportion of future Puerto Rican deficits will continue to go to these two areas.

The charge has been made that this feature of the present law causes a maldistribution of sugar supplies within the United States, resulting in an alleged shortage of sugar in the Northeast and an oversupply in the Midwest. Of course there has been no actual shortage of sugar in the Northeast as alleged. And of course under the act more raw supplies from offshore areas other than Puerto Rico can be routed to the Northeast and less to the refiners supplying the Midwest. Accordingly, we have hoped that the situation would in time correct itself. However, it is evident that the market conditions on which the charge is based still persist, and consequently the law should be changed to provide for Puerto Rican deficits to be allotted to ther areas normally supplying raw sugar to the Northeast.

The allocations of Puerto Rican deficits to the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas in recent years have eased the pressure on these areas for higher basic quotas. Even so, the demand for additional beet acreage remains unsatisfied. In light of this fact, and if the domestic beet and mainland cane areas are to relinquish their rights to future Puerto Rican deficits, their basic quotas must be increased in line with their present and immediate future production and marketing potentials. Such basic quota increases are particularly desirable now at a time when the need for more reliance upon domestic continental sugar production is underscored by the present uncertain Cuban situation. Exchanging Puerto Rican deficits for comparable flat additions to their quotas will enable these areas better to program their production and selling operations, will facilitate general administration of the law, and should ameliorate some of the market conditions said to be created by the present Puerto Rican deficit situation.

Despite the conflicting views of the various interests involved, we are happy to be able to say that there is complete agreement among domestic producers and refiners that additions to the domestic beet and mainland cane quotas totaling 200,000 tons—150,000 tons for beets and 50,000 tons for cane—should be made in the next extension of the act. It is hoped that the industrial users of sugar, who have often indicated their belief that the present Puerto Rican deficit provision should be changed, will feel that this is a practical way to handle this problem at this time.

Obviously the chief concern of American sugar consumers, like that of the U.S. sugar industry, is an assurance of adequate, dependable and timely future sugar supplies at prices fair to both interests. The correction of the Puerto Rican deficit provision would contribute to this objective.

In light of the present Cuban situation another hole in the law should be plugged. In any extension of the Sugar Act the President should be vested with power, in the interest of national security, to cut the sugar quota of any foreign country for any given calendar year.

With such a provision in the law American sugar consumers would no longer need to worry about almost one-third of their normal sugar supplies being jeopardized by Castroism. Under such a provision other foreign countries, with governments friendly to the United States, could, if needed, bring in sugar equivalent to any cut made in the Cuban quota for this reason. Many such friendly countries already have available surplus sugar stocks. With this additional power the Cuban quota could be cut, if such action is required, and replacement sugar provided for, at a time and in a manner which would best protect the interests of the United States.

With Castro still heaping vilifications upon the American people, the American Government, the American Ambassador to Cuba, the Vice President, and the President of the United States, it is understandable that some people feel strongly that Cuba's quota should be cut, and drastically cut, right now. To many people it is unthinkable that, because of the current Cuban situation, farmers in America who risked their lives to fight communism in foreign lands should be denied for still another year the right to grow more sugar beets. It is hard for others to understand why the United States does not award more generous quotas to nations now friendly to the United States.

A more reflective view, however, is that we should not let our justifiable anger at Castro blind us to the effect that drastic action at this time would have upon the Cuban people. Nor should we forget the fact that the Cuban people in the past have made substantial contributions to the workability of the American sugar program. Cuba has never yet failed to supply her allotted share of the market, even at times when international incidents sent the so-called world market soaring, and she could have sold her sugar for more money elsewhere. Domestic sugar interests have always had a sympathetic appreciation for what the Cuban people have done. And we should like to preserve for the Cuban people in the future the opportunity to continue to maintain a responsible role in supplying a significant portion of the sugar the U.S. market requires—in spite of the poisonous provocations of their present anti-American leaders.

At the same time, a simple extension of the law without change for any period would not correct the Puerto Rican deficit problem, would not give American consumers the added protection they now need, and would not give the President of the United

States the additional negotiating power he needs in the interest of the national security to deal with Castro. In fact, a simple extension of the law without change would condone Castroism.

A simple extension without change actually would give Castro more U.S. quota than he now has without any strings to it. This would be true because in the present law Cuba's quota increases each year with increases in U.S. sugar consumption. On the basis of the average annual growth of the U.S. sugar market of 150,000 tons a year, a simple extension without change would increase Castro's quota about 50,000 tons a year.

An extension of the law for a reasonable period of time incorporating the desired amendments would benefit everyone having an interest in the Sugar Act—the American Government, U.S. consumers, the domestic sugar industry, foreign suppliers, and exporters who sell to countries from which we buy sugar. As the trend of events points dramatically to the importance of maintaining a sound, healthy domestic sugar industry, the need for advance planning becomes even more important to the Nation's welfare. The ability to plan ahead also contributes to more stable marketing of this sensitive commodity, and market stability is, of course, in the interests of all consumers as well as all producers.

Sugar legislation is likely to be up for consideration in the Congress in the next few weeks. I hope what I have said here will be of help to you in discussing this vital matter with your Congressmen and Senators. They know that over the years you sugarbeet growers and processors have made substantial and valuable contributions to the Nation's economy. Accordingly, we can all rely with confidence upon your representatives in the House and Senate to act wisely and sympathetically in your interest at the appropriate time.

United States Acts To Curb Drinks Aloft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very enlightening article by Harry C. Kenney, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor:

UNITED STATES ACTS TO CURB DRINKS ALOFT

(By Harry C. Kenney)

NEW YORK.—The Federal Government through the Federal Aviation Agency has taken a step to reduce the amount of drinking aboard airplanes.

The FAA rule governing the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft provides that no alcoholic beverages may be consumed which are not served by the carrier, nor will alcoholic beverages be served to passengers who appear to be intoxicated.

There are teeth in the rule which states that enforcement will be carried out by FAA enforcement processes and which provide for civil penalties up to $1,000. The rule takes effect March 10.

The wording of the rule attempts to relieve the carriers from judging whether or not a passenger actually is intoxicated. Crew members may rely on the appearance of the passenger in determining whether or not to serve alcoholic beverages. Officials also noted existing regulations already forbid carriers from taking on passengers who are obviously under the influence of alcohol.

DIRECTNESS EXPECTED

From here on, the airlines are expected to be more direct in telling passengers of the new restriction and make suitable reports to the FAA of any known violations.

The crew members are not required to physically restrain a passenger who wishes to consume drinks that are not served by the plane. FAA said a crew member would be required to take direct action only when such action is necessary to the safety of the flight. This provision is already covered under existing regulations.

Already the FAA has received comments that the rule does not go far enough. Many have commented that the serving and drinking of alcoholic beverages on aircraft should be completely prohibited.

But FAA officials—noting their responsibility is limited to safety considerations—say that their studies show no facts to support the contention that serving alcoholic beverages to passengers constituted a safety hazard.

STEWARDESS POURS

Under the new rule, a passenger can take liquor aboard but the stewardess is supposed to pour the drinks. If the stewardess or steward feels that the passenger has had enough, then drinks can be refused.

There appears to be a number of reasons why the FAA has come out with this ruling. There has been an increasing number of complaints from pilots and stewardesses about the drunkenness and disorderliness of drinking passengers. Not only have such passengers proved to be an annoyance but in some cases have interfered with the proper operations of the aircraft.

During an interview with an official of the Air Lines Pilots Association, this reporter was told that soon there will be a bill introduced into the Senate which would abolish all drinking on airplanes.

For a very long time the pilots' association and the Air Lines Stewardesses and Stewards Association have been opposed to drinking on aircraft on the basis that it is dangerous to flight.

ABOLISHMENT FAVORED

A number of top executives have told this reporter that they wished liquor would be abolished on aircraft for a number of good and obvious reasons. Countless passengers and organized groups also have protested.

It is doubted whether this latest ruling will prove to be effective.

The ALPA official said that it is not the role of the pilots or stewardesses to "bounce" "high" passengers. In fact, there is a strong rule against pilots leaving the cockpit except under emergency circumstances.

If a stewardess accuses a passenger of being drunk and he is not, the carrier could get into trouble. If a passenger is drunk and he is refused more liquor, he causes trouble which should not be the responsibility of the stewardess or the carrier. If a passenger appears to be drunk and the pilot contacts the airport to have the man arrested, it is the carrier that is in the position of being the prosecutor. This it does not want to be.

ALPA says that it should not be up to the carrier, the pilots, or the stewardesses to enforce the law. Also, if the FAA is going to make these rules they should be responsible for them and provide the means for prosecution.

All of this underlines the point made by so many people and organizations within the airline field and out of it—that the problem of drinking aloft will be halted only when it is prohibited. This takes into consideration the FAA claim that too many people would go aboard drunk. There is major and mature thinking which contends that passengers would not go aboard in this manner.

In any case, airlines do not now permit passengers aboard who are obviously drunk.

INCIDENTS REPORTED

FAA said that their studies show no facts to support the contention that serving alcoholic beverages to passengers constituted a safety hazard. ALPA has submitted to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Transportation a list of incidents caused by intoxicated airline passengers which directly affected the ability of the flight crews to conduct their flights with the highest degree of safety.

The incidents were listed in six categories:

1. Attempts to enter the flight deck and interfere with the operation of the aircraft by the crews.

2. Causing disturbances in the passenger cabin—possibly under critical flight conditions and at the risk of bodily injury.

3. Inflight emergencies requiring unscheduled landings to remove inebriated passengers who are causing disturbances or hazards.

4. Inebriated passengers inadvertently actuating or damaging exit and pressurization devices in flight.

5. Fire hazards from inebriated passengers and refusal to comply with safety regulations.

6. Social and moral problems and effect of alcohol at altitude.

The FAA knows that even in a partial attempt at reducing the liquor hazard there are dangers involved. During the present rapidly developing jet age, jet speed requires that carriers, pilots and crew, and passengers conduct themselves at the best possible safety level.

It is the contention of many of those responsible for flight safety that abolition of liquor aloft is the only solution.

We Can and Must Do More for Our Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, American labor unions have been particularly concerned about the problems of our older citizens who have retired from the labor force. The United Auto Workers of the AFL–CIO has done an outstanding job of helping its older members meet the problems of retirement, and the secretary-treasurer of the U.A.W., Emil Mazey, has written a very thoughtful article on the income, health and housing needs of our older citizens.

Mr. Mazey's article deals with these needs in a very sound, realistic and humanitarian way. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the January issue of the American Federationist magazine of the AFL–CIO be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN AND MUST DO MORE FOR OUR OLDER PEOPLE

(By Emil Mazey)

We stand today on the threshold of an abundant life for all Americans. Our ca-

pacity to produce is unprecedented. This productive capacity is not confined to material goods alone. In the past half century we have made phenomenal progress in our capacity to prolong human life.

Through dramatic advances in medical research, public health, and sanitation measures, we have added about 30 years to the life span of the average American. This has been reflected in a vast increase in the numbers in our society in the older age groups. When we contemplate the means of providing a more abundant life for all Americans, we must give special attention to the needs and opportunities presented by this generation of oldsters.

In the past 25 years we have made significant progress in providing a measure of economic security for our senior citizens through income maintenance programs such as social security, old-age assistance and hard-won negotiated pension plans and other retirement benefits. But the fact remains that senior citizenship in America still remains a second-class citizenship at best.

The great majority of the 16 million Americans past 65 are living out their lives on drastically reduced incomes, without adequate health and hospital insurance protection, without much chance of income supplementation through employment and without proper social, educational, and recreational services in the community. Their basic problems are further complicated by the ominous prospect of social isolation, loneliness and desolation as relatives and friends pass away and mobility is diminished by chronic disease and disability.

To provide this important and growing segment of our population with a greater share of our potentiality for abundance is one of the great challenges faced by American society.

On the one hand, we must provide the basic security which those who have contributed so much to our society so richly deserve. On the other hand, we must strive to increase and extend opportunities for the older person to contribute to our society and maintain his dignity and self-respect, even though he is retired from full-time remunerative employment.

In line with this challenge, we in the United Auto Workers believe older people can continue to be useful and constructive members of our society. Our experience over the past 10 years with the more than 100,000 who have retired under United Auto Workers contracts has been that they continue to be valued and valuable members of our union.

This assumes, of course, that the individual has a reasonable prospect of meeting his basic needs for food, clothing, shelter and health, along with a reasonable opportunity to develop and pursue a useful role or function in retirement. In an abundant society such as ours, older people have the right to expect that we will help them to achieve these simple but fundamental objectives:

Sufficient income to maintain their accustomed standard of living.

Health, housing, education, recreation, and social resources and services in the community adequate to meet their emerging needs and problems.

Opportunities to prepare for useful and creative roles in retirement life that are consistent with their basic interests and abilities.

These are understandable and manageable objectives. What must we do by way of changes or improvements in social policy to help our older people achieve them? The best way to answer this question intelligently is to inventory the present status of programs and services for older people, identify the shortcomings and propose specific modifications and improvements.

More than 10 million of the 16 million Americans who are 65 and over are now drawing social security benefits. These benefits average slightly over $72 a month in benefits paid to individuals and about $110 a month in benefits to older couples. About 2,500,000 persons are receiving old-age assistance and the average payment is a little over $65 a month.

Low incomes among the aged are reflected in generally lower standards of living in all other aspects of their lives—poor housing, poor nutrition, and poor health. This results in an unnecessarily heavy drain on the economic health and welfare of the entire community at the point where the effects of cumulative social neglect result in critical physical or mental illness.

Decline, disability, and chronic illness are associated with old age when, in part at least, our basic social policy automatically downgrades older people economically and socially at the point of retirement. It is the UAW's firm belief that much of this can be avoided. We can afford the social and economic costs of a preventive program. In the long run, this will cost far less than a policy of charity measures to deal only with the crisis aspects of aging at the point of no return.

It would be idle to minimize the value and importance of the changes in benefit levels, scope of protection and coverage that have taken place in what is now the OASDI program since 1950. We firmly believe that these changes have made the program a far more effective vehicle for providing a measure of security for the aged, their survivors, and the disabled. We are just as firmly convinced, however, that it does not adequately cover their needs.

We know of no valid reason why, for example, the concept of a "basic floor of protection" should become sanctified as a basic principle of our social security system. No doubt the vision of millions of retired Americans with substantial savings, privately purchased retirement annuities and retirement income from industrial pension plans is an intriguing one, but it is essentially a false picture. The fact is that, for the great majority of retired workers, social security benefits are the major if not the sole source of income.

If the best we can do under the "floor of protection" idea is to provide below-subsistence-level retirement incomes for the majority of our retired population, it is time to consider adopting benefit standards reasonably related to the cost of decent living. This means basic reexamination of the whole benefit structure to ensure that retired workers share in the increasing productivity of our society along with all other groups.

The United Auto Workers are gravely concerned over the fact that the disability insurance program under the Social Security Act fails to provide immediate meaningful protection for a very substantial number of disabled workers. Consideration must be given to the income needs of those who become totally disabled under age 50, as well as to those who would be considered totally and permanently disabled under any standards and administrative procedures but the most severe.

Approximately 20 percent of UAW members who are retired under the total and permanent disability provisions of negotiated pension plans in the automobile industry are disqualified for disability insurance under the Social Security Act. Certainly the standards of the Government program should not be more severe than those of the Big Three auto companies.

The definitions of permanent and total disability under the Social Security Act as well as the implementing procedures ought to be reexamined and liberalized to conform at least to the realities of current industry policy and practice.

Congress should also give some thought, we think, to lowering the retirement age under the Social Security Act for both men and women and consider means for making special early retirement provisions for workers, displaced by technological innovations or geographic redistribution of industrial plants, who, because of their age, are unable to find other suitable employment. Under such a provision the older worker who is a longtime resident in an area of labor surplus could be retired without actuarial reduction of his OASI, provided he is on long-term layoff by his employer and the local employment office certifies that his prospects for new employment are improbable or impossible.

Such a provision would help immeasurably to meet the income problem of the worker who is now too old to work and too young to retire. At the same time it would tend to reduce the competition for the same jobs between the older and the younger unemployed.

Inflation takes its most tragic toll on the Nation's older men and women. Their lifetime efforts to provide for a measure of security, dignity, and independence in their old age are nullified by a relentless rise in living costs that erodes the purchasing power of their savings. Protection against loss of purchasing power has become a critical need of America's aged people.

While wage escalator clauses provide cost of living protection for the current income of most UAW members and several million other workers while they are employed, inflation still eats away at the value of savings they may have set aside for protection when they retire. And once people have retired, the overwhelming majority have no adequate protection for their pensions, much less for their savings, against further increases in the cost of living.

Government has a major responsibility for the prevention of inflation. When it fails to meet that responsibility through effective economic policies, it has a moral obligation to provide protection against rising prices for the retirement savings and pensions of older people, who are least able to protect themselves.

A specific method for providing such protection was recently proposed by Prof. H. S. Houthakker of Stanford University. As he points out, an essential characteristic required in retirement savings is freedom from risk. Under present arrangements this freedom from risk cannot be assured, especially to the small asset holder. As a means of solving this problem and providing small investors as well as pension funds and insurance programs with a genuinely risk-free and inflation-proof form of investment, Mr. Houthakker suggests the issuance of what he calls index bonds, that is bonds whose face value and interest payments would be adjusted in accordance with changes in the consumers' price index.

We in the UAW propose that the Government issue a special series of nonnegotiable bonds for purchase only by the trustees of pension funds, by insurance companies providing annuities for retirement purposes and, up to a specified maximum amount and under other safeguards, by individuals saving for retirement.

The redemption value of these bonds would include face value plus accumulated interest, plus an adjustment to compensate for any increase in the consumers' price index during the period since they were issued.

When purchased by the trustees of pension funds or administrators of annuity programs, such bonds would be available only to finance pensions or annuities which would also contain the same constant purchasing power protection. When purchased by individuals, the guarantee of constant purchasing power would apply only to bonds held by the purchaser until he attained a given age, perhaps 60.

Such bonds would help us to settle a very thorny problem which now troubles labor-management relations—the question of how to put into our pension plans automatic protection for the buying power of the pensions they provide. Corporations which employ UAW members have always resisted the incorporation of any automatic cost-of-living adjustments into pension plans because, they have argued, such a provision would subject them to unpredictable and possibly heavy costs.

We in the UAW have for some time recognized that older people need special protection against the ravages of inflation, because they are most vulnerable to it. Our 1957 and 1959 conventions adopted resolutions calling for the issuance of constant purchasing power bonds for this purpose. We strongly urge such action.

A more liberal distribution program for surplus foods would be a practical, inexpensive and immediate way in which to share our abundance with older persons. Under present policies and procedures many States and localities have no surplus foods distribution system even though they all have their share of needy aged who would benefit from the program. Many other States and localities have such restrictive eligibility requirements that only a small portion of those who would benefit from the surplus program are involved.

We have numerous examples of retired persons who are denied surplus foods because they have so-called liquid assets that exceed by a few dollars the amounts laid down in policy. Many of these people have exceedingly low incomes. The liquid assets they hold would probably not finance 1 week of serious illness, yet they are denied surplus foods which cost as much or more to store than would be involved in their distribution.

Adequate health care ranks high, we happen to believe first, among the unmet needs of our aged population. Public awareness of the need is reaching a point where continued neglect of the problem is becoming increasingly unthinkable. The debate now brewing, however, revolves almost exclusively about the method for meeting the need.

While we may hear a great deal about the alleged fact that any American who needs medical care can get it, regardless of ability to pay, this contention is largely irrelevant, for public assistance or any other types of free medical care are generally repugnant to most self-respecting Americans, whatever their ages.

When a choice, which cannot be long delayed, is made, it will surely be between an effort to bring most of the aged under the protection of voluntary health insurance and legislative action such as contemplated in H.R. 4700 to provide insurance for certain health needs for OASI beneficiaries through our social security system.

Ideological issues raised by opponents of the legislative approach are specious. The question is simply this: Which approach offers the more meaningful solution? To us, the superiority of the legislative approach is beyond question.

While the economic research department of the American Medical Association chooses to quibble over the validity of the often referred to statistic that 60 percent of America's aged have annual incomes of $1,000 or less, it is nonetheless clear that for most Americans old age is a time of diminished economic resources and increased health needs.

While there are conflicting, even competing, estimates of the number of retired persons now covered by insurance, it is surely debatable whether those covered represent much more than 40 percent of the population aged 65 and over. Only a Federal legislative solution offers any immediate prospect of something approaching universal coverage.

There is no justification in asking the current aged to wait another 3, 5, or 10 years while the voluntary system makes up its mind to get them covered.

The quality of the health insurance protection available to persons of retirement age is, at best, uneven. At its worst it may come close to being worthless. We have no assurance that continued reliance on the voluntary approach will bring forth any significant improvements in this regard. We do know, however, that a Federal system can provide a basic standard of protection which can be supplemented by a rich variety of private arrangements providing protection above the minimum.

Given the limited resources of the aged, the voluntary approach fails to provide them with any real relief from the burden for paying for coverage or can do so only at the expense of benefit adequacy. We need to spread the cost as broadly as possible over the working lifetime of people and over the working population of America. This can best be accomplished through social security.

It is for these reasons that our organization, as part of the organized labor movement in the United States, has made the passage of H.R. 4700 or similar legislation a major legislative goal for 1960.

Certainly we feel that any serious proposals that would broaden H.R. 4700 to include protection, for example, for the cost of drugs used outside the hospital, home care services, and medical care in the hospital would merit earnest consideration.

What is alarming is that medical costs and the costs of hospital and medical insurance continue to rise farther and farther beyond the reach of the majority of senior citizens. This is ultimately a burden borne by the entire population which can be met more economically and effectively through social insurance than through the catch-as-catch-can measures now being proposed by the doctors and the insurance companies.

Such legislation would materially improve the income maintenance situation for retired workers and would remove a burden from the voluntary health insurance program which has done so much to force costs upward.

Today one out of every four patients in our mental hospitals is 65 and over—more than three times their proportion in the general population.

Studies show clearly that the average State mental hospital is ill-equipped, from the point of view of staff and facilities, to deal in a positive manner with the mental health needs of elderly patients. Furthermore, there is a growing and rather well-founded suspicion that many older persons now in mental hospitals do not belong there at all.

Because of the lack of other appropriate facilities to care for him, the so-called senile patient tends to live out his life in an environment that only further contributes to his disorientation and decline. Many of these older people who end up in the morass of a mental institution could be better cared for at home, in nursing or boarding homes, in homes for the aged, in geriatric clinics or in community-centered mental hygiene and rehabilitation centers.

Most States and communities already have many of the resources to deal with this type of problem. What they lack is the technical leadership and know-how that an aggressive national program of research, demonstration, and technical assistance in the field of mental health for the elderly could provide. As a Nation and in individual States, we must reverse this trend toward making the mental hospital the dumping ground for our unresolved problems with older people who need better facilities of other types.

Another corollary of low incomes and consequent low living standards among the older population is the effect which this has on their housing. Although a considerable proportion, perhaps two out of three, of the retired persons in America own their own homes, these are usually older dwellings which become increasingly rundown as income from maintenance and repairs declines and physical capacity for do-it-yourself projects also diminishes. Furthermore, the older homes in older neighborhoods occupied by older persons are typically larger homes which are hardest to heat, to keep clean, to repair, and to maintain.

In general, studies of housing needs and preferences of older persons show that they want less space, a minimum of stairs and a maximum of safety features to minimize falls due to poor lighting, narrow, high-pitched stairways and raised doorsills. What older people need is smaller quarters on one floor, easy to maintain and keep clean, well lighted and incorporating simple safety features. Yet those over 65 are at a particular disadvantage in either renting or buying the kind of housing they need.

In a real sense, the housing needs of older persons are a part of the much larger problem of the housing needs of all low and moderate income groups in our population. What is needed is a comprehensive national housing program with special provisions to meet the special problems of older people, for the most part living on reduced incomes. This means that we must provide funds for more public housing for the elderly and must also provide financial incentives and leadership to States and localities in planning and building such projects. At the same time we must avoid housing concepts and programs which result in the segregation of older people in isolated apartment houses or retirement villages.

Institutional housing for the elderly is also woefully inadequate in both capacity and quality. Standards for nursing homes and homes for the aged in most States are largely paper standards.

Furthermore, little attention is given to the need for good medical care and rehabilitation measures that would restore older patients to a sense of dignity, self-respect and self-care. One little recognized advantage of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, is that it would provide a sounder base for financing most nursing home care which could result in better facilities and higher standards of care and practice.

If the needs I have mentioned were more adequately met—liberalized and more flexible social security benefits, medical and hospital insurance, mental health services, and low-cost, specially designed housing—we would have taken long strides forward in achieving the basic objective of meeting the basic needs of retired workers for food, shelter, and clothing which would permit them to function in accordance with their accustomed living standards.

In addition, we must recognize that the fact of a particular chronological age of retirement does not alter their basic needs as people for the whole range of community services in the related fields of education, recreation, and social welfare.

It is obvious that retirement, to be an attractive alternative to work at the appropriate time in life, must not result in so drastic a reduction in income as to cause anxiety and hardship. However, there are other uncertainties concerning retirement which must be resolved if older workers are going to accept it and enjoy it. These have to do with the availability of opportunities for a constructive role in retirement—opportunities for social contact, education, recreation, and other health and welfare services.

The real issues we face in providing for an aging population in an abundant America resolve themselves down to a willingness to recognize and accept our respon-

sibilities and to a determination to plan and coordinate our efforts by establishing sound social policies and by providing effective machinery for carrying out these policies.

Will Small Packers Be Stamped Out of the Packing Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the present administration and the Department of Agriculture have been stressing the importance of competition in agriculture. However, in his recent order to stop Government lamb grading, Secretary Benson is bringing to a sharp halt the competition among meatpackers.

Let me illustrate. Under the present grading system Jones' meat with the "U.S. Good" or "U.S. Choice" marked on it is equal to Swift's Premium, Armour's Star, Wilson's Certified or Morrel's Pride. But take away the grade and you have Jones' unmarked meat competing against a large, well-advertised product. Without the grade, the small packer cannot receive as much for his meat and will eventually be run out of business.

This grading serves two purposes. First, this entirely self-supporting grading system makes the small packer's product equivalent to the large packer and helps keep our economy on a competitive basis. Second, it protects the consumers by assuring them that all the meat they buy is of top value.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a recent article by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post. This article brings out very adequately many of the evils to the consumer and the small businessman if the lamb grading would end.

The article follows:

RULING DUE ON LAMB GRADING END

(By Drew Pearson)

Today is the day when Ezra Taft Benson will finally decide whether to line up on the side of housewives and farmers or on the side of the big meatpacking lobby in regard to the grading of lamb and mutton.

A closed-door meeting has been called in the Agriculture Department at which Secretary Benson will weigh the evidence pro and con meat grading. Meat Lobbyist Aled Davies, close friend of Benson's, will not be present. But from a distance, he will be watching over Benson's shoulder.

Davies, who is vice president of the American Meat Institute, is given credit for persuading the Secretary of Agriculture to abandon Government grading of lamb and mutton even though it costs the Government nothing and is an important protection to housewives and independent meatpackers. (The packers pay for the grading). Davies is close to Benson, was one of the family guests invited to the musicale at Anderson House, headquarters of the Society of the Cincinnati, when Benson's daughter, Beverly, made her musical debut.

In front of Benson during today's closed session, however, will be a voluminous stack of testimony from all sorts of people taken before the House Agriculture Committee, urging that Government grading of lamb and mutton be continued. The testimony is from such people as Miss Sally Butler of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Fred Schneider of the American Steamship Purchasing Agents; Arnold Mayer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen; Charles Sullivan of the Division of Purchase and Property of New Jersey; Jim Hoge, representing the lamb producers of Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina; Irving Michelson of the Consumers Union, plus many others.

ENTERING WEDGE

"Government grading is essential," said Harold G. Smith of the U.S. Wholesalers Association. "Grading gives us protection against fancy sounding grade names imposed by the packers."

Most important of all, however, was a statement by Benson's good friend, Charles B. Shuman, head of the Farm Bureau, who has supported the Secretary of Agriculture on some of his most unpopular policies, but not on this one.

"We are strongly opposed to the discontinuance of the grading of lamb and mutton carcasses that was announced to be effective January 4," wrote Shuman. "We believe that discontinuing would be a step backward."

This testimony literally inundated Congress after Benson's order to stop lamb and mutton grading. Congress has now turned the testimony over to him. And the Secretary will have to decide today whether or not to reverse his own order and continue grading.

NOTE 1.—Many consumer groups fear that the ending of lamb and mutton grading would be the entering wedge for cutting out the grading of beef and all other meat, as desired by the big packers.

NOTE 2.—The House Agriculture Committee unanimously recommended that standards for mutton-lamb grading be continued but that standards be changed. Representative CLEM MILLER, of California, argued that it was not necessary to put so much fat on lambs to qualify as Prime and that consumers paid a higher price because of this extra fat. This change in standards will probably be made.

We're Exporting Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article by George Todt. It appeared recently in the North Hollywood, California, Valley Times.

FOREIGN TRADE PLIGHT SERIOUS

"If you're trying to sell $3 labor in a 50-cent market, you're in trouble."—Auden R. Fredriksen, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

Are American-made products in trouble when it comes to competition on the world market?

One conspicuous piece of evidence that such is the case lies in the fact that more than a million potential jobs have already been exported abroad.

These are jobs that an expanding population here in the United States needs desperately for the years immediately ahead of us. But foreign workers are tabbed to get them, not our people.

Could we be penny-wise and dollar-foolish, maybe?

Not long ago, I dropped in for a meal and a chat with Al Sorrentino, proprietor of Alphonse's Restaurant in North Hollywood, on Riverside Drive in the fashionable Toluca Lake district.

Al is a conscientious businessman who is keenly alert and awake to the pressing problems which our Republic is facing today on the world stage. He is somewhat short on scholastic degrees, but long on an even more important property—which is native intelligence. And what's more important than that?

I have seldom failed to find Al's ideas stimulating to me and this night was no exception. We immediately got into the world trade situation—which we have been kicking around for more than a year now—and found that our earlier predictions seemed to be coming true: the United States is presently seen to have a gigantic economic problem on its hands. And things are going to get much worse before they get better.

The awful truth is that a large portion of American investment capital is fleeing overseas.

It is going abroad, in many cases, because the world's highest labor costs have priced a great many of our products out of competition with European and Asiatic factories. Frankly, we're in a tight spot.

As the gentleman said in the quotation which commenced this column: "If you're trying to sell $3 labor in a 50-cent market, you're in trouble." I mentioned this to Al.

"And yet we can observe the incredible shortsightedness now going on at this very moment in the steel industry," Al told me. "A tremendous attempt is being made to boost labor costs upwards in this bellwether of American business. If it succeeds, what then?"

"Well, we can look forward to another round of wage-price boosts in all other industries after that," I replied "Then that ole-debil inflation will have his way with us some more."

"But how long can Americans permit costs of production to rise beyond the point where their goods can actually compete on their merits with those of foreign competitors?" Al asked me. "What about the law of diminishing returns? Doesn't it apply here?"

"One way to get around it if we were a socialist nation," I remarked, "might be simply to dump our finished products abroad for free in a superwelfare effort. Possibly under the auspices of the United Nations, or something. As a matter of fact, Victor Reuther has already made some such proposal, to the effect that we give away $10 billions of goods per year for 20 years to aid and uplift the global unwashed. Sounds very altruistic, of course."

"Altruistic in a pig's eye," exploded Al, mine host. "What Mr. Reuther really means is that since we can't compete pricewise with our oversea competitors by this time, we had better dump our surpluses abroad for free, at public taxpayers' expense, naturally, in what would amount to another multibillion-dollar subsidy."

"But such a plan would be intended to keep the work force busy and the wheels of industry turning," I reminded Al. "The idea of our Keynesian economic philosophers and deficit financiers is centered in taking people off the unemployment rolls, you know, even if they only produce gluts for the market which are not salable."

"Well, if this might keep up long enough," observed my friend, the able restaurateur, "maybe we can all make a living someday by taking in each other's washing. In the meantime, the flight of American capital is on, and hundreds of thousands of potential jobs continue to be exported abroad. What's the answer to that?"

It's a good question, isn't it?

Facing the Facts of Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call the attention of this Congress and of this Nation to a magnificent expression of concern about the use of alcohol by teenagers, by Miss Linda Jones, of Fort Mill Junior High School, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Jones, of Fort Mill, S.C. Miss Jones was recently declared winner of an essay contest held as a feature of Religious Emphasis Week conducted by the Fort Mill Ministers Association. Her essay was on facing the facts of alcoholism. I salute the accomplishments of this young lady and enclose as part of my remarks the essay which is attached.

The essay follows:

FACING THE FACTS OF ALCOHOL

(By Linda Jones)

"Youth Killed in Motorcycle Crash" screamed the morning headlines. The newspaper went on to state that the popular teenage boy had been trying to outdrink a friend just before he raced to his death. This tragic accident does not happen to every indulging teenager, but sooner or later his life will be dangerously affected unless he does wake up.

The problem of social drinking confronts most people at the college level or when they first go out to meet the world as it actually is. Temptations will and do come. Those trying to persuade others to drink often use the fact that people such as Jack London and O. Henry became famous because of the way alcohol spirited them. However, these two writers became famous in spite of their drinking, not because of it. Furthermore, social drinking will not help a person get ahead in the world. An executive of United States Steel Corp. stated, "The last man hired—the first man fired—the man who drinks."

Statistics tell us that there are in the United States approximately 100 million people 25 years of age or older. Thirty-five million of these do not drink. Of the 65 million who do drink, 48 million drink occasionally, 10 million drink about 3 times a week, 3 million are addicts, and 1 million are what are called chronic drinkers. The three times-a-week drinkers are those who get into domestic, social or business trouble because of their drinking. They can stop if they wish. The addict cannot stop when he wants to, but must have treatment. Among the chronic drinkers are those who have suffered physical and mental breakdowns.

Since alcohol is a narcotic, its use tends to become a habit. There is no way of predicting whether or not a person will become an alcoholic. The stages of rehabilitation of an alcoholic are difficult but have been proved to be effective, mainly through the efforts of Dr. Leslie E. Kelley with his gold cure.

The ways in which alcohol affects a person physically, mentally, and socially have been given. But, does it have any spiritual effects? The Bible answers it this way: "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging: and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Proverbs 20:1); Be not among winebibbers; among riotous eaters of flesh—for the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty and the drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags" (Proverbs 23:20–21).

In conclusion, what can teenagers do about the problem of drinking? There are more than 230 posts in the United States where organizations known as "Allied Youth" devote much time to the study of the causes and effects of drinking. However, every Christian teenager is obligated to take a distinct stand against alcohol in order to influence others so that they won't have to face the facts of alcohol the hard way.

Rules and Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed with the calm, judicial way which the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Special Investigations has conducted its hearings concerning activities of retired military officers in using their influence to secure Government contracts for business concerns. This is a delicate and intricate subject and the committee has approached it in a broadminded but firm manner. The appended editorial from the Washington Post of February 1, 1960, is constructive and well worth while:

RULES AND CONSCIENCE

The House Armed Services Subcommittee which has recommended additional rules to curb possible "influence peddling" by retired military officers has done an excellent job, we think, of keeping this difficult matter in perspective. It might have concentrated on a narrow search for specific instances of apparent wrongdoing and neglected the broader but more significant picture which it has unfolded. This is that the great majority of the large defense contractors employ high-ranking retired officers, creating a situation in which the opportunities for undue influence upon the award of Government contracts clearly are widespread.

Of course it might be argued that since nearly every big company is involved, none has an advantage over the others and the practice even tends to be self-policing. But while this consideration may indeed account for the seeming absence of any serious abuses, it does not obviate the fact that the special knowledge and experience of many former high-ranking public servants are now at the disposal of private interests and in potential conflict with the public interest.

The subcommittee proposes that retired officers register with the Pentagon any employment by defense contractors, that they be barred for 2 years after retirement or resignation from jobs directly or indirectly involving "selling" to the Defense Department (with "selling" to a broadly defined) and that a code of ethical conduct be prescribed which would permanently bar retired officers from activities of various kinds that are too closely related to or based upon special knowledge gained in the service. Such requirements would not of course insure against all wrongdoing. But they seem to provide a fair balancing of the public interest and the private rights of retired public servants. They would set a wholesome framework for defense procurement activities, minimizing the occasions for possible conflicts of interest.

Rev. O. D. Dempsey: "Mayor of Harlem"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper column:

REV. O. D. DEMPSEY: "MAYOR OF HARLEM"

(By Joseph Wershba)

The Reverend O. D. Dempsey is associate minister of the largest Baptist church in the world. He is an assistant to the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who is probably the most powerful individual in Harlem today. POWELL chose Dempsey 5 years ago as a potential leader in the city's Negro community, and Dempsey has returned the trust with a record of loyalty and selfless devotion to POWELL's cause.

But it would be hard to find two other men who appear to be so different from each other.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL moves in the grand tradition of the high-born, well-educated cosmopolitan who is a master at combining spiritual power—as head of the Abyssinian Baptist Church—with political power, as a longtime U.S. Congressman.

Oberia Davis Dempsey, on the other hand, sprang from a far different tradition; up from grinding poverty, toiling day and night for an education, tireless service for his people, and entering the ministry many years after most men usually make the choice.

He is a man of uncomplicated optimism that God is on the side of those who are righteous and who justly struggle for bread and dignity; but there is a constant sadness about him, making him look older than his 40 years.

The sadness was accentuated the other day—almost at the very moment that President Eisenhower was assuring the country that our fat-dripping prosperity would continue without stint—and Oberia Dempsey was proposing his minimum program for the needs of his community:

"A man ought to have at least some changing clothes, two meals a day, a place to sleep, and a job. These are the bare necessities. There are some who have less than that in Harlem."

Dempsey knows the problem at first hand, both in his church capacity and also as the elected "mayor of Harlem," a nonpaying job but one that had to be campaigned for as intensely as any congressional seat. In both posts, O. D. Dempsey has daily reminders of men in need of jobs, families in need of apartments when old houses are torn down to make way for new, of people without heat, light, and hot water, and neighbors who need him in court as a character reference for someone in trouble. He serves.

But if the outsider sees an O. D. Dempsey touched with sadness, he is missing the view from the inner eye. "I don't have any money, I'm still struggling, but I'm always happy," he says, "because I think I'm able to do things for people."

His home base is his church, at 132 West 138th Street, religious and social center for a vast network of community activities.

Oberia Dempsey (the name is derived from the Biblical Obadiah) was born in Paris, Tex., May 11, 1919, one of nine children. His father was a Baptist minister. Oberia was 14 when he left home to find work. He decided to work his way through school in Muskogee, Okla. He didn't know anyone in Muskogee and had only $4 when he arrived there, but a friend back in Paris had given

him the names of relatives in Muskogee—"and the relatives took me in."

Dempsey worked his way through high school, starred on the basketball and football teams, joined the church, NAACP, and local civic groups, was a lay teacher in church work, and made friends easily, Negro and white. He had a year at Wiley College in Marshall, Tex., and then in August 1940, enlisted in the U.S. Army. "And that's when life for me really began," he says.

He was a tech sergeant by the time he went overseas with the 349th Field Artillery. He saw action in five battles in France and Germany and was awarded the Bronze Star medal for meritorious service. After the war, he and his wife, the former Vivian Edwards, moved to Brooklyn and for the next 7 years Dempsey was the youth director of the Cornerstone Baptist Church.

The church was his avocation. He made his living, days, working in a mattress and spring factory. And he went to Brooklyn College, nights, for 7 years until he qualified for a degree in business administration and politics. He is now taking courses in religion and sociology at New York University. "The more I know," he says, "the easier it is for me to work here."

He had not planned to become a minister—"I had observed my father's sacrifices and felt it was just a little bit too much for me." But in 1953 he felt the call. He was permitted a trial sermon, and 10 months later he was invited to become assistant minister of the Mt. Lebanon Baptist Church in Brooklyn. That invitation led to his direct ordination in November 1953.

His religious, social, and civic work eventually caught the eye of ADAM POWELL, who finally prevailed on Dempsey, in 1955, to join him at the Abyssinian Church. He began as assistant minister. Seven weeks ago he was elevated to associate minister.

The Dempseys have four children. The girls are Janice Roslyn, 12, and Thealeta Monet, 11. The boys are Oberia Dewayne, Jr., 6, and Hurlan Lemuel, 13 months.

A Second Look at Kinzua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial which appeared in the January 24 edition of the Washington Post.

The editorial follows:

A SECOND LOOK AT KINZUA

The forced dispersal of a whole community is an irrevocable act, and ought to be considered only when no feasible alternative exists. This, in sum, is the core of the debate over the Kinzua Dam in Pennsylvania, a controversy which is still alive despite the fact that Congress has already approved funds for the project.

No one questions the desirability of a project intended to end the disastrous floods on the upper Allegheny River. But it is open to serious questions whether the only way the Corps of Engineers can achieve this end is by dishonoring a treaty with the Seneca Indians signed in 1794 by George Washington—the oldest treaty, to which the United States is a party and which is still in force.

Arthur E. Morgan, former Chairman of TVA, insists that a feasible, less costly, alternative to the Kinzua project exists. He has gone into the question in some detail, and he contends that the Corps of Engineers has in 30 years never made an overall examination of other proposals. Last year the House Public Works Subcommittee decided to freeze appropriations until Mr. Morgan's proposal had been fully studied. No such study was made; in the adjournment rush, the Senate's position prevailed and the funds were voted for Kinzua.

So far, work has not begun in earnest on the dam, and there is a possibility for Congress to take a more considered second look. This would, no doubt, discomfit the Corps of Engineers—but it would surely be welcomed by all who are disturbed by a seizure of Seneca lands for a project still in dispute. The relocation of a small group of Indians can hardly seem a minor matter in a country which is quick to denounce the manhandling of minorities elsewhere. Edmund Wilson, the distinguished literary critic, who has lately taken up the Indian cause, asks this troubling question:

"For whatever the difference in scale, is there any real difference in principle between uprooting whole communities of well-to-do Russian farmers and shipping them off to the Urals, and depriving the Senecas of the use of their lands in such a way as to scatter the republican unit and telling this intelligent and capable people to go and find homes where they can?"

The War We Are Losing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the American people are rightfully concerned about the international position and prestige of this Nation in our accomplishments in space. The failure of the administration to recognize the importance of this area of exploration and its imposing efforts to keep the challenge from upsetting its neat fiscal plans have created some alarm.

This alarm is quite often expressed in questions to authorities that amount to what are you going to do about it. At the top, they get little satisfaction. At his press conference a week ago, the President asked rather sharply of a reporter who posed a perfectly legitimate question where he had the idea that international prestige was at stake. The President said he did not think it was, particularly.

This idea differs, of course, from that of Mr. Eisenhower's Chief of the U.S. Information Agency, who told the Committee on Science and Astronautics on the opening of our hearings into the space situation:

Space has become for many people the primary symbol of world leadership in all areas of science and technology.

Whether the White House is worried or not, the people are concerned. If they had all the facts, they might recognize that the picture is not nearly so glum as a contented Mr. Khrushchev may preach to the Supreme Soviet, but they would also see clearly that it does require effort, management, and determination—in short, leadership—which has not been too evident thus far. However, it has never been the practice of this administration to let the people know the facts, and the glowing reassurances of the Secretary of Defense over the weekend have continued this tradition.

The realization that all is not well has been spreading despite the soft sell of the administration. In a recent editorial in an outstanding newspaper in my district, the Hartford Times, the question is posed: "Can we wait?" The answer is a troubling one. I have found this editorial to be a most keen and perceptive analysis of this difficulty, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD so that all may read it.

The editorial follows:

THE WAR WE'RE LOSING

Excerpts from the transcript of the presidential press conference January 26, 1960:

"WILLIAM MCGAFFIN, of the Chicago Daily News. Mr. President, in view of the international prestige at stake, why are we not moving with a greater sense of urgency to catch up with Russia in the field of space exploration?

"The PRESIDENT. Just start at that again—how did you start it, how did you start that question?

"Mr. MCGAFFIN. I said, 'In view of the international prestige at stake'.

"The PRESIDENT. Is it?

"Mr. MCGAFFIN. Well, sir, do you not feel that it is?

"The PRESIDENT. Not particularly, no."

(Etc., etc.)

Thus the principal obstacle to American progress in space science was spotlighted. It is the President himself. Mr. Eisenhower has given testimony many times through his actions or lack of action, and now in a public statement to the press, that he does not consider this country's reputation and fate are riding on our rockets.

Our space program has a split personality. It is half civilian, half military. This dichotomy is a result of several factors, including first the reluctance of civilian scientists to work under military direction for the development of military missiles, and second the separation of space research into two departments, the civilians thinking about scientific progress and the soldiers and their civilian employees working on weapons.

If anyone doubts, with Mr. Eisenhower, that American prestige has suffered badly at the hands of the Soviet Union's space scientists, let him read a few foreign periodicals. Even our friends abroad acknowledge that the reputation of the United States as the world's leader in science, industry, and technology has taken a bad beating from the Russians. If Mr. Eisenhower at his press conference was talking just to justify the record of his administration, he is a mere politician. If he sincerely believes that our prestige has not suffered, he is very poorly informed and advised.

Later in his answer to Mr. McGaffin, Mr. Eisenhower mentioned the "good, hard, steady work" of American scientists in "keeping satellites in the air and getting from them more information all the time." Except that satellites operate beyond the air, not in it, this is not to be questioned. The American satellite program is a spectacular one indeed, and if it were the only one in existence it would startle the world. The trouble is that the Soviet program is even more spectacular. The Russians may not be getting as much scientific information about the environment of the earth as we are, but they are making a much deeper impression on the peoples of the earth.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, is very well informed on

this matter. An article by him was published in the New York Times magazine on January 17 in which the achievements of Russian and American space scientists were well assessed.

Mr. Baldwin wrote: "There have been few at the top level of Government (and their influence has been small) who have stressed the importance of national prestige or evaluated the tremendous impact of space accomplishments on international politics and mass psychology." In those areas, Mr. Baldwin said, Russia is far ahead of the United States.

Mr. Eisenhower and other soldiers of his generation, though they fought a war in which no holds were barred, seem to have trouble understanding that the present cold war is a total war just as World War II was. The guns are not actually being fired, the bombs not actually dropped, but the threat is constantly there. The other weapons—economic, intellectual, and psychological—are being employed full force by the enemy. It is less important to the Soviet Union to gather data about radiation from the sun than to launch the first satellite, put the first living animal into space, take the first picture of the dark side of the moon, and recover the first human space traveler alive. The first three of these the Soviet Union has already accomplished. The fourth? Informed opinion favors a Russian victory in that, too.

The 10-year program put before Congress by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration aims at catching up with the Soviet Union by the late 1960's. Can we wait?

It is obvious that the present administration fails to recognize the importance of space research—not its importance to physical science but its value as ammunition in the continual propaganda war with Russia. What is needed most in our space program is an admixture of imagination and daring at the very top. We cannot expect those qualities of Mr. Eisenhower; they would be contradictory to the safe, conventional, and conservative essence of his being. We can only hope that the change of administration will not be too late and that it will bring with it a refreshingly new attitude.

The Surprising Case of the ILO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in the December 1959 issue of American Opinion there are two articles which discuss the International Labor Organization, commonly referred to as ILO.

The first is "The Surprising Case of the ILO," written by Mr. William L. McGrath of my own city, a former U.S. delegate.

The second article is entitled, "What Communists Say in the ILO," by Don Knowlton, one of Cleveland's leading citizens.

In view of the fact that Members of the House will shortly again be called upon to appropriate money for the continuance of ILO, it is my feeling that every Member of the Congress should carefully digest what has been said by these two men who are in an excellent position to know the facts.

The articles follow:

THE SURPRISING CASE OF THE ILO
(By William L. McGrath)

I

The taxpayers of the United States are currently paying some $3¼ million a year to support the International Labor Organization. This is just another example of our tax money going for a purpose that few Americans know anything about. How many readers even of American Opinion are familiar with the ILO, and what it does? Most of you know, I presume, that it is affiliated with the United Nations. But are you aware that the International Labor Organization has been in existence for some 40 years, considers itself an international parliament, and is drafting basic laws on social and economic matters which are having profound influence upon legislation all over the world?

As the years have gone by you have seen one Socialist proposal after another introduced into the House and the Senate of the United States. Have you ever wondered where these things came from? Well, I can give you the answer. Many of them have originated in the ILO, which has for decades been the breeding ground of the international socialistic legislation.

The ILO originated with the League of Nations; with the idea that an international organization devoted to consideration of the problems of labor the world over would be a useful adjunct to the League, and an instrument on behalf of world peace. The League of Nations died, but the ILO kept right on going; and the United States joined it in 1934.

Then along came the United Nations, and the ILO hooked up with it in 1945. The ILO is, however, not under the direction of the United Nations. It runs its own show, and gets its own budget appropriations directly from member governments. It is, nevertheless, granted additional money by the United Nations for what the ILO calls its "technical assistance program."

The ILO as originally conceived was supposed to concern itself purely with questions dealing with labor. But at a meeting in Philadelphia in 1944 the delegates adopted a declaration which said, among other things, that "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere," and that people have a "right" to economic security; also that "It is the responsibility of the International Labor Organization to examine and consider all international, economic and financial policies in the light of this fundamental objective." By this device the ILO arrogated unto itself the supposed right to draft basic laws, on social and economic questions, for adoption by member countries all over the world.

II

Now let's consider the functioning of the ILO. It is unusual among international agencies because it is not composed solely of representatives of Government. At its annual conference held each June in Geneva, Switzerland, each participating nation has four voting delegates; two representing government, one representing employers, and one representing workers. The delegates are accompanied by advisers. Total attendance is usually over 600, with 80 nations represented.

At the annual conference, the ILO enacts proposals that are in effect drafts of legislation which it hopes will be enacted by member countries. These may be passed in the form of resolutions, recommendations, or "conventions." A convention—and pay close attention to this—is a draft of a proposed international law which, when ratified by member nations, stands as a treaty among them. By this means the ILO seeks to introduce standardized basic laws into countries all over the world.

The ILO has a governing body, composed of representatives of governments, workers, and employers, which serves, you might say, as its board of directors. I was elected one of the 10 employer members of the governing body.

The ILO has a permanent office in Geneva headed by a director general, with a staff of about 800 persons. This is known as the International Labor Office. It sends missions of technical assistance to countries all over the world, supposedly to help increase productivity, but I suspect largely to propagandize on behalf of socialism. It conducts research and makes investigations, the purpose and results of which are not clear. And it releases publications, the purpose of which is only too clear—namely, that of spreading propaganda all over the world on behalf of the ILO and the socialistic measures which it champions and promotes. And there is something unique about the Geneva ILO staff and personnel. They are all tax-exempt. Although they are deeply sympathetic with measures that will add to the taxes of every body else, they themselves pay no income taxes to any country.

III

In its earlier years the ILO devoted itself to matters directly concerned with labor. It enacted conventions, for example, on living quarters of seamen in the international marine service, on the employment of women in underground mines, on the employment of children in factories, or concerning safety provisions. But the ideology of state socialism was coming into ascendancy in Europe, and spreading to other parts of the world. The ILO fell completely under the domination of a social government-labor coalition. It decided that anything in industry, government, or social systems that in any way affected the working man was a subject for consideration by the ILO. The state socialists moved in on the organization. And in recent years the growing Communist influence in the ILO has provided additional support for socialistic proposals. The free employer delegates to the ILO have consistently and eloquently objected to the proposed drafts of international socialist laws fostered by the ILO; but they have been hopelessly in the minority, and outvoted on practically all issues. Let's review the basic principles of socialism as I understand them from my ILO experience, and then get down to specific cases.

In the United States we believe, as was said in our Declaration of Independence, that men are born with certain unalienable rights, and that government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. The principle of socialism is exactly the opposite. The premise of socialism is that all rights belong to government—and government then parcels them out to the people in line with its own divine judgment. I have sometimes said that the main purpose of the ILO is that of trying to substitute government for God.

The underlying theme of ILO proposals is always government regulation, government domination, government control, government direction, government supervision; all leading of course, in the long run, to government ownership of industry, government price control, and government dictation as to jobs and wages. There is no halfway stopping point on the road paved by the ILO. And for a start on specific cases, let's take the subject of collective bargaining.

It is certainly quite proper for the ILO to endeavor to protect the right of collective bargaining. But let me tell you how far the ILO is going in that direction. It has proposed that if most of the workers in an industry have signed a collective bargaining agreement, government should have the power to compel the rest of the workers in that industry to sign up likewise, regardless of whether or not they wish to do so. What the ILO wants is nationwide collective bargaining enforced by government decree.

But the Socialists go further than that. Some of them in the ILO have suggested that one-half of the board of directors of a company should be chosen by management and the other half should be chosen by the union, which would have an equal right with management to decide the course of action of the company. In case of a deadlock, the matter would be submitted to government. This would put government in the position of being the controlling factor in the future destiny of industrial enterprise. This scheme is known as codetermination, and it is the law in Germany today.

Next, consider social security. It may interest you to know how the ILO brags that one of its earliest and most successful technical assistance projects was its sending of two experts over to the United States to show us how to set up our social security system. For social security was born and bred in the ILO. And social security, according to the ILO, is still in its infancy. In 1952 the ILO enacted a convention entitled "Minimum Standards of Social Security." I want to emphasize that word "minimum" because it is the intent of the ILO at some time in the future to develop, God help us, what they are going to call advanced standards of social security. Under the title "Minimum Standards of Social Security," the ILO drafted an international law providing government benefits for practically "all the ills the flesh is heir to." It is a blueprint for the biggest giveaway program yet devised.

Under this proposal government would pay its citizens money for the following:

Any condition requiring medical care of a preventive or corrective nature, including pregnancy, and any morbid condition, whatever its cause.

Loss of earnings due to sickness or unemployment.

Survival beyond a prescribed age.

Employment injuries.

Babies. The government pays you for having them; the more you have the more money you get.

Child birth, including medical care and hospitalization.

Invalidity—which is defined as "inability to engage in any gainful activity."

Death benefits—that is, life insurance.

Originally included in this proposal was a provision to the effect that all life insurance must be compulsory and subsidized by government, and any insurance would be illegal unless government paid at least 25 percent of the cost of the premiums. This effort at socializing insurance was aimed at putting out of business insurance companies such as we have in the United States. This convention also contained provisions for socialized medicine, such as England now has.

Well, 3 years later we got echoes in the United States. A bill was pased by our Congress providing that if at any time after the age of 50 a man became totally disabled, and was so certified by the Government, he could collect the same amount of social security benefits that he would otherwise get after retirement at the age of 65. Think what that means. There is, in this bill, an opening wedge toward both socialized medicine and socialized insurance; and those provisions were lifted bodily out of the ILO convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security.

For example, the ILO convention proposes Government payments for invalidity, which it defines as the "inability to engage in any gainful activity." Our bill defines "disability" as the "inability to engage in any substantial gainful atcivity"—a change of only one word. Incidentally, the ILO convention says that a person may be ruled disabled as a result of "any morbid condition, whatever its cause." We can learn something from socialists. We used to criticize the bums and the hoboes who would not work. Now we must be more charitable, because we learn that their "inability to engage in any gainful activity" was merely the result of a "morbid condition."

IV

In 1952 the ILO passed a convention called the Maternity Protection Convention. It provides that:

(1) An employed woman should be given at least 12 weeks off to have her baby, with free medical care and hospitalization.

During this period she would receive from the government, in cash, an amount equal to two-thirds of her pay.

(2) A woman cannot be discharged while on maternity leave.

Interruptions for nursing the baby (and I quote: "In cases where the matter is governed by or in accordance with laws and regulations") are to be counted as working hours and paid for by the company.

I sat in the Committee on Maternity Protection, and at times I couldn't believe my ears. In that committee, representatives from countries all over the world spent an entire half day debating as to whether or not an international law should contain a provision to the effect that a mother should nurse her baby for 1 hour, during the working day, or for two half-hour nursing periods. As I recall it, France held out for two half hours, and Israel held out for 1 full hour. No conclusion was reached, for the reason, I imagine, that the men on the committee knew little about the subject, and the women on the committee seemed singularly unequipped for the purpose under discussion.

Apparently, in the golden days of the socialistic utopia, practically all women are supposed to work. Their babies are to be financed by government benefits. In due course the mothers will bring their babies with them to work, placing their offspring in government-run nurseries, and leaving their machines or typewriters to nurse them on company time. There is no distinction in this socialist planning between legitimacy and illegitimacy. The place of the father, married or unmarried, in this scheme of things, is reduced purely to the function of paternity. The state takes over, to a large extent, the functions of the family. It provides against a multitude of contingencies for which, in a free society, the husband and father is supposed to provide.

Under such circumstances, what becomes of the family? What becomes of the home? What is the object of the institution of marriage? What happens to the children, starting life in government or industrial nurseries? What are the people, save wards of the State?

In 1955, the conference discussed what they termed "welfare facilities for workers." The proposal stated that "competent authority" (meaning government) should prepare suggestions for the operations of canteens, feeding equipment, types of meals, balanced diets, food service, and feeding costs. The implication was that government should take over and supervise all phases of inplant feeding in industrial institutions.

At its 1955 conference the ILO enacted a resolution entitled "Vocational Training in Agriculture." Never have I seen a document more foreign to the philosophy of the United States. It assumed, as a basic premise, that the agricultural worker is an employee. It assumed that wages in agriculture are determined on the basis of collective bargaining. And it proposed the setting up of an apprentice system for young farmworkers.

Well, in the United States most of our workers are not employees—they are members of the farmer's family. They don't belong to unions, so the collective bargaining idea has no application in our country. And as for apprenticeships, about the only way this could be worked out would be for farmers' sons to be apprenticed to their fathers.

Furthermore, embodied in this proposal is a definite pattern of Government domination and control. The general idea is that the Government should take over the vocational training of all youngsters on the farm, in what the ILO calls a "systematic and coordinated program." This program provides that Government should supply school textbooks and other educational material, should pass on the qualifications of teachers and examination requirements, should subsidize educational facilities, and make sure that the education and training of young people on the farm would be done by the Government and not by their parents.

V

I don't think I need go any further. I could cite more examples. But I have given you enough to indicate the overall trend of the proposals which the ILO government-labor majority hopes to enact into basic laws which will be followed by countries all over the world. And if you think this is not happening, you are very much mistaken. Thus far the ILO has enacted 114 conventions. Of these, Great Britain has ratified 56, France has ratified 73, Belgium has ratified 58, Holland has ratified 49, Argentina has ratified 53.

You will ask, How many ILO conventions have been ratified by the United States? So here is the answer. Seven conventions have been approved by the Senate and ratified by the President's signature. Most of these deal with conditions of maritime employment and are not directly socialistic. There have been a few conventions that were approved by the Senate but not signed by the President; and a few that have been sent by the President to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for action, with no action taken.

Now—why has no further action been taken with respect to these conventions? In recent years our Government, in ILO conferences, has voted in favor of a number of socialistic conventions on matters that would affect our own internal domestic affairs. Why have most of these never even been submitted to the Senate for consideration?

Frankly, I think the proponents of such measures have not dared to bring them out on the floor of the Senate. This is because the country and the Congress have been alerted to the danger of having socialistic measures imposed upon us by the back door of convention ratification. Remember, a convention, when ratified, stands as a treaty among the nations which have ratified it; and under our Constitution a treaty is a supreme law of the land. It was this fact that Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, so forcibly called to the attention of the Nation when he proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to correct that situation. The amendment did not pass; but I am convinced that its proposal, and the debates that ensued, served to forestall and to defeat many efforts that otherwise might have been made to advance us on the road to socialism through legislation by treaty.

But in the rest of the world things have gone the other way. A major share of the social, labor, and economic legislation enacted in Europe and in many other parts of the world during the last 20 years has been born in the ILO. The South American countries and the underdeveloped countries of the Far East have been following the lead of the ILO. They have been told by socialist Europeans that socialism is the hope of the future; and that the kind of civilization we have in the United States is outmoded and in some mysterious way still lingering along, operating under old-fashioned concepts that are holdovers from the last century.

Meanwhile the Communist nations have been exerting more and more influence

within the ILO, as they have everywhere else. The fact is that the United States and Canada are practically the only countries left that are still operating in the main on the basis of the free competitive system. And that is an excellent introduction to the question of the ILO budget, and of comparative voting strength among its members.

The annual ILO budget, which is met by direct contributions from member countries, totals today some $9 million. Of this the United States pays 25 percent—that is $2,250,000. There are 80 member countries in the ILO, so the United States has one-eightieth of the votes. Let me repeat that contrast. We pay one-fourth of the ILO budget and we have one-eightieth of the votes.

Now let's go beyond that. At the outset, I said the ILO was costing the American taxpayers $3¼ million a year. That is because, in addition to direct contributions from member countries, the United Nations, last year, contributed $3¾ million to the ILO for so-called technical assistance. The United States furnished about a million dollars of that money, or about 29 percent—while our voice as to how the money should be spent is still only one-eightieth of the total.

VI

Now I want to get into the subject of the part that the Communists play in the ILO. It is a complicated subject, but an important one, because it brings squarely to the fore a basic issue which I think may prove to be unsolvable.

For many years prior to 1954, Russia had not participated in the ILO. But in that year the Russians came back, in a big way. And over the course of successive years they have brought their satellites with them.

There is now a solid group of 10 Communist nations in the ILO. First there is Russia; and Russia is in the ILO not as a nation, but as three—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. This gives Russia alone three times the voting power of the United States. There are six Communist satellite nations: Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Albania. Then there is Yugoslavia, which is Communist and invariably votes with the other Communists. That gives the Communists 10 times the voting strength of the United States.

These nations always vote as a bloc. Normally, on most issues, there is a divergence of opinion among the government, worker, and employer delegations, from various countries, on the ILO proposals which are up for discussion. But not among the Communist nations. In their case, government, employer, and worker delegations from each country always vote alike; and the delegations from all 10 countries always vote together. The word goes out from the Communist Party, which is the boss, and that's that.

Now from the very beginning of the Communist reentry—that is, back in 1954—the employer delegates to the ILO, who, under its constitution, are supposed to represent free associations of free employers, contended that the Communist so-called employer delegates could not possibly represent free associations of free employers, because there were no such associations in Communist countries. Our claim was that the so-called employer delegates from Communist countries were simply government agents, and agents of the Communist Party. We tried, therefore, to have the Communist so-called employer delegates disqualified from participation in the conference. On that issue we were defeated.

Then we tried to keep the Communist so-called employer representatives out of the employer groups on the working committees which discuss and formulate ILO proposals. Starting with 1954, and continuing through 1959, the employers continued to take this stand. We met with very little success. The Communist employer representatives were first allowed to sit in these committees on a deputy basis; and then, in 1959, by the use of an arbitrary device which violates the ILO constitution, they were given full membership on such committees, with the same status as any other employer representatives.

Let me explain the employer's objection to having these people placed on employer groups of the ILO. The working committees of the ILO are tripartite; that is, on each committee we are supposed to have representatives of government, employers, and workers. But what happens if we get Communists officially seated as members of employer groups? The result is as preposterous as if the national Association of Manufacturers, or the United States Chamber of Commerce, should accept Communist agents on their Boards of Directors.

I simply could not accept such a situation. At the 1954 Conference I protested as strongly as possible, but to no avail. At the 1955 Conference I withdrew the United States employer delegation from participation in any ILO working committees upon which Communist so-called employers had been seated. I felt that a time had come to make a stand on principle.

At that time I got very little support for my action, and considerable criticism. But at the June 1959 Conference, when, as I said, it was ruled definitely that Communist so-called employers could sit with full rights in the employer groups of the ILO committees, the employers from forty-six nations withdrew, in protest, from participation in those committees. This was due in no small part to the effective leadership by the U.S. employer delegate, Cola Parker.

In past years, the U.S. State Department has followed the theory that the Communists and the Socialists were violently opposed to each other; and that the United States should support the Socialists because that would help us contain the Communists. This was a ridiculous assumption. It is true that in the ILO the Socialists and the Communists wrangle perpetually with each other. But in actual fact this means very little, because they are, you might say, simply two breeds of the same animal. What they are doing is competing for followers and political power, but their fundamental philosophers are really much the same. At an ILO meeting, which I attended, one of the worker delegates said, in substance:

"Why should free enterprise consider itself so important? It is free enterprise that has been responsible for many of the ills of the world. Now, fortunately, nationalized industry is coming to the fore and free enterprise can be put where it belongs."

Was it a Communist who said that? No indeed. It was Sir Alfred Roberts, the workers' delegate from England. I think the distinction between communism and socialism has been excellently stated by Earl Bunting, who said to me one day, "communism is the cruel force required to put socialism into effect."

The fact is that there is a fundamental cleavage within the ILO, and one for which I see no possible solution. It hinges upon the isue of nationalization of industry, Government regimentation and control, against private ownership of industry, freedom of the individual, and freedom of competition.

Each year the situation of the free employers has ben growing more impossible; and each year they have been louder in their objections to it. Each year the Communists have been getting more insistent upon forcing teir points, and more resentful when they fail to win some of them. Each year the Communist orators in the ILO have been growing more violently abusive of the United States, to such a point that, frankly, I cannot understand how the representatives of our Government can sit there and listen to the accusations.

If things keep on getting rougher, I would not be surprised if some day the ILO blew up with a bang. And I must say that I, for one, would not be disappointed.

WHAT COMMUNISTS SAY IN THE ILO

(By Don Knowlton)

Supporting the preceding article, Mr. Knowlton has sent us a few excerpts from addresses of Communist delegates before the plenary session of the June 1959 Annual Conference of the International Labor Organization. This meeting was attended by the representatives of 80 nations. And, as Mr. McGrath emphasized, your Government is paying out over $3 million per year of your tax money to give the Communists a forum and an opportunity to tell lies about us.

"As a result of the slackening in economic development, one of the most important social problems affecting millions of workers in capitalist countries at the moment is that of mass unemployment." (Mr. Goroshkin, Government delegate, U.S.S.R.)

"The capitalist world is in need of sound social organization. But we cannot agree that social and political disorder * * * arises as a result of maladjustment. The fact is that the workers do not wish to adjust themselves to exploitation and they never will. Hence such social and political disorder is absolutely inevitable in capitalist countries." (Mr. Popovich, Workers' delegate, Ukraine.)

"American experts have found that by a better distribution of the social product a far larger population could be supported in the United States than is the case at the present time. And yet, as we know, the United States has several million unemployed, while further millions are living in poverty. This is not the result of a growth in population. The fault is to be found in the economic structure, in which the greater part of the population enjoys only a very small part of the national revenue while millions of people starve, despite the enormous food reserves and the frequent destruction of food stocks to maintain artificially inflated prices." (Mr. Shvidchenko, government delegate, Ukraine.)

"Unemployment in capitalist countries is a chronic social evil for millions of workers and their families. * * * The self-styled free employers seek not to satisfy the needs of the population but to get the maximum profits. This is the economic law of capitalism and it is independent of the will of man." (Mr. Pasek, workers' delegate, Czechoslovakia.)

"Tens of millions of tons of coal stacked at pitheads, millions of barrels of oil which cannot be economically disposed of, stacks of undisposed textile goods, foreshadowing a crisis in the textile industry, a critical situation in shipping and shipbuilding—those are some of the characteristics of the present situation of the capitalist economy as a whole." (Mr. Chajn, Government delegate, Poland.)

"Reality shows us that the monopolies are seeking more and more to restrict trade union rights and freedoms. They wish to weaken the trade union organizations at any price. * * * The U.S. Government is already applying antiworker legislation and new antiworker texts are at present being drafted." (Mr. Mihai, workers' delegate, Rumania.)

"It is true that an American continually speaks about free economy, and the free play of economic forces, and that he terms his system as that of a competitive society. But such concepts are just a part of national tradition and have little, if anything,

to do with reality. The time of free initiative and free competition has gone forever." (Mr. Januszewicz, employers' delegate, Poland.)

"I know that in many countries the desire to achieve maximum profits induces the capitalist leaders to introduce various methods of compulsion, such as the so-called scientific organization of work, the main characteristic of which is an exaggerated intensification of individual labor." (Mr. Volik, employers' delegate, Ukraine.)

"We, in the Socialist countries, know that our workers need not fear the consequences of automation; leaders of industry in the capitalist countries, on the other hand, do not consider themselves responsible for their workers' fate and dismiss them when they are not longer needed." (Mr. Surguchev, employers' delegate, U.S.S.R.)

"For the monopolies, the cold war, wherever and however it is waged, is merely a source of profitable business." (Mr. Slipchenko, Government delegate, Ukraine.)

"We heard a representative of the Government of the United States who, having collected all the lies and slander from the garbage can of imperialist propaganda, spoke to distract our attention from the serious problem of defending the workers' real interests." (Mr. Pimenov, workers' delegate, U.S.S.R.)

Let Us Not Forget Our Veterans—Address by Emanuel Targum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a speech delivered on January 17, 1960, at Rochester, N.Y., before the western district council and the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans by Emanuel Targum, State commander of the Jewish War Veterans. Mr. Targum, who is one of my constituents, is a distinguished leader active in community affairs, and he has made significant contributions in the relation of government to veterans' problems.

The following is Commander Targum's address:

ADDRESS BY EMANUEL TARGUM, STATE COMMANDER, JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Ladies and gentlemen, in three great wars since the birth of this century, millions of Americans have given their lives, their limbs and their hearts to a lofty ideal—the ideal of freedom.

They served in their country's uniforms, from the Argonne to the Rhine, from Pearl Harbor to the Bay of Tokyo, and from the southern tip of Korea to the Yalu.

In those days, we were called soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. Now, we are called veterans.

In those days, our country was grateful for the sacrifices we made, and, when the guns finally fell silent and we were allowed to return home—those of us who could—our countrymen hastened to show their gratitude in every way they could.

Laws were passed to make it easier for us to buy homes and start businesses; we were given bonuses, larger pensions and disability payments; provisions were made for our widows and children; and every type of hospital facility was made available to us. Seemingly, nothing was too good for us—in the days when our country was grateful.

But, gratitude depends upon that most fragile of all qualities, the memory of man, and the memory of man—all too often, unfortunately—is short lived in such matters.

For some time, now, we, as veterans, have been seeing signs that our countrymen are beginning to forget our services. One by one, the benefits we bought with blood are being "repossessed."

The GI bill—our so-called "bill of rights"—is a good example. Our lawmakers drew a line through this bill one day and said—after some reasoning only they could understand—that anyone who had served his country before 1955 was a veteran—but anyone who served in our military forces after that year was not a veteran. For the latter, there is no "GI bill of rights."

Most of us here today will not be affected by this, but, in this action by our lawmakers, we can read a warning—a warning that in the future our country is ging to measure its gratitude more carefully.

If we need further evidence, we can call to mind the Veterans Pension Act of 1959 which goes into effect the first of July.

At first glance, this piece of legislation seems to provide veterans with a generous umbrella for their rainy days. But, does it? Actually, it provides a sliding scale formula for pension benefits, based to a greater extent than before on need, for all veterans and their dependents who go on the Veterans' Administration rolls after the effective date of the law.

Those of us who come within the provisions of this new law will have higher pensions—if we have little or no income. But, those of us who have been thrifty—who have managed to provide in some measure for ourselves—will not fare so well. The more outside income we have—the more we have earned through our own efforts—the smaller will be our pensions.

As an example, veterans with no dependents will get $85 a month under this new law if their annual income is $600 a year or less—but they will get only $40 a month in their pension check if their annual income is between $1,200 and $1,800 a year—less than half, in other words. Our Government seems to be telling us—"Don't be thrifty."

But, the point is, the pension provisions—along with many other provisions in this act—are far less generous to veterans than were the corresponding provisions of the previous law relating to pensions.

This is one more piece of evidence, if we need it, to establish that—one by one—the benefits we earned in France, Tarawa, and Korea are being "repossessed."

Once we were exempted from paying real estate property taxes, but this exemption is in the process of being dropped.

Ten of our States extended themselves in the case of Korean war veterans and passed special compensation laws affecting these men and women—but New York—the Empire State of New York, which has more Korean veterans than any other State and, by far, the largest treasury—was not one of these States.

More than half of the 50 States have rest homes for veterans and others are contemplating or planning the construction of such homes. Our own State of New York, however, is doing just the opposite—our State is getting ready to deprive us of one of the most useful rest facilities we now have.

In this case, I am referring to Mount McGregor.

Let me tell you something about Mount McGregor.

This facility has served the convalescent needs of some 30,000 veterans since its inception in 1945. Now, the State wants to convert it into an annex for the Rome School for Retarded Children.

As veterans, we certainly don't object to helping retarded children—that's a worthy cause if ever there was one—but we claim the State can find other means of helping retarded children without depriving veterans of a facility they need.

Nor can the State complain about the cost of this operation at Mount McGregor. The daily cost per veteran-patient at this facility is only $7.78, although 1,500 prescriptions are filled each month at the pharmacy, in spite of the fact that one-third of the patients require special diets, and in spite of the additional fact that 40 of the veterans are receiving active physiotherapy treatments of one kind or another.

Where else could these veterans go for this much-needed treatment at such a low cost to the State of New York? If this is a financial burden to our State treasury, it is possible—I have been told—that the Federal Government might be willing to supply some of the necessary funds for Mount McGregor.

On this point, it is interesting to note that if Mount McGregor is taken away from the veterans, and is turned over to the Rome School for Retarded Children, the State is going to be put to the additional expense of half a million dollars to effect this conversion. This is not saving money; this is taking money from one pocket to pay a bill instead of taking it from the other.

But, I am happy to be able to tell you today that we have not yet lost the fight to save Mount McGregor.

Last Tuesday, the top State officials of eight veterans' organizations—including your State commander—visited Governor Rockefeller and urged him to reconsider his decision.

The Governor said he agreed with us that veterans deserve and need special assistance in many cases. He argued that Mount McGregor was not rendering the service it could or should to veterans, and that they could obtain this service at some other facility.

We disputed that, and finally won his promise to postpone the decision to deprive us of Mount McGregor until he had considered the matter still more.

We have won no more than a delay in the fight to save Mount McGregor for veterans, but, at least, we have won that much. I think we still have a good chance to win the fight entirely, especially if each one of us lets the Governor know how much this facility means to veterans all over the State. What we need here is a determined show of strength.

You know—that's our secret weapon in this battle to preserve the benefits we have won on the battlefields of three great wars—our strength. As of last year, there were 22 million war veterans in the United States. That's a lot of votes in any election if we ever learn to use them the way we can.

Let's not forget—we had to fight a foreign enemy to earn these benefits. Let's not surrender them without a fight.

Repeal of the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DOWDY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, a copy of a telegram sent to the hearing before

the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, being a statement opposing the repeal of the Connally amendment, was sent to me with the request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I, too, feel that it would be a mistake to repeal such amendment, and seek unanimous consent that the copy of such telegram be included in the Appendix:

HUNTSVILLE, TEX.,
January 24, 1960.

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I am informed that all persons wishing to testify on repeal of Connally amendment will have only the afternoon of Wednesday, January 27. Entire morning being given State Department who insist on this surrender of U.S. sovereignty over internal affairs. Please extend time of hearing so that all who wish to testify on this vital subject may be heard. Please advise by letter what domestic questions the advocates of repeal want decided by foreign judges of a one-world court and why they feel U.S. own court system inadequate on purely domestic cases. Also ask your honest opinion as to whether or not this constitutes treason to the United States and flagrant violation of oaths of office taken voluntarily by its advocates. Also ask this telegram be made part of official committee hearing minutes.

W. H. KELLOGG.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the letter written by Mr. Francis Brinker, of Cawker City, Kans., to Life magazine in answer to their series of articles on the farm program. I thought so highly of Mr. Brinker's letter that I would like all Members of Congress to have an opportunity of reading it.

The letter follows:

THE FARM PROBLEM

DEAR SIR: As an introduction I would like to state that I am a farmer and I am proud of it. I live about 30 miles from the geographical center of the United States (before Alaska and Hawaii). I live on what I like to think is a family-sized farm for this area. It consists of 640 acres. All but 50 acres are under cultivation, 120 acres of which are irrigated. I am a full-time farmer. Every dollar I make has to come from the land. I own 320 acres (with the mortgage company) and rent 320 acres.

This area had one of the worst droughts on record from 1955 to 1957. Most farmers had to mortgage their land and machinery to stay in the business. 1958 and 1959 have been excellent crop years, yet with the disastrous prices at which farmers have to sell and the high costs of the things he has to buy, very few farmers, (including myself) have been able to reduce our debts incurred during the drought. How will we be able to survive the subnormal years if this situation continues?

In order to be as efficient as Secretary of Agriculture Benson claims the farmers should be I would have to expand the size of my operations, perhaps to several times its present size, but I am not financially able to do this. At present values my farming operations represent an investment of approximately $130,000, which consists of land (both rented and owned), machinery and buildings; yet I have a hard time to maintain an income equal to the minimum wage of labor. U.S.D.A. statistics show that the investment per worker in industry is approximately $15,000 per worker, yet their average net income for the past several years has been two to three times as much as the average net income of the farmer.

I have just finished studying, with great interest, your editorial and The Farm Problem (pt. III) in the December 14 issue of Life, which has prompted me to write this letter.

Your statement that, "Farmers themselves are just as fed up with the mess as everybody else," is the understatement of the year. We are the most fed up of all and rightly so.

The worst part of the farm programs of the past is that the farmer has lost so many of the freedoms so dear to him. In return for the loss of the freedoms, he has had the privilege (if it can be called that) of being the most underpaid person in our economy while the people of the United States are the best fed people in the world.

The thing that is so hard to understand is why so many people want to blame the farmer for producing too much of the good things of life (they should thank God that we have) while in so many countries they produce too few of these things.

To most farmers, including myself, Secretary of Agriculture Benson's philosophy is about as wrong as it can possibly be. He says that we have too many inefficient farmers. The truth of the matter is our farmers are too efficient. Let's look at it this way: If all farmers had been more efficient in the past our present so-called surplus could easily be several times greater than it is today. Production figures for the past 10 years will prove this to be true. What happens every time an inefficient farmer leaves the land? It does not stay out of production. Instead, a more efficient farmer takes it over and produces more, thus adding to the surplus. Most economists tell us that every time the supply of farm products increase 1 percent, the price will decline 6 percent. Many agronomists in our agricultural colleges tell us, if every acre of land was farmed in the most efficient manner, by using the best varieties of crops, best breeds of livestock and proper use of fertilizers, insecticides, hormones, etc., its possible to double our present production. If both figures are correct, the farmer would have to pay to get someone to take his products, long before he reaches this height of efficiency. How efficient must we become in order to make a living?

We hear so much about the law of supply and demand yet very little has been done to balance them. Industry has the advantage of being able to adjust their supply to the demand much easier than most other segments of our economy. In past years, labor had a problem similar to that of the farmer. There weren't enough jobs available for the number of workers. Their solution was simple, even though it was difficult to attain. They each worked fewer hours, thus bringing the supply of labor more in balance with the demand.

In order to balance the supply of farm produce with the demand there are only two answers. We either have to increase the demand or decrease the supply.

Increasing the demand is to a large extent out of the hands of the farmer because we just don't have enough people in the United States to consume all that we are able to produce. (The farmer of today isn't as worried about the United States being overpopulated as are the birth controllers.) Our foreign trade has diminished through the years. Its har dto say who has been responsible for this, but surely you can't blame the farmer.

There is no question but what the farm programs of the past, which have consisted of commodity controls, have failed completely in trying to decrease the supply. They have split the farm organizations into commodity groups and have become increasingly costly to operate. The surpluses have continued to mount, while the farmers have continued to go broke.

If labor had tried to solve their problem in the same manner as the past farm programs, they might have limited the number of people that could work in each industry, then those left over might have been told, "We don't have room for you in this country, you'll have to go some place else."

One of the duties of any good government is to regulate. Every time I hear the word "control" used, I can't help but think it belongs right along the side of the word "dictator."

Why not use the same method to solve the farm problem that was used to solve the labor problem. It is working for labor and it will work just as well to solve the farm problem. (Acres under production are to the farmer what hours are to labor.) Therefore, it's about time the farmer be given the opportunity to vote for the reduction of acres which would compare to the wage and hour law for labor.

The Secretary of Agriculture should be required to call a referendum to allow the farmers to vote on themselves a 20 percent reduction of all productive land. In order to vote in this referendum, proof should be shown that at least 50 percent or more of the voters net income is derived directly from the farm. It wouldn't be right for a hobby farmer or part time farmer to vote on a program for the true farmer.

The farmer should receive no payment for this reduction. The laborer doesn't get paid for the hours that he doesn't work, so why should the farmer receive payment for the acreage he doesn't farm? All profits should be derived from production or services, never from nonproduction or nonservices.

In return for this reduction the farmer should receive a guarantee that the Government will not release any Government-held farm commodity for home consumption at less than 100 percent of parity, nor will any imports of farm commodities be allowed to enter our domestic market at less than 100 percent of parity. This would require the Government to enter the import business, but it has been taking large losses in the exports of farm commodities. Why shouldn't it be allowed to make a profit on the imports to help cover this loss. It is impossible for the U.S. farmer (with his high costs of production) to compete with many foreign farmers (with their low cost of production) on many farm commodities.

It wouldn't be unreasonable for the Government to withhold from the domestic market, these commodities at not less than 100 percent of parity, because this would only be an assurance that the farmer might expect an income about equal to the minimum wage of labor. For example: According to statistics, in 1952 farm parity was 100 percent, yet the average income per person of farm people was $753 from farming, $271 from other sources, making a total of $1,024. For the same year the average income per person of nonfarm people was $1,973; which is proof that our present parity formula does not represent a true parity.

The goal to this program should be for the farmer to receive an income equal to nonfarm people. This investment is much greater, the hours of labor for most farm people are longer and his education requirements whether formal or otherwise are probably as high, if not higher than for

many other segments of our economy. So why shouldn't he be entitled to at least as much income?

Another necessary part of the program is a penalty for noncompliance. This penalty should be in the form of a tax of 20 percent of the gross farm income. This would stop the chiselers.

The agricultural land to be taken from production under this program should be handled in three separate categories; namely, grassland, irrigated land, and nonirrigated lands. This reduction should be based on a farm unit not to exceed 160 acres for cultivated land; a larger unit could be used for grazing land. The reason for this is to distribute the idle land and to assure that a more near average land will be taken from production. The idle land should be handled similar to land in the conservation reserve, so as to build it up for future use. Some economists predict that we'll need the full use of all our productive land within 20 years. I think that time is much further away, especially if we build up and conserve our soil as we should.

The reduction should be for a given period of time, such as the 4-year presidential term. Each time the reduction is determined the farmer should be required to change the area of reduction to build up the entire farm for future use.

Statistics show that for the past several years the overall supply has exceeded the demand by about 8 percent. The reduction will need to be greater than this to help absorb the present surplus and it will also take more than an 8-percent reduction in acreage to get an 8-percent reduction of supplies because the land taken from production would be the poorer land of each 160. Also, the land under production would without a doubt receive better care.

Under this program all of the cows at the trough in your cartoon on page 105 (December 14) should gradually diminish to nothing, with the exception of conservation.

I believe that conservation is everybody's responsibility. Most conservation practices are of just as much value to the city people of the future as they will be to the future farmers, because in times of shortages of farm products, usually the farm people are the best off. This generation has been making Government debts for future generations to pay, so the least we should do is to leave them some fertile soil.

The advantages of this program over the present program are: It would treat all farmers equal and the cost to the Government would be minor. It would regulate the supply rather than control individual commodities. The price of each commodity would be the balancing factor between commodities and it would give the farmer an opportunity to be on a more equal basis with the rest of our economy.

The big disadvantage to this type of farm program is that the cost to the consumer will increase, thus adding to inflation. But, in all justice this is a necessary evil. The decline in farm prices since World War II has been the big factor in holding down inflation. We have reached the place where the farmer can't survive much longer if this decline continues.

The history of the United States shows that all major depressions have been preceded by declining farm prices while nonfarm prices increased. Whenever farm prices declined to the point where the farmer's resources reached a low enough level, he was forced to quit buying. When this happened factories were forced to close, creating unemployment. The unemployed are poor consumers, therefore, these unemployed caused more unemployment until we were in a depression.

As a group, farm people are a minority today, yet they are still among the largest consumers of steel, petroleum products, rubber, etc., and whenever they are forced to quit buying, it will certainly have a big effect on the rest of the economy.

The United States is at present, enjoying a very high standard of living, through a false economy. This false economy is brought about by our defense spending and Government borrowing. Our Government is, in reality, spending the earnings of future generations.

Our defense spending is indirectly a subsidy to both labor and industry. Without it, it is very possible that the United States could be in a worse depression today than in the 1930's.

I am sure that most of the people of the United States would like to see the cold war come to an end, so they should also want the economics of this country in shape so that we might be assured of prosperity in peace, even though it might cause a slight increase in their grocery bill.

I firmly believe that any person that believes in the Golden Rule would agree to this program.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BRINKER,
Farmer.

Privileged Imports: Major Textile Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting statement on imports from W. Ray Bell, president of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, as follows:

PRIVILEGED IMPORTS: MAJOR TEXTILE PERIL

From "10 Years of Cotton Textiles," December 1959:

"The chief roadblock in the way of extended textile industry recovery and the source of direst peril to future progress lie in the always mounting tide of imported fabrics and apparel whose origins now represent over 50 separate nations. Each of them enjoys the waiver by our Government of the statutory working conditions and social standards under which American textile mills are forced to operate. This means a privileged status of low labor costs for which there is no equalization in existing tariff schedules. Tariff reduction to impotency has long since been accomplished through concessions made in GATT negotiations. Many of the foreign competitors now possess ultramodern textile equipment supplied by American taxpayers and some of them share special benefits of large textile purchases by the U.S. Government either in the nature of offshore procurement or in the processing of cotton under triangular deals. The crowning discrimination against American enterprise and employment has been the U.S. Government policy of selling American grown cotton to foreign textile producers at a bargain price, now lower by 8 cents a pound or $40 per bale than the prices American mills are forced to pay for the same raw material.

"Under these existing and extraordinary policies of preferential treatment, foreign competitors have been equipped with overwhelming advantages in price competition. Sharing no responsibility for the maintenance of American standards, employment or taxes, they remain free to flood our markets will the products of ill-paid labor, made under any kind of working conditions, out of the bargain priced cotton endowed by our own Government or cheaper foreign growths. Over the past 5 years, the records of market experience show an unmistakable trend toward displacement of American goods through their inability to cope in price with the competition especially from Asiatic countries whose wage and labor costs are but a small fraction of American minimum standards."

W. RAY BELL,
President, the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, New York, N.Y.

The Late Hon. Thomas A. Jenkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of last month the Nation sustained a serious loss in the passing of a great and patriotic statesman, our friend and colleague, Thomas A. Jenkins. He had served with distinction, devotion, and wisdom in the House of Representatives for a period of 35 years. His public service actually convered a span of a half a century because of the previous offices he held as prosecuting attorney and State senator in his beloved State of Ohio.

It was my rich privilege to serve with this great American as one of his colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means. During the time of our mutual service I had opportunity to observe Mr. Jenkins' able work and I found him to be a man who addressed himself to his duties with compassionate understanding of the problems of all our citizens and with a dedicated comprehension of the basic concepts of human freedom, economic opportunity, and national strength—concepts that were inherent in the founding of our Republic that have been strengthened because of Tom Jenkins' work in our midst.

One important principle that motivated the endeavors of this great American was his insistence on fairness and equity for all the people. He worked diligently and with ability to try to improve our Federal tax structure so that its application to our citizens would be without discrimination and without unwarranted burden. In this connection it was my privilege to serve with him as a cosponsor of legislation that was known across the breadth of the land as the Jenkins-Keogh bill. This legislation was designed to alleviate the discriminatory treatment contained in existing law against self-employed individuals in providing for their retirement security. Tom Jenkins believed with conviction in the principle embodied in this bill because he recognized its justness and the merit it contained for the benefit of the American farmer, storekeeper, professional man, and the millions of other self-employed Americans.

Mr. Jenkins and I first joined in sponsoring this legislation in January 1953

at which time Mr. Jenkins introduced H.R. 10 and I was privileged to cosponsor H.R. 11. After years of perseverance and work in behalf of this constructive measure, we now seem to be on the threshold of what I hope will be the enactment of this proposal into law. If we are successful to this end, a large measure of the credit must go to our esteemed late colleague, Tom Jenkins.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that Tom Jenkins will not be able to continue to serve in this distinguished body on the occasion of the final approval of his bill. I regret, Mr. Speaker, this great American's untimely passing, but I am grateful for the privilege that was mine in serving with him.

House Antitrust Subcommittee's Shipping Investigation—A Notable Public Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, indeed all Americans, owe a vote of thanks to the House Antitrust Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for its investigation of antitrust and monopoly problems in the ocean steamship industry.

Through painstaking effort, which included a study of the activities of major steamship lines, associations, and conferences, and examination of over 100,000 documents in the files of these groups, the subcommittee has brought to light matters of the most serious import. These included hundreds of apparent and serious violations of various provisions of the Shipping Act and other statutes dealing with competitive practices.

The hearings held by the Celler Antitrust Subcommittee last fall in New York City emphasized the problems that arise when an industry is granted antitrust exemption such as that set forth in section 15 of the Shipping Act. The hearings established—as recognized by majority and minority members of the subcommittee—that in 43 years of responsibility under the Shipping Act of 1916, the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors had been incredibly negligent in administering and regulating the maritime industry.

The hundreds of apparent violations of the act uncovered by the subcommittee were for the most part either unknown to, or unnoticed by, the Maritime Board. It is little short of amazing that, as the Chairman of the Maritime Board admitted, not once since 1916 had the Board or its predecessors taken punitive action against any shipping line for violating the strictures imposed by section 15 of the act. Thus the industry has been permitted to fix its own rates collusively and keep out competitors free from antitrust requirements and without imposition of the public safeguards that Congress wrote into the act.

As a result of the Celler subcommittee hearings, the Justice Department has begun extensive grand jury investigations into the maritime industry for possible violations of the antitrust laws, the Shipping Act, and related statutes. The Maritime Board has also inaugurated some 15 separate dockets to take action on some of the matters brought to light by the subcommittee.

The impact of the Celler subcommittee investigation and hearings may well be felt by every American who buys an imported article. Increased competition in the tradition of American free enterprise, and in a manner envisaged by the Shipping Act, could well bring lower freight rates. In many cases ocean freight is an important part of the selling price of imported goods. Moreover, the Federal Government is the largest single shipper of goods in the foreign commerce of the United States; consequently, reductions in the rates it pays will also redound to the benefit of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, a recent penetrating and cogent article by Bernard Nossiter in the Washington Post and Times Herald summarizes some of the effects of the Celler Antitrust Subcommittee's work. I commend this article to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

SHIP LINES ACCUSED OF ILLEGALITIES—MARITIME BOARD SEEN "INCREDIBLY" LAX IN ITS JOB

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

A little-noticed House investigation has jolted the shipping lines with charges of more than 300 possible violations of several Federal laws.

The inquiry by the Antitrust Subcommittee under Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, brought bipartisan accusations of "incredible neglect" and "laxity" against the Federal Maritime Board.

That Agency, obviously distressed, has been building up its policing staff and has begun a closer watch in major ports over the lines.

The investigation, held last fall in New York, has also had repercussions elsewhere in Government. The Justice Department has set up grand juries in Washington and San Francisco examining the records of several dozen companies. The General Accounting Office is examining charges that the International Cooperation Administration was billed three times as much as private shippers for transportation of wheat and other aid commodities.

BOARD APPROVAL REQUIRED

A major portion of the Celler subcommittee's charges dealt with secret "gentlemen's agreements" between competing lines to fix cargo rates.

Under the 1916 Shipping Act, the lines are allowed to get together on rates and other matters free of antitrust prosecution—provided the Maritime Board gives its approval. The Board is supposed to prohibit pacts that discriminate unfairly between shipping lines, shippers, and ports, and harm U.S. trade. Any agreement not filed with the Board may result in a $1,000-a-day fine.

The House investigators came up with about 40 agreements never submitted to the Maritime Board; these yielded an estimated 105 breaches of the law.

One alleged violation, for example, involved a reported plan by a division of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., and the Farrell Lines to drive a Japanese competitor from the trade to South Africa. As the investigators described it, the two American lines would take turns cutting rates to spread the losses until the route was clear.

SECRET PACT ALLEGED

In another case, a group of companies that had filed their pact with the Board, agreed to go their own, competitive rate-setting way on cargo from Japan to the United States. However, the Celler group discovered what it contends was a secret pact between the big United States Lines Co. and the Barber Wilhelmsen group to fix tariffs.

A second big batch of alleged violations—CELLER said he found 141 of these—involved rebates. A rebate is a return to favored shippers of a portion of his freight charges and is specifically outlawed in the Shipping Act.

Among its findings the House unit turned up a pact between the American Export Lines and two foreign-flag companies, granting alleged rebates of 2 to 20 percent for several major shippers.

Some of the shipping company officials openly expressed their pain at the disclosures.

Vice President William Rand of the United States Lines, commenting on disguised payments made several years ago to an agent for some importers, said:

"I am personally ashamed of it. It is not within our company principles to behave in this manner whatsoever. If we hadn't gone into these lousy shenanigans, we never could have gotten the cargo."

The States Marine Lines was accused of inaccurately describing some cargo to give a lower rate. Vice president Robert G. Stone said, "We have absolutely no excuse. It was wrong, our people were wrong—ethically, morally, and every other way."

So many of the cases were spelled out in company files that Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, a subcommittee member, observed that "laxity of the enforcement agencies has induced a recklessness on the part of the shipping lines in the maintenance of these records. You are rather surprised to find them in the files of the companies."

A blunter appraisal was offered by Chairman CELLER. He said the Maritime Board "has been incredibly negligent" and "has not even offered a token gesture of enforcement." CELLER stressed that his evaluation applied to the Board and its predecessors in both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Chairman Clarence G. Morse, of the Maritime Board, has promised to check every case uncovered by the subcommittee. So far, he has marked down 13 for formal inquiry. Another 17 have been referred to the Justice Department, and staff investigations have been started in 72 more. In all, the Board figures the Celler group's listing can be boiled down to 102 cases.

Morse candidly said in a recent interview, "I was disturbed" by the House findings. He attributed them to a lack of policing staff and a "philosophy in the industry—not only by the carriers, but the shippers and receivers—that they do not have to adhere strictly to the law."

NO PENALTY IN 44 YEARS

While any shipping company guilty of a secret agreement can be fined $1,000 a day, no penalty has ever been assessed in the Shipping Act's 44 years. In the past, Morse said, the Board believed in showing violators the error of their ways rather than in prosecuting. Now, he said, he will seek penalties in at least some cases.

Morse is also increasing the regulation office staff from 33 to 41 and is adding 3 investigators to the 3 the board now has.

Board member Thomas E. Stakem has been put in charge of a special unit overseeing the investigations.

In addition, three new offices have been set up on the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts. Their chiefs will watch the rate-fixing meetings of the lines.

Morse, however, does not intend to deal strictly with the companies his board regulates. His three new field men will ask, not demand, to sit in on the rate-fixing conferences. "We're going down that path slowly," he said.

Despite the rich harvest reaped by the House unit, Morse won't send Board agents through the steamship lines' files to see whether there are other violations. "Under our system of government," he maintained, "that is not the way an agency of the Government should conduct its business."

PENALTIES NOT FOR ALL

He will not, he said, ask for penalties against all lines that have broken the law. Willful intent and the facts in each case will determine who gets punished, he said.

Moreover, he added that "100-odd violations over 15 years is not too far out of line for a big, active industry like shipping."

Timely Remarks on Our Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the emphasis given our agricultural problems, and the attention drawn to farm subsidies, the following comments are most timely. They are drawn from a speech delivered in Iowa last week by Mr. Herb Plambeck, of radio station WHO, in Des Moines. Mr. Plambeck is recognized as one of America's leading farm editors:

Yes, agriculture is vital to America. Believe it or not, agriculture is the biggest buyer, seller, and borrower in the United States.

1. Farmers purchase farm supplies worth about $14 billion—if they have the money to buy—and there are lots of other things they need besides farm supplies.

2. There are twice as many jobs in industries serving farmers as there are farm jobs. Sixteen million Americans in manufacturing, processing and distribution are dependent on farmers.

3. The inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the total assets of the American steel industry.

4. Many people think the auto industry is the Nation's most important. Agriculture's equipment valuation totals five times that of the auto industry—and this does not include the value of land and livestock.

5. The long steel strike certainly affected farmers. They use 6½ million tons of finished steel each year * * * that's more than the auto business uses.

6. Farms in America consume 17½ billion gallons of crude petroleum—more than any other industry.

7. That farming is "on wheels" is evidenced by the fact that 285 million pounds of raw rubber are used annually for farm equipment.

8. In global terms U.S. farmers make up less than 1 percent of the world's population, but they provide 20 percent of the world's meat, 30 percent of the milk, and 40 percent of the corn.

9. Recently, here in Iowa, we had new proof that food production is a key factor in international thinking—when Nikita Khrushchev paid Iowa a visit, and made it rather obvious that next to his talks with the President, seeing Iowa's agriculture was his No. 1 objective.

What is the reward? Just how are the farmers sharing in U.S. prosperity? One piece of evidence is that realized net income in 1959 is 12 percent under 1958. Let's look at broilers as an example:

Year	Produced	Cost	Sale price	Profit or loss
		Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
1948	400,000	26.0	36	+10
1955	1,100,000	21.0	22	+1
1959	1,750,000	18.5	17	−1½

Red meats is another example: in 1951 21 billion pounds produced, $11.4 billion received; in 1957 27 billion pounds produced, $9.4 billion received.

I have pondered this question a thousand times—and so have you, and countless other have, too—and it keeps adding up to an unhappy answer—the more we produce, the less we get. How long can we continue to do this and remain solvent?

Permit me to mention a few facts of life about Government subsidies, as they apply across the board. In doing so I am neither praising nor condemning the principle.

First, we must recognize subsidies, to which Life magazine and a lot of others have taken strong dislike, have been with us a long time. The truth is, subsidies are the oldest economic principle written into the laws of the United States. In fact, tariffs, which are a subsidy originally designed to protect and promote industrial development in early America, were enacted into law when the first Congress convened back in 1789. They were enacted the first day of the assembly, and they stipulated a tonnage tax in favor of American shipping.

Subsidies have taken many forms since, but the tariff is with us still, preceding subsidies by about 130 years or so.

One rather significant subsidy was the granting of 6,340,000 acres of public lands to private interests for canal building, river improvement between 1826 and 1866. Another, 183 million acres of lands were given to the railways.

Through the years, it's been the same—and it's still going on. Mail subsidies came into being in 1845, and they're still going strong. Life magazine, in its vicious attack on farm subsidies, failed to mention it accepts a $9 million a year subsidy in the way of postal rates. Reader's Digest sees no objection to accepting $5 million while condemning individual farmers for taking a few thousand.

Lest I be misunderstood, I have not said the postal subsidies are wrong. The truth is, I am glad to have access to fine publications like Life and Reader's Digest, at prices I can afford. I know a little about the value of advertising, and how magazines and newspapers, along with radio and TV, provide us with a fuller life—and a higher living standard. I recognize the educational value of these publications.

The only thing I ask, and again I speak as an individual, is that the magazines who charge farmers as being government money-grabbers admit to the same crime. This they have not done.

This I submit is an injustice to the people of agriculture.

Countless additional millions have gone to subsidize shipbuilding. A recent example is a $40 million subsidy to build the luxury liner, the *United States*.

Airlines have been especially large beneficiaries.

There are an amazing lot of subsidies, and some of them add up to a surprising total. And what must be hardest to believe of all for farm critics is the relatively small number that apply to agriculture.

Cost plus is a subsidy and no one objected if cost plus was needed to get necessary defense items.

Depletion allowances in oil and mining industries are subsidy, and they total $23 billion. Business reconversion payments (including tax amortization) are a subsidy, and they total $45 billion in recent years.

Maritime organizations have a $3½ billion subsidy.

These figures are not my own. They have been taken from a U.S. Government Printing Office bulletin, and you, as a taxpayer, are just as much entitled to them as anyone else. It is called Government Subsidy in Historical Review, and you can secure a copy from your own Congressman.

The truth is, subsidies to business, industry, publications, transportation and other interests far exceed the amount agriculture gets.

For example, in the last 5 years, 50 large corporations have received over $80 billion in Government contracts, which though not labeled as subsidies, certainly represent significant financial help from the Federal Government. Why in Heaven's name can't we have the whole story told—a story that might make some of us cringe.

The postal deficit over a 10-year period, for instance, exceeds the total of the CCC farm programs for the past 25 years.

Capper's Farmer, a magazine that accepts postal subsidies like all the others, says that in the past 50 years, for every $1,000 this country has spent on subsidies, agriculture has received only $5. That's just one-half of 1 percent, isn't it? Moreover, Capper's points out that the American housewife, as she bemoans the fact that some of her tax dollars go for farm subsidies, forgets that the American consumer has benefited to the tune of $70 billion because food costs would have been that much higher without farm supports.

Meanwhile, there is still another aspect to the so-called farm subsidy. Dick Hansen, Successful Farming editor, now in Russia, called this to his readers' attention in July. He shows that the amount going to farmers is actually only half that charged to farmers.

Daniel Rice Co., of the New York Stock Exchange, made an interesting breakdown of the figures charged against farm subsidies. It showed farmers getting a total of a billion, and consumers getting about a billion. The rest should have been charged to the State Department for foreign relief loans repayable as in REA, soil conservation, which benefits all the Nation. The Forest Service, emergency relief, these are just a few.

The Rice Co., in its conclusion, appealed to the public to look at the true facts, and to recognize the prosperity of the farmer as the economic backbone of the Nation.

I believe that if, as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce suggests, we take away all the farm subsidies, the repercussions in business and industry would be overwhelming. That billion dollars that goes to farmers in the way of soil bank payments, or in commodity stabilization, or in ASP, etc., is a pretty important item if you happen to be in the feed business, or in the seed business, or in the machinery business. Or in a thousand other farm-related fields.

Presently, farmers are charged with one-tenth of the Government's total subsidy programs.

I say that because I believe that for America to stay strong, agriculture must remain strong, and unless there is a greater appreciа-

tion of the contribution agriculture is making to American prosperity, unless present injustices are corrected, unless agriculture no longer remains an island of poverty in a sea of prosperity, America will not maintain its present position of strength and leadership, in a world crying for freedom and the abundance farmers must help provide.

The National Imperative Versus Carl Harris, American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the technologically unemployed of this land, who have been callously ignored by the Eisenhower administration, have had no greater champion at this Congress than my able colleague from West Virginia, Mr. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

In the January 31 edition of the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail, largest newspaper in West Virginia, Mr. SLACK had an article which poignantly summarizes the plight of the unemployed and what could be done to help them. I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding article by Mr. SLACK be printed in the RECORD:

THE NATIONAL IMPERATIVE VERSUS CARL HARRIS, AMERICAN

(By JOHN M. SLACK, JR., Representative, Sixth Congressional District)

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO US?

In early 1959, when the impact of the 1958 recession was being felt most severely, I visited a number of communities in Kanawha and adjoining counties. In one of them I met and talked with an important and significant American. His name is Carl Harris. He is just 40 years old, married, and the father of seven children ranging from 4 to 16 years of age.

For many years he was a machine operator in a coal mine, but there has been no regular work in his trade for more than 2 years. Harris has no income. He owns no automobile, television set or radio, and has no access to a newspaper.

Long ago he exhausted 36 weeks of unemployment compensation benefits. He is months behind in his house rent, but the utilities still function. That's because he gathers scrap copper around abandoned mines and sell it to a junk dealer for 10 cents per pounds, averaging about $12 per month, which just pays the utility bills.

The backbone of his family's diet is flour, rice, cornmeal and other surplus commodities received from the surplus commodities program of the Department of Agriculture.

His wife will tell you that a few beans or potatoes would be a welcome change. The children breakfast regularly on gravy and oats, although sometimes necessity forces a change to cornmeal and water.

Among his neighbors these foods have earned the collective nickname of "molligrub," and they supply about one-third the amount of calories required to sustain normal health in a human being.

The children themselves show remarkably little bitterness over the fact that this skid-row diet has handed them a legacy of rotten, snaggled teeth, abcessed to the point where wholesale extraction is often necessary by the age of 13.

They do not even envy the children of those so amply blessed with good food that they can afford to throw eggs at Anastas Mikoyan and other unpopular visitors.

The Harris family is not alone. They are front rank veterans in a growing army of peons which now totals about 4 million Americans. Their condition is a manifestation of what happens when a socio-economic sore is left untended. They symbolize the classic tragedy—as did the ragged masses of refugees who flooded the highways of Europe during World War II.

The circumstances of Carl Harris today are the challenge that faces all of us in West Virginia who are attempting to effect a turnabout in prevailing economic conditions. For that reason Carl Harris is important to us.

He is significant also, because he represents the end-product of failure to master the several social and economic problems which follow in the wake of technological advance in industry. As of today, the State administration, the legislature, the congressional delegation, many public and private organizations, and hundreds of public-minded citizens have recognized the need of forthright action to reverse the prevailing economic cycle in some sections of the State.

By and large this general recognition has arisen only during the past year. With recognition has come determination, and excellent prospects for unified action at the several levels of our society. But in our planning, we must not underestimate the size of the task, or fall victim to the belief that any one public or private body can handle the job alone.

Make no mistake about it—we have entered the arena of combat with a Colossus whose size and strength is still unknown, even to the most informed economists in the United States.

At any given point in history, in any era or any country, whenever the massive force of catacylsmic change in the economic or political affairs of mankind develops an unrestrained momentum, and bends human quantities to its will, the elements of classic tragedy are present.

Carl Harris and about 1 million other American workmen are involved in such a change, caught and smashed between the hammer of productivity and the anvil of national economic and diplomatic policy.

They are the human beings behind the oft-repeated and little understood phrase "long-term technologically unemployed."

Their number is increasing, and their condition grows steadily worse, while their very existence casts a lengthening shadow that deepens from gray reproach to black omen for all of us.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

To ask how our present economic condition can exist in a Nation boasting the world's highest standard of living, with a high level of prosperity for nearly 15 years without major interruption, is to inquire into the fundamentals of our objectives as a people.

The traceable origins of today's technological unemployment can be found before the turn of the century but its more immediate source can be pinned to industry's "great leap forward" which began immediately after the close of World War II and has continued at a scarcely undiminished rate ever since.

The business community originally adapted and exploited the technological break-throughs of the war production years to meet a huge pent-up demand for capital and consumer goods.

After several rounds of wage increases by major unions, the business leaders pressed further into technological research simply to keep costs down in a time of rising wages.

In the beginning the process was relatively slow and orderly, as it had been for 50 years. Comparatively few workers were displaced, and they were able to adapt themselves to other livelihoods,, even as the wagonmakers and wheelwrights of 1900–1915 were able to transfer their skills to automotive manufacture.

Since 1950, however, the drive for industrial efficiency has slashed its way across the board, striking a dozen major industries and thousands of employers simultaneously.

For the displaced worker there is nowhere to go, and in this circumstance lies the immediate cause for the growth of a backlog of long-term technologically unemployed.

For a few years there was hope that the process would level out on a plateau which would permit new indutsrial development and population demand to soak up those displaced. That hope is now gone. Finally.

With the launching of the first sputnik, the drive for industrial efficiency got a massive injection of energy, and moved into a new pattern which may well be the pattern for the rest of our children's lives.

When Khrushchev smiled and restated his snarling challenge "We will bury you," into the statement "We will surpass you in a peaceful contest of economic advancement," the situation was confirmed.

Technological advancement under forced draft in industry is now an imperative—a pillar of national military and diplomatic policy. It is an absolute, because at all costs we must retain our topmost ranking as the first producer of goods and services for our people and our friends overseas. To fall in this is to lose the contest to the Soviet economic system before the eyes of the world.

We have accepted the challenge because we must. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, has said that Soviet industrial production is now about 40 percent of U.S. output, and is scheduled to grow by 8 to 9 percent annually, as it has for the past decade.

At this rate it will reach 60 percent of the U.S. level by 1970, unless American industry spurts ahead of its recent average 4½-percent yearly increase. If this is permitted to happen, Dulles says our lead will be "narrowed dangerously" by 1970.

We already have been put on notice that automation is the key to success in the economic contest with the Soviets. And we have been warned by leading experts on automation and computer technology that an inquiry into the economic and social effects of technological progress is a must because not only "individuals but also whole communities may be bypassed and thus create a "very dangerous situation for the Nation."

Aside from our ideological convictions and firm belief in the superiority of our way of life, it does not seem likely that we will lose a straight-out productivity contest with the Soviet Union or anybody else.

Our labor force is increasing at the rate of 860,000 persons per year and the Bureau of the Census estimates it will increase by 1,440,000 annually between 1970 and 1975.

Analyses of our productivity since 1900 establish that—with only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the land area—we produce more than one-third of the world's goods. The average American worker's output today in a 40-hour week is triple that of his grandfather in a 70-hour week.

The output for each man an hour in manufacturing has increased steadily in this country since 1908—an increase of 55 percent during the 20 years between 1909–1928.

But in response to the "great leap forward" (catch-phrase of Mao's Communist Chinese), output each man-hour after World War II jumped an overwhelming 74 percent in the 10 years between 1947 and 1956—an increase generally credited to technological advance.

One survey of business plans for new plant and equipment says American business ex-

pects a productivity increase of 3 percent an employee each year to continue until 1962, at least, and that this will be supported by over $34 billion in capital spending during 1960.

The same survey reports the business community expects, during the period 1959–62, an increase of 18 percent in sales, but only an 8 percent increase in employment.

But, if our economy expands at the rate of 3 percent a year with the average productivity increase per employee, it will mean that our national output will double in about 24 years, as gross national product rises from the present $467 billion rate to $950 billion per year.

All of these calculations are predicated upon the existence of a mass of regularly employed consumers, among other things.

In other words, we are masters of the tools of business economics, but we may fail unless we plan the disposition of our working and consuming forces more intelligently.

Last May, Secretary of Labor Mitchell issued a summary of the unemployed which said that there were 1,400,000 persons unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and 700,000 who had been unemployed for more than 26 weeks. He acknowledged that this is the most serious aspect of the current problem of unemployment.

In mid-July, just before the steel strike made itself felt, Secretary Mitchell reported that total employment had risen to an all-time high of 67,600,000, but there were still 3,700,000 unemployed.

How is it possible to have more than 5 percent of the labor force unemployed in a time of unparalleled prosperity and record-breaking production totals?

The answer lies, of course, in the use of our new technology to the full range of business enterprise.

From small beginnings during World War II, down through a postwar decade of research and the spending of $5 billion by Government and industry in electronics development, we have now reached a stage where little cells, tubes and tapes can be combined to perform tasks which rival the magic of Aladdin's Jinn:

Computers design space vehicles, test flight characteristics of aircraft; solve logistics problems, forecast weather, plot the course of hurricanes; compose music, translate languages, predict genetic changes in fruit flies.

A thin magnetic tape gives orders to a $600,000 machine tool which shapes metal for an aircraft wing.

Six automated machines produce tailor-made parts for generators weighing up to 90 tons.

A new pushbutton coal mine digs, cleans, processes and loads 1,200 tons of coal an hour under the watchful eye of closed-circuit television.

A computer designs power transformers in 2 or 3 days which formerly required 3 to 4 months of engineering work. It has been educated to think like a handbook engineer, owners say.

In a Detroit automotive plant a giant machine snaps up 100 engine blocks an hour, flips them into 7 different positions and machines each one with 555 drilling, tapping, countersinking, reaming, boring and milling operations.

In a Louisiana refinery, a computer the size of an office desk, is in charge of mixing 6 million gallons of gasoline per day.

The list is endless, and it's all part of a production process defined by an industry leader as a series of technicial revolutions, comparable to shipping's change from sail to steam, but with each revolution superimposed on its predecessors.

But there is another side to this picture of streamlined efficiency:

A meatpacker shuts down 7 plants involving 4,500 jobs.

A refrigerator maker installs automation equipment costing $3 million and the work force is reduced by 2,200 persons.

A county coal association reports an increase of 357,000 tons of coal mined in a 4-month period, but notes the use of 1,000 fewer miners.

The length and variety of this list would match the preceding one, point for point, and the displaced workers can take small comfort from current assurances that automation will make more jobs for everybody "in the long run."

The most realistic and ominous statement is contained in a Department of Labor report issued last June in which an official pointed out that production recovery from the recession far outstripped man-hours worked, but admitted that "many jobs that existed before the recession are still unfilled, and perhaps nonexistent as improved technology has made it unnecessary to continue some jobs."

What has now become casually apparent to the Department of Labor has been known to more than a hundred Members of Congress for the past 10 years. They have watched the growing stagnation of communities in their districts and the gradual decline of living standards among their people wherever the power of technological advance has swept a working force into the dustbin of long-term unemployment.

They have also noted the regular appearance of what is probably the most useless publication issued by the Federal Government—a list of "surplus labor areas" on which the names of the same communities appear year in, year out, to the point where the list itself tends to become a catalog of futility rampant.

IS ANYONE DOING ANYTHING?

During recent years, scores of Congressmen, especially those from Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia, have repeatedly described the need for a forthright program to reverse the economic cycle in areas weakened by this technological revolution.

So far all their efforts have ended in failure, not only in the enactment of legislation, but also even in attempts to obtain general recognition that a problem exists.

Naturally enough, the big unions have not viewed these developments calmly. Five of the largest industrial unions have suffered membership declines ranging from 100,000 to 400,000 members in recent years. They are aware that between 1947 and 1957, when industrial production was rising 40 percent, the number of production workers in industry rose only 1 percent. Meanwhile, nonproduction workers, chiefly white-collar employees, increased by 55 percent.

The record reveals that there has been virtually no increase in the number of jobs in the goods-producting industries during the past 40 years, despite a 66-percent increase in population.

But the next major impact of automation is scheduled for the office, where "computers * * * are going to be like bulldozers in the construction industry."

Nobody is safe, it seems.

The unions' answer to it is to gain protection through the bargaining process—wring the difference out of the employer or consumer. As a result, the recent steel strike, with its $5 billion economic loss in four months, was not a clash over wages, but over administration of rules which determine the number and kind of skills in the work force.

A similar nub of controversy resulted in temporary settlements between the longshoremen and meatpackers unions and several employers. In the packers' case, the companies agreed to establish a fund to undertake research and develop programs designed to retrain and relocate displaced workers.

The teamsters have served notice that they may demand a royalty on every truckload delivered, starting in 1961, to "share the benefits" of increased company profits due to mechanization.

All of the foregoing adds up to the simple fact that we are paying for something we aren't getting.

We are paying out millions in unemployment compensation and agricultural commodity costs and billions in economic losses through strikes and negotiated labor-management agreements, and we will pay more each year in each of these categories.

In return, we gain nothing in knowledge or skill that can be brought to bear on the core of the problem of how best to exploit our technology to the utmost and thereby guarantee victory in the international economic race without creating additional thousands of hopeless drones each year?

As matters stand in Washington, we may anticipate continuation of many uncoordinated activities:

The Labor Department will issue employment statistics by the bale;

The Commerce Department will make small gestures at area redevelopment;

The Agriculture Department will distribute more fodder for consumption by the unemployed;

The Defense Department will dabble at placing military contracts in depressed areas.

And the President's Council of Economic Advisers will continue its weighty studies of long-term economic trends, politely overlooking this problem, as it has to date.

The air on Capitol Hill will be charged with vibrant proposals—for more unemployment compensation, a lower social security age limit, the 30-hour workweek, Federal financing to support area redevelopment, tax exemptions for corporations who locate in depressed areas, and a thousand others. Many of them undoubtedly have merit, but we have no yardstick by which their value can be judged.

We are well into a period which was foretold by a prophet—Prof. Norbert Wiener, the father of cybernetics (comparative study of control systems) whose work represents a major pillar on which the age of automation is being erected. A decade ago he described the shape of things to come and extended a thoughtful warning:

"The man who has nothing but his physical power to sell has nothing to sell which it is worth anyone's money to buy * * * the machine plays no favorites between manual labor and white-colar labor. Thus the possible fields into which the new industrial revolution is likely to penetrate are very extensive, and include labor performing judgments of a low level * * * the intermediate period of the introduction of the new means, especially if it comes in the fulminating manner to be expected from a new war, will lead to an immediate transitional period of disastrous confusion."

We have the new war, a cold, economic war. And the confusion is upon us, although we may yet avoid the disaster. In 1959, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 84th Congress, held extensive hearings on the general subject "Automation and Technological Change."

In its report the committee noted that "* * * many individuals will suffer personal, mental, and physical hardships as the adjustments go forward," but concluded that "* * * no specific broad-gage economic legislation appears to be called for * * *" above and beyond already existing areas of Federal interest contained in the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Since that time we have proceeded on a course which has added something new and quaintly American in the history of man's inhumanity to man.

We have mobilized the full power of our national effort in a way which virtually

guarantees the creation of new areas of insular poverty, in the penetrating definition of Prof. John Galbraith.

In the past such areas have evolved gradually because they fell out of step with economic progress; during the last 10 years, however, we have inadvertently arranged to create them.

No other democratic nation has ever done this to its own people as an integral part of its national policy.

If we continue to ignore the realities of long-term technological unemployment, we may reasonably expect developments of the next 10 years to parallel those of the past 10, and to have established by 1970 a built-in, hard core of 4 million unemployed, each averaging 3 dependents, or a total of 16 million Americans subsisting on some sort of dole at a cost of about $8 billion per year.

We may also anticipate a long series of tremendous labor-management clashes, causing billions in economic loss, or else the negotiation of collusive agreements which will burden the consumer and minimize the benefits of our technology.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Before we can improve our position, we will have to admit two things to ourselves:

First, that we are engaged in a life-and-death international contest to maintain our top position in productivity and efficiency, and this effort will unquestionably cause methods, and machines to displace workers.

Second, that we have badly misjudged the impact of the new technology on our society and have been caught unprepared to deal with the consequences.

As to the first, the cold war may be a standoff for a century, and the standard bearer for tomorrow's world may well be the nation whose system offers the best hope for a full material life combined with maximum personal freedom from regimentation. A mass of 16 million half-starved American peons will hardly contribute to our stature in 1970, by which time Khrushchev boasts that the U.S.S.R. will match the American standard of living.

It's an endless circle. To hold world leadership we must use every means to spur technical progress in industry. We must even attempt to speed up the cycle of development and application by training more engineers and technicians through the National Defense Education Act.

At the same time, we dare not permit the machine to overwhelm the citizen. The answer appears to be to make a determined investment in what Prof. Theodore Schultz calls "the formation of human capital," a conscious effort to speed up human effectiveness based on capacities that develop from investments in man.

Four immediate undertakings suggest themselves:

1. A surplus agricultural commodities program which meets at least the minimum nutrition requirements for sound health. At least the equivalent, say, of the foods we were so quick to rush to postwar Europe. Considerations of humanity aside, if the long-term unemployed are not fed properly, they will soon be unable to work, and their families will be permanent charges of society.

2. Formal recognition by the President of the scope of the problem, and its relationship to national objectives, such recognition to be made manifest by appointment of a top assistant at near-Cabinet rank. The Secretaries of Labor, Commrece, Agriculture, and above all, Treasury, have an interest in this situation.

All of their activities bearing on the matter should be coordinated at once by a top-flight business economist-administrator, reporting directly to the President. Without the prestige of the White House behind him, no man can hope to untangle the mess that has developed.

In this connection let it be said at once that this is not a partisan issue, and has no proper place in the 1960 campaign unless injected by default. No one has fought harder against political, sectional, and White House indifference to the problem than a handful of Republican Congressmen from Pennsylvania in a Democratic Congress.

3. Institution of an immediate inquiry by a suitable group of experts into the theoretical aspects of the displacement of men by machines in an effort to develop a yardstick whereby counteractive programs may be planned.

Conduct of such an inquiry should be the most important obligation of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Somewhere there are signposts by which we may identify technological unemployment in its infancy, and somewhere there is a measuring gage to guide a practical course of action. Perhaps it lies in the application of a reverse of the leadtime principle for tooling and preparation which is fundamental to mass production. At any rate, there is an answer somewhere, and we must find it.

4. Pursuit of both Federal legislation and administrative programs designed to place the financial support of the Government behind short-term betterment undertakings to the extent practicable. Any program which will divert some of the Federal purchasing billions into the weakened areas will more than repay us in the years to come, and any program of physical improvements which will encourage private industrial development can be assured of manifold long-range return.

These are not the only possibilities, by any means, and if they are received only to be rejected in favor of superior suggestions they will have served their purpose. We cannot muddle through in the vague hope that our economy will expand fast enough to soak up all new jobseekers, plus those displaced by the growth of technology. The evidence against the chances of such a hope is not to be denied.

The present status of Carl Harris and his family is just around the corner for almost every one of us who must work to earn his daily bread. It advances, literally, with the speed of light, as the little cells and tubes wink their way forward with inhuman remorselessness.

White collar, blue collar, or no collar, there is no place to hide, so it behooves us to set about learning the dimensions of the problem that faces us and our posterity.

Barnett Sounds the Clarion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address by the Governor of Mississippi, the Honorable Ross R. Barnett, delivered to a statewide Citizens' Council meeting in Columbia, S.C., on Friday, January 29, 1960. Mr. Barnett, a distinguished constitutional lawyer, and an ardent defender of the American tradition of States rights, has given the southern people as well as the alien meddlers something to understand and something on which to meditate. Mr. Barnett's address is one of calm and well reasoned advice. His firmness and positive admonitions demonstrate the type of man who will preside over the fortunes of the great State of Mississippi during his term as Governor. The mongrelists and the mixiecrats who have infiltrated the Democratic Party will find the South is determined to be on the defensive no longer.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that some time ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE in which he gave notice to those who have infiltrated the Democratic Party of a similar determination on the part of our people to take the offensive. Gov. Ross Barnett again indicates that our forces are preparing for the greatest counterattack any way of life has ever undertaken. Mr. Speaker, I urge you, the majority leader, and every other Member of this body to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest what Ross Barnett told the South Carolinians at Columbia, S.C., on January 29, 1960.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. ROSS R. BARNETT OF MISSISSIPPI TO STATEWIDE CITIZEN'S COUNCIL BANQUET, COLUMBIA, S.C., JANUARY 29, 1960

Friends, it's good to be in South Carolina. I am particularly pleased that my first speaking engagement outside Mississippi since my inauguration is before this distinguished audience.

I am always happy to speak before such a distinguished group of men and women who are dedicated to the preservation of our way of life—and who are not afraid to stand up and be counted, even when it costs them $20 apiece.

Your most capable Governor, Ernest Hollings, honored my by flying to Jackson for my inauguration on January 19—and I said then that with Governor Hollings, Gov. John Patterson of Alabama, Governor-elect Jimmie Davis of Louisiana, and official representatives from Arkansas, Georgia, and Tennessee all present, it looked like some real southern unity was beginning to crystallize.

I am particularly grateful that some of the members of the South Carolina congressional delegation are present tonight. I'm sure we can all agree that Mississippi and South Carolina have two of the finest groups representing us in Washington of all 50 States. Some other States, to be sure, have bigger delegations—but the Senators and Representatives from your State and mine more than make up in quality for whatever may be lacking in quantity. If all 50 States were served by such capable and honorable men, this Nation would be in a far better position today.

Let me take this opportunity to pay special tribute to a courageous South Carolinian—a former governor of your State, now a U.S. Senator—the Honorable STROM THURMOND. We in Mississippi have the deepest affection and respect for Senator THURMOND. He has been close to our hearts ever since 1948, when he carried the South's banner so proudly by putting principles above partisan politics. Mississippi's late beloved Gov. Fielding Wright was Senator THURMOND'S running mate 12 years ago—and these two dedicated statesmen conducted an admirable campaign.

This is one reason why the people of Mississippi feel so close to the people of South Carolina, and one reason why I am so happy to bring you the friendly greetings of all Mississippi.

The warm ties of brotherhood between our two States began during the infancy of our

Republic; they were strengthened immeasurably 100 years ago, when South Carolina and Mississippi made common cause with other Southern States in our battle against tyranny and oppression.

Friends, the bonds which join our two beloved states were forged on the anvil of freedom, and tempered with the blood of our most gallant sons. The years of adversity did not weaken the ties which bound us together; rather, they served to unite us all the more, and to arm us with renewed determination and dedication.

This unity among our people—in the Magnolia State of Mississippi and the Palmetto State of South Carolina, in Georgia and Alabama and Louisiana—is what makes the South truly great. It is the reason why I know that our cause will prevail.

This does not mean that the road ahead is an easy one. Our laws, customs and traditions will come under assault as never before.

Our people are determined—they must be ready to meet this new challenge. We must provide the leadership if we are to win this mortal struggle.

Yes, friends, this is a mortal struggle. But it is a struggle we can and will win if we cast aside petty differences and work with renewed effort for the preservation of our southern heritage.

Sad to say, there are those in your State and mine—and in the other Southern States—who put personal gain or political advantage above the common good. There are evil and sinister forces at work, whose sole desire is for the utter destruction of our southern system of biracial living.

Allied with these forces are powerful and corrupt elements in the North, with bulging treasuries, and exercising virtual control over most of this Nation's media of mass communications.

Although these groups are relatively small in number, they make a powerful lot of noise. And if the voice of the majority—the voice of the South—is to be heard, we are going to have to speak up loudly enough to drown out all their noise.

This, however, is not as simple as it sounds. What do we mean when we talk about "The Voice of the South"?

You know, the South actually has many voices. Perhaps part of our present trouble is that we have too many. As I see it, our problem is twofold: First, to separate the South's true voices from the false; and second, to find ways of making the South's true voices heard throughout our Nation.

The way things are now, the South's false prophets are held in high regard up North. I don't have to name them—you already know who they are: editors who sell their southern heritage for a byline in Look magazine; and politicians who turn their backs on their own people while seeking special favors at the national level.

You also know the True voices of the South—editors like Tom Waring in Charleston and Tom Hederman and Jimmy Ward back home in Jackson; political leaders like STROM THURMOND and DICK RUSSELL and JIM EASTLAND—and it must be our purpose to make those voices heard throughout our great land.

Friends, we hear a lot nowadays about moderates. In fact, this has become almost a sacred word with the northern press. They keep telling us that if all of us segregationists would shut up, then the moderates could sneak in and take over, and everything down South would be fine.

That all depends on how you look at it. If you were trying every way under the sun to integrate the races in the South, then things probably would be fine if the moderates took over.

A burglar would probably tell you that if all the policemen left their beats and went home every night, then he could take over and things would be fine—for him. But is that any reason for us to give the police force the night off?

Actually, friends, these moderates we've been hearing so much about are nothing more than southern burglars. They want to rob us of our priceless heritage, and they tell us that we shouldn't complain, as long as they steal it a little bit at a time.

Now if you surprised a burglar in your house tonight, and he told you not to worry—that he just wanted a little bit of the family silver—how many of you would stand idly by while he went on ransacking your home? You'd be foolish if you did—because if he finds out you're a soft touch, he'll be back tomorrow night and the night after and the night after that. And he won't be content with just the silver. Pretty soon, he'll be wanting your jewelry, and then your wallet.

Another expression we're being bombarded with these days is token integration. Well, here's my definition of token integration. That's when one of these moderates—these southern burglars—comes into your house and tells you that if you give him just a few of your valuables, he'll go away. Just sort of a token burglary, you might call it.

The only trouble is that once you reach in the cupboard or under the mattress for your bankroll so you can give him part of it, he's not satisfied. He wants it all. He'll tell you then that he needs another $100 for a suit of clothes, and maybe $5,000 more for a big, black limousine.

Where you make your mistake is to listen to him in the first place. As long as you keep giving, he'll keep taking. And isn't it foolish to give him anything until you're sure he's a burglar? Let's make these moderates take off their cloaks of pious phrases and professions of good will and brotherhood. Let's find out what sort of ugly race-mixing weapons they're hiding underneath their camouflage.

When a burglar has been making the rounds in your neighborhood, what do you do? Do you call all the neighbors together and arrange a conference with the burglar—a mediation or conciliation session, if you will? Do you greet him with outstretched arms and, holding your hat in your hands, ask him meekly: "Please, sir, Mr. Burglar, won't you leave us alone?"

Of course not. You first call on the authorities to come get the burglar. Then you go home and make sure you're ready to defend yourself, in case the burglar arrives at your house before the sheriff catches him. That's the only way to deal with any kind of burglars—whether they're after your money or your southern heritage. Be ready to meet them head on.

This is just good commonsense. People all over the country would agree with this, if they only knew the facts. But the facts are being kept from them. The people who control the big newspapers and magazines and television and radio networks keep their best brains busy, plotting new ways to hide and twist the true facts about the South.

And that's not all. These plotters aren't content with giving the Nation a totally false picture of the South. No, the northerners are also being brainwashed systematically about what's going on in their own back yards.

I dare say that we in Mississippi and you in South Carolina have heard and read more about the teenaged gangs of Washington and New York than residents of those two cities have been permitted to know. For example, we know that a large number of those gang members are not members of the white race. That's a provable fact.

But do the New York or Washington papers or TV stations tell their own people these facts? Mercy, no. They're afraid that what they call "race prejudice" might rear its ugly head.

That's the slick, Madison Avenue way of saying that if the people of New York or Washington really knew the true situations in their own cities, they'd be hopping mad. They'd be mad because police are ordered to keep hands off these young thugs—to treat them with kid gloves, while they go on robbing, stabbing, raping, and killing.

And people in the Chicago area tell me that they aren't getting the true story behind the attempt to build an integrated housing development in Deerfield, Ill. Several folks said that the only factual account they've read about the Deerfield situation has been in the Citizen's Council newspaper—published in Jackson, Miss.

The situation is pretty much the same throughout the North. If the people are kept from knowing the truth even about events in their own cities, they certainly can't be expected to have any accurate ideas about what's going on any place else—particularly in the South.

That's where we in the South face a big job. We've got to tell our story to the country, and we've got to do it now. Our story must be told in simple, unmistakably clear terms. The job must be done effectively and professionally. We have one big advantage in this struggle: The majority of Americans are still on our side.

Yes, friends, in spite of all the propaganda the race mixers can produce, in spite of all the phony "brotherhood" being talked, the fact remains that the average white American, wherever he lives, doesn't want integration. Maybe he doesn't know why—and maybe the propagandists have even aroused a little sympathy in him—but that's the way he feels. He doesn't want to integrate.

We in the South must capitalize on this feeling, before it's too late. We must give our northern friends our backing; we must show them that segregation of the races is based on right thinking. We must show them that mixing the races leads inevitably to the production of an inferior mongrel race. We must show the Nation that continued separation of the races is vital, if we are to preserve the greatness of America.

If we can give facts to our friends throughout the Nation, then the children of the North and West won't be brainwashed by their leftwing teachers.

The women of the North and West won't be fooled by the do-gooders and the social agitators.

And the men of the North and West won't be taken in by the phony economists, who rave and rant and argue that integration is good for business.

The rest of the country is ready to hear our story. In fact, they are, in many cases, begging to hear it. They need our moral support. And we cannot—we must not—let them down.

The magnitude of this project taxes the imagination. The scope it must encompass borders on the infinite. But we in the South will do the job, because it must be done. There must be cooperation between the Southern States as never before. There must be no petty bickering, no wasteful duplication, no diversion of time and energy from the vital task before us.

If each Southern State were to go its separate way, perhaps some good could be accomplished. But think of the multiplied good of a unified, cooperative program, with all the Southern States working together, pooling our resources and our talent, and armed with the certain knowledge that right is on our side.

To win this life-or-death fight, we must start with a total mobilization of all our resources. This has been delayed too long already. There is no room for halfway measures. We are going to enter this fight to win.

I have urged the people of Mississippi and I now urge the people of the South to respond

to this call for total mobilization. All of our resources—both public and private—must be fully utilized. There are certain fields where private agencies—such as the citizens' councils—can be most effective. There are other activities that the people should undertake through their State governments. Our leaders must get in step with our people.

The South's financial resources must be mobilized. We are currently enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. Surely, we should be willing to divert whatever funds are necessary to win this fight, so we may continue to enjoy our prosperity.

We must mobilize our mental resources. The best brains of the South should work together to formulate specific programs in our drive to reeducate the North in fundamental American principles.

Our moral and spiritual resources must be mobilized. We know we're right—and we must show it in our everyday living. We must not apologize for being right; rather, we should assume the attitude of long-suffering, patient missionaries, laboring diligently to bring enlightenment to a people less fortunate than ourselves. The South has a great spiritual heritage—it is the stronghold of religion in America—and our moral and spiritual leaders should provide us with the kind of leadership we will need so badly if our cause is to prevail.

Finally, we must mobilize our physical resources. This means, frankly, that we must find out now who among us can be counted upon to do whatever is necessary to preserve our freedoms. My friends, physical courage is a trait sadly lacking in altogether too many of the South's so-called leaders. We must separate the men from the boys. We must identify the traitors in our midst. We must eliminate the cowards from our front lines.

And, friends, let me say to you tonight that in this respect Ross Barnett will do his best to provide Mississippi with the kind of leadership that comes from setting a good example. I am sure your officials can be counted upon to do the same.

Now up to this point, I've been talking about southern unity in rather general terms. That's the easy way—and the safe way—to do it. Everyone's in favor of southern unity, as long as you keep it in the abstract. And it's easy to talk in generalities.

But, friends, I propose to do more than just talk about southern unity. I propose that all of us begin here and now to take specific action which will achieve that unity we're all seeking.

First, I propose that the southern Governors really get acquainted with one another—that we create close, personal working relationships. That's one of the reasons why I was so happy to see Governors Hollings, Patterson and Davis at my inauguration in Jackson. We need to get together—to really know each other—to form close and lasting friendships. That's the way real unity begins.

The same thing holds true with the leaders in our State legislatures, and with other State officials. By exchanging visits, by keeping in touch with each other, by meeting together periodically, the entire leadership structure of the South can and should be molded into a solid group. We are all under attack by the same enemies—why shouldn't we get together to plan the ways in which we can win this fight?

Now you'll notice I said win this fight. I didn't say we should unite to defend ourselves. There's a world of difference, friends.

In my humble opinion, we in the South have too long regarded our State government merely as instruments of passive defense. We have been too hesitant in taking the offensive.

This is my second proposal—once our Southern leaders are united, we must launch a vigorous campaign to get the full power of our State governments into this fight as offensive weapons—to take an aggressive position—and to take the initiative away from our enemies.

One way we can do this is through the creation of special agencies in each Southern State to coordinate our efforts, and to finance this battle with public funds.

Mississippi already has such an agency—it's called the State Sovereignty Commission. And similar agencies already exist—or are in the final planning stages—in several other Southern States.

The law which created the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission stated the Commission's functions in this manner:

"It shall be the duty of the Commission to do and perform any and all acts and things deemed necessary and proper to protect the sovereignty of the State of Mississippi, and her sister States, from encroachment thereon by the Federal Government or any branch, department, or agency thereof; and to resist the usurpation of the rights and powers preserved to this State and our sister States by the Federal Government or any branch, department, or agency thereof."

Now, the Mississippi legislature which adopted this act 4 years ago certainly didn't think that one State could do the job all by itself. Not at all. In fact, here's what our legislature wrote into the law regarding how the Commission should carry out its duties:

"The Commission may cooperate with one or more of the States of the Union, or any agency or agencies, commission or commissions thereof, or with any person or persons, corporation or corporations, oganization or oganizations, and may join with them or any of them, and pool such of the funds and resources of this Commission in carrying out the objectives and purposes of this act as may be deemed necessary and proper by the Commission."

Let me ask you—isn't this a fine example of southern unity already in being? Wouldn't it be wonderful if all the Southern States would create similar commissions, to work together toward our common goals? This is my third proposal—that each State create a special agency to work on this problem, in cooperation with similar groups from other Southern States, and also in cooperation with private agencies, such as the citizens' councils.

Ladies and gentlemen, the people of the South are already united. Just look at the thousands of dollars from all over the South that poured into Little Rock and to Virginia for their private schools. The people of the South already realize that what happens somewhere else today can have a profound influence on what happens at home tomorrow. And the people are anxious to do something about it.

Let me say here that the citizens' councils throughout the South are the one capable and responsible organization through which our people are making their strength felt through unity.

Friends, that's what our Southern State governments need, too—strength through unity. There's no need to waste our time in planning strategy until we have that strength mobilized—strength in our Governors, legislatures, private citizens, and organizations.

Then and only then will our views prevail. When we have the strength, the solutions to all of our problems will be easy. Our strength will give us the means of solving them.

My friends, the only way we can win this fight is to defeat the enemy—to destroy them before they destroy us. No victory can ever be won if we sit back and wait for our enemies to attack us. Our enemies wish we would continue such a policy. That way, they could pick off the entire South, one State at a time, concentrating all their propaganda machinery and all their high-priced legal talent on just one State.

But we are not going to fall into this trap. We still remember the words of Benjamin Franklin, spoken at the beginning of the American Revolution. Franklin said: "We must all hang together, or assuredly, we shall all hang separately." Friends, that statement is just as true today as it was in colonial times. The South must stick together if victory is to be ours. The left-wing elements in this Nation must be completely and utterly crushed—and that's just what we intend to do, using as our chief weapon the impact of nationwide public opinion.

There is another vital area where the South must stand united against a common enemy. That is in the field of national politics. This summer, both major political parties will hold their national conventions to write platforms and select candidates for President and Vice President.

And if present indications hold true, the conventions will degenerate into a contest in which each party tries to outdo the other in submitting the South to abuse, vilification, scorn, and contempt. Both parties will likely be eagerly seeking the title of champion South-haters.

This unhappy prediction can be forestalled only by forceful, determined, and courageous leadership in the South, acting boldly to preserve the self-respect of a proud and honorable people.

I have told my people repeatedly that, as far as national politics are concerned, I am a Mississippi Democrat—and the first word of that phrase means far more to me than the second.

When I go to the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles this summer, I will conduct myself at all times as a Mississippi Democrat. I will remember at all times that as Governor of Mississippi, I am at that convention representing the people of our great State. And the racial integrity of our people is not for sale on the political auction block.

Where the principles of the people of Mississippi are involved, there can be no compromise. The people did not elect me Governor of Mississippi to bargain their heritage away in a smoke-filled room.

I did not become their Governor to preside over the liquidation of our precious freedoms.

And I know that the Governors of most other Southern States feel as I do in this regard. The only question in the minds of the dedicated leaders of the South is what course should be followed.

This decision must be made soon. It must be made while there is time for active consultation among our political leaders throughout the South. It must not be delayed until the last minute, when our opponents will use the age-old strategy of divide and conquer.

The South must go to the Democratic National Convention united—and the South must remain united, either in the convention or out.

Friends, I am the newest Southern Governor on the job. It would be presumptuous of me to call a meeting of other Southern Governors to plan our unified course of action. I'm certain such a meeting will be called by one of the senior Southern Governors. When it is called, I will be there, speaking up for the people of Mississippi. And if no one else calls the meeting, I will. You can count on that.

Out of this meeting must come a determined, fearless course of action. We must know that the South is committed, solidly and in advance, to a plan of action which will show our desire to remain within the ranks of the party of our fathers, while at the same time, demonstrating in no uncertain terms that we do not intend to acqui-

esce in the destruction of the ideals of our fathers by any party.

I've been thinking over some of our political problems. And if a southwide meeting were being held right now, here's what I'd say.

First, I'd say that the South must unite to use its influence to restore sanity to our national government. A united South could have a tremendous influence on the outcome of this fall's elections.

Next, I'd say that Mississippi and the other Southern States must make certain that our election laws are in order. We must make sure that the South will have real freedom of choice and action this fall. We must be absolutely certain that our people will have the opportunity to vote their real convictions.

Along these lines, I've already said back home that the Mississippi Democratic Party should hold a recessed State convention—a convention that will automatically meet back after the national convention to review whatever decisions are made in Los Angeles by the national party. Naturally, I hope other Southern States will do the same.

Only the other day, I was reading a plan suggested by one of our Mississippi Congressmen, BILL COLMER. He's the dean of our State's congressional delegation, and is also the chairman of the southern strategy group in Congress. Congressman COLMER urges the consideration of a plan to put independent electors on the ballot in every Southern State this November. He's not talking about a third-party movement—but he does want to be certain that southern voters will have an opportunity to vote their convictions on election day.

I believe this proposal has merit from two standpoints: First, if the Democrats and Republicans get into a close race up North, the 100 or so independent electors from the South—the Solid South—could be a real factor in determining the outcome of the presidential election. The South could hold the balance of power.

But even if this is not the case, the proposal is still sound on a moral basis. Friends, I am going to vote my convictions this November. The way I look at it, if we vote for integration, how can we expect anything else?

One of the parties is virtually certain to nominate a presidential candidate who's a card-carrying member of the NAACP. The way things look now, both parties might do this.

Can you vote for an NAACP member for President?

Ross Barnett certainly cannot. In my humble opinion, if we are so foolish as to vote for our own destruction, we will deserve whatever we get as a consequence.

Now if both parties do nominate NAACP members for President, what can we in the South do?

Well, friends, we certainly can't vote for either of them. We've got to be sure we've got someplace to go on election day—and there sure wouldn't be enough fishing holes to go around. I intend to see that the people of Mississippi do have someplace to go—someplace on the ballot where they can cast their votes without apology, and without sacrificing our cherished American principles and southern heritage. As a loyal southerner, I can do no less.

Let there be no misunderstanding—I am not here tonight to advocate a third-party movement. I am simply urging the South not to commit ourselves in advance to whatever Earl Warren or Walter Reuther may decide. We will have ample time to decide on a specific course of action. In the meantime, we must become united—we must pledge ourselves to stick together, to put the South in the strongest possible bargaining position. If there is to be an independent elector plan, it must be a southwide plan. There is no place in the Solid South for splinter movements—we must be united in whatever we do.

Only a prophet could tell at this early date what the outcome of the 1960 election will be. I will not even venture a guess. But I do know this: When the election is over, Ross Barnett will not have to apologize. I will be able to look the people of Mississippi in the eye and say, "I have kept the faith."

By now, many of you may be wondering, "What can I, as a private citizen, do?"

Friends, your presence here tonight indicates to me that you are already doing one of the most important things any private citizen can do to help win this mortal struggle. You are supporting the Citizens' Council movement.

The Citizens' Councils and their affiliates in other southern States, some of which have different names, are the only private agencies which have risen to meet the challenge of our times.

The Citizens' Councils—which were born in Mississippi—have now organized in thousands of communities throughout the South. They have sent a steady flow of literature into northern and western States. The Councils have provided the only organized opposition to the hundred-and-one left-wing groups dedicated to forcibly mixing the races—and the Councils have emerged victorious.

The Citizens' Councils have published a monthly newspaper for the past 5 years. This paper goes into every State in the Union and to many foreign countries. It finds its way into countless libraries, high schools, and colleges throughout the Nation, carrying its message of truth behind the paper curtain of the North.

Leaders of the Citizens' Council movement have appeared on speakers' platforms in the North and West dozens of times. They have given our friends in these areas renewed inspiration.

But perhaps the most dramatic success story of the Citizens' Council movement is in the field of television and radio. Every week, "Citizens' Council Forum" is seen and heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. Every week, millions of Americans everywhere watch and listen as outstanding Senators and Congressmen talk about fundamental American principles.

More than 300 television and radio stations in 43 States have scheduled these "Citizens' Council Forum" programs. Thousands of letters from interested citizens have been received in Jackson. Truly, the response has been nothing short of amazing.

Also, there's another fact that might occasionally be overlooked. "Citizens' Council Forum" has played an important part in maintaining conservative solidarity in Congress. As of tonight, one out of every six of this Nation's Senators and Congressmen has appeared on at least one "Citizens' Council Forum" program. And that list is growing steadily. This is not without its effect on the Washington scene.

"Citizens' Council Forum" has accomplished all this in just two short years. It has been done entirely as a public-service project, supported by voluntary contributions from interested citizens—mostly from people back home in Mississippi.

I hope you see fit to do as I have done—to support the work of "Citizens' Council Forum" through a monthly pledge.

Friends, I am proud that I have been a Citizens' Council member since the Council's early days. I hope that every single white southerner will join with me in becoming a member of this fine organization. The Citizens' Councils are fighting your fight—they deserve your support. That is one thing each of you, as individuals, can and should be doing.

As far as I'm concerned, the day of the artful dodger in southern politics is ended. The time of the apologist is gone. Ross Barnett is a Mississippi segregationist and proud of it. And I will do everything within my power to preserve our sacred heritage, and to unite the South behind a bold and determined program to make the voice of the South heard throughout the Nation.

My friends, the solid South will again become a force to be reckoned with.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you.

Experts Doubt Russia's Missile Pinpointed Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, January 22, 1960:

SPACE AGE REPORT—EXPERTS DOUBT RUSSIA'S MISSILE PINPOINTED TARGET

(By Rembert James)

U.S. experts are no longer inclined to downgrade Russian rocketry, but they are suspicious of Moscow's claims that the first Russian rocket fired into the Central Pacific landed within 1.24 miles of its target. It may have done so, but based on American experience, it is not possible for the Russians to be sure. The Russians did not have enough measuring equipment in the area to make such a claim entirely believable.

American rockets fired into the Atlantic from Cape Canaveral commonly travel down a pathway of tracking stations. If they are long-range Atlas missiles, they commonly land now in what is called a splash net off Ascension Island in the South Atlantic, more than 5,000 miles from Canaveral.

A splash net is actually a circle of hydrophones on the ocean floor, at accurately measured positions. When a missile splashes, these hydrophones record the time that it takes the sound to reach them.

By triangulating the results from three hydrophones, it is possible to get a reasonably reliable fix on the actual location where the missile landed.

Although this is the most accurate way of measuring, it is not without error. Differences in the temperature of the water make differences in the speed with which the sound travels.

WAYS TO MEASURE

There are other ways of measuring. The missile, for example, may carry a small depth charge which explodes after the missile lands and sinks to a certain depth in the water. In this case, listening stations at three locations compare figures and arrive at an estimate of the point of impact.

Radar observation, from ship or shore stations, also is used to determine the location of impact. In long-range Atlas tests in the Atlantic, the radar on Ascension Island and ships' radars join in triangulating the missile's path and landing point.

If the missile is in powered flight, its position can be observed electronically until engine burnout time.

ESTIMATES DIFFER

Even if all of these systems are used, there still can be differences of several miles in estimates of where the missile actually landed.

U.S. informants say the Russians had no hydrophones on the Pacific Ocean bottom. Lacking a splash net, it seems apparent that the measurements came from radar tracking of the missile before it hit.

With three ships on station, as was the case, the Russians would have been able to triangulate the course, but U.S. experts doubt they could have pinpointed the impact area within 1.24 of a mile.

Michigan Is No. 1 Bean Producing State Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, while such records are not at all new to Michigan, I am proud to report that our State has again shown itself to be the Nation's No. 1 bean producing State, based on the latest statistics for the 1959 crop.

Furthermore, these figures show that Michigan produces 97 percent of the Nation's navy beans, 81 percent of the yelloweye beans and 77 percent of the cranberry beans.

Not only does Michigan produce the greatest volume of beans but our beans are of the highest quality—as my colleagues well know from partaking of the bean soup made of Michigan beans and served daily in the House restaurants.

Referring to Michigan as the top-ranking bean State I would like to quote from the latest issue of Modern Farming. It follows:

Michigan, with a dry bean crop of 5,974,000 bags (100 pounds each), cleaned basis, again ranked first in total dry bean production among the States. California, with 3,720,000 bags, was second, followed by Idaho, 2,590,000 bags; Colorado, 1,600,000 bags; Nebraska, 1,190,000 bags; Wyoming, 1,036,000 bags; Washington, 940,000 bags; and New York, 837,000 bags. About 325,000 bags were produced in other States, making the total U.S. production 18,212,000 bags.

Michigan produced nearly one-third of the Nation's total crop of beans and accounted for 97 percent of the navy (pea) beans, 81 percent of the yelloweye beans, and 77 percent of the cranberry beans.

The final crop report issued by the Michigan Crop Reporting Service, from which this data is taken, reduced the crop estimate from over 6 million bags predicted earlier to just under the 6 million mark. The final estimate, however, still indicates a record crop was harvested—472,000 bags above the previous record crop of 5,502,000 bags in 1949, and 748,000 bags above last year's big crop.

The bean producers of Michigan, many of whom live in the 10th Congressional District which I represent, are rapidly becoming highly specialized producers. Improved bean varieties have been developed and there have been many advances in controlling bean diseases. Another boon to the farmer-producer is the new techniques developed by the elevator and grain processing industry in handling his crop more expeditiously.

In connection with my reference to Michigan as the No. 1 bean State I would also like to mention tribute recently paid to one of our Michigan citizens who has devoted a half century of his life to the bean industry and 44 years of that time with one company. I refer to Mr. A. L. Riedel, divisional president and general manager of the Michigan Bean Co., division of the Wickes Corp. At appropriate ceremonies Mr. Riedel was recently presented with a gold watch engraved with the Jack Rabbit emblem which he has made famous the world around in the promotion of Michigan beans moving into channels of trade under that name.

A Tax That Should End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's recommendation that the telephone tax be continued for another year is the subject of an excellent editorial in the January 26 issue of the Bridgeport Post, a newspaper of wide readership in Connecticut.

The editorial follows:

A TAX THAT SHOULD END

In wartime, or at a time of immediate preparation for war, the public expects to pay additional taxes. It does so willingly and will do so again if it appears that we are going to be involved in military conflict.

A wartime tax was imposed on railway fares to keep people off the trains that were so urgently needed to transport servicemen. A tax was imposed on telephone calls to limit the use of the telephone. But both taxes were levied in order to produce greater revenues to pay for military needs.

In the years since the war ended these levies have been extended by each Congress beyond the date of expiration despite public protest. The Government collects 10 percent on phone calls and the tax, once again, is due to expire next June 30. President Eisenhower has asked Congress to keep it on the books another year.

There has been some, but not enough, indication that Congress will allow the tax to vanish on its due date. To drop it would not only help the public, weary of high taxes, but it would be a good political move in the big election year.

Governor Rockefeller, of New York, wants the tax turned over to the States, his particularly, as he hopes to raise from $70 to $80 million by a levy on phone calls. He needs the money, he says, for education. If he can do it, every Governor in the Nation will undoubtedly follow suit.

When the tax expires, it should be allowed to pass away peacefully, not to be revived again. The telephone is a necessity, not in any way a luxury, even for those inconsiderate people who hog the wires on party lines.

Congress must know that the American people want this tax to go. Elimination will set a precedent, and once Congress gets the feel of removing an unfair charge on a business and household necessity, the lawmakers may continue the practice. The tax should be killed so dead that no State can take it over, for any purpose whatsoever.

The Pellets of Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the January 1960 issue of the Michigan Audubon Newsletter telling of the disasterous effect of spraying parts of Detroit, Dearborn, and the city of Monroe with aldrin, a powerful pesticide.

The spraying, according to the newsletter, decimated wildlife in the area and was extremely destructive even to domestic pets.

The article follows:

THE PELLETS OF DEATH

During the second week in November 1959, parts of Detroit, Dearborn, and the city of Monroe were subjected to a blitz by 2 planes flying at about 300 feet. The enemy, allegedly, was the Japanese beetle, but it is highly questionable that any considerable portion of the area poisoned was actually infested. Invoking a State statute which permits the Department of Agriculture to invade private property despite the objections of the owners, "if the public good is at stake," a spray program was inaugurated to cover about 26,000 acres with pellets containing 2 pounds of aldrin per acre.

At the invitation of the Detroit Audubon Society, the biologist from National Audubon, Harold Peters, came to Detroit, and upon investigation revealed that the Detroit City Council was persuaded to allocate $12,500 for a Japanese beetle control program. Bids were obtained from private pest-control firms, and the one proposing aldrin was chosen, presumably because aldrin was the cheapest. Unfortunately, aldrin is rated about 100 times more toxic to wildlife than DDT, and is is also higher in dermal and oral toxicity of any warmblooded animals. According to Mr. Peters, Detroit's health officer, who might have done a little investigating for himself beforehand, was erroneously persuaded that this program would not harm humans or other warmblooded creatures. And so the rain of death began.

In the spaces between shingles on roofs, in eaves troughs, in the cracks in bark and twigs, the little white pellets of aldrin and clay, no bigger than a pinhead, were lodged by the millions. Children on the way to and from school were peppered with the pellets, too, although aldrin is toxic to the skin. When the snow and rain came, every puddle became a possible death potion. The Detroit Audubon Society, by week's end, began to get many phone calls about dead and dying birds, in northwest Detroit and Dearborn. The birds were mostly English sparrows and starlings, it is true, for they are the most common city birds, but there were also bluejays, cardinals, and at least one nuthatch turned in to your editor, personally. It is worthy of note that starlings are especially fond of Japanese beetle grubs.

Several individuals called to report personal symptoms, similar to a severe cold, including chest pains, nasal discharge, and a feeling of lassitude. In one case there was even blood in the sputum. These unpleasant symptoms continued for a day or so; one woman, affected on Saturday but better by evening, had a violent recurrence of the illness when she and her husband

raked up leaves in their yard on Sunday, and both had to give the job up. A man on the border of Detroit and Dearborn called to say that his whole neighborhood was stirred up by the number of dead birds found, and that there was what he called a smell of carrion in the air itself.

Dead squirrels were reported. Local veterinarians noticed a sudden increase in ailments among pets * * * especially cats, which groom their fur and paws with their tongues so often, and also eat birds. In these animals the symptoms were diarrhea, vomiting, even convulsions. There was "standing room only" at her veterinarian's, according to one phone caller. The symptoms eventually abated, it is true, but the poison is still in the ground, still in the puddles, will still stick to the animals' feet, and is cumulative in the system.

During the fire ant eradication program in the South, the inhabitants of areas about to be treated were warned in advance to lock up livestock and poultry; not to hang out the wash; to cover all water supplies; not to eat anything touched by the chemicals; to keep pets and children indoors and to prohibit their playing in puddles of water. No such warnings were issued here; alarmed residents were assured that the spray was harmful only to beetles.

So the death toll continues. There is no way to prove that the vanished flocks of English sparrows and starlings are all dead, nor that the pellets of death have made many feeding stations completely tenantless. In the thick windrows of November's fallen leaves many small, feathered bodies could fall, unnoticed, and be burned in the autumn bonfires. Many people did find dead birds, it now develops, but merely threw them in the trash. Birds that were picked up in a dying condition all showed similar symptoms: fluttering, loss of flight, paralysis of the feet, convulsions, protesting cries, and finally death.

Ironically, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its own yearbook entitled "Insects" (1952, No. 413), has this to say:

"Lawns can be protected from injury by the (Japanese beetle) grubs for at least 6 years with one application of DDT, for at least 3 years with one application of chlordane, and indefinitely with one application of milky disease spore dust."

"About 25 different soil micro-organisms can cause some stage of Japanese beetles to become diseased. Among these are bacteria, fungi, protozoa, nematodes and viruses. The bacteria causing the milky disease of the Japanese beetle grubs were found to be the most important of the organisms. These are sporeforming bacteria.

"The milky disease of grubs of the Japanese beetle has caused a marked reduction in the abundance of the pest in the older infested areas. The disease is caused by germs which the grubs take in as they work their way through the soil and feed on plant roots. * * * Under favorable conditions the disease kills a high percentage of the grubs of Japanese beetles and some of the grubs of closely related insects. It has no effect on other insects, warm-blooded animals, earthworms, plants or human beings."

The catch is twofold: Spore dust made commercially is expensive, though the overall cost might be comparable if only infested areas were treated. Japanese beetle grubs are practically never found on roofs, under parking lots, or in paved roads. But the pellets of death fell everywhere, on parking lots and pavements, on children's sand boxes, on lawns and vegetable gardens. The poison-out pellets were slow to dissolve and remained visible for many days. The poison lasts several years in the ground. Who cares to prophesy what next spring's warm, wet days may offer to the returning migrants, and the preschool youngsters, turned loose in their own yards to nibble and taste as little children will?

The other reason is that it is quicker to use poisons which are potentially deadly to all living things as well as the grubs of Japanese beetles. And yet, although Japanese beetles have been recorded on about 275 different plants, they seem rarely to feed upon ornamental trees and shrubs, vegetables and grains, and the common trees such as ash, catalpa, dogwood, evergreens, locust, maple, oaks, redbud, sweetgum, and poplar.

It is too late to undo the damage in northwest Detroit, Dearborn, and Monroe. But each of you may be a committee of one to see that your local health officer and city council make no such blunders, and are given the accumulating evidence of what devastating effects pesticides may have when irresponsibly used. Irresponsibility is the cardinal crime in using these poisons on a widespread basis. No one wants to go back to the era when he found half a worm in the apple he was eating. The pesticide manufacturers cannot be blamed if their products are misused. But there has been far too little research on the effects of these deadly substances on the human population which inescapably ingests DDT and others of the chlorinated hydrocarbons and distillates known to be poisonous, from other things besides cranberries and lipsticks. Research has shown that the poisons are cumulative in human tissues, and all of us are taking in much more of them than we realize. A series of restraurant meals in a southern city, analyzed in a laboratory, re-revealed traces of DDT in every one of them.

Ironically, too, the Government to which we look for protection can condone and even assist in our undoing. The Outdoor News Bulletin of the Wildlife Management Institute, in its current issue November 20, 1959, paragraphs "Cranberry Clash Underscores Poisons Problem," and says, among other things:

"News media reveal that the USDA is siding with the cranberry growers, a position that seemingly stems from financial, not health, considerations. If that is true, then the public should be thankful that there is another agency to protect its health."

That agency is the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, which is cracking down at last on the use of poisons on plants grown for food and on cattle fodder that may affect milk and beef. That very agency, the Food and Drug Administration, was in part the outgrowth of a public demand for protection. Public opinion, spearheaded by the National Audubon Society, restored the egrets to their marshlands. Nationwide public opinion helped to save our own Porcupine Mountains from the despoilers. An aroused public opinion is an almost irresistible force—and that means you and you and you.

Too Much, but Never Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the very interesting article from the January 10, 1960, American Weekly on fundamental honesty and Americanism. This is what made America great. Let us all work to keep America strong morally, spiritually, and economically.

The article is as follows:

TOO MUCH, BUT NEVER ENOUGH

(By Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Second Congressional District, New York)

During school vacations I always worked for my father, who was an importer and distributor of food specialties. Once I overweighed a cheese shipment by 10 pounds and the customer naturally sent in a complaint. The vehemence of my father's reproof astonished me.

"But, Pop," I protested, "it was just a mistake. I'm sorry."

"You made a mistake and you're sorry," my father stormed. "That's what every dishonesty person says when he's caught. Sure, I know you didn't mean to do the wrong thing, but who else knows it? A reputation for honesty is one thing money can't buy. It can be preserved only by not making mistakes, not by making apologies. You remember that, boy, as long as you live."

I remembered. I guess I was still remembering when I sat with the eight other members of the legislative committee investigating TV quizzes and listened to Charles Van Doren. He had made a mistake. He was sorry. He measured the gravity of his error with such candor and he expressed his contrition in such an agony of self-abasement that some of the committee members were understandably moved. I wasn't.

When it came my turn to express my sentiments, I said: "I am glad to have heard your story today but I disagree with my colleagues because I don't think that an adult of your intelligence should be commended for telling the truth."

This wasn't a courtroom hearing we were conducting. There were no charges against Van Doren, who permitted himself to be seduced by cajolery and greed, nor against the fixers who rigged the quiz shows nor against the television industry which blithely allowed it all to happen. But as the shocking stories poured out day after day and were accepted with such complacency by the public, it seemed to me that a trial actually was being held and in the docket stood the American people.

The judge and jury, in this fantasy of mine, was my father, Boghos Derounian. Although he was the most honest man I ever knew, he might have been a little prejudiced toward the defendant public because he was so completely sold on the mass conscience of Americans. The whole get-rich-quick hoopla of the quiz shows, the payola and the rest of it, the ease with which a man could pick up $129,000 and a $50,000-a-year job would have worried my father. He didn't think it was good for anyone to acquire things too easily.

We lived in Mineola, Long Island, and my father's business was in New York City. For years he brought home almost all our food because he felt he could get better quality at a lower price. But no solicitor for church, charity or civic improvement ever left our house without a substantial donation.

"I've learned a lot about good and evil. They are not always what they appear to be," was the way Van Doren began his confession. My father never had any difficulty in distinguishing good and evil, and he saw plenty of both. He and mother were Armenians driven from one country to another by the Balkan wars and religious persecution as Christians. Each time they moved they could take only what they could carry with them. Father would convert his holdings into gold, which mother always put into a

cloth bag fastened with 10 safety pins inside the bodice of her dress.

By the time I was born in 1918 the family had settled in Sofia, Bulgaria, where father had become a wholesale candy merchant thinking only of one day living in America. Mother's brother was already there. Uncle Antranig found a house for us in Mineola and we came over and moved into it on April 2, 1921, my parents, my oldest brother, Avedis, 9, Hagop (whom we later called John) and I.

Mother could speak a little English but father spoke none, although he was fluent in Armenian, Greek, French, Turkish and Bulgarian. He had brought along some oriental rugs as currency and he sold them off one by one the first 2 years to pay our expenses. Then, having learned English by reading the newspapers, he founded his food importing business.

It didn't take father long to learn that there were plenty of chiselers around, but most of them, he felt, didn't represent America. He became a citizen as soon as it was legally possible and celebrated the occasion by inviting 50 guests to a dinner that took a week to prepare and 4 hours to eat. Afterward he made a little speech. "I am proud to be an American," he said, "and happy that my sons will be brought up far away from hate and prejudice, in a land where honesty and decency rank over distrust and greed."

He sent us boys through New York University and was delighted when I went on to get a law degree and, after the war, set up a law practice in Mineola. He became a Hoover Republican, followed politics carefully through the papers, was usually the first to vote in his precinct and was certainly one of my stanchest supporters when I was elected to Congress in 1953.

On one occasion he borrowed $10,000 for 60 days. When the period was up he paid the bank half the principal and was given a 60-day renewal on the balance. He paid that off in 30 days and then the bank started to look for his note to cancel it. The officers discovered to their horror that no one had asked him to sign a note. It hadn't made the slightest difference to father.

Father loved to entertain. He was happiest when the house was filled with guests and food was being served. "Ger dzo. Ger" (Eat more—eat) he would insist, helping himself at the same time. He did not, however, enjoy being entertained elsewhere. The Johnsons were close neighbors during the 34 years that father lived in the Mineola house. They were most hospitable and he was on excellent terms with them, but the only time he went to their home was to listen to Herbert Hoover's acceptance speech on the radio in 1928.

Until he was past 83, he continued to commute 2 hours a day, by bus and subway, to and from his business. One spring afternoon in 1955, after a game of solitaire in which he had turned up the ace of spades—the "death card"—he took off his marriage ring, took out his wallet and his gold watch, and placed them on the table. He cautioned mother to pay the tax bill and the telephone bill, which had just arrived, and then lay down for a nap from which he didn't awaken.

Television meant nothing to father but the TV scandals would have shocked him, perhaps as much as some of the rest of us would be shocked if we learned that the Rose Bowl game was fixed—although that is only entertainment, too.

He never saw a quiz show, but if the duplicity of Van Doren and the others could have been explained to him, his unwavering faith in the moral integrity of America would have been rudely shaken when he was told that an amazing number of people refused to condemn them.

He might even have begun to lump a lot of Americans into that group about whom he used to say, when they were willing to go to any lengths for a fast buck: "They have too much, but never enough."

Amendment to the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Social Security Act to provide that a child entitled to child's insurance benefits shall not lose the right to such benefits by reason of adoption should the adoptive parent be the child's brother or sister.

As the law reads now, Mr. Speaker, only in cases where the adoptive parents are stepparents, grandparents, aunt or uncle can a child continue to be eligible for the benefits due her as the survivor of a deceased insured individual.

Practically speaking, I doubt that this is a situation which would arise very frequently. But during the recent adjournment when I was in my district this exact situation was brought to my attention and to show just how the law presently operates to deprive a child of his or her entitlement to survivor's insurance benefits, I should like to quote from a letter which I received recently from a constituent:

My father died May 18, 1952 and my mother passed away on August 20 of this year (1959) as a result of lung cancer. I have an 11-year-old sister who since my mother's death has been making her home with my husband and me. We have no children of our own and since my sister has requested our last name, we of course immediately started adoption proceedings.

Since I paid my mother's burial expenses, I am, as you know, entitled to the social security death benefit. At the time application was made for this benefit, the claims examiner of the social security district office informed me that my sister would be entitled to monthly benefits as a survivor of my mother. My mother paid into social security from the time of its inception in 1935 to December 1948.

Upon investigation, it was found that if my husband and I adopt my young sister she will not be eligible for monthly benefits because the law as it stands now provides that when the child of a deceased insured person is adopted, his payments end unless the adopting person is the child's stepparent, grandparent, aunt or uncle. Since I am a sister, she is not entitled to our mother's benefits. Incidentally, her aunts and uncles are in their late fifties, her grandfathers are deceased, her paternal grandmother is 76 and bedridden.

The writer of this letter goes on to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular case circumstances are such that the prospective adoptive parents—sister and brother-in-law—are in a position to go ahead with the adoption of their younger sister despite the automatic cutoff in benefits to which she would otherwise be entitled until she became 18.

However, it is easily conceivable that there might be some cases where, because of sickness, death, or other hardship, money would be an important—or even the determining—factor in caring for a child whose parents are deceased and who wishes to be adopted by her closest living relative.

If this minor revision of the social security laws could serve to enable an orphan the happiness, comfort, and, more importantly, the security which comes with having one's own family, then, this in itself, Mr. Speaker, is sufficient argument to merit favorable consideration of my proposed amendment.

NBC–TV Program "Today" Offers Half-hour Weekly for Science Course Conducted by Dr. Edward Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, enthusiastic congratulations are in order for Dave Garroway, nationally known television star, because of his firm offer to Dr. Edward Teller to conduct a physics-appreciation course on a weekly basis on the NBC–TV program "Today."

I have been deeply concerned with the necessity to better inform the American people through the media of television, and so I found Dave Garroway's offer particularly encouraging.

Such an educational program conducted by Dr. Teller, a recognized authority in the field of nuclear physics, could and would awaken millions of American citizens from the present state of disastrous apathy in this nuclear age.

An awakened populace would, of course, demand an end to the present Pollyannish, soothing-sirup attitude which was greatly encouraged by the 80 simultaneous dinners in 43 States and the District of Columbia which launched the 1960 GOP campaign with a partisan roar. An aroused citizenry, deeply aware of the issues, is a prime requisite if the missile gap is to be closed, and if the United States is to be enabled to overtake the Soviet Union.

I include the text of a telegram I sent to Dave Garroway, and I invite my colleagues to join with me in urging Mr. Garroway and the National Broadcasting Co. to arrange this significant program.

JANUARY 28, 1960.

Mr. DAVE GARROWAY,
Today Program,
National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N.Y.:

My enthusiastic congratulations in support of your firm offer to make available one-half hour of your program "Today" to enable Dr. Edward Teller to conduct a physics-appreciation course. As a Member of Congress who is deeply concerned with the necessity to better inform the American people through the media of television, I find

your leadership most heartening. Such an educational program conducted by Dr. Teller, a recognized authority in the field of nuclear physics, could awaken millions of American citizens from the present state of disastrous apathy in this nuclear age. I am suggesting that my colleagues in the Congress join me in expressions of support for this dynamic display of leadership on your part.

HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr.,
Congressman at Large, Delaware.

Retirement of a Fine Army Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter of commendation to Col. Clifford A. Poutre, who recently retired as commanding officer of the Tobyhanna (Pa.) Signal Depot, from Maj. Gen. Earle F. Cook, Acting Chief Signal Officer, Headquarters, Department of the Army. This impressive commendation was occasioned by the retirement of Colonel Poutre after 30 years of distinguished service in many responsible positions in the U.S. Army. As a member of Congress, I had occasion in many instances to work closely with Colonel Poutre on matters concerning my constituency and I, without exception, received the finest cooperation from him in resolving these problems. I would like to take this means and opportunity to wish Colonel Poutre a happy and well earned retirement.

The letter follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER,
Washington, D.C., December 23, 1959.

Col. CLIFFORD A. POUTRE,
Tobyhanna Signal Depot,
Tobyhanna, Pa.

DEAR COLONEL POUTRE: The occasion of your retirement brings with it an opportunity for me to express my deep appreciation for the outstanding contributions you have made to the Army Signal Corps during your more than 30 years of active service.

You enlisted in the Regular Army in 1929 and served for more than 12 years as a noncommissioned officer. During those years you became an expert in developing and perfecting scientific methods of breeding and training homing pigeons. In 1941 you were commissioned in the Officers Reserve Corps; and your specialty was fully utilized in your initial assignment as Pigeon Breeding and Training Officer at Fort Monmouth. As a result of your competence in this specialized field, you were selected to establish and command the Pigeon Breeding and Training Center at Camp Crowder. After graduating from the Command and General Staff School you returned to Camp Crowder and served in various capacities in the Training Division of the Army Service Forces Training Center. In May 1945 you began the Advanced Officers Course at the Eastern Signal Corps Schools, Fort Monmouth, but were ordered to an overseas assignment before you could complete the course. You served with Headquarters, U.S. Army Service Command C; the Signal Section of the Eighth Army; the 504th Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, Signal Service Battalion, Eighth Army; and the Yokohama Signal Depot. You had amply demonstrated your proficiency in the training of troops, your ability to handle subordinates; and your capability of succeeding in any position, regardless of obstacles or pressures. All these commendable attributes led to your selection for appointment in the Regular Army.

On your return to the United States, you were assigned as an Instructor at the Signal School, and during your tour there, you served as the Fort Monmouth representative at LOGEX-50. The excellent showing of the Signal Corps during that exercise was largely due to your efforts. In August 1950 you reported to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to pursue the Economic Mobilization Course, and when you had successfully completed the course, you were assigned as Chief, Office of Electronic Programs, Munitions Board, Office of the Secretary of Defense. It was as if you were beginning an entirely new career. Having proved your capabilities as a leader, an instructor of men, you now began to establish your reputation as an expert in the field of electronics industrial mobilization planning. The outstanding manner in which you met the challenge of this key position led to your subsequent assignments as Deputy for Industrial Mobilization and Deputy Commanding Officer, U.S. Army Signal Supply Agency. You coped successfully with the problems of providing industrial ability to meet emergency procurement programs and integrating current procurement with industrial mobilization planning. You were one of the first to realize the tremendous impact that Electronic Data Processing could have on the Army's procurement, storage, and supply operations; and accepted responsibility for guiding installation of the necessary equipment and programing the system. As a result of your efforts, our supply agency now has one of the most comprehensive and effective systems in operation anywhere within the United States. Your terminal assignment was as commanding officer of the Tobyhanna Signal Depot, and there you guided the operations of the depot to a peak of efficiency never before experienced.

Your many achievements have added in no small measure to the splendid reputation enjoyed by the Army Signal Corps, and I am pleased to have had you as a member of my senior staff. You take with you my best wishes as well as those of the entire Corps. May you find in your retirement the many years of health, happiness, and continuing success you so richly deserve.

Sincerely,

EARLE F. COOK,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Acting Chief Signal Officer.

Hon. Richard M. Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we in America have lost a real champion in the passing of Dick Simpson, our illustrious colleague from Pennsylvania. Dick Simpson epitomized integrity, forthrightness, and responsibility in Government by his every action. His sincerity has always been an inspiration to me.

Through the years that I have known Dick Simpson, he always had a moment in his busy schedule to counsel and assist each one of us so that we could better perform our responsibilities as representatives of the people. It is rare to find a man of his character and understanding.

I join with all my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and his family.

Forgotten Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter about the veterans of World War I sent to me by Frank J. Shurtz, past commander, Muskingum County Barracks No. 454 of Zanesville, Ohio.

The letter follows:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I,
OF THE U.S.A., INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio, January 27, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I remember—yes, I remember well—42 years ago in 1917 when President Wilson declared war on Germany; the call to arms when so many enlisted; the selling of war bonds; the speeches; the songs—"Over There, and we won't come back till it's over, over there."

The camps; the ships that carried us over there; the sleeping quarters where baggage was formerly carried; the subs that sank many ships; and the landing on French soil. Yes, we had come for a purpose—a just cause—so that freedom would not perish from this earth.

Yes, I remember the battles in the early part—Belleau Woods, Chateau Thierre, Meuse-Argonne, and many others; how we fought with airplanes (called crates) and the French 75 guns; how we lived and slept in the trenches for $30 a month (many never returned but sleep eternally in Flanders Field); the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, in a railroad car in France, so that this war would end all wars; also Armistice Day, 1918, and the singing and rejoicing that the war had ended in victory and glory for us and our allies.

So now all we ask is that the remaining forgotten soldiers be given an adequate pension, with no penalties attached because of a little savings or income which he or his wife may have.

Pensions given to all ex-Presidents and ex-President's wives (also Congressmen and generals) have no penalties attached because of their earnings or their wife's earnings or because of their incomes. We ask only for the same consideration for the soldiers of 1917 which is now given to the Spanish War veterans.

Yes, all of us remember last Armistice Day, November 11, 1959, when taps were blown and the guns facing the east were fired in memory of those who have answered their last roll call. As one speaker said, "They should be remembered this day and every day for the sacrifices they made so that we might have peace and liberty once more." Permit us to remind you of the World War I

veterans who rememebred to join the U.S. forces in 1917 and who did not forget to salute our flag in 1959. We now ask that you not forget the veterans of 1917.

We now respectfully ask that you, as a member of this Congress of the United States, amend pension bill No. 7650 of 1959, or pass bill H.R. 9336 without income penalties attached and that this be done this year.

An early reply to this letter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MUSKINGUM COUNTY BARRACKS No. 454,
FRANK J. SHURTZ,
Past Commander, Zanesville, Ohio.

Mark Clark States Citadel's Code of Ethics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a statement by Gen. Mark Clark made in response to a request from This Week magazine of January 31, 1960. Gen. Mark Clark, the distinguished president of America's most distinguished military college, gave the code by which his cadets live. General Clark is a classic example of this peerless and priceless rule by which the young men under his supervision spend their time at the military college of South Carolina.

I wish every American could see this magnificent institution, could witness its morale, could see the happiness in the young men who attend this fine military college, and could see the products who leave The Citadel at the end of their college careers. The Citadel excels in military, it excels in athletics, it excels in education, and best of all it excels in making young men—from every part of America—better Americans.

The statement by General Clark follows:

[From This Week magazine, Jan. 31, 1960]

HONOR

(By Gen. Mark W. Clark)

I have always believed that everyone needs to impose upon himself some rigid code of personal ethics. The Ten Commandments are probably the most perfect example of such a code.

But it seems to me that young people, who perhaps need rules of conduct the most, tend to shy away from long or complex lists of "do's" and "don'ts." That is why we at The Citadel have established our Honor Code which consists of just one rule expressed in nine words: "A Cadet does not lie, or cheat, or steal."

Just nine words. But what important words they are, for without them none can hope to build a decent or a happy life.

Of course, The Citadel's Honor Code is only a beginning. Of course, our 2,000 cadets know that there is more to character than merely not lying, cheating, or stealing. But these negatives are important as a starting point. A man can then go on from these "don'ts" to more positive rules of life. If, as a boy, he learns what not to do, then as he matures the positive values will slowly move into place. "Do unto others * * *," "Love thy neighbor"—these "do's" are the true capstones of a moral code. But the "don'ts," learned in childhood, are its foundation.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President, Board of Education of New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, undear leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert an address made by the Honorable Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education of the city of New York, at the ceremonies held in connection with the setting of the cornerstone of Public School No. 134, Manhattan:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT THE SETTING OF THE CORNERSTONE AT THE NEW PUBLIC SCHOOL 134, MANHATTAN

As we gather here today, we can take pride that, on this ground, will rise a structure to honor a great lady whose life and deeds have ennobled the name of all womanhood.

It is quite appropriate that we pay tribute to the memory of Henrietta Szold and that our tribute take the form of a magnificent new school.

I am filled with a warm sense of "belonging" whenever my duties take me to this exciting and colorful section of our city. I remember the cramped and ill kept classrooms where boys and girls who had come here from every corner of the world sat and listened wide eyed to the wonderful story of America. I still can hear a chorus of voices in assembly singing "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty * * *"—and the teacher telling us the meaning of that magic word, "liberty." I learned, then, how rich a gift was becoming mine just by being an American.

What a little boy learns he never forgets. And I have never forgotten the East Side where I learned the precious fact that there is no more important title in the world than that of "American citizen." Thousands of boys and girls who study within the walls that will form around this cornerstone will learn how true that is.

Henrietta Szold was a great American. She was born in Baltimore in 1860 and in founding the world's largest Zionist group, Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, she became in herself a living bridge between this citadel of democracy and the ancient homeland of her people.

How can I picture to you what she was and what this school is destined to become because it bears her name. As a child she studied German, Hebrew and French with her father, Rabbi Benjamin Szold, learning from him not only a wisdom and culture born of the ages but a humane attitude toward life, an abiding love of people and a burning desire to serve youth.

One of her earliest memories was that of being held up high above his shoulders by father to look at a procession of people walking in the street behind a casket. "That, my child," he told her, "is the coffin of Abraham Lincoln who hated slavery and loved freedom." She, too, hated the yoke that man imposes on his fellows. For her, freedom was the birthright of mankind and she fought for it throughout her days.

To her, the prophet's query was very real and intensely personal: "And what does the Lord require of thee?" The answer to that question seemed to lay upon her life a constant command which she never failed to obey: "To do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." For her the Commandmants became the only way of life and the Torah was a light to those who walk the roads of the world in darkness.

She reached out along those roads and into that darkness and under the comforting mantle of Hadassah she brought thousands to shelter, to safety, to renewed hope and to health. In her name and by her example, Hadassah over the years has spread a network of health institutions throughout the Holy Land serving Christian, Moslem and Jew, alike. Hadassah has waged successful war against man's oldest enemies—ignorance, poverty and diease. It has raised the standards of medicine, introduced modern methods of treatment, advanced health education among the neglected masses of the Middle East, it has trained graduate doctors and nurses, improving the living conditions and extending the lives of the people to such an extent that Israel today, thanks mainly to Hadassah, is not only a leader in the field of public health, but has set high standards in this area.

Toward the end of a life of unfaltering service and self-sacrifice, in 1934 at the age of 75, Henrietta Szold became the director of the movement which sought to rescue thousands upon thousands of children from a life of hopeless persecution decreed for them by the Nazi regime. She consecrated herself to the project of bringing these children out of Germany to Palestine. In her woman's heart, she saw these small anxious faces, pathetic creatures, practicing the refugees' age-old ritual of patience—of waiting—of endless waiting. And she could not sleep because of the constant question that echoed in her brain—for what are they waiting? There on the clogged roads, huddled, hungry in the damp and filthy camps: For whom are they waiting, those sad, silent masses of wandering humanity? And she knew that they were waiting for her, for a woman who had lived and worked for children during more than a quarter of a century of dedication to humanity.

She spoke in the voice of warmth and friendship, of love and faith and goodness in the midst of a world gone mad. She spoke in the voice of "Hadassah, caring for her people." She spoke in the still, small voice of a single woman, a voice that is echoed today by the more than 300,000 women who are members of Hadassah. She said, of the haunted and tormented, of the wanderer, the oppressed, the homeless, frightened child—"They need not die. They need not fear. They shall find a home."

Today, the voice of Henrietta Szold, like her eternal torch of faith, is carried forward in the devotion of such women of Hadassah as: Dr. Miriam Freund, tireless president of this inspired organization, and Mrs. Nathan D. Perlman, national chairman of the Hadassah Medical Organization.

You know, it was Mrs. Perlman who originally suggested that we name this school for the founder of Hadassah—and those of you who are acquainted with Mrs. Perlman will realize that she suggested it, not once, but many times, for she is a woman of determination—for which we can indeed be thankful.

In setting this cornerstone we offer dramatic proof of the progress we are making in widening the frontiers of our municipal educational program. Henrietta Szold would have loved this school that is to be constructed here in her name. She would have taken her place beside all present-day champions of education to emphasize our aim in building bigger and better schools

so that no child in any area of our city may be deprived of the fullest possible educational opportunities.

And the memory of her devotion should inspire us to look to our responsibilities to the children in our city who are still housed in the 190 ancient and obsolete schoolbuildings that are more than 50 years old. And we need to look to those other 170,000 youngsters whose schools are so crowded that their schoolday must be shortened or half-day school sessions run end to end.

We must heed the warnings of our city fathers that the financial picture for the future makes it unlikely that we will be able to give these children their full due measure of educational opportunity. What a grim thought this is in the greatest city in the land of opportunity.

Fortunately, we have been provided with a way of insuring the continuance of our building program—a way to give all our children their proper educational setting.

Two State legislatures and two Governors, Governor Harriman and Governor Rockefeller, have passed and signed a measure to permit New York City to issue a limited amount of additional bonds for school construction only, if it needs to do so.

In November, you the people will have the chance to give our children this insurance for their educational future by voting for amendment No. 4 on the voting machine.

We must not break faith with those like Henrietta Szold who devoted her life to the task of securing such opportunity for America's children.

In closing, I could do no better than to quote these few words which were part of Henrietta Szold's acceptance speech broadcast from her home in Jerusalem in March 1944 when she received a degree of doctor of humanities from Boston University. She said, "I can only indulge the hope that I may have felt the influence of the law of kindness and truth which demands readiness to shoulder responsibility with forgetfulness of self."

In helping to set this cornerstone, I pray that this school may transmit to the young people who study here the law of kindness and truth and that you and I will be ready and worthy to shoulder our responsibilities, serving the God and the purpose and the sacred memory of Henrietta Szold.

Widening Gap?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Waterbury Republican, one of Connecticut's leading newspapers.

The editorial points out that there is reason for serious concern over some of the statements that have been made about the missile lag.

The following is the editorial, from the January 27 issue of the Waterbury Republican:

WIDENING GAP?

We suppose nothing is simple in this space-missile age, least of all such calculations as measure the proficiency of our national defense. But it does seem to us that something more than what we are currently getting from Government leaders with respect to the state of our preparedness is deserved by the American people. Most Washington utterances on the subject sound like double talk.

The latest voice to be held in the Defense Department's defensive chorus is that of Air Force Secretary Dudley C. Sharp. He says that there is no overall deterrent gap.

What he apparently means by that is that while a ceratin gap may exist in the matter of missile development our Strategic Air Command force of long-range bombers would still make the Russkis think several times about pushing the famous button. Delivering atomic destruction personally, via manned airplanes, may have become somewhat horse-and-buggy but we are prepared to do it in a wholesale way to make retaliation really massive.

If there is a wide and maybe widening gap it is in the one particular of missile development though, for what comfort it may be worth, Mr. Sharp doubts that it is of the three-to-one order predicted a year ago by Defense Secretary McElroy.

It could, however, be a lot less than three-to-one and still be deemed a just subject for very deep concern. When is the gap going to narrow? Until it narrows aren't we losing a scientific and technological race which may be vital for our country? And if that is so, then why aren't we making more of an effort to reverse an intolerable trend?

Ignorance a Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the January 21 edition of the Lansing Journal, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought provoking commentary on the subject of the distribution of profits under our vital free enterprise system:

IGNORANCE A WEAPON

Economic ignorance can be about as dangerous a weapon as an atom bomb. It leads to beliefs, attitudes and demands that could ultimately eat away the foundations on which this kind of country and this kind of government rest.

For instance, polls have shown that large numbers of employees have an unbelievably mistaken idea of what happens to the money taken in by corporations. They think that only 25 percent of corporation income goes to employees—and 75 percent to the owners. The truth is that of all the money in a corporation going to employees and owners, the employees get 87 percent and the owners 13 percent.

A breakdown of total national income also produces some significant facts. Two-thirds—66⅔ percent—is received by employees. Professional people, farmers, landlords and others get a share of the remainder. Owner-stockholders are well down the list, with 6 percent. Then, of that 6 percent, about 2½ percent, on the average, is retained in the business for expansion, machinery and similar uses.

The people who use the tools of industry get the big share of industry's earnings. The people whose savings provide the tools get a far, far smaller share. And that is one of the reasons why capitalism has provided the highest mass living standards ever known.

The Portuguese Colony of Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

UNIAO DAS POPULACOES DE ANGOLA

DELEGATION ABROAD

The subjugation of the former sovereign and independent African States has more often than not been the result of fradulent trade transactions, or the assertion of the right to the strongest over the weakest.

One of the most characteristic cases of this colonization of an African people is undoubtedly the Portuguese colony of Angola. Angola is the largest Portuguese African possession with 1,246,700 square kilometers and 4,145,184 inhabitants of whom more than 300,000 are white.

PORTUGUESE COLONIALISM

A prime factor in the evolution of a people, especially a colonized people, derives from the contradiction colonialism entails. That is to say, the economic, political, cultural, religious and social manifestations of Portuguese colonization have greatly influenced the Angola nation in its present form. What are these manifestations?

Economic manifestations

Every colonization is above all an exploitation of the national resources and soil of the colonized country to the advantage of the colonizer. The economic policy practiced by Portugal in Angola is governed by what is now universally called the "Colonial Pact," whatever its outward manifestations.

Produce of the soil and subsoil of Angola feeds the Portuguese consumer market and reciprocally the products of Portugal have priority access to Angola markets. Industries are not nonexistent, they are even encouraged, such as cotton spinning and weaving mills, sugar and cement factories, large plantations of coffee and cocoa, and the massive and abusive exploitation of cooper, diamond, manganese, bauxite and gold.

This is to say, industries are established in Angola only insofar as they do not duplicate Portuguese home industries. It is nothing more than the exclusive colonial system. There exists between Portugal and the Portuguese settlers in the various African territories of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea, and Sao Tome, close solidarity, as evidenced by the preferential customs tariffs. Portugal invites foreign capital for commercial exploitation of Angola's resources but she does not tolerate any foreign initiative which could bring about the development of the colonial territories.

Political manifestations

The consequences of such an economy in the field of politics can be summed up in the following terms: Political unification and departmentalization of Angola. Portugal in effect seems to be a unitary state with one territory. But the population of this so-called unitary state is not homogeneous. It comprises in effect the following five categories:

Portuguese born in Portugal; Portuguese born in Angola or Mozambique who cannot do national military service in Africa. (African-born Portuguese are excluded from national military service in Africa for fear that they might join forces with the African majority, as happened in Brazil).

Mulattoes enjoying the same privileges as the whites born in Africa; Assimilated

Africans (Assimiladoes) whose wives are exempted from forced labor and whose children enjoy the privileges of continuing their education in the all too rare secondary schools. Besides this, Assimiladoes have the privilege of paying taxes like the whites—and quite naturally, there come last the millions of black aborigines of Angola. This last category is separated from all the others by the color barrier, with all it entails of racial emasculation.

Cultural assimilation

In the inevitable interpenetration of Portuguese and Angola cultures, Portugal has always sought to make Portuguese culture predominant, and it would be no exaggeration to assert that Portugal practices spiritual assimilation of the indigenous population. Roman Catholicism remains the state religion and missionary zeal seeks to destroy the traditional culture and to render brutish the colonized with the pretext of making them identical to the colonizers. The religious organizations are themselves distorted and espouse completely the colonial policy of which they have become the veritable and completely devoted auxiliaries.

Interracial education and social life does not exist since racial segregation is rife, and altogether Angola boasts of 68 African pupils in secondary schools, according to the American author John Gunther. It must be mentioned that only 5 percent of the children of school age can attend the rudimentary primary schools which exist. The remainder are marked out as victims of a system of exploitation second to none.

In 1956 there were 245 educational institutions for the entire territory of Angola, including 112 private institutions, attended by 16,114 pupils, broken down as follows:

Government primary schools

Children of white persons born in Europe	2,531
Children of white persons born in Africa	3,382
Children of mulattoes and grandchildren of whites	3,210
Children of Africans	737

Private primary schools

Children of white persons born in Europe	1,290
Children of white persons born in Africa	1,429
Children of mulattoes and grandchildren of whites	1,109
Children of Africans	2,446

It should be noted that the 737 primary school pupils in government schools are all children of indigenous assimilated public officials.

Social consequences

Far too much could be said on this score—the opulence of the colonizers and settlers triumphing beside the latest misery of the colonized, but we content ourselves with recalling briefly that forced labor constitutes the essence of the social policy of the Portuguese in Africa.

In effect, there is applied in the villages the system of forced labor which consists in recruiting men, women, and children, called contratados and the valuntarios. This is done through African supervisors called regedores under the direction of the administrators and chefes dos postos who then supply them to the concessionary settlers who employ their labor to work on coffee and cocoa plantations, mines, and fishery. More often than not, members of the same family toil away in different plantations. Very often at the end of their term of forced labor, which sometimes lasts 24 months, they are not reunited, some of them having died or been killed in the course of their work.

Working hours are from 5 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock in the evening, that is 14 hours a day, Sundays included. Each worker is allotted a fixed task which he is supposed to finish by the end of the working day or else run the risk of persecution.

The stipend allocated is not only ridiculously small, since it scarcely amounts to $40 for 24 months, but an amount fixed by the authority entrusted with payment is deducted for tax. This deduction operates automatically without the worker daring to discuss it, under pain of deportation.

Another category of workers, comprising both men and women, is allotted to building and maintaining roads and bridges, without stipend, and to crown it all, they must use their own tools.

The number of the indigenous workers maintained under forced labor annually in Angola is broken down as follows: From 5 to 14 years old, 100,000 people; from 15 to 50 years old, 500,000; from 50 to 70 years old, 100,000; for a total of 700,000 people.

The Portuguese Government affirms that there exists a labor code as from 1928 which protects the native in Portuguese African territories, while the reality proves abundantly that the contratados and voluntarios toil away in slavery conditions in contravention of the antislavery convention of 1926 ratified by Portugal. There results from this in addition a mortality rate in excess of the birth rate.

Most of the time the villagers take refuge for months in the forests in order to escape conscription. In the villages, people are searched and the natives are compelled to pay extra taxes on their possessions.

What is more, any short of removal from one village to a neighboring one is subject to administrative control and all villagers who do this without the proper formality "Guia de Desembarco" run the risk of being immediately sent to coffee plantations.

This measure is intended to exercise control over the laborers and thereby to prevent desertions among them. Military patrols called "Guarda Fiscal" go about the roads and paths in order to reinforce this measure.

For over 20 years the Colonial Administration of Angola has been depriving the natives of their plantations, forcing them into the arid unproductive areas, and has built up for itself large estates where liberty does not exist, because the administration itself exploits a large portion of them and allows companies and individual colonists to exploit them. Several European colonies have already been created which are entirely closed to the African, particularly at Cela, Matala Libollo and Amboim, Southern Angola.

The first condition of the operation was the occupation of Angolan soil. The theft of lands was thus systematically organized. A decree anticipating the evacuation of all of the villages was created and at the beginning of 1931 the native populations in the villages received the order to leave the regions in which they lived without any indemnity, in order to go to construct other villages in the arid and unproductive regions. These villages are actually all along the highways.

This massive displacement of the populations permitted the colonist to appropriate, in emulation of one another, all the plantations and lands under the pretext of occupation of abandoned properties.

These populations were transformed into an immense subproletariat and were considered foreign on their own soil. This unfortunate and deplorable situation provided the colons with cheap manual labor to the great profit of Portuguese capitalism and its accomplices.

The Portuguese colonial economic system which makes Portugal the sole beneficiary of the products of the surface soil and the subsoil of Angola, with an oppressive internal protectionist policy, is fundamentally opposed to the interests of the indigenous masses.

The concentration of property in the hands of the Portuguese colons under the protection of the Colonial Administration plunged the native populations in the most cruel misery which is without equal in colonial annals. They are truly destitute of all and are subjected to the most satanic forced labor, unqualified pillage, and whiplashes.

Portugal hopes to be able to make of Angola a settlers colony. They want a European population equal or superior to the native population.

It is thus that Mr. de Sa Vianna Rebello, Governor General of Angola, was able to declare in 1958:

"Each family of colons costs the state 1 million for its installation. But one cannot envisage the revenue of the colonist solely on the economic plan. We must consider rather and principally the returns of the colons under the plan of our policy in Africa. These colons will increase so that there will be a greater number of Europeans who will install themselves on the African soil, drawing from it a healthy easy life. The problem is this: to attach the Portuguese to these lands in such a manner that he will love them as much as his village in Portgual. One part of the cost which the state makes for the colons is reimbursed by the latter, the rest constitutes, let us not forget, an amelioration of the national inheritance by the creation of routes of telephone lines, of public services and by an increase in the value of lands which are uncultivated. As soon as the colon settles down, as is the case at present, we always come out the winner. Now that is precisely what matters: to gain the cause with the influx of Europeans, to gain Europeans for Africa. Angola is very large and we are here to remain. We respect what is said and done elsewhere, but as far as we are concerned, questions of autonomy and emancipation do not arise and we are very vigilant to see that they remain so. As soon as the colonist establishes himself, as has so far been the case, we always win through. Now this is precisely what matters, that we should win through by bringing in more Portuguese."

Three months ago, in welcoming Mr. Cornelis, Governor General of the Belgian Congo, on an official visit in Angola, an official of the Portuguese Colonialist Administration announced the approaching arrival of 2,000 Portuguese families coming from Portgual to install themselves in Angola at the expense of the administration. The ever growing misery of the natives already deprived of means of existence worthy of humanity is only amplified and deepened.

This process does not stop there, moreover. It continues in an implacable manner, deceiving international opinion by a false propaganda.

What becomes of these people to whom the colonial system denies even the right to work?

What becomes of these people who, even in their own country and on their own soil have only the right to die of hunger?

Abject poverty encourages emigration in large numbers into the Belgian Congo and French territory where living conditions are better. More than 1,000,000 from Angola are living outside their native land.

An unwarranted harsh form of pressure is exercised in the collection of taxes. There is no age limit, only death releases the taxpayer. The worst of it is that even emigrants have to continue to pay taxes because if they do not their relatives will be persecuted and drafted to the coffee plantations or road works.

Health

The health services are negligible. There are several serious diseases, the worst of

which is sleeping sickness. There is one doctor to 100,000 people. With malnutrition as a contributory factor, tuberculosis takes grievous toll and about 75 percent of the hospital patients suffer from it. In some areas the building of lavatories is subject to a tax, and it follows that few Africans have any. Naturally the bush is used as a place of convenience and the rains wash the deposits toward the streams and the ponds from which the natives drink at the risk of contracting every imaginable type of disease. This is so because there are no village pumps or tanks.

According to the 1950 census, Angola's African population exceeded 4,000,000. These figures were based on native tax receipts. But other official Portuguese sources put the number of African taxpayers in 1954 at 692,376 with another 1, 1,384,752 "Excused" from tax payment as disabled or unemployable—the old, the sick and the infants. Thus the African population of Angola stands at just over two million, having decreased from 2,700,000 since the 1900 census.

While the African population of Angola has been reduced and incapacitated, Portuguese settlers, during the same period from 1900 to 1950, have increased from 9,000 to 300,000.

Portuguese policy which forces large masses into the channels of integration, in utter contempt for their aspirations toward liberty and justice, clearly leads to a political awakening and a craving for independence. The breaking up and destruction of the rich and age-old tradition of Angola in favor of an imported culture leads the masses to claim more urgently every day a reestimate of their national culture.

As colonization expanded and unified Angola, (which in actual fact enjoyed unity before the European conquest); as it developed interchange, and gave rise to the movement of populations within the territory itself, as well as the constant emigration of the working people of Angola, it promoted in spite of itself the development of a national consciousness that transcended the bounds of the original Bantu tribes.

At the same time the most barbarous forms of oppression and the scorched earth policy that Portugal practices in Angola have proved to be additional unifying factors and have automatically made the patriotism of the people of Angola wider and stronger.

The movement of emancipation at first consisted in an attempt to create family and civic ties among the Portuguese settlers who had established themselves in Angola, and who regarded Angola as their native land, while looking upon Portugal as their country of origin.

Later this movement admitted the masses of Angola's African population, and tended to seek the right to develop a separate Angolan entity, but it did not, however, claim an independent Angola. This explains the creation and the evolution of the African National League (Liga Nacional Africana) since 1929. But what exactly is this Liga Nacional Africana which reflects the real anomalies of Portuguese colonization?

This league is a pseudo-cultural association composed of the Angolan Portuguese who, by law, are considered as Africans, mulattoes, and assimilados (African Negroes), yet all of whom bear the name of Africans.

But it is not surprising to note that only whites and mulattoes form the steering committee, the African Negroes being in the position of poor relations who have no choice but to remain where they are.

It is clear that the consciousness of belonging to a nation, the existence of an Angolan national consciousness, could have turned the movement for emancipation into a plea for an independent Angolan State, as happened in South America. But if the history of Angola has strengthened the patriotism of the Bantu people, the Angolan elements of Portuguese origin have, on the other hand, by looking constantly to their ancient native land, postponed the birth of a new feeling of Angolan nationhood.

The historical movement for emancipation which was exemplified in the creation of the Liga Nacional Africana could not lead to independence particularly as the numerical strength of the original Bantu people and the people of European origin played a decisive part. In this country, as in Algeria, the European section of the population is slow to appreciate the national consciousness because they are faced with an indigenous people who have some knowledge of a higher social standard, and because the harsh repression has not succeeded in whittling them down to a minority as was the case with the Red Indians in America.

In 1928, the High Commissioner, Norton de Matos, in agreement with a certain section of colonial middle-class opinion in Angola, asked Portugal to grant independence to Angola. But his dismissal, coupled with the harsh reaction of Portugal, have proved that these events are, in fact, the real cause of the extreme indifference of those settlers who might have attained the true level of national consciousness that the historical movement requires.

It is a fact that the vast majority of the native Angolans of Bantu origin have realized the existence of the national consciousness, but could only sketch a program for the Angolan national liberation movement. Thus arose the Union of the Peoples of Northern Angola in 1954.

Taking into consideration Angola's history, it was inevitable that the Union of Northern Angola should very quickly exceed the limits of its constitution.

Indeed by forcing its way north, south, east, and west, into every stratum of the Bantu section of the population, even the mulattoes, and the national liberation movement, through secret organization, converted itself into Angola Peoples Union in 1958 and its objective is unequivocal. The Angola Peoples Union makes a strong plea for: Complete and immediate independence for Angola; dignity as opposed to alienation; strengthening of Afro-Asian solidarity; honor as opposed to racial segregation and inhuman treatment.

INTERNATIONAL OPINION

Any African Negro who attempts to raise his voice to put forward any claim whatever is imprisoned, beaten to death, or sent into one of the concentration camps that Portugal has set up in the island of Sao Tome and in Angola (Foz de Cunene, Forte Rossada, Baia does Tigres, Silva Porto, and Porto Alexandre).

A day does not pass without the occurrence of provocations, arbitrary arrests, attacks on individual and collective liberty and massive deportations. A day does not pass that unyielding nationalitists in Angola are not illegally incarcerated and kept in secret, awaiting their disappearance forever.

The institutions only serve to perfect the heavy repressive apparatus in order to drown the legitimate demands of the blacks. No institution capable of defending these human beings exists. A work of sabotage on a national scale is undertaken with the forecast of eternal Portuguese domination. A quick glance at the number of revolts that have been stifled is enough to convince those who in their "Naivete" still imagine that the Portuguese colonists are choir boys. Angola today is one of the worst advertisements for the West that exists throughout the length and breadth of the free world. It would be paradoxical if the preservation of solidarity and amiability amongst the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be placed above the interests of those defenseless people that NATO exists to protect from alien tyrannies.

The 1914 revolt that occurred in the North of Angola as a result of nationalist activities by Buta and his associates to put the brake on deportations to the islands of Sao Tome and Cape Verde meant a series of punitive expeditions which lasted 2 years and a state of siege which consumed 10 years.

In fact, from 1888 to 1929, the number of workers deported to the island of Sao Tome rose to more than 200,000 men. And when the scandal was uncovered, only 10,000 were liberated and sent back to their villages, leaving many villages in Angola still depopulated. At present the system has changed and the people of Angola are slaves in their own country.

The former Minister of the President, Mr. Marcelo Caetano, said in an official report:

"If it is certain that the Portuguese generally treat the natives in a more paternal and understanding manner than do the English, there are, however, against us two circumstances which bring grave prejudices against the success of our colonial policy and which determine in a large measure the reduction in the populations of the two colonies, Angola and Mozambique: the blind greed of the landlords and the system of forced labor."

Also the former deputy, Henrique Galvao, now in exile in Argentina, wrote:

"That which is done under the pretext of custom or habit, condemned by law, but imposed by means of circulars and official orders of a confidential nature, exceed all the limits of dishonor in administration. From one point of view, the situation is worse than during the period of pure slavery. Then, when a black was bought like an animal, he represented a property which his master was interested in maintaining, much as he was interested in caring for his horses and cattle. Now, the black is not purchased; he is simply borrowed by the state although he is theoretically a freeman. And the landlord is indifferent to the fact that the black falls sick or that he dies; he is interested only in getting the maximum amount of labor while the black lives; if the worker becomes ill or dies, the landlord will demand another. There are landlords who have had 35 percent of the workers die during the period of their contracts. And nothing has been heard of any landlord being deprived of more workers when he has requested them."

In the Congolese weekly Presence Congolaise published at Leopoldville (February 21 issue) Me Joseph Ngalula posed the following questions:

"More than 200 of the repatriate undesirables of Leopoldville which the administration drove back in great numbers toward the bush are, it appears, from Angola. The authorities expell them from the Congo and are going to resettle them across the frontier in the hands of the Portuguese.

"Extraordinary commotions circulate about this subject. They say that scarcely arrived at the frontier, the repatriates are stripped of everything even to their last piece of baggage. Mountains of baggage accumulate alongside the frontier post. The repatriates, far from being taken back to their own villages, have been deported by the Portuguese authorities into concentration camps where they are placed under forced labor. Can the authorities deny these rumors which we hope are false? Have the Belgian authorities no interest in the fate of these men whom they turn over to the Portuguese authorities? It must not be forgotten that even if those expelled are neither Belgian nor Congolese, they are above all human beings. Belgium has signed the Human Rights Charter and thereto has a responsibility. It is not a question, let us not forget, of pillagers or thieves, but of simple people who are unregistered."

In effect in Angola the liberty of the individual, freedom of expression, worship, and association do not exist. Consequently a

national liberation movement like the Union of the Peoples of Angola cannot exist except as an underground movement in the country, whose aim is enlisting international opinion in support of the nationalists of Angola.

In point of fact, since its inception in 1954, the Union of the Peoples of Angola has maintained a constant struggle. In December 1955 the general discontent of the people was shown by the public scenes when the north systematically took a stand against the system of forced labor and constant abuses. In February 1956, Portugal reacted, making a series of arrests and deportations. Ambrosio Luyanzi was among the leaders who were persecuted to death, while patriots such as Figueira Lello and Liborio Nefwane were exiled to the concentration camp of Silva Porto.

On the international plane, the Iron Curtain which separates Angola from the rest of the outside world has hardly encouraged any systematic campaign in connection with the tragedy of Angola. However, the visit to Angola of some West African brothers from Ghana and Liberia during the C.C.T.A. Conference in 1957 warmed the hearts of Angolans who interpreted the gesture as a mark of active solidarity. The masses benefited from this visit, although it was followed by dreadful instances of the arrests of men, women and children. People are still asking for the whereabouts of the patriotic militants, Julio Afonso, Issaias Kamutuke, Cunha, Alfredo Benga, Loureiro Joao Sequeira and their families.

But patriotism will express itself and it is no use failing to recognize as just the stand taken by so many members of the Angolan resistance movement; the people of Angola will not give in. In August 1958, the African Manifesto saw the light of day. This document condemned the horrors of 500 years of Portuguese colonization and exhorted the people of Angola as one man to assert with all dignity their right to self-determination, so that Angola might recover freedom, justice and prosperity.

Since the tragedy of Angola is already well known to those concerned, the people of Angola deplore the attitude of silence adopted by the most competent international bodies. And yet no country that loves justice and freedom can fail to see that this conspiracy of silence is a contributory factor, since it unquestionably creates the impression that the greater part of mankind holds sacred the most retrograde form of colonialism as practiced in Angola.

When in 1956, Iraq tried to condemn Portugal through the United Nations for its colonialist oppression, the Portuguese delegate declared that from the constitutional and legal point of view, there was no difference between the Portuguese provinces and African territories under Portuguese domination.

In 1957, again concerning Angola and Mozambique, Mr. Marcelo Caetano, the former Minister of the Portuguese Presidence du Conseil, declared that the territories in Africa under Portuguese domination were an integral part of the Portuguese provinces.

These purely colonialist arguments seem to have convinced certain countries which have known the bitterness of colonialism. But it remains however, to point out that the representatives of Portugal at the U.N. speak only of the provinces and not of the people. Now it is not a secret to anyone that there is a difference as night from day between the civil rights which benefit the Portuguese people and those of the people of the African colonies.

Between the Portuguese nation and the people of the colonies, there are no fundamental characteristics which permit one to identify the two as a common nation. There is no historic community, no territorial community, no community of economic interests, no spiritual and cultural community and no common language. What do exist are antagonisms aggravated day by day by racial discrimination and inequality of even the most elementary rights. What does exist is a growing revolt of the colonial peoples against the ferocious colonial policy which exploits them, oppresses them and pillages their country, their riches and their natural resources.

It suffices on this subject to pose a question: what importance does the government of Portugal give to the desires of millions of inhabitants of the Portuguese colonies when there is not a single native representative in the national assembly?

In spite of this, in international affairs, Portuguese territories in Africa are considered as an integral part of Portugal without, of course, the Africans having the least means of expressing their wish to be Portuguese or not.

The truth is that Portuguese colonialism in Angola is far from being a civilizing and humanitarian work. One cannot, out of respect for modesty, cite all of the cases committed daily against the native populations, and the methods used in spite of international rights. The administrative authorities have not the right to violate such rights without seeing raised against them all the forces of the entire world concerned with the welfare and love of all humans.

It is certain that there are honest people who will condemn the flagrant violations of liberty which each individual and each people should enjoy.

The collapse of the colonial system which continues in Africa under our eyes with an accelerated rhythm is not an unusual phenomenon. It is not necessary to be a prophet in order to predict that this powerful force will move rapidly to its conclusion. But in spite of this great current, that of the liberation of the peoples, the colonialists and the imperialists still have hope of being able to maintain their positions.

Above all they do not wish to be conscious of this transformation of the times and of the world. They do not wish to understand that this need of liberty, equality and justice is felt by the Africans so much the more since they were subjected to injustice, slavery, and inequality.

If there is any place where the utterance of the word "independence" signifies something else, it is certainly Angola.

There is no doubt that the political policy employed by the Portuguese in their African territories is still a mystery. What is perfectly obvious is that in those territories it is cruelly forbidden to utter the simple word "independence." In this respect it may be recalled that the Governor General of Angola, Sa Vianna Pebello, declared this year in a press conference: "The Portuguese nation is indivisible. We cannot permit any opinion whatever which tends toward secession or independence. It will be a crime of high treason to express such ideas."

Angola is a province of Portugal and as such it should be considered as enjoying the same liberties and considerations as Portugal. Angola is therefore free. But where is the proof that Angola is independent, or rather that it enjoys the same principles as Portugal? From everywhere laments and complaints shoot out from the families of assassinated blacks, from deported blacks, and from blacks who have been tortured for having dared to speak of independence or for having simply tried to ask that they be granted human dignity and liberty.

For 500 years Portuguese colonialists have been masters in Angola. That is a long period to have studied the life of the native people and should have resulted in considerable progress. This has not figured, however, in the plans of the Portuguese colonialists. Hiding themselves behind hypocritical statements according to which there is no racial discrimination and in which they talk about their good acts, the Portuguese slave masters have created the most violent system of colonial exploitation. The All-African People's Conference held in Accra in December 1958 openly stated in its decisions that the native people of the Portuguese colonies live under a Fascist colonial regime and are deprived of the most elementary human and democratic rights. A small group of white colonialists monopolized elementary human and democratic rights. A small group of white colonialists took over the immense wealth of Angola and is ruthlessly exploiting its population.

Even the Governor of Moxico, a district in Angola, Senhor Daniel Rodrigues Bastos, was forced to admit in 1956 that the food situation now is actually worse than it was 100 years ago, that education was on or about the same level as it was during the European invasions, and that 99 percent of the Angolans were illiterate. Nevertheless, according to the 6-year plan for Angola's development, about which there is so much publicity, the Portuguese administration has allocated to education a sum which is exactly five times less than the sum for the enlargement of the country's ports whose main purpose is to export looted wealth.

The Portuguese colonies in Africa, especially Angola and Mozambique, possess immense resources. Oil is found in abundance, as well as coal, iron, manganese, gold, diamonds, copper, and other raw materials necessary for the development of a powerful and modern industry. The lands and the climate favor the development of agriculture and stockraising. The rivers and coastal waters favor flourishing fisheries. However, generation after generation have lived lives of misery and ignorance, subject to unparalleled and inhuman exploitation and persecution. The laborers die premature deaths for lack of medical assistance. African culture is despised, forgotten and destroyed. African languages are discredited and their development is checked. The contribution of the black man to the development of human culture is reduced to nothing.

Let us add to this the degrading traffic with the slavers of South Africa (for the gold mines of the Rand 100,000 Africans from Mozambique are supplied annually which represents for the Portuguese state a revenue of over 50 million escudos) and the agreement with the Rhodesian and Nyasaland Governments according to which the Governor General of Mozambique has authorized the recruitment in the district of Tete of an annual total of 100,000 Africans to work in the mines. This later agreements establishes that the "recruiters" will pay an annual recruiting tariff, the recruits have to pay a passport tax, as well as the renewal of the passport and a native tax. As for the working conditions imposed on the mineworkers of the Rand, and the deadly results that this emigration has upon the health of the population, the Minister Marcelo Caetano notes in the report already quoted "the long stay of the natives of the Portuguese territories in the Transvaal mines provokes the destruction of the race by sickness (pneumonia, silicosis, tuberculosis). He who has once visited the compounds of the Rand mines cannot prevent himself from experiencing a certain emotion in watching the Negroes who are treated as in a system of concentration camps, "in an atmosphere of sheer zootechnical preoccupation."

He who travels over the territory of the southern province of Save is forcibly struck by the desolation; he meets only women and old people, almost everywhere. And the magnificent race which inhabited this region perishes progressively gnawed in its vitality,

corrupted in its morals, undermined by terrible sickness, and by abominable vices.

Portuguese authorities practice a so-called policy of assimilation. But what does that mean? It appears that the native people can become Portuguese citizens but to have the right to do so they have to go through many severe tests which, in actual fact, make it practically impossible for them to do so. Less than 1 percent of the Angolan population was found to be worthy of the doubtful honor of being granted the right of obtaining citizenship in their own country.

The statutes of indigenato created by decree law No. 39,666 of May 20, 1954, and the assimilacao serve only to conceal the Portuguese version of South African apartheid.

The Portuguese colonies are among the oldest on the African Continent. But, Angola with its native population of a little more than 4 million persons includes only about 290,000 persons who are considered to be evolved (and this is according to official statistics) and of these more than 260,000 are of white race. In Mozambique the situation is even more striking, for of a population of 6 million there are only 4,349 Africans who have been declared evolved. Finally, in Guinea of the 510,000 inhabitants, only 1,500 are included among the evolved. The total population of these three African colonies, according to official statistics, is 10,510,000; of this total 10,214,151 are considered unevolved. This figure gives a clear indication of what the so-called civilizing mission of the Portuguese slavemasters has accomplished in five centuries of domination.

Before the Chamber of Mines of Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the vice admiral Vasco Lopes Alves, Portuguese Minister of Colonies, declared:

"We are accomplishing a parallel task in our territories and, given the fact that Western civilization is threatened on this continent, South Africa and Portugal should work together."

These words clearly express the segregationist policy symbolized by apartheid, for South Africa does not emancipate the blacks—it crushes them and prevents their evolution within a multi-national community.

Furthermore, one may wonder if it is the "Civilization of Porto wine" which the Portuguese introduced into Africa to stupefy the African which is threatened, or simply with privileges of Portuguese and other vested interests.

In order to leave the Africans in the most complete ignorance, the Portuguese absolutely limit instruction to some 4 years of rudimentary primary school education where they learn Portuguese, arithmetic and writing, i.e., all that is necessary in order to become a trader, and nothing more. The Portuguese authorities forbid the missionaries to hire qualified teachers so as to raise the level of instruction. The recent letter from the Vatican to the bishop of Portuguese Africa in which the Holy See complains of the slowness in forming local clergy—the Portuguese colonies are the sole African territories where there is still no African bishop—confirms this general neglect of education.

In the course of the debates of the session of the Legislative Council (No. 60) of October 20, 1958, presided over by the Governor General of Angola, Horacio Jose de sa Viana Rebello, one of the members of the Council, Mr. Manuel Bento Ribiero made, among other remarks, the following

"Native education, as it is administered in Angola, does not correspond to the obligations of sovereignty. One may note an ever-growing desire among the natives to learn, our schools are overflowing. During the school year 1958–59 we could have had 50,000 pupils if we had had more means to pay the teachers and to build new classrooms. We must confess however that the situation is less alarming, thanks to the contribution that is made by the foreign Protestant missions to the instruction of the natives without any remuneration from the State. To conclude, I request the President that the conditions of the problems which affect the lives of the natives should be revised, above all in the domain of native education, in order that it should undergo an expansion worthy of the secular presence of Portugal in this country."

In his reply, M. Viana Rebello congratulates M. Ribeiro, who, he says has demonstrated forcibly the lacuna of the social regime of which he is the spokesman within the Council to such a degree that he owes it to himself to make further comments. He continues by saying, the population of Angola being 4 million strong, the percentage of educated natives does not reach even 1 percent. "This argument is often used in international assemblies by our most sworn enemies. In relation to 4 million individuals, this percentage is so infinitesimally small that I could say that nobody has obtained any education whatever during the years preceding 1955."

Frightened by the spread of the national liberation movement in Angola, Portuguese colonialists decided to take steps to intimidate the native population. Weapons have been given to all the Portuguese settlers. The Portuguese Government recently sent to Angola a parachute unit and a large number of fighter-bombers equipped with napalm bombs. Then so-called "manoeuvres" were carried out. Even Agencia Portuguesa was forced to admit that this frightening demonstration of force was made to warn the 4 million Africans in Angola against their nationalist action. Fearing the development of a movement which was echoing the freedom struggles of other colonial peoples at the same time that they were enforcing the repressive measures of the police (PIDE) and the military, the colonialist Portuguese were trying to prevent the people they dominate from contacting the outside world. From their position in the United Nations where they deny that the colonies are colonies, and from their active participation in conferences in coalition with other countries which have African colonies to fortify their colonial positions, they repress movements of liberation and continue to propagate the plans of the Salazarists to rehabilitate colonialism.

For many years a veritable atmosphere from hell reigns in Angola. The people have been victims of an unmerciful foreign domination—a domination without soul and one which scoffs at the very foundation of Christianity and Western civilization.

The international press having pointed out the odious atrocities which the authorities even in Portugal are perpetrating, we may leave to the imagination of world opinion the inhuman and barbarous form that these atrocities take in the colonies towards human beings without defense and for whom no account is rendered.

That leads us to think of the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. When carrying His cross, He marched toward Golgotha, and as women were lamenting behind Him, He said, "If they do these things in the green tree, what will they do in the dry?"

In so doing, they forget altogether that the government in these countries is not an instrument with which to torture or persecute the indigenous people, but a medium that Portugal has placed at their disposal to help them.

On the island of Sao Tome in 1953, Portuguese colonialism revealed its true face. In this year in the month of February, because of a provocation by the Governor, Carlos de Sousa Gorgulho, who increased production by forced labor, the inhabitants of the island arose in protest. The Government then took brutal and bloody repressive measures. Three thousand and eighty persons were killed. Thousands were imprisoned, hundreds tortured and assassinated; entire villages were sacked and burned, and their people massacred or deported. Blood flowed in a flood. The people filled the prisons. Most of the black civil servants were arrested and sent to the brigades of Fernao Dias where they were tied with heavy chains attached to their necks, with bands around their legs. They were then forced to carry large buckets of water on their heads while standing submerged in water up to their necks. Many in prison were tortured to death to make them confess. Many of them were forced to submit to electric shocks for hours at a time.

Many uprisings have already taken place in Angola, but on each occasion the repression has been bloody.

An aura of hell with all the evils comparable to the genius of Satan, rages in Angola and Mozambique. One cannot describe the events which happened since the recent uprisings in the Belgian Congo and Nyasaland. Troubles having broken out in Angola, about 200 members of the nationalist movement, among whom were some of the elite of the country (some of whose name are listed below) have been deported to an unknown destination. The most frightful stores are circulating concerning the fate which they have suffered. These are some of the names: Pedro Antonio Benge, Fernando Pascoal, Figueriredo Alfredo, Andre Rodrigues Domingos, Tanclero, Sebastiao Gaspar Domingos, Gaspar d'Almeida, Nobre Pereira Dias, Agostinho Mendes de Carvalho, Jose Vieira Dias Van Dune, Belarmino Vandune, Correio, Lucrecio da Silva, Almeida Pires da Conceicao, Armando Ferreira, Teofilo Kinkela, and Dr. Boavida.

On August 15, 1959, a Congolese newspaper "La Presence Africaine," published at Leopoldville (Belgian Congo), printed the following:

"Once again, neither the policy of intimidation nor demonstrations of force have been able to produce any effect on African nationalists. In fact, a communique from Agence Belga of a few days ago announced that about 50 people were arrested in Angola for a crime against the internal and external security of the Portuguese State. A most pronounced silence is being observed in official Portuguese circles on the subject of charges against the accused, but they are charged with having participated in an activity which is qualified as communistic.

"It is difficult to obtain more complete information on the troubles, since the Portuguese colonial administration does not permit any kind of freedom of the press or other types of freedom recognized in other African territories. However, apart from information from Agence Belga, other information has reached us directly. This group of patriots, according to this information, presented a manifest to the government of Dictator Salazar in which they requested independence in 1960 for the colony of Angola. This group of patriots which is not at all composed of Communists or fellow travelers, were victims of outright duplicity "a la Lacoste." It is said that the Portuguese Government made these poor unfortunates board a vessel. There was an accident and they were all drowned. In our eyes, this justifies a very thorough investigation. The United Nations must intervene."

Once again, it is a question of asking oneself just where are the liberties and well-being that the Portuguese are always talking about. On the contrary, military reinforcements continue unceasingly to cover this ancient territory, about which the Portuguese eternally and compulsorily demand silence.

This is the reason that the cries and moans of the poor Angolans have remained thus far "vox claimantis in deserto."

Out of the numberless cases of atrocities and barbarities in which the Portuguese are engaged in Angola, the following examples are only a few.

In January 1958 a contract laborer from the village of Kaluka detached from Administration office of Belem (territory of Sao Salvador), a region in northern Angola, was killed by one Lemos, a Portuguese settler. The victim who had been kicked in the lower stomach died instantly.

When the corpse was taken to the morgue of S. Salvador, Dr. Barades, a government doctor who performed the autopsy, concluded that the man had died of natural causes and declared that being kicked had nothing to do with the man's death. Rather it was due to the Negro's poor health.

These allegations can be refuted however, since all contract laborers are given a medical examination before being sent to any job. Furthermore, because of the bruises found on the man, the authorities had refused to allow the corpse to be returned to the family. For this reason the Administrator, Mr. Matoso Pio, took care of the burial himself.

During the years 1957–1958, Mr. Alfredo Veloso, Chief of the Luvo Station, on the border of Northern Angola and the Belgian Congo, compelled women recruited from the surrounding villages, under the threat of imprisonment, to go down into the Luvo River to retrieve sand. This activity exposed the women to the greatest peril because the river is infested with crocodiles. Only providence prevented any mishaps from taking place.

These few facts bear witness to the state of mind which leaves no doubt that Portuguese colonial policy continues according to the local inspiration of the administrator and, more often than not, according to the whim of the chiefs of the administrative stations.

Thus, in Angola, apart from the administration, there are only three categories of people: those deported, those in prison, and those doing forced labor.

These facts and this testimony suffices to prove the inconsistency of the affirmations of the Portuguese Government according to which the colonies are an integral part of the Portuguese nation, and according to which are proclaimed the moral and political unity of this so-called nation which exists only in the imagination of Salazar's policymakers.

It is also regrettable to state that the charter of the United Nations which contains in its clauses a section which lays an obligation on administering authorities to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses, and the development of self-government, is crushed under foot by those who are at the foundation of its elaboration. Thus the argument of communism behind which the Portuguese Government entrenches itself, is one of these pretexts aiming to set aside this resolution of the charter, for the sole purpose of achieving its egoistic interests.

We thank in advance all those who by charity and solidarity with mankind, and consequently in conformity with the worldwide, humanitarian community, join together under whatever form it may be, to aid the people of Angola, in order to find a solution to this painful problem on which depends the existence of millions of souls.

Thus, united for the love of humanity, in search for a peaceful solution, we shirk our duty, neglecting the solution which present circumstances imposes on the entire world. It is not only a question of nation and nationalism but of survival, for the Angolans have been exhausted through long periods of slavery and repression.

We hope that the universal conscience, supreme judge of the peoples and nations, will judge this painful situation.

Samuel I. Newhouse—Publisher With a Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Samuel I. Newhouse made a gift last month of $2 million to Syracuse University to establish what is described as the world's largest center for the study of journalism, television and other media of mass communication.

This most generous gesture, made by one of the country's outstanding journalistic figures, has received wide acclaim across these United States but the people living in my congressional district—Syracuse, N.Y., and the surrounding Onondaga County—have long been aware of, and benefited from, the interests and activities of Mr. Newhouse. He owns the two fine daily newspapers in Syracuse, the Post-Standard and the Herald-Journal, as well as radio and television facilities.

Mr. Newhouse has been an important figure in our community and, in order that my colleagues might be able to learn more about the remarkable achievements of this benefactor of communications, I am enclosing, under leave to extend my remarks, the following article from the New York Times, January 26, 1960:

PUBLISHER WITH A CURE: SAMUEL I. NEWHOUSE

The restless 5-foot-3-inch son of Russian immigrant parents, Samuel I. Newhouse has amassed more than $150 million as a doctor of an uncommon sort.

MAN IN THE NEWS

For 38 year, Mr. Newhouse, who donated $2 million this week to Syracuse University, has specialized in buying financially sick newspapers and curing them, sometimes merging them. His medicine works, judging by his ownership of 14 newspapers, composing the third largest newspaper group in the country, and an assortment of magazines, television and radio stations.

At the age of 64, looking youthful despite chronic insomnia, still bustling on a stopwatch schedule, Mr. Newhouse continues to shop for newspapers.

"I'm having too much fun to quit," he says.

The Newhouse formula for putting a newspaper ledger in the black consists of chopping costs hard and perking up advertising, circulation, and mechanial operations while leaving editorial matters to local management.

PAPERS OPPOSED

In Syracuse, two of the Newhouse newspapers—the Herald-Journal, which has backed the Democratic Party, and the Post-Standard, of Republican sympathies—have attacked each other editorially. Mr. Newhouse is a registered Democrat.

In conversation, Mr. Newhouse displays a gentle manner. But in business, "S. I." (he says the I. is just an initial) can be tough. He has not backed off from long, costly labor strife when he has felt that a union was blocking the most efficient operation of one of his newspapers.

Born in New York City, eldest of eight children, Mr. Newhouse went to work at the age of 12 for a lawyer, Herman Lazarus, who sent the youngster on his career 4 years later with the order: "Sammy, go and look after the paper."

A self-styled brash kid, the young Newhouse took over the ailing Bayonne Times, of which Mr. Lazarus was majority stockholder, and soon turned it into a profitable venture.

He studied in night school, passed his bar examination and, at the age of 26, bought his first newspaper, the Staten Island Advance, for $98,000. Thirty-three years later, he purchased the Birmingham News and its radio and television stations for $18,642,000.

In addition to his Syracuse newspapers, Mr. Newhouse also owns the Jersey Journal, the Newark Star-Ledger, the Long Island Press, the Long Island Star-Journal, the Harrisburg Patriot and the News in Pennsylvania, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Portland Oregonian and the Huntsville Times in Alabama. Of his 14 newspapers, 12 were losing money when Mr. Newhouse bought them.

With his newspaper properties flourishing, Mr. Newhouse inquired about a year ago if the Curtis Publishing Co., the leader in the magazine field, was for sale. The answer was no, but Mr. Newhouse did not give up his intention to expand into magazine publishing.

OFFICE ON THE RUN

Mr. Newhouse and his wife, Mitzi, live in a 12-room Park Avenue duplex, but it is hard to say just where Mr. Newhouse's office is. Indefatigably on the move by train and air and in his telephone-equipped black Cadillac, Mr. Newhouse works mainly out of an old, battered briefcase.

He has something of an office at the Newark Star-Ledger, where he shares a pool secretary. Reputed to have an encyclopedic knowledge of the newspaper field, Mr. Newhouse is well known for quick telephoned decisions.

Mr. Newhouse says he has drawn up a will that will keep his newspaper empire intact after his death.

"I dont' want any outside interest, such as some banker, dictating how the papers should be run," he declares.

SONS TO KEEP CONTROL

The newspapers will be bequeathed to a philanthropic foundation free of inheritance tax. Mr. Newhousers two sons, Samuel I., Jr., 32 years old, who is in charge of the Newark Star-Ledger, and Donald Edward, 30, who heads the Jersey Journal, will retain control through the possession of the only voting stock. Mr. Newhouse said this stock would consist of only about 10 shares, and his sons will have to depend on their salaries for their income.

"They will have jobs; if they don't do their jobs well, they will be out of luck," he said.

Mr. Newhouse said he had earmarked 10 percent of his estate for his wife, whom he described as "my heavyweight." (She is 5 feet tall and weighs 74 pounds). When Mrs. Newhouse married the publisher in 1924, she gave up her school studies in fashion designing. Last year, she was back in the fashion world. Her husband bought Condé Nast Publications, publisher of Vogue, Glamour and other magazines, and then rounded out these new interests by acquiring Street & Smith publications. Mrs. Newhouse is on the board of directors of Condé Nast.

Mr. Newhouse, who relaxes at the theater and opera, is off this week on another of his diversions. He will fly to Europe on a holiday and will join Mrs. Newhouse, who is viewing the Paris fashion collections with the Condé Nast editors.

The Fine Hand of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Mr. Lyle C. Wilson relating to the activities of the FBI in the Apalachin case:

THE FINE HAND OF THE FBI
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

When the chips were down in the trial of 20 delegates to the Apalachin hoodlum convention, it was the Federal Bureau of Investigation that came up with most of the evidence which sent the gangsters to jail.

U.S. District Judge Irving Kaufman in New York laid on sentences of from 3 to 5 years. The mob was found guilty of no more than conspiracy to refuse to talk and thus to protect themselves by withholding from the Government the purpose of their Apalachin meeting.

The nature of the crime alleged put the matter within FBI jurisdiction. It is not generally understood that the authority for the areas of investigation by the FBI are precisely defined and limited by law or executive order. Congress enacted a law after the kidnaping of the Lindbergh baby to authorize the FBI to act in kidnap cases.

Kidnaping is one of 46 items within FBI jurisdiction by act of Congress or executive order. The list ranges from antitrust investigations to enforcement of the Mann Act which forbids the interstate transportation of a female for prostitution, debauchery or other immoral purposes.

The FBI got into the Apalachin case because it is the U.S. investigative agency responsible for protecting the Government against fraud. In this instance, the fraud consisted of "the misrepresentation or concealment of facts concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the Government."

Smart New York State police work in detecting the hoodlums' presence in Apalachin and in taking instant action was widely remarked before and during the trial. A rundown of the proceedings will show, however, that the FBI furnished approximately 80 percent of the evidence produced against the hoodlum delegates.

Sixteen FBI agents and one former agent were witnesses for the Government. Thirty-three statements introduced by the Government in connection with the trial were prepared as a result of FBI investigation.

The public is little aware of such phases of FBI operations. The communist, fellow traveler and other left-wing operators who, from time to time, attempt to oust Director J. Edgar Hoover or otherwise hamper the operations of the FBI are better informed than is the general public about what the FBI does and why.

There were a couple of more sorties against the FBI during the Truman administration, apparently encouraged by what their promoters interpreted as President Truman's chilly attitude toward the organization. None of these got off the ground although there was published a book denouncing the FBI and proposing Mr. Hoover's ouster.

This book was denounced in the Senate as "an utterly biased piece of propaganda." The author was Max Lowenthal, a Truman associate during Harry S. Truman's Senate days. Mr. Lowenthal, for example, accused Mr. Hoover of reaching out on his own in 1940 for authority to investigate subversive activities in particular and internal security in general.

What Mr. Lowenthal must have known but did mention was that on September 6, 1939, Franklin D. Roosevelt by executive order instructed Mr. Hoover to "take charge of investigative work in matters relating to espionage and sabotage."

Tribute to John G. Butter, Chief Engineer, Iowa State Highway Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, February 1 marked the retirement of one of Iowa's most devoted public servants, John G. Butter, chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission. His years of service are marked by the attributes which characterize the ideal public servant; honesty, integrity, devotion to duty, and a dedication to the public interest.

This type of record should be recognized and I take this means of placing a brief biography before the Members so that proper tribute is paid to a good man and at the same time, the seeds of inspiration can be sown for emulation by those who would seek to serve their community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, John G. Butter, chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission from April 1, 1954, to the present time, was born at Blairstown, in Benton County, Iowa, on January 3, 1895. His father was a Presbyterian minister.

Two years later, the Reverend Mr. Butter received a call to a pastorate in the city of Omaha, Nebr. There young John grew up. He received his preliminary, grade, and high school education in the Omaha public schools. He graduated from high school in the spring of 1913, at the age of 18.

In September 1913, young John G. Butter, the future Iowa highway engineer, enrolled in the College of Engineering of the University of Nebraska, at Lincoln. He enrolled in the civil engineering course. He wanted to be a civil engineer.

There was an Iowa State Highway Commission in 1913, but young John Butter had never heard of it. This lack of acquaintance was mutual. The Iowa State Highway Commission of 1913 had not heard of John Butter. At that time, the Iowa Highway Commission was a small, embryo organization, located at Iowa State College, at Ames. It had no State road funds to spend, under its own control, on the highways, but it did have a large measure of general supervisory control over the county and township road officers in Iowa with respect to their expenditure of the approximately $5 million per year of road and bridge funds available for their use.

In fact, in 1913, the whole highway problem with which the several States and the Federal Government wrestle today had not yet begun to take shape. In Iowa, as in many other States, there was no State road system—either improved or unimproved. No motor vehicle fuel tax had been levied in any State. No comprehensive Federal Aid Highway Act had yet been passed by the Congress. Each State registered its motor vehicles and collected fees therefor, but, in most States, the rates of motor vehicle registration fees were so low that the funds derived therefrom for highway improvement were grossly inadequate. Worse yet, some of the States diverted a large portion of their motor vehicle registration fee receipts to nonhighway uses.

In 1913, there were 75,000 motor vehicles registered in the State of Iowa. Twenty-five hundred of these vehicles were trucks. The remaining 72,500 registered vehicles were passenger cars. Eighty percent of these passenger cars were model T Fords—"Tin Lizzies." The trucks were small, two-axle, four-wheel vehicles. The multiaxled, dual-tired, semitrailer, cargo vans which swarm over the highways of the present day had not yet been built. Today, there are 1,400,000 motor vehicles registered in Iowa, of which 225,000, or 1 out of 6, are trucks. In 1913, there were 1,258,000 motor vehicles registered in the whole United States. Sixty-eight thousand of these vehicles were trucks. The remaining 1,190,000 registered vehicles were passenger cars. Today there are 72 million motor vehicles registered in the United States, of which 10,800,000 are trucks.

Civil engineering student, John G. Butter, graduated from the University of Nebraska in April 1917, with the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering. In that month, the United States entered World War I and joined the Allies in fighting the Kaiser's Germany. One month later, in May 1917, graduate engineer John G. Butter joined the U.S. Navy Aviation Corps. He served in that group throughout the war and was honorably discharged in December 1918, after the war was over.

In the spring of 1919, the 38th General Assembly of Iowa passed a comprehensive road bill known as the primary road bill. That act created a State road system known as the primary road system; created a primary road fund for the improvement and maintenance of the primary road system; provided for the voting and issuance of primary road bonds and other means of financing the hard surfacing (paving) of the primary roads; credited all of the net proceeds of the motor vehicle registration fees to the primary road fund and set up the necessary machinery for administering the primary road work. That same 38th General Assembly of Iowa also rewrote the State's motor vehicle registration law and increased the rates of motor vehicle registration fees to just about double their former rates. These two acts became effective in the spring of 1919.

Now, the State of Iowa was ready to really go to work on its road system. These new highway laws, providing for a new and greatly expanded highway program, required immediate and correspondingly great expansion of the State highway commission's staff. Engineers were scarce in 1919, much in demand and hard to come by. Young John G. Butter, 2 years out of the Civil Engineering College of the University of Nebraska and 6 months out of the U.S. Navy, needed work. He applied to the Iowa State Highway Commission for a job and got it. He was hired by the highway commission on October 6, 1919, almost sight unseen, and was sent to Benton County, the county in which he was born.

With the exception of 1 year and 9 months, in the early 1920's, Mr. Butter has been continuously employed by the Iowa State Highway Commission from October 6, 1919, until this time, a total of about 39 years. He started near the bottom of the commission's engineering staff, as instrumentman on a road survey party, and step by step was advanced in rank from one position to the next until he reached the top. He became the commission's chief engineer on April 1, 1954.

A listing of the various positions held by Mr. Butter on the Iowa State Highway Commission's engineering staff sounds like a catalog of all the commission's engineering classifications—instrumentman on road survey party, inspector on construction, resident engineer on construction, division maintenance engineer, assistant district engineer, district engineer, administration engineer—head of the administration department—and, for the past nearly 6 years, chief engineer. Each of these advancements was won by Mr. Butter on his own merits.

Mr. Butter was honest, faithful, dependable, loyal to his job and to his employer. He did not shrink from long hours of hard work. He had the ability to get the job done, and done well.

During his 6 years as chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission, John G. Butter has been the chief administrative officer and engineer in charge of the expenditure of some $430 million for highway construction and of about $75 million for highway maintenance. Not a shade of a shadow of doubt or suspicion as to the honesty and good faith of any of these expenditures has ever been expressed by anyone.

While assigned to highway work in Benton County in the early 1920's, Mr. Butter wooed and won Miss Helen Hayes, employed in the office of the clerk of the district court at Vinton, Iowa, the county seat of Benton County. They were married on November 18, 1921. To that union, two children were born—both girls. One died in infancy. The other, named Joan, is now Mrs. D. F. Pierce of Cheney, Wash.

Mr. Butter is a member of the American Legion. He served as commander of the American Legion post at Council Bluffs, Iowa, where he was stationed for many years; served as district commander of the Legion district in which Council Bluffs is located, and served as vice commander of the American Legion's Department of Iowa. He is a member of the Iowa Engineering Society, past president of Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments, and past regional vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Having reached the age of 65, Mr. Butter was, at his request, relieved of the duties of chief engineer of the Iowa State Highway Commission on February 1, 1960. He is not retiring from the commission's staff. He will continue in the employ of the commission, but with the title and duties of consulting engineer, thus adding yet another to the list of numerous positions he has held on the State highway commission's engineering staff in his long and honorable service to the State of Iowa.

Mr. Butter's retirement as Iowa commission chief engineer marks the end of leadership as chief of one of that small group of highway engineers who saw the commission grow from an organization of about 250 employees to more than 10 times that number. He was the first of Iowa's highway chief engineers who had the advantage in experience of having worked his way all the way up the ladder of service in his particular field. His achievement in the quality of service in the field of highway engineers will stand as a challenge to all highway engineers in Iowa and in the Nation. His was a commendable and very significant contribution to the cause of more adequate and more economic highway facilities for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, John Butter has built a monument for himself, not one of bronze, marble, or stone, and it will not be found in a city square, near the office of the highway commission, or at the capitol of our State. It is found in the hearts and mind of all the people in Iowa who honor justice, fair play, admire devotion to duty and respectability to build highways. It is found in all thoroughfares of Iowa where roads and highways have been built and maintained in the last 40 years.

I join with his many friends who wish for him continued good health and happiness as he continues to live with the folks he has served so well—the people of Iowa.

The Late Honorable David M. Hall

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I knew DAVE HALL from the days when he was a student at the University of North Carolina, which is located in my home town of Chapel Hill. Everybody who knew DAVE in his student days admired him for his courage in the face of crushing physical disabilities and for his keen and inquiring mind. After receiving his law degree in 1948, DAVE returned to his home community and engaged in the practice of law and also in farming operations, two strenuous pursuits which would tax the strength of a person in robust health.

DAVID HALL's tenure of office here was relatively brief, but already he had made his mark and earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in this body and in the committee where he so ably served. He was a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, an appropriate assignment, it seems to me, for a young man who felt a keen interest in the opening up of a new world. He was devoted and dedicated to his committee work and to it he brought a fine and understanding intellect.

We know that since boyhood DAVE had suffered from a bone infection which necessitated his undergoing more than 200 operations. Through these ordeals he emerged with his fighting spirit still intact, exemplifying the theme of the old ballad of Sir Andrew Barton, which runs:

> I'll but lie down and bleed a while,
> And then I'll rise and fight again.

DAVE always rose and fought again, and even after this last surgical ordeal he was confident that he could continue his career and return to these Halls. Since courage was the foundation stone of DAVE's life and career, the following quotation from Seneca seems to provide a fitting epitaph to our colleague, who never gave in to the vicissitudes of life but rose above them in a fashion that should be a lesson and inspiration to us all:

> Now has my valor borne me to the stars, and to the gods themselves.

To DAVE's family—his wife and children, his mother, and his brother and sisters—I extend my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement and express the hope that the fine monument of DAVE's life and works will comfort and sustain them in their hour of loss.

Who Has the Answers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the important role in our democracy which is played by the smaller local newspapers around the country. I think perhaps even more than the larger metropolitan newspapers, they reflect as well as influence public opinion. I want to call the attention of this body to the editorial comments of one of the many such fine newspapers in my own district on the administration's budget proposals for the coming year. These are the comments of the Record-Courier in my hometown of Baker, Oreg. They are, I believe, sound, commonsense comments

and I think we will all find them worth reading:

[From the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier of Jan. 21, 1960]

WHO HAS THE ANSWERS?

Citizens cannot be too reassured by the state of the Union talks by President Eisenhower to the Congress this week. For election-year consumption he combined platitudes with sheer demagogery and hypocrisy to come up with such headlines as "Ike Opens Inflation Battle" and "Budget Surplus, Tax Cut in Offing."

A balanced budget and tax cuts have been just around the corner for so long that Mr. Eisenhower can hardly be sincere in proclaiming that 1960 is the corner. Nor, with rampant inflation robbing the pockets of every American after his 7 years in the White House, can he be taken seriously for his Wednesday move to "rally the Nation to a new battle against inflation."

But for his political astuteness in appraising the balanced budget, cut in taxes and anti-inflation issues as the key to the 1960 aspirations of the American people there can be no doubt. His platitudes are well aimed.

This column year after year has pointed out that every time the administration slaps the country on the wrist with a scolding for its inflation tendencies, it is the signal for more inflation. The administration simply cannot stand before the American people with proof that it can scold big labor, big business, big finance into resisting the temptation to go hog wild. And his predictions for a hog-wild economy year of 1960 are but a horrible prospect for the evil fruits of this kind of a laissez faire I'll-turn-my-back type of government.

We look back on the administration's original position that only the removal of price controls was necessary to unleash the productive forces of this country which would voluntarily end scarcity and inflation for all time. Price control was completely eliminated and the forces of industry and business installed in the White House and in complete control of even Congress by the exercise of veto. The country has operated completely under their program for 7 years and it is brazen hypocrisy for the President to come out as he did Wednesday with another of his perennial headlines that he is combating inflation and that everyone-else-is-to-blame-but-me.

Surely Ike and NIXON must have their reason for insuring big industry, big labor and big finance a free access to boom pocketbooks, but surely they cannot be so naive as to believe it is in the name of a fight against inflation. The highway program alone is the greatest public spending spree in the history of the world, and added onto this is the fantastic project of spending $41 billion—over half of the national budget—on another scheme which outdoes the new deal except it is vitally important—the national defense budget for 1961. In any economist's language this is inflationary, and no annual slap on the wrist will stop the evil tide. The White House has turned its back. One of the issues of 1960 will be whether the next President will have both the desire and the courage to face the problem of inflation as a Government responsibility.

Yet the budget message was even more a political sleight of hand. Holding out tax cuts and a balanced budget in the headlines, he had the greatest expenditure in the history of the Nation and a fist full of higher taxes in the fine print, including permanent gas tax and postal cost increases. Eighty billion dollars in spending. And the headlines have the gall to say the President proposes cutbacks in spending—for resource conservation, and public welfare items, of course. And with deficits 5 of the 7 years he has been in office and after the whopping $12½ billion last year—the greatest since the war, he makes an election-year claim that he is the guardian of the balanced budget and debt reduction.

Don't think for a moment these are not big election-year issues. The opposition won't find it hard to talk about them either. But it may find it harder to outdo Mr. NIXON with the answers.

The Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of six articles on the subject of the missile gap written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, the articles having appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald beginning on Monday, January 25, 1960, and the final article appeared in that newspaper on Saturday, January 30, 1960:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP: BASIC FACTS

(By Joseph Alsop)

A deeply disturbing conflict of the highest official opinion on the sole problem which literally involves the survival of the United States was unobtrusively revealed last week.

The problem of the missile gap was painted in the roslest, most reassuring colors in congressional testimony by the able new Secretary of Defense, Thomas Gates, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining. General Twining even suggested that it was downright unpatriotic to regard the missile gap as constituting a problem.

Almost simultaneously, the same problem was painted in the most somber and alarming colors by the Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas Power. Virtually no attention was given to the extraordinary speech, before the New York Economic Club, by the man who has more responsibility than anyone else for bridging the missile gap. Yet the message of SAC's brilliant leader was as grave as possible, as can be seen from the following excerpts:

"If [the Soviets] could effectively threaten us from a position of such military superiority that we would feel unable to defend ourselves, our capability to resist * * * would be greatly reduced, if not nullified. [Such] military superiority would be achieved through accumulation of [enough] ballistic missiles to destroy our retaliatory forces before they could be launched. Surprisingly, this would not take very many missiles under present conditions. * * * The total number of installations and facilities from which we can launch nuclear-armed aircraft or missiles at this moment is only about 100. All of these facilities present 'soft targets'—that is, they could suffer crippling damage even [from] a near miss.

"It would take an average of three missiles, in their current stage of development, to give an aggressor a mathematical probability of 95 percent that he can destroy one given soft target, from 5,000 miles away. This means that, with only some 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes. To further heighten this threat, only about half these missiles would have to be ICBM's. The rest could be the smaller intermediate range ballistic missiles."

These words, so terrible in their implications, as will be seen, were in the hands of the Pentagon censorship for no less than 3 weeks. During this interminable processing, General Power's speech was extensively pruned and toned down. If General Power's facts could have been attacked, the censors would surely have pruned them, too. Hence the foregoing must be accepted as the first authoritative statement, from a source commanding absolute belief, of the missile capability the Soviets now need to bring this country to its knees.

As might have been expected, General Power did not overtly challenge the views expressed by Secretary Gates and General Twining. But the challenge is plain enough and terrible enough, if you place General Power's statement of facts against its background of theory. The theory of deterrence, which gives the key to General Power's speech, is not merely accepted by General Power and Secretary Gates and General Twining. It is also accepted by Nikita S. Khrushchev, as he disclosed in the most significant passage of his recent speech to the Supreme Soviet.

In brief, true deterrence depends on careful calculations of "first-strike capability" and "counterstrike capability." The United States today, for instance, has enough nuclear striking power to destroy the Soviet Union 10 times over. But the Soviet Union today also has formidable nuclear striking power. The United States therefore has no "first-strike capability," if our first strike cannot take out all the pinpoint targets presented by the Soviet panoply of nuclear power. We have first of all to destroy this power before it gets off the ground. If we cannot do this, our first strike will merely trigger the Soviet "counterstrike capability." If we are thus faced with the prospect of national destruction by the enemy's counterstrike, we are effectively "deterred." Just this is our present situation, according to Khrushchev.

Furthermore, as General Power admitted, America's nuclear striking power, "though vast, is also very vulnerable to missile attack." This is because our power, mainly SAC, is concentrated in a few targets, lacks effective warning, and so on. For these reasons, a small number of Soviet missiles—General Power says 300—will be enough to wipe out virtually all our nuclear power before it can get off the ground. With these missiles in their armory, the Soviets will not need to fear our counterstrike; and our deterrent will then cease to deter.

This was, of course, the exact situation that General Power grimly described. It could be, he implied, the true American situation before very long. His description was so grim for two reasons: His frank admission of our deterrent's extreme vulnerability; and his startlingly low estimate of the number of missiles the Soviets would need to destroy our deterrent.

There is only one way to reconcile General Power's statement of the facts with the interpretation of the facts offered to Congress by Secretary Gates and General Twining. General Power obviously suspects that the Soviets may soon have the smaller number of operational missiles required to destroy our deterrent. But Secretary Gates and General Twining are convinced, as they have testified, that it is absolutely impossible for the Soviets to have this number of missiles within the period of our deterrent's vulnerability.

General Twining and Secretary Gates have derived this comforting conviction, as they have also testified, from the national intelligence estimates. Thus two questions immediately present themselves. Are the national estimates correct? And even if the

estimates are correct, is it permissible to gamble the whole national future on mere estimates? These questions will be examined in the next article of this series.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP: THE ESTIMATES

(By Joseph Alsop)

"With only some 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes. To further heighten this threat, only about half of these missiles would have to be ICBM's. The rest could be the small intermediate range ballistic missiles." (Speech last week by the U.S. strategic air commander, Gen. Thomas Power.)

This first authoritative statement of the missiles the Soviets need to destroy the American deterrent came straight from the man in charge of the deterrent. But almost simultaneously, Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Nathan Twining, were telling a congressional committee that we hardly need to worry about Soviet missiles, or about a missile gap.

Therefore Secretary Gates and General Twining plainly believe that the Soviets cannot possibly have or produce the missiles General Power says they need. The Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in fact place absolute confidence in the national intelligence estimates—the official guesses at Soviet military capability prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency in cooperation with the State Department and the armed services.

As survival quite literally depends on Secretary Gates being right, it is important to know whether his confidence in the estimates is well founded. The first thing to note is the extreme narrowness of the national estimates' margin of error, beyond which further error may mean national suicide.

According to General Power, the Soviets could destroy our deterrent with 150 intercontinental missiles, for our nuclear launching sites in this hemisphere, plus another 150 intermediate-range missiles, for our air and missile bases overseas. The national estimates themselves have long granted the Soviets an ample stock of IRBM's. Over 100 IRBM launching pads are known to exist in Eastern Europe alone. Thus everything hangs upon the single question, whether the Soviets now have, or will soon have, only 150 operational intercontinental missiles.

The number is not large. It is, for example, only 10 months of the productive capacity of our own Atlas ICBM plant, if the Atlas production line were working on a three-shift basis instead of a business-as-usual basis. It is also less than the number of operational ICBM's we would now have in this country, if President Eisenhower had ordered an all-out missile effort after the warning of the first sputnik.

Again, 150 ICBM's is only three-fifths of the rockets that Nikita S. Khrushchev has said the Soviets produced last year in a single factory. From the context, he seemed to be talking about intercontinental rockets. He was hopefully interpreted here as talking only about IRBM's. At that, the interpretation is not overly comforting, for we have no factory today that is currently producing half Khrushchev's number of major rockets, even in the IRBM range.

Finally, and most important of all, 150 ICBM's is, or at least ought to be, a much smaller number of operational missiles by Soviet standards than by American standards. This is because of the lamentable difference in the histories of the Soviet and American missile programs.

In brief, there was no coherent, sensible American program of long-range missile development before 1954. Only in that year were practical recommendations for big missiles presented by the late Dr. John von Neumann, and rammed through the resisting Pentagon by the late Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott and former Assistant Secretary Trevor Gardner. This late start is the main reason why the first American ICBM, the Atlas, though operational and efficient, is basically an engineering hybrid.

The Soviet program of missile development, in contrast, began early, always had a high priority, and has been marked by methodical, orderly continuity. In the years after the war, before the United States had managed to build a single Chinese copy of the German V–2, the Soviets produced 1,000 V–2's in the captured underground V–2 plant in East Germany, just to get their hands in, so to say. Development thereafter proceeded by generations: the T–1, an improved V–2; the T–2, and IRBM prototype; the T–3A and T–3B, which are the present Soviet ICBM's; and the new, longer range Soviet missile tested in the Pacific which is the fourth generation.

If the United States had followed a similar development curve over a similar period of time, there can be no doubt at all that we would have, not a mere 150 ICBM's operational, but 1,500 ICBM's if the requirement were that big. Hence the published facts are dead against Secretary Gates. The problem remains whether the unpublished facts justify the Secretary's confidence that the Soviets certainly do not have what they most certainly ought to be able to have and must greatly want to have. This problem will be examined in the next report in this series.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP: OUR GAMBLE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The Eisenhower administration is gambling the national future on the assumption that the Soviets cannot possibly have a number of operational ICBM's equivalent to 10 months capacity output at our own Atlas missile plant.

The fact sounds incredible when stated in this blunt manner. It is a hard fact nonetheless. The man who should know best, the brilliant strategic air commander, Gen. Thomas Power, has flatly said that the Soviets can virtually wipe out our nuclear deterrent with no more than 150 intercontinental ballistic missiles, plus the IRBM's they already have in plenty. The Atlas plant has long been capable of turning out 15 ICBM's per month, if ordered into three-shift production.

Yet no serious emergency measures are being taken to forestall the "wiping out" of our nuclear deterrent, on which our national survival depends. According to Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, such measures are not needed, because the national intelligence estimates do not give the Soviets even the very limited number of ICBM's that General Power says could win the war for the Kremlin.

There are several things to note about this gamble on the micrometric accuracy of the national intelligence estimates. In the first place, it is certainly not justified by the past record. This record shows a consistent series of gross American underestimates of Soviet weapons achievements from 1946 onward.

From the atom bomb, to the first Soviet jet engine for aircraft, to the the first Soviet long-range jet bombers, to the ICBM itself, the estimators went on making the same kind of error. On average, the Soviets were always expected to make each major advance a good 2 years later than the actual moment when the advance was made.

Once, and once only, there was an overestimate, of Soviet heavy bomber output. But this belated correction of previous mistakes about Soviet bomber capabilities was only an overestimate because of still another gross underestimate. At that time, the Soviet missile program was being all but ignored. The Soviet changeover from bombers to missiles was therefore wholly unforeseen.

In the second place, these persistent, often-repeated errors have clearly resulted from the very nature of the process by which the national intelligence estimates are still produced. The intelligence collector, the Central Intelligence Agency, does not produce the estimates. The CIA may do, and by every feasible test the CIA apparently does, a remarkable job of intelligence collection. But when data come in, say about the rate of Soviet missile tests, the CIA must go into committee with the armed services and the State Department. The committee decides the meaning of the newly collected data. The committee's interpretation of the data is the national estimate.

CIA Director Dulles, a devoted and exceptional public servant, has struggled to overcome the tendency to error in the estimates. But Dulles is not in the weapons-producing business, along with the armed services. He hardly has a more effective answer than this reporter had, long ago, when the late General Hoyt Vandenberg angrily insisted that the "Soviets could not possibly be producing more than six jet engines a month, and anyone who says different is a damn liar."

The former Chief of Air Staff was angry because six jet engines a month was the maximum output we had then attained in this country. The true Soviet output at that time is now well known to have been above 200 jet engines a month.

This in turn suggests the main source of error in the estimates. American experience is consistently used to measure current and future Soviet achievements. But the Soviet effort to develop new weapons has always been far more intensive than the American effort. In reality, the Soviet leadtime from drawing board to production line is commonly only half the American leadtime. So errors have obstinately recurred.

Sometimes, it must be added, the Pentagon majority really seems to prefer error to truth. For example, the late Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald Quarles, represented the Pentagon majority when he did everything to obstruct the installation of the missile-watching radars in Turkey. When installed, these radars at once revealed the progress of the Soviet missile program; but even after this sharp lesson the radar evidence has often been pooh-poohed. For instance, former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson publicly ridiculed the radars' proofs that the Soviets were testing their first ICBM's. Long thereafter, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, continued to insist that the Soviet ICBM's did not have true intercontinental range.

Such is the depressing background against which it is necessary to examine the detailed intelligence estimates which are the basis of the most hair-raising gamble a government has ever made. This analysis will be attempted in the next article in this series.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1960]

MATTER OF FACT—THE MISSILE GAP: FISHY STUFF

(By Joseph Alsop)

The following article is the fourth in a series of six.

The American intelligence estimate prepared at the time of the first sputnik gave the Soviets about 500 intercontinental missiles by the end of this year. If these first estimates happened to be correct, the Kremlin may already have enough ICBM's to wipe out our nuclear deterrent.

During 1958, however, the first estimates were downgraded. New and lower estimates were conveniently revealed by former Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, during his presentation of business-as-usual 1959 defense

budget. This second set of estimates gave the Kremlin 500 ICBM's by the end of 1961. If the revised estimates happened to be correct, the Kremlin should be in a position to win the world about 12 months from now.

During 1959, however, the revised estimates were revised yet again. The new and still lower estimates were conveniently revealed by Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, during his presentation of the business-as-usual 1960 defense budget. If the twice downgraded estimates happen to be correct, we may perhaps bridge the missile gap without any final catastrophe—provided the Pentagon's highly optimistic schedules for the Minuteman missile and other weapons of the future also happen to be correct.

On the face of it, there is something very fishy about these repeated, strikingly convenient downgradings of intelligence estimates. How can anyone be so sure that Nikita S. Khrushchev was lying, in late 1958, when he stated that Soviet ICBM's were already "in serial production"? How can anyone prove that he was being deliberately misleading, more recently, when he seemed to say that a single Soviet factory had turned out 250 ICBM's last year?

If he was telling the truth, Khrushchev must now have at least 150 operational ICBM's. The highest American authority, the Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas Power, has publicly said 150 ICBM's could virtually wipe out our nuclear deterrent. And the answer to the questions posed above is, quite simply, that no one in America can possibly be sure Khrushchev was not telling the truth, despite our downgraded estimates.

The proof of that statement lies not merely in the disturbing record of the estimates and the peculiar machinery that produces them, both of which have already been described in this series. In the evidence itself lies the best proof that the estimates are no more absolutely reliable than their name implies.

The gaps in our evidence on the Soviet ICBM program are quite certainly very great. We do not know whether the Soviets have one, or two, or three, or more ICBM plants comparable to our own Atlas plant, which could turn out 150 ICBM's in 10 months if ordered into three-shift production. We do not know whether crews have been diverted for ICBM's from the admittedly massive Soviet IRBM program. We do not know about launching pads, since even the doubly downgraded estimates suggested that the Soviet ICBM's are probably rail-mobile.

Such are the vast areas of ignorance, which unchallengeable authorities assert are concealed behind the national estimates. There are hints and indications, of course, to garnish the gap. But there is in fact only one main area of certainty. Our missile-watching radars have told us that the Soviets were not running great numbers of ICBM tests—only three per month until recently. We also have information about the Soviet testing facilities apparently confirming the information about the ICBM tests.

This limited Soviet program of ICBM tests has been almost the only excuse for twice downgrading the estimates. On this point, the Central Intelligence Agency, which is not in the missile business, is ill equipped to argue with the Pentagon, which is very much in the missile business. The Pentagon uses American test requirements as the yardstick—a highly dubious yardstick for many technical reasons. Insisting on this yardstick, the Pentagon has also insisted that the Soviets cannot be engaged in a crash program of ICBM output.

The words "crash program" are doubly revealing. They show first the deforming effect of budgetary pressures. A mere 10 months of capacity output by our own Atlas plant—the Kremlin requirement as stated by General Power—could not be called a "crash program" by anyone who had not lost his grip on reality.

Second, these words, "crash program," also imply a shocking fact that Secretary Gates has now publicly admitted. They show that our estimates are no longer calculations of Soviet "capabilities"—calculations of the utmost the Soviet can do, by a crash program for instance. They indicate that our estimates are now mere calculations of Soviet "intentions." Despite Secretary Gates' subsequent attempts to fuzz the whole thing over, his original testimony on this point was crystal clear:

"Figures (of Soviet ICBM output) that have been testified to in years past * * * were based on Soviet capabilities. This present one is an intelligence estimate of what we believe (the Soviet) will probably do, not what (the Soviets are) capable of doing."

Pearl Harbor was the result, the last time the American Government based its defense posture on what it believed a hostile power would probably do, and not on what the hostile power was capable of doing. If the estimates are wrong by no more than a hairsbreadth, something much worse than Pearl Harbor can now be the result.

In this matter, it is folly to blame the estimators, and above all the Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA has never claimed to provide gospel instead of estimates. It has done its best with a bad, difficult business. But those who have pressed for downgraded estimates, and have then used mere estimates as gospel, can certainly be blamed. These sponsors of our business-as-usual defense budgets, headed by the President, are playing a vast game of Russian roulette with the national future.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP: THE BRIDGE

(By Joseph Alsop)

The incredible thing about the official approach to the missile gap is the needlessness of the hair-raising risk that is being run. In order to save some hundreds of millions of dollars, the Eisenhower administration is literally playing a gigantic game of Russian roulette with the national future.

These are strong statements. They are also factual statements. Their coldly factual character is at once apparent, if you grasp why the American Strategic Air Commander, the man who knows most about the problem, Gen. Thomas Power, has now begun to talk about the Soviets' opportunity to wipe out our nuclear deterrent. The total vulnerability of the American deterrent is obviously General Power's first worry. Here and overseas, there are now about 100 missile bases and launching pads, from which we can send nuclear weapons against an enemy. All these bases and launching pads are soft targets. Soft, in Pentagonese, means capable of being utterly destroyed by the 5 pounds of blast pressure per square inch which is caused, over a 4-mile radius, by a 1 megaton bomb explosion.

According to General Power, three Soviet ballistic missiles will give the Kremlin a 95 percent chance of destroying any soft target. This is the basis of General Power's estimate of 300 Soviet missiles, half IRBM's, to wipe out the deterrent. As previously noted in this series, there is no doubt the Soviets already have the intermediate range missiles. They will also have the 150 ICBM's they require with the equivalent of 10 months of capacity production of our own Atlas missile plant.

The lack of any warning against missile attack is clearly General Power's second worry. At present, and until at least the end of 1961 SAC and all the West's other nuclear forces cannot count on any warning against surprise attack with missiles. True, an antimissile warning system is now being installed. But the eastern sector of this BMEWS system, as it is called, is only just coming into operation. The central sector is still far in the future. The western sector, which has to be based in Scotland, has not even been started. There will be no sure warning until the whole system is completed

The combination of zero warning and total vulnerability in turn adds up in General Power's mind (and in any other mind capable of simple arithmetic) to the likelihood of the American deterrent being wiped out—if the Soviets just have or acquire the 150 ICBM's they need. Right here is where the game of Russian roulette begins.

After two budgetarily convenient downgradings, the national intelligence estimates do not credit the Soviets with those 150 ICBM's. One must pray the estimates are right. But no intelligence service on earth can be absolutely certain that the closed Soviet society, using all the resources of the huge Soviet economy, has not produced a number of weapons equal to a mere 10 months of capacity production in a single American factory.

There is at least one chance in six—the normal chance when juvenile delinquents play Russian roulette—that our intelligence estimates are wrong, some say it may be one chance in five, or maybe even one chance in four or three, or two. And if the estimates are wrong by a hair, our power to resist the Kremlin will be nullified, according to General Power.

The macabre roulette game is needless, however, because there are steps that can be taken to solve the problem of the American deterrent's total vulnerability and its total lack of warning. If we take those steps, the missile gap can probably be bridged. They are as follows:

A maximum airborne alert is the most obvious and urgent need. A plane that is already in the air, with bombs and fuel aboard, is not vulnerable to a one megaton explosion, or to a 100 megaton explosion. Before launching his own attack, the enemy must be ready to defend against all planes on airborne alert. Otherwise if there are enough such planes, a Soviet strike at us will invite the destruction of the Soviet Union.

At present the Strategic Air Command has a 15-minute ground alert, which is useless in conditions of zero warning. In the new budget, the administration has reluctantly tossed General Power some peanuts for airborne alert—$20 million this year, and $90 million next year. But this is the old trick of token appropriations to delude the Nation.

A maximum alert is needed, at least of General Power's big B–52 bombers, which are the only suitable planes he has. Even a maximum alert of 25 percent of his 600 or so B–52's will give him a dependable first strike of only 150 aircraft. Even after due allowance for the improvement in the bombs carried, a first strike by 150 aircraft is a melancholy contrast with the old SAC requirement for a first strike by about 1,500 aircraft. The contrast is all the more serious, because of the recent Soviet installation of a powerful air-defense system based on missiles like our Nike-Hercules. But the maximum airborne alert of the B–52's is the only remedy immediately available, and it is a good remedy, too. It would add about $900 million to the budget.

Better warning can be provided within 18 months, in all probability, by larger investment in the highly promising Midas missile-seeing satellite. Within 18 minutes warning from Midas, General Power could greatly increase the strength of his first strike. The Pentagon's kept scientists say that it is still a gamble to invest the extra $200 million needed to buy an operational Midas warning system immediately. But the Midas builders say it is a good gamble. It should be taken.

Later dangers can be reduced too, by buying more Atlas and Titan missiles for the perilous year, 1963. These late-coming mis-

siles will be in "hard" pads. Being hard targets, each of these American ICBM's will add something like 25 Soviet ICBM's to the Kremlin's missile requirement, at the very time when the Kremlin's missile program is quite sure to be in highest gear. An increased effort to close the far end of the gap in this manner might cost a little more than $1.5 billion.

These sums are not trifling. But surely it is not worth playing Russian roulette with the national future, to save a total amount no bigger than the invested capital of a single American charitable foundation.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 30, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP: THE KING'S CLOTHES

(By Joseph Alsop)

With any other President in the White House, the missile gap and the way it has been neglected and misrepresented by the administration would by now constitute a huge, emotion-charged national scandal.

But Dwight D. Eisenhower not only has the curious, often useful political knack of acting as a kind of supertranquilizer, a whole nation's Miltown. He is also, and with justice, remembered as the general who led our men to victory in the last war. Because he is a military hero, the country fells itself, "Ike knows best," while the Eisenhower Defense Department plays its macabre game of Russian roulette with the country's future.

In this way, Eisenhower the man is a key part of the problem of the missile gap. For this reason, no study of the problem can be complete without an attempt to answer the question, whether Ike really does know best.

It is a truism, of course, that military heroes cannot always and forever be trusted to know best. Indeed, the fields of history are whitened by the bones of armies that were prepared for the next war by generals who won the last war. But truisms need not be universally applicable; so one must look at Eisenhower's individual record in order to form a judgment.

In that record, the most significant single episode is surely the part President Eisenhower played in our most disastrous postwar defense budget. This was the budget prepared when President Truman was having his own bout of budget-mania, under the Defense Department leadership of the egregious Louis Johnson. This was the budget that invited the Korean aggression. As some predicted, its invitation was quickly accepted.

By Louis Johnson's request, Eisenhower came back to Washington that year, to work with the Joint Chiefs of Staff while the budget was being prepared. Without contradiction from Eisenhower, the budget was then presented to Congress by Johnson as an Eisenhower budget. Nor was Eisenhower the only great American military figure with a major share of responsibility for this budget that invited disaster.

A wholly different budget had been prepared, with infinite toil, by the great James V. Forrestal; and President Truman had made Gen. George C. Marshall the judge between Forrestal and himself. For the specific reason that the national economy could not support the Forrestal budget (which totaled $18 billion.) General Marshall told Truman to go ahead and cut Forrestal's handiwork to the bone. Gen. Omar C. Bradley also testified that if we spent a dollar more for defense than the Eisenhower-Johnson budget (which totaled $13 billion) the national economy would promptly collapse under the strain.

Here we see not just Eisenhower alone, but three of our greatest soldiers of the last war, all making the same appalling mistake for the same reason. It is the very reason that Eisenhower now puts forward, once again, to justify skimping the national defense in the current budget. Our generals, apparently, are taught to regard the economy of the richest Nation in history as a sort of sensitive plant, likely to fall into decline at the merest touch. In Eisenhower, of course, this viewpoint has more recently been vastly strengthened by the powerful influence of men like George M. Humphrey.

If you believe, with Humphrey, that paying the full bill for national defense is a quick road to national suicide it is of course tempting to avert the eyes from all the reasons why not paying the defense bill may be suicidal. There is evidence, too, that the President has done just this. If Eisenhower were a less transparently honest man, such Eisenhower defense speeches as the one after the first sputnik would have had to be called something far uglier than grossly misleading. The facts were wrong, and they were wrongly presented as well.

The chief fault lay, perhaps, in the White House staff's constant, sedulous effort to protect their chief from anything too disturbing or too disagreeable. One thinks of the former secretary of the National Security Council, Robert Cutler, the greatest of all the President-protectors, viciously ridiculing the awe-inspiring, wholly accurate warnings of the Gaither report.

One thinks, too, of the Pentagon warning to Gen. Andrew Goodpaster that the President had better not claim our Vanguard satellite would soon match the Soviet sputnik, because the Vanguard project was in a mess. The warning, overly calculated to upset the President, was never transmitted. The claim that we would match the sputnik was duly made. And for many months on end, the United States looked silly among its unsuccessful satellites.

This is no attempt to denigrate the President. It is an effort rather to show why, in this crucial case, a very virtuous king may be claiming to wear all sorts of clothes he has not got on. But perhaps it would have been better to assert, at the outset, that it is always wrong for any nation to trust any leader, instead of trusting the hard facts.

The hard facts say that a very small number of Soviet ICBM's can wipe out the American nuclear deterrent. The hard facts say there is a good chance of error in the intelligence estimates which deny the Soviets this small number of ICBM's. The hard facts say, therefore, that the remedies must be urgently applied that are needed to put an end to the Russian roulette game.

Admiral Rickover Meets the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier at this session I commented on the outstanding contributions Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover is making toward a much-needed reevaluation of our educational system. And at that time I pointed out that, although Admiral Rickover is only a telephone call away from the President, Mr. Eisenhower and his staff apparently are so indifferent to the Nation's critical educational needs that they haven't even bothered to seek out Admiral Rickover's views.

This frightening indifference to the Nation's future was revealed during Admiral Rickover's recent appearance on NBC–TV's "Meet the Press." I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD the transcript of this provocative interview.

I would like to point out that Admiral Rickover underlines with crystal clarity that support of education is actually more important than some of the expenditures we are now making in the name of "national defense." Admiral Rickover very wisely concludes: "Education is more important because military developments are transitory. They change every year or so, but education is permanent. Unless we have a thoroughly educated citizenry, we will not be able to solve either our military problems or the many other problems that are facing this country. That is why I consider education of far greater importance than anything there is in this country, any problem we have."

The transcript follows:

"MEET THE PRESS"

Mr. BROOKS. Welcome once again to "Meet the Press." Our guest today is Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, widely recognized as the father of the atomic Navy. His achievement in applying atomic energy to submarine propulsion is ranged as one of the greatest scientific contributions of our time. In 1958 Congress voted him a special gold medal. Last year he was assigned by President Eisenhower to accompany Vice President NIXON on his visit to the Soviet Union.

Admiral Rickover has aroused nationwide interest in his crusade for fundamental changes in our educational system. He believes that education holds the key to our survival. He has become one of the sharpest critics of the school system at all levels. He has made a deep impression on the country by his brilliance and his refusal to be diverted when he considers the goal important.

Admiral Rickover is making his first appearance today on a panel interview program.

Mr. SPIVAK. Admiral, some of your critics are saying "Admiral Rickover is a great engineer. Why doesn't he stick to engineering and leave education to the educators?" Will you tell us why you have taken so much of your valuable time to attack our educational system?

Admiral RICKOVER. You remember what Clemenceau said about war—it was too important to leave to the educators. The educators are public servants. As such they have every right to be criticized by any citizen in a democracy. When you cannot criticize your public servants, then you have the Russian system. Therefore, if we cannot criticize, we do not have democratic education.

Mr. SPIVAK. About 2 years ago in an article for This Week magazine you wrote:

"As a people we have been caught napping, but the launching of sputnik may well do for education what Pearl Harbor did for industry and the military." Would you say that the hope you expressed 2 years ago has been fulfilled?

Admiral RICKOVER. No, sir, it has not. There is some little activity going on; there is some lipservice being given to better education, but it is by fits and starts. Our people do not yet recognize how far we are falling behind.

Mr. SPIVAK. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who certainly is in a position to know, or ought to be in a position to know, says "I do not agree with those who say we are behind Europe and Russia in education. Taking the educational system as a whole, we have the best there is anywhere at the present time." Upon what do you base your judgment?

Admiral RICKOVER. If that is the case, why then is he asking for more money for education—if we already have the best educational

system in the world? I base my estimate on the fact that the U.S. Office of Education has published examinations which are asked of about 1.6 million Russians at the age of 17, in mathematics, in physics, in chemistry, in history, in foreign languages, and so on. Very few of our high school graduates can pass that examination. When our children can pass an examination as severe as that—and that examination is not as severe as children in Western Europe can pass—then I will be satisfied with our school system.

Mr. RESTON. Is our trouble that we are lacking brains, or that we are not using the brains we have?

Admiral RICKOVER. We have plenty of brains in this country. We simply are not using them. The children in our schools are wasting their time on many subjects which have nothing to do with education whatsoever. Of course, this makes many jobs for guidance counselors, athletic coaches, school administrators, and so on, but it does not add to education.

Mr. RESTON. Admiral, it seems to me there is a paradox here. We may be behind in missiles, but in atomic submarines, for example, we apparently are leading the world. You managed to recruit an extraordinary group of people and bring them in. Why do we not do that in other forms, in other fields of endeavor in the country?

Admiral RICKOVER. I can't answer that; I can only tell you this. I did not recruit extraordinary people. I recruited people who had extraordinary potential and then I trained them. There are no good people waiting to be hired. All the good people already have good jobs and the only way you can do it is to get promising people and devote most of your time and energy to training them. I am sure if people who have charge of other projects will do that, they could have better luck too.

Mr. RESTON. What are you looking for, brains or character?

Admiral RICKOVER. I am looking for brains at the present time. You can't built submarines with character.

Mr. RESTON. You mean you can take a heel and if he is smart you can whip him around. You will take your chances on that?

Admiral RICKOVER. If he does a good design job, I don't care what else he does in his spare time.

Mr. ROBERTS. Starting with the fact that this country is in favor of general free public education for everybody, and recognizing that we don't all have the same amount of brains—you are the only one in the room who could do anything about this submarine; none of the rest of us could—is your quarrel with the total nature of our system, or only that it doesn't pull out of it the relatively small percentage of our people who can do these extraordinarily skillful jobs that seem to be needed to be done in this competition with the Communists?

Admiral RICKOVER. My objection is to the total system. I believe that many, many more of our youngsters can be trained to be good scientists, good engineers, good administrators, good musicians and good artists if we simply make the try. The U.S. Office of Education claims officially that 60 percent of our youngsters cannot be trained in the way I would wish. I think that many can. We simply are not trying hard enough. We give up too soon. This is my basic complaint against our education system.

Mr. ROBERTS. Now I understand from what you have been saying and writing, one of your proposals to solve this is to have much more Federal control. You have said there are too many school boards, and people on local school boards are not equipped to run education. Yet isn't this the basic objection of most Americans; they don't want an office of education to run the local schools. Isn't this the problem that you are up against?

Admiral RICKOVER. We don't have to run our schools federally, but we can set up Federal standards. Education has not been improved anywhere else in the world without first setting up standards. We have standards for railroad transportation; we have standards for airplane travel, for lipstick colors, for the size of socks, but we have no standard for education. We have standards for what goes into people's mouths, but we will not even permit permissive standards for what goes into their heads. I advocate that a Federal permissive standard be set up for what every boy or girl at age 18 should know. Then every parent can tell how well his children have done in school, how well the teachers are doing. Wherever this has been done, it has inevitably resulted in an upgrading of the school system.

Mr. LINDLEY. Although your work requires a high degree of specialization, you advocate a liberal education as the foundation of education in this country, and as you indicated a moment ago, you think with that type of education that many people who are not now considered good students could be driven or encouraged to enlarge their minds. How far would you carry that? How many years of general liberal education do you think every American should have?

Admiral RICKOVER. I thoroughly agree that the basic education should be liberal. In Western Europe at the age of 17 or 18 the boys and girls who go to the academic high schools have acquired a liberal education which is about the equivalent of what we get after 3 or 4 years of college. This I advocate for all of our children. I would let them go just as far as they could. If, after a while they were not able to assimilate it, they would have to get off into technical training. But first of all I would try as hard as I could to give every child in the United States a liberal education.

Mr. LINDLEY. Through high school?

Admiral RICKOVER. At least through high school.

Mr. LINDLEY. The Russian system recently was changed—at least a change was announced, I don't know whether it has been carried through—to make it more difficult to get into the university and, in effect, to require 2 years of work, or 2 or 3 years of work in the factory or in the fields after high school or the equivalent of high school. Do you think that is a good thing?

Admiral RICKOVER. In Russia only about 30 percent of the high school graduates can go to college. Therefore, they have far more people wanting to go to college than they can accommodate, so they can be choosey. I talked with Mr. Khrushchev on this very point. He said there were too many people who were just going to school for the sake of going to school, but they have not carried that thought into effect fully. The smart youngsters getting out of high school go directly to college. The others go to work for about 2 years and study at nighttime and then go on to college.

Mr. LINDLEY. Do you think that would be a good plan to adopt in this country?

Admiral RICKOVER. I personally do not believe in working after high school and before college. I think that the children should go on immediately after high school because the mind can grasp more, the younger the child is.

Mr. SPIVAK. I don't quite understand this. Do you think too few people are going on to higher education, or too many, or some of both?

Admiral RICKOVER. I think too many are going on into higher education in the United States who are not prepared for it. I think we could probably stand having more going on to higher education than we do now, but that they should be better prepared than they are at the present time.

Mr. SPIVAK. Admiral, you yourself are the product of our American school system. You went to Annapolis; you went to the public schools, here. They tell me that you have done pretty well. What is wrong with a school system that can produce someone like you?

Admiral RICKOVER. My education consists of the few technical things I learned at the Naval Academy plus about 40 years of study and reading and thought in science and literature and art and history and engineering. Those 40 years plus my public school education have made me what I am today.

Mr. SPIVAK. In short, you have found plenty of opportunity to educate yourself here if you have the desire to do so?

Admiral RICKOVER. Of course, anyone who has the desire to educate himself can do so. But most people are lazy; their children see that they are lazy, and the children follow the habits of the parents.

Mr. SPIVAK. How are you going to instill this desire? You say our educational system can take care of the people who want an education, because it certainly took care of you. You had a chance to study and gain what you wanted.

Admiral RICKOVER. Not through our educational system.

Mr. SPIVAK. You did it right here in this country though, didn't you?

Admiral RICKOVER. Yes, but not in the educational system. I did it in spite of our educational system.

Mr. SPIVAK. What major steps would you take. If you were a dictator of education, today, if you could change the system. What would be your first step; what would you go about doing?

Admiral RICKOVER. The first thing I would do is set up a standard, as I said before. You cannot get anywhere unless you have standards. For example, when we went to nuclear power in the Navy, we had to set up new standards for the welding of stainless steel and many other types of standards. We found unless we had those standards the shipyards and the factories could not do a good job. This is true everywhere in life. So, first, is the standard. Second, I would get better teachers. Third, I would knock off some of the administrators who are really running our schools. For example, in one State, 60 percent of the public school principals are ex-athletic coaches. People of that type should not be running our schools. In fact, the voice of education is not the voice of the teachers; it is the voice of the administrators. The teachers never get to talk. I get many letters from teachers who tell me about conditions in the schools, and they say, "Please don't use my name; I am afraid."

Mr. SPIVAK. You talk about standards, but we have standards, here. I mean a boy has to get certain grades; he has to pass certain subjects in order to get through Harvard or Yale or any college, so we do have standards. What do you mean by standards? You would set your own standards?

Admiral RICKOVER. I am talking mostly about the grammar schools and the high schools. The high school diploma in this country has very little meaning because the requirements are so different in various parts of the country. It merely means in general that the child has sat in school for 4 years. It does not have anywhere near the same meaning that it has in Western Europe.

Mr. RESTON. You said you talked to Mr. Khrushchev about this. Have you ever talked with the President about it?

Admiral RICKOVER. No, sir.

Mr. RESTON. He has never asked you to come and talk to him about it?

Admiral RICKOVER. No, sir.

Mr. RESTON. What about Mr. Flemming?

Admiral RICKOVER. No, sir.

Mr. RESTON. Anybody in the Government at all?

Admiral RICKOVER. No, sir.

Mr. RESTON. Mr. Brooks said you had made an enormous impression on this country with your agitation.

Admiral RICKOVER. Not on our Government, though.

Mr. RESTON. Why is that?

Admiral RICKOVER. You will have to ask our governmental leaders about that.

Mr. RESTON. Going back to what Mr. Spivak said earlier, you managed to do all right. What about the responsibility of the home in all this?

Admiral RICKOVER. I believe that if the parents did their job, we could have much better educated children. It has been found out after considerable research that how children do in school, not only here but even in Russia, is based on the influence of the home. If the home is a place where there are simply good surroundings, where the children simply get good clothes and lots of entertainment and there is no intellectual discussion in the home, that has quite an effect on the children. You will find many studies show that the parents are the greatest influence in how well their children do. Until and unless the parents recognize that if they decide to bring children forth into this world, they have a deep responsibility to look out for their posterity. Until they decide that, until they understand that that is their most important function in life, we will not have better schools. Today the parents are mostly satisfied with having a good time, and with looking out for things that are not concerned with the intellect of their children.

Mr. RESTON. What do you do about the kids that come out of good homes and where there is agitation for standards of excellence in the family, intellectually, and who go to good universities, and then they use this excellence in very secondary endeavors, whereas in Russia, which you are always quoting, they direct their brains to the place where the state needs those brains the most. What do you about this problem?

Admiral RICKOVER. We can do the same thing here without state compulsion, if our values were not such that we gave material possession such a high place in our scheme of things—if we were taught now that this is really an affluent society where everybody really has enough to get along on, that there are many other things in life besides possessions, filling our homes with new things. Every day the nursery rhymes on TV and radio urge us to buy new things. If we would learn that these things are thrown in the ashcan in a couple of years but what you put in a child's mind stays there forever, if we realize that the intellectual life, the life of the mind, is just as important as getting money and material things, I believe many of these youngsters would go on to do intellectual endeavors.

Mr. RESTON. What you are talking about now is the whole philosophy of the country?

Admiral RICKOVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RESTON. The sense of values of the country, not the educational system? Is this the heart of the problem?

Admiral RICKOVER. The education of our country is a part of the sum total. You can't divorce the educational system from the country, nor can you divorce the responsibility of all the people from our educational troubles. You can't blame one group of society. It is our collective fault.

Mr. ROBERTS. I'd like to ask you about one proposal you have made specifically, if I understand it correctly, and that is the idea of doing something more for the so-called bright kids in our schools, who, if I understand your criticism and that of others, have been often lost by making schools the lowest common denominator. The bright kid is lost in the mass. Am I right that you want to have a separate school system for the brighter kids, or how would you pull that boy or girl up above the level of the mass of the kids?

Admiral RICKOVER. I believe that every child in this country no matter where he comes from, what the financial status of his parents is, what his social status is, should have an equal opportunity to develop himself to the maximum. I would give Federal aid to education as is necessary to accomplish this. I would not stop any youngster who is brilliant. I would not have him held back by anyone else. I would let each child proceed at his maximum. I would not have separate schools, necessarily. You could have it in separate parts of the same school, but I would group children, after about 10 or 11 years of age, in accordance with their abilities, so that every child in every school is working as hard as he can. If you put the bright youngster in with the dullard, the bright one becomes lazy and becomes troublesome. The dullard becomes dissatisfied because he reaches an inferiority complex. So I would separate them so that each one is doing the best he can.

Mr. ROBERTS. Are you in favor of a strictly limited kind of education? You have criticized so-called frills or trivia in education. Do you think we ought to get rid of all sports that we have in our school system, high school football and that sort of thing, and stick to the classroom? Is that what you are talking about?

Admiral RICKOVER. I would stick to the classroom with the exception of physical education. Physical education is essential, but many of the organized sports are done more for the entertainment of the parents than it is for the children themselves. It also is done to a great extent to make jobs for various people. The school is not the place for this. The school is tax supported. There is a distinction between training and education. Education can be done best in the school. Training should be done by the home, by the church and by the community. And when we try in a 180-day school year, 5 hours a day, to do everything in a school, we accomplish nothing well. I would use the school to train the intellect.

Mr. LINDLEY. I wonder if we might turn to atomic development for a moment. You have seen at first hand—at least parts—of the Russian atomic program, and you know what we are doing. Are they ahead of us in any significant phase of atomic development, either peaceful or for military purposes?

Admiral RICKOVER. I can only talk about the subject with which I am familiar. That is atomic submarines, and the peaceful applications of atomic power. I do not believe they are ahead of us in atomic submarines. I do not know of any atomic submarine they have. I am sure with the Russian tendency to boast about what they have done, if they did have an atomic submarine at the present time we would know about it.

As far as the peaceful uses of atomic energy are concerned, I do not think they are in advance of us. We haven't gotten very far either, but I don't think they have gotten as far as we have.

Mr. LINDLEY. Could you make an estimate today as to when atomic power will become competitive economically with other sources of power?

Admiral RICKOVER. It is foolhardy to say what will happen in the next year or so, but I confidentially predict that it will not be economically competitive for at least 10 years, perhaps 20.

Mr. LINDLEY. You would agree, I suppose, that the Russians are ahead of us in space—at least they have been able to put larger objects into space. Have you any recommendation as to what we might do with our space program in order to overcome this handicap?

Admiral RICKOVER. I can only talk in generalities. I think our governmental operations could be very much streamlined so that the people who are trying to do a job are not interfered with as much as they are, with reports, committees, memorandums, and so on. For example, my own time is taken up about 75 percent with writing reports. The other day I told one man who asked me to write a report that I could either give his this report or build a submarine; which did he choose? I believe I will probably have to write the report.

Mr. LINDLEY. Was he in the executive branch or the Congress?

Admiral RICKOVER. The executive branch, not Congress.

Mr. SPIVAK. Admiral, do you think we are in a life-and-death struggle with the Soviet Union?

Admiral RICKOVER. Why, of course, we are.

Mr. SPIVAK. And do you think education of military defense is more important in that life-and-death struggle at the present time?

Admiral RICKOVER. Education is more important because military developments are transitory. They change every year or so, but education is permanent. Unless we have a thoroughly educated citizenry, we will not be able to solve either our military problems or the many other problems that are facing this country. This is why I consider education of far greater importance than anything there is in this country, any problem we have.

Mr. SPIVAK. If we did everything you wanted us to do, it would take years before we began getting results of your plans for education, wouldn't it?

Admiral RICKOVER. But the sooner we start, the quicker we will catch up.

Mr. RESTON. You are not suggesting, are you, that there might be some waste in the Pentagon that might be applied to education, are you?

Admiral RICKOVER. I know that if we cut the people in the Pentagon by about 20 to 30 percent a lot of the work would go on much quicker than it does now.

Mr. RESTON. You mean if we cut them we could both improve the Pentagon and education?

Admiral RICKOVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. Are you satisfied with the number of Polaris nuclear submarines the Government is producing now?

Admiral RICKOVER. No. We should have more.

The Late Honorable John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, among his host of friends, many Members of the House were grieved to learn of the death of John J. O'Connor, of New York. John O'Connor, with whom I had the privilege of serving during the 75th Congress, was first elected to the House in November 1923 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of another great statesman, W. Bourke Cochran; and he served continuously and with distinction from November 1923 until January 3, 1939.

As chairman of the House Committee on Rules, he demonstrated to a marked degree his unusual competence as a legislator and parliamentarian. A statesman in the true sense of the word, John O'Connor stood fast to his principles of representative government even

thought it were to cost him his reelection.

His early training in the law equipped him well for his future career in government and as an active practitioner. He was admitted to the bar of Massachusetts before his graduating from Harvard Law School in 1911 and shortly afterward, moved to New York where he soon commenced the practice of law and entered political life. Before becoming a member of the New York State Assembly in 1920, he served as secretary to the Democratic members of the New York State Constitutional Convention in 1915—a post that undoubtedly whetted his appetite for constitutional and legislative problems.

As a member of the New York Assembly he served as vice chairman of the Legislative Committee on the Exploitation of Immigrants in 1922 and 1923. He was also a member of the Committee on the Revision of the Corporation Laws of New York, and was legislative secretary for the Child Welfare Commission.

An active Democrat for many years, John O'Connor was a delegate to every State and county convention in New York for 20 years, as well as delegate at large to the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia in 1936.

After leaving Congress in 1939, John O'Connor devoted his talents and energy to the practice of the law and earned an enviable reputation as a trial lawyer, particularly in the important field of maritime law.

John O'Connor survived his wife who passed away in 1952. We extend our sincere condolences to his four distinguished sons who have followed his footsteps in professional pursuits of law, medicine and education; also to his two lawyer brothers, Basil and James O'Connor as well as his sister Miss Mary O'Connor.

The legal profession, the science of government and countless persons in all walks of life have lost a good friend.

Polluted Water, Undiluted Gall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle of November 23, 1959.

The editorial follows:

POLLUTED WATER, UNDILUTED GALL

For undiluted arrogance and contempt of public welfare we can recall few acts and pronouncements more notable than those of the Bayshore Sanitation District.

Before a hearing of the Regional Water Pollution Control Board, its spokesman and general counsel conceded last week that the district has created an intolerable situation and announced that it will persist in doing so. Under discussion was the open ditch through which the district leads household and industrial sewage up to the Bayshore Freeway and thence into San Francisco Bay.

The misnamed sanitation district thereby not only affronts the public eye and nose and pollutes bay waters to the detriment of marine life and human recreation, but in the opinion of the control board maintains a health hazard of especial concern to many thousands of motorists who travel the freeway daily.

In an attempt to end this multiple nuisance, the control board months ago formulated regulations that would require treatment of the district's sewage. The district responded with what members of the board's staff regard as dilatory and evasive tactics. Meanwhile, public outcry against the so-called big stink, to which the district largely contributes, led to erection of a dike as a preventive measure. The dike, by changing physical conditions in the area, made the control board's regulations inapplicable, according to legal authority, and thus gave the district a reprieve.

New regulations are in the making—but the district meanwhile has devised a plan by which, its spokesmen indicate, it hopes to circumvent the board's jurisdiction. It proposes to construct a dam across its open sewer at a point just west of the freeway, thereby cutting off the remainder from the bay and taking it supposedly out of board control.

But board members assert that this proposal would lead to a dangerous aggravation of the already intolerable situation. It would have the effect of making a settling basin out of the open sewer and increasing the present outrage to public health and welfare. Further, they argue, it would defeat its evasive purpose because the dammed ditch could not possibly hold back the combined volume of sewage and runoff during rainy periods and would continue to pollute the bay with its overflow.

Plainly, the control board is powerless to act at tihs time, while its new regulations are in the making. Perhaps it may still be powerless when the dam is in place. But the Bayshore Sanitary District is not therefore free to befoul the air and endanger health. Its present operations are clearly a nuisance and may constitute a health hazard. Unless it voluntarily changes its attitude and radically alters its ways, outraged public opinion will compel it to do so.

The Crisis of the Commuter Railroads: No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include therein an article which appeared in the New York Times by Clayton Knowles which skillfully analyzes the woeful situation on the commuter railroads.

In this third of a series of insertions I am offering, we see what happens when railroads try to skimp on maintenance and we also see what can be done through Government help to provide good, safe commuter service while aiding cities to cope with increasingly serious highway traffic problems.

The article follows:

BLEAK YEAR ON THE RAILS—NEW HAVEN'S ULTIMATUM POINTS OUT THE DIM PROSPECT FOR COMMUTING

(By Clayton Knowles)

The year 1960 looks bleak for the railroad commuter in the metropolitan region. He does not need a crystal ball to see that, bad as commuting may seem today, it will probably get worse.

Higher fares, further attrition of services and, in some cases, discontinuance of passenger operations are in prospect. The ultimatum from the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Tuesday on fares and subsidies revealed nothing new. Yet, stripped of Madison Avenue touches such as "The countdown has begun," the statement underscored a situation daily becoming more obvious.

The fact is that the only road whose service is not contracting and deteriorating is the Long Island Rail Road, which operates with substantial Government help.

State, county, and local governments agreed to abate half of the road's taxes to get the Long Island, which had been bankrupt, back on its feet. As part of the arrangement, the parent Pennsylvania Railroad waived all interest on its investment.

COULD RAISE FARES

And further, the Long Island was empowered to raise fares and arrange schedules to suit requirements, subject only to later scrutiny by the Public Service Commission. This 12-year relief package is now in its 6th year.

The railroad is providing good, clean, fast, reliable service, but there is no indication that it can be maintained without the aid arrangement.

Two points in the Long Island story form a lesson for the 225,000 who commute to work by rail from Long Island, the Hudson Valley, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

First, nothing was done about the railroad's plight until 2 horrible accidents—1 took 31 lives and the other 79—in 1950. The accidents pointed up the invitation that operating in the red may extend; try to save on maintenance.

Secondly, the State and three of its biggest units of local government, New York City and Nassau and Suffolk Counties, had to team up to produce a solution. This emphasizes that the impact of a breakdown in rail commuter facilities is regional, not isolated.

THERE IS NO MECHANISM

Even a full appreciation of implications of the story, does not ease the search for a means to save the disintegrating regional rail network. The said fact is that there is no mechanism, existing or in prospect, to get the necessary interstate cooperation.

The leadership has been lacking. The Federal Government has no rounded transportation policy for metropolitan areas despite the increasing urbanization in the Nation. There are billions for highways that glut cities with automobiles; subsidies for air, sea and open road. But there is little for commuter railroads except an easier means to withdraw completely from commuter operation when deficits pile high.

If this situation proceeded to its ultimate, Manhattan could not possibly accommodate all the buses and automobiles needed to bring the commuting public to work if the railroads collapsed. Main arteries leading into the city would be clogged far out into the suburbs.

A single lane of rail can handle 48,000 commuters an hour, compared with 6,720 by bus and 2,250 by automobile on a single expressway lane.

ONE PLAN FAILED

The Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission's proposal for a New York-New Jersey

transit district failed in good part because it omitted Connecticut and because it was, many said, politically unrealistic.

Governor Rockefeller moved forcefully on the problem during his first few months in office. The Democratic Governors of New Jersey and Connecticut seemed ready to cooperate. But when they got down to cases, the community interest was not controlling. Action, such as it was, stopped at State lines.

The Rockefeller program provided the means for roads operating within the State to get new cars under a State-aided easy payment plan, and to get a substantial degree of tax abatement. The New Haven's situation now indicates this is not enough for an interstate carrier.

George Alpert, New Haven president, says he needs $8,400,000 more a year to continue commuter service. Under the Rockefeller plan, the line's tax abatement for 1959 came to $112,500. It will be $464,000 in 1960, and $943,000 in 1961, and $1,422,000 in 1962, when the program reaches its peak.

RIBICOFF CITES LIGHT TAX

In Connecticut, Governor Ribicoff said that the railroad was very lightly taxed and that subsidies were barred under the State constitution. He has said, in effect, that Connecticut's 24,000 rail commuters are a small part of the total for the region and thus the State's involvement is slight. The State now is investigating the New Haven.

Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, sought to tap surpluses of the Turnpike Authority to assist the Lackawanna, the Jersey Central, and other commuter lines. His proposal, accepting the total transport concept, would have pooled on a limited basis transportation surpluses, for the benefit of all.

The proposal met a crushing defeat in referendum last November. The Turnpike Authority's surplus for 1959 is expected to total $17 million.

The Port of New York Authority, acting only for New York and New Jersey, has stubbornly resisted involvement in the region's commuter rail problems despite the fact that many think its charter calls for is to act. And each year the authority builds new, subsidized facilities to compete with the railroads.

The prospect is bleak.

Is Uncle Sam Insolvent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Economic News for November 1959, entitled "Is Uncle Sam Insolvent?"

This article was sent to me by one of my constituents, a Dr. James Barnabee, with the request that it be inserted in the RECORD so that Members of Congress could digest its contents. Dr. Barnabee was of the opinion that it was interesting and timely, and I commend it to my colleagues:

IS UNCLE SAM INSOLVENT?

Will the U.S. Treasury soon be unable to pay its debts? Insolvency, or inability to pay one's debts, usually is the prelude to bankruptcy proceedings. That anyone should seriously question whether Uncle Sam is nearly bankrupt may seem silly to many readers, but consideration of the facts in the case inclines us to believe that the question is far more serious than silly.

Heretofore many well-informed observers have concluded that the U.S. Treasury simply cannot become insolvent. Those who entertain this view argue that, no matter how much the Treasury may owe, and no matter how much may be falling due at any particular time, the Treasury always can manage to pay its debts. How is that possible? By the simple expedient of stuffing Government securities into the commercial banks, the Treasury can obtain credits to its checking accounts and thus pay maturing obligations.

Students of money-credit matters long have understood that the process of monetizing Government debt via the banking system is the same, in underlying principle, as running the printing presses to print paper currency with which to repay maturing obligations. In other words, monetizing Government debt is inflationary precisely as is the printing of paper currency, although the inflationary aspect of the former is not so widely understood as is the latter.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Government can monetize its debt; in fact, it has been doing so in some degree for many years. Therefore, insofar as is domestic creditors are concerned, any question of insolvency is indeed silly. By statute, citizens can be forced to take whatever the Government chooses to pay them in settlement of its debts, either newly issued paper currency or newly created checking accounts that represent the monetization of Government debt. Therefore, the Government need not become insolvent with reference to its domestic debts.

Nevertheless, in asking whether or not Uncle Sam is insolvent, we raise not a silly question but one of immediate practical concern. Those who are smugly complacent about Uncle Sam's ability to meet his financial obligations when they fall due overlook one important fact: their spendthrift Uncle has been incurring debts not only to American citizens but also to foreign governments, their citizens, and international institutions. These latter holders of claims against the Treasury cannot be treated as American citizens can be treated; the foreign creditors are entitled to real dollars on demand. As holders of claims on dollars (which by statute are one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold), whether in the form of deposits in U.S. banks or U.S. short-term securities, the foreign creditors can and often do demand payment in real dollars rather than in the paper claims on dollars that U.S. citizens are forced to accept. (Read the fine print on the $10 or $20 bill in your wallet.) If and when Uncle Sam is unable to meet those demands, he will be insolvent and on the road to bankruptcy regardless of the comforting delusions entertained by so many U.S. citizens.

What then, is the actual situation? On chart I, below, we show two lines. One represents the total U.S. gold reserves held by the U.S. Treasury. The other shows the rapidly mounting total of foreign demand and potential demand claims against that gold. Obviously, the Treasury will be unable to pay all its foreign creditors if the trends shown continue for a few more months and those creditors demand payment.

In short, the U.S. Treasury stands today on the brink of insolvency. Failure to remedy the situation soon may result in the supposed tower of financial strength for the free world becoming simply another bankrupt nation, bankrupt by an almost incredible succession of economic and financial follies.

Before considering the unwise policies that have resulted in the present situation, further brief comment is advisable. In order to understand the full extent of the present financial difficulties, readers should realize that much of the gold held by the Treasury is needed for domestic purposes. The statutory reserves of the Nation's commercial banking system require nearly $11 billion in gold today. In chart II we show two curves. The first is the required gold reserves of the Nation's commercial banks. The second is the net Treasury holding of gold after deducting potential foreign demand claims. Thus viewed, the Treasury's net gold holdings have been below the statutory level for their domestic function since 1952 and now are but a small fraction of the amount required.

Of course, as some economists already have pointed out, statutory gold reserves can be altered by an act of Congress. The present legal level of gold reserves for the Federal Reserve banks was reduced to 25 percent from 40 percent in order that the Federal Reserve System might aid Treasury financing (monetization of U.S. debt) during World War II. What Congress has done once can be done again. Instead of 25 percent, the statutory level can be made 10 percent, or 5 percent, or a fraction of 1 percent, or even zero. However, what would be the reaction of the American public to such action?

The Treasury, for the maintenance of domestic solvency, is dependent upon the frequent periodic refinancing of huge amounts of maturing debt. Who would buy these Treasury obligations if confidence in the Nation's money were badly shaken? Consider the situation today with $140 billion of paper and credit purchasing media (currency and demand deposits) pyramided on the slender foundation of only $3 billion gold (after allowing for net foreign claims). If and when most of that gold has gone, is there any reason to believe that confidence in the stability of American currency or other claims on dollars will remain?

At this stage of the discussion readers may well wonder why foreign creditors are willing to continue to trust a debtor so nearly insolvent as is Uncle Sam. Why don't they demand the gold on which they hold claims before the debtor defaults and, by an embargo on gold or in some other way (including perhaps another devaluation), prevents them from obtaining the gold that is rightfully theirs?

First, foreign creditors recently have been taking their gold. In 1958 they took $2,275,100,000 (net) in gold, and $1,013,000,000 was taken in 1959 to the end of August. Chart III shows the accumulation of foreign claims in recent years less offsetting U.S. claims on foreigners. Also shown is the portion of such foreign claims for which gold has been demanded. Obviously, foreign creditors to an increasing extent have been demanding gold.

Second, as long as the United States persists in its delusions of economic grandeur, it presumably will continue the lavish giving and lending abroad. Moreover, when American businesses under the stimulus of prolonged inflation price their products out of world markets, foreign businesses benefit. A typical foreign viewpoint may well be, why shoot the American Santa Claus; how much more sensible it is from a foreign point of view, to encourage Uncle Sam's profligacy as long as possible. Presumably, exposure of U.S. near-insolvency would mark the end of lavish foreign gifts and loans, perforce, even if not by the ultimate triumph of commonsense.

Third, we assume that at the meeting of central bankers in London last spring Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, gave the strongest possible assurances that the United States proposed to correct the situation by drastically higher money rates and some deflation if necessary. We believe that without such assurances the demands for gold would have been greater in recent months. Moreover, unless some deflation soon occurs we expect the demands of

foreign creditors for gold to increase greatly in the not far distant future. We do not see how they can observe without concern for the safety of their claims the further accumulation of foreign claims on U.S. gold to the point where actual insolvency may result. That point, as chart I shows, is not far distant.

Turning now to the Government policies of recent years that account for the present precarious financial position of the United States, we shall be repeating to some extent comments in earlier issues of Economic News. However, the situation is of such vital importance to every American citizen that some repetition is warranted.

Without doubt, the most influential single factor has been inflation: one aspect was the great monetization of U.S. debt during World War II; and another aspect has been the monetization of much private noncommercial debt since World War II. The details of this procedure will be discussed in a subsequent issue of Economic News.

Also contributing to the difficulties now confronting the Nation have been the farm policies that, while encouraging surpluses at home, have discouraged sales abroad by artificially high prices. Similarly stupid have been the purchases of huge quantities of basic commodities theoretically for defense stockpiles but too often without regard for the changing needs of national defense. Not only has the Government been burdened with the costs of buying and storing things not needed, but also, as has been the situation for many agricultural products, the higher prices fostered in the United States have ruined export markets.

Made possible by the great and prolonged inflation have been round after round of wage increases in major industries where the organized minority of labor has enjoyed monopoly or near-monopoly privileges. Such wage increases have far more than absorbed the differential between costs of efficient production for American mass markets and the less efficient production for smaller markets abroad. These and other costs increases, such as the cost of "featherbedding" for example, to an increasing extent have priced American goods out of foreign markets and even have priced some American goods out of domestic markets with a resulting encouragement of imports from abroad.

CONCLUSIONS

We may summarize as follows:

(a) From a position of relatively great strength after World War II the Nation's money-credit system has deteriorated under the influence of continued inflating at home and lavish giving and lending to nations abroad.

(b) Apparently, before long the vast superstructure of inflationary debt and credit will rest on a gold base none of which will be free of foreign demand claims.

(c) What will happen if foreign claimants choose to demand their gold? The U.S. Treasury finally may refuse to honor foreign claims on U.S. gold. If and when that time comes, the dollar will depreciate in foreign markets. What will U.S. citizens do then; will they rush to convert dollar claims and fixed dollar investments into stocks, real estate, etc.; or will U.S. citizens ignore a flight from the dollar abroad? No one knows.

Or the U.S. Treasury may honor all foreign claims until the Nation's gold reserves are exhausted. How will U.S. citizens react to that situation, especially to the deflation that will occur unless purchasing media retired when gold is claimed are replaced by other newly created purchasing media? Will U.S. citizens fearing deflation rush to sell stocks and other equities in order to hoard currency and accumulate idle checking accounts or perhaps invest in bonds; or, especially if new purchasing media are created by monetizing more Government debt, will U.S. citizens fearing more inflation rush to buy stocks, etc.? Again, the only truthful answer is, no one knows.

However, we do know this: If Russia had been able to plant its agents, unknown Alger Hisses and Harry Dexter Whites, in key positions of the U.S. Government with instructions to carry out Lenin's plan for destruction of a capitalistic economy by means of inflating, they hardly could have accomplished a more thorough job of "gutting" the economy by extracting its basic gold reserves. With incredible folly, presumably honorable and sincere men in positions of authority have accomplished in a decade what Harry Dexter White apparently sought to accomplish when he arranged for Russia to have the plates from which we had printed our occupation currency during World War II. Thus has arisen the possibility, which need never have been permitted to exist, of a "run" on the dollar.

In the light of the foregoing, we hope that readers will understand why Secretary of the Treasury Robert Anderson is seriously concerned about the Nation's financial plight. Obviously, inflation must end and some deflation must occur or the United States soon will be a bankrupt profligate instead of a tower of financial strength for the free world.

The Balance-of-Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John J. McCloy, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank, given at the annual dinner of the Investment Association of New York on December 15, 1959:

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

(By John J. McCloy)

I would like to say something about a subject which is preoccupying many minds at present—our balance-of-payments problem. There have been a number of speeches and comments on this subject, particularly since the Monetary Fund and World Bank meetings held this fall in Washington, but I am so concerned with the prominence which seems to have been given to this single factor as an influence on our foreign and defense policy that I am impelled to talk about it a little tonight.

Certainly it is well for those as knowledgeable as you are to examine this situation, if for no other reason than to appraise its true relation to our vital interests. In spite of the publicity it has received I suspect that the problem is still very little understood and, misunderstood, it has some very dangerous aspects. For a nation's balance of payments mirrors its many basic trends and policies.

In our case the deficit has been seized upon by anyone who has a particular devil to exorcise. Those who would withdraw our defenses from NATO, those who would do away with foreign aid, those who would seek a return to protectionism, those who would like to return to that misnomer of "fortress America"—all have been using our imbalance of international payments as an argument for their cause.

Actually, the basic elements of the problem are not overly complex. For some years now (ever since 1950) the United States has been spending more dollars abroad than other countries have chosen to spend here in the United States. In that sense our international payments have long been out of balance. But up until 1958 the imbalance was not great—it averaged about $1 billion a year—and for the free world this was healthy. You all remember the talk not too long ago of the dollar shortage. That talk had a real basis in fact.

There was a dollar shortage throughout the world, and by running an imbalance in its payments with other countries the United States made it possible for the rest of the world (and particularly Western Europe) to rebuild its foreign exchange reserves of gold and dollars. World trade and production could not have increased as it did without this. I might add, too, that dollars have been regarded as good as gold—a very important fact, since there is not enough gold in all the treasuries of the world to meet the full needs for international reserves.

IMBALANCE INCREASES

But in 1958 some very important changes began to take place. With the onset of a world recession, minor though it proved to be, the imbalance in our foreign payments suddenly increased, and very markedly so. In 1958 it amounted to $3.4 billion; moreover, this imbalance was accompanied by a sizable outflow of gold—$2.3 billion, to be exact. Likewise, a substantial imbalance has continued throughout 1959, when the total may amount to as much as $4 billion.

I should add, however, that the outflow of gold this year has been reduced to approximately $1 billion, in part because high interest rates in the United States have encouraged foreigners to keep the dollars they accumulate invested here.

BANKER TO THE WORLD

Now I think I ought to emphasize that sizeable deficits in our balance of payments—even deficits of $3 billion to $4 billion annually—do not place the United States in any immediate tight spot. There is no question about the internal strength of our economy—it is stronger than ever. And to meet any external drain we still have the largest gold reserve in the world, some $19½ billion, almost half the total monetary gold held by all nations.

But the United States has also become the world's leading banker. Central banks alone hold reserves in the form of dollar deposits or short-term investments of more than $9 billion in the United States. And if we add the dollar deposits and short-term investments of other foreign entities (individuals, corporations, and banks), the total comes to about $19 billion. So, like any banker, we have many claims against our assets, and it is vitally important that our creditors continue to retain complete confidence in us.

The plain fact is that a balance-of-payments deficit of $3 to $4 billion yearly, if allowed to persist, is too much. It increases the claims against the United States at too rapid a rate, and it causes our creditors justifiably to take a close look at how we are managing things.

Well, how are we managing things? Why have we had this sudden increase in the imbalance of our foreign payments? The immediate cause is not hard to discern. After 1957 the United States experienced a decline in its exports and an increase in its imports. In 1957 our exports amounted to more than $19 billion, and our imports were about $13 billion. We had a favorable balance on trade alone of $6 billion. Admittedly that was a peak year—influenced among other things by the Suez crisis.

BALANCE STILL FAVORABLE

Nevertheless, it looks as though our exports in 1959 may not run to more than $16½ billion, while imports will have climbed above $15 billion. Our favorable balance on

trade, then, will have been cut to less than $1½ billion.

Of course, this balance on trade is still favorable, and more so than many countries in the world can claim today. What are the elements, then, that actually bring about the adverse balance in our total foreign payments? As you know, there are a whole host of services that we exchange with other countries—travel, shipping, banking, insurance and the like. For Britain these are net earners of foreign exchange, but for us they add up to pretty much of a standoff—we pay out as much as we earn.

But then there is still another set of transactions, a set that has assumed unusual importance for the United States in the postwar years—transactions that reflect vital commitments of a political, military and economic character. These, of course, are our foreign aid, the expenditures we make abroad on our military bases, and our private foreign investment. These all add up to a huge sum in excess of $10 billion annually.

I think it is of great importance that knowledgeable people in investment circles and industry particularly should understand just what is involved in financing these various commitments abroad. Some of these commitments do account for a sizable net outflow of dollars, but others do not.

Take first the matter of economic aid. This now amounts to about $2.6 billion annually if we include in the total approximately $1 billion of loans made by the Export-Import Bank, the Development Loan Fund and other Government agencies. There has been a persistent tendency to single out such aid as the culprit behind the scenes in the current imbalance of our foreign payments.

The facts, however, do not justify this placement of blame, for the great bulk of such aid always has been tied specifically to U.S. exports. Thus if we cut back on the aid, we simply cut back on exports. As a matter of fact, a growing amount of such aid in recent years has taken the form of surplus farm commodities, and if we fail to ship these abroad they merely pile up on our own doorstep.

There has been a portion of economic aid dollars, it is true, which has not necessarily been spent in the United States. So far as I can gather, this has not represented a major amount—perhaps no more than a fourth of the total. Recently the administration ruled that where possible this aid, too, should take the form of U.S. exports. A great hue and cry has been raised over this action, and our Government is accused of deserting the liberal trade policy which it has fought so long to bring into effect on a worldwide basis.

A PRUDENT STEP

I am afraid we must admit that tying loans and grants to exports in theory is a backward step. But it is also a step which, given the full range of our commitments abroad, seems to me to be prudent in the present circumstances. It does not mean that we shall cut out any and all aid that fails to be tied to United States experts. Some essential aid, for example, takes the form of commodities which the United States does not ship abroad on a net basis. Sugar and rubber are cases in point. But the amount left over in this category should be relatively small.

Let us now look at military aid—an outlay as large as its economic counterpart. Here I am talking about shipments abroad of military and related supplies under the various mutual defense treaties which the United States has with other countries. In 1958 this aid amounted to $2½ billion. The entire sum took the form of U.S. exports; so again if we cut back on aid, it would seem we automatically cut back on exports. There appears to be no immediate relief here for the balance of payments.

There are those who would argue against this point of view, however, contending that if we cut back on aid we might get some of the recipients to pay dollars for the military equipment they need. I am afraid that the prospect for this is not very promising. The countries that can really afford to pay for weapons in the United States are already doing so on an increasing scale. Germany is a case in point. It is countries that cannot afford payment—Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Korea among them—that receive much of the aid.

OUR BURDEN IS HEAVY

Yet we must recognize also that these countries are undertaking a considerable defense effort on their own, and that the Western World benefits greatly from the forces they are able to muster. In spite of all this, the burden of military aid, as well as economic aid, has fallen very heavily on the United States for a number of years. I would certainly agree that the time has come for other nations in the West to shoulder a larger share, and in the process of redistributing the load we should keep an eye open for any impact on our balance of payments.

That brings us to the second category of special payments which I singled out earlier—payments in support of our own military establishments abroad. These establishments lie at the very heart of our defense policy, but there is no denying that they are one of the major elements in the current imbalance in our foreign payments.

MILITARY COSTS ABROAD

Last year the United States spent about $3.4 billion on the maintenance and support of its military bases abroad; this year the sum is likely again to exceed $3 billion. None of this is tied to exports from the United States, and the countries receiving the dollars are free to use them as they choose.

For what do the military services spend these huge sums? Well, they need to pay U.S. troops in Germany, Britain, Japan, and other nations, who in turn exchange dollars for currencies of those countries. Last year such troop expenditures acocunted for about $900 million of the total. Another $1,100 million went for jet fuel, motor gasoline, fresh foodstuffs and other supplies bought at the most convenient locations. Still a further $800 million was paid out for local services necessary to support and maintain the bases. And so on down the line.

I might add, too, that these dollars are spread out all over the world. Nevertheless, more than half the total goes to Western Europe, with Germany, France, and Britain the major recipients. Another $450 million flows to Canada, while Japan is the chief recipient in the Far East.

Before we consider what if anything might be done about these defense expenditures, let me complete this survey with a brief look at the final category of special outlays which enter into our balance of payments: namely, private foreign investment. Again it has been the policy of our Government to encourage the flow of private investment abroad, and over the past decade business has made a substantial response.

From 1956 through 1958 our private foreign investment ran close to $3 billion. This year, however, the flow has been cut back and may amount to no more than $2 to $2½ billion, in part because high interest rates have made the United States a less attractive place to borrow from. Nevertheless, one of the significant developments in recent years has been the revival of portfolio investment.

MANY CALLS FOR AID

A large number of foreign governments have been coming to the United States for money, including Belgium, Italy, Austria, and Japan, to name a few of them. You may recall that only last week Credit Foncier of France floated $50 million of dollar bonds, part of which were bought by American accounts, to help finance French municipal housing. In addition, Canadian municipalities have long looked to the New York market for substantial funds, and, of course, you all know of the purchase of Canadian and European industrial securities by Americans.

Very few of the dollars arising out of transactions like these are spent directly for exports from the United States. Likewise a part of the direct investment made by U.S. business in branches and subsidiaries abroad is not tied to exports but initially represents a transfer of dollars to pay for plant and equipment in other countries.

At the same time, in judging the full impact of foreign investment on our international balance sheet, we cannot forget the earnings received from such investment which create needed foreign exchange when they are brought back to the United States. These repatriated earnings also have been growing and now come to the quite large total of $2.6 billion a year. One could say, then, that from a balance of payments view our private foreign investment to a considerable extent merely represents a ploughing back of earnings received from previous investment.

In one other sense, however, some of the direct investment abroad could in the future have an adverse impact on the U.S. balance of payments. Many American companies are now establishing facilities in Western Europe, encouraged by the relatively low costs there, as well as by the development of the Common Market. Certain of these companies also are coming to regard Western Europe as a principal base for their exports to other areas.

All this, of course, could in the future act to hold U.S. exports at a lower level than that at which they might otherwise be. I belive it is important to recognize these factors in assessing certain bills which are now before Congress with the objective of adding further stimulus to private foreign investment through special tax incentives. If such bills were to be adopted, it would seem to me to be advisable to limit any special incentives to the encouragement of investment in the under-developed countries.

AREAS OF INVESTMENT

Today very little of U.S. foreign investment flows to areas like southeast Asia and Africa. Rather the great bulk is directed to Canada and Western Europe, and to some of the more advanced countries of South America. I would question whether, as a matter of public policy, we should seek to stimulate artificially investment in heavily industrialized countries abroad, particularly in the face of our present problems.

Let me just recapitulate briefly by restating the balance-of-payments problem in very general terms. Our Nation now has a small, favorable balance on its trade with other countries, but this is more than offset by heavy military spending abroad, plus a small amount of foreign aid which is not tied to exports, and in most recent years by a net marginal of private foreign investment. The result today adds up to a sizable deficit in our total foreign payments. What can and should be done about it? From all points of view the most beneficial move would be to expand exports. I think this can be done, but probably not to the full extent necessary to solve the whole problem.

Exports were clearly depressed over much of 1958 and early 1959 by the business slowdown in Western Europe. In recent months shipments have been reviving, and I think we shall see such items as cotton, aircraft, and even machinery moving out in larger volume in 1960. In this regard it is important that we continue to press other nations to remove discriminatory restrictions that

still stand against U.S. exports. Some nations have made a good start on this, but much remains to be done.

A NEW LOOK AT MARKETS

More will be required, however, than a mere passive acceptance of an expanding market abroad. I suspect that American business will have to take a fresh, hard look at export markets and seek more vigorously to cultivate them. There has been a tendency for many firms to look upon exports as merely an overflow from the domestic market. Products have not been tailored specifically for customers abroad; nor have marketing and servicing facilities been adequate.

Moreover, through many postwar years American producers held an advantage in being able to quote earlier delivery dates. Now this advantage is gone. The plain truth is that the United States has not had to fight for exports as have many countries in Western Europe. Those days, I am afraid, are gone forever.

STILL AHEAD IN SALES

You are all familiar, of course, with the complaint that the United States has priced itself out of world markets. Certainly the inflationary move of the fifties did us no good, and with some products, steel and automobiles, for instance, we no longer hold the competitive position we once possessed. But this Nation has not priced itself out of world markets in any overall sense. We still sell more abroad than any nation in the world; we are spending far more than any of our friends on the search for new products and new ways of doing things.

World trade is never a static thing. It is made up of an ever-changing mix, a mix in which the nation that develops something new gains an advantage. I am sure that we shall be shipping abroad over the next 5 years a whole host of items that have never entered into world trade before.

Yet with all of this, the adverse position in our balance of payments has flashed a warning signal. It has told us that a nation which lacks discipline, which shuns hard, honest work, which looks for the easy way out through Government largesse, is a nation that is heading for trouble, no matter how great its initial power. Certainly the United States is no exception. It is more essential than ever that we avoid the easy path of inflation; that we hold our costs, our Government budgets, and our prices under effective control.

It is an awareness of this need, more than any other, which has caused the eyes of the Nation to focus on the current debate in steel—a recognition that the interests of all the people, and not merely those of the individual disputants, are directly involved.

I think we can say too that the administration is alive to the facts and needs embodied in the balance-of-payments problem. It has taken already a number of steps that are traditional to meet such a problem: The budget is being balanced; a policy of tight money is being pursued; and interest rates are held high to encourage an inflow of funds. All these are important, but we can't be content to let matters rest. Every avenue needs to be explored.

What more, then, can be done, other than expanding exports, to bring futrher relief for the balance-of-payments problem? Clearly the answer does not lie in cutting foreign aid. Nor does it lie in moving backward to new forms of protectionism. Either of these moves would be a signal, not only to the free world but to the Communists as well, that the United States is unwilling to pay the price or bear the burden of world leadership. Once started down this path, there is no telling where we might end, except that the chances for world domination by the Communists would have brightened immeasurably.

A CURIOUS POSITION

One of the political leaders of Europe told me recently that the United States today stood in a most curious yet critical position. "Here you are," he said, "more wealthy and in many respects more powerful than ever. Your national income has never been greater, your people have never been better off. Yet in the eyes of the world you are weaker. The Russians beat you into outer space and then to the moon. For a third of a year the most basic of your heavy industries lies idle. Now you are losing gold; the statements of your own Treasury head have furnished some doubts as to the strength of the dollar; and you are threatening to pull back on your commitments to NATO. Is it any wonder, then," he added, "that the free world is beginning to question whether you can provide the leadership we all so sorely need?"

OUR LEADERSHIP REQUIRED

Certainly the free world continues to need our leadership—aggressive, forceful and constructive—and no matter what the problem with our balance of payments, we must exercise it. No other nation has the resources, the basic strength and the outreach to take over the responsibility from us. It is up to each and all of us to demonstrate that our Nation has the will and the moral fiber to meet our great obligations.

The world we lead today is vastly different from that of a decade ago—due in great measure to the farsighted policies which our Nation has pursued in the past. Rather than a weak Europe, threatened from within and without, we see a vigorous community, exploring new political and economic forms, and growing more rapidly even than we.

In Asia and Africa new nations have climbed to their knees but continue to need a helping hand if they are ever to rise to their feet. And to the south of us our neighbors also show progress, but again they require not only inner discipline but also outside assistance. We have, therefore, not only an East-West problem but, as Sir Oliver Franks puts it, "a North-South" problem: the old adjustment between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

There is certainly no room for complacency in all of this. The European world has been more than rehabilitated and is at present imbued with a new spirit of energy. The other world, however, the Communist world that would bury us, also has been hard at work. And today we find ourselves confronting a monolithic, dynamic force that is more assertive than ever of its eventual triumph.

Confronted with this heavy and unrelenting challenge, and with the changes that have been wrought in the West, I believe the time has come for a new look at the political and institutional arrangements we have in effect for strengthening the free world. I have in mind particularly the arrangements for marshalling the resources necessary for defense and economic aid.

AID PROGRAM EXTENDED

There was a time when the major problem involved allocating resources which the United States largely could make available. OEEC was developed and later NATO and SEATO. As time went on, the United States undertook a broader aid program and Britain joined with others in the Colombo Plan. Nor should we forget the aid which France, even when hard pressed, gave to her overseas territories.

All of this is to the good. But it has led today to a scattered, disparate use of available resources. No longer is the United States the sole nation with a considerable margin of strength to throw into the balance. Western Europe has come to the point where it too can shoulder substantial responsibility for economic and military aid. The problem is how to join all the available resources, including brains, in a common pool which can be effectively allocated among all the pressing needs.

We have to check the disparate forces. We have no institutional arrangement today which can accomplish this. NATO, OEEC, the Colombo Plan—none of them is broad enough. What is needed is an organization which joins North America to Europe to deal with the problems of the Atlantic world as well as its relations with the less developed lands. It could be a regional organization both in terms of politics and economics. An organization of this compass could then look to the whole range and weight of economic forces throughout the free world and see that they are effectively deployed and held in balance.

It would not be too much to ask, in these circumstances, that Western Europe take over the financing of part of the local expenditures the United States incurs in maintaining military establishments within the European area. This would certainly go a long way to assist our balance of payments. And in return we might expand shipments, under both military and economic aid, of items our Nation is best qualified to produce and export. Here is an example of the type of coordination which the free world must undertake if it is actually to realize the progress that will be required. Moreover, it would tend to coordinate not only our economic, but also our political, direction.

OVERALL PLAN NEEDED

The need is not for less aid; if anything, it is for more. And we of the Western Hemisphere and the Europeans are quite rich and strong enough to afford it. But we have moved to the point where a greater measure of overall planning and coordination must be introduced into the process. Balance-of-payment factors cannot be ignored, but they would be dealt with automatically in such a coordinated effort. They would take their place as a concomitant of a free world's consideration of its joint problems. They would not dictate policy but be submerged into it.

To have it otherwise would be to unlearn all the lessons of the 20th century, assimilated at such pain and at such great cost. I have faith that the peoples of the West will grasp this truth, and that one way and another we shall make the adjustments that permit us to move forward.

NEW FORMS ESSENTIAL

To accomplish this consolidation of free world strength we need new forms. It is time, I feel that we should use our good offices to put an end to the incipient economic schism which is developing in Europe. The so-called sixes and sevens, which have arisen, it seems, through a combination of French hesitancy and British traditionalism regarding a continental coalition, embody the beginnings of a political division which would start Europe in precisely the opposite direction from that in which it should now be traveling.

New forms are needed to cope with the problems not only of Europe but of Britain, America and the Western Hemisphere. The composition of eocnomic problems in Europe was very well worked out in the postwar period through the operation of OEEC, and some such form should in my judgment be set up to deal with similar problems of the entire Atlantic world. With such an organization the matter of our imbalance of payments might have been anticipated and composed.

In this case our deficit would have been set in a perspective which would have reduced its significance as a factor in our whole defense policy (which it threatened to become recently, when the early withdrawal of our forces or a substantial portion of them from Europe apparently was contemplated

as a means of alleviating the imbalance). New organizational forms are needed to consolidate our free world strength and make more distinct our whole posture toward both the underdeveloped world and the Communist powers.

And now let me sermonize a little:

The Nation and the free world still face heavy challenges. To meet these we must have a new statesmanship and new forms, but it is even more important that we exert new disciplines—or perhaps revive old ones.

We shall not match and overcome the challenge of the new spirit and mass energy of the Sino-Soviet bloc, with its vast resources of material and manpower, by continued emphasis on increased leisure on our part. It will require the statesmanship I have been speaking of, buttressed by an intensive, inspired, and continuous effort on the part of the ordinary citizen to make himself both more knowledgeable and more productive, if we are to preserve what we might call the good life on this increasingly finite planet. We may have to postpone for a while the flight to suburbia and security if we are to cope with some of the imperatives with which the modern world confronts us.

I hope I have not struck too pessimistic a note. I do not intend to, for though I see a well-defined challenge ahead—of which our balance of payments problem is only a part—I believe I also see a well-defined reply to it.

What it demands is the expenditure of greater thought, energy, and persuasion. I see that Drew Pearson has collaborated in the writing of a book dealing with the forces which are playing about the world and it is called, I believe, "U.S.A.—A Second-Class Power?" We are far from a second-class power. We only could be.

Health Is Paramount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been under heavy attack by industry and farm groups because of the cranberry and poultry incidents.

The following item from the New York Times shows the heavy pressure that is being brought on the White House to try to curb Mr. Flemming's efforts to protect the public health by enforcing the Food Additives Amendment of 1958.

It is encouraging that two such outstanding newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Star fully support the Secretary, and I include editorials from both papers.

The article and editorials follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1960]

ELEVEN FARM UNITS ASK WHITE HOUSE TO CURB FLEMMING ON ADDITIVES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—Eleven farm groups took to the White House today their plea that the Administration curb the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his handling of chemicals and drugs used in agriculture.

Representatives of the farm groups discussed the situation arising out of the tainted cranberry and poultry cases with Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, the Assistant to the President, Gerald D. Morgan, Deputy Assistant, and Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant for Interdepartmental affairs.

The representatives submitted a proposal that President Eisenhower name a factfinding body to review the problems in the field and to recommend changes in existing laws and procedures relating to chemicals and drugs used in the production of crops and livestock.

The farm leaders said they had received no promises but they felt the White House aids were aware of the problem and that it was being worked on. The problem, including the dispute between Secretary Arthur S. Flemming and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, has already been discussed in the Cabinet.

The farm organizations are seeking to prevent Mr. Flemming from repeating the cranberry and poultry incidents, which they contend unduly alarmed the public and caused producers undue losses. Mr. Benson has supported their position.

It also was the impression of some leaders that the White House was eager to prevent the interdepartmental fight from becoming the subject of congressional hearings and election campaign material for the Democrats.

The farm group included officials of the country's three general farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange and Farmers Union, and dairy, poultry and other commodity bodies.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1960]

CHEMICALS AND OUR FOOD

In the wake of his efforts to protect the health of the American people against any potential health menace that may exist in the growing use of chemicals to increase food production, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming has come under increasingly sharp attack in recent months. The peak of this campaign was reached last Friday when representatives of 11 major farm organizations—embodying essentially the massive political might of the entire farm bloc—went to the White House, and, in effect, demanded that President Eisenhower repudiate Mr. Flemming.

It would be unfortunate, indeed, if the President were to give in to this open use of political pressure aimed at curbing a devoted public servant engaged in a vitally important job. The many chemicals used in producing our foods today have had many beneficial effects in increasing output per acre and lowering costs. But the multiplication of such chemicals and their uses have raised ever more serious questions of the impact upon the health of our people of the residues of these chemicals remaining in the food we consume. With regard to these questions, many of which are complex, the principle must be upheld that where there is doubt that doubt must be settled on the assumption that the health of the American people is primary.

Of course, nobody supposes that the farmers of our Nation want to poison our people. And of course farmers eat the same food that the rest of us do. But as last Friday's White House visit showed, farmers' organizations tend to put more emphasis upon the financial interests of their members and less emphasis upon the health problem than would organizations representing consumers. Mr. Flemming may have made mistakes in the past, but from the point of view of the Nation as a whole it is preferable that any mistakes be on the side of excessive caution rather than of inadequate caution. Those who would use political pressure to weaken Mr. Flemming might do well to remember that consumers vote.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 23, 1960]

HEALTH IS PARAMOUNT

In administering the Food and Drug Act, the paramount consideration of the Government must be the safeguarding of the public against dangerous contaminants. It is axiomatic that the public health must have priority over special interests which may be affected economically by restraints imposed by the Food and Drug Administration.

It is unlikely that the mobilization of 11 major farm organizations against present policies and methods of enforcing the laws governing food additives was inspired by public health considerations. It is only natural, of course, that the groups should be concerned over the effects of the cranberry, chicken and other "scarces" on their members—the farmers who produce the country's food. So it is hardly a surprise that farm organizations should be planning to ask the President to support a proposed transfer of the FDA to the Department of Agriculture from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The proposal, however, would be a step backward—one that would run counter to the persuasive reason that led to the removal of the FDA from the Department of Agriculture's control in 1940. It was pointed out at that time that since the FDA was concerned primarily with the protection of the public against health hazards from foods and drugs, the agency more logically belonged in a department charged with safeguarding public health. It also was pointed out that the FDA should not be in a department whose primary concern is the welfare of farmers.

These reasons for keeping the FDA under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are still sound. We are confident that the President, if the issue should be brought to his attention, will view the farmers' problem against the general background of the public health and that, as a result, he will continue to support the present effective setup—political pressures notwithstanding.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Senator Gore's Plan for School of Diplomacy Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter as published in the Chattanooga Times of January 27 which was written to my colleague, Senator GORE, by Ralph Shumacker, an able lawyer and well-known student of government in Chattanooga, Tenn.

The letter applauds Senator GORE's effort through his bill S. 2495 to set up a school of diplomacy to attract the best talent in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECTIVE DIPLOMACY SENATOR GORE'S AIM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator GORE says that his bill, S. 2495, is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee and that he is hopeful for its passage.)

To the EDITOR OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES:

About a year ago you proposed that the Government of the United States establish a school or academy of diplomacy. I was greatly impressed by the basic merit of your proposal, and I am sure that millions of Americans were similarly impressed.

Our Nation, all will agree, is engaged in a great world struggle with another great power. This struggle is not the shooting kind, and it seems, for the moment at least, to have been taken out of the deep freeze. This does not mean that the stakes are different or any less vital to our ultimate survival as a free society.

Precisely, what is this struggle? We Americans want a peaceful community of independent sovereign nations, whose citizens have, as a matter of right, certain basic political and religious freedoms, who enjoy, through whatever means they deem appropriate to so provide, a measure of social and economic justice compatible with human dignity, and whose governments exist primarily to secure unto each of its citizens a genuine opportunity to attain his maximum potential in all areas of civilized human interest and endeavor.

I believe that the Soviet Union also wants a peaceful community of nations. There is little evidence, however, that it wants other nations to be truly sovereign or independent. The Soviet Union wants to raise the living standards of its own people, but it has absolutely no concern for the social, economic, political, or religious freedom of the individual, and whatever measure of betterment (and it has been truly considerable) it has wrought for its people has been to the primary end that they thereby become of greater value and use to the state, stronger threads in the fabric of a collectivist society.

Hundreds of millions of human beings in the underdeveloped and emerging nations of Asia and Europe are now seeking and will soon demand a narrowing of the awesome gap between their standards of living and those of the more wealthy nations. The spectacular achievements of the 40-year-old Soviet system—although for us at an unconscionable cost in human life, suffering, and degredation—will have great appeal.

If the United States and the Soviet Union, as the leaders of opposing and irreconcilable ideologies, have abandoned war as an effective instrumentality of world politics because it is suicidal, we are obliged and privileged to wage this struggle for the kind of world we want with the weapons of effective diplomacy.

To wage this struggle, we must have men and women, hundreds of them, who know and understand the history, the language, the culture, the religions, the politics, the economics, the resources, the hopes, the ambitions and the aspirations of every people on earth, from the smallest to the largest, from the poorest to the richest. * * *

Thus staffed, our State Department should be infinitely more able to communicate and elucidate our foreign policy to us citizens and to enlist our informed and discriminating support. It should be in better position also to develop well-conceived strategy for conducting our foreign policy and waging the aforementioned struggle throughout the world. This would lend genuine continuity and stability, as distinguished from rigidity or inflexibility, to our foreign policy, would strengthen the President in the discharge of this major constitutional responsibility, and would make meaningful the much talked of nonpartisan aspect of our role in world affairs.

Your suggestion of a school of diplomacy of the highest caliber, good enough to attract our best young minds and personalities, and staffed with the finest faculty we can muster, is in my opinion the best answer to this great problem. There must also be just rewards in the compensation we pay and in the respect we accord such able public servants.

If the battlefield is indeed shifting to the conference room, we need strategists, technicians, and advocates in world politics as much or more than military brains, strength and prowess.

Someone will surely ask about the cost. But the cost, like the cost of remaining militarily strong, doesn't really matter, because failure in this international ideological struggle will mean the ultimate death of our free society.

For the foregoing reasons, I applaud your past efforts in this vital area. I hope your labors will soon be crowned with success and before it is too late.

RALPH SHUMACKER.

In Defense of a Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, next to the high honor I enjoy as a Member of Congress there is that which accrues to me by reason of some 17 years as a member of the American Legion's National Publications Commission. This group is charged with the responsibility of managing the American Legion magazine, the organization's nationwide publication, and it is because of that association that I have particular pride in an article appearing in our current issue entitled, "Why Can't Some of Our Universities Be Fair to the U.S. Congress?"

This splendid article rather effectively answers the criticism leveled at the loyalty oath required under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and is from the pen of Managing Editor Robert B. Pitkin, a distinguished journalist and a personal friend of mine. Incidentally, in addition to his personal qualifications for the task of answering Congress' collegiate critics, it would seem pertinent to point out that Mr. Pitkin is the son of Dr. Walter B. Pitkin, a former distinguished professor of journalism at Columbia University and one of America's best known authors.

In answering criticism by the president of Yale of the action of Congress in this instance Mr. Pitkin identifies the charges as "complaints" Nos. 1, 2, and 3 and replies to them in order.

Complaint No. 1 that Congress has singled out college students for "distrust" above all other Federal beneficiaries is answered by pointing out that this is a defense program and that on the assumption that the student may someday be handling defense secrets we have a right to be sure of his loyalty.

Complaint No. 2 that loyalty oaths will not make a person loyal is answered by reminding the complainants that first it will prevent subsidizing someone who is unable or unwilling to pledge loyalty to the United States; and second it will provide the Government with an instrument for proceeding against perjurers.

Complaint No. 3 that loyalty oaths lead to political and religious oaths Mr. Pitkin dismisses as completely irrelevent and unsupported by any previous action taken by the Congress in this field. And then Mr. Pitkin suggests to the president of Yale that he might look into some of the secret oaths exacted on his own campus by college-sanctioned fraternities.

To sum up, Bob Pitkin has done an admirable job in pinpointing the inaccuracies and fallacies in the charges leveled at the so-called loyalty oath and in addition he has supported Congress in the discharge of its sworn duty as has no other writer in my recolection. The American Legion magazine article in full was made a part of the extension of remarks of the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., on February 1 and is recommended to the careful perusal of every

citizen who believes that the protection of our Government from enemies both foreign and domestic is a paramount responsibility of every American.

Freight Car Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on behalf of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, before the special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of Senate bills 1789, 1811 and 1812, on June 8 and 9, 1959.

This is a copy of the statement which appeared in the hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Freight Car Shortage of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and is contained in the freight car supply report issued by that committee at the conclusion of its hearings.

I should like to point out at this time that, so far as freight car shortages are concerned, we in the West suffer under an undue handicap. I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be aware of that fact, because the railroad cars which have been allocated to Western railroads have too often been found piled up in the eastern part of the country for use on a rental basis, it is true, but a very low rental basis, to keep the industries of the East going. So we ask a fair share in the use of railroad cars, and we hope that our plea, which we make year after year, will be heeded this time, and that we shall not be confronted next fall with further shortages.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF S. 1789, S. 1811, AND S. 1812, JUNE 8 AND 9, 1959

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners is a voluntary organization embracing within its membership the members of the railroad and public utility regulatory commissions and boards of the several States of the United States. The Federal regulatory commissions, the ICC, the FCC, the FPC, the SEC, and the CAB are also members of the association but on matters of legislation the association does not presume or attempt to speak for these Federal agencies. My appearance is on behalf of the State commission members of the association.

At a regular meeting of the executive committee of the association held in Washington, D.C., on February 28, 1957, the following resolution was duly adopted:

"RESOLUTION RELATING TO S. 942 AND H.R. 3626, 85TH CONGRESS

"Whereas there has been introduced in the 85th Congress legislation to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency or threatened emergency by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to promote the expeditious movement, distribution, and interchange or return of freight cars: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Executive Committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners hereby records its support of the objectives of such legislation; and

"*Resolved further*, That the legal representatives of the association are hereby authorized to present the views of the association to the appropriate committees of the Congress on such legislation or any similar bills designed to accomplish the same objective; namely, to help alleviate shortages of railroad freight cars."

One of the most vexing, costly, and serious problems in railroad transportation today is the problem of inadequate freight-car supply. The size of the Nation's railroad freight-car fleet has been steadily decreasing over the years. The problem has become one of such serious proportions, that the NARUC in 1955 established a special committee to study the matter. The committee, since that time, has been actively engaged in its study, directed toward accomplishing two objectives: (1) An increase in the Nation's freight-car supply through the building of new and additional cars, and (2) the maximum utilization of the existing car supply.

In line with these efforts, the committee recommended and the executive committee of the NARUC endorsed the enactment of so-called per diem legislation in the 85th Congress. Similar bills, S. 1789, S. 1811, and S. 1812, have been introduced in this Congress. S. 1789 and S. 1811 would empower the ICC in fixing per diem rates to consider factors such as level of freight-car ownership and the value of the use of the car. Such an approach serves more directly as a stimulus to the building of new and additional cars. S. 1812 would empower the ICC, during periods of shortage or threatening shortage, to fix charges in addition to existing per diem charges aimed to promote the maximum utilization of equipment.

Each of these bills is aimed at the same objective; namely, to help alleviate shortages of railroad freight cars, and this objective is heartily endorsed by the NARUC.

While such an endorsement is a serious step, it appears to be a reasonable and necessary one in light of the adverse economic impact resulting from the periodic crises in freight-car supply. The inability of shippers to secure freight cars results in reduced production and payrolls, increased inventories causing greater costs and postponed or canceled expansion programs. While this total loss cannot be fully determined, it does nevertheless clearly emphasize the serious and stifling effect that the freight-car shortage has on the economy in some areas of the United States. The areas most distressed are in those States economically concerned with the transportation facilities available for grain, cotton, lumber, and coal shipments, and the shipment of commodities requiring refrigeration cars.

Furthermore, and perhaps paramount, is the question of what would happen to our defense effort in the event of another full-scale war emergency if the Nation's railroads cannot expeditiously handle the commercial traffic now offered them.

Accordingly, it is deemed appropriate to take all reasonable steps directed toward the acquisition of an adequate freight-car supply and toward maximum utilization of our Nation's existing freight-car supply. In the opinion of the State regulatory commissions, the enactment of such legislation as is before this special committee at this time will contribute to that end. The NARUC, therefore, favors the enactment of this legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

AUSTIN L. ROBERTS, Jr.,
General Solicitor, NARUC.

Automation Object Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 30, 1960, entitled "Automation Object Lesson."

The Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., one of the giant industrial enterprises of my district and the surrounding area, has made manifest the kind of cooperation which is needed between management and labor as progressive steps are taken to improve services to the consumer.

Consolidated Edison is to be congratulated on the intelligent attitude with which it operates and labor is to be commended for the fine spirit of rapport it has shown.

The article follows:

AUTOMATION OBJECT LESSON

The visit of 30 New York union leaders to the Consolidated Edison atomic generating plant, now being built up the Hudson, calls attention to a story of automation that everyone should know—especially leaders of management and labor.

The new plant is one more sweeping technological improvement of the many which Consolidated Edison has put into effect during the past two decades. As a result of these the company is now turning out about three times as much current as in the late thirties with only about half as many employees. Even more miraculous, this has been done without discharging any workers on account of technological advances. And, far from resisting the changes, the AFL–CIO Utility Workers Union, Local 1–2, which represents the employees, has cooperated in carrying them out.

All this has come through the company's basic policy of what might be called natural employment attrition. None of the places of those workers who died, or who left the company because of retirement, ill health, or other causes, has been filled as the years went by. And, whenever possible, the workers who remained were upgraded—trained by the company to take the more skilled positions demanded by the increasingly complex mechanisms of generation and control. Then, too, the company has followed a consistent policy of discussion with the union leaders about each step in the march of automation, before it has been taken. The same sort of union-management cooperation has been used in the working out of safety arrangements.

The payoff of these policies has been impressive. With the great increase in the

company's production per worker hour have come constantly higher wages for its employees—average weekly earnings of $116.35 last year, compared with $32.10 in 1930. And there has been no impairment, but rather improvement, in the dividends paid since 1942. Also the mutual respect of management and union that grew with consultation has been a major factor in the company's remarkable record of uninterrupted production. The Con Edison story is an object lesson needed by both management and labor in these strike-bedeviled years.

The Federal Elections Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, editorial approval of the Senate version of the Federal Elections Act of 1960, better known, perhaps as the clean elections bill, has been heart warming to those of us who have spent years fighting for revision of our election laws. The Nation's newspapers have consistently supported the cause of clean elections over the years it has been, in one form or another, before the Congress. Newspaper editorials—many published prior to Senate passage of the bill; others printed even before the Senate voted on amendments—should, I feel, be made available to my colleagues. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Louisville Times and the Wheeling News-Register be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

TOWARD A BETTER ELECTION LAW

From the time of their birth, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939 have been criticized as inadequate to the task of assuring clean elections. But for a variety of reasons, Congress had done little or nothing in the intervening years to strengthen them.

For several years Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, a Missouri Democrat, has been a leader in this frustrating fight. He is leading it again this year, and he has been surprisingly successful in the early skirmishing. That is no proof he will win the battle, but at least it permits some qualified optimism.

As reported out by the Senate Rules Committee, a bill now being debated would require more detailed reporting of campaign financing and would raise the legal spending limits which are now at completely unrealistic levels. Senator HENNINGS, however, has several amendments he wants tacked on to that measure.

One of these would make the bill apply to primaries as well as general elections. Another would cover campaign committees operating only within a single State (in its present form the bill applies only to committees working in more than one State). Still another would put an overall limit on the political contributions an individual could make.

HENNING's first success—and it was a notable one—came Tuesday when the Senate voted to accept the amendment making State primaries subject to spending limits and financial reporting. Obviously this is needed, for in some States, especially in the one-party South, the primaries are in effect the final election.

The familiar conservative southern Democrat-northern Republican coalition took one of its rather infrequent beatings in the rollcall. Thirty-four Democrats and 16 Republicans voted for the amendment; 21 Democrats, mostly from the South, and 18 Republicans voted against it. We are gratified that both of Kentucky's Senators, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and THRUSTON MORTON, voted for the admendment, as did VANCE HARTKE of Indiana. Senator CAPEHART of Indiana voted against it.

As we have said, this early success does not assure final victory, either for this one amendment or for the bill as a whole. The fact that the two party leaders, Senator JOHNSON of Texas and Senator DIRKSEN of Illinois, voted against the amendment indicates that stiff fighting remains. Still, a good start has been made and we hope that the good fight continues.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Jan. 18, 1960]

CAMPAIGN DOLLARS

Assuming the necessity and efficacy of congressional limits on campaign spending where Federal offices are involved, extension of the law to primaries and nominating conventions, as proposed in a bill introduced under the bipartisan sponsorship of Senators THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, and KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, would appear to have logic on its side. It is logical, too, in that it would enlarge the spending limits in the Corrupt Practices Act and tighten up reporting provisions.

This newspaper never has had much faith in the effectiveness of campaign spending limits, and is disposed to feel that it is the use made of campaign money rather than the amount of it that should be a matter of public concern. Inasmuch, however, as the principle has been accepted, we can see no good reason for exempting nominations, which are part of the election process, or for refusal to provide additional safeguards intended to produce more effective compliance. It is to be suspected that those who complain that the proposed extension would constitute an "invasion of the proper function of the States" are more concerned about preserving control of nominating machinery than assuring the honesty of elections.

A Bill To Strengthen Penalties for Sending Obscene Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill already introduced by Mrs. GRANAHAN, which strengthens the penalties for sending obscene literature through the mails.

It has been estimated that these smut salesmen, as they have been called, do a $500 million business a year. This can only mean that our present laws are not strong enough to deter them from these immoral activities.

I feel that we must make the penalties so severe that this business will simply not be worthwhile.

No one knows how much juvenile delinquency might be prevented if this literature were not readily available to every youngster. We do know that there is a definite link between obscenity and sex crimes, and that obscene matter contributes to the general corruption of youthful morals.

Congress has a responsibility to see to it that this source of corruption is discouraged. I think that one way in which this can be accomplished is to raise the maximum and minimum penalties, as this bill does, and to make prison terms mandatory even for first offenders.

The American Farm School in Greece: Splendid Americans in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my particular pleasure yesterday to welcome Bruce M. Lansdale, director of the American Farm School in Thessaloniki, Greece, who is visiting this country to report on the activities of the school. Mr. Lansdale, formerly of Rochester, N.Y., is the son of the former general secretary of the YMCA in Rochester, Mr. Herbert P. Lansdale. The senior Mr. Lansdale is now general secretary of the national council of the YMCA.

I have followed with interest the great variety of activities in which the school is engaged to serve the best interest both of the people of Greece and of the United States. It is an outstanding example of practical technical assistance which is helping people at the grassroots level to improve their way of life. The school is thus strengthening the bonds of friendship between America and Greece and is winning friends for our country all over the world.

The American Farm School, which was founded in 1904, operates a multipurpose program of agricultural and technical training leadership for the villages of Greece. The growth of the school over the past 50 years has been phenomenal. From one mud brick house on 50 acres of land it has grown to a modern productive institution with 50 buildings on 375 acres of land providing a guiding light to rural people of Greece. In addition to a 4-year course for 200 boys, the school operates a short course program for a thousand adults each year, a community development program for training existing leadership, a model demon-

stration center, and a livestock distribution program.

The school has received recognition from both the Greek and American Governments through special help to provide scholarships for students who come from villages all over the country.

I think it is particularly significant that visitors from so many underdeveloped countries of the world have come to study the school's methods to determine its application in their own countries. They thus seek to utilize the unique methods of this school in helping their people to solve their own problems.

One of the most interesting elements in the school's effort is that two-thirds of its income is raised in Greece through the work of the staff and the students and the sale of the products of the farm and its shops. The other third is made possible by the generous support of interested Americans.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to salute Director Lansdale and his associates for their splendid example of American friendship and assistance in action. The American Farm School typifies many of this Nation's best features and is therefore doing much to improve our world standing. It is my hope that thoughtful Americans will continue their strong support for this fine and vital activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the pamphlet recently issued by the American Farm School.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DREAM REALIZED

In 1902, Dr. John Henry House, a 60-year-old American who had devoted 30 years of service to the people of the Balkans, realized his most cherished dream. He borrowed $500 and purchased 50 acres of land a few miles outside Salonica and started a school to give rural boys agricultural and industrial training under Christian leadership. He built a two-room adobe cottage where the first orphan boys lived and learned. He had no money and no sources of support, but he had faith and a vision and was able to make it come true.

THE FIRE

In 1906 he started construction on the main school building which took him and his boys 10 years to finish. Each new contribution meant a few more bricks and mortar until it was finally completed in 1916. But in the fall of that year, a spark from a charcoal heating bucket set fire to the roof and in a few short hours 10 years of work were burned to the ground. But despite his years, Dr. House did not give up. With help from local sources and from his son, Charles, who came over to help him and later succeeded him, he was able to rebuild his school and a great deal more.

THE PERIOD OF GROWTH

Over the next 23 years the school grew in enrollment and size in its service to the villages of Greece. By the time the war came and the founder's son and his wife were interned in Germany, there were nearly 150 students and over 15 major structures. The land had been increased to 300 acres and the school had established itself as a vital institution in the minds of the Greek people.

THE BOMB

But the occupation brought serious destruction to the school. Before the troops left, they set two bombs in the classroom building and blew it to bits. For a third time it had to be rebuilt, but thanks to the generosity of friends from America the school was ready to reopen by the fall of 1945.

THE KIDNAPING

Tragedy, however, did not end with the war. In January 1949, Communist guerrillas from the north crept into the school one night, kidnaped 43 boys and took them off toward the Iron Curtain. But each in his own way was able to escape and every last boy returned to the school to graduate in June.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

On May 29, 1955, the school celebrated the 50th anniversary of its incorporation. Messages of congratulation poured in from many parts of the world. King Paul and Queen Frederika attended the celebration where retiring Director Charles L. House was honored with decorations from the King and the Royal Academy of Athens and a doctor's degree from the University of Salonica in tribute to his loyal and faithful service to the people of Greece.

THE SCHOOL TODAY

Today, with over 50 buildings, 370 acres of land, 200 students in the 4-year course and over 450 in the short courses, the school is continuing its vital training program. Under Director Bruce M. Lansdale (B.S., University of Rochester; M.A., Cornell), the school is cooperating closely with the Ministry of Agriculture in the improvement of the living standards of the rural population of a country 65 percent agricultural. This striking growth and development has only been made possible through the continued support of a generous company of thoughtful Americans. Thanks to these friends the school approaches the future with confidence that it will meet successfully the challenge of increasing needs for assistance to the families of rural Greece.

Activities of the Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, with the permission of the House, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by the Asbury Park Press concerning the activities of the Port of New York Authority and I am glad to receive permission to insert another editorial by the Asbury Park Press which appeared in their newspaper of February 1, 1960, on the same subject. The arguments presented in this editorial have a great deal of logic and it is too bad that the ambitions of those in charge of the Port of New York Authority blind their minds to the realities of the situation which confronts the area covered by the scope of their activities. The Port of New York Authority should be concerned about all phases of transportation affecting the economy of New York and New Jersey and the able minds of the authority should be addressed to the solution of the grave problems facing commuters and the railroads they have to travel on.

The editorial follows:

MUDDLED THINKING STILL RULES THE PORT AUTHORITY

If railroad commuters are perplexed by the refusal of the Port of New York Authority to live up to its public obligations they have cause to become indignant over the news that the port authority plans to spend $20 million for more bus facilities in Manhattan. Moreover, the port authority believes this $20 million will accommodate all bus demands in the foreseeable future. Then it adds this crushing blow to its rapidly dwindling reputation: "Providing existing rail facilities continue to be available." How it can expect precarious rail facilities to remain available at the same time another $20 million of public credit (sold to bondholders through the use of legislative power) gives buses a greater advantage over railroads is a puzzle. But in recent days the port authority, either through arrogance or stupidity, has not been noted for clear thinking.

This newspaper recently commented on the need for a thorough investigation of port authority operations by the New Jersey Legislature. Its persistent refusal to accept responsibility for the deplorable condition of passenger rail service, though it was created to develop terminal, transportation, and other facilities of commerce, prompted the view that the time has arrived when New Jersey learns througs public inquiry whether it has created a supergovernment, immune to public opinion.

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS inserted these views in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, and commented: "The growth and power of the various authorities like the Port of New York Authority is something which should have the careful consideration of the Congress to the end that if necessary the public's rights and conveniences should be protected and the operations of the port authority should be confined to the prerogatives given to it under the law."

The port authority has many achievements to its credit but it cannot bask in the glow of these achievements while it persists in a calculated plan to favor one form of transportation over another. The authority has been severely criticized, even to the suggestion that evil forces are at work in behalf of private interests, and its latest scheme will not lessen the growing belief that the authority is endangering its usefulness.

The Sugar Industry in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there appears in today's Washington Evening Star an advertisement concerning the sugar industry in the Dominican Republic.

The spirit of cooperativeness which exists between the United States and the Dominican Republic is in sharp contrast to recent events in another sugar producing country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this advertisement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the eastern two-thirds of the Island of Hispaniola, which Columbus discovered even before he discovered America, an extremely fertile, subtropical and of almost 20,000 square miles (over three-fourths of it cultivable) already produces some million tons of sugar a year.

This proud record is no mere accident of geography * * * no fortuitous sweep of the lavish hand of nature. It is deliberate, manmade, and science-fostered.

In this island republic history reaches as far back as Western Hemisphere history goes. Its Ciudad Trujillo metropolis dates from 1496. Its traditions are rich and colorful. But here is a case where tradition, far from impeding progress, has actively encouraged it.

Here steadily expanding capacity for sugar production has not depended on mere planting of more cane from year to year.

Here the sugar is run by long-experienced business men, by agronomists who know the soil and climate as they know the palms of their hands, by engineers who harness the skills of mechanization to the growth of the soil.

Here, inevitably, sugar output has risen to match sugar opportunity—for this is the land where sugar first grew.

Here too sugar never has failed to meet its export commitments to a world that is hungry for it. It has even made up the sugar export deficits of other producing nations.

From the most powerful and the greatest consuming nation in the world the Dominican Sugar Commission asks only fair and equitable consideration for its country's leading crop—for this increasingly important source of supply in this area which is now so sensitive and responsive to world political and economic conditions.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC SUGAR COMMISSION.
CIUDAD TRUJILLO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

A Program To Combat the Expansion of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a provocative letter from one of Westchester County's outstanding builders, Alan Carnoy, who has come forward with an inspiring program to combat the expansion of communism in various areas of the world. Mr. Carnoy has already inaugurated his program in Mexico and has won the respect and cooperation of authorities in the locality where he has developed private homes at low cost for workers and retired people.

In a word, Mr. Carnoy's idea is simply to construct low-cost homes with long-term mortgages so that the purchaser can pay off his obligation as though he were paying rent. By constructing private homes in contrast to apartment buildings the purchaser is given an equity in his own property, long lasting equity in his own country, and a certain sense of pride that comes with home ownership. Experience has shown that people everywhere take pride in their own homes, care for them and improve them because they are capital assets, and in so doing they develop a sense of loyalty to their homeland.

In various parts of the world I have noted a vast program of apartment building where people are housed like pigeons and where there is no sense of home ownership. Such a habitat makes the residents vulnerable to the blandishments of communism. Were these same people given an opportunity to purchase their own homes they would have a sense of dedication to their country that would make them immune to subversion.

Mr. Carnoy's idea, frought as it is with wonderful possibilities, has brought him little but frustration in his contacts with our lending agencies. It is time that we in this country awakened to the need for promoting this intelligent approach to the world Communist problem, with particular reference to Mexico and South America, France and Italy. As Mr. Carnoy points out so eloquently in his letter, the number of Communists is insignificant in all literate countries where home ownership is available. Note for example the United States, Canada, the British Isles, the Scandinavian and Benelux countries, West Germany, Australia, and New Zealand. On the other hand, in countries where home ownership is discouraged communism germinates, takes root, and flourishes.

As Mr. Carnoy's representative in the Congress, I strongly urge that our lending agencies give serious thought to the beneficial results attainable by furthering his program of home ownership throughout the world.

The letter follows:

CARNOY INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CORP.,
New York, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

The Honorable EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOOLEY: After 3 years of trying to build homes abroad, I have come to the conclusion that we are sure to lose the so-called economic competition with the Soviet Union in many countries, unless the huge gap between rich and poor is reduced. Our middle class system—a characteristic of which is homeownership—has succeeded in bridging this gap with income taxes and higher wages.

But in many countries the social differences are so great that they give the Communists confidence that their system will expand. Hence, I believe that we can take an important step toward correcting this situation by demonstrating how homeownership can be made available for those in the middle income brackets.

Obviously, a few thousand new homeowners cannot be offered as a substitute for development of natural resources and creation of jobs. However, the psychological appeal of homeownership on those already employed is tremendous, putting their dreams of a better life suddenly within reach.

By purchasing a home through a small down payment, a person with income too small for savings can become a real estate property owner. Each monthly mortgage payment, instead of rent, increases the owner's equity, a source of personal satisfaction. I know from experience that a homeowner is always improving his property, for it belongs to him, is worth money, and will be inherited by his family, whereas a tenant has no interest in even maintaining, let alone improving, the property.

It is of tremendous importance that the home buyer get good value, for he must be sure of a genuine equity from his monthly payments. No restrictions should be placed on his freedom to sell, although when some governments grant really good terms they require that the mortgage be paid off before re-sale is permitted. Of course, the Soviet Union, which theoretically has homeownership, just as it theoretically has personal freedom, would have to require the buyer to resell to the State to prevent creation of capitalists.

The number of Communists is insignificant in all literate countries where home ownership is available. Such is the case in the United States, Canada, the British Isles, the Scandinavian and Benelux countries, West Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Israel, Australia and New Zealand, altogether about 12 percent of the world.

But the Communist vote for years has been enormous and continues to be where the laws do not encourage home ownership, even in highly developed and democratic countries such as wealthy France, or Italy. They are not really Communists, but mostly discontented people who vote to protest against the lack of opportunity for improving their living conditions.

To make possible the building and offering of good homes at a low price all over the world, three factors are fundamental: (1) Land; (2) Mortgages, and (3) Government encouragement. Let us look at these from a practical builder's angle:

1. Availability of land, and not at an exorbitant price: The cost of land was 15.4 percent of the total price of the average home built in the United States in 1959, according to the National Association of Home Builders of the United States. In Latin America, an improved lot usually costs more than the low-priced home which will be built on it, and prices are much higher than in North America.

This stems mainly from the tradition, encouraged by laws, that first a lot should be bought and then a house built with a contractor. This setup is excellent for landowners whose share may be more than all labor and material for the home. In any case, this system will not produce homes with good value when wages for construction workers go up.

In countries which do not have standards of valuation, real estate taxes may be unequal or insignificant, thus encouraging hoarding. In England also with a low real estate tax, land is offered for sale readily because of income tax which actually limits regular income and forces many to sell capital assets.

2. Mortgage money and appropriate mortgages: Public savings are the normal source of mortgages for low-priced homes. In most countries, the governments directly regulate the proportion of public savings for mortgages, as a rule very small and badly used.

For example, the French direct all national savings to one fund which annually allocates the amount of mortgages for each district. The mortgages are up to 70 percent of cost of construction, but as land is not taken into consideration, practically only apartments are built, and far out of the cities, where land is cheaper. If this continues, Paris, like Moscow, may be surrounded by satellite apartment cities in the future.

In Italy, there are some mortgages on 50 percent of the combined value of land and house, a proportion clearly insufficient for the middle class. The government, meanwhile, finances big apartment projects.

In underdeveloped countries, a mortgage banker who takes in public savings will prefer to finance expensive homes for more security.

Savings appear as a natural human instinct in every country not facing currency devaluation. Homes available for a small downpayment are the greatest incentive for more savings. Unlike the nonreturnable investment in public housing or any long-term general development expense, payments on home mortgages are started 30 days after the loan is made.

The higher the mortgage and the longer the term, the more people can buy homes. In most countries right now, 20-year mortgages for 80 percent of the price would be sufficient for many years before satisfying the demand. The interest should be about 2 percent higher than interest paid on savings by mortgage institutions. Any commission or premiums should be prohibited, as these immediately add to the price, which must be kept at the lowest possible figure.

3. Government encouragement through proper laws and taxation: In many countries, taxes and regulations make home ownership very difficult for the middle class.

The tax on change of ownership may exceed 10 percent of the price which adds a very tough cash requirement to purchase of a home. The tax on volume of business raises the price by the amount of the tax. Other indirect taxes such as stamps and special privileges, as of notary publics, not only add to costs, but take time.

Government regulations with respect to technical routine of land subdivision, mortgages, and construction can actually make it impossible to build a home project. As an example, a building permit for a one-family home in the State of New York must be issued within 3 days or refused for a valid reason. To get the same permit in France within 3 months is an achievement, although France has centuries-old traditions of social organizations and cultural leadership.

Our problem, I believe, is to find a practical way, acceptable to other countries, of demonstrating how homeownership can be made available to the middle class. In my opinion this could be done effectively and quickly by using U.S. loans to build model home colonies in the suburbs of the capitals of countries in which we are interested. Such loans should be channeled through local mortgage-savings institutions, with land improvements, home construction, and form of sales handled according to local laws. Changes in the laws could be requested as they become necessary. From practical experience, I know that they will be granted.

In my negotiations with U.S. international lending institutions, I found that our official stand is that housing abroad is such a tremendous problem that it would cost us untold billions, and that therefore the United States should stay away from it.

Such an attitude may help to explain the answer I received from a minor Latin American official when I asked him what he thought of our U.S. Ambassador. "Very charming man," he answered. And what did he think of the Soviet Ambassador? "That's different," the official replied, "he understands our problems."

The Communists have an answer to the housing problem: The government builds. Naturally, the more the government is in business, the more it wants to take over, to produce better and cheaper, thus advancing the economy toward the Communist goal of total control, along with enslavement of the individual.

We, on the other hand, can offer a solution of a free people to the housing problem all over the world: Pay like rent, but own. The obvious mistake is to think about the millions of units needed for poor workers all over the world. Such units as are built are very much disliked by the worker, who does not want to stay poor, nor to be treated as such. So instead of millions of units let us start with thousands of real homes, for which the workers will know that they will also eventually qualify as owners.

No additional burden would have to be assumed by the American taxpayer for carrying out such a program. The Cooley amendment to Public Law 480 (commodity sales) provides that 25 percent of the proceeds of agricultural surplus sales abroad may be loaned, with local government approval, to local American companies.

These loans are now granted mostly to affiliates of the largest American companies, who do create jobs and teach American methods. They are undoubtedly helping the local economy and at the same time creating a certain amount of good will for the United States. The latter is diluted, however, by the fact that many of the products of this and other industrialization measures, especially in the smaller countries, are put on the market at prices which most local residents cannot afford.

Such loans, I feel, could be granted also to small American homebuilders who, with local partners, would demonstrate the American way of homeownership. These loans to builders, in my opinion, would go hand in hand with industrial loans in achieving our basic aims, because homebuilding in those countries is done primarily by hand, using local materials, thus creating more employment per dollar than any other type of investment. This is certainly another of many valid reasons for directing savings in a balanced proportion to home mortgages, not as substitutes for industrial loans but complementary to them.

I can assure you, my dear Congressman, that such a policy, even on a small scale, will make people in other countries say that we understand their problems and that we are willing to help them. On a larger scale, homeownership can defeat communism.

With many thanks for your help in Washington during the past 3 years, and with bes wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALAN CARNOY.

Soviet Attempts To Infiltrate Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Edward Crankshaw, the distinguished British expert on Soviet affairs, has written an article on the increasing Soviet attempts to infiltrate Africa. I hope that the article, which was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, will receive the thoughtful attention of our State Department. I should particularly like to underline the lead paragraph:

It looks like 1960 will be the Soviet Union's African year. A whole galaxy of Soviet leaders and functionaries has lately been shedding its light on all sorts of corners of the Dark Continent, and many more Russian visitations are expected.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this article will help us to awaken to the need to more fully identify ourselves with the needs and aspirations of the emerging peoples of Africa.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crankshaw's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET VISITORS PAVE WAY FOR MOVES INTO AFRICA—GALAXY LIGHTS DARK CONTINENT

(By Edward Crankshaw)

LONDON.—It looks like 1960 will be the Soviet Union's African year. A whole galaxy of Soviet leaders and functionaries has lately been shedding its light on all sorts of corners of the dark continent and many more Russian visitations are expected.

The delegation attending the independence celebrations in the Cameroons was headed by M. M. Firyubin, husband of the redoubtable Madame Furtseva, former Soviet Ambassador to Belgrade and now a Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs who accompanied Marshal Voroshilov on his trip to India.

Firyubin's entourage included official representatives of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Republics, as though to establish a precedent of offcenter dealings with new states.

INAUGURATION CELEBRATED

To Monrovia, to celebrate the inauguration of the Liberian President's fourth term, went an even more imposing tributary: the young and powerful Uzbek member of the Central Committee Presidium and Secretariat, N. A. Mukhitdinov. He worked very hard, seizing the opportunity to have talks with other African leaders.

He met the President of Guinea, Sekou Toure, only lately returned from his own grand tour of the Soviet Union. He met also the Deputy Prime Minister of Ghana and the Prime Minister of Togoland, who took the opportunity to invite a Soviet delegation to attend the ceremonies planned to mark Togoland's own independence later this year.

Finally, the Soviet Union has just sent a new Ambassador to Guinea, who turns out to be none other than Daniel Sollod, Moscow's Middle Eastern ball of fire. After a very successful time in Syria, Sollod went to Cairo, where he had a great deal to do with the events leading up to Suez. Until the other day he was head of the Middle Eastern Department of the Soviet Foreign Office. He seems rather a heavyweight for Guinea.

How much of a threat is all this? And what kind of a threat? For the time being, it does not amount to very much. The Russians are learning rather than doing. Africa is a new field for Russian interests and, obviously, a very promising one.

GREAT DEAL TO LEARN

The Russians themselves seem to have realized that they know next to nothing about Africa and that there is a very great deal to learn, particularly about the variety of Africa and its history.

There is no sign at all that they are preparing for the violent sort of activity that characterized their postwar penetration into the Far East; nor are they blundering about as they did more recently in the Middle East. They are being very cautious indeed.

The breakaway of Guinea from France offered, of course, an opportunity too good to be missed, and Moscow certainly regards the credits extended last summer as money

well invested. But even in Guinea no serious attempt is being made to spread Communist doctrine so far. This applies to the whole of Africa.

Certainly there is a school in Budapest where African leaders are being trained as Communist-minded trade unionists; but it is a very small school running very short courses. In the first 4-week course early last autumn, there were only 30 Africans from 10 African countries—mostly French-speaking territories. And the purpose of the course seems to be fairly generalized anti-colonial agitation.

In Moscow, Prof. Ivan Potekhin, perhaps the leading Soviet expert on Africa, has been appointed chairman of a new body, the Soviet Association of Friendship for the Peoples of Africa. Prof. Potekhin is rather more than an academic; he is taking it upon himself to tell African nationalists what Moscow expects of them.

It expects a certain amount of violence. Thus in the Contemporary East, an organ of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Prof. Potekhin has criticized those African nationalist leaders who think that the proper way to national freedom is through negotiation and compromise.

But with all this, there is no emphasis on communism. Moscow is offering moral support to African nationalist movements, expressed for tactical reasons in varying tones of voice, but no more.

Try a "Vimburger"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is no limit to the ingenuity of the American housewife. Mrs. Wayne F. Smith, of 1319 North Izard, Forrest City, Ark., has devoted her talents both as a cook and as a nutritionist to the development of tasty vimburgers made from soybeans and rice.

Mrs. Smith, who collects health recipes, finds that soybeans ground and added to other recipes enhances both the taste and the protein value of the food. The following article from the January 28, 1960, issue of the Crowley Ridge Chronicle will be of interest to Members:

TRY A "VIMBURGER"

Milk, cheese, sandwich spread, appetizers, cooking oil, and vimburgers are now being made in Forest City from soybeans.

Offhand, this sounds as if a new industry had located here. Actually, making these products is a daily activity of Mrs. W. F. Smith, who grinds soybeans in her own mill on a kitchen table.

Mrs. Smith points out that soybean products are very nutritious and high in protein.

"They are also cheap, and 65 cents worth of soybeans will last for months," she says "Vimburgers are a substitute for meat, and are made with about two parts of brown rice and one part of soybeans. Both of these are ground, seasoned, and then cooked in a pressure cooker."

Mrs. Smith says that she often uses these vimburgers for breakfast as a substitute for sausage.

She also grinds her own corn for cornbread, and keeps corn in the shuck on hand. It is much healthier than the meal bought in stores, she says.

The soybean flour is always used with meal, or wheat flour. Since she has been using so many soybeans and other health foods, Mrs. Smith says that she has felt much better. You'd be surprised how much proper nutrition, with plenty of protein helps.

People who have suffered with gall bladder attacks, ulcers, and even heart trouble have had no reoccurrence of their trouble when they eat health foods, she said.

A mock oyster stew is one of her favorite foods. This is made by taking all of the starch out of flour. "After the flour is soaked and washed in cold water, the starch is taken out and the gray mass that is left is gluten. This may be ground and from it, oyster stew, or even substitute roasts made."

One of Mrs. Smith's hobbies is the collection of health recipes.

The home grinding carries over into a shampoo, which she makes with a mixture of ivory snow, mineral oil, lemon juice, and water.

Mrs. Smith was reared north of Forrest City, had lived for a number of years in Chicago, before returning here.

For an appetizing breakfast, why not try this protein-packed soybean-rice meat substitute as sausage. They will tickle your palate and be good for your health.

Aid to Africa and Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the forthcoming meeting of eight capital exporting countries in Washington late in March, to discuss national and international efforts at coordinating investment in Africa, and other emerging nations of the world, as reported in the New York Times, February 2, 1960, by Dana Adams Schmidt. The same dispatch includes a recapitulation of economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas by France, Belgium, Portugal, Israel, West Germany, and other countries. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Schmidt's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICAN AID LOAD SEEN AS EUROPE'S—UNITED STATES TO TAKE MINOR ROLE BUT PLANS TO INCREASE HELP TO LANDS BELOW SAHARA

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—The United States expects Europe to carry the main burden of assisting the economic development of newly independent African nations, U.S. officials said today.

The State Department expects, however, to ask Congress this spring to increase the programs of technical assistance for the countries south of the Sahara. They now amount to about $15 million a year.

Education and training are the pressing needs of all the African countries except the Union of South Africa, according to State Department studies.

Yet the Department hopes to avoid large programs of U.S. grants and loans for capital investment in this part of the world.

While the Development Loan Fund has made loans of $20 million for projects in Ethiopia, Somalia, and Liberia, and the Export-Import Bank is willing to consider loans to African borrowers, the State Department expects the big investments to continue to be made by European countries and by international institutions.

MUCH AID NOW PROVIDED

The French Government has reported that it is putting $600 million a year into grants and loans to its African territories, excluding Algeria. The British figure for all forms of aid to African territories is $180 million.

The Belgian Government planned to spend $75 million in the Belgian Congo this year on economic development, balancing the budget, and health and scientific research. Belgian sources in Washington expect this program to continue even though the Congo will become independent June 30.

Portugal has reported spending $40 million to $50 million per year on such programs, and Italy between $6 million and $7 million.

Israel has begun to play a small but important part in West Africa where her investors, contractors, and technicians are sometimes favored over the representatives of larger and more powerful nations.

West Germany, with a $20 million technical assistance program, is also beginning to play a role.

WORLD BANK BIG INVESTOR

The big international investor in Africa's future is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which has lent $530 million to countries south of the Sahara and $100 million to countries in north Africa.

The six nations of the European Common Market have set up a $300 million fund to back African development.

An effort to coordinate all national and international investment in Africa and other under-developed areas will be made by a meeting of eight capital exporting countries due to meet here late this month in March. The meeting is sponsored by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

One of the main objectives of the meeting will be to devise means of dealing with Soviet penetration.

In Africa south of the Sahara this has taken the form of credits of $35 million to Guinea and $100 million to Ethiopia.

Guinea has agreed in principle to receive French economic aid again and the United States has begun negotiations for an aid agreement.

Today's Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the magazine U.S. News & World Report, in its issue dated February 8, 1960, has published an unusual but factual appraisal of today's farm problem. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and a lifelong operating farmer, I can testify to the many frustrations with which the modern farmer is faced, in staying in step with new developments

and financing new equipment and facilities. Some legislation that was passed to help the farmer has over the years been of questionable benefit to the small wheat farmer, particularly. I must say, I have not given up hope for legislative relief in 1960, but the outlook is not bright. The complexion of the Congress is the same as last year, but it would be my desire to lay aside political differences on this important matter.

The disagreements among the major farm organizations over a basic approach, I believe, have been tempered to a small degree. Among our farm population itself, I believe, there is recognition that a further buildup of surpluses must be stopped. Under the circumstances so clearly set out in this article, it is difficult to see how the farmer could cut his production and stay in business without an increase in price.

Mr. Speaker, the magazine article I ask to include here contains some basic truths about the situation in farming today, and I commend it to the House of Representatives:

WHERE MODERN EFFICIENCY DOESN'T PAY OFF

Farmers once again are caught in a squeeze between rising costs and declining income. The squeeze is expected to grow tighter as pay raises for city workers, sparked by the raise in steel, are passed on to farmers in the form of higher prices on the things they buy.

What the farmer sees when he looks at the facts is shown by the accompanying chart. He sees, for one thing, that efficiency hasn't paid off for him.

The American farmer, on the average, has increased his efficiency by 65 percent in the past 10 years. He has done this by investing his own money, or borrowed money, in new machinery and improved methods. This improved efficiency has been accompanied by a drop of 7 percent in farm prices.

By contrast, the city worker in offices and factory has had raises far greater than his increase in efficiency. While efficiency in offices and factories has gone up by 21 percent in the past 10 years, pay has risen by 58 percent. The increase in efficiency by city workers was due largely to investment by employers in new equipment and methods.

BARGAIN FOOD? NO

Consumers, however, have not enjoyed lower food prices as a result of declining farm prices.

The food from U.S. farms that goes into the market basket of the average housewife now returns the farmer 12 percent less than it did 10 years ago. The housewife, however, has to pay 9 percent more than she paid 10 years ago. Increases in middleman costs have more than offset the farmer's loss.

Farmers, as a result, get a smaller percentage of the consumer's food dollar than at any time since 1939.

Another comparison watched by the farmer is the parity ratio, official measure of his buying power. It has dropped nearly 20 percent since 1950, to the lowest point since 1940. In simple terms, this means that a bushel of corn, a bale of cotton, a slaughter hog will buy less than 10 years ago.

All this has put the farmer on a treadmill. He has increased efficiency, enlarged his farm, sold more products. But his income for a year's work remained virtually the same in 1959 as in 1950—about $2,500 for the average U.S. farm. Those dollars, today, are worth 18 percent less than in 1950.

That is today's farm problem as seen by farmers.

The Van Buren Award to Mrs. Olga Weber, of Louisville, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have recently learned that Mrs. Olga Weber, of Louisville, Ohio, is the first individual not in the service of the Federal Government to become the recipient of the Van Buren Memorial Award, presented by the Defenders of the American Constitution.

I am pleased to join with her many friends in extending sincere congratulations upon the occasion of her being the recipient of this significant document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this Van Buren Memorial Award be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the award was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1959.

The Defenders of the American Constitution take pleasure in presenting their award for the American citizen, not a member of the Federal Government, who has done the most during the year 1959 and before, to promote love, respect, and knowledge of the American Constitution among his or her fellow citizens, to Mrs. Olga T. Weber, of Louisville, Ohio, citing the following achievements:

Displaying extraordinary courage, persistence, and energy in her unselfish, patriotic endeavor to keep alive in the minds and hearts of her fellow citizens the proper reverence for the American Constitution, which is the spirit of the Republic and our shield against tyranny, Mrs. Weber contributed books and patriotic literature to schools and the general public. She persuaded Gov. FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, to proclaim September 17 as Constitution Day in that State. Through Congressman Bow, of Ohio, she introduced in Congress a resolution to declare this date a legal holiday, and caused a resolution to be passed by the Congress and signed by President Eisenhower observing September 17-23 as Constitution Week. She obtained from the town council a resolution making Louisville, Ohio, "Constitution Town," and followed this up with highway markers obtained through the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Commission reading: "Louisville, Constitution Town, originator of Ohio's annual Constitution Day, September 17." Finally, she has brought about in Louisville a great celebration on September 17, Constitution Day, with parade, speeches by prominent people in the public square, and Constitution quizzes in the schools.

Undaunted by the indifference and sometimes the hostility of some citizens and officials, Mrs. Weber carries on her campaign. By her conduct she has rendered great and lasting service to the United States of America, and set an example of patriotism which, in these dangerous and precarious times, is invaluable. The Defenders of the American Constitution doff their hats to a great American who ranks with the Founding Fathers in preserving the Constitution which was their legacy to Americans of today.

P. A. DEL VALLE,
President, Lieutenant General U.S.M.C. (Retired).

Achieving a Peaceful and Prosperous World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, truly one of the major challenges facing us today is that presented by the underdeveloped areas of the world. As more and more nations emerge into independence, the ideological contest for these uncommitted peoples will become ever more intense.

In a recent address before the 64th Congress of American Industry in New York, Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of International Business Machines Corp., forcefully outlined the nature of this challenge and underscored the urgency of vigorous U.S. action to meet accelerated Communist programs. Mr. Watson's remarks are particularly significant in view of his capacity as one of our Nation's prominent leaders in the business community.

Believing that it will be of wide interest, I ask that his address entitled "Achieving a Peaceful and Prosperous World," reprinted in the January 1 issue of Vital Speeches of the Day, be included at this point in the RECORD:

ACHIEVING A PEACEFUL AND PROSPEROUS WORLD—IT WILL TAKE SACRIFICES, COURAGE, AND HARD WORK

(By Thomas J. Watson, Jr.)

I have been assigned a very broad title today, and I shall try and cover just a small portion of it. It is, as you perhaps know—"Achieving a Peaceful and Prosperous World."

This hopeful world the subject describes depends upon our progress here at home, our progress with the industrialized nations of the world, our relationship with the Soviet Union, and our relationship with the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Obviously, there is time this morning to deal with only a fractional part of the problem. I have picked an area which I believe deserves our attention and is getting very little of it. The problem of the underdeveloped or developing areas of our world.

Before I start, may I congratulate Stanley Hope and all of the officers and directors of the N.A.M. for the magnificent planning that has gone into this very interesting conference. I'm sure that all of us will gain a great deal through our presence here.

In order to think about some of the means at our disposal for achieving a peaceful and prosperous world, it is necessary to begin by looking backward.

Since the end of World War II, we have witnessed a number of revolutionary developments—events of great historical significance.

We have seen the production of goods and services in the United States doubled and resulting benefits in the form of higher incomes and greater leisure.

We have seen the triumph of the Marshall plan, and the beginning of the common market * * * a dramatic demonstration that at long last, major countries in Western Europe are beginning to adopt the American philosophy of broad consumer markets and an economy of the working man.

We have witnessed a technological renaissance in science, in the atom, in missile development, in satellites, and space exploration, in electronics, and in chemistry.

We have seen emerge a new world balance of power, with a Soviet Union that has made formidable strides on every front: economic, social, and scientific.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, we have seen the emergence—the political birth or achievement of independence—of 22 new nations. These new nations are concentrated in the nonwesternworld. They are found in Africa and the Middle and Far East. Largely, their names are unfamiliar, their locations obscure.

In Africa: Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, and Tunisia; in the Middle East: Israel, Jordan, and the United Arab Republic; and in the Far East: Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, North and South Korea, Laos, Malaya, Pakistan, the Philippines, and North and South Vietnam.

I mention them all, for in the years to come, many of them will become tremendously important to the Western World.

These nations have a total population of about 800 million * * * one-third of the world total. They have a great deal in common * * * despite their different cultures, backgrounds, histories, political institutions, and varying stages of economic development.

They have all undergone—or are undergoing—radical changes * * * political, economic, and social. These changes are inspired by a nationalistic fervor; an almost fanatic desire to thrust off the yoke of colonialism; to free themselves from imperialism; to establish self-rule and to achieve in their own right the dignity of being free. These nations are most anxious to eliminate poverty and to secure a standard of living and a degree of security commensurate with what mid-20th century technology can provide.

It's appalling to realize while we sit in our warm comfortable America that almost a billion people have an average per capita income of about $150 per year. It seems obvious that these people are susceptible to a new governmental philosophy in the future. What that philosophy will be will depend largely on how interested we Americans become in the problem and how well we sell our ways to these people.

Therefore, I believe that one of the major keys to a peaceful and prosperous world is to be found in these underdeveloped and largely uncommitted areas of the world.

In the great ideological contest of our times—that of Western democracy and Euro-Asian communism—these uncommitted nations will play a strategic part; indeed, as they grow in power and strength, their weight may be great enough to shift again the entire world balance of power.

It is, therefore, imperative that all Americans know more about these nations and that we in the United States exert the kind of bold and imaginative leadership essential to win the large majority of these nations toward Western orientation.

In the great contest for these all-important, uncommitted nations—two major problems immediately stand out:

First, we face a serious challenge from Moscow. Economically, they are still far behind us but they are growing rapidly and they have the advantage of being able to concentrate their resources where it is politically most feasible.

To those not living in the advanced industrial nations, communism, on the surface, is easy to describe with appeal. It offers what sounds like a magic road to success. It proposes to take from the rich and give to the poor. There are concrete successes which it can point to and its salesmen never speak of its weak points. Its one-party system * * * its state-above-individual philosophy * * * its dictated policies * * * all these are left out of the sales talk.

The Soviet acknowledges—even publicizes—the reality that more than one-half of the world's populations still live on inadequate diets. Most important, it proposes to change this for the better.

Communism points with pride at its own achievements. Khrushchev has told us and the underdeveloped nations in ringing statements that:

Industrial production in the Soviet Union has increased 36 times since 1913, but only 4 times in the United States. He forgets our relatively high and his very low 1913 base.

That all Soviet citizens are literate versus 24-percent literacy before the revolution.

That last year, they graduated 94,000 engineers against our 35,000.

He tells us how successful his 7-year plan is already proving to be—how in 1959 alone they will produce more than $10 billion worth of goods more than the plan for this year calls for.

He talks boldly of radical increases in oil production, steel production, hydropower developments—and not least of all—their space and missile achievements. All this is tremendously impressive to underdeveloped nations.

Some years ago, Lord Balfour described communism as a great way of making rich men poor but a dubious way of making poor men rich. Their record of performance is to the contrary. Communism has raised the standard of living in Russia materially. Our democratic system has done much better under any comparison but attempts to prove the Soviet system an economic failure are wishful thinking.

The people from the less developed nations see what is going on. They are constantly reminded of it in glowing terms, and they cannot help but wonder whether they should not try to emulate what may appear to them to be a successful system. And, the Soviet does what it can to spark this belief. In addition to extensive propaganda warfare, the Soviet Government has put out more than $2 billion worth of capital commitments in 19 countries since 1953—supervised by more than 2,800 very enthusiastic Soviet technicians.

In the face of the startling increases in production which I have related and which are a matter of common knowledge to all of you, I would make a plea for complete realism in understanding the appeal of communism to underdeveloped and underprivileged nations. To look on Khrushchev's claims, however exaggerated, as ineffectual is merely to put one's head in the sand.

I was stationed in the Soviet Union during World War II and went back to Moscow this summer for a short visit. The enthusiasm of the average Russian for his system and what it has produced is amazing. They are proud and they believe solidly in what they are doing.

I'm sure when they go abroad as technicians assigned to an underdeveloped area, their pride and enthusiasm make them very effective salesmen for communism.

The second major problem we face is internal and perhaps it is more important than the external problem, which is largely Russian.

Specifically speaking, it's the apathy which has crept across our whole land. Our system has produced so much for us that it has an ominous tendency to soften us as a people. We are apathetic about our Government, our defense posture, inflation, and many other things.

Today I will address myself to our apathy about things international. Internationally, we've had our way for so long that perhaps we conclude we can continue to win on international issues without real knowledge and effort.

We are an acknowledged world leader but we can't run on our reputation. We've got problems abroad as close as Cuba, Panama, and South America. The sooner we reccgnize these problems as serious * * * and the sooner many of us get interested in them, the sooner they will begin to be solved.

Our apathy, internationally, is based on lack of knowledge. We are the world's largest international investors and traders. If we lose our position in world markets, we lose more than anyone else. Yet, we don't seem to realize it. World markets are vital to our whole economic machine. A substantial loss in these markets will mean a lessened prosperity here at home. The philosophy of isolation isn't compatible with our modern United States, even just on an economic basis.

Those are the two sharp facets of the problem. Soviet realism and salesmanship sparked by great enthusiasm * * * and America's vastly superior economy and political system with an apathetic American public.

Of course, there are a number of things to be done. Many are already started and I detect a stirring in the United States which I suspect is a change in our national attitudes.

It's imperative that we understand our need for friends and allies abroad. We simply can't exist without them.

One of the very important ways of winning allies is through our mutual security program—Foreign Aid. This is a program which has always had bipartisan support. President Truman and President Eisenhower both have strongly supported the program. Yet, it is always debated and pared in Congress.

For the fiscal year 1960, Congress was asked to appropriate $3.9 billion for the mutual security program * * * much of it for underdeveloped nations. It was emphasized that this was the minimum figure necessary to accomplish our objectives. The final appropriation was $700 million short * * * almost 20 percent less than was requested.

While we cut our appropriations, the Communists increase theirs. By concentrating their expenditures in selected countries, they are getting more mileage per ruble spent. Currently, they are spending considerably more than we are in Indonesia, in the United Arab Republic, in Yugoslavia, in Afghanistan, in Ceylon, in Iraq, and in Ethiopia * * * all countries important to us.

We must realize that the Communists are fully committed to the contest for the underdeveloped nations, while at times it appears that we haven't really decided whether we are competing or not.

There are many critics of the whole foreign aid idea. We should ask ourselves why we initiated our aid program with the Marshall plan and why we have initiated all other aid programs abroad * * * ask ourselves the basic reason for the expenditure of every American penny abroad. Of course, it has been our enlightened self-interest. For this reason, requests for appreciation from foreigners and requests for publicity in foreign papers as to how much we have done for their nation are really ridiculous.

The Marshall plan money was spent abroad to prevent the entire European Continent from becoming Communist satellites * * * and I think that there are few in this room that would deny its success.

Our military and economic aid abroad since that time has all been for this very same reason.

Foreign aid is aimed at building up the economies of our allies and friends throughout the world. Developing nations need capital just as we needed foreign capital

here at home to aid in developing our own economy years ago.

Foreign aid must one day cease, even in underdeveloped areas. It must be supplanted by a trade program of major proportions and on a two-way basis. The Soviet is most active in making trade agreements, supplemented by long-term credits to these nations * * * and we must compete and win in this area.

These nations are capital shortage nations. They can raise capital by trading abroad, by importing capital, by encouraging private investment. We should aid them * * * by lowering tariffs, investing abroad and sharing our great stockpile of know-how with them.

We must strengthen and improve our posture of leadership throughout the world. We must elect Government leaders who understand that partisan politics at home must be balanced by effective international leadership.

Finally, to reach the goals which we set for ourselves, we must realize that some sacrifice is necessary. We can't do all of the things necessary for the United States to do—in this country and abroad—and still proceed on the "business as usual" basis. Additional expenses should be balanced by additional taxes or a commensurate reduction in existing Governmental expense. We want to spend everything that is necessary for all of the programs to strengthen America * * * we want a balanced budget * * * and we want the same or lowered taxes. These three are incompatible. One of our first sacrifices must be a willingness to accept higher taxes, if necessary, in order to accomplish our purpose of keeping America ahead of the world on all counts. There are no easy solutions.

The future can be as bright or as dark as we choose to make it.

The choice of how America goes in the years ahead is squarely up to us. We can't lay the responsibility on our Government, our President, or our military leaders * * * for in the end, we are the policymakers.

The decision that we will make the sacrifices necessary for victory is a difficult one to reach. Our Government can reach it only if it is backed and led by a majority of people who clearly support its decision.

This country is a shining goal for nearly all the people on earth whether they admit it or not. The fact that nearly all Americans have a chance for success and that many or most do in fact succeed, is well known abroad. Most of the uncommitted nations want to follow us. Let's make it possible, even easy, for them to do it.

We won't do it with fizzling rockets or lowered taxes or something for everyone. It will take sacrifices and courage and hard work, but the goals are tremendous, so let's get on with the job.

The alternative is not one which we would want to contemplate.

The Social Security Drama of 25 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during its lifetime, the United States—as a pioneering nation of free government—has faced tasks of designing programs to meet the many-faceted needs of its citizens, within its political and economic principles and systems.

The success of these endeavors is probably best illustrated by the fact that, as a people, we now enjoy the highest standard of living in the history of the world.

We recognize, of course, that during our trial and error processes, we have not always been successful; too, there still remain many unsolved problems as we face the future.

In a nation of freedom and progress, however, the creation of ever-better living conditions has miraculously lengthened the lives of our people.

The 1900 life expectancy was 47 years. By contrast, the average today is 70 years.

With greater longevity has come the challenge of providing for the increasing number of senior citizens at the apex of life—in retirement when they are no longer members of the labor force, often with little or no income, and without a retirement "nest egg."

Recognizing that a great need exists in this field, there nevertheless have been widely divergent views as to how the need should be met, or whether it should be met at all through a national program.

However, the Nation 25 years ago established the old-age and survivors insurance program. The program has from time to time been the target for criticism. For example, there have been those who thought that the program was not the kind that should be integrated into a basically free-enterprise, private-initiative system.

Whatever its shortcomings, social security was adopted, and is now one of the broadest pieces of welfare legislation enacted in our history. Today, about 9 out of every 10 of our citizens are covered by the social security law. At the end of 1959, almost 13,750,000 men, women, and children were drawing old-age and survivors and disability benefits averaging $80 a month. The benefits totaled $10.3 billion.

In Wisconsin last year, more than 319,000 persons drew benefits totaling more than $20 million a month.

Despite the broad coverage of OASI, I nevertheless believe individuals and private enterprise through privately sponsored programs should be encouraged to provide benefits for retirement years to the maximum extent possible.

Generally, however, social security is helping to meet the needs of more than 13 million citizens—many of whom are not otherwise provided for—and continues to make a substantial contribution to better living conditions for these upper-age citizens.

The program, itself, of course, needs improvement. Among other things, I believe, that the present limitation of $1,200 annually allowable on extra earnings is absolutely unrealistic. For that reason I have introduced legislation to increase the amount from $1,200 to $1,800 annually.

In view of the high cost of today's living, Congress, too, should, I believe, take a sympathetic look at various other aspects of the program, including the level of benefits, age of eligibility for disability retirement, and other requirements of the program.

In designing the social security system, there were a number of individuals in Wisconsin who played significant roles. These include Prof. John R. Commons of the University of Wisconsin; Edwin E. Witte, sometimes called the father of social security; Arthur J. Altmeyer, the first Federal Administrator, who was dubbed "Mr. Social Security;" and Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, a pupil and aid of Professor Witte at the Madison campus of the University of Wisconsin.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal carried an article entitled "Social Security Drma of 25 Years." This informative article reveals the significance of the role which social security has played in the life of the people of our country.

Reflective of the U.S. pioneering efforts to fulfill the needs of its aging citizens, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 31, 1960]

THE SOCIAL SECURITY DRAMA OF 25 YEARS, MOST IMPORTANT SOCIAL LAW IN U.S. HISTORY, HAS BROUGHT BIG BENEFITS, STILL IS GROWING; FOUR WISCONSIN MEN HAD MAJOR ROLES

(By Ellen Gibson)

To Americans under 45, social security is as much a part of their way of life as the public schools, collective bargaining or weiner roasts. Older citizens may remember how the very idea of social security 25 years ago shocked some contemporaries into cries of "socialism" and predictions that initiative and thrift were doomed.

This year social security celebrates its silver anniversary. The act setting it up was approved by a lopsided congressional majority in the heyday of the New Deal. When President Roosevelt signed it on August 14, 1935, he called the measure the cornerstone of a structure which is by no means complete. It is still unfinished.

Congress has added repeatedly to the original framework, and additional proposals for changes are expected this year.

WHAT SOCIAL SECURITY DID

Whatever its shortcomings, the social security act towers as the most important single piece of social legislation enacted in American history.

This is what it did:

1. It said that the National Government had some responsibility for the relief of individual suffering. The countrywide depression had proved that each man could not always look after himself and his family if he just worked hard enough and behaved himself.

2. It authorized the Federal Government to establish a compulsory old age and survivors' insurance program (OASI) under which employers and workers would be taxed. When a worker died or retired at 65, benefits would be paid out of the trust fund to him or his survivors to replace part of the earnings the family had lost. (Recently, benefits also have been made available for persons over 50 retired by disability.)

3. It provided for Federal grants of money to States to share the cost of public assistance to the needy blind, aged, and dependent children. It said that records should be confidential and that grants to these persons should be made monthly and in cash, not in commodities as had been typical in relief programs. (Aid to the totally and perma-

nently disabled joined the other three categories later.)

4. It encouraged State unemployment compensation plans modeled along the lines of the only system then in operation—Wisconsin's.

5. It increased Federal funds for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare.

Four Wisconsin men

For this monumental concept, four Wisconsin men may claim major credit. The theoretical basis for such social action had been debated in the University of Wisconsin classroom of Prof. John R. Commons, world famed labor economist, in the early 1920's. Edwin E. Witte, the father of social security, and Arthur J. Altmeyer, its first administrator who was dubbed Mr. Social Security, were proteges of Professor Commons. Wilbur J. Cohen was a pupil and aid to Witte at the Madison campus.

Return in imagination now to the United States of 25 years ago. The central fact was that two out of every nine workers were unemployed. Many of those with jobs worked only part time. The average weekly wage in manufacturing was $18.40. Welfare resources were few. Steps were being undertaken to haul the Nation out of its worst depression.

On June 8, 1934, President Roosevelt told Congress that "among our objectives, I place the security of the men, women and children of the Nation first." He expressed his belief in social insurance financed by compulsory contributions.

Three weeks later he appointed a committee on economic security, headed by Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, to draft a program.

PROF. WITTE CALLED "TOWER OF STRENGTH"

Wisconsin's Professor Witte was named executive director, and he took Cohen to Washington with him as research assistant. Altmeyer, then Second Assistant Secretary of Labor, became chairman of the technical board.

Witte, now 73 and living in Madison, was born in Jefferson County and graduated from the University of Wisconsin, where he also spent 46 years on the faculty. Professor Witte never was content inside an ivory tower. Before his social security assignment, he had been statistician and secretary for the State industrial commission and first director of the pioneer unemployment compensation program. As its chief, Witte had made the Wisconsin legislative reference library a model.

Miss Perkins, a renowned social worker with uncommon political and administrative skill, called Witte a "tower of strength, a miracle of intelligence, imagination and flexibility" as he directed the high powered 100-member committee in its enormous task.

Altmeyer, now 66 and also a Madison resident, was born in De Pere. After his graduation from the State university he became Professor Commons' assistant and later was statistician and secretary for the State industrial commission, where he started the Nation's first unemployment index.

Altmeyer's role

In 1933 Altmeyer became chief of the compliance division of the national recovery administration. After the committee on economic security concluded its work, Altmeyer nursed the newborn program to maturity as chairman of the social security board. He was later commissioner for social security. He was retired in 1953 by an Eisenhower administration reorganization. Succeeding him was another Wisconsin man, John W. Tramburg, former State welfare director.

For the "prodigious achievement" of launching the social security program on a smooth and efficient course, Altmeyer deserves major credit, according to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., historian of the New Deal. He ran the biggest insurance business in the world, but was little known. Typically, Altmeyer himself once observed, "A successful administration is about as interesting as cold spinach."

MILWAUKEEAN COHEN NOW AT MICHIGAN

Cohen, now 46 and professor of public welfare administration at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, is a Milwaukee native who became a specialist in the theory and practice of social security here and abroad. After his job with the draft committee he became Altmeyer's personal assistant and technical adviser. When he resigned from Government service in 1956 he was director of research and statistics for the Social Security Administration. Dynamic and articulate, he contributes continuously to the thinking of social welfare circles on basic policy issues.

Social welfare, economics, and the law were not well prepared for the challenge and opportunity of writing social security legislation. There was no popular demand for it; people stil lare amazingly indifferent, considering that the annuities they are purchasing with 3 percent of their annual earnings (up to $4,800) may be worth $20,000 to $35,000 each.

Unemployment compensation aroused the most controversy within the committee. Because Wisconsin had the only working plan, and because this program had ardent supporters in strategic positions, the idea of separate, State administered funds to which employers would contribute (gaining tax rebates if they kept unemployment down) prevailed. The President also favored State plans because he believed they would sit better with Congress and not be challenged as unconstitutional. Many persons then, and more now, argue that this has resulted in a crazy-quilt pattern of uneven coverage, and that a national program would have been better.

EUROPEAN PLANS FIRST

The bulk of the truly radical social security proposals were agreed upon with surprisingly little fuss. There were no American blueprints, but most European nations had developed social insurance much earlier. The first plan was activated in Germany in the 1880's by the conservative Chancellor Otto von Bismarck.

The committee and the Congress might have gone much further than they did. Specifically, they might have included provision for medical care insurance—the hottest unsolved issue in the field now—with little argument. Sicknes costs were one of the first things the European systems had sought to protect against.

Miss Perkins, among others, objected to the employee contribution feature. She argued that the employer would shift his share to the consumer and that the worker, as consumer, would be paying both portions. President Roosevelt contended that the joint contribution gave workers a legal, moral, and political right to collect benefits.

"With those taxes in there," he is quoted by Schlesinger, "no damn politician can ever scrap my social security program."

BUSINESS WOULD DEMAND SYSTEM

Social security did not provoke the uproar that many other New Deal proposals did. But the opposition was bitter and mainly from the business world.

This is a puzzle to such persons as Arthur Larson, director of the Duke University world rule of law center and Republican Party philosopher, who wrote an expert handbook on social security.

"If the entire system were destroyed tomorrow," he said, "it would not be long before American business would have to demand its reinstatement. * * * For a 20th century, private enterprise, cash wage economy without an income maintenance mechanism is almost unthinkable. No such economy exists on earth today."

The first contributions to the social security reserve fund were collected from workers and their bosses in 1937. The first benefits were paid in 1940. The impact of the program is hard to exaggerate.

Paid out, $50.4 billion

Nine out of every ten working Americans are now protected by social security laws against some of the income loss which is a frightening risk of old age and unemployment, and with no loss of dignity or pride. (The major exceptions in coverage today are self-employed physicians, employees of Communist groups and certain migratory farm workers.)

At the end of 1959 almost 13,750,000 men, women, and children were drawing old-age insurance, survivors', and disability benefits averaging $80 a month. In 1959 the paid out benefits totaled $10,300 million. A total of $50,400 million has been paid since January 1940 to 21 million persons.

In Wisconsin last year more than 319,000 persons received benefits totaling more than $20 million a month. In Milwaukee County alone the recipients numbered more than 75,000 and their income from social security more than $5 million a month.

Unemployment compensation has paid out more than $24,500 million. In each of the three postwar recessions it has replaced between a fifth and a quarter of the resulting loss in wages.

Some 7 million aged, blind, or disabled persons and dependent children (17,420 in Milwaukee County) are drawing $3,500 million a year in public assistance grants, supplied by Federal, State, and local taxes.

This stream of cash has helped stabilize the economy and keep up the purchasing power of the persons who would be first out of the market in hard times. Social security has not, as some opponents feared it would, cut individual savings, insurance purchases, or investments.

IT HAS KEPT FAMILIES TOGETHER

It has encouraged retirement (although the average social security beneficiary retires at 69, not the permissible 65 for men and 62 for women) thus opening job opportunities for younger workers.

It has kept together families which formerly would have been scattered by adversity. Children, for example, no longer need to be placed in orphanages because of poverty. Thanks to social security survivors' benefits and aid to dependent children, mothers can rear their own children in spite of the loss of the father by death, desertion, or divorce.

It has vastly stimulated private pension plans and voluntary health insurance.

It has resulted in the establishment of comprehensive public welfare services in every State. Before the 1930's, needy persons had to rely on the grudging aid of local governments alone, plus the usually meager resources of private relief-giving agencies. In many places, whenever tax funds ran low, aid was withheld entirely.

AVERAGE BENEFIT NEAR $70 A MONTH

A chief criticism today is that benefits are pegged too low in relation to buying power. Public assistance, which was supposed to wither away as insurance coverage spread, is still a costly item. One-fourth of the recipients of social security benefits have no other cash income and need the extra help.

The average benefit to a retired or disabled worker or his survivors is $69.88 in Milwaukee County and $62.14 in Wisconsin. The lowest grant possible is $33 a month and the most an individual retired worker may collect now is $116. When recent liberalizations

have come into effect, the maximum will be $127.

In a recent analysis, Wilbur Cohen predicted that in the next 10 years social security benefits would be boosted by 40 to 50 percent and that some provision would be made for financing hospital, nursing, and other health services to the aged and disabled.

New England Facing Threat From Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article of importance to the New England area, which was written by John Harriman for the Boston Daily Globe of November 19, 1959.

The article follows:

NEW ENGLAND FACING THREAT FROM ABROAD—AREA MUST PUT UP FIGHT TO HOLD ITS INDUSTRIES—EVEN ELECTRONICS TO FEEL EUROPEAN COMPETITION

(By John Harriman)

Quite suddenly we in New England have been jolted out of the complacency of the last 3 or 4 years.

This complacency was born of mushrooming plants along route 128, and the conviction that in electronics and other new industries we were going to discover a new golden economic age.

But it appears that other corporations have been drifting away, offsetting in part at least the increase in new companies, and that, even in electronics, we shall have to put up a fight to hold what we have.

The political aspect of this State's industrial problem was put firmly on the line in yesterday's Globe by our political editor, John Harris. Some of its economic aspects were pointed out in yesterday's Wall Street Journal.

Today I want to suggest that our most serious competitor in the industries now important to this area may not be the South, which harried us in textiles, or California, which today is thought to hold our electronic industry under threat.

Instead, it may be Europe. For instance, it is interesting to note that Nicholoson File has closed its Providence plant, choosing to shut down that one out of the three it operated in this country, while it has recently opened a factory in Holland.

Raytheon redesigned its big ship radar not in Waltham, but in Rome, where it did the job thoroughly a third of the time and cost of doing it here.

Furthermore, as I reported from Italy a month ago, from Raytheon's new factory outside Palermo in Sicily, it can produce and land a microwave tube of a certain type in Boston, freight and duty paid, for roughly three-fourths of what it would cost to produce the same equipment here.

In the face of such facts, who can be sanguine about this large company's future plans for expansion * * * from the stand point of "where"?

We have here in New England, of course, one heavy anchor to windward in this matter. Much of our "new" industry produces defense products and is hence forced to operate in the United States. Then, too, our research facilities should keep up ahead in certain kinds of advanced engineering and development.

But no one likes to contemplate a regional economy based in large part solely on defense. And it is not research and development that move the assembly lines that mean jobs and money in a region's pocketbook. It is production, and production in many (although by no means all) lines is cheaper in Europe than in the United States today.

This threat to domestic industry is not unique to this area; it is something that much of industry in many places is going to face in the next few years.

But the threat may be more immediate here, and more acutely felt in its result than in other areas. This is not to say that we face a migration of industry such as closed so much of our textile production. But an erosion of production here of even modest proportion would occur in an economy already scaled down and somewhat weakened by our past experience in textiles. It would be an occurrence unfortunate and debilitating in psychological as well as in economic effect.

Dillon Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, represented the U.S. Government in negotiations on a rationalization and liberalization of trade among the nations of the free world and partnership aid to the free world's newly developing areas. His outstanding leadership set in motion the forces which hopefully will lead to a bridging of the gap between the European Common Market countries and the European free trade area, known as the Outer Seven. An evaluation of the Dillon plan was published in the Christian Science Monitor, January 30, written by Nate White, business and financial editor of the Monitor. This plan had its genesis in the work of the NATO Parliamentary Economic Committee of which I am chairman. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREND OF ECONOMY—VIEW FROM A PROMONTORY

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—It isn't often that the world needs a Marshall plan—an economic plan to put together the bits and pieces after the catastrophe of world war. But the world is in constant need of the kind of leaders who launched the Marshall plan.

Three men stood on a promontory in 1946 and 1947 and surveyed the bits and pieces. The late George C. Marshall, then U.S. Secretary of State, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and Paul G. Hoffman saw the pieces. They knew, as Mr. Hoffman so often has said in the words used to this reporter in 1947, that "if we in the United States do not pick up the pieces, the Russians will."

These men, plus the little-identified Joe Jones in the State Department, plus the political leaders in of the times, President Truman in the White House, and supporters of Senator Vandenberg in the Congress, blueprinted, engineered, and constructed the prosperous world of today.

It was an almost incredible achievement. If they had not stood on the promontory it would never have come about.

Few observers today are on a sufficiently high promontory to detect the mighty floodtides of economic movements which are in full flow. The daily business of the world, of governments, of financial and industrial affairs, of households tends to bog even the most alert men and women in the complications of dailiness when they should be watching the direction and significance of the forces of human activity.

Who is on the Promontory? Paul G. Hoffman is still there. As Chairman of the United Nations Special Fund for Assisting Underdeveloped Nations, he is a strategic spot to observe the tides.

Sir Oliver Franks, Chairman of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., and formerly British Ambassador to the United States, is on the promontory. And it looks as though he and Mr. Hoffman have been joined by U.S. Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon.

What do they see?

They see peoples everywhere in large economic movements. The tides of the world are shifting. Even the economic poles are in motion.

In a memorable, unpublicized address last November before the trustees of the Committee for Economic Development; Sir Oliver set forth the economic world as he sees it. This address has now been published by the Saturday Review in its January 16 issue. It could reach the altitude of Secretary Marshall's famous Harvard University address of June 1947. In the same issue Mr. Hoffman tells of the challenge as he sees it today.

The tides are flowing not only east and west but north and south. How they flow in each direction and what happens in the diffusion of the eddies: these are the movements which concern Sir Oliver, Mr. Hoffman, and Mr. Dillon.

"If 12 years ago (1947) the balance of the world turned on the recovery of western Europe, now it turns on a right relationship of the industrial north of the globe to the developing south," Sir Oliver told us. "There is a second consideration. If we in the Western World, in North America and in Europe, are to succeed in two dimensions, north-south as well as eastwest, then it is essential that our economic strength be adequate to our tasks. This means a more consciously dynamic view of growth in our communities than we have perhaps had before."

Sir Oliver went on to discuss a Europe and Britain at sixes and sevens referring to the rivalry in Europe which seems to exist in the European Economic Community (the six) and the European Free Trade Association (the seven).

What he proposed was a kind of informal new arrangement which would bring the United States and Canada into the economic trading world of Europe.

Here is where Mr. Dillon's work seems to be paying off. In his recent visit with chiefs of state and economic ministers of the six and the seven he seems to have built the practical bridge between the two European groups themselves and a second bridge between them and the United States and Canada.

The bridges may now be only of the temporary pontoon variety, still subject to structural changes. But the caissons for a strong superstructure probably have been sunk, Time will tell.

In setting the goals of today, Mr. Hoffman put it this way: "I suggest that the kind and scale of economic growth we need and seek are at the frontiers of world poverty.

I suggest that this requires partnership in effort and in investment."

And a final word from Sir Oliver: "I do not understate when I say that the world balance will shift decisively against us if we fail to devise adequate means to realize the twin objectives I have identified."

Comment: the world is too small and the issues too great to lose time in a revival of an international trade war between the nations of the free West. The rest of the world is in movement and the free nations of the north have a job to do if they are to include the developing nations of the south in freedom's tides.

With Accent on the Deliberate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, there follows an editorial from the Idaho Statesman published in Boise, Idaho, under date of January 30, 1960. I sincerely hope the U.S. Senate proceeds in accordance with the suggestions of the Statesman and particularly the last sentence of the editorial:

WITH ACCENT ON THE DELIBERATE

Latest in a group of distinguished Americans all testifying to the same effect, Secretary of State Christian Herter and Attorney General William P. Rogers are urging U.S. acceptance, without reservations, of the compulsory jurisdiction of the United Nations International Court of Justice in all disputes involving other countries.

They're putting their argument on the high grounds that the rule of law should be supreme throughout the world. Unhappily in the present phase of civilization's development, it's a basis that's more idealistic than practical.

The argument would be more impressive if there were actually in existence a recognized and comprehensive body of international law. But there isn't. As compared with national law, international law, which Webster defines as "a body of rules which modern civilized nations regard as binding them in their mutual intercourse," is still in its infancy. Its formation is a developing process to which Great Britain and the United States so far have made by far the most substantial contribution. Again quoting Webster: "The doctrines of international law have been elaborated by a course of legal reasoning and are mainly based in the practices of Great Britain and the United States, on the customs and usages of civilized nations, treaties, acts of executives in international matters, statutes and judicial decisions, especially in prize courts. In European continental countries opinions of text writers are also received as law to greater or less extent, but in British and American practice they are only evidence of what the law is."

It's pretty evident, then, under these circumstances, that the World Court will be making up international law as it goes along dealing with whatever disputes may be brought before it.

In this situation, the composition of the Court, must be deserving of attention perhaps even more serious just now than its functions and power. The salient facts are these:

This international court has 15 judges, elected for 9-year terms of $21,000 tax-free salary by majority vote of the U.N. general assembly and security council. No nation may have more than one judge. A quorum of nine judges suffices to constitute the Court. All questions are decided by a majority of the judges present.

The United States has one member. The Soviet bloc has two (from Russia and Poland). The remainder are from European, Latin American and Asiatic countries.

In view of the evident inadequacy of existing international law to provide basis for all the decisions this court might be called upon to make, and because of the probability that these magistrates would necessarily improvise bases for their rulings, it must be apparent that this tribunal, in some instances, must function more in the capacity of a jury than of a court of law.

It is to be observed that, as a practical matter, no attorney ever enters upon a jury trial of a lawsuit without searching examination of the members of the jury.

The Soviet Union quite frankly takes that position. It has declared that it will not allow itself to be bound by decisions of an international organization which could not be vetoed so long as a majority of states, or judges in the case of a court, represented a political philosophy different from its own. No Soviet bloc country has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of this world court even with reservations.

The United States has gone a good deal further. It has pledged its readiness to accept the jurisdiction and decisions of the world court, except in matters which it might itself decide are purely domestic affairs, such, for instance, as immigration, tariffs, or matters relating to the Panama Canal.

This is the reservation set forth in what is known as the Connally amendment which the Senate in 1946 attached to a treaty accepting the jurisdiction of the world court. And it is this amendment which Mr. Herter, Mr. Rogers, and the others are urging the Senate to repeal.

Obviously, their argument poses a matter of grave concern. Were they to prevail in their contentions, thus country, a recognized leader in this advancement, would be the first to let go all holds and plunge headlong into deep and untried waters with consequences that could be disastrous to the high cause of world rule by law. Imagine, for instance, the widely disillusioning and devastating consequences of the issuance of a world court order which country could not, with honor and in justice, accept.

Ordinary prudence, as well as genuine concern for worldwide welfare, demands that this proposal, and all its implications, be examined with utmost care. The course proposed my indeed be one to be pursued with all deliberate speed," but it must be with accent on the "deliberate."

Kiwanis Distinguished Service Award to A. Mose Siskin and Garrison Siskin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the 1959 Kiwanis service award presentation. This year recipients are my very good friends Mose and Garrison Siskin, two brothers who not only have made a tremendous success of their own lives, but have, through their generosity and graciousness, enabled so many others to achieve something beyond that to which they would have normally aspired. They have accomplished this good work with a deep sense of humility, unselfishness and an abundance of love for their fellowman. This high honor which is not given lightly is richly deserved by Mose and Garrison Siskin, and I join with their countless friends in wishing for them many more years of success in their endeavors.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript is estimated to make 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $216. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE KIWANIS SERVICE AWARD PRESENTATION—A. MOSE SISKIN AND GARRISON SISKIN, JANUARY 19, 1960

INVOCATION BY RABBI HARRIS SWIFT

Heavenly Father. We lift up our grateful hearts unto Thee, and we supplicate Thee to bless all assembled here and to reward with Thy choicest gifts the officers and members of the Chattanooga Kiwanis Club.

We thank Thee for the food of which we shall partake, which makes us mindful of the many who are not so fortunate. We offer Thee our gratitude for the wholeness of our bodies, mindful that there are many whose physical needs are great. We express our appreciation for the blessings of happy home lives, well knowing that there are many in our community whose lives are saddened, homes that are broken and devoid of fellowship and love.

Eternal God and Father. We thank Thee for the precious gift of years Thou has given our friends, Mose and Garrison Siskin, whom we are honoring this day. May the awareness of dedicating their lives to the task of human rehabilitation and the knowledge of making a significant contribution to human welfare give them the satisfaction that comes from a sense of self-fulfillment. Grant them, we pray Thee, many more years in which to continue their humanitarian endeavors. May they ever serve as an inspiring and stimulating example to all of us assembled here to do them honor. Bless, we pray Thee, their faithful and devoted life partners and their children; and crown them and all their dear ones with Thy favor.

Merciful God. By Thine inscrutable will Thou hast seen fit to smite some of Thy children. May it be Thy will to increase our capacity for sympathy and understanding that we may be feet to the lame and eyes to the blind, and be ever ready to give food to the body, wisdom to the mind and skill to the hand. Our love of Thee can only be reflected in the love of our fellowmen. May we be inspired to that love, constantly and generously.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, who feedest us with Thy goodness. Amen.

KIWANIS SERVICE AWARD ADDRESS PRESENTED BY DR. WM. G. WEST, JANUARY 19, 1960

The Kiwanis Club of Chattanooga has made its distinguished service award to three brothers: Thomas S. McCallie, Spencer J. McCallie, and J. Park McCallie; but this is the first time the award has been made

jointly to brothers. These brothers, Mose and Garrison Siskin, have demonstrated in an extraordinary manner that it is possible for brothers to work together in a unique and harmonious way. They are one and inseparable in their family relationships, their business enterprises and their generous philanthropy.

These brothers were born in Chattanooga—Mose in 1900 and Garrison in 1903. They are the sons of Anna and Robert H. Siskin, both of whom came to Chattanooga from Russia in 1890. Mose and Garrison received their education in the public schools of Chattanooga. But much of their early education was received from their immigrant parents, who settled on the west side of our city to carve out the future in their new land, overcoming language difficulties, poverty and strange customs with initiative, resourcefulness, enterprise, thrift, and hard work. What the Siskins achieved could have happened neither in Czarist Russia nor even less in present-day Communist Russia.

Their father was a peddler and the boys began selling newspapers on the streets of Chattanooga when Mose was six. When the father went to work for a scrap dealer, the boys assisted him by collecting scrap metal from families in the neighborhood. In 1910, with a capital of $6 and a rented lot at the corner of 19th and Chestnut Streets, the father entered the scrap metal business which became the forerunner of the now flourishing steel business of Siskin Steel & Supply Co., one of the largest businesses of its kind in the South.

At one time a streetcar served as an office for the business. Twenty-nine years ago the office was a 12 x 20 foot 1-story structure comprising 240 square feet. Today the Siskin enterprises occupy 40,000 square feet of office space. They are the Republic Steel Co's. seventh largest customer in the United States. It is no secret among insurance men that an advertisement in a national magazine has noted that the Siskin brothers are insured for $4½ million between them. Much of this insurance will be used to perpetuate their good works in the Siskin Memorial Foundation, but it is a badge of not only material success, but character, also.

Not just anyone can get that much insurance, even if he can pay the premiums. Their parents literally had nothing in the beginning; these brothers became successful and today could be wealthy in a material way if they had made wealth and not helping people their primary goal in life. They could not have achieved their good works, though, if they had not been successful in an almost American Horatio Alger bound to rise tradition.

These brothers are inseparable from one another, but they are also bound together in strong family ties.

Mose is married to the former Eva Witt of Columbus, Ga., and has two children, Claire Ethel Binder, wife of Dr. Samuel Binder of Chattanooga, and Robert H. Siskin, a student at McCallie School. They have two grandchildren.

Garrison is married to the former Goldie Temerson of Tuscaloosa and Birmingham, Ala. They have two children, Anita Levine, wife of Lawrence D. Levine of Chattanooga, and Helen S. Pregulman, who is married to our own Kiwanian Mervin Pregulman, who is known among Chattanooga sports fans as a former All-American football player at the University of Michigan and a star footballer with the Green Bay Packers. The Garrison Siskins have five grandchildren.

Both Mose and Garrison are family men. They are devoted to each other and to each other's families. Garrison once stated: "We couldn't do these things for others without the cooperation of our wives."

One day Mose, in recalling the example of his parents, stated: "Your parents give you an example to live by; when you see harmony and family love in the home, you learn to do right, too."

"From my mother," stated Garrison, "we learned to mind our own business and not to engage in gossip which she taught us was one of a person's worst faults. And my father taught me that a good name was something that you can't buy."

Both brothers are proud of the fact that they have inherited a cigar box from their father into which good deeds money can be put and withdrawn without accounting to each other. To this date, they have done millions of dollars of business with Republic Steel Co. and Combustion Engineering without written contracts. Perhaps 95 percent of their business is done without signed contracts. They apparently use them only when the Government rules in certain contracts that they must. "Our word," states Garrison Siskin, "is our bond."

When Garrison graduated from city high school, the Dynamo carried this quotation under his senior class picture: "Never idle a moment, but thrifty and thoughtful of others." He won a scholarship to Syracuse University but never used it because he did not have the train fare to get to New York.

He and Mose went to work. They worked long, hard hours. They still do. They became successful; but if this were all, our story would never be told today.

In 1942 while traveling to New York, Garrison Siskin, after stretching his legs at Johnson City, Tenn., was reboarding the train at night when the steel grid which covered the staircase fell heavily and sharply against his right leg. The force of the 50-pound steel grid threw him violently against the train and his right leg was severely injured. Hot wet towels were applied to his leg, but at the next station it was discovered that this was the worst possible treatment. A clot had formed, the circulation was gravely impaired and his life was endangered. One of the surgeons told him that only a miracle could save him.

Garrison remembered how his own father had complained of a clot in his right leg 14 years before and how a few days later he died. The story of how Garrison promised his Maker that if he ever recovered he would henceforth devote his time, energy, and financial resources to the welfare of humanity is a classic one, which has been told in Guideposts edited by Norman Vincent Peale. He became a changed man. In his own words, he dedicated himself "to help those who cannot help themselves." Unlike some men who make promises when they are ill, and do not fulfill them, Garrison Siskin has kept the promise which he made to his Maker on that night in 1942.

In the 19 years since that accident, Mose and Garrison Siskin have teamed together to fulfill what became Mose's compact, too. Their good deeds would fill a thick book.

They are active members of the Industrial Committee of 100 and have played a significant part in influencing the expansion of the Combustion Engineering Co. They have also played a big role in getting the General Electric Corp. to locate several of their plants in this section of the country. They were instrumental in having the TAG Railway buy large acreage of land to attract additional plants to locate in our metropolitan area. They offered the Crane Co. a hugh tract of land for $1; and though Crane did not locate their new plant here, such cooperation reveals their keen interest in Chattanooga's industrial development.

Here is a list of the organization both serve: The Tennessee Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the Chattanooga Big Brothers Association, Abilities, Inc. of Tennessee (formerly Disabled Enterprises), the Chattanooga-Hamilton County Speech and Hearing Center, the American Cancer Society, the Orange Grove School (honorary), United Cerebral Palsy Association of Hamilton County, the Cumberland Youth Foundation.

In addition, Mose Siskin is a member of the Patrons Association—McCallie School.

Garrison Siskin is also on: the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; Big Brothers of America (board of directors, executive committee, and honorary president of national organization) which handles more than 700,000 cases of delinquent boys annually; Brandeis University, adviser to president; chairman of the board, Tennessee, Alabama & Georgia Railway; and Abilities, Inc., of New York.

These brothers have established the Mose and Garrison Siskin Memorial Foundation which is dedicated to high religious, social welfare and humanitarian ideals. This foundation will go on blessing humanity after they are gone; and if any person of means wants to live on in a well-planned work, I can think of no better work to which he can give a sizable gift.

They have built the Siskin Memorial Building on Vine Street which is used by people of all creeds. In this building are located offices for several welfare organizations, a large assembly hall, and also a remarkable museum of religious antiquities which includes rare sacred volumes and art objects representing many religious faiths. A remarkable cultural asset to our city, a Harvard professor stated that it would be a cultural shrine if it were located in London or New York City.

A new finely equipped building costing more than $1 million has been recently completed on Oak Street which is devoted to expressing one of our Kiwanis objectives for 1959: helping handicapped citizens. Here come the blind, the crippled, the deaf, those with speech difficulties and those who need dental care. Our own Kiwanian "Coach" Rike will soon be receiving speech help here following a laryngectomy. Already, this building, and more importantly its program has attracted nationwide attention. The Siskins are financing a program of help to the handicapped and have given as much attention to getting highly trained personnel as they have given to furnishing a fine building. When William Clay Ford, national campaign chairman of the United Cerebral Palsy Association for 1960, visited these facilities on November 19, 1959, he exclaimed:

"Wonderful, just wonderful. I couldn't be more impressed. I have not seen anything like it anywhere. Chattanooga should be very proud of the Siskins and the facilities they have provided for the handicapped. I wish there were more such facilities around the country and I wish there were more men like the Siskins."

The $2 million center now provides free headquarters for the Chattanooga Big Brothers Association, the Adult Education Council, the Hamilton County Chapter of the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, the Association for the Blind, the Cerebral Palsy Association, the Association for the Mentally Retarded, the local chapter of the Literacy Movement in the Southeast, the Dental Clinic for the Handicapped. Of the latter, our own Kiwanian, Dr. Charles Scott, has stated it is the "best dental clinic in the Nation, with the latest and most ultra-automatic equipment and the finest supplies which can be purchased today."

The Siskins brothers have given steel ramps to hospitals, the Old Ladies Home, many churches, private homes and needy folk, and to the Memorial Auditorium.

They donated an iron lung to Erlanger Hospital at a time when they were hard to secure. They equipped the gift shop at Memorial Hospital and have given many other materials to both Erlanger and Memorial Hospitals.

They gave the steel and other materials for the Field House at Warner Park and helped Kiwanian John Martin complete the job on time for the Billy Graham meeting. Dr. Billy Graham has awarded his special Bible to only three persons: one he gave to President Eisenhower and the other two he gave to Mose and to Garrison Siskin.

These humanitarian-minded citizens have given steel, as well as money, to churches of all denomination, large and small, white and colored.

When the gymnasium of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Roman Catholic Church and School burned down they gave steel and their time to rebuild this gymnasium.

They have given substantial amounts of money to schools and colleges throughout this area.

They are large contributors to the Opera Association, the Community Concerts, the United Fund, the Chattanooga Jewish Welfare Federation, the Art Fund, and the Cancer Fund, to name only a few.

The Siskin brothers bore a large part of the cost of remodeling the Orange Grove School, an institution which offers hope for the future of children who are mentally retarded. They built the new classroom wing and the sheltered workshop unit for this school.

This team of brothers built new and large quarters for Abilities, Inc., of Tennessee (formerly Disabled Enterprises) which provides lifegiving work opportunities for the disabled. They have provided a large number of disabled persons with wheelchairs free of charge.

They have been regular and substantial contributors to the work of the Paraplegia Foundation which offers independence and a productive life to persons suffering from this dreaded and crippling ailment. When a citizen once objected that a prospective employee had no voice, Garrison Siskin replied: "He still has to eat." The Governor of Tennessee in 1958 gave these stalwart brothers a special citation praising them for their many-sided efforts in the rehabilitation of handicapped persons.

One of the most heart-warming stories in any business in this country, large or small, in my judgment, is the stirring story of their employment of a large number of handicapped personnel, ex-alcoholics, persons with prison records, people who have been paroled to them from courts in Chattanooga, down and outers, the beaten, and the downtrodden. The Siskin Steel & Supply Co. alone employs 150 persons, one-half of whom are persons in the category of the helpless and the hopeless. Many of these persons had no active church connections; the Siskins always encourage them to become active members of the church of their choice.

Here is the classic story of Joyce Rominger. Blind from birth, she later trained in Minneapolis to become a Braille switchboard operator. But when she returned to Chattanooga there was no Braille switchboard. There were only three in the country. Industries stated that they were too expensive to install. The Siskins heard of her problem. In 29 weeks the telephone company had built and installed the proper equipment which was described in Popular Mechanics of January 1959. Joyce's first words to the Governor of Tennessee were these: "This is the happiest day of my life." She is still happy as she operates 14 incoming lines, 4 long-distance lines, 14 stations, and handles an average of 1,000 daily calls. She is a symbol of dozens of people whose story I know and could tell, if there were time.

The Siskin brothers have helped the Republic Steel Co. to set up a program to employ the physically handicapped.

To those who know these stories of how these good men give their time, their experience, their advice, their encouragement, and their selves to help those who need help, it is not an occasion for wonder that on November 9, 1959, the announcement was made that the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped was made to Mose and Garrison Siskin for meritorious service on a national scope in the interest of the handicapped.

Time would fail me to tell you of a Texas couple, injured in an automobile accident, whose hospital and travel expenses were paid by the Siskins; of the long correspondence with the president of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad to arrange for a father's transfer to North Carolina to be near his sick boy; of a girl who was sent to Mayo; of a boy who was sent by these good men to a prominent medical specialist in New York. These stories are legion, but they all carry out in bold outline the Kiwanis motto of 1959, "Build Individual Responsibility."

Much of their good work in bringing sight to the blind, liberty to those in prison, making the lame to walk, the speechless to talk, the handicapped to have self-respect and dignity of life is unknown. Therefore, only the recording angel has a record of it. Instances of helping people have been so numerous and their work on behalf of human beings so all-encompassing even the recording angel must have difficulty keeping up with it. It fulfills the injunction of Micah on what God requires for the good man; and what Jesus of Nazareth, whom 600 million call Lord, announced as a significant part of His program at the beginning of His ministry: to preach good news to the poor, release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind.

Down at the office when I saw these men busily answering telephones before Christmas, I asked Mervin Pregulman how they kept going. I remember his reply, "They get joy out of their work and out of helping people."

"My religion," states Garrison Siskin, "is in treating people right. The Lord has been good to me and I try to do the best I can for other people. Some people invest in stocks and bonds, Mose and I invest in people. Our dividends come from the people we help."

It hasn't always been easy. One of the half-serious mottoes in their conference room is this one, "I consider the day a total loss if I don't catch hell about something." Even we clergymen can appreciate that statement. But today infamous and ominous swastikas are appearing in various parts of the world. These brothers are members of a minority religious faith in Chattanooga and in America. Never once have I heard them complain about bitter prejudice we know sometimes exists, even in our beloved land of the free. They have big hearts—and would help anybody, regardless of creed or color. Grossinger's ad in the New York Times of August 30, 1959, is right—"Their aid is a golden sermon."

When the children of a classroom in Barger School wrote notes of appreciation for the building they erected for handicapped people, Garrison's granddaughter summed up the reaction of the children in her salutation and complimentary closing:

"Dear Daddy Garry and Uncle Mose," she began, and closed: "Your friend, Mindy."

They have indeed been friends to those who have needed the benediction of friendship.

On the walls of the Siskin Memorial Building is an eloquent message which expresses gratitude no one can purchase with money alone:

"IN APPRECIATION

"Some could give land, but we have none; others would give wealth, but we have so little; yet we present from our hearts, what no man can buy: Our deepest love. For the opportunity of education for ourselves and the many handicapped children who will follow us.

"To Garrison and Mose Siskin.

"Chattanooga, Tenn., September 1, 1956.

"CHILDREN FROM THE SCHOOL OF CHATTANOOGA-HAMILTON COUNTY SPEECH AND HEARING CENTER."

All who know these brothers who are princes in the household of Israel will applaud the mercy and loving kindness of their labor and benevolence. All wish that the prophecy written 2 years ago by Mr. Bernard Baruch, distinguished American citizen and advisor to many Presidents of the United States, will be fulfilled in long life for these greathearted citizens. He inscribed on a copy of "My Own Story" these words:

"To Garrison Siskin who is making life useful and bearable for the disabled and the unfortunate with high hopes for his success. I envy him his age, for he has time to finish his noble task.

"B. M. BARUCH.

"JANUARY 1958."

These are men of service and theirs are honored names we add today to the list of outstanding and distinguished Chattanoogans who have received the Kiwanis Service Award.

And now to you, Mose Siskin and Garrison Siskin, I want to express the appreciation of our Kiwanis Club for your generosity and goodness to so many people in Chattanooga. I now have the honor, on behalf of my fellow members, to present to you first, an honorary membership in the Chattanooga Kiwanis Club, and secondly, to each of you a silver bowl which is a symbol of the highest honor we can bestow on any of our citizens. You will find inscribed thereon:

"Kiwanis Club of Chattanooga 1959 Service Award to A. Mose and Garrison Siskin who have helped the blind to see, the lame to walk, the afflicted, the handicapped, and the despondent to new hope and better life. This award is made for outstanding service to their fellow men."

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS: 1959 KIWANIS SERVICE AWARD PRESENTATION, GARRISON SISKIN, SPEAKING BOTH FOR HIMSELF AND FOR A. MOSE SISKIN, JANUARY 19, 1960

Mr. President, Dr. West, Mr. Carriger, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with hearts filled with gratitude, my brother Mose and I thank you most sincerely for the honor which the Kiwanis Service Award bestows upon us and for the tributes which you have paid to us. We are deeply conscious of the privilege of being singled out of the many citizens of this city to receive the presentation for service made by one of our foremost civic clubs.

To us, the award and your kind and eloquent words—this presentation function and your presence—come as encouragement and inspiration and will provide us with joyous memories and the happiest personal recollections. Your kindness to us expresses so much the sentiments we humbly feel, and we are the more grateful for it, for we take it as symbol of brotherhood and of man's feeling for fellow man. And, just as it is for us a source of inspiring encouragement, we pray, with humility, that what we have done may, more than all else, invoke the blessings of fraternity and peace upon us all.

"The crest and crowning of all good,
Life's final star, is brotherhood;
For it will bring again to earth
Her long-lost poesy and mirth;
Will send new light on every face,
A kingly power upon the race."

It is in that spirit that we thank the Kiwanis Club, and as citizens, grasps the opportunity to pay tribute to this club which is doing so much public-spirited work in the alleviation of human need and in the raising of human standards. In our beloved land, synonymous with freedom, Mose and I pay tribute to the Kiwanis and its members for:

"* * * True freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
Earnest to make others free."

To you, Mr. President; to you, Dr. West; to you Mr. Carriger; and to you, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, from us both come our heartfelt thanks and our deepest gratitude.

Don't Sell America Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, an interesting news dispatch from Moscow, Russia, appeared on the front page of the New York Times recently.

This Russian dispatch said that the Soviet Government had given an unnamed U.S. automobile dealer a franchise for the distribution during the next 2 years of 10,000 Russian-manufactured Moskvich automobiles. The Moskvich is a four-cylinder, four-passenger car that sells in Russia for 25,000 rubles—$6,250. If anything like that price is asked for the Moskvich in the United States, it probably will obtain few buyers here.

The Times Moscow dispatch went on to say that the Moskvich factory is now producing 70,000 cars a year and that this production represents more than half of all the passenger automobiles produced in Russia. In short, Russia's present production of passenger automobiles, according to the Times dispatch, is less than 140,000 cars a year. American automobile factories, with an annual production of more than 6 million cars, are producing as many passenger automobiles in 48 hours as Russia produced in an entire year.

Many engineers are required to design and constantly improve American automobiles and to invent the many parts that go into them. It requires many more engineers to invent, design, and produce the great variety of machine tools necessary to manufacture the 6 million American cars a year and the parts that go into them. Great numbers of other engineers and chemists also are needed to design and build the highways on which these automobiles operate and the highgrade fuels that assure their efficient operation. Multitudes of mechanics are needed to keep the Nation's present 60 million automobiles in repair and in operation.

The automotive industry and its allied industries are not the only ones in which the United States is ahead of the Russians in the production of peacetime goods. We outproduce them manyfold in radios, television sets, telephones, in electrical goods of all kinds and in housing and the manufacture and use of modern farm tools and machines of all kinds. All of these industries require engineers, inventors, and scientists to maintain them at peak production and to ever expand the production of peacetime consumer goods for the American people.

Comparatively, Russia employs few engineers, inventors, scientists, and chemists in these peacetime fields. She employs most of her engineers, scientists, and technicians in war efforts. In this field Russia from time to time makes some spectacular achievements.

These few spectacular achievements, however, do not justify claims of political orators and writers that are heard and read from time to time that Russia has more and better engineers, more and better scientists, and a better educational system than the United States.

The vast numbers of American scientists, engineers, and inventors engaged in producing civilian goods are not lost to the American defense effort. In World War II and again in the Korean war it was demonstrated that plants and the skilled manpower of engineers, chemists, and inventors engaged in peacetime production could be quickly and effectively diverted and transferred to defense efforts when and wherever necessary. In World War I the United States in the making of defense weapons not only equipped its own millions of fighting men but also supplied a large part of the weapons, planes, tanks, and other fighting equipment used by our allies.

A few spectacular achievements by the Russians is no reason for anyone to sell America short.

Featherbedding on the Railroads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Featherbedding on the Railroads?" written by Benjamin L. Masse and published in the January 2, 1960, issue of America, the National Catholic Weekly Review. The article is well worth reading by all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEATHERBEDDING ON THE RAILROADS?
(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Over a lifetime of more than a half-century, I remember many trains. As a boy in my native Wisconsin, I often watched the St. Paul passenger trains as they swept gracefully around a gentle bend in the Fox River and headed for the old Green Bay depot on South Washington Street. I remember well the Alton between Chicago and St. Louis, and the Wabash as well, and how I used to argue, with nothing more than a vague impression to go on, that the Alton had the better roadbed and offered the smoother ride. I saw the first silvery Union Pacific streamliner, which shortened the tedious trip between Chicago and Denver, and in later years, after management had retired it to the Kansas City-Manhattan run, I rode on it a number of times.

FAMOUS TRAINS OF YORE

I remember, too, many of the other storied trains of U.S. railroading: the Rock Island Rockets, the Burlington Zephyrs, the New York Central's Commodore Vanderbilt—one of my favorites—the Pennsy's Broadway Limited, the B & O's Royal Blue and the diverting ferryboat ride across the Hudson to board it in Jersey City. And will I ever forget that plodding Louisville & Nashville train that carried me one brisk spring day from Louisville, I think it was, to Cincinnati? It was only through a miracle of God that I did not suffocate from the musty, billowing heat. (Why is it that so many trains, and buses, too, for that matter, are oberheated from October 1 to, roughly, May 15? Isn't there some way, once the vehicle starts, of regulating or turning off the heat?)

At any rate, it will be obvious to the reader that like most American boys I was early touched by the romance of the Iron Horse and never really got over it. If I never ambitioned sitting in the engineer's cab, or swinging recklessly with a brakeman's lantern from the end of a swaying freight train, it was because I had previously decided to become a big-league ball player. Believe me, it was for no lack of admiration for railroad men, or attraction for the glamorous lives they led. I can still recall how highly railroad men were respected in our quiet community—it was only later that the "Packers" put the town on the map—and how many of them owned their own homes. After working on the railroad all the livelong day, as the song says, it didn't take them long at night to wash up, change clothes and, in the summertime, sit sedately with their wives on their front porches like respectable middle-class citizens. (Note to the reader: there is some gentle irony here.)

Now, alas, it seems that all this glamour and respectability cloaked a grasping and shiftless spirit. As the years went on, I had learned, of course, that railroadmen were, after all, human, and that their overalls covered hearts even like yours and mine. They were not above taking a "5" for a relaxing smoke, or talking too long at the station with the hangers-on and making the train 10 or 15 minutes late. But then by that time I had also come to know that even bankers and businessmen had little ways of relieving the monotony of toil; and that only machines never became tired, never had heavy heads and tired hands and upset stomachs. What I was not prepared to hear was that railroaders as a group, or rather, the one-fourth of them who operate the trains, were just a bunch of featherbedders; that they worked on the railroad all right, but not by any means all the livelong day; that, in short, they not only accepted pay for work not done but insisted that the outmoded rules which consecrated this vicious featherbedding remain inviolate.

This required some looking into, since a man doesn't jettison his romantic illusions easily. Had I been less impetuous, I could, of course, have found confirmation of my shattered dreams in the daily press. But I did not know then that the Association of American Railroads was to stigmatize the tarnished knights of the shining rails in a series of full-page advertisements in newspapers throughout the land. So I asked the AAR to please be so kind as to send me the indictment of their shiftless employees,

sparing nothing of the truth, no matter how disillusioning. After all, I was a big boy now and ought to be able to take it.

Not to keep the reader in suspense, the bill of particulars eventually arrived, and that was how it came about that one evening I read from beginning to end the famous speech which Daniel P. Loomis delivered in St. Louis last February before the National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards. I don't know what the shippers thought of that speech, but it left me limp on the ropes, I could only think to myself, momentarily losing faith in free speech, free press and the entire first amendment, that this sort of utterance ought to be suppressed. If it ever got over to Moscow, I wondered, what comfort it would give the enemy. Seeing how we run our railroads, wouldn't Mr. Khrushchev be more confident than ever that he was riding the wave of the future? Wouldn't he imagine that our railroad proletariat was ripe for revolution?

Mr. Loomis, who is the president of the AAR, told those shippers that our rail transportation system was afflicted with a festering and cancerous growth that had to be cleaned out before the track was clear for progress. And what was this cancerous growth? Listen to Mr. Loomis:

I refer now to the wasteful and burdensome work rules—commonly known as featherbedding—which hang like an economic albatross around the neck of American progress. Rooted in the horse-and-buggy era of 40 and more years ago, the work rules have remained fixed and inflexible while the industry made enormous strides in technical improvement. These outmoded rules now constitute an immediate drain on the industry in excess of $500 million annually.

Five hundred million dollars in sheer waste. As Mr. Loomis said, the railroads could surely use that kind of money to spruce up their plant and improve their service. Just imagine, we might again ride in clean trains and see easily through the windows. We might be served meals at reasonable prices. Once again we might even be able to telephone for train information and get something besides a busy signal.

THREE OUTMODED WORKING RULES

I read on with mounting interest and perturbation. It seems that three classes of working rules account for most of the cancerous growth. The first is, according to Mr. Loomis, "the antiquated mileage-day pay system," under which the crew of a freight train receives a basic day's pay for covering 100 miles, and the crew of a passenger train the same psy for 150 miles. The rule made sense 40 years ago, said Mr. Loomis, when it took a freight train about 8 hours to run 100 miles, and a passenger train about 7½ hours to do 150 miles. But it doesn't make sense now when diesels, plus other improvements, have double train speeds.

Does the reader know what the wage-bill is for the 1,034-mile Chicago-Denver run, which takes 16½ hours? To-day's pay, you guess? No, siree. The carrier's cost on that run equal a total of 10½ basic days' pay. And the same goes almost to the penny for the New York-Chicago run. The New York-Washington stint is an even more flagrant example of featherbedding. Engineers on that "red apple" run receive 4½ days' pay for a round trip of 450 miles.

The other two areas of featherbedding mentioned by Mr. Loomis are "the towering jurisdictional walls that stand rock-hard in the path of streamlined service," and "the senseless requirements for useless crewmen on trains and other equipment." Mr. Loomis spoke scornfully of firemen who tend no fires and extra brakemen who handle no brakes, and he told the story of a yard crew that got extra pay for 100 miles of road service because they made a 4-mile trip to help a snowbound train. "How long," he asked, "can the Nation's economy bear such a deadly drag?" How long, indeed, when the annual price tag for redundant firemen is, again according to Mr. Loomis, $200 million?

It was no fun admitting it, but the facts appeared to be that something more tangible than romance moves men to ambition careers on the Iron Horse. Scratch a railroader and it was clear that the same basic commercial urges drove him as drove his brother in the factory or the countinghouse. Only one step remained to be taken before writing off the fancies of boyhood and getting on with the prosaic, dollars-and-cents business of life. I had to find out what, if anything, the featherbedders had to say for themselves.

That turned out to be a mistake. For from the Railway Labor Executives' Association in Washington came in response to my request a flood of material that nearly swamped me. Our railroad unions may not have the money to finance national advertising campaigns, but they do have a mimeograph machine, and that machine, I swear, must run right around the clock. They have, too, a director of public relations named Milton Plumb, and if anywhere on Madison Avenue there is a more capable and energetic craftsman, I have never met him.

Anyway, coming to the point, I learned, after pages and pages of text and many columns of figures, that the featherbedders were not pleading guilty at all, or hanging their heads in shame. They did not deny that there was featherbedding on the rails. There was a lot of it, they said. But if the public wanted to know who were reposing cozily in beds of feathers, it wasn't the employees in overalls. It was their bosses. As for the employees, they were stretched out on beds of thorns. The following paragraph, which occurred in a reply by the RLEA to a memorandum, "Featherbedding: Facts Versus Fancy," circulated through the press by the AAR, will give the reader the general idea:

Ordinarily, the RLEA would not dignify the absurd statements on this subject now being circulated by the railroads wtih a detailed reply because the facts about railway labor's soaring productivity speak for themselves and send the AAR's strawman up in smoke faster than any heat such charges may engender.

YET PRODUCTIVITY SOARS

In the RLEA counterbarrage, mention of the productivity factor occurs time and time again. Obviously, if productivity is increasing faster on the railroads than it is in industry generally, featherbedding cannot be much of a problem. And, say railway labor spokesmen, it is increasing faster. Over a 10-year period, from 1947 to 1956, the real product of rail workers, measured in revenue traffic units per hour, jumped 43.6 percent. The increase in industry as a whole was 26.1 percent. The Brotherhoods gleefully cite the testimony of President Harry W. Von Willer of the Erie Railroad. At a rate case hearing conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission on November 26, 1956, he said: "The so-called featherbedding of railroad wages has been greatly exaggerated by railroad executives. There is very little so-called featherbedding."

Far from overpaying their operating employees, says the RLEA, the railroads don't pay them adequately. Workers on the mileage pay system, which is the equivalent of incentive systems in other industries, receive no overtime pay, no paid holidays, no differential pay for night work, and no premium pay for Saturdays and Sundays. Actually, they are not so well off as many skilled workers in other industries. Nor do the brotherhoods dodge the "horrible examples" of overpayment mentioned by Mr. Loomis. They quote the case of engineer M. H. Nelson, who has been on the choice New York-Washington run for 17 years. That run, going and coming, does take only 8 hours, and for the run Mr. Nelson does receive 4½ days' pay, or $90.39. However, as Mr. Nelson himself explains, the actual running time is only part of his chore. On the Washington end of the trip, he must report for duty 1¼ hours before departure time; on the New York end, 1¾ hours before leaving. On each end of the run, he has to dispose of the train and take the locomotive to the enginehouse. That task consumes about an hour. To all of that must be added layover time, during which, incidentally, he must pay his own expenses. Mr. Nelson testifies that the round trip usually takes about 20 hours. It can never be made in less than 16 hours. Estimating his pay at about $5 an hour, and his maximum monthly base pay at $912, the Washington Post and Times Herald commented that "this is by no means exorbitant for the skill and judgment required where safety is always at stake."

And it must be remembered, the RLEA adds, that the New York-Washington run is one of the plums of the business, given only to a handful of engineers of great skill and much seniority. Actually, the mileage pay system as a whole covers only a small minority of rail workers—less than 100,000 of a total of more than 800,000—and wages paid under it are only 4.5 percent of all railway wages.

As for working rules generally, these have been an issue since 1934. Time after time, say union spokesmen, they have been reviewed by Presidential emergency boards, "with generally adverse decisions to the railroads." The brotherhoods describe their attitude toward the rules as flexible, but they insist that before changes are made, safety factors, as well as economic factors, must be carefully considered. They note that 23 States have so-called full-crew laws, and that before the railroads can get rid of firemen who tend no fires and extra brakemen who handle no brakes, they must first persuade those States that the changes can safely be made.

As a matter of fact, the brotherhoods don't think these changes ought to be made. The fireman on a diesel, they concede, shovels no coal, but he performs a number of other duties—including the duty of acquiring the engineer's skill—that are necessary for safe and efficient operations. Similarly with brakemen. Most trains today do have air brakes, but modern trains are fast and long. A train of 100 freight cars, which is short by today's standards, is almost a mile long. It has 400 swinging brake beams, 200 air hose and 800 wheel bearings. Unless trouble in any of these is quickly detected, say the unions, a wreck may result.

And so the RLEA rebuttal goes. The kind reader will sympathize, I hope, when I confess that at this stage in my study, I threw up my hands in despair. On the one hand, I felt, there must be something to the railroads' charges. Otherwise they would not have adopted the dangerous and expensive strategy they have followed. They would not have risked angering their employees and destroying their morale. They would not have spent millions of dollars on advertising. They would not have taken out strike insurance, as if daring their employees to strike. Management doesn't go to such extremes unless it feels deeply the reasonableness and justice of its cause.

On the other hand, the railway unions seem completely sincere in rejecting management's charges. They are old organizations, respected by the public, fully acquainted with their industry, not given to radical demands. They obviously feel the justice of their cause no less strongly than the railroads feel theirs.

Fortunately, under the procedures of the Railroad Labor Act, there can be no precipitate action. Although the contract was opened for changes, in wages as well as working rules, on November 1, there cannot be a legal strike or lockout until well into the spring. Before that time a miracle of some kind may happen—and a miracle, seemingly, will be needed. Some informed observers are convinced that railway management and labor, despite their long experience in collective bargaining, are simply incapable of compromising their present differences. If this is true, one may hope that both sides will have the humility to admit their bankruptcy and invite a neutral third party to arbitrate.

Dog-in-Manger Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald on December 27, 1959:

DOG-IN-MANGER COAL

The soft coal industry—as represented by the National Coal Policy Conference—is willing to hurt New England a good deal in order to help the coal industry a little. It has a dog-in-the-manger attitude. Here's how it is:

Last March the Federal Government imposed mandatory controls on oil imports, including residual oil. The curbs on foreign crude oil were sought by domestic petroleum producers. But it was the coal industry that got a quota limitation on residual oil. This is the oil which fuels many industries and utilities and apartment, store and office buildings in New England.

The restrictions have not worked well. The attempt to maintain the domestic price in the face of the tremendous increase in oil production abroad has failed.

But the coal industry doesn't give up easily.

The Interior Department moved last month to let in for the first half of 1960 an additional 100,000 barrels a day of residual above the present 365,000-barrel daily limit.

But the coal lobby, assisted by a coal State Senator, protested so loudly that the increase was cut back to 62,000 barrels a day.

Even among sources that had been favorable to some import curbs, this was too much.

The periodical "Petroleum Week" called it "the lowest form of a political pacification of a pressure group."

What makes it particularly outrageous is the fact that relatively only a small amount of coal has been lost to residual oil competition. One spokesman for the coal industry said that only 5 million tons was lost to residual oil last year. This is only 1¼ percent of last year's production.

It is not the 5 million tons that chiefly concerns the coal industry. The industry knows it cannot get it all back even if residual supplies are sharply restricted—many customers will turn to natural gas rather than return to coal.

The industry simply wants to increase the general level of fuel prices so that what it does sell will bring in more money.

The fight will be on in Congress next year, and the issue will be whether the Government can properly assist one industry to rig the market.

Rural Development: A Constructive Step Toward Improving the Outlook in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today the Nation is striving to find a solution to our complex problems in agriculture. In recent years we have witnessed far-reaching changes in farming, particularly as a result of the technological revolution.

In a field so complicated as agriculture, it has been extremely difficult to find any single-type panacea. Currently, however, there is one fundamental broad-scope program which—even though just in the exploratory state—shows real promise of dealing effectively with the basic problems of agriculture. I refer to the rural development program.

The aims of this program include: First, to expand industry and widen the range of off-farm jobs in areas with many small, low-production farms; second, to help families having the desire and ability to stay in farming gain necessary land, tools, and skills; third, to help younger rural people obtain adequate education and, especially, improved job skills.

Inaugurated in 1957, the rural development program now has designated about 200 counties in 30 States—including programs in Sawyer and Price Counties in Wisconsin—for such projects.

What have been the results?

New searching looks at the potentials of economically hard-pressed areas;

Community cooperation to carry out the agreed-upon projects for economic betterment;

Introduction of new industrial projects into low-income areas;

Expansion of existing small industries and enterprises;

Improvement of agricultural processing and marketing facilities;

Stimulated tourist business and recreation income, including development of more parks and attractive towns and communities;

Homes are being built to attract retired people and clinics and other health facilities are being established;

Forests and farm woodlands are being developed and woodworking industries are being expanded to give more employment and incomes to local people; and other activities.

Overall, the program involves close cooperation among local groups and agencies and appropriate Federal and State agencies in creating a many-sided program aimed at development of industries and other enterprises, educational and vocational training, better sanitation and health facilities, better and more efficient agriculture and marketing and generally opening new opportunities for small, low-income communities.

Believing this program represents a fundamentally sound approach to resolving some of the problems in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have a recent fact sheet published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on the rural development program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, accompanied by a list of the Federal agencies cooperating in this program.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, FACT SHEET, JANUARY 1960

WHY A RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM?

Fifty-six percent of the Nation's farms produce only 9 percent of farm products going to market. Most of these farms are operated by farmers earning a large part of their income in nonfarm work, by older farmers, and by those on poor land or inadequate units. They obtain little, if any, benefit from publicly supported price stabilization programs. Many of the farmers on these small, low-production units suffer the effects of underemployment. They may have productive employment equal to only one-half year of work or less. Underemployment in widespread farming areas of the Nation is not primarily a farm problem. It is a social problem calling for entirely different approaches than the income problem of commercial farmers.

WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES?

The rural development program, which was inaugurated locally in 1957, has three major aims: (1) To expand industry and widen the range of off-farm jobs in areas with many small, low-production farms. (2) To help families having the desire and ability to stay in farming gain necessary land, tools, and skills. (3) To help younger rural people obtain adequate education and, especially, improved job skills.

WHERE IS THE PROGRAM GOING FORWARD?

About 200 counties in 30 States have now been designated for the rural development program.[1] Individual State programs are under guidance of interagency committees, with administrative services provided by State colleges of agriculture through their extension services.

WHAT IS BEING ACCOMPLISHED?

Most counties participating in the program reported an increase in both farm and nonfarm opportunities in 1959. Industry expansion continued. Small woodlots and timber processing enterprises yielded a higher return. Several areas built new marketing and processing facilities or organized farmers' marketing cooperatives. Changes in agricultural production on small farms continued, with vegetable and livestock enterprises increasing in numbers and output. Vocational guidance and training for young people, as well as special campaigns to encourage advanced education,

[1] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nesbraka, Montana, Nevada, New Mexica, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Puerto Rico.

received more attention in areas participating in the rural development program.

WHO TAKES THE LEAD?

Federal and State government and educational agencies, such as land-grant colleges and universities, are helping people in the program areas plan the work, and supplying technical assistance and personnel as needed. However, local people representing farm, business, civic, educational, church, and other interests provide the day-to-day leadership.

WHAT ARE FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS DOING?

Special assistance from the Federal Government for the rural development program includes:

Provision of some 140 State extension agents and specialists; technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service equivalent to 75 man-years; assignment by State and Federal forest services of technicians to aid in forest industry improvement; increased allocations of agricultural conservation program funds in 19 States; and special research projects in low-income areas in 22 States.

The Farmers Home Administration increased lending in rural development counties by some $3 million in 1958–59. Cooperating with State employment services, the U.S. Labor Department inaugurated special community employment programs in selected rural towns and communities. And through its regular credit programs, the U.S. Small Business Administration shared in a total of 63 loans for $2,540,885 to small firms in 48 participating counties.

Among important steps taken recently at the national level to strengthen the rural development program were the following:

President Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10847 formally establishing a Cabinet-level Committee for Rural Development Program to provide leadership and policy guidance to Federal agencies.

A senior Agricultural Research Service economist was named to serve as interim executive secretary to the national committee.

State extension service directors recommended that all States use the rural development approach to aid in the development of potential resources in lagging rural communities.

Farmers Home Administration is providing additional credit in rural development areas for farmers regularly employed off the farm.

And in May 1955, a week-long national workshop was held to train agency personnel assisting in the new program.

President Eisenhower has said, "The rural development program is successfully attacking the age-old and chronic problem of low incomes in widespread rural areas where there are fine farm families on small farms and poor soils. Rural families of such areas—nonfarm and farm alike—need, and we are determined must have, more adequate incomes and greater opportunities."

The National Committee for Rural Development Program—of which True D. Morse, Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, is chairman—was established by Executive order of the President, and is composed of the Under Secretaries and Administrator of the following departments and agency:

U.S. Department of the Interior—is of service through such responsibilities as National Parks and Monuments; Public Domain, including mineral resources; Fish and Wildlife Service; and Indian Affairs.

U.S. Department of Agriculture—has 10 services actively working on rural development—Forest Service; Soil Conservation Service; Agricultural Conservation Program; Extension Service; Farmers Cooperative Service; Research; Marketing; Commodity Stabilization; Farmers Home Administration; Rural Electrification and Telephone; and Office of Information.

The Farm Credit Administration is active in support of the program.

U.S. Department of Commerce—through its Office of Area Development and its various bureaus offers a wide scope of services of assistance to businesses and industries. Roads, railroads, air services, and power are illustrations.

U.S. Department of Labor—is responsible for employment and career counseling services, and various apprenticeship and training programs. The Department has pilot programs in four of the rural development areas to determine how to extend more effective service to rural people.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—has many agencies, which with State cooperation, can help speed the progress of any rural development program. Examples are education, including vocational training; health services, including clinics and hospitals; social security and old-age assistance.

U.S. Small Business Administration is very active and has recently been making rural development type loans in small towns, villages, and rural communities at a rate of $120 million per year. Advisory and supervisory services are offered to small businesses and industries.

Council of Economic Advisers—has one of its three members serving on the national committee to help relate the program to the total economy of the United States.

Unfair Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written by a patriotic American and expert on textiles. It should command attention from every Member of this Congress:

M. LOWENSTEIN & SONS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 25, 1960.

Hon. HENRY KEARNS,
Assistant Secretary of International Affairs, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEARNS: The writer is executive chairman of the board of M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc. So that you may know something about us, we are an integrated textile company with 17 plants and upwards of 17,000 employees.

I know your job is a rough one, and you cannot please everyone. However, I believe first things first, which means, you've got to take care of the home ground first. Are you doing it properly?

We have, throughout our American industry, the double danger of diminishing exports and increasing imports, which means—and whoever would have thought we would be talking of that now—jeopardy of the U.S. dollar and the threat of unemployment.

In a speech which you made before the American Marketing Association on December 28, 1959, you stated that what is hurting sales of U.S. products abroad is lack of effective marketing, and not price.

With your background in sales and manufacturing, I am amazed at your statement. It may be that in your experience you have never had the privilege of trying to compete with unfair competition—competing with imported products made by labor that is receiving slave wages. If someone has a price edge, he gets stronger and stronger, and you get weaker and weaker, and it is only a matter of time before the fellow who can't compete is out of business.

Looking at American textiles, how can one say that all that is involved is effective marketing and not price? Indonesia was formerly a major foreign market for U.S. textiles. A recent news item states that Japan in a barter transaction will send Indonesia $10½ million of cotton textiles in exchange for raw cotton and processing charges—all of the fabrics to be shipped by September 30, 1960.

We are losing the European common market, and what will happen when the floodgates of Red China and Russia are opened and their products compete with ours in this country and freely in the world market? Just within the last month, Russia signed an agreement with 40 American textile machinery companies for $20 million of equipment for an integrated textile operation in Russia. German, Italian, and other U.S. interests are also assisting the building of synthetic plants in Russia.

Now, what does all of that mean to a company like ours? It means loss of foreign markets, increased competition and the threat of unemployment at home—unless our Government imposes proper duties and proper quotas.

The above applies to textiles, and is—or soon will be—true of steel, chemicals, drugs, typewriters, and practically the entire range of U.S. industry.

Realists as we all are, what's going to happen—I'm not talking about 1960 because that's a presidential year, and if we have unemployment, I know the Government will start pump priming—but what about 1961 and the years thereafter? What about the people coming up who are looking forward to inheriting this wonderful country of ours with flourishing times? Are they going to have it?

We've heard a lot about "giveaway" plans. How much have we got to give away today, with the flight of money the way it is and the flight of money extending further and further? How much employment can we give away before we will have to ask for help from nations all over this world? Now, I am not a politician. I vote and support what I consider, both nationally and locally, the best for our country.

We cannot be selfish. I don't believe in this. The textile business today is, to a certain extent, booming. It is not always going to be this way, and it is just in times such as these when we sow the seeds of danger which we will be unable to cope with when things are not going so well.

Now, I don't want to be misunderstood. Our policy is going to be "if we can't lick 'em, we are going to join them." If the policy of our country is to have foreign goods made with labor receiving slave labor rates take away our domestic market, and throw our good citizens out of work, we have to join in setting up foreign plants.

If we were a private company and not a public corporation, I—being in my 77th year—would say we will just stick to America. However, I am just one of the employees in our company which is owned by many, many stockholders.

Again, I urge, in the interest of not alone our industry, but of our country, that proper and fair consideration be given to protecting American jobs so that we can keep America strong which, I say, is our first job, and if we do not handle that job properly, then it doesn't much matter what else we try to do.

Very truly yours,

LEON LOWENSTEIN,
Executive Chairman of the Board.

A Balanced Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program begins its work under the able leadership of the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, it is to be assumed that the whole, vast range of the program will be explored and certain legislative improvements developed. The subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be a member, will be seeking, among other things, to find possible ways and means of reducing the cost of completing construction of the system, a matter of serious concern to us all. However, in doing so, we must not, I think, lose sight of the need for building a balanced system that will not neglect our congested urban areas in which an estimated three-fourths of our people will reside by 1975.

The subcommittee is to begin, I understand, by reviewing the question of whether or not the Interstate System is meeting our so-called defense needs. Let us remember that those defense needs are manifold in nature, and involve not only the transportation of missiles and other military weapons and vehicles, but the transportation of defense workers to and from their place of employment, the transportation of defense materiel and supplies, the transportation of food and medical aid and supplies in time of emergencies, and, finally, that those highways must also serve as a means of escape for the citizens of our metropolitan areas in the event of an attack.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I accordingly insert the recent remarks of the Honorable S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the New York Port Authority, and a former member of the Clay Commission, touching on this subject:

A BALANCED HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR THE NATION

(Remarks by Hon. S. Sloan Colt, chairman, the Port of New York Authority, at the annual meeting of the board of trustees, the Automobile Safety Foundation, November 4, 1959)

Chairman Hope, trustees of the Automotive Safety Foundation, President Mattson, and gentlemen, I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to you today on a matter of timely interest to all of us. I refer to a balanced highway program for the Nation. It is most appropriate that this subject be considered at this meeting because of the many major contributions the Automotive Safety Foundation has made to the improvement of highway transportation in the United States. Through the foundation, during these past 22 years, businessmen have joined together to attack head on the critical problems facing our Nation's highway transportation network. The splendid record of the foundation has established it as a leading force in the promotion of safety, economy and efficiency on our streets and highways.

It was suggested that I should consider speaking here today as a banker, since the Bankers Trust Co. has for many years participated in the program of the Automotive Safety Foundation. But with your permission I should like to speak as a former member of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, frequently referred to as the Clay Committee.

I should also like to speak as chairman of the Port of New York Authority. In these two posts, I have had to deal directly with the problems of providing modern highway transportation facilities. And it is these tasks which lead me to speak out today on a matter of deep concern to those of us who are responsible for arterial highway development.

This Nation today is in the midst of a vast expansion of its highway system. This program was conceived in 1954 by President Eisenhower who recognized clearly that our highway system, to a great extent, was obsolete, unsafe, and inadequate. The Clay Committee, established by the President, was charged with the responsibility of developing a "grand plan for a properly articulated (highway) system that solves the problems of speedy, safe transcontinental traffic, intercity transportation, access highways and farm to farm movement, metropolitan area congestion, bottlenecks, and parking."

With the cooperation and assistance of the staff of the Automotive Safety Foundation, the Clay Committee submitted its report to the President in January 1955. The report recognized that the need for rapid improvement of the Interstate Highway System, including the necessary urban sections, was vital to the Nation's welfare. It recommended a 10-year construction program for the 40,000-mile Interstate System at a cost to the Federal Government of approximately $25 billion. The committee's recommendations led to the current interstate highway construction program which was initiated by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956.

I am sure we are all pleased that the Federal aid highway bill enacted during the past session of Congress assures that construction will continue on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, even though it will be at a reduced level and will require several more years to complete than originally conceived.

I am, however, greatly disturbed by recent developments concerning certain aspects of the forthcoming review of the Federal highway program by both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. Reports indicate that the review will involve consideration of ways and means of reducing the cost of constructing the system, through more austere design or by giving priority to the less costly rural sections of the system. The question of design, of course, is primarily for highway engineers and traffic experts to resolve. However, of overriding importance and of the most serious concern is the suggestion that current construction schedules be altered to deemphasize urban sections of the interstate system.

Frankly, it is inconceivable to me that consideration can be given to sacrificing the scheduled critical urban highway construction in favor of a priority for rural highways as an economy measure. Such a view loses sight of the basic purpose of this great Federal highway program—to provide a safe and efficient highway network essential to the economy of the Nation and adequate for the needs of national defense.

There is a clear and apparent need for urban highway construction. The United States is becoming increasingly an urban Nation. It is in these urban areas that the majority of the people of this country live, own and drive most of the cars and pay a large part of the taxes which finance the Interstate Highway System. These are the areas that are facing the serious problem of traffic congestion—congestion that would be compounded immeasurably if adequate urban highway capacity is not provided. And it is in these urban areas that lack of arterial highways can strangle the Nation's defense industries, commercial activities and economic growth. I must add, too, that the urban highways planned as part of the interstate system will not alone be sufficient at best to solve the total highway problem of today's metropolitan areas. But it is in the metropolitan areas that the need for highway improvements is the greatest and the interstate program is of major importance in this regard.

It can be expected that the trend toward urbanization and its accompanying highway requirements will, without doubt, continue as our population expands and as our metropolitan districts enlarge. By 1975, almost three-fourths of the Nation's people will reside in metropolitan areas. These people will own about 60 percent of the 110 million vehicles expected to be registered in 1975. Metropolitan areas will thus face increasing highway requirements. For example, the Port of New York Authority operates six bridges and tunnels connecting the States of New York and New Jersey as part of the highway complex of the metropolitan area. In 1959 these facilities will handle about 95 million vehicles. By 1975, we expect that the vehicular volume will increase to over 150 million. Similar expansion of traffic is anticipated in all parts of the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. Nor is this increased traffic to be deplored. It is the result of a dynamic, thriving economy. Urban areas are increasingly the sparkplugs of the economy and their needs must be met if the objectives of the Federal highway program are to be achieved.

The Interstate Highway System is planned to connect all major cities and metropolitan areas of the Nation. Certainly these connecting highways cannot end on the fringe of urban areas or merely bypass them. Any new highways built without adequate access to the traffic-generating urban areas would be useless and an economic waste. Indeed, any such plan would be compounding the expensive, hazardous bottlenecks which the President specifically aimed at eliminating in formulating his highway program.

Urban highways are located in the areas where the traffic is—over one-half of today's highway traffic is generated in urban areas. And it is these urban areas that contain the industrial concentrations which form the backbone of the Nation's strength—both economic and military.

Throughout the country, the development of arterial highways has been a major stimulant to the economy of the areas they serve. Modern highway facilities increase business and industry values; improve the residential attractions of the community; encourage shoppers and recreational driving and contribute to job opportunities and buying power.

The investment in urban highways of the interstate system thus pays rich dividends. To subtract from the scheduled improvements within urban areas in order to add greater connecting mileage between urban areas would be self-defeating insofar as dollar-for-dollar economy and utility are concerned.

The report of the Clay Committee called for a balanced program of modern highways. It was fully aware that this program required expensive urban highway construction and did not hesitate to recommend that "the Federal Government assume primary responsibility for the Interstate network—to include the most essential urban arterial connections." The Committee specifically noted that to "render the Interstate System fully effective, it must be tied in much more closely with existing roads in congested

areas." Just for this purpose alone, the connections to the roads of the urban areas, the Committee in its appraisal of minimum needs included $4 billion to be spent over a 10-year period.

Similarly, the Clay Committee report noted the relative importance of urban highways. The Committee's report stated that only about 10 percent of the total highway mileage of the Nation is within urban areas but that these highways account for approximately 50 percent of the total vehicle miles of travel on all highways in the United States. It was estimated, too, that almost one-half of the total expenditures on the Interstate System would be required to be spent in the urban areas to satisfy the needs and to accommodate the increasing pressures of traffic. This forecast has been borne out by the experience of the first few years of the highway construction program, with anticipated expenditures in the urban areas approximating 42 percent of the cost of the total program.

The need for metropolitan highway improvement is not new. Indeed, it was clearly foreseen as early as 1944, in two separate reports to Congress. One, "The Role of the Federal Government in Highway Development," was prepared by the Automotive Safety Foundation at the request of the Senate Postwar Planning Committee, and the other, entitled "Interregional Highways," was prepared by the National Interregional Highway Committee appointed by the President in 1941. Both documents gave special emphasis to the highways needs in urban areas, and the latter report provided the basis for the establishment of the Interstate Highway System which was subsequently authorized by Congress in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944. The following statement from the interregional highway report emphasizes the importance of adequate highways to serve large cities and metropolitan areas:

"All facts available to the committee point to the sections of the recommended system within and in the environs of the larger cities and metropolitan areas, as at once the most important in traffic service and least adequate in the present state of improvement. These sections include routes around as well as into and through the urban areas. If priority of improvement within the system be determined by either the magnitude of benefits resulting or the urgency of need, it is to these sections that first attention should be accorded."

A balanced program of modern highways has now been under construction for over 3 years. The States have accepted in good faith the expression of Congress to continue this national highway program on schedule, and have provided the necessary manpower and financial arrangements for meeting the State's share of the cost of the program. In fact, many States and some cities that are participating financially in this program have borrowed money through the sale of bonds to finance their share of this program. Consequently, many of these States and cities would be perilously close to serious financial difficulties if the Federal highway program provided by Congress and supervised by the Bureau of Public Roads with the cooperation of the State highway departments were to deemphasize the urban portion of the overall program.

Similarly, the elimination of urban highways from the interstate program would force local and State agencies to divert a larger proportion of their tax resources, already under tremendous pressures for other basic public needs, for the construction of the essential connecting arteries to the Interstate System. The placing of such an additional burden on local jurisdictions is far from the original intention of the President's highway program.

These past 5 years have seen an increased glut of traffic congestion in urban areas. They have demonstrated the continued concentration of our population in urban centers. They have confirmed the President's wisdom in recommending, and the Congress' foresight in enacting, what is now the Federal highway program. Certainly the program will fail in one of its major purposes if the cities and industrial areas remain strangled with traffic because of lack of needed expanded arterial streets and highways. Therefore, let any reexamination of that program keep in mind the fundamental objective of the program as stated by the President, "a grand plan for a properly articulated highway system," "paying off in economic growth," and making "a good start on the highways the country will need for a population of 200 million people."

Desecration of Houses of Worship

SPEECH
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to the remarks of my senior colleagues, but I think it is important that by passage of House Concurrent Resolution 465 the prestige of the Congress of the United States is added to the growing list of those who have expressed shock, outrage, and disgust at the desecrations which have been committed to houses of worship, cemetaries, and other sacred sites.

It is significant, too, that while this resolution condemns, in no uncertain terms, these acts of desecration, it refrains from directing accusations in any particular direction or at any particular group of people. It recognizes that none of us are blameless, and that these shameful acts have occurred in America as they have in other countries. It calls upon all peoples, of all nations, to devote their best energies to stamping out those who harbor and promote the hate which manifests itself in such a cowardly fashion.

Whatever the causes of these recent outbursts of anti-Semitism, and I suspect they are numerous and complex, we who are opposed to them must act vigorously to discourage their recurrence, and to punish those who are found guilty of their perpetration.

This resolution is a good beginning, but it cannot be the end of our efforts to stamp out racial and religious prejudice. Resolutions such as this serve to focus the weight of public opinion on the issue, but resolutions alone will not root out of our society those latent seeds of bigotry and hate from which these outrages spring. It is only through militant devotion to the principle of universal brotherhood and the practice of good will and mutual respect which this feeling of brotherhood engenders that we can hope to weed out the hatemongers among us.

House Concurrent Resolution 465 can be, if we make it so, a vital first step in a new campaign against intolerance and prejudice of all kinds. As such it is eminently worthy of the support of every Member of the House, and I shall certainly give it my full support.

The Corn Tassel as U.S. Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, these days there are many decisions Congress is required to make. There are many steps which Congress has an obligation to take. There are many questions Congress is bound to deliberate for the well-being of the country and its people. At the outset, I will say that the question of a floral emblem does not stand in the highest rank in order of priority. But this fact does not make selection of an emblem a lighthearted, gay, jocular pastime for the Congress. It is about the selection of an emblem that I speak today.

I bring it up at this time, Mr. Speaker, because in recent weeks the subject of a floral emblem has been mentioned. Much has been made over the various positions held by advocates of certain flowers, shrubs, and plants. Contradictory views have been expressed over the relative beauty of proposed flowers and growths. I believe that if we decide to take the time to consider an emblem we should give this subject the full deliberation it deserves. For that reason, I have a few remarks dealing with what I believe to be the qualities desired in an emblem.

I believe that selection of an emblem is more important than any ordinary beauty contest. A national emblem is, after all, a symbol of our entire country, its people, its past, and its qualities of character as it faces the future.

For that reason, I believe that the entire nature of a plant—its identification with and importance to America—should be taken into consideration. A Minnesota woman, Miss Margo Cairns, of Minneapolis, has long pointed out the desirability of the corn tassel as our national emblem. She has cited the fact that corn has been identified with America, that it was literally the major crop of the Indian as well as the pioneers, and that our history is replete with examples of human dependency on corn.

Miss Cairns has written:

A national floral emblem must also be distinctively and wholly American. It, too, must be a symbol of the land, the Nation, its people, its history.

1. It must be of American origin, born in the Western Hemisphere, and found nowhere else before 1492.

2. It must have its roots in every State unifying the Nation.

3. It must serve the Nation, and it certainly has served it well from the first landings on the Atlantic coast to the present.

4. It must not be a flower of mere prettiness, but possess the rare beauty of practicality, or productivity.

5. Its choice as a national floral emblem should be based on gratitude for what it has been, is, and always will be to the people of the United States—a true symbol of this Nation.

Because corn is identified with our heritage, I believe it should be given serious consideration whenever the Congress takes upon itself the matter of a national emblem.

Dent Demands Facts on Foreign Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes one wonders how far we can go in underselling the importance of maintaining our own economic defenses as well as our military.

Russia and the communistic threat seems to have made this country into a punch-drunk fighter shadowboxing the sound of every bell, or even worse, a cringing coward who dodges every feint and anticipated punch and forgets to throw a few of his own.

All one has to do is read our own papers and business magazines to find out that all is not well in our economy.

The following release by me followed a story in Business Week which covered the subject matter contained therein:

DENT DEMANDS FACTS ON FOREIGN BIDS

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, today called upon the Bureau of Reclamation to disclose facts in the bid controversy between English-Electric, England, and Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, United States of America for eight hydroturbines for Glen Canyon Dam, a Federal project.

DENT claims that this case points up the ridiculous and idiotic position in which this Government has placed American producers and American workers because of the interpretation of the Buy American Act by this administration.

Here are the facts outlined by DENT: The English bid, $6,214,552; the American bid, $6,392,000. Although the President has cut the buy American 25 percent differential down to 6 percent, the American company met this unrealistic differential and was in line for the work.

The English company has protested and won a 45-day delay in the granting of the award on the grounds that the American company is producing more than 50 percent of the costs of the equipment in a foreign country (Belgium). The English argue that under this arrangement the American company is denied the protection of the Buy American Act.

The controversy began over which figure is right, the British or the American.

DENT further explained that the real issue is not that an English company can tell our Government where to buy, but goes deeper.

The American company was forced to go to a foreign supplier in order to even come close in the bids by the ridiculous operation of our Federal purchase plan.

If the product were wholly manufactured in the United States, the American company would be so far out that the British company would have had no competition for the bid.

DENT said that the problem posed is this—Do we quit bidding American products? Do we buy all the component parts in foreign countries and still claim "buy American protection"? Do we stop kidding ourselves and get back to American fundamentals, or do we quit kidding the foreign countries about the meaning of buy American legisaltion.

"As a Congressman, and as a citizen taxpayer," said DENT, "I want to know and it's about time the American people, especially the American workers, businessmen and particularly Members of Congress know, what's going on in our Government."

I will not elaborate on this particular case because the record contains my many presentations on this subject. I will say, however, in passing, that sooner or later this subject of American investment abroad, American aid to other competitive nations, American home economy, and social security amendments will be the major issue in our political arena. We cannot continue with the kind of idiotic thinking that seems to start from nowhere and aims to go to the same place.

In this regard, listen to this little item out of one of the leading American newspaper's business section, telling American manufacturers that there are many fine locations for their plants in Europe. It goes on to show where the locations are that offer the least costs of operation because of lowest wages. It further goes on to say that they can sell not only in the European trade bloc, but can undersell their own plants here in America.

How then do we help our economy by taking American money, investing it in Europe and Asia, hiring foreign labor, selling to our former customers as well as shipping back into the United States the same goods we manufacture here in surplus?

Recently, a notice came out about the Japanese building a watch factory in India. However, when you read the details, you find that the Japs are building a plant for the Indian Government to operate. Further, they are being paid for building it and for providing the technical assistance. Of course, we do it differently, we not only give them the money but we even allow them to buy the construction needs somewhere else and then give them a free market here in America for their products. We not only help private enterprise abroad, but we also help governments to get into business to compete with us.

One question seems unanswerable. How can an American watch manufacturer pay taxes, dividends, wages, and local civic charges and compete against monopoly government-owned, non-tax-paying plants abroad?

One example of this is Volkswagen, owned and operated by the West German Government. Here is a little story of how we get suckered in by our friends: The United States refused to allow American pipe producers to sell Russia 12,000 miles of pipe for an oil pipeline on the grounds of security, and so forth. The West German Government sold Russia the pipe from plants rehabilitated by American foreign aid and American taxpayers' dollars. The Germans take 100,000 Russian-made automobiles as part of the payment. The German Government took the Russian-made cars, sold them through the Volkswagen distribution system and released 100,000 Volkswagens for sale outside of Germany mostly in the United States. We not only lost the pipe order, but in the end we probably paid for most of it.

Another angle that this administration seems to overlook is its blind opposition to area development, high interest rates and refusal to amend the Social Security Act by lowering age limits and increasing benefits, both medical and minimums. In the face of this attitude, it is strange to see the President demanding more economic aid for foreign countries when these same countries are doing exactly what he refuses to do here in America and in many cases doing it with our money.

West Germany, for instance, has set up a special tax and development aid for so-called distressed and underdeveloped industrial areas and communities in Germany. The President and our own chamber of commerce oppose this program for Americans, but both support vigorously the billions for foreign countries.

Belgium: This is really a dandy setup. Belgium has also set up a special set of help moves for its own underdeveloped industrial areas and one of the concessions is that these communities can borrow money at an interest as low as 1 percent. Imagine this—when your community and mine cannot get money without paying the exorbitant high interest rate demanded by this administration who are even now demanding that Congress lift the ceiling on interest rates on long-term bonds to an unrestricted amount.

Where do the Belgians get the money they loan? Much of the money used by these nations comes from the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, foreign economic aid, the technical assistance program, the Export-Import Bank, the Development Fund—United States completely—Special United Nations Fund, the new Inter American Development Fund for Latin American countries only, and, of course, the new IDA under the World Bank.

This will make it possible to loan money to India and other so-named underdeveloped countries on "soft" loans, loans that can be paid back in the "soft," hardly negotiable funds of the countries getting the money.

The United States starts this one off with over $320 million and also this will give us a chance to spend the accumulated funds under Public Law 480, which is the soft money that the countries now owe us and which we cannot take out of their country owed us in payment for farm products, and so forth, but we can spend it by loaning it back to them, or giving it to other needy nations to build production machinery for industrial goods.

One thing I want to call to your attention is that the new Fund will be able to loan money where the World Bank is restricted by law and cannot do it. I will quote from the Washington Post of February 1 to give you an authentic position and not one prejudiced by political partisanship:

World Bank officials said yesterday a deliberately "broad latitude" will be used in granting loans to the underdeveloped nations. Some may be free of interest, some long-term, some repayable wholly in "soft" currency.

Individual nations will not be required to stand as guarantors for loans made to borrowers within their borders, such as is true now for World Bank loans, and IDA, unlike the World Bank, will be able to loan money for such projects as community water supplies, sanitation, and housing developments.

One item in the IDA charter is of particular interest to the United States. It permits a member nation to contribute "soft" currency in addition to its own "hard" currency quota. This means that the United States will be able to put to use the huge accumulations of Public Law 480 funds, which may total $5 billion this year. These funds are the repayments in "soft" currency which underdeveloped countries have made for U.S. surplus crop shipments.

Now to keep the record straight, the "surplus farm products" they are talking about were paid for by American taxpayers; and if in the end we get no payments for them, then why did we not just give them away in the first place, and stop all the added costs, and so forth, that we are still paying.

You will also note that this administration and business organizations such as the national chamber of commerce claim that it is inflationary to spend money for public facilities in urban redevelopment, housing, and for other area needs, but it is OK for others to spend our money to do the same thing.

This is only part of the picture. For instance, the arguments against social security benefits for medical and hospital care here in America are advanced by the same promoters of giving our American aid to countries that have complete socialized medicine as part of their system of government.

We further find the President opposing aid to education for student housing under a loan program while promoting student housing and aid to education in other countries.

Recently Campbell Soups announced the plans for a large canning plant in Mexico—Business Week—"because farm produce is cheaper, construction and labor costs are the lowest, and they can still sell through their established American outlets."

We are paying for surplus farm products, the American farmers' income is lower than it has been for years, we have surplus labor, surplus farms, but that does not seem to matter to the kind of profit-seeking internationalism we are now practicing in this country.

This, Mr. Speaker, is only a scratch on the surface of this economic as well as military problem. I am personally convinced that just as we are admitted to be second to Russia on missiles, if we do not stop our "ducking at every swing," we will be knocked out of the economic war not because we were hit, but because we wore ourselves out.

The Economic Plight of the American Family Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 18 this year my insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD was entitled, "How Many Farmers?" and dwelled on the economic factors that are fast reducing the population of our family farms. With little, if any, firm assistance from the present Secretary of Agriculture and the national administration, the family farmer in America is slowly but surely being forced into bankruptcy. The period for him to emerge, in the face of expenditures exceeding income, is long overdue and fading fast, particularly so when no administrative efforts are being made to give him a fair and just share of the increasing wealth of our national economy.

The economic plight of the American family farmer is profoundly expressed in the attached editorial published in the January 28 issue of the Burt County (Nebr.) Plaindealer, an enterprising weekly newspaper that is close to the agricultural situation. The editorial goes further than the problem of the family farmer, and emphasizes the root of the evil will eventually reach the small businessman in the rural communities and destroy him along with the farmer.

This editorial, and more like it that have been published throughout the land are reminders of the voice of St. John, crying in the wilderness, hoping that the message will be heeded before it is too late. The national administration agricultural policies of the past 7 years have brought nothing more than economic stagnation to the agricultural areas of the country, and I will endeavor to emphasize seven primary reasons in a further paragraph following the editorial.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of my colleagues to extend my remarks, may I commend your attention to the timely and warning editorial of the Burt County Plaindealer:

FARM PROGRAM PLEASES NEARLY EVERYONE, EXCEPT THE FARMER

Secretary Benson's farm program, under which thousands of farmers are leaving the land to seek more lucrative employment in other fields, seems to satisfy about everyone—everyone, that is, except the farmer who must still make his living farming the soil and raising livestock.

We get lots of mail and publicity releases from industrial organizations, financial groups, Republican politicians, educators and farm advisers with cozy, secure jobs, who plead the cause of "freedom for the farmer" and the Benson program.

Cheap food is fine for the fellow who doesn't have to produce it at a loss and "we must keep eatin' costs down" even though everything else, including taxes continues to climb in these days of prosperity created by continuously growing Government bureaus, a record national debt and more and more taxes.

The day when a hard-working farmer could support his family on a moderately sized farm will soon be a time of the past and the little business in rural communities will fall victim to the same conditions which are selling the farmer down the road. Will that be good for America? We don't think so.

FARM INCOME STATUS—PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

First. Farm prices at 77 percent of parity, the lowest in 19 years.

Second. Farmer's share of consumer's food dollar at 37 cents, lowest in 20 years.

Third. Net farm income, $10.3 billion (1959), lowest in 17 years.

Fourth. Farmers' out-of-pocket net income losses since 1952, almost $20 billion.

Fifth. Farm production expenses at new peak of $26 billion in 1959, using up 68 cents out of each gross farm dollar. That's almost as bad as 1932.

Sixth. Forecast of even lower farm prices and net income for 1960.

Seventh. Five Presidential vetoes of major farm bills in 7 years.

Prosperity for our farmers can be brought about only by passage of good, workable farm legislation that will boost the net income of farm families, and by revamping our lopsided national economy into some semblance of equal balance between the annual incomes of the urban industrial workers and other high-paying occupations, and the farmer who toils in our agricultural areas. Lack of equal prosperity for the farmer will not only destroy small business in the rural communities but will be reflected in considerable measure throughout the industrial and manufacturing areas of the rest of the Nation.

A Plug for the Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article which appeared in the Boston Traveler on January 20, 1960:

A PLUG FOR THE PARKS

It's to be hoped that President Eisenhower's support in his budget message for two national parks in Massachusetts will stir Congress into early action. Both the

Minuteman National Historical Park in Concord, Lincoln, and Lexington, and the Cape Cod National Seashore Park have been hanging fire longer than necessary.

And, as the President points out, speed is essential in the Cape project "before it is too late."

The 32,000-acre stretch of shore, which the Interior Department wants to set aside as a U.S. recreation area, is one of the few remaining undeveloped spots on the Atlantic seaboard.

If it isn't reserved soon as a park—which would be a big tourist attraction—it certainly will be commercialized. Cape residents, both pro- and anti-park, are understandably irked by congressional delay, which hamstrings local planning for the future.

There should be fast action, too, in completing plans to make the Revolutionary battlegrounds around Concord a National shrine. Congress approved the idea a year ago. All that's needed now is the money—$65,000.

Stamp of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in every country where national deficits become a habit the value of that nation's money deteriorates and eventually becomes practically worthless. Several examples of this have occurred within the lifetime of all Americans now living. These should warn all of us that it is time to get the budget in balance and keep it in balance to the end that our present dollar, now worth only 48 cents in purchasing power, does not deteriorate into a 25-cent dollar, a 10-cent dollar, or a dollar of even lesser buying power.

The Seattle Post-Intelligencer, a Hearst publication and one of the most widely circulated and influential newspapers in Washington State, said of this danger editorially in its issue of January 29, 1960:

STAMP OF INFLATION

Ralph Lomen, prominent Seattle-Alaska businessman, puts forth an interesting—and simple—illustration of inflation. As he says, the language of the economist on the subject is not easily understood by the layman.

However, Germany offers a classic example of inflation evils in the period following the First World War. Being a philatelist, Mr. Lomen illustrates the trend with a page from one of his stamp albums.

The denomination of German postage stamps in that period advanced from 1 mark through more than a dozen additional issues until, in 1923, the ultimate stamp of a billion marks was reached.

Mr. Lomen points out that the story of U.S. postage is as yet a lesser example, but is in the classic pattern—a 5-cent fee being advocated to succeed the raises from the original 2 cents, 3 cents, and the present 4 cents.

Yes; the day could come here when you would approach the window of your post office and diffidently ask for a $10 stamp in order to write your Aunt Emma in Kansas City. For a small temporary loan of $10,000 to catch up on your grocery bill.

The Poles Are Spiritual Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of including in the RECORD today an editorial which appeared this morning in the Chicago Sun-Times. I wish to congratulate the Sun-Times for its deep understanding of the problem which today confronts Poland.

I am in full agreement with the Sun-Times editorial that the "impulse toward liberalism and freedom still reaches out in every way it can" among the people of Poland, despite the fact that today they are forced to live under a Communist government imposed upon them against their will.

I believe that the people of Poland, by their stubborn refusal to submit to Communist dogma, today constitute one of the most significant factors in keeping the Soviet Union from engaging in all-out war.

The money that the United States has given the people of Poland in recent years is indeed a small amount when we compare our annual appropriations for national defense during that same period. The Sun-Times is to be congratulated for placing this American financial assistance to the people of Poland in its proper perspective. But this economic assistance should in no way deter the United States from taking a firm position that there can be no real lasting peace in Europe so long as Poland and other satellite nations remain enslaved by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the Sun-Times editorial follows:

THE POLES ARE SPIRITUAL ALLIES

Poland, among all the Soviet satellites, has received the most solicitous treatment from the United States. In the past 3 years our total assistance to that country has amounted to more than $300 million. Most of it has been in food credits (example: this week's deal for $40 million worth of our surplus wheat). A total of $61 million has been for machinery.

This is good business from every point of view.

On the practical side it has helped to shore up the Polish economy. An incidental effect has been to help put Poland in a position where she is now reported both able and ready to pay $40 million in settlement for U.S. property in Poland confiscated in World War II.

But a more persuasive reason for this country to work at good relations with Poland is found in reports by correspondents and travelers returning from Warsaw.

Poland is technically Communist, dominated politically and militarily by the Soviet Union. But in spirit, Poland is still Poland. It shows in many ways—many deviations from the party line so sedulously followed in Russia. Poles still establish their own standards in music, literature and art. They are, moreover, a deeply religious people, and they worship pretty much as they please. The impulse toward liberalism and freedom still reaches out in every way it can; Soviet-style communism has not found the way to engulf their souls.

To foster this spirit in a poeple who have often been dominated but never wholly conquered is surely as useful and promising a part of our policy as anything we may undertake at the top-level conference tables. It builds and conserves basic support for freedom against a time when that strength can make itself felt.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that one of my young constituents is the Alabama State winner in the current "Voice of Democracy" broadcast scriptwriting contest, which is sponsored nationally each year by the National Association of Broadcasters.

The Alabama winner is Miss Geraldine Reeves, a student at Plainview High School at Rainsville, Ala. She will be in Washington later this month to participate in the national contest finals.

It is inspiring to read this young lady's script and it is also reassuring to know that the generation soon to assume the leadership of our democracy carries with it these cherished sentiments. For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit Miss Reeves' prize-winning script which is entitled "I Speak for Democracy."

It follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

We who live in the troubled times of the 20th century know all too well the threat to our great democracy. Therefore it is not only our right but our duty, to join hands with our fellow men and make even stronger the great chain which binds us together, because that chain is no stronger, no better, than the men and women who compose its strength.

Dictatorship is brutal because it is brittle. It cannot bend—it can only break or be broken. It cannot lead its people, it can only drive them.

Democracy, on the other hand, is resilient. It bends without breaking, it sways to the left or to the right and returns to the point of natural balance. It calls for leaders, not for drivers. A free people can be led a greater distance and to greater heights than a slave people can be driven. We are a great people and a great Nation today because we have carried forward the shining spirit of the Declaration of Independence. We are great because we have built and maintained government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And we realize even more every day that eternal vigilance is the price of our liberty.

No date in the long history of freedom means more to liberty-loving men in all liberty-loving countries than the 15th day of December 1791. On this day 168 years ago, a new Nation, through an elected Congress, adopted a declaration of human rights. In this bill was the provision of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. Above all, it was to protect absolutely the equal rights of the poorest, and the richest, of the most ignorant and the most intelligent citizen, and it is to stand

forth as a triple wall of iron around our native land, against the mad blows of violence and the fatal cause of corrupted minds. This is our system of liberty under law and this alone can give us freedom.

It has been said that America fears no enemy but ignorance. Ignorance of our Government, ignorance of the people we chose to run our Government, and ignorance of matters which compose our everyday life. In order to remain the great Nation we are today we must forever hold high the eternal guiding light that expresses a faith in individualism, in freedom, and in equality, that our forefathers fought and died so gallantly for. So we have fought and we will fight again if need be, for the things we have always carried nearest to our hearts—for a greater democracy.

And we, the youth of the 20th century, realize this; we realize that the fate of our Nation will someday rest upon our shoulders, and who are we to throw aside this great responsibility to our country that God so generously gave to us? We should bow our heads and say a thankful prayer that the flag of the United States of America which stands for peace, democracy, and freedom for the individual, is still there, waving proudly in the breeze, over a Nation whose very armor is peace, democracy, and the American way.

Our Nation stands for so much freedom, and offers so many opportunities that it is the responsibility of its citizens to support it. I feel that it is an honor and duty to speak for democracy.

Congress Delays Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to include in the Appendix an excellent editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on February 1, 1960, on the subject of the need for additional judgeships in the Federal system. The House Judiciary Committee is currently holding hearings on the Judicial-Conference-backed omnibus judgeships bill. This editorial is most pertinent.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS DELAYS JUSTICE

Nonpartisan spokesmen for good government must be ever alert to two constant partisan pressures on the courts—even where they are not elective. Each party seeks the patronage involved in judicial appointments. And each seeks to embed its political philosophy in the judiciary. The considerations appear to be governing the excessive slowness of Congress in creating badly needed new Federal judgeships.

When justice becomes tardy and expensive it turns into injustice. Court delays have become intolerable in many Federal districts. Rarely should the blame go to the judges; many of them are laboring conscientiously but vainly to keep up with the increase in court business. A survey shows that one category alone—automobile injury cases—has risen 500 percent in 20 years. From 1941 to 1959 the backlog of untried cases jumped 117 percent. In the southern New York district the median time required to bring a case to trial is 4 years.

For 5 years Congress has had before it proposals to increase the number of judgeships to meet the mounting burden of business. Every year the Judicial Council of the United States, a nonpartisan body, has urged action. One proposal calls for the addition of 45 judges to the Federal bench. President Eisenhower has repeatedly cited the needs to Congress and has even promised to divide the appointments equally on a bipartisan basis.

Proposals for correcting this situation have been pigeonholed by congressional committees. From our nonpartisan sideline this looks like a flagrant delay of justice by Congress. We hope the Democratic leaders there will soon recognize that this great disservice to the country cannot really serve their party.

Invite Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is our good fortune in Colorado to have the privilege of reading the Denver Post, whose editorial page unflinchingly talks sense to the people.

On January 25, the leading editorial calls attention to a fact which must come to influence American policy:

RED CHINA SHOULD BE INVITED TO THE DISARMAMENT TALKS

Both the State Department and Secretary Herter now admit that if any international disarmament treaty is to mean anything, Red China must be a party to the agreements.

The issue comes up because the nations are now preparing for their next great round of general disarmament talks at Geneva on March 15.

Red Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi has reminded them that his Government cannot be bound by any agreement it does not help negotiate, or sign.

One State Department announcement hinted that this country hopes Red China might be brought in toward the end of the talks if they are getting anywhere.

But this is a naive hope.

Red China is primarily interested in asserting its international prestige.

It is highly unlikely that Peiping would ever join any agreement it had not been working on from the early negotiating stages.

And so this country once again finds itself impaled by a policy toward Red China that has in effect denied the existence of a Communist revolution now 10 years accomplished.

None of the reasons why we have taken our past stand have changed very much during that decade.

Red China is still arrogant, militaristic, and still feeds its people "hate America" propaganda every day.

The wounds of Korea are still there, as are five Americans in Red Chinese prisons.

Chiang Kai-shek is still on Formosa, too, a faithful if minor ally on a tiny island that is recognized in the United Nations as one of the world's five great powers.

Across from him on the mainland sit generals commanding the world's largest standing army. And in the background lurks the threat of their getting nuclear weapons.

Secretary Herter's admission—that Red China must someday be represented in any worldwide disarmament system—is courageous, since he represents a political party that has made fervent pledges of support to Chiang.

But that fervor was part of a world in which we had a near-monopoly of atomic weapons and in which it was still a question whether the Chinese Communists could stabilize their regime.

Now Herter is looking at the cold truth. Red China is stabilized and is a member of a hostile bloc of nations that is at least our equal in weaponry.

These facts can only mean, realistically, that Red China should be invited to the disarmament conference at its beginning, whether we like it or not.

Our hope for peace—perhaps a slim one but the best one we have—is to use what influence we can to encourage Peiping to join in arms control.

This cannot possibly be done if Red China's chair at the conference table is empty.

Raymond Palombo of Nahant, Mass., Pioneer in Lobster Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article about my constituent, Raymond Palombo of Nahant, Mass., who is planning to open a new frontier in the fishing industry—deep sea lobster fishing.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 24, 1960]

DEEP SEA LOBSTERING NEW VENTURE IN FISHING

(By Mary Sarah King)

Most folks think of a lobster boat as a small 20-foot work boat, chug-chugging through the murky mist of the early morn, stopping at lobster pots as the crustaceans are scooped up for market.

Raymond Palombo of Nahant has a better and bigger idea of lobster fishing.

A fisherman for the past 30 years, he is building an 80-foot vessel, which he plans to devote to a new frontier in the fishing industry—deep sea lobster fishing.

Palombo, a husky, red-faced 6-footer, has been working 3 years now with his partners on the enormous boat in his yard on Forty Steps Lane, Nahant.

He got the idea a short while back when the Fish and Wildlife Service discovered a well-stocked lobster bed in the ocean off the coast of Nahant. He decided that this would be a lucrative enterprise.

He has been working on the boat now for 3 years. It should be completed by 1961 and will be valued at $125,000.

When the project was begun, Palombo ran up against some red tape in Washington and never did receive the loan he requested.

The frame of the boat fills the near horizon and towers over the five-room ranch house, which he also built. Hundreds have watched its various stages of building, coming from all parts of the State.

There is another observer, whose interest is more than casual—Palombo's comely wife, Almena, who has been living these past months with the huge form greeting her

vision every time she stepped out the back door.

Almena doesn't mind, however. In fact, she looks upon the vessel with pride and admiration for her husband's courage and persistence.

That 80-foot monster represents dancing parties, theaters, and other entertainment that might have been if the investment, $25,000 to date, had not been diverted toward the building of what they claim is their investment in the future.

Even the children are active participants in the project. Raymond Jr., 17, doesn't balk at carrying lumber and other back-breaking tasks.

Six-year-old Almena and young brother, Marc, 3, pause in their play, to yell encouragement to their dad drilling the frames on the deck high above them.

On other boats, her husband has built, Mrs. Palombo has lent a craftsman's touch, but on this, she prefers to stick to her housekeeping tasks which includes cooking tasty Italian dishes.

Palombo and his partners, Frank "Swede" McClain Jr., and Charles Baxter, both Nahanters, are not disheartened over this long-term building project. They expect in early 1961 to launch the vessel which will open a new era in lobstering on the north shore.

We Must Condemn the Desecration of Sacred Places as We Would Condemn an Attack on Our Basic Democracy

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues in this House for their firm action in unanimously supporting passage of House Concurrent Resolution 465 condemning the desecration of sacred places and the violent and outrageous attacks upon the religious beliefs of people here in our own country and in several countries abroad.

In many cases I believe these hate bombings and disgusting hate mailings have been the work of cranks, young hoodlums and ignorant pranksters. However, I understand that reliable information indicates that some of these acts of vandalism in Germany are Communist inspired. For that matter, we might assume this is also the case in some instances here in our country.

Nonetheless, it is people like these who knowingly or perhaps unknowingly, undermine and tend to destroy our form of government. We, who boast of religous freedom as one of the cornerstones upon which this great Nation was built, cannot afford to tolerate such attacks on our basic democracy.

People of all faiths have joined in their denunciation of this desecration—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants throughout the Nation have expressed their indignation of these attacks. And I believe that now, after the Members of this House have conveyed the feeling of the American people to the rest of the world through the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 465, some action, in the form of strong, effective legislation should be enacted.

Oceanography: Jules Verne 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, these days we are overwhelmed, almost on the hour every hour, by the announcements of advances of one sort and another occurring throughout the world in the various scientific fields.

Mostly these advances are in terms of the relative competitive status of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Mostly they seem to be in the fascinating field of space science. Sometimes they are exciting stories of man's battle against nature for greater knowledge of the earth by wresting secrets from the rarefied atmosphere of untamed, soaring mountain peaks.

More and more, but still too seldom, do we hear of the exploits of brave, inquiring men delving into the mysteries of the oceans that comprise more than 70 percent of the earth's surface.

It is generally accepted, but not fully appreciated, that life on this planet has developed from the seas. National economies have grown around their perimeters. Systems of security have been based upon mastery of the oceans—on the surface and below.

Yet we know so little of this vast natural region of great potential.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the U.S. Navy has performed a feat of historic significance with the descent of a manned bathyscaph to the bottom of the ocean in one of its deepest areas. The famous Swiss scientist Jacques Piccard, and U.S. Navy Lt. Don Walsh, descended to the bottom of the ocean deeper than any men have ever gone before. Their trip downward—37,800 feet—exceeded by more than a mile and a half the grueling upward climb of Sir Edmond Hillary and other brave men who have scaled the 29,000-foot eminence of Mount Everest in the Himalayas.

The story of the magnificent feat of the aquanauts of the bathyscaph *Trieste* is important reading for everyone.

I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of January 24, 1960, at this point in the RECORD:

TWO NAVY MEN IN BATHYSCAPH DESCEND 7 MILES IN OCEAN FOR NEW DEPTH MARK

Two Navy scientists descended in a bathyscaph yesterday into the deepest hole in the ocean, more than 7 miles down in the chill and dark bottom of the Pacific off the island of Guam.

Last night the Navy said Jacques Piccard, of the famous Swiss scientist family, and Navy Lt. Don Walsh had given their first report of what it was like to sit for half an hour 37,800 feet down in the Marianas Trench, deeper than any man has gone before.

The Navy relayed the following description, based on an early report from the two men after the bathyscaph *Trieste* had surfaced 210 miles southwest of Guam shortly before 1 a.m. (EST) yesterday:

"It was very cold at the bottom. Both were wet when they came out of the *Trieste* and their teeth were chattering. (Navy experts said they did not take this to mean the craft leaked.)

"They related that they had spent approximately one-half hour on the bottom and could see living and moving objects at 37,800 feet. The bottom was very soft and when they landed they stirred up silt and what they termed 'dust.' The lights were turned on as soon as the bottom was calm but it was a few minutes before they could see anything.

"They started down at 4:22 p.m. on January 22 (east longitude date) and reached bottom at 9:10 p.m. the same date, staying 30 minutes on the bottom and surfacing at 12:57 a.m. on January 23. This means that they took 4 hours and 48 minutes to descend, stayed on bottom 30 minutes approximately, and took 3 hours and 17 minutes to ascend and surface.

"They reported that they lost voice contact (apparently with the surface ships) about halfway down but that it was reestablished upon hitting bottom and maintained until about halfway up.

"The only food they ate was chocolate bars, one every hour, to keep up their energy.

"Upon surfacing, Lieutenant Walsh dropped a plastic container with an American flag on the spot of surfacing."

TWO HUNDRED AND TEN MILES FROM GUAM

The Navy located the position as 210 miles southwest of Apra Harbor, Guam.

Navy experts here said the men probably got wet while boarding the bathyscaph, or perhaps from condensation within the gondola as it descended into the cold water. In leaving the bathyscaph, the men had to climb up through a shaft which was still dripping from the water that had filled it during the dive.

The Navy said one purpose of deep ocean probes is to gather information on the transmission of man-made sounds. While the Navy did not spell it out, this information is important in the operation of sonar devices to detect enemy submarines.

Submarines use the thermal layers of different temperature levels to hide below the surface. A cold layer of water diffuses or entirely blocks sonar beams.

Comparatively little has been known of sound transmission below the comparatively shallow depths of the sea until scientists began descending thousands of feet below the surface.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, chief of naval operations, sent congratulations to the two men for their "valorous action in descending into the depths of the ocean farther than any other man."

"There is no whale in the world who has been so deep as you have," Admiral Burke added.

Admiral Burke said the accomplishment by Dr. Piccard and Lieutenant Walsh "may well mark the opening of a new age in exploration of the depths of the ocean which can well be as important as exploration in space has been in the past."

TEAM BROKE OWN RECORD

The team broke a depth record set only a few days ago, when the Trieste went down

to 24,000 feet in the same Marianas Trench, which parallels and extends beyond Guam.

Dr. Piccard and Lieutenant Walsh thus have been farther down below sea level than the highest mountain of the earth. Mount Everest, in the Himalayas, is slightly over 29,000 feet above sea level.

Records of the Navy Hydrographic Office and the National Geographic Society show the Marianas Trench to be the deepest hole so far discovered in long years of exploration from surface ships.

The Triest was built by Jacques Piccard and his father, Auguste. After its performance had been demonstrated dramatically by dives in the Mediterranean and nearby waters, the Navy bought the Trieste and engaged the younger Piccard.

The word "bathyscaph" means "deep boat" in Greek. The craft is a successor to the bathysphere, or deep sphere, developed by the elder Piccard for underwater observation. The bathysphere was merely a big hollow ball with portholes, lowered by cable from a surface vessel.

The bathyscaph weighs 75 tons and is loaded with gasoline and shot in even balance. When water is pumped in to replace air in end chambers, it sinks. When the tons of buckshot are released at the bottom of the dive, the buoyant gasoline brings it back to the surface. Propellers powered by electric motors provide some cruising and turning maneuverability.

Auto Dealers—Modern "Minutemen" of America's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that the National Automobile Dealers Association is currently holding its annual convention here in the Nation's Capitol.

I should like to express my own personal wishes for a very successful convention to these auto dealers, who I consider the modern minutemen of our national economy. I am delighted that many of the automobile dealers from my own congressional district are participating in this convention.

We all know that the automobile industry constitutes one of the most important aspects of American economy. These men, who have undertaken the difficult task of promoting the sale of automobiles, are performing a great service not only to the economic survival of the United States, but indeed the entire world. Few people stop to realize that every time an automobile is sold in this country, it touches off an economic chain reaction which assures employment for millions of Americans.

The automobile industry is undoubtedly one of the most competitive fields of free enterprise in this country. These men, who are participating in this competition as auto dealers, deserve the highest respect of all of us. Within the framework of free enterprise day in and day out, these are the men who manage to keep the wheels of American industry rolling.

I congratulate them for their great contribution and wish them profound success in their deliberations here in Washington.

Drinking in Planes Hit on Two Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most timely article which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor:

DRINKING IN PLANES HIT ON TWO COUNTS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—"The public interest requires the elimination of all and any known potential factors which can be hazardous to air safety and commerce.

"Alcoholic beverages from time immemorial have never had a rightful place in this industry."

These are words of Clarence N. Sayen, president of the Air Line Pilots Association. Addressing himself to the need for legislation to ban drinking aloft, Mr. Sayen has this to say:

"The time and place concerning the use and consumption of alcoholic beverages historically has always been a matter of legislation by the appropriate authority whenever a threat to public safety, welfare, or a social problem is known to exist.

INSTITUTION RULES CITED

"For example, the consumption of alcoholic beverages has always been prohibited in schools or churches where it is socially or morally wrong or anywhere a safety problem is created.

"The modern-day aircraft crosses many municipal, county, State, and international boundaries in a single flight, making regulation by the normal method impractical. In our opinion, therefore, it falls to the Federal Government to protect the public interest in this matter.

"Unless this is done now, we fear that it will be done in the near future as the result of public clamor arising from a major air calamity caused by the irresponsible action of an inebriated passenger."

TWO REASONS GIVEN

In support of such legislation, Rowland K. Quinn, Jr., president of the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, has this to say:

"In our opinion, it is difficult to draw the line where an unruly obstreperous drunk becomes more than a nuisance and becomes a safety hazard.

"Because of the high density passenger load on an aircraft, we feel that it is appropriate to legislate on the basis of safety, obviously; and also that it is appropriate and in the public interest to legislate with an eye toward reducing the social nuisances or disturbances which are encouraged by this practice.

"If this service were eliminated from commercial air transportation we do not feel that any airline would suffer in the number of passengers it carries.

"If this legislation is passed we do not feel that any large segment of the traveling public will be hurt or deprived of essential service. On the contrary, a potentially dangerous practice will have been eliminated."

One Bad Apple

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert in the RECORD another example of the commonsense which is so often reflected in the editorial columns of our independent small city newspapers. This editorial appeared in the East Oregonian, which is a daily published in Pendleton, Oreg., in my district. That its comments regarding the Idaho Power Co. are moderate and restrained will be recognized by anyone who has been involved in the continuing battle for full development of the Middle Snake River.

The editorial follows:

ONE BAD APPLE

Under the best of conditions the fish versus dams controversy in the Columbia River is laden with explosives. The reasonable people in the middle are constantly trying to keep the extremists under control. The extremists are those at one end who would build big hydroelectric dams on all streams without concern for fish and those at the other end who would discontinue all building of dams.

One could not blame the people who want to keep a tight lid on this explosive laden controversy if they ordered some Idaho Power Co. officials to face a firing squad. Idaho Power Co. is making it terribly tough on the peacemakers.

It started last year when thousands of fish died at Idaho Power Co.'s Brownlee Dam on the Snake River because the company had not adequately prepared to get the fish past construction work on the dam. Because consultation with aquatic biologists could have prevented the catastrophe at Brownlee, public reaction was that Idaho Power Co. just didn't give a hang about the fish.

Now, the Federal Power Commission is holding hearings at which plans for passing fish at Brownlee Dam and two other dams Idaho Power Co. intends to build, Oxbow and Little Hells Canyon, are under discussion. An Idaho Power Co. spokesman got things off to a fine start by suggesting that the cost of facilities that would safely pass the fish would be so large it might be better to forget it—cost to consumers of power produced by the dams would be much less if fish passage facilities were not built, so why build 'em?

Public utilities that are as shallow as this in their understanding of public relations give all public utilities a bad reputaton, which many do not deserve. It's the old story of one bad apple in the box spoiling all the others.

Idaho Power Co. has run roughshod over all opposition in the State of Idaho for years. The influence it has over the economy of Idaho must frighten some good people in that State.

But Idaho Power Co. is working outside its bailiwick now. What it does at Brownlee, Oxbow, and Little Hells Canyon is the concern of many people outside the State of Idaho. That Idaho Power Co. has not recognized that is painfully evident.

The Russian Economic Offensive: Meaning and Intent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, there have been many views expressed these past 2 years with regard to the economic competition that the Soviet Union is supposed to be generating against the United States. Most, if not all, of the familiar views are based on the assumption that the Soviet Union is a national entity comparable in character and nature to this country.

One obtains an entirely different picture of the problem when the economic analysis is properly placed in the context of political reality. A recent article appearing in the Free World Forum under the title of "The Russian Economic Offensive: Meaning and Intent" presents an analysis on the basis of the Soviet Union being an empire economy with Russian Moscow at the helm. Written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the article critically evaluates most of the standard views on the subject and casts an analysis in the light of Russia's exploitation of the economic resources of the many captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

In combating Moscow's economic cold-war strategy, the thesis advanced by Dr. Dobriansky offers a number of interesting possibilities. Because the different perspective and analysis contained in this article merits the attention of our Members, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUSSIAN ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE: MEANING AND INTENT

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

There is as much fallacious thinking in this country about the so-called Russian economic offensive as one finds about the motives behind Moscow's cultural exchanges and exhibits. The fallacies stem ultimately from our protracted inability to grasp and comprehend the totalistic nature of traditional Russian cold-war activity. We Americans do not think in totalistic contexts with an eye constantly affixed to all the interrelated parts and components. Our reasoning processes tend generally to concentrate on the isolated event, the piecemeal and the single development, seemingly unrelated to other developments which are different either in type or spatial location. From an intellectual point of view, this incapacity to match the totalitarian character of characteristic Russian political thinking may well be regarded as the root cause of our failures to meet the cold-war challenges posed by Moscow, including the ostensible economic challenge.

Economists dealing with this subject are notorious for their vacuous interpretations. Although it is true that foreign exchange considerations, the requirements of the 7-year plan, and certain raw-material shortages are factors which must be carefully weighed in any assessment of Moscow's economic offensive, these factors are, nevertheless, only facets of a broader context of thought and operation. Indeed, I cannot realistically conceive of any Russian action, irrespective of its nature, being without a basic political motivation and an objective. So it is in the economic sphere. For a realistic appraisal one cannot even begin to analyze this offensive without a preliminary, steady awareness that the economic constitutes only a means for higher Russian political ends. The unfortunate fact is that no such awareness characterizes the utterances and statements of many American leaders in business and government.

Starting at an extreme, Cyrus Eaton, for example, views Moscow's offensive as a stroke of "peaceful competitive coexistence" which we must accept as any businessman would in his given industry. The folly of this point of view cannot be too strongly emphasized. This is the appropriate view which Russian propaganda seeks to disseminate. This year I had an opportunity to talk to a number of American businessmen and industrialists who, like Eaton, hold this point of view. They see the challenge as an economic duel without realizing that the duel is of a broader and different character and that the economic is only another weapon in the struggle. In short, with this primary and indispensable perspective, the total offensive, of which the economic is only another and, at that, a less important phase, is really neither peaceful nor fairly competitive, and certainly not coexistent.

By dangling the prospect of a $3 billion market for U.S. goods in the Soviet Union, Mr. Eaton cannot fool too many people as to the type of so-called economic competition confronting us. The fact is that Moscow's economic competition is vastly different from our challenges in the past. Despite the existence of similar ingredients of political determination, German and Japanese economic competition prior to World War II was pursued far more in accord with the canons of international trade than one can ascribe to Russian economic competition. Basic economic considerations of comparative costs, material shortages, foreign exchange scarcity and going markets weighed far more heavily than in the present case. Thus, when Phillip Cortney, chairman of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, speaks of establishing trade relations with the U.S.S.R. under ICC rules, he is unwittingly exposing himself to endless talks which will be designed by Moscow to change these rules (Chamber of Commerce Weighs Trade Talks With Soviet, UPI, Aug. 20).

Another fallacious view is that by seeking trade and extending aid, Moscow is seriously aiming at a lessening of world tensions. The naivete of this view compares equally with the previous one. Again, the view is expressed in a void of fact and cold war reality. As we shall see, the very opposite is the case. Both trade and economic aid are Russian expedients for the deepening and creation of tensions that would accommodate Moscow's imperial expansionism. On the economic front, various techniques are employed to bring this about.

Another notion frequently discussed is that by trading with the Communist empire, we would reap many economic advantages, proving that our system is superior and laying a firm base for understanding and peaceful relations. All of the elements of this argument are to a greater or lesser extent specious. With a monopolistic trade-control system, Moscow has the first advantage. It is illusory to believe that any net economic advantages in terms of trade would flow in our direction. What might appear as a gross advantage to a particular firm here may well be of double advantage to the development of the empire's economic system where real costs in effort and lives are by far not as determinative as here.

Those who speak of the need to demonstrate the superiority of our economic system disply either their ignorance of our and the totalitarian Russian systems or their complete vulnerability to Russian propaganda bluffs. On November 22, 1957, Khrushchev boasted that "the treat to the United States is not the ICBM but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system." Apparently, too many Americans, ignorant of the functioning of our system and little conversant with the perpetual war economy of the U.S.S.R., took this grandiose statement to heart. This is not the first time that Kremlin leaders have boasted in this vein. Moreover, any intensive analysis of the two systems shows that the question of superiority is an academic one. In terms of human and civilized values, there exists no need for us to demonstrate the superiority of our system.

Paradoxical as it may seem, some of our industrialists and popular writers are even more deterministic in their economic thinking than the alleged Marxists in the Kremlin. In fact, there is very little, if any, Marxism involved in the behavior and actions of the new Russian imperialist class. The claim that trade lays a firm base for understanding and peaceful relations is, to a great degree, a myth. In this century Germany and Great Britain were the best of customers and yet this relationship failed to produce peaceful relations between them. In relation to Moscow, the determinism implicit in this argument is hardly applicable. Moscow considers trade insofar as it abets the development of its colonial economic system and enables it to further its objectives in the free world; individual entrepreneurs in the free world are not motivated by such totalistic ends, which are essentially political in nature. Trade relations with a complete state monopoly are hardly grounds for understanding the many peoples and nations in the Soviet Union. Were such an understanding achieved, proponents of this specious argument would then begin to understand why we should not trade with the Moscow monopoly.

There are even some among us who view Russian economic aid as an attempt to build up genuine good will for the new regime in Moscow. Others go further to impute humanitarian gestures in Moscow's actions. The most that one can say is that evidently there is no limit to wishful thinking. Aside from these analytical comments, it is a wonder that some of us do not pay heed to the observations made by the present leaders of the new ruling class in Russia. In 1955, for example, Khrushchev openly stated that "we (the U.S.S.R.) value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes." This observation is well substandiated by all the essential facts of the so-called Russian economic offensive. Our trouble is that we fail to view this offensive in perspective and with factual and interpretative background. If we fail to see Russian actions in toto, we shall fail to understand any individual one of them intelligently.

THE PICTURE OF RUSSIAN AID AND TRADE

Russian aid and trade is, of course, only a part of Moscow's cold war operation. This is, by far, not the most important part; however, it reflects an activity which contributes to Russian efforts in this main bout against the Free World. Those who are preparing to avoid or to win in this struggle cannot be said to be aware of the realities of the fight in which we are engaged. Moscow's strategy and tactics are not new, nor are they peculiarly Communist. They are perfectly in tradition with the empire-building techniques of old Russia. They appear new to many who are unfamiliar with the history of

the Russian Empire, both past and present. The economic picture reflects these old techniques. The shell-game method of "now you see it, now you don't" manifests itself in the economic sphere as in any other. And so it is with other methods.

Considering first the aid part of the picture, there are heavy elements of exaggeration and misplaced thought. The empire, including China, has up to the end of 1958 allocated some $2.2 billion for foreign aid. The Soviet Union presumably has contributed over a billion, and the remainder has come from the so-called satellites. Much of this is still on paper since only about $900 million of goods and services have actually been tendered. China, in contrast to the Soviet Union, has extended about $647 million in aid in the form of grants mostly. Loans over long varying periods and at a low 2½ percent interest feature almost all U.S.S.R. aid. Moscow's aid to China over the past 5 years has approximated $430 million in loans. The so-called satellite nations in Europe, which are supposed to be extending "independent" aid, follow the loan basis technique at interest charges ranging as high as 5 percent.

Aid dispensed by Moscow is not a handout. It is naive to think that such aid is not without strings. Where any form of economic dependence comes into being, strings are inevitably attached. Even without the appearance of such dependence, Moscow sees to it that political strings are immediately attached to indigenous elements. But what is most significant in the picture of Moscow's economic aid is that about 95 percent of it goes to countries near the borders of the Soviet Union. Afghanistan, Iraq, India, Burma, and Indonesia are relatively close and strategically situated for Russian solicitude. Meager as it is, such Russian aid is an economic penetration in conformity with imperial Russia's old borderlands policy which today points at the entire southern and southeastern Asiatic spheres.

Russian economic penetration is the opening wedge for more important political and psychological infiltration. The minor $133 million credits extended to India were so exaggerated that many throughout the world received the impression of a major economic assault upon the free world. Steel mills are being built in greater aggregate value by the West Germans, Americans and the British in India, but popular impression has it that Moscow almost dominates this field of aid. The psychological and propaganda value of the Russian-supported Bhilai steel mill is incalculable. Percentagewise, U.S.S.R. trade with India has soared fortyfold over the past 7 years; yet, the near half billion rupees of trade make up only 2½ percent of India's total foreign trade. It is obvious, then, that Moscow's aid and trade contribution in the direction of India is thinly marginal, as it is in all other areas. The value of this contribution, however, is by no means an adequate measure of the actual penetration made by Moscow in this part of Asia. As Khrushchev said, the valuation must be made most "for political purposes."

In India and elsewhere, Moscow's economic penetration unavoidably means the infiltration of men and ideas, the formation of cadres under pretense that projects could be operated and managed only by technicians from the Soviet Union; it means preparing the ground for a trade imperialism which would contribute to the political isolation of the country involved in preparation for the eventual takeover. Here, too, the technique is not new. The Russian Communists used it with perhaps less vigor in connection with many now captive non-Russian nations, including those in the present Soviet Union; before them, the czars made use of economic means and slogans to create dissension in neighboring countries.

The President of the United Arab Republic recently sensed this sequence of events and is now leaning more toward economic sources in the free world. Egypt alone has been promised some $500 million aid by Moscow over a 12-year period at 2½ percent interest. Its trade with the Soviet Union has increased 10 times in the past 2 years. Last year, about 60 percent of total Egyptian exports were taken by the Communist empire. Egypt's experience in 1957, when Moscow bought up the bulk of its cotton at a high price and resold it in Western Europe at low prices, revealed in part the designs of the Russian economic offensive. Moscow's aim is clearly to attach the U.A.R.'s economy to the Communist empire's. Without the normal supplies of foreign exchange, the U.A.R. would have to turn, as indeed it did, to Moscow for oil, textiles, ships, and mining equipment. Like others, the Egyptians are beginning to recall the old adage, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes" (I fear the Greeks even bearing gifts).

Different manipulations by Moscow are noticeable in other areas, too. Syria, the other part of the U.A.R., received credits up to $167 million when Moscow moved in, particularly during the 1958 crop failure. To further this aid, Moscow has had its planes photograph the entire area, thereby gaining considerable military value from the transaction. In Iraq, recipient of about $138 million credits from the U.S.S.R., the same story is being repeated. The political consequences of this story of infiltration and reconnaissance are yet to be witnessed in full. Whether the initial links are by aid or trade, Moscow will develop some means for political infiltration of the target country. It did not hesitate to violate its trade pact with Finland in order to produce a change in the hard-pressed Finnish Government. Iran and Yugoslavia were unsuccessfully subjected to similar pressures. To show favor toward the Arab world, Moscow shifted its demand for oranges from Israel to Morocco. It placed its wool orders with South Africa instead of once-favored Australia to display its displeasure over the asylum given to escapees from the Communist empire. Just recently, Moscow moved in quickly to offer Bolivia a credit of $40 million for a 40-year period when signs of a U.S. refusal for further aid appeared. The very offer can serve to intensify the political division and tension in that country.

An astute examination of the economic facts pertaining to any country with whom the U.S.S.R. has such relations will reveal some actual or potential political value which Moscow considers of greater importance anyway. The economic data in themselves show that both aid and trade by the Soviet Union are meager and marginal. Total U.S.S.R. trade with the free world is not more than that of Switzerland, approximately 1 percent. A fact that most Westerners seem to overlook is that trade by the Russian Empire, whether of the past or present, has always been small. Empire self-sufficiency is a traditional policy observed by Russian autocrats right down to the present. The Soviet Union is making no great sacrifices in its aid and trade program. Needless to say, the imperial economy of the U.S.S.R. comes first. Despite these truths, however, the danger in the Russian economic offensive rests in its political ramifications. The economic offensive as such, measured in goods and services, is thin and harmless. What is of perilous import to the free world is Moscow's political capitalization of its marginal economic inroads.

In 1958, U.S.S.R. world trade amounted to $8.5 billion. Of this, only a little over $2 billion was with the free world and, significantly, half of this amount was with NATO countries. For our purposes here, there are two points of significance in this distribution. One is that the only NATO country for whom this trade assumes marked proportions is Iceland. Its trade with the U.S.S.R. averages about one-quarter of its total world trade. The higher this goes, the greater the vulnerability of the country's economy to shock and dislodgment once Moscow exercises its leverage for political ends. In this respect, there is little to be concerned about the other NATO countries, including Great Britain with its 5-year trade pact with Moscow. Aside from Egypt, much the same observation can be made in connection with U.S.S.R.'s trade and aid activities in Africa. So far, much of it has been small. But Guinea's trade with the Communist empire has soared to about 30 percent of its total trade.

The second significant point to bear in mind is that this expansion of trade with the economically advanced countries also is not new with regard to aim and purpose. Essentially, it repeats the pattern of the 1930's. With the goals of the present 7-year plan reaching even unrealistic heights, Moscow seeks to obtain goods necessary to the fulfillment of its plan. The Russians have always been expert copyists and much of their progress in many fields has been due to technological imitation. As before, the prospect of a drastic cutoff in such trade should not be ruled out. Consumer goods represent the lowest priority rating in U.S.S.R. imports. There are some 900 nonlicensed commodities available to Moscow from the United States, but one can rest assured that this category will hardly be tapped. As shown by its trade pact with Great Britain, Moscow is primarily interested in chemicals, synthetics plants, new types of machineries and similar producers' goods.

MEANING, INTENT AND METHODS OF COUNTERACTION

From this picture, the meaning and intent of the so-called Russian economic offensive should be quite clear. There is every logical justification for one to view the aid and trade, issued from any sector of the Communist empire, as a calculated effort determined ultimately by Moscow. The effort is made to the largest extent with captive resources in this empire. This includes the Soviet Union and the captive resources represented there by the subugated non-Russian nations. It is vital to bear this fact in mind for purposes of propaganda counteraction. I had the privilege of both planning and writing the Captive Nations Resolution which caused such an outburst in Moscow during Vice President NIXON's tour in the U.S.S.R. To those who say that without the outbursts by Khrushchev, the resolution would be little known, I say that his reflexive action could not have been otherwise. For the first time, our Government recognized the existence of all the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. The reader need not think twice how Russia would appear, not only in the economic but every other sphere, if we built our propaganda and informational output on the basis of this basic fact. With the exploitation of rich resources in the captive non-Russian sectors of the Soviet Union, Russia's development would not be held in the same light among the underdeveloped countries as it is when we fallaciously synonymize the U.S.S.R. with Russia.

Nevertheless, Moscow's prime consideration is the economy of the empire. The economy is being employed both for the purposes of accelerating the empire's economic growth and, concurrently, gaining political leverage in every conceivable part of the free world. To achieve the first, Moscow has to take care and be cautious with its manipulations of aid and trade. The field is not wide open for reckless and irresponsible action which may well backfire concerning its first

purpose. In the matter of commodity dumping, for example, Moscow itself would suffer from such action and the volume of exportable commodities is usually inadequate for it to do any serious harm in the pattern of world prices. Moreover, it cannot afford for long to delay on its promises and to provide inferior goods without developing an unwholesome reputation in the eyes of those least familiar with its techniques. It took Moscow a full year to deliver oil to Brazil. So far, the promises have been long and the deeds short. The propaganda and political value has also far exceeded the nominal value of the promised aid and trade.

If we watch the political ramifications of this so-called economic offensive, there is no reason for us to fear in the least any strictly economic offensive from Moscow. Without at all simplifying the situation, this operation repeats an old story: namely, with little means Russian political cunning can reap greatly disproportionate gains. As Mikoyan has said, "A modern Communist is one who has the zeal of a Bolshevik and the practicality of a capitalist. "To which one may add, "The modern Communist is truly the heir of Peter the Great's legacy." For the differences between the two are really accidental and not substantial. After all, an empire, unprecedented in numerous ways, was built by these methods.

The methods of counteraction require the combination of economic, political, and psychological techniques. To show the diminutive size of Russian economic strength without the captive resources both within and outside the Soviet Union would undoubtedly produce a major score. Close cooperation among the democratic countries in fashioning new techniques to outbid Moscow is another practical avenue for our efforts. Western Germany has taken a lead in this respect and with much success. For political value, where it becomes necessary, uneconomical deals should be indulged in by taking surpluses from one area and contributing them to another. Also, a more liberalized foreign economic policy should be developed with the aim of expanding our imports from the very areas that Moscow shows its deepest concern in. These and many other methods can be utilized profitably to prevent the Communist empire from capitalizing politically on its marginal economic inroads. Their selection and use, for the ends in view, presuppose always the broader framework of interpretative understanding suggested earlier. To understand truly the Russians, it is first necessary to understand their understanding of these things.

Portage Park Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of attending the installation of new officers for the coming year who will head the Portage Park Chamber of Commerce in my district.

The newly elected president is Mrs. Ruth Melville, the first woman to be elected as president of a local chamber of commerce in the history of Cook County.

The Portage Park Chamber of Commerce has made a significant contribution toward the growth and progress of a large portion of my district. The members of the chamber, who are all businessmen, have, through their participation in this organization, demonstrated that the small businessman is the keystone of progress in a community.

I will not attempt to elaborate on the tremendous contribution these businessmen have made toward making my district a better area in which to live; but I do want to express a deep concern that this Nation is indeed losing a valuable tool of democracy by driving the small businessman out of business in ever-increasing numbers. I feel strongly that it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to recognize the fact that it is becoming increasingly more difficult for the small businessman to exist in the face of mounting competition from large corporations.

I am enclosing in the RECORD the remarks delivered by Mrs. Melville as she assumed the important position of president of the Portage Park Chamber of Commerce. Her remarks are significant not only because she is the first woman to assume this important position in a local chamber of commerce in the Chicago area, but also because they give us an insight of how keenly she and the other members of the chamber recognize their responsibility to the community. I would like to take this opportunity to extend to the Portage Park Chamber of Commerce my own congratulations on their excellent choice of president and also to wish the organization unprecedented success in the coming year under the leadership of Mrs. Melville.

Mrs. Melville's comments follow:

PORTAGE PARK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, RUTH MELVILLE, PRESIDENT, JANUARY 16, 1960

Installing officer, master of ceremonies, distinguished guests, members of the Portage Park Chamber of Commerce, and friends, a deep sense of honor arose within me as I accepted the gavel of responsibility as your president. Never before has my humility asserted itself more strongly than now as I stand here tonight before this gathering of business and professional people.

Fully aware of the duties entrusted to me, I am stimulated by hope and ambition as I see a dawn of opportunity to offer service and helpfulness to my fellow members and community.

It is my earnest desire to follow the path of leadership so well blazed by my competent predecessors, and I will be ever mindful of their successes that have strengthened and developed our business area.

We are looking forward to another year of progress. Our keywords will be service and action as our organization goes ahead in 1960, with constant effort to work together in harmony and friendship, promoting a stronger bond of unity.

In keeping with the planning sessions of our new officrs and directors a positive approach will be emphasized in carrying out a comprehensive platform of projects designed to expand and develop the prosperity of Portage Park's business district putting it second to none in all Chicagoland.

We are pledged to redouble our efforts for off-street parking space and concentrate on greater use of our existing facilities. Expediting traffic and better traffic control to eliminate peak jams will be sought, along with improved street lighting, neighborhood conservation, and the growth of better customer relationship, through a program stressing courtesy and service. We will continue to have forceful promotions throughout the year accenting the advantages of shopping in our stores.

An innovation will be the addition of a community service program, designed to bring the chamber of commerce into closer relationship with service organizations such as the Kiwanis and Lions Clubs, veterans' units, and other community groups, thereby gaining much for us in the way of good will among our customers and proving that even the tenor of commerce can be tempered with a helping hand.

To achieve our several goals, active committees will be formulated with a specific understanding of their duties, and with the continued cooperation of our members the Portage Park Chamber of Commerce will go forward in 1960.

And now I would like to acknowledge my sincere appreciation to Mr. Hill, our installing officer, for the gracious manner in which he performed his duties, Mr. Levey, our master of ceremonies, who always adds so much to our festive occasions, and last but certainly not least, Mr. Christophill and his committee, for their delightful party arrangements. To each and every one present, thank you for being in attendance on this memorable January event, may you all enjoy to the utmost the dancing and entertainment.

I am so pleased and happy to have my family, Jimmie and Sherri, Mr. Workman, my employer, Congressman Pucinski, Alderman Cullerton, State Representative Fio Rito, Mr. Paul Salinar, and such a splendid representation from our downtown office with me this evening.

In closing, may I add it has been a real privilege and pleasure to serve my fellow officers and directors as executive secretary last year, and I solemnly pledge to serve as president to the very best of my ability, doing everything possible to be a credit to the members of this outstanding organization who have placed their confidence in me.

Thank you again from the very bottom of my heart.

A Report on Alcoholic Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on alcoholic rehabilitation, by Mr. Robert J. Conner, Sr., director of probation, municipal court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C. This study points out the fine work that Mr. Conner is doing, and I was most impressed by the progress that he is making in the field of alcoholic rehabilitation.

The report follows:

To: Hon. John Lewis Smith, Jr., chief judge, municipal court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

From: Robert J. Conner, Sr., director of probation, municipal court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Report of the alcoholic rehabilitation (expanded) program in the municipal court for the District of Columbia covering the first year of operation—September 19, 1958, to September 30, 1959.

Authorities report that the disease of alcoholism is claiming 200,000 new victims each year. The destruction it wreaks cannot be measured in dollars or cents or in human values.

The U.S. Public Health Service ranks it only below cardiovascular diseases, cancer, and mental illness as a menace to public well-being.

Despite the fact that one-half or more of the victims of this disease can be rehabilitated, provided they can be convinced that they can be helped, and provided they can be persuaded to recognize their condition, the fact remains that only a minute fraction of alcoholics are being reached.

Many years ago society punished the drunk with the ducking stool, the lash, the public cage or stocks, and even poured molten lead down his throat.

Today these forms of punishment have been replaced by arrest and jail. Yet year after year this method has produced no results.

Alcoholics Anonymous had its inception in 1935. As of today, hundreds of thousands of victims of alcoholism have been rehabilitated by and through the fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous.

There is hardly an alcoholic project working today that does not request and receive Alcoholic Anonymous help. Practically every community approach, every educational project and every rehabilitation program recommends Alcoholics Anonymous teachings, philosophy, and counsel and advice to alcoholics. The sole purpose of Alcoholics Anonymous is to keep its members sober and help other alcoholics achieve sobriety.

It has been said that if a program doesn't work with Alcoholics Anonymous then the program has no valid treatment.

Since 1946, the municipal court for the District of Columbia has been associated with Alcoholics Anonymous in a program to reclaim problem drinkers.

When two men, in 1939, called on one of the municipal judges, he found that they discussed the problem of alcoholism from personal experience and not theory. Each admitted frankly that he had a history of compulsive drinking but each was undeniably sober. The judge often said he was impressed with the sincerity and philosophy of his two visitors.

At that time, however, the judge was seeking a remedy for a congested court docket and he wanted a mass production method of dealing with persons charged with drunkenness. His two callers insisted that compulsive drunkenness was an individual problem and there was, therefore, no formula that could be applied to all.

In 1945 the judge called Alcoholics Anonymous and two members answered and they and a probation officer discussed at length the increasing number of persons appearing in court charged with intoxication. Their meeting resulted in an experiment to offer Alcoholics Anonymous to at least some of the prisoners.

On December 24, 1945, the first probationer under this experiment was referred to the probation department.

The experiment encountered many trials and tribulations, but time proved its worth and effectiveness.

Probation rules required a weekly report in person and on Saturdays Alcoholics Anonymous members began to meet with these probationers when they reported and discussed their problems and the opportunities offered by the Alcoholics Anonymous program.

These small informal meetings grew, and finally the group met in a small room in the courthouse. This proved popular and grew and eventually a courtroom was made available for the gathering.

Basically the meetings in the courtroom on Saturday were opened and closed informally in contrast to regular Alcoholics Anonymous groups. At each meeting it was announced that the meeting was not an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting, but simply a meeting about Alcoholics Anonymous. It was always stated that the meeting was not a part of probation but devoted to giving information and was an invitation for each present to affiliate with an Alcoholics Anonymous group of the individual's choice.

The court program proved its worth and in 1956 the Karrick report focused attention on facts and statistics heretofore unknown or where known had been ignored. The report also pointed to the need for expanding the then existing program with emphasis on the success it had accomplished.

Briefly, the expansion was authorized, personnel engaged, and on September 19, 1958, the new expanded program was begun.

Many trials and tribulations were experienced during the early days of expansion. At the beginning, men who had been arrested for intoxication and lodged in the cellblock of the district court awaiting appearance before a judge, were interviewed in that cellblock at 7 a.m. each morning for the purpose of attempting to select men likely to be helped by the program. The overcrowding, noise, turmoil, lack of proper facilities, and environment for interviewing was very apparent and clearly indicated the need for a change. After a period of time this method was discontinued.

At the present time a system has been developed and put into effect and, although simple, accomplishes the purpose for which it was established.

The following résumé explains the technique now in effect:

When a defendant appears in municipal court before one of its judges and charged with intoxication, and who either pleads guilty or is found guilty, one of the probation officers assigned to the alcoholic rehabilitation unit and working with the court, presents to the judge a copy of the individual's arrest record. The probation officer makes a quick evaluation of the defendant standing before the court, both from his record as well as his appearance and conduct, and if there is the slightest indication that the individual might benefit from the alcoholic program, a request is made that the individual concerned be interviewed by another probation officer assigned to the unit. When the probation officer interviews the man, he does not sit in judgment, but in reality, merely talks with the man from the standpoint of obtaining, so far as possible, an indication as to the honesty and sincerity of the individual with regard to his drinking problem. If the individual expresses a desire to help himself and do something about his drinking problem, it is explained that it will be necessary for him to return to the District of Columbia jail for a period of 3 to 5 days or more, if necessary, in order for him to sober up and "dry out," get cleaned up, and get himself back into a mental and physical condition so that he can be helped and can understand what will be offered to him in connection with the program offered by the court.

After expressing an interest in helping themselves, they are then again brought before the court, at which time the probation officer handling this particular phase of the program requests that the individual's case be continued for the number of days deemed necessary for proper "drying out."

We have in our department of corrections, so efficiently operated by Mr. Donald Clemmer, a system by which drunks are returned to the court. Mr. Clemmer and his staff deserve much credit for the manner in which they handle this situation. The change in these people when they return from the District jail is almost unbelievable. Physically and mentally, they are in much better condition than had they been released from another type of institution. The District of Columbia is indeed fortunate to have a director such as Mr. Clemmer and his staff who are able to implement so complex a program.

At approximately 7:45 a.m., on Tuesdays through Fridays, one of the probation officers goes to the cellblock, and those men who have been "dried out" are then taken to a courtroom which has been assigned for the exclusive use of this program.

This courtroom, which is air conditioned, is comfortable, clean, and these men find themselves in a relaxed environment.

Two of the probation officers who understand the problem from personal experience speak to these groups and explain the details of the court program as well as the program and operation of Alcoholics Anonymous. They speak the language that is so necessary and important at this particular stage. Usually three to five members of Alcoholics Anonymous also speak to these groups. They give of their time and energy voluntarily. Perhaps this program works as well as it does because these members of Alcoholics Anonymous give unstintingly of their time and energy and their advice is based upon personal experience.

At the conclusion of these explanations and talks, the groups are offered the program, but only after they have heard all the facts and all that is offered to them. They are permitted to make a decision as to whether they want to accept or reject the offer and no coercion in any form is used.

They are advised that in accepting the program only one thing is asked of them in return. That is an investment of 1 hour of their time to attend a meeting about Alcoholics Anonymous which is held at 9 a.m. every Saturday morning in courtroom 18 of the criminal division of the municipal court or a meeting held Monday evenings at 8:30 p.m. in a courtroom located in the civil division of the municipal court.

It is emphasized that the work of the court in this field is not carried on as a group of Alcoholics Anonymous, but that the principles and philosophy of Alcoholics Anonymous are applied.

Upon acceptance of the program, these men appear before the court and on recommendation of the probation officer handling these affairs, they are released on personal bond.

After appearing in court, these men are then interviewed individually by probation officers assigned to this unit and certain personal data is recorded for record and statistical purposes. When necessary, referrals are made for temporary food and lodging. Employment placements are made frequently and much employment counseling is done. The office is open every afternoon for the purpose of permitting these men to discuss personal and other problems which is so necessary for an individual in this category. Referrals for clothing are made when necessary. We are deeply appreciative of the excellent cooperation afforded us by the municipal lodging house, operated under the capable direction of Mr. Henry Koch. The Salvation Army harbor light program directed by Envoy Morgan as well as the excellent cooperation of the staff connected with the newly organized employment counseling service. We are also indebted to the Alcoholics Anonymous home, the Central Union Mission, and the Volunteers of America. There are many other community agencies and organizations to whom we are indebted for excellent cooperation and assistance.

Many of those we are attempting to help are referred to various hospitals in the area for medical care when necessary. Careful interviewing and screening has detected a number of active tubercular cases which are referred to hospitals for treatment. In several recent instances the work of the personnel resulted in the detection of mental patients who had escaped or eloped and these men were returned to hospitals from which they escaped.

One of the interesting highlights of the Monday evening meetings is the fact that they are conducted by men who obtained sobriety through the court program. These men make a tremendous and valuable contribution.

It is also heartening to observe the wives, parents, and relatives who often attend these meetings. This not only lends encouragement to those concerned, but adds strength to the program, because it is not only reaching alcoholics, but is also reaching those affected by alcoholism.

Probation officers, making presentence investigations for the court, upon discovering the existance of an alcoholic problem, have been referring their clients to this program for information and help. The same is true of cases placed on probation and where a drinking problem is evident.

Other agencies, in allied fields, are referring men to whom the program is explained and in this manner learn about alcoholism and what can be done about it.

The alcoholic rehabilitation unit consists of three probation officers, a case supervisor, and a stenographer-clerk. Considerable of their time is spent in conducting and preparing presentence investigation reports and making field visits in connection with regular probation work.

Statistics are necessary in preparing reports that are required by and for the information of the court and the success of the expanded program for the past year can best be evaluated by the following:

Statistical report

Number of arrests by Metropolitan Police for intoxication and appearing in court Sept. 19, 1958, to Sept. 30, 1959:	
White males	9,659
White females	806
Total	10,465
Negro males	11,277
Negro females	1,168
Total	12,445
Total males	20,936
Total females	1,974
Grand total	[1] 22,910
Number of defendants screened by probation officers:	
In court	5,265
In cellblock	2,336
Total	7,601
Court dispositions:	
Not guilty	398
Personal bond—direct action of court	4,167
Personal bond—direct action of court after screening	608
Personal bond (quasi-probation) after screening	2,415
Probation (placed on program)	304
Total	7,892
Number placed on program (quasi-probation and probation)	2,719
Number rearrested	[3] 1,215
Number not rearrested	[3] 1,504
Percentage of success on program	[3] 55.32
Services rendered: number referred for temporary food and lodging	440
Number referred for employment referrance	204

Statistical report—Continued

Job placements as a result of direct effort	28
Medical referrals	14
Evaluation of estimated savings to taxpayers of the District of Columbia:	
Total number placed on program (probation and quasi-probation)	2,719
Total number rearrested	1,215
Total number succeeding on program	1,504
Total number of days those on program would have served, based on their past records, of average 25-day sentence, less 4 days average "drying out" period	31,584
Per capital cost per day at District of Columbia jail as per Karrick report	$2.86
Estimated savings to taxpayers on a first arrest basis only	$90,330.24
Estimated savings to taxpayers effected by overall program	[4] $260,660.40

[1] In addition to this number, approximately 40 percent of the total number arrested forfeit and do not appear in court.

[2] Many were not rearrested until months after going on the program, yet we consider them failures for purposes of statistics and monetary evaluation.

[3] We do not claim all of these individuals have remained sober, but rather, that they have not reappeared in court.

[4] Quasi-probationers would have been sentenced according to their past records, an average of three times. (Probationers placed on program were evaluated on a first arrest basis only.)

Most significant of these figures is that many of these individuals from the standpoint of society and their arrest records were considered, by many, as hopeless cases.

Any further expansion of the program will, of course, depend upon additional personnel in order to enlarge the scope of our activity.

Plans are now in the thinking stage for the further expansion of our activities in order to reach more alcoholics appearing daily before the court and suffering from this disease. Perhaps in the not too distant future we will be able to interview in the District jail those men who have been sentenced to a specific term and who evidence a desire to do something about their drinking problem. Perhaps we will be able to recommend to the court that the remainder of their sentences be suspended and that they be released on personal bond in order to take part in this program.

Perhaps in the future we will be able to expand our program to enable us to talk with men who are released after 60-, 90-, and 180-day sentences and who are returned to society without funds, in many instances without clothes, a place to live, no job, and no idea where their next meal is coming from. Perhaps we will be able to eventually help many of these men much in the same manner and along the same lines as those we are working with today.

The savings to the taxpayers is almost impossible to estimate despite the fact that the above statistics reveal a tremendous saving in this direction. Sufficient information is not available to replace or measure the intangibles of savings to welfare agencies, or to evaluate the results of new jobs, higher pay, taxes being paid, and above and most important of all, the salvaging of individuals, homes and families.

The program now in effect and its accomplishments are possible only because of the wholehearted cooperation of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia, the judges of the municipal court, the dedication of the director of probation and the personnel assigned to the unit. Without the unselfish devotion of Alcoholics Anonymous members and Alcoholics Anonymous, this program would not be possible.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT J. CONNER,
Director of Probation.

Murray Proposal for Destruction of Nuclear Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a memorandum prepared by the former Atomic Energy Commissioner, Thomas E. Murray, on his proposal to dismantle the stocks of large nuclear weapons held by the three nuclear powers.

Mr. Murray first advanced his proposal in a speech delivered to the World Affairs Institute at Pasadena on December 9, 1959. Earlier this week the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] inserted the text of this speech in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read this speech, as well as the excerpts which I am about to place in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Murray has given generously of his time and energy to the problem of how to control the nuclear arms race. I have not always agreed with him; but I have tremendous respect for his determination to continue to press for acceptable, realistic, and safe means by which the threat of large-scale nuclear war may be diminished and ultimately abolished. This new proposal of Mr. Murray's is one which could be worked into U.S. policy at the forthcoming general disarmament negotiations with nine other nations, to be convened in mid-March of this year. Since I understand the United States still has no policy regarding these talks, Mr. Murray's proposal is certainly one that should be given the most serious and careful consideration.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THOMAS E. MURRAY REGARDING DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL MADE BEFORE THE INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS, DECEMBER 9, 1959

I propose, as the primary and most necessary practical goal, that we negotiate an agreement with the Soviet Union to stop the perilous and irrational effort to maintain the balance of terror. An agreement to this effect would be as much in the Communist interest as in our own. Hence it appears as possible and practical.

This goal is limited, as all political goals must be. There would remain, both for the United States and for the U.S.S.R., the problem of maintaining a balance of power between the Communist world and the free world. This problem has as many aspects as the word "power" has meanings. In any case, it is a genuine political problem that can be rationally and successfully handled. A true balance of power, in all the many meanings of power is a necessary contributing element of world peace, whereas the present precarious balance of terror is nothing but an invitation to catastrophe.

Thus the proximate political goal is clear enough. It is a question, not of upsetting the balance of terror, which would entail serious risk, but of dissipating the terror itself.

Therefore the process whereby this limited political goal may be achieved is likewise clear enough. It is a question of initiating an orderly and controlled process of destroying the megaton weapons that have created, and still sustain the terror. The final details of the process are proper matter for negotiation, once the end in view is agreed on.

First of all, I think that any proposal, laid down by the United States as the basis of negotiation, should be kept clear, clean, and simple, free of the kind of detail that might give rise to resistance or bickering, whether on political or on scientific grounds.

For instance, we need not be particular about the composition of the international commission to supervise the dismantling of Russian and American megaton weapons. It is sufficient that the scientific staff be competent. It would be advisable to have them work under a political committee with the widest representation. What is chiefly important is that the work be done, as it were, under the eyes of all the world. Access to all the details of the operation should be open to all the media of communications.

The really essential question concerns the methods by which this proposal should be carried out. In the first place, the dismantling process should take place in stages. The first stage is an important one. Enough megatonage should be destroyed in it to affirm emphatically and at the outset a mutual seriousness of intent to end the era of terror. What would constitute such a quantity of megatonage? The immediate answer to this question may be reached by asking another. How many megatons would be sufficient to create, if exploded, a serious threat to civilization disaster on a scale intolerable both to ourselves, the legatees of Western civilization, and also to the artisans of the Communist world revolution?

The question is crucial. All experts agree that there is a limit to the amount of fissionable material that may be explosively released without creating this serious threat, both in terms of immediate destruction of life and property and also in terms of future radioactive fallout. Within this basic agreement there will doubtless be differences of opinion on the sheer arithmetic. However, it will be most important not to let a straightforward answer to a straightforward question get lost amid the endless niceties of scientific argument.

I once made an estimate myself, when I was a member of the AEC. My figure published in an article in Life (May 7, 1957) was 3,500 megatons. The figure was not challenged either at the time or subsequently. An amount of 3,500 megatons might well serve as the basis of the initial dismantling stage, which, under the agreement I envision, would cover a period of approximately 3 years. The United States and the U.S.S.R. would agree to hand over 1,750 megatons each to the international agency. It would be desirable for the United States to offer a substantial portion of its total share in the first stage—let us say 500 megatons—as its first consignment, to be matched by the Soviet Union.

It should be further agreed that the remaining 2,500 megatons will be delivered to the international agency in matching lots at prescribed intervals within the 3-year period. By that time it is to be hoped that the international climate will have been so improved that the negotiations of other disarmament measures will have become possible.

The political effects of carrying through these measures to end the terror that has brooded over a decade cannot fail to be beneficial to the whole international community. Of course, the deep reality of the cold war will remain untouched. But the illegitimate issue of sheer physical survival will no longer dominate the continuing rivalry between opposed forms of social and political organizations. Hence it should be possible to see more clearly the real issues—moral, political, and economic—and to deal with them more firmly.

I know that my proposal has raised misgivings in some minds. "We face an enemy," so runs the argument, "who recognizes no moral restraints in his use of force, and who will stop at nothing to gain his ends. Only terror of intolerable reprisals will deter him from aggression. Therefore, we should not surrender the weapons of terror." This argument, if valid at all, would forbid any kind of nuclear disarmament negotiations in good faith. It would condemn the world to go on living under an unstable balance of terror until the unlikely event of a Communist conversion to morality. Hence the argument reduces itself to absurdity. Moreover, it implies an abject admission that human reason is powerless to cope with evil except by stooping to evil. And it would require that we forever commit ourselves, in the name of an undefined morality, to the profound lack of moral control and to the equally profound lack of political rationality that have characterized our armament policies for the past decade. I do not recognize the validity of this kind of twisted and despairful argument. In fact, I do not think that any kind of political or moral or even military argument can be made, with any plausibility, in favor of a balance of terror as a basis of peace. Terror, induced by the threat of unlimited violence, has no place in the moral or political universe. Advocacy of unlimited violence, or consent to it, will make barbarians of us all. Our first duty as a civilized people is to banish the barbarism of terror from the place it has usurped in public policy.

The moral cynicism of communism is a poor excuse for maintaining a policy of terror. I readily grant that no moral scruples hinder communism in the pursuit of its aims. But it does not follow that communism recognizes no restraints at all on its use of force in pursuit of its aims. The supreme restraint is imposed by the very Communist dogma of world revolution which is supposed to usher in a new era of world organization, the dogma supposes that there will be a productive world and masses of peoples to organize. Hence the dogma forbids the use of unlimited nuclear violence that could imperil the sheer existence of peoples and world alike.

There is, moreover, the Communist assurance that its revolutionary advance is as inevitable as history itself. But the revolution is to advance as history advances, gradually and little by little. The capitalist camp is not to be shattered by some sudden overwhelming release of nuclear violence, let loose with no defined political purpose but only with the intention of sheer destruction.

This is not the strategy of the revolution. Rather, the revolutionary assurance is that there will be a continuing series of limited political victories, and an accumulation of limited economic conquests, and above all a growing conversion of the peoples of the world to belief in the truth of the Communist ideology and in the superior merits of the Communist system of social organization.

All these gradual advances will be supported at every turn by apt force, when the use or threat of it is useful or necessary for the limited end in view at the moment. This is the ever-present danger that American political, military, and weapons policy must confront and overcome. The essential problem is to possess the apt force to meet the limited threat of the moment, wherever it may arise.

However, the same Communist dogma and the same Communist assurance of inevitable success that dictate the use of apt force, if force is necessary to insure success, also set limits to the force to be used and forbid the extremes of violence. The Communist purpose is success, the political success of the revolution. Limited force is an apt means to this success. Unlimited nuclear violence is an inept means, a useless means, a far too dangerous means.

Therefore is it true to say that communism "will stop at nothing" in the matter of the use of nuclear arms? It does recognize its own kinds of restraint. Its own dogma is a discipline on the use of force. To overlook this fact is to mistake the real peril we face. Policy designed to meet fanciful dangers is a work of fantasy, not statesmanship.

Finally, in this same connection a serious question must be raised. Is it true to say that the American policy of nuclear terror has been a success? Has the unlimited nuclear deterrent, backed by the threat of massive retaliation, achieved any real purpose, military or political? Has this policy effectively "contained" the Communist revolution? Has it stopped the Communist regimes from moving toward any of their selected goals?

No serious man may answer these questions with an unhesitating and unqualified "Yes." At best, the answer can be only conjectural. And there are serious reasons for thinking that the answer ought to be "No." The main reason is that during the past decade the advance of the Communist revolution has not in fact been halted. Or, where it has suffered a check, the credit must go either to the altered course of events or to policies other than massive retaliation.

The argument made by the advocates of our present strategy of massive retaliation, namely, that only a policy of terror will deter the immoral Communist enemy, and that therefore the surrender of our megaton weapons of terror would entail serious risk to American security, is a purely gratuitous assertion. It cannot be proved. It must be taken on faith, and hence constitutes a poor basis for a rational policy. Much better arguments than this would have to be put forward before the categoric rejection of my proposal would be justified.

The proposal does involve an element of risk, as all disarmament proposals must. But on any calculation of relative risks, especially those involved in current American armament and disarmament policy, I much prefer to accept the risk involved in my proposal. No other nuclear disarmament plan now before the American public involves a risk as minimal.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate worked on school construction bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1708–1717

Bills Introduced: 7 bills and 5 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2970–2976; and S. Con. Res. 85–89. Pages 1708–1709, 1805

Resolution Reported: Report was made as follows: S. Res. 247, to provide additional staff and funds for the Committee on Public Works ($125,000) (S. Rept. 1075)—referred to Committee on Rules and Administration. Page 1708

Bills Referred: 19 House-passed bills and 2 House-passed concurrent resolutions were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 1707–1708

School Construction: Senate continued its work on S. 8, authorizing Federal assistance for school construction, taking the following actions on amendments to committee amendment (in nature of a substitute for the bill):

Rejected: By 18 yeas to 71 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Cooper amendment (in nature of a substitute for committee substitute), authorizing appropriations annually of such sums as necessary to pay principal and interest annually coming due on school construction obligations in the aggregate principal of $4 billion and allocating for each of the next 4 years $1 billion for school purposes; Cotton amendment (as substitute for Cooper substitute), authorizing annual appropriations to each State for school purposes in an amount equal to 1 cent on each package of cigarettes sold in that State; by 44 yeas to 44 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Clark amendment to increase authorized appropriations from $500 million for each of next 2 fiscal years to $25 per school-age child (amounting to $1.1 billion for next fiscal year), for each succeeding fiscal year, and to be used for either school construction or teachers' salaries, or both, after rejecting, on division vote, Magnuson amendment (to Clark amendment) giving to States discretionary authority over purposes for which grants may be used, and after rejecting by 33 yeas to 54 nays (motion to reconsider table), Case (South Dakota) amendment (to Clark amendment) to increase authorized appropriations to $15 per school-age child (instead of $25 in Clark amendment).

After the Clark amendment above was rejected by 44 yeas to 44 nays, Senate adopted by 45 yeas to 44 nays (Vice President voting to break tie), Dirksen motion to table Johnson (Texas) motion to reconsider vote on its rejection.

Pending at adjournment was Monroney amendment to increase authorized appropriations from $500 million for each of next 2 fiscal years to $20 per school-age child for each of next 4 fiscal years. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment.

Pages 1717–1728, 1736–1755, 1756–1767, 1768–1770, 1773–1805

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that on Thursday, February 4, after morning hour Senate will hear tributes to the life and character of former Senator Langer, following which S. 8, school construction, will be further considered with the hope of completing action on it. If Senate is in session on Friday and Saturday there will be no record votes taken on those days. Page 1801

Authority To Meet: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet on Thursday, February 4, while Senate is in session. Page 1801

Record Votes and Quorum Calls: During Senate proceedings today, four record votes and 2 quorum calls were taken, which appear on pages 1728, 1748, 1751, 1797, 1799, and 1800–1801.

Confirmations: Senate confirmed the following nominations: Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be member of National Mediation Board; and 69 in the Public Health Service. Page 1806

Nominations: One civilian and six judicial nominations were received. Pages 1805–1806

Program for Thursday: Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 11:06 p.m. until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 4, when it will hear tributes to the life and character of former Senator Langer, to be followed by consideration of S. 8, school construction. Pages 1801, 1805

Appendix

Advertising Builds the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate obtained a rare insight both into the effectiveness of television and the ability of our national economy to grow at a breakfast meeting in Washington, D.C., Thursday, February 4.

As one of those privileged to attend the meeting, arranged by the Television Bureau of Advertising, Inc., whose board of directors is headed by Otto Brandt, of KING-TV, Seattle, I commend both the fine presentation made and the response delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MAGNUSON's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WARREN G. MAGNUSON, SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you, Pete Cash.

I am convinced that TV advertising is an important part of our economy.

I am convinced also that it's a very young industry. I am convinced also that we are very young ourselves, but the time goes by quickly, and probably as in advertising, as in politics, the time is now.

I am glad for the invitation to be here this morning. I am particularly pleased because my old friend Otto Brandt, who is one of your officers, invited me. He is one of the fine and responsible citizens of our community.

Television advertising, however, faces a sort of arduous task, a searching task; it is young; the whole medium is young, and that is why I suppose in the last few months they have taken the youngster out in the woodshed and given him a little spanking. I don't think that will hurt him; I think probably that will make him grow up to be a better person.

But television, and television advertising as an adjunct, is in the public domain, and therefore the responsibility to the public becomes a real and a real moving thing with all of you engaged in this industry. It is a little different than the normal type of advertising, and if this movie showed anything this morning, it showed that the impact of the great medium of television is the greatest the world has ever known, and therefore the greater the responsibility to you people.

I suppose if I were to suggest anything this morning looking at it from my angle, when you attract, intrigue and intrude, that that responsibility would carry with it that you do so in good taste; that you do so consistent with the responsibility that indirectly you have because this is in the public domain.

There are only so many channels, as you all well know; so much available space in the spectrum. There are only so many hours in the day, and that narrows the impact of what you people do in television advertising. And there again, this would point up the great responsibility.

For instance, that public domain is now being used by just a few channels. For instance, there are other uses that domain might be put to. I think of eduactional TV, which offers a great future to the problem that the U.S. Senate this morning is considering, namely, the school problem.

I suggest that probably that is one of the things that you people in the whole industry, from the licensee, to the advertisers, to the agencies, and those of you associated, consider as part of your public responsibility. Because if you don't accept that responsibility, which I think you have, or at least I think you are becoming more conscious of it—the very fact that you meet here today and break bread, and exchange ideas about it, the future, or the now, of television, surely augurs good for the fact that you do accept the responsibility that you have to the American public.

I am sure you will do that; I am sure you will realize it; I am sure also that you will face up to it, and we who are in Government, who are part also of that public responsibility, those of us in particular who have charge of the committees in the Congress of the United States that deal with this new media of television, also feel that you will measure up to that responsibility.

For instance, when I said Otto Brandt is a responsible citizen of our community, one of your high officers, that is true, and when a man is a responsible citizen I think he assumes his responsibility in that light.

So I do congratulate you on having an organization of this type and putting together this very vivid film. It is not only vivid to the mind and the eye, but it calls our attention to the fast-moving world. You are part of the Nation's economy, and without advertising I don't suppose America would be—despite all the talk you hear—the greatest power in the history of the world, and the greatest power in the world today, and in that role you play a very important part.

We up in the Congress have a deep feeling, I believe, leaving out headlines or specific instances that we have been reading about for the past few weeks, or past few months, have a great feeling that the industry of which you are a part is going to take care of a lot of these so-called evils themselves, because you are responsible citizens, and when I say good taste, I mean that. When you intrude into the American home, you must do it in good taste; you must do it honestly; you must not be carried away by a portion of this film which pointed out that if your competitor does something, you have got to do something, too.

Sometimes because the speed, the haste that is necessary, does move people to do something that may not be in the public responsibility, and may be sometimes in what I like to term bad taste, maybe we should look twice at some of the things we do in advertising, which I hope you will. And in doing that, you are going to help all of us, the public, the Government, and yourselves, to make this the thing that we hope it will be, a great force in not only a free America, but in the economy of these United States.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Survival Is Possible—Hopeless Message of "On the Beach" Overlooks Possibility for Protection Against Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago my colleague, the junior Senator from New York State [KENNETH B. KEATING], arranged for Members of the House and Senate, as well as for their staffs and families, to witness a special showing of the popular motion picture "On the Beach." This film, starring Ava Gardner and Gregory Peck, purports to represent the end of the world as atomic fallout from a nuclear war already concluded in the northern hemisphere gradually filters down into Australia. This motion picture certainly packs an emotional wallop and puts across, of course, the need for all of us to do everything we can to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war.

Nevertheless, there are a number of elements of unrealism in the film which could, I think, have very disturbing consequences. The casual moviegoer will find it hard to believe, for example, that Mr. Peck would ever leave as attractive a young lady as Miss Gardner alone and unprotected "on the beach" and take his ship and crew out to sea alone for a few more days of survival. But this bit of unrealism is only one small evidence of the basic unrealism of the film as a whole, which revolves chiefly around the point that there is nothing we can do to protect ourselves against atomic radiation or fallout. The people in the film stand quietly by and wait for death to overtake them.

Such a message is, of course, completely contrary to the facts. There are many things indeed which can be done to protect us against radiation, as even Mr. Peck's Ship's actions in the film demonstrate. In fact the impression that we are absolutely helpless in the face of radiation and that there is nothing we can do about it could actually do very great harm to our national defense program.

In that connection action which has been recently taken by the Civilian De-

fense organization in my State of New York in circulating a booklet entitled "Protection From Radioactive Fallout" is most significant and illustrative of some of the positive steps we can take, and should make plans to take, to protect ourselves from the helpless fictional situation which "On the Beach" represents. Indeed, the extent to which we protect ourselves in advance against radioactive fallout may well contribute, in my opinion, in deterring the occurrence of any such incident.

To illustrate the impact of this little booklet, I include herewith an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of February 2 describing it:

HANDBOOK FOR SURVIVAL

Over the weekend, local Boy Scouts distributed free handbooks, entitled "Protection From Radioactive Fallout." Material contained in the booklets is based on a report made to Governor Rockefeller concerning the problem of radioactive fallout in the event of a nuclear attack. It spells out the protective steps to be taken for survival of citizens.

The handbook describes the hazards of fallout, how it spreads, and what measures responsible citizens should be prepared to take for the protection of their families. It could be a ticket to life, should an atomic bomb ever be dropped in this area.

Those who received one of these little booklets should peruse it thoroughly. Those who were missed should make it a point to obtain a copy. They are available from members of Scout troops or the Montgomery County civil defense organization.

A little knowledge may at times be a dangerous thing. But in other cases and nuclear warfare is certainly such a case, knowledge, little or great, could mean the difference between life and death.

A Positive Means for Combating Pornographic Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, tremendous interest has been generated all over the country in the great effort to combat the spread of pornographic literature and other materials. Religious and civic groups, government officials at all levels, and just plain interested citizens have joined the fray with particular emphasis on means for preventing the flood of obscene publications into the hands of our young people.

There are a number of legislative proposals in this field, each of which holds some promise for finding solutions to this perplexing problem. I am hopeful Congress will act soon in this area.

A recent editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle pointed up a positive means for combating the spread of pornographic literature. The Batavia (N.Y.) Youth Bureau suggests that a good way to stamp out smut is by keeping a watchful eye on the mails. The Democrat & Chronicle further suggests that parents launch their own campaigns to get interesting and wholesome reading into the hands of their children, and to stimulate them to take an interest in this kind of literature. There is certainly great merit in this editorial's comment that "the problem of salacious literature finding its way into young hands does not exist for youngsters who have been intelligently and skillfully motivated in their reading." I hope this idea will gain wide circulation, because it contains great promise.

I certainly commend the Democrat & Chronicle, which has consistently been in the forefront of efforts to wipe out the flood of filth, for its editorial stand, and I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT READING

While police and citizens' committees everywhere are debating how best to protect children from indecent books, the Batavia Youth Bureau comes up with a suggestion so simple many agencies haven't thought of it. That is for parents to do the protecting. Specifically the Batavia Youth Bureau asks that parents watch the mails for offensive reading matter addressed to minors.

Parents can do more. From the moment youngsters begin to recognize words, they should be provided with wholesome reading * * * preferably in books they themselves own. A colleague, besides drastically rationing televiewing time for his youngsters, lets the light stay on in their rooms an additional half hour if its spent reading. Other parents are reviving the art of reading aloud.

The point is that the problem of salacious literature finding its way into young hands does not exist for youngsters who have been intelligently and skillfully motivated in their reading.

World War I Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for several years the veterans of World War I have been appealing to Congress for a pension. Members of the several barracks of the organization in the 15th District of Ohio have advised me that they are continuing their efforts to convince Congress of the need for such legislation.

Recently I received a letter from a member of the Muskingum County Barracks 454 in Zanesville setting forth his feelings with regard to the pension legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

The letter follows:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I
OF THE U.S.A., INC.,
Zanesville, Ohio, January 27, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HENDERSON: I remember—yes, I remember well—42 years ago in 1917 when President Wilson declared war on Germany; the call to arms when so many enlisted; the selling of war bonds; the speeches; the songs—"Over there, and we won't come back till it's over, over there."

The camps; the ships that carried us over there; the sleeping quarters where baggage was formerly carried; the subs that sank many ships; and the landing on French soil. Yes, we had come for a purpose—a just cause—so that freedom would not perish from this earth.

Yes, I remember the battles in the early part—Belleau Woods, Chateau Thierre, Meuse-Argonne, and many others; how we fought with airplanes (called crates) and the French 75 guns; how we lived and slept in the trenches for $30 a month (many never returned but sleep eternally in Flanders Field); the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918, in a railroad car in France, so that this war would end all wars; also Armistice Day, 1918, and the singing and rejoicing that the war had ended in victory and glory for us and our allies.

So now all we ask is that the remaining "forgotten soldiers" be given an adequate pension, with no penalties attached because of a little savings or income which he or his wife may have.

Pensionas given to all ex-Presidents and ex-Presidents' wives (also Congressmen and generals) have no penalties attached because of their earnings or their wife's earnings or because of their incomes. We ask only for the same conideration for the soldiers of 1917 which is now given to the Spanish War veterans.

Yes, all of us remember last Armistice Day, November 11, 1959, when taps were blown and the guns facing the east were fired in memory of those who have answered their last rollcall. As one speaker said, "They should be remembered this day and every day for the sacrifices they made so that we might have peace and liberty once more." Permit us to remind you of the World War I veterans who remembered to join the U.S. forces in 1917 and who did not forget to salute our flag in 1959. We now ask that you not forget the veterans of 1917.

We now respectfully ask that you, as a Member of this Congress of the United States, amend pension bill No. 7650 of 1959, or pass bill H.R. 9336 without income penalties attached and that this be done this year.

An early reply to this letter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
MUSKINGUM COUNTY BARRACKS
No. 454,
FRANK J. SHURTZ,
Past Commander.

International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the International Development Association is a fine new instrument for the development of the high capabilities of full association among free nations and freemen for high

policy. It has the potential of expanding aid to the industrially newly developing nations such as India which is so vital to the free world which faces crisis times on a large scale within a few years unless considerably more aid is forthcoming to enable its development plan to succeed. As the soft currency subsidiary of the World Bank, IDA needs the prompt approval of its charter if it is to do the work for which it was created. It will support a lending program of $160 million annually to newly developing nations, which is really not more than a beginning but which provides a base for development and broader application. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Beginning," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 2, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BEGINNING

Member nations of the World Bank ought to lose no time in approving the charter of the Bank's new soft loan subsidiary, the International Development Association. The initial capitalization of $1 billion, with about four-fifths of it in hard currencies, will support a lending program of only some $160 million a year to underdeveloped nations. Obviously this will need to be expanded before IDA can take on a truly significant share of the economic development task.

India alone, for example, will require several times as much assistance annually if it is to break the tightening grip of poverty. Thus the industrial countries cannot view their IDA subscriptions as alternatives to continuing national programs, at least until the IDA's sights are materially lifted. Nor should there be any illusion that the subscription of soft currencies by countries which have acquired large amounts will significantly lessen the need for hard capital in the early stages.

With the experience and integrity of the World Bank behind it, IDA ought in time to attract a growing proportion of the industrial nations' foreign economic assistance funds. Through such a multilateral approach, the broadest possible participation would be assured, while the political and other inhibitions that often attach to strictly bilateral aid programs could be avoided. Ultimately, this new window at the Bank could become the focal point for a mighty, free-world effort to bridge the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots," to which the latter could in time make their own growing contribution.

The Need for Depressed Area Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as Congress gets down to the business of acting upon the many important issues that must be acted upon in the coming months, it is important that every Member be apprised of two important facts relating to a highly urgent matter:

First. Despite the rising level of general industrial and business activity, there remain surplus labor areas in which thousands of American families are deprived of an opportunity to obtain adequate food, clothing, and shelter; and

Second. President Eisenhower has reiterated his desire for legislation to assist areas of urgent need.

The White House position in this regard should be noted carefully by the Congress. The President has appealed for a law specifically designed to provide assistance to regions of chronic unemployment, but he cannot in conscience subscribe to the catchall bills that have been proposed from time to time for the purpose of attaching to a reasonable and proper measure an assortment of pork barrel projects that have no relevance to distressed areas. Nor can any of us whose immediate concern is for those unemployed citizens who have been looking in vain for Congress to take the lead in stimulating the economy of their neglected communities.

Surplus labor legislation should and must be kept free of political implication, for the savage consequence of prolonged unemployment have no regard for party affiliation. A number of the depressed regions are represented by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I have been working with many of my friends over there for many months on this problem. Those of us who have walked through stricken communities cannot help but resent their situation in a period when most of America is enjoying a high degree of prosperity. Our only recourse is to appeal to Representatives of districts which have fortunately escaped the horror of chronic idleness persisting in our constituencies for many years.

I do not belittle efforts that the Federal Government has put forth in its program to wipe out pockets of unemployment. In many States there is ample evidence of success in the small business programs, financial assistance for urban renewal, public facilities, State and local industrial development corporations, and the procurement of goods and services and construction of Government facilities.

Yet even these projects have their limitations, with some areas almost wholly outside the perimeter of benefits extended. A sound distressed area bill is therefore vital to reinvigorate the economy of those communities which, through no fault of their own, have not been able to take advantage of other Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a distressed area bill soon after the 85th Congress convened in 1953. Similar bills have been proposed by other Republicans and Democrats alike. Which of these measures is enacted is of no significance. I assure you that I shall give my enthusiastic support to whichever one comes up for a vote. I ask only that the House reject any attempts to tack on a myriad of other items that have no relationship to the serious problem which is facing us at this time, and work towards a bill that will become a reality.

The Right To Vote for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 2 the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 39 which, among other things, gives Washington, D.C., residents the right to vote. This, together with the home rule legislation which the Senate passed last year, culminates what has been an arduous, but gratifying, effort in giving the residents of the District of Columbia the full measure of self-government which they so rightly deserve.

I was pleased to join the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in proposing the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 39, and I share their hopes that our efforts will be duplicated by early action in the House.

The Washington Evening Star of February 3 and the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 4 carried editorials commenting on the success of the Keating amendment and expressing similar hopes that the House will act quickly in approving this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 3, 1960]

THREE CHEERS

The heavy Senate majority, comfortably exceeding the required two-thirds, which approved the Constitutional amendment yesterday granting Washington residents the right to vote for President, Vice President, and representation in Congress, is something to cheer about.

Some 65 proposals of the same sort have been introduced in Congress in the past 83 years. A few have received adverse reports from committees and about as many have been favorably reported. But yesterday's Senate vote on the Keating resolution, previously sponsored also by Senator CASE of South Dakota, and BEALL, of Maryland, was the first time the matter has ever received a test on the floor in either House of Congress.

We are confident that if it can be brought to the floor of the House it will be as decisively approved. For it is unthinkable that the extraordinary contradiction, here at the heart of the Republic, of everything we preach to ourselves and the rest of the world regarding the right to vote can much longer to condoned. We would have wished that the Keating resolution could have been considered alone and on its own merits, rather than as part of a package containing two other Constitutional amendments, one of them of more political than actual importance. But the Senate vote yesterday was of great significance in registering the support of the District's cause by so many Senators.

It is a matter of interest that the House Judiciary Committee, which now receive the

Senate resolution, is headed by a chairman who long since demonstrated his own support of its objectives. When the late Hatton Sumners, of Texas was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the present chairman, Representative CELLER, of New York, conducted hearings on a somewhat similar resolution which brought a favorable report from the committee. Many Members of the House, unable to stomach home rule, have indicated their support of granting to residents of Washington their basic rights as citizens to be represented in their National Government. These are the rights secured by the Senate-approved amendment.

We hope Chairman CELLER will arrange prompt hearings, and that the amendment will be sent to the 50 States in this election year of 1960.

SALUTE TO THE SENATE

The Senate's feat of Tuesday is nothing less than a constitutional handspring. Two of the constitutional amendments it approved with dramatic speed have been kicking around the corridors of the Capitol for decades. Apparently the sponsors were able to catch the Senate in an amending mood. In any event, the coup is a remarkable one, and it greatly encourages hope that three grave defects in the Constitution can now be remedied.

Ordinarily it is risky to tie several amendments together, as this gives the opposition to each a chance to combine and kill them all. Fortunately, this did not happen in the Senate. If the House will now accept the entire package, each amendment can be considered separately on its merits by the States, under terms of the resolution. At least that will prevent one amendment from dragging on the others in the ratification process.

This newspaper has previously given hearty support to the objectives behind all of these amendments. The poll tax is a discredited device used largely to disfranchise poor Negroes in five Southern States. We applaud the Senate vote to wipe it out. Senator KEFAUVER's amendment to authorize Governors to fill vacancies in the House in case of a national disaster is also a laudable precaution in these days of nuclear rockets. The Keating amendment to permit District residents to vote in presidential elections is a simple act of justice that should have been approved a century and a half ago.

Some fear is being expressed that this proposed grant of national suffrage to residents of the District may impede action on the District home rule bill in the House. Actually these measures are unrelated, except in one particular. The home rule bill, which requires approval by only a majority of the House, would create a local government here, with an elected legislature. Its chief purpose is to give District residents a voice in their local government and to relieve Congress of the burden of serving as a city council.

The Keating amendment, which must have approval by two-thirds of the House and by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, would enable District residents to vote for presidential electors as if the District were a State and for delegates to the House equal to the number of Representatives that the District would have if it were a State. The proposed delegates could be transformed into voting Representatives by act of Congress. We should much prefer an amendment that would make these proposed legislators full-fledged Representatives from the outset. But the amendment as it stands would be a great step forward.

The only overlap between the home rule bill and the Keating amendment comes at this point. The home rule bill calls for a nonvoting District delegate in the House. It is said, however, that this provision may be stricken as a compromise to get action on the bill. That would be a logical step if there is a chance of getting House action on the three-amendment package.

The most pressing step is completion of the roster of 219 names on the petition to dislodge the home rule bill from the House District Committee. No vision of presidential suffrage should be permitted to interfere with this drive. If the right to vote for presidential candidates and for potential Congressmen can be happily added to home rule, the District will indeed be grateful.

Today's Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the magazine U.S. News & World Report, in its issue dated February 8, 1960, has published an unusual but factual appraisal of today's farm problem. As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and a lifelong operating farmer, I can testify to the many frustrations with which the modern farmer is faced, in staying in step with new developments and financing new equipment and facilities. Some legislation that was passed to help the farmer has, over the years, been of questionable benefit to the small wheat farmer, particularly. I must say, I have not given up hope for legislative relief in 1960, but the outlook is not bright. The complexion of the Congress is the same as last year, but it would be my desire to lay aside political differences on this important matter.

The disagreements among the major farm organizations over a basic approach, I believe, have been tempered to a small degree. Among our farm population itself, I believe, there is recognition that a further buildup of surpluses must be stopped. Under the circumstances so clearly set out in this article, it is difficult to see how the farmer could cut his production and stay in business without an increase in price.

Mr. Speaker, the magazine article I ask to include here contains some basic truths about the situation in farming today, and I commend it to the House of Representatives:

WHERE MODERN EFFICIENCY DOESN'T PAY OFF

Farmers once again are caught in a squeeze between rising costs and declining income. The squeeze is expected to grow tighter as pay raises for city workers, sparked by the raise in steel, are passed on to farmers in the form of higher prices on the things they buy.

What the farmer sees when he looks at the facts is shown by the accompanying chart. He sees, for one thing, that efficiency hasn't paid off for him.

The American farmer, on the average, has increased his efficiency by 65 percent in the past 10 years. He has done this by investing his own money, or borrowed money, in new machinery and improved methods. This improved efficiency has been accompanied by a drop of 7 percent in farm prices.

By contrast, the city worker in office and factory has had raises far greater than his increase in efficiency. While efficiency in offices and factories has gone up by 21 percent in the past 10 years, pay has risen by 58 percent. The increase in efficiency by city workers was due largely to investment by employers in new equipment and methods.

BARGAIN FOOD? NO

Consumers, however, have not enjoyed lower food prices as a result of declining farm prices.

The food from U.S. farms that goes into the market basket of the average housewife now returns the farmer 12 percent less than it did 10 years ago. The housewife, however, has to pay 9 percent more than she paid 10 years ago. Increases in "middleman's" costs have more than offset the farmer's loss.

Farmers, as a result, get a smaller percentage of the consumer's food dollar than at any time since 1939.

Another comparison watched by the farmer is the "parity ratio," official measure of his buying power. It has dropped nearly 20 percent since 1950, to the lowest point since 1940. In simple terms, this means that a bushel of corn, a bale of cotton, a slaughter hog will buy less than 10 years ago.

All this has put the farmer on a treadmill. He has increased efficiency, enlarged his farm, sold more products. But his income for a year's work remained virtually the same in 1959 as in 1950—about $2,500 for the average U.S. farm. Those dollars, today, are worth 18 percent less than in 1950.

That is today's farm problem as seen by farmers.

Higher output means gains for everybody but the farmer

SINCE 1950	Percent
Workers' output, in factories and offices, per man-hour	up 21
Workers' wages per hour	up 58
Farmers' output, per man-hour	up 65
Farmers' income, from products they grow	down 1

Result: Farmers ended the 1950's, a "decade of progress," with income dropping, despite increased efficiency.

Food prices rise but farmers get less of the money

SINCE 1950	Percent
Housewife's cost, for a market basket of food	up 9
"Middlemen's" charges, for processing and selling the food	up 28
Farmer's prices, for the food in the basket	down 12

Result: Farmers get 38 percent of the housewife's food dollar, their smallest share since 1939.

Farm buying power lowest in 20 years

Parity ration, the official measure of purchasing power of farm products:

	Percent of the 1910–14 level
10 years ago	96
Now	77

Result: Buying power of farmers' products is at the lowest level since August, 1940.

Basic data: U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S. Department of Labor.

The Meaning of Yeshiva University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, from its modest beginning in 1928, when 750

students formed its first class, Yeshiva University, in New York City, has grown to become one of the outstanding centers of learning in the United States. Today, Yeshiva University has a student enrollment of 5,000, and its dynamic building program envisages, in the years ahead, a new Yeshiva with its own campus and with facilities for 10,000 students.

Recently, at the annual scholarship dinner of Yeshiva University, held in New York City, Charles H. Silver, president of the board of education of the city of New York, and one of the great moving spirits behind the success of Yeshiva, delivered an address on the subject of the creation of this university and of its meaning in the modern world as a symbol of spiritual triumph. In view of the inspirational character of the address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER AT THE YESHIVA UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, DECEMBER 13, 1959

In the procession of civilization no period can claim a monopoly on the defense of human rights. Nor may any one people boast of being the sole champions of education.

Every age has had its own struggle to keep burning the lamp of liberty and learning. Every race and creed has, at some moment in time, brought forth a leader to advance the cause of understanding and knowledge.

But it has been the particular obligation and privilege of the Jew to bestow upon the world the eternal blessing of our Holy Scriptures—the law and commandments. These have been a beacon of hope and divine guidance to all the generations of man.

And it has been the Jew on every page of history, in almost any corner of the world, hounded, beaten, and at bay, who has turned on his tormentors to cry out for justice and to strike at least one telling blow for humanity.

As we approach the feast of lights in tribute to the dauntless courage of the Maccabees, we take pride in the survival of their fierce determination to protect the ancient heritage and immortal teachings of our tradition. We see their flaming deeds kindled again in a brave new nation. We see them growing to greater strength on our own shores, in the modern miracle of our great university.

For what is Yeshiva but our people's hopes and dreams, preserved in a notable center of culture, as surely as they have been in our noble Commonwealth of Israel.

One is the embodiment of our legacy of learning. The other is the living symbol of our love of freedom.

I know of nothing more glorious in the long, tortured road we have traveled through space and time, than the creation and development of that citadel of learning whose anniversary we celebrate tonight.

The very fact of Yeshiva University with its 17 schools and divisions must bring a surge of pride to every Jewish soul. It surely must fill your hearts with satisfaction, as it does mine, that we have been given the opportunity to share in establishing and sustaining this vast contribution to human knowledge.

Yeshiva is a wonder of our age, and of the ages, for here we find an impossible dream come true in a type of pioneering which combines the most advanced scientific methods of our missile age with the imperishable wisdom of the Torah.

We have tapped the deep wellsprings of the past to serve the needs of the future.

In the last few years, Yeshiva University has established four graduate schools, offering instruction in the vital fields of mathematics and physics, teaching, social service, and medicine. From the limited facilities which offered meager accommodation to 750 students in 1928, we have grown to a student body of 5,000, with a faculty second to none. The years ahead will see a new Yeshiva University rise on its own campus with classrooms and dormitories for 10,000 students, on an ideal site, four blocks square on Broadway, in the eighties. This will be the dynamic center of the Yeshiva University of tomorrow which you are building with your hands and hearts—and never-failing help—today.

Our graduate school of education has become, in a few short years, the third largest in the entire metropolitan area, richly deserving of a building of its own and recipient of a Ford Foundation grant of half a million dollars. The Stern College for Women has earned such eminence that it can accept only one out of every nine young women who seek to enter. Our Albert Einstein College of Medicine, a $140 million city of health, is the only medical school under Jewish sponsorship in America, and is already recognized as one of the finest in the world.

Meanwhile, across the seas, Israel waits watchfully as the Middle East rumbles with threats of renewed violence. And it must grieve many of you who know the suffering and anguish of the refugee and the wanderer, who look to the Holy Land as a haven, to hear one of our own leaders question the principle of aid to Israel from the Jews of America. What a tragedy it is that this infant land, with more borders than territory, and not a day of peace, facing foes on every hand, should now be threatened by one among her friends.

Behind the Iron Curtain, despite the smiling assurances of our recent visitor, the Jew is little better than a tolerated intruder, deprived of status and even of hope for a better day. In North Africa, he faces a harrowing wall of hostility. In Germany, he sees the smouldering ashes of anti-Semitism licking up into sickening new tongues of hate.

Even here, in our own God-loved land, bombed synagogues and fanatical pamphlets remind us that the fear-makers have not abandoned their evil trade.

Against this background of darkness and distrust, the lights of the Menorah remind us of a handful of Jews, 20 centuries ago, who triumphed over adversity and seemingly certain defeat. And the soaring towers of Yeshiva tell the world that our rich traditions and love of learning will survive the threat of prejudice and the ravages of circumstances to serve mankind, through all eternity.

Our feet have remained firmly fixed in the shifting sands of time. Our eyes are set on a star—and however painful the climb, however long or far the winding path ahead—we shall remain faithful to our destiny:

To bear the word of God.

To build the world of man.

To sustain Israel as one more beacon light of justice and liberty.

And to support Yeshiva for all men of all lands, of all races and creeds, asking only that they love knowledge—and truth.

Reapportionment of Congressional Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a report to me from the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., dated January 5, 1960, generally concerning the subject of reapportionment of congressional districts in connection with the oncoming anticipated U.S. census report. I know it will be of nationwide information and interest.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1960.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: In response to your request of November 13, 1959, asking several questions about congressional districts and the population of certain of the States, the legislative reference service submits the following information and materials for your consideration.

In answer to question 1—Which 25 Congressional districts in the United States contain the largest population, according to latest information?

In attempting to answer this question, an examination was made of figures found in the Census Bureau's files. These figures consist of estimates made up from local sources by different methods and at different dates, the latest of which is July 1958. These estimates therefore are in no way official in nature. The result of our search was the compilation of a list of 23 congressional districts—rather than 25—on which population information of the nature described immediately above is presently available. The 23 districts are listed numerically by district and alphabetically by State below in the answer to question 3.

The latest available official and complete population statistics for congressional districts are those compiled as a result of the census of 1950. We are inclosing a copy of a study done by the legislative reference service entitled "Congressional Districts, 83d Congress, Ranked by Population as of April 1, 1950 (17th Census)" hoping that this will also prove useful in answering this first question.

In answer to question 2—Which States are losing population; and how much is California gaining in population?

The States of the Union which are losing population are three in number, namely, Arkansas, Vermont, and West Virginia. There are, however, at least 13 States in the Union which will lose seats in the House of Representatives after the 1960 census has been taken. These are the following:

	Seats lost
Alabama	1
Arkansas	2
Georgia	1
Iowa	1
Kansas	1
Maine	1
Massachusetts	2

	Seats lost
Minnesota	1
Mississippi	1
New York	3
North Carolina	1
Pennsylvania	3
West Virginia	1

California is one of a number of States which continue to show a very substantial gain in population. As a result of the census of 1950, the State had a population of 10,586,223 people. The provisional estimate for July 1, 1959, was 14,639,000. Thus, there has been an approximate increase of 4,053,000 persons since the 1950 census was taken, or in terms of percentages an increase of 38.3 percent.

We are enclosing copies of two Bureau of the Census publications which should prove helpful in fully answering this second question. One of these is entitled "Projected Reapportionment of Number of Congressmen by States." The second, which became available only last December 27, is "Provisional Estimates of the Population of States and Selected Outlying Areas of the United States."

In answer to question 3—How many congressional districts in the United States have a population of more than 600,000? Where are they?

The list of districts which follows cannot be said to be definitive. As indicated above, the estimates of population are made up from local sources, by different methods, and at different dates, the latest being July 1958. Congressional districts possessing 600,000 or more population are the following:

District	Year	Population
9th Alabama	1957	607,758
10th California	1958	661,500
17th California	1956	632,269
25th California	1956	609,060
28th California	1956	619,762
30th California	1956	666,598
1st Florida	1958	606,000
4th Florida	1958	803,100
5th Florida	1958	644,600
6th Florida	1958	627,300
5th Georgia	1957	739,196
11th Indiana	1957	652,000
5th Maryland	1958	687,830
6th Michigan	1957	613,400
7th Michigan	1957	613,830
18th Michigan	1957	637,200
1st New Jersey	1956	645,000
1st New York	1956	606,663
3d Ohio	1958	600,739
12th Ohio	1958	660,853
9th Tennessee	1957	600,500
5th Texas	1956	837,915
20th Texas	1956	600,317

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. ELSBREE,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS, 83RD CONGRESS, RANKED BY POPULATION AS OF APRIL 1, 1950 (17TH CENSUS)

Final population figures from the 1950 census for the 424 congressional districts in the United States were reported on October 16, 1952 by Roy V. Peel, Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. Although the House of Representatives has 435 Members, 11 are currently elected at large and do not represent specific congressional districts

The 424 congressional districts ranged in population from the Second District of South Dakota, which had 159,099 inhabitants on April 1, 1950, to the Eighth District of Texas, which had 806,701 inhabitants. Three out of every five of the congressional districts, however, had between 300,000 and 400,000 inhabitants, and 19 out of every 20 fell in the range from 200,000 to 500,000 inhabitants.

The Representatives of six States—Delaware, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming—are elected at large. Of these six States, New Mexico and North Dakota have two Representatives each, and the remaining four States have one Representative each. Connecticut, Texas, and Washington, although they have districts, each elect one additional Representative at Large.

Congressional district boundaries were redrawn in 16 States following the apportionment based upon the 1950 census. These 16 included 14 of the 16 States which had either gained or lost Representatives as a result of the apportionment. Two additional States which had no change in the number of Representatives—Ohio and West Virginia—revised the boundaries of their congressional districts. In the remaining 32 States, the boundaries of the congressional districts were not changed. In Texas and Washington, each of which gained a Representative, the additional Representative is elected at large.

At-large congressional districts—11 House seats

State	Number of at-large seats	Population
Texas	1	7,711,194
Washington	1	2,378,963
Connecticut	1	2,007,280
New Mexico	2	681,187
North Dakota	2	619,636
Vermont	1	377,747
Delaware	1	318,085
Wyoming	1	290,529
Nevada	1	100,083

Regular congressional districts—424 House seats

Rank	State	District	Population
1	Texas	8th	806,701
2	Georgia	5th	618,431
3	Texas	5th	614,799
4	Alabama	9th	558,928
5	Indiana	11th	551,777
6	Ohio	3d	545,644
7	Connecticut	1st	539,661
8	Washington	1st	527,768
9	Michigan	16th	525,334
10	Florida	4th	525,041
11	Connecticut	4th	504,342
12	Ohio	12th	503,410
13	Texas	20th	500,460
14	South Dakota	1st	493,641
15	Kentucky	3d	484,615
16	Tennessee	9th	482,393
17	California	26th	480,827
18	Oregon	3d	471,537
19	Michigan	6th	470,629
20	Tennessee	2d	468,080
21	Michigan	14th	466,448
22	Illinois	13th	466,064
23	Texas	14th	457,290
24	Washington	6th	456,653
25	Texas	15th	455,421
26	California	19th	453,942
27	Ohio	14th	450,449
28	Kansas	4th	448,435
29	West Virginia	6th	446,466
30	Pennsylvania	26th	444,921
31	New Jersey	1st	441,978
32	Illinois	4th	441,887
33	Oklahoma	1st	439,518
34	Wisconsin	4th	438,041
35	Oklahoma	5th	436,620
36	Florida	1st	436,365
37	Oregon	1st	434,414
38	Tennessee	1st	434,171
39	Minnesota	3d	433,942
40	Wisconsin	5th	433,006
41	California	17th	431,254
42	Ohio	21st	430,345
43	Missouri	1st	427,856
44	Mississippi	4th	426,396
45	Maryland	5th	426,371
46	California	30th	426,188
47	Missouri	3d	426,088
48	California	14th	424,341
49	Texas	12th	422,000
50	California	23d	421,623
51	New Jersey	5th	419,911
52	Louisiana	6th	417,898
53	Arizona	2d	417,817
54	Kentucky	8th	416,936
55	Rhode Island	2d	416,605
56	Maryland	6th	416,389
57	South Carolina	2d	415,893
58	Colorado	1st	415,786
59	Michigan	7th	414,598
60	Iowa	2d	414,421
61	Pennsylvania	7th	414,234
62	California	8th	413,672
63	Ohio	20th	413,492
64	California	5th	412,549
65	Mississippi	3d	412,547
66	Ohio	16th	412,230
67	Pennsylvania	24th	410,290
68	Missouri	2d	409,291
69	Arkansas	1st	407,480
70	Texas	9th	406,311
71	Florida	3d	404,824
72	Virginia	2d	403,923
73	California	6th	403,817
74	Missouri	7th	402,442
75	Utah	2d	402,310
76	North Carolina	4th	401,913
77	Colorado	2d	401,112
78	Texas	2d	401,003
79	Oklahoma	6th	400,769
80	North Carolina	6th	398,351
81	Illinois	7th	398,296
82	New Jersey	6th	398,138
83	South Carolina	4th	396,809
84	Michigan	18th	396,001
85	Indiana	3d	395,846
86	Ohio	9th	395,551
87	California	3d	395,538
88	Oklahoma	2d	394,872
89	California	13th	394,782
90	North Carolina	7th	394,214
91	Pennsylvania	9th	393,858
92	Indiana	8th	393,520
93	New York	37th	393,130
94	Louisiana	2d	392,891
95	Pennsylvania	11th	392,241
96	Indiana	5th	391,696
97	Massachusetts	10th	390,896
98	Pennsylvania	30th	390,895
99	California	21st	390,824
100	Virginia	9th	390,380
101	Tennessee	4th	390,363
102	New Jersey	3d	390,333
103	Wisconsin	2d	389,901
104	Illinois	24th	388,302
105	New York	10th	388,295
106	New York	6th	385,761
107	South Carolina	6th	384,094
108	Michigan	15th	383,944
109	New York	14th	383,544
110	New York	7th	383,382
111	California	12th	383,250
112	Georgia	3d	383,148
113	New York	8th	382,911
114	Michigan	2d	382,829
115	Mississippi	6th	382,272
116	New York	11th	381,455
117	New York	15th	381,449
118	New York	9th	380,969
119	Michigan	1st	380,670
120	Tennessee	3d	380,649
121	Pennsylvania	25th	377,632
122	Pennsylvania	27th	377,219
123	Pennsylvania	2d	376,752
124	Pennsylvania	29th	376,679
125	Rhode Island	1st	375,291
126	Washington	2d	374,695
127	New York	5th	372,762
128	Iowa	1st	372,574
129	Pennsylvania	5th	372,257
130	Kentucky	5th	372,164
131	Illinois	10th	371,879
132	Florida	5th	371,454
133	California	10th	371,451
134	New Jersey	7th	371,224
135	Alabama	1st	371,119
136	Pennsylvania	28th	371,044
137	Alabama	2d	370,389
138	Connecticut	3d	370,356
139	Nebraska	1st	369,970
140	California	25th	369,848
141	North Carolina	8th	369,455
142	Texas	19th	369,315
143	Indiana	1st	368,152
144	Oregon	4th	368,007
145	Georgia	7th	367,598
146	Pennsylvania	22d	367,489
147	New York	13th	367,471
148	Ohio	2d	367,190
149	Iowa	3d	367,137
150	Maryland	2d	366,962
151	Massachusetts	5th	365,724
152	New Jersey	4th	365,691
153	California	1st	365,281
154	Mississippi	1st	365,152
155	New York	40th	364,962
156	New York	41st	364,836
157	Kentucky	6th	363,423
158	New York	24th	362,924

Regular congressional districts—424 House seats—Continued

Rank	State	District	Population
159	New York	23d	362,833
160	New York	22d	362,825
161	California	4th	362,808
162	New York	25th	362,695
163	Michigan	5th	362,043
164	Wisconsin	8th	360,610
165	North Carolina	10th	360,318
166	California	15th	360,139
167	Kansas	2d	359,473
168	New York	42d	359,432
169	Washington	4th	357,416
170	Ohio	1st	356,762
171	Illinois	14th	355,643
172	Missouri	5th	355,640
173	Minnesota	4th	355,332
174	North Carolina	5th	355,088
175	New York	4th	354,795
176	Massachusetts	13th	354,679
177	Illinois	2d	354,611
178	Illinois	12th	354,065
179	Missouri	9th	353,791
180	Illinois	16th	353,631
181	Pennsylvania	13th	353,008
182	Massachusetts	4th	352,509
183	New Jersey	9th	351,976
184	Texas	16th	351,710
185	Iowa	5th	350,784
186	Louisiana	1st	350,311
187	Georgia	1st	350,052
188	Pennsylvania	10th	349,780
189	Michigan	3d	349,661
190	Illinois	3d	349,091
191	Indiana	10th	347,642
192	Kentucky	7th	347,451
193	California	24th	346,844
194	South Carolina	1st	345,953
195	Michigan	13th	345,341
196	Illinois	21st	345,287
197	Ohio	11th	345,177
198	Massachusetts	9th	344,710
199	Idaho	2d	344,660
200	Illinois	17th	344,573
201	Wisconsin	1st	343,357
202	Massachusetts	2d	343,206
203	Pennsylvania	8th	342,827
204	New York	38th	342,789
205	Pennsylvania	3d	342,118
206	Washington	5th	341,869
207	New York	35th	341,719
208	Nebraska	2d	341,641
209	Pennsylvania	19th	341,391
210	Massachusetts	14th	340,571
211	Pennsylvania	4th	340,173
212	Pennsylvania	18th	339,527
213	Montana	2d	339,247
214	North Carolina	9th	338,907
215	Illinois	9th	338,701
216	New Jersey	12th	338,535
217	Virginia	4th	338,514
218	Virginia	6th	337,947
219	Minnesota	1st	337,730
220	Minnesota	5th	337,552
221	Arkansas	4th	337,181
222	Illinois	6th	336,762
223	Illinois	23d	336,693
224	New York	16th	336,441
225	Missouri	6th	336,214
226	New York	20th	336,203
227	New York	19th	336,122
228	Ohio	7th	335,739
229	Illinois	25th	335,394
230	Colorado	3d	334,893
231	Massachusetts	11th	334,672
232	Virginia	3d	334,127
233	Michigan	17th	333,498
234	Michigan	8th	333,277
235	Louisiana	4th	333,069
236	Arkansas	6th	333,012
237	Missouri	10th	332,680
238	Massachusetts	12th	332,581
239	Illinois	5th	331,972
240	Arizona	1st	331,770
241	New Jersey	8th	331,691
242	West Virginia	4th	330,906
243	New York	34th	330,476
244	West Virginia	5th	330,450
245	Pennsylvania	6th	330,161
246	California	2d	329,060
247	New York	33d	328,950
248	Massachusetts	8th	328,867
249	Kentucky	2d	328,086
250	Indiana	4th	328,039
251	California	11th	327,981
252	Maine	1st	327,874
253	Kentucky	4th	327,153
254	New York	36th	326,776
255	New York	28th	326,682
256	California	7th	326,643
257	Minnesota	6th	326,328
258	Illinois	19th	325,903
259	New York	27th	325,842
260	Illinois	15th	324,129
261	Arkansas	3d	324,123
262	New York	29th	324,032
263	Louisiana	5th	323,891
264	Missouri	4th	323,648
265	Illinois	1st	323,354
266	Tennessee	5th	321,758
267	Alabama	8th	321,459
268	Minnesota	2d	321,397
269	Ohio	18th	321,248
270	Washington	3d	321,162
271	New York	26th	320,281
272	Georgia	10th	320,241
273	New York	31st	319,801
274	Pennsylvania	16th	319,492
275	Kansas	1st	319,297
276	Connecticut	2d	318,621
277	Illinois	23d	318,549
278	Tennessee	6th	318,449
279	Massachusetts	3d	318,447
280	Florida	2d	318,352
281	Pennsylvania	17th	318,271
282	Pennsylvania	12th	317,692
283	New York	12th	317,635
284	New York	18th	317,594
285	New York	3d	317,414
286	New York	21st	317,307
287	New York	2d	317,164
288	Ohio	6th	316,937
289	Virginia	5th	316,734
290	Ohio	19th	316,641
291	New York	17th	316,434
292	Louisiana	7th	315,933
293	Nebraska	4th	315,795
294	Wisconsin	6th	315,666
295	West Virginia	3d	315,479
296	Illinois	11th	315,025
297	Illinois	18th	314,715
298	Texas	10th	314,467
299	New York	1st	314,316
300	Pennsylvania	21st	313,179
301	Maryland	4th	312,835
302	New York	39th	312,404
303	New Jersey	10th	312,306
304	Mississippi	5th	311,340
305	Kansas	5th	311,283
306	Maryland	7th	311,223
307	New Jersey	11th	310,723
308	Alabama	5th	310,683
309	Missouri	11th	310,594
310	Ohio	17th	310,456
311	Pennsylvania	1st	310,144
312	North Carolina	3d	308,470
313	New York	32d	307,980
314	Georgia	6th	307,951
315	South Carolina	3d	307,719
316	Virginia	1st	307,144
317	North Carolina	2d	306,904
318	Illinois	8th	306,202
319	Ohio	4th	305,808
320	Minnesota	7th	305,519
321	Ohio	22d	305,472
322	Kentucky	1st	304,978
323	Indiana	2d	304,235
324	Alabama	3d	303,587
325	Wisconsin	7th	303,389
326	Virginia	10th	303,328
327	Massachusetts	6th	302,440
328	West Virginia	2d	302,297
329	New York	30th	302,118
330	Alabama	4th	301,665
331	Wisconsin	9th	300,866
332	Iowa	6th	300,341
333	Wisconsin	3d	300,025
334	Louisiana	3d	299,747
335	Massachusetts	1st	299,623
336	Indiana	7th	298,798
337	Maryland	3d	298,598
338	Georgia	4th	298,251
339	Nebraska	3d	298,104
340	New York	43d	297,131
341	Virginia	8th	296,985
342	Iowa	8th	296,637
343	Indiana	6th	296,078
344	Maine	2d	295,754
345	North Carolina	11th	295,724
346	Oklahoma	4th	294,577
347	Texas	13th	292,047
348	Michigan	4th	291,818
349	Pennsylvania	23d	291,571
350	Minnesota	8th	291,558
351	Pennsylvania	20th	291,393
352	Maine	3d	290,146
353	Virginia	7th	289,598
354	Texas	18th	289,449
355	California	24th	287,325
356	Utah	1st	286,552
357	California	18th	286,505
358	Ohio	13th	285,194
359	Georgia	2d	285,665
360	North Carolina	12th	284,691
361	Florida	6th	284,362
362	Arkansas	5th	283,437
363	Texas	11th	282,447
364	California	27th	281,642
365	Massachusetts	7th	281,589
366	Illinois	20th	281,468
367	Mississippi	2d	281,207
368	West Virginia	1st	279,954
369	New Hampshire	1st	276,945
370	Texas	1st	276,945
371	Pennsylvania	15th	276,574
372	Missouri	8th	276,499
373	Michigan	9th	275,109
374	New Jersey	14th	275,053
375	Connecticut	5th	274,300
376	Alabama	7th	273,187
377	Minnesota	9th	273,125
378	Texas	3d	271,020
379	New Jersey	13th	269,643
380	Texas	21st	268,894
381	Georgia	8th	267,014
832	Oklahoma	3d	260,995
383	South Carolina	5th	260,559
384	Iowa	7th	260,253
385	Indiana	9th	258,441
386	New Jersey	2d	258,127
387	Ohio	5th	256,470
388	New Hampshire	2d	256,297
389	Pennsylvania	14th	255,740
390	Michigan	10th	254,508
391	Ohio	10th	253,267
392	Iowa	4th	252,926
393	Montana	1st	251,777
394	Ohio	8th	251,581
395	Alabama	6th	250,726
396	Louisiana	8th	249,776
397	Wisconsin	10th	249,654
398	Texas	7th	248,329
399	Tennessee	8th	247,943
400	Tennessee	7th	247,912
401	North Carolina	1st	247,894
402	Oregon	2d	247,383
403	Georgia	9th	246,227
404	Idaho	1st	243,977
405	Ohio	23d	240,223
406	Kansas	6th	239,541
407	California	9th	235,659
408	California	29th	233,021
409	Texas	6th	228,112
410	Michigan	11th	227,810
411	Texas	4th	227,735
412	Kansas	3d	227,270
413	Texas	17th	226,739
414	California	20th	226,679
415	Ohio	15th	226,341
416	Arkansas	2d	224,278
417	California	16th	223,703
418	Florida	7th	220,479
419	California	22d	219,018
420	Maryland	1st	210,623
421	Florida	8th	210,428
422	Michigan	12th	178,251
423	Colorado	4th	173,298
424	South Dakota	2d	159,099

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1950 Census of Population. Advance Reports. Series PC-9, No. 5 for Oct. 16, 1952. "Population of Congressional Districts: Apr. 1, 1950." 4 pages.

The Emergence of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the emergence of Red China as a powerful nation, dominated by an aggressive Communist regime, requires, I believe, effective long-range planning aimed at determining how to cope best with this evergrowing threat to the security of the free world.

Today, Red China is No. 1 in world population with about 650 million people. In land area, it ranks third with a total of 3,750,000 square miles.

The Chinese Communist regime is undertaking a dynamic industrial, agricultural-military development program.

Recently, a special study prepared by the Library of Congress published, at my request, under the auspices of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reveals that, although there are serious difficulties within Red China, the Commu-

nist regime retains an iron grip on the reins of that country. Despite real problems, however, the country is moving forward at all possible speed.

Contrary to our own precepts of justice, this progress—to a large degree—unfortunately neglects the interests of the individual—all such rights and interests being made subservient to the will of the Communist state.

However, the major threat is for the years ahead, rather than as an immediate threat to our security—or competition to U.S. progress economically.

Currently, for example, the national output of Red China is only about $55 billion—or about one-ninth that of the United States.

In the light of the growing and expanding power of communism, however, we—as a world leader—and our allies must undertake long-range programs designed to preserve our security and freedom for the future.

Fortunately for us, the balance of power will not depend upon manpower alone. If it did, there is a real possibility that we would eventually be engulfed.

However, the weapons of the future will be created out of the ingenious technological and scientific capabilities of man—a field in which the United States and other free countries have splendid records.

In the face of the long-range challenge, however, I believe there are some fundamental principles which must serve as guidelines to development of policies for the future. These include:

For the present, prevent any further territorial expansion of communism.

Effectively combat the ideological campaigns of communism.

Assure economic superiority of our own over the Communist system.

Strengthen the regional coalitions of non-Communist nations in a self-preservation-type program.

Attempt to establish world law—and the machinery to enforce such law with justice; so as to eliminate the possibility of nations and people being subjected against their will to alien ideas and power.

Recently, a special research project was conducted by Prof. Daniel Lerner and Morton Gorden of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for International Studies. Among other things, the study revealed that, in the minds of a great many people throughout the free world, Communist China may become the most powerful nation on earth by the year 2000. Reflective of a situation that demands our serious consideration in policy planning, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CHINA BE TOP DOG?

(By Peter Edson)

The thought that Communist China may be the most powerful nation on earth by the year A.D. 2000 has emerged from a special research project conducted by Profs. Daniel Lerner and Morton Gorden of Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies.

This completely unexpected opinion on the rise of Red China over the next 40 years came from over 2,000 out of 4,000 British, French, and German Government and civilian leaders interviewed over the last 5 years. Most of the 2,000 were in France and Germany—only a few in Britain.

The interviews were not conducted like one-shot public opinion polls. They were what research men call interviews in depth. They ran over an hour. They covered some 200 questions, 50 on key issues.

Early interviews conducted by nationals of each country in 1954–58 were rechecked in 1959 to determine any changes in thought trends. Results of the complete survey will be published in book form later this year. It is expected to prove useful in foreign-policy guidance.

It will contain none of the usual predictions of weekends on the moon, pushbutton living, exploding populations, and you'll have to eat algae and like them.

Here are serious efforts to see what the international political situation will be. But anyone interested in the kind of world his children will be living in four decades hence will find food for thought in such research.

About two-thirds of the Western European leaders interviewed do not look for a third world war in this century. They do foresee continuation of the cold war. No chance is seen for full disarmament. Continued heavy expenses for national defense are therefore seen necessary.

As of today, the United States is ranked the most powerful nation on earth. Soviet Russia is second and Communist China third. The rise of Red China to surpass Russia in less than two generations would be an achievement equal to the Soviet's rise from 1917 to 1960. Curiously, no one ranked India as a future world leader or rival to Red China.

Only 7 percent of the Western European leaders interviewed for Messrs. Lerner and Gorden think the world balance of power will remain in the West at the end of the century.

But at the end of the 5-year study period a growing confidence in European unification was apparent. A few leaders now venture the opinion that a politically and economically unified Western Europe could become a leading world power. This may be one of the important new international facts of life developing in this century.

A number of other research projects in this field of international relations are revealing many interesting findings on which foreign policy can be based.

Lloyd A. Free, president of the International Institute for Social Research, Princeton, N.J., last year published the results of his interviews with 100 parliamentary leaders in each of "Six Countries and a Neutral"—Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United States, and India.

Mr. Free found American Congressmen pessimistic on the possibility of closer relations with Russia. Only 2 percent here thought it held promise, against 14 percent in Britain, 24 percent in France, 26 percent in Germany.

Oregon Honored—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the University of Oregon is about to lose the services of a great president, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, who is accepting a new position as president of the University of Minnesota. Dr. Wilson's contributions to the University of Oregon, and to all of Oregon's educational system, cannot possibly be overestimated. He has been a real source of pride to the students and faculty of the university and to the people of the entire State. But under the present State administration which, like the national administration after which it professes to pattern itself, values a balanced budget as the highest of all goals, we cannot afford to pay for the services of this great educator.

Oregon's Governor, Mark Hatfield, has greeted the news of Dr. Wilson's move to Minnesota with the astonishing statement that "it is an honor to Oregon that Minnesota should come here for a university president." So it is, of course. Minnesota stands at the top of the list of the States in expenditures for educational purposes, and its leadership has traditionally been willing to pay for what that educational system needs. But the honor which has been paid to Oregon is a little bit offset, I think, by the disgrace which is Oregon's at being unwilling to offer enough to retain the services of this fine college president.

Dr. Wilson's departure for Minnesota is not the only loss the State of Oregon has suffered in recent months. Dr. Harold M. Erickson, State health officer, has also resigned his post to go to California. Dr. Erickson plainly pointed out that his departure was occasioned by the State's unwillingness to take the problems of public health in the modern age seriously. Again by Governor Hatfield's criteria, Dr. Erickson's departure for California is an honor paid to Oregon.

I hope I will not be accused of a lack of appreciation when I suggest that Oregon can ill afford many more such honors. I think most of the people of Oregon who are interested in topflight education and topflight public health services, would just as soon pay, instead of having the honor of the thing.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial on this subject, appearing in the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OREGON HONORED—AGAIN

Governor Mark Hatfield said yesterday he felt Oregon was honored to have the University of Minnesota hire Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Oregon, as president of the midwestern school.

That's one way of looking at it.

We realize that the $27,000 offered Dr. Wilson by Minnesota can't be matched by the university at Eugene, and we are happy for Dr. Wilson that he can step up to a better job—almost the very essence or realization of ambition in America.

But he follows Dr. Harold M. Erickson, former State health officer, from the State too closely to promote a feeling of comfort.

Dr. Wilson is leaving the State, he says, with regrets. Dr. Erickson didn't express too many, despite his many years of service. It was apparent he felt frustrated in his inability to promote good health conditions under current conditions.

We hope Dr. Wilson is not covering a similiar situation with bland words.

Despite the honor of losing Dr. Wilson to Minnesota and Dr. Erickson to California where he was willing to become assistant in order to find a more favorable climate for performance, we are concerned over this migration of top men to other States.

Oregon needs every able and talented man and woman it can get if the State is to progress to the position the State's resources portend.

But, as someone remarked, we still have Len Casanova, head coach at the university, who turned down a chance to go to the University of California.

A good football coach is far more valuable than a university president or a health officer, someone said during a discussion of Wilson's departure.

And that must be so, because in many places the coach is paid more than the school president.

And money is the American standard of worth.

So we get what we pay for, not what we need most, perhaps, but what we want most.—Coos Bay World.

Newspaper Editors Evaluate Article in Saturday Evening Post Concerning West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I made comment in this chamber concerning a Saturday Evening Post article on the problems and possibilities of West Virginia and its citizens. Reaction to the Post writer's observations and conclusions has been voiced by several newspaper editors and through published statements by public officials. Two editorials, one from the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times and the other from the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, both published on February 2, 1960, are well written and couched in restrained, yet realistic, phraselogy. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, Feb. 2, 1960]

NOT OUT OF BUSINESS YET

A national magazine article, "The Strange Case of West Virginia," is attracting wide attention in the Mountain State. It is not a pretty picture that Ruol Tunley, the author, has painted but most of his facts apparently are correct.

Any competent reporter could have done the same type of piece on any State or large city in the country if he set out to find their worst features. Without leaving the main offices of the Saturday Evening Post in Philadelphia, he could have pointed to the vast improvements being made in the downtown section of the historic city while slums continue to flourish on its outskirts.

He could have visited some of the lavish resorts in the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania and compared them to the misery in the long-suffering anthracite fields only a short distance away precisely as he contrasted the luxury of the Greenbrier Hotel at White Sulphur Springs with abandoned mining camps in nearby southern West Virginia coal regions.

For that matter, the very approaches to the magnificent vistas of the Nation's Capital are such that there is some embarrassment on the part of those who greet distinguished visitors arriving at Andrews Air Force Base and have to enter Washington from the south. Only a few blocks away from the Capitol itself are shacks and tenements scarcely fit for human occupation.

That these conditions exist in West Virginia, almost side by side with prosperous—even booming—communities has long been known. For 30 years, at least, the problem of what to do about them has been of concern at local, State, and National levels.

One point that the magazine writer may not have made entirely clear when he spoke of the inroads made by the mechanization of the coal industry on the total number of employed was that some of the mining camps he singled out as ghost towns didn't get that way because of automation. Many resulted from worked-out acreage, and the camps would have been abandoned by the operating companies if a machine had never been used to extract the coal.

Doubtless the article will be used as a peg for political machinations in Charleston and pontificating by pundits throughout the State. Governor Underwood can point to his "rendezvous with hunger" public works program as being the sole and only path to the alleviation of the conditions mentioned in the nationally circulated piece. The Democrats can claim they have a better way of doing it without making the program a Republican boondoggle.

Had West Virginia's plight been so desperate as the magazine writer suggested, it is doubtful whether a single one of the major industries which have come to the State in recent years would have located within its boundaries. We may assume that plant locators will not rely wholly on the Tunley report in making future decisions and from that take hope that West Virginia itself will not become a ghost State.

West Virginia has survived what many constitutional authorities claim to this day was an illegitimate birth; it has withstood the rape of its minerals and its timber by outsiders, and it has borne up under almost total indifference to its well-being on the part of successive Federal administrations, Democratic as well as Republican.

There is no reason to believe that a single magazine article, rasping to West Virginia sensibilities as it is, will prove to be the back-breaking blow that will put the State out of business once and for all.

[From the Charleston Daily Mail, Feb. 2, 1960]

IT HURTS, BUT THE POST'S FULL PORTRAIT OF WEST VIRGINIA IS LARGELY THE TRUTH

The Saturday Evening Post's long-awaited look at West Virgina is out, lavishly illustrated, in the issue for February 6.

West Virginians who read it will wince, bridle and fume. It is not a pleasant picture. If they can cool down long enough to read it again, they cannot escape the truth: What the Post says of West Virginia and West Virginians is not only the way we look to an outsider well equipped for color photography; it is very nearly the way we are.

The author traveled everywhere. He saw Charleston and the Greenbrier. He also saw Stotesbury and the random chain of "ghost towns" which link them. He inquired as he moved, and there is not much that he missed.

The detail he picked up along the way is comprehensive and judiciously balanced. The diagnosis is almost indulgently fair. The author (Roul Tunley) has gone to exhaustive lengths to avoid the criticism that he did not stay long enough or talk with the right people. In summary he points his finger squarely at the bewildering paradox: How could a people sitting upon one of the world's great concentrations of natural wealth live so long in wretched and almost hereditary poverty?

For all this the Post's look at West Virginia is also fairly superficial in several important respects.

Mr. Tunley does not note that in the era of the "great handout" West Virginia has been "handed" nothing. In defense industries, in the whole range of national and foreign economic policy (TVA, the sugar subsidy, price supports) West Virginia's interests have been steadfastly ignored.

Mr. Tunley touches upon the price the State has paid or its absentee ownership, a sore point with many West Virginians. He does not acknowledge the coequal truth that it is also absentee ownership which is responsible for the development of its progressive and prosperous chemical, aluminum and steel industries.

Neither does he assess the heavy price West Virginia has paid for its two great wars—the Civil War which gave it birth and still splits its social structure, the mine wars which marked its industrialization and still infect every effort to arrive at some common cause. Sometimes the State seems destined to illustrate everything Marx wrote about the conflict of the classes.

Most disappointingly, perhaps, Mr. Tunley does not touch upon what may be the most serious possibility of all—the possibility that the State's misery is in the evolutionary sense inbreeding and self-perpetuating. That is to say that as the State becomes less and less attractive, the more alert and progressive of its citizens will go elsewhere, leaving the State's problems to those who are less and less capable of solving them. There is some suspicion of this already. Any confirmation of it could become the worst problem of all.

But this is not to find fault with what the author has done. He was not trying to write a social and economic history of the State. He was commissioned, rather, to paint a picture, and this he has done in broad, sure strokes. There are a few factual erorrs: West Virginia's illiteracy is not so great as he says it is, and he accepts uncritically the figures on illegitimacy. But in the main it is an honest and even generous effort to see West Virginia in the round—beautiful, but depressed, free (mountaineers always are), but backward, deserving, but unenterprising and leaderless.

The 54th legislature ought to pause long enough in its labor to listen while the whole thing is read aloud from the rostrum.

The Spirit of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Nicholas Meligakes, proprietor of the Plaza Restaurant, located on the town square in Gettysburg, Pa., and owner of the Book Mart, a book and gift shop, situated in the same town, is the author of "The Spirit of Gettysburg," a book which is of

great interest to persons concerned with that portion of our Nation's history.

Mr. Meligakes, a young unlettered immigrant from his native Greece, settled in Gettysburg and through hard work and perseverance achieved success in the restaurant business. His industry, honesty, and integrity won him the respect of his fellow townsmen.

Not being very familiar with the history of his newly adopted country, Mr. Meligakes was constantly beset at his inability to answer queries about Gettysburg made to him by tourists who patronized his restaurant. He determined to learn all he could about the area, its early history, the historic battle which took place there, and most important—the significance of all these things.

He searched available records, books, old newspapers, and talked with persons conversant with the region's history. As a boon which enabled him to understand all he read and heard about the region, since his formal education didn't amount to very much, he kept a dictionary near at hand and used it to help him understand the words and phrases which had been perviously printed about his newly adopted home community.

After years of laborious research and note taking, Mr. Meligakes determined to preserve this material for the benefit of others who might be interested in the compelling history of the battle which was the turning point of the War Between the States. This material is the basis of the book he wrote, "The Spirit of Gettysburg," which is now available to all persons interested in Gettysburg and its meaning.

In further recognition of Mr. Meligakes' impressive achievement, Mr. Charles McCarthy, a student and writer of history from Pittston, Pa., located in my congressional district, wrote an interesting background article which appeared in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch, January 31, 1960, and as part of my remarks I quote the article:

LOCAL INTEREST IN CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL

Local interest in the Centennial Commemoration of the Civil War which will be held next year is heightened by the information that a 252-page book on this subject, "The Spirit of Gettysburg" was written some time ago by Nicholas A. Meligakes, the owner of the Plaza Restaurant and the Bookmart, an outstanding book and gift shop, both situated in Gettysburg.

His wife is the former Sophia Sfarnas, a former resident of 26 Exeter Ave., West Pittston, whose father, Peter D. Starnas, operated Sweetland in Pittston for over 30 years. This business is currently maintained by her brother, Ernest G. Sfarnas, one of Pittston's popular young businessmen.

In commenting on his book, "The Spirit of Gettysburg," Mr. Milegakes said: "It is a recorded tribute to those brave men whose blood baptised this hallowed spot. Here, courageous men of the Blue met brave men of the Gray as destiny guided a divided nation to a new objective."

In the introduction to "The Spirit of Gettysburg," Paul L. Roy, the editor of the Gettysburg Times, lauded Mr. Meligakes for his tireless efforts in delving into the history of this phase of the War Between the States.

Dr. Robert Fortenbaugh, professor of history at Gettysburg College described Mr. Meligakes' book as "a graceful tribute to the American spirit by one who cherishes his American citizenship."

Safety for Household and Farm Chemicals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I recently invited John L. Harvey, Deputy Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, to appear before the Indiana Farm Safety Council, Indianapolis, Ind. Mr. Harvey accepted and made an address on the safety of chemicals which are used on farms and in households.

Much has been said about proper labelling of household and farm chemicals. Last session I conducted hearings of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on legislation requiring proper labelling of hazardous household substances as a safeguard. More children die each year from poisonings than from the combined total of the so-called dread diseases—polio, diptheria, scarlet fever, and meningitis.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Harvey's remarks to the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Harvey's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY FOR HOUSEHOLD AND FARM CHEMICALS

(By John L. Harvey, Deputy Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I was delighted indeed to receive a request from Senator HARTKE to participate in this meeting with the Indiana Farm Safety Council in the old Hoosier State. While I knew that the date indicated would find me still busy indeed, I nevertheless took advantage of the occasion to meet with you. Your program chairman with the education committee, Mrs. Scheibner, has been most helpful in furnishing me with information, and I am indebted to your Food and Drug Director from Indiana, Tim Sullivan, for constituting a host and reception committee for me.

I shall, of course, discuss the safety of chemicals which are involved in the household and in farm life from the standpoint of the Federal Government and particularly from the standpoint of laws enforced by the Food and Drug Administration.

The tremendous, indeed revolutionary, advances in science and technology within the last 15 to 25 years is completely apparent to everyone. When we reflect upon the literally thousands of new and relatively new aids to agriculture, aids to health, aids to housekeeping, and aids to food production and manufacture which are chemical in nature, we get some idea of the monumental and complex problems that are involved.

In modern life it is essential that we have pesticides to produce food crops. It is essential that pesticides be capable of killing pests. Therefore it is necessary that we use in the production of our food crops substances which if not properly handled, controlled, and regulated, constitute a health hazard to the user and to the consumer. It is entirely necessary under our modern scheme of food production and distribution to employ many chemical food additives in order to have sound, ready-to-use food available for consumption thousands of miles from the point of production, months beyond the date of maturity, and ready to be used in the time that is allotted by the busy housewife who has many other things to do besides prepare meals. Indeed many housewives do a full day's work in an office, shop, or factory in addition to the preparation of meals.

To manage the household efficiently there are countless chemicals for cleansing purposes, for sanitation purposes, and to fill many other household needs which save hours of labor and make modern housekeeping possible.

Not too many years ago most of the drugs available, and particularly those that were available for self-treatment and household use, had the virtue of being relatively harmless—whatever may have been their value in curing the sick. Just as has been true in food and other allied industries, there have been in the past decade or so changes which amount to a revolution in the drug business. Drugs in use today are effective and are potent and are thereby tremendously more dangerous if misused than the simple remedies available in grandfather's day. In this evolution there has really been little choice. Modern inventiveness in science and industry has merely kept pace with demand and need so that it would not be possible for the trend to be reversed back to the good old days where life was relatively simple and our environment was relatively safe. We have developed a way of life which employs in our day-to-day living these substances which are tremendously important, tremendously valuable, and which contribute so much to our lives. Concomitant with such great value to us, they carry with them a significant hazard to our health and well-being if they are not handled properly and properly regulated and controlled.

This situation has created the necessity for governmental regulation and control of these items which we use in our daily lives, and the development of appropriate methods and schemes of adequate control so that the public may have the benefits and avoid the dangers which have constituted and do still constitute major problems in government.

The concern about these matters from a governmental standpoint has, of course, not been exclusively Federal. In some instances, and in some areas, the States, and even municipalities, have been more forward-looking than has the National Government. In other instances, the National Government has taken the lead, followed by appropriate legislation at State and other levels of government—generally in uniformity and conformity with the Federal pattern.

Because of the limitation of jurisdiction of the Federal Government, all of these problems of regulation must be shared by the States. The Federal Government must discharge its proper role because the vast majority of the products about which I am talking are nationally distributed and are articles of interstate commerce. This being true, they are, to a considerable extent, beyond State regulation.

Indiana, significantly, has displayed outstanding leadership in enacting and enforcing laws designed to protect its citizens more adequately from hazards associated with the use of chemicals on the farm and in the home. It is one of the pioneer States in enacting hazardous substances labeling law and we are looking with a great deal of interest at the development of this new law in your State.

Perhaps of necessity the different kinds of farm and household chemicals and the different uses to which they are put produce not a single all-purpose law, but a pattern of laws which are similar in character and which for the most part, from the Federal standpoint at least, are enforced along with

or as a part of the pure food and drug laws.

One important law which bears the distinction of being jointly enforced by two different Federal departments is the pesticide law of 1954. This law, or these laws, to be more exact, revamped the insecticide and fungicide law of the Department of Agriculture and amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act enforced by the Food and Drug Administration. It provides that the U.S. Department of Agriculture shall deal with the registration and approval of pesticidal chemicals for use on the farm and in and around the home from the standpoint of their safety to users and safety to crops and farm animals and their usefulness for the purposes for which they are intended. At the same time it is recognized that when toxic pesticidal chemicals are used on farm crops and those farm crops are used as food for man and other animals that there are problems of carrying over the toxic residues in our food and feed supply. It therefore is provided that whereas the Department of Agriculture regulates the phases I have mentioned, the Food and Drug Administration is required to exercise its authority over the food supply by fixing regulations and tolerances specifying conditions and limitations under which residues of the pesticidal materials may be permitted or must be excluded from the foods and feeds. So under the law protection is afforded by the activities carried out jointly between the two departments.

The Food Additives Amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is designed to accomplish the same kind of regulation of chemicals used in processed and manufactured foods that is afforded raw agricultural commodities upon which pesticides are used. The enforcement of the food additives law is entirely the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration. In brief, it requires that chemicals not known to be safe must be proven to be safe before they may be legally used in foods at all. It provides for the issuance of regulations which specify the conditions and limitations under which such additives may be used.

In the drug area, the Food and Drug Administration enforces not only the general law which prohibits the marketing of drugs which are unsafe under the conditions specified in the labeling, but also the new drug law. This new drug law requires that no new drug may be placed on the market until satisfactory evidence has been presented by its manufacturer to demonstrate that it is not dangerous to users when used as directed.

In the field of cosmetics the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibits the marketing in interstate commerce of cosmetic products which are dangerous or injurious when used according to directions or when used under conditions that are customary and usual. For example, a preparation intended for the hair, such as a shampoo, can easily bear directions to keep the product out of the eyes. On the other hand, the conditions that customarily prevail among most of us in shampooing our hair almost inevitably involve getting some of the shampoo material in the eyes. Of course, if it is innocuous it makes little difference, but if the material is capable of causing harm to the eyes then it is important that contact with the eyes not be had. Therefore, even though labeling may indicate that the product should not be allowed to get in the eyes, if the customary conditions of use are such that it is likely to get into the eyes anyway, the manner of labeling is not sufficient and the product must be kept off the market.

Now, in the case of chemical products used in the household and on the farm that are not pesticides, not food additives, not drugs, and not cosmetics, there is not at this time any comprehensive Federal law calculated to adequately insure safety of use. There is the Federal Caustic Poison Act which applies to 12 caustic and corrosive substances and which requires special warning labeling calculated to prevent misuse. This law has been of inestimable value in reducing the incidence of injury from lye, strong acids, and similar substances. It is, however, inadequate because it is limited to a dozen dangerous household chemicals in use in 1927, and our households now abound in hundreds of dangerous household chemicals.

As I indicated earlier, Indiana has passed a comprehensive law to require special labeling for this vast group of chemicals which constitute a hazard unless they are properly used. There is pending in the Federal Congress a comprehensive hazardous substances labeling act which in my opinion will go a long way toward providing a much greater degree of safety in the use of household chemicals. This proposed legislation is not significantly different from the Indiana statute, but if and when it is passed it will apply nationwide. Manufacturers of chemical products and chemical specialties generally have not only declared their support of this legislation, but, indeed, have taken a very active part in developing and sponsoring it. The particular bill which has already served as a basis for a hearing in the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress is in fact not a bill introduced at the request of our Department. It was introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, of the State Washington, and I am sure it is of considerable interest to you that Senator HARTKE, of Indiana, is the chairman of the subcommittee which pushed this bill forward to a hearing. Senator HARTHE has contributed much to carrying this legislation forward and undoubtedly will lend his tremendous strength to its enactment. I know also that my good friend Senator CAPEHART, the senior Senator from your great State, is deeply interested in this protective legislation.

It appears that putting all of these various laws and the pending legislation just mentioned together, the Federal pattern of law will constitute quite comprehensive protection to the farm and household in the use of chemicals which require control and regulation. There is one remaining piece of legislation which is pending which ties into the same picture. Historically, coal-tar colors, which play a significant role in our food and cosmetic supply and which are also indispensable ingredients in some drugs, have been treated in a separate category and have been required to be specially certified for safety before they may be used. Advances in methods for evaluating safety of such products have demonstrated that many of these colors which have been considered suitable for use are not completely harmless in the sense that the law requires. It has therefore been necessary to discontinue authority for distribution of a significant number of the coal-tar colors. This has been necessary under the law even though in many instances these colors can be used under appropriate limitations in a variety of products even though in greater quantities and under other conditions they may not be wholly harmless. There is pending in the Congress a bill designed to modernize the color situation and provide for approval of all colors—non-coal-tar colors as well as coal-tar colors—on essentially the same basis as we now give approval to food additives and pesticidal residues; that is, after a determination is made that they are assuredly safe under the particular condition of use.

Now, I have attempted to point out in general terms that the Federal law pattern is directed toward safety for household and farm chemicals. I think it is worthwhile for me to add that laws of this nature are by no means self-enforcing and that they now require and will continue to require a significant amount of investigational and inspectional activity to insure that the rules for use of such substances are soundly established and that the rules so established are uniformly followed.

The cost of utilizing these boons to our standard of living is to be measured in terms of considerable expenditure of tax money by qualified experts employed by Government in guarding you against the dangers that can arise through improper, uniformed, and careless use of such products. It is therefore again worthwhile for me to point out that much of this tremendous effort which is being and will be exerted for your protection will fail in its purpose unless you as users and consumers take advantage of and apply all of the labeling information the law requires that you receive with these products, and that you use care and good sense invariably, and—above all—keep these substances out of the reach of children.

Address by Senator Thomas J. Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this past weekend to attend a luncheon of the Fairfield County (Conn.) Federation of Women's Clubs in Fairfield, Conn., at which my esteemed friend and colleague, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, delivered an inspiring and enlightening address.

With the permission of the House, I would like to introduce Senator DODD'S remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD DELIVERED AT LUNCHEON OF FAIRFIELD COUNTY FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, JANUARY 30, 1960 AT CONTINENTAL RESTAURANT, FAIRFIELD, CONN.

We are living in an era that greatly resembles the late 1920's. At that time, our Nation was bathed in an optimistic glow of apparent prosperity. An enormously popular President, Calvin Coolidge, was preparing to leave office and his heir-apparent, Herbert Hoover, was waiting in the wings to assume the mantle of peace and prosperity.

Competent observers of our national life realized that the surface appearance of calm and well-being had been purchased at the cost of sweeping under the rug all of the really great problems of that time. The Republican administration of that day had ignored America's international responsibilities. It had ignored the farm problem. It had refused to make needed reforms in the field of mergers, trusts and stock market manipulation. It had paid no attention to the plight of millions of American workers who were laboring under sweatshop conditions for a wage that was inadequate to meet the minimum decent standards of living.

Calvin Coolidge was scarcely out of office when the great bubble burst and the false prosperity became a real depression. A series of disasters forced the Nation to face up to a host of economic, social, and governmental problems, problems with which his successor seemed unable to cope.

There is no need to recount the details of the great depression. It is enough to recall that for many, the promise of American life seemed at a shabby end. In desperation, the people turned to the Democratic Party and we led them out of the darkness.

Today, too, we live in an era of complacency, lethargy, and false optimism. Today, too, an enormously popular President is preparing to leave office and a new heir-apparent is ready to assume the mantle of peace and prosperity.

Today, too, we have reached the stage where we have swept so many problems under the rug for so many years that the day of reckoning must be close at hand.

For 7 years this administration has failed to develop a consistent foreign policy. It has failed to develop a realistic military policy. We have no transportation policy. We have no civil defense policy. There is no administration policy on the conservation of natural resources, no education policy, no comprehensive plans for eliminating urban slums. Certainly there has not been adequate administration leadership on questions of agriculture, small business, depressed areas, interest rates, inflation, and in other vital questions. One by one these problems have been swept under the rug where they lie in wait for the next administration to solve.

Just as there are similarities between the 1920's and the present, there are also basic differences.

Then the problem was ignorance—ignorance of how to deal with complicated forces being let loose at home and abroad. Today the problem is not so much ignorance, but lack of determination and vigor.

Then the machinery of government was inadequate. Today it is adequate but unused. Then the price of failure of government was several years of misery, injustice, and suffering for many millions of people. This was a terrible price, but it was one we could pay. Today the price of failure may be permanent and total defeat for our country, a defeat from which we cannot recover.

I hope that there is another difference. I hope that the American people are more informed, more perceptive, more concerned with public affairs today than they were in the 1920's. I think they are. I think there is growing concern among the American people that, under this administration, America is allowing itself to become a second-best nation—second best in military strength, second best in diplomacy, second best in scientific achievement, second best in education, second best in economic growth.

Once again the Democratic Party offers the people of America an alternative. Once again we are asking for a chance to fire up the locomotive of government and put the train back on the track.

We offer the people of this country peace through strength. We offer a stronger defense, a speedup in scientific research, a vigorous space program. We offer a revitalized educational system and an increased rate of economic growth. We offer programs in place of platitudes.

Will this be another 1928 for our party, or will it be a 1932? Will the Democratic Party be given a chance to prevent disaster, or will the Presidency be denied us once more until all we can do is salvage the ruins? We cannot know. But we do know this:

We are far better equipped to carry our message to the country than we were 32 years ago. The country is more willing to listen to Democrats now than it was then. We are better organized and better prepared to make our appeal. We have a wealth of outstanding candidates.

We have a formidable task to perform in the next 9 months. We have 9 months to convince the American people of the terrible danger of our position in the world.

Those of us in Washington will do our best to make the image of the Democratic Party clear and strong, but it is those of you at home who must carry the message street by street and town by town.

Working together, I think we can gain a great victory for our party and usher in, as we did in the 1930's, a new era of American strength, progress, and achievement for our people and for the world.

The President and Alarmist Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The President and Alarmist Talk," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND ALARMIST TALK—MR. EISENHOWER'S CALM HANDLING OF ARGUMENTS CALLED INSPIRING

(By David Lawrence)

There is something inspiring about the calm and dispassionate way that President Eisenhower deals with the alarmist talk that has been filling the headlines of late about the safety of the United States against Soviet attack.

Mr. Eisenhower, in his delicate position, naturally cannot do any saber-rattling. For the Soviets would criticize him as a warmonger. Yet he must answer the criticism at home that comes from generals, as well as politicians, who think America is losing the race or failing to catch up on missiles, trips to the moon, and various other endeavors in the field of science and exploration. The President said at his press conference yesterday:

"I am always a little bit amazed about this business of catching up. What you want is enough—a thing that is adequate. A deterrent has no added power, once it has become completely adequate, for compelling the respect of any potential opponent for your deterrent and, therefore, to make him act prudently."

This is but another way of saying that the United States has the military power today to destroy the Soviet Union and doesn't have to feel inferior because some other country may have more of certain types of weapons. It is the adequacy of our overall power that Mr. Eisenhower explicitly reaffirms.

But, it is asked, how is it that General Power of the Strategic Air Command can testify that, with 300 missiles, the Soviets can destroy our ability to fight back? The answer to that is the one that the general himself gives—the airborne alert. This means that the United States would have in the air at all times enough manned bombers to deliver a destructive blow in retaliation, and the mere knowledge that this can happen is enough to deter the Russians from making the attack.

General Power wants more money for the "airborne alert." He is sincere about it. He thinks this is essential. But the President and his other military advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, think that until a crisis is imminent—and it certainly doesn't seem to be for the next few months at least—the same money, about $750 million, can be put into the development of missiles and the improvement of other weapons of warfare. In fact, the President put it this way in his budget message to Congress recently:

"It is neither necessary nor practical to fly a continuous airborne alert at this time. Such a procedure would, over a relatively short period of time, seriously degrade our overall capability to respond to attack. What I am recommending is a capability to fly such an alert if the need should arise, and to maintain that alert for a reasonable period of time, until the situation which necessitated it becomes clarified."

But a general naturally isn't satisfied with this. It's his business to keep his defenses up. The civilian side, however, takes what are called calculated risks. It means that in this era of Soviet policy the belief is that Moscow will not take a chance on a nuclear blow at the United States, for the Soviet Union would have to face manned bombers from European bases as well as missiles from naval vessels, and the Russians would not wish to risk such destruction.

"I don't believe," said the President yesterday, "that anyone today can destroy all of our capabilities for retaliation, and they cannot destroy today enough of them that we couldn't retaliate very effectively to the point of destructiveness to them."

As for the so-called psychological aspect—the widespread belief that America might be forced into a posture of "second best"—Mr. Eisenhower says that in certain things the Soviet Union will continue to be first and America will be second. He cited the Olympic games as something that the Soviet Union won, even though it had to resort to professionalism in sports and virtually make the athletes a part of the Government personnel. Naturally, the Soviets would win such contests, but, as the President puts it, "What did we do with that?" Nobody has lost much sleep over that defeat.

As for trips to the moon and various planets, what is important is whether any military knowledge is gained by such stunts. This is carefully studied by the United States, whose experts in science are constantly at work on the same problem.

But, as the President explains it, the United States isn't going to alter its system of life and abandon individual freedoms and enslave people as they do in Russia, just to win first place in certain contests.

Mr. Eisenhower concedes that there are disturbing headlines arising out of such things as "hitting the moon," and that often an interpretation is given "far beyond its true meaning." He adds:

"I've heard people say: 'Well, soon there'll be colonies on the moon and they'll be shooting at the earth from the moon.' I saw that in one story. Well, this is long after you and I will be gone. That I'll assure you."

So the President pointed out that the things "we should think about and talk about more in the world are the values which we do treasure."

It's all a matter of proportion and perspective, but the basic fact is that the American defense system is up to date and progressing, and that it has the power to deter a potential enemy from attack by being able to inflict counterblows of massive retaliation.

Delhi Tech World Affairs Forums an Educational and Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the vitality and strength of our democratic system rests on informed public opinion. Institutions of higher learning have among their responsibilities the training of young men and women who can critically examine and evaluate information. As part of its educational program the Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi, State University of New York, which is located in my congressional district, is presenting a series of five forums on "World Trouble Spots and the United States," designed to create a greater awareness on the part of its student body of world affairs, but more specifically to stimulate and enhance the student's ability to think critically about the world in which he lives.

The general education division of the college, with the cooperation of the student union, has this year brought to the Delhi Tech campus His Excellency Sir S. S. R. Gunawardene, Ceylonese Ambassador to the United States and the United Nations, and His Excellency Avraham Harman, Israeli Ambassador to the United States. Each Ambassador addressed large audiences on problems in southeast Asia and the Middle East and during the day of their respective visits informally met with students enrolled in the international relations course at the college. In future weeks, Delhi Tech students will hear the Ghanan, Indian, and United Arab Republic Ambassadors to the United States discuss the problems and issues of those areas.

Dr. William R. Kunsela, president of the college, in opening the forum series stated that—

The Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi will continue vigorously to pursue every means to enrich the educational and cultural life of our students. This series—

Dr. Kunsela went on—

allows all our students, as well as those enrolled in international relations, to understand the practice as well as the theory of international politics. These forums provide us with the opportunity at least to understand the ideas and values of people the world over.

In conclusion, he noted that—

The benefits to be reaped from this series go far beyond our student body, extending to the people of Delaware County, whose attendance we invite and welcome, because we believe that this institution has the task of stimulating and enriching the cultural and educational life of the community.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the remarks made by Dean William Kennaugh and Prof. Seldon Kruger who moderated the first two forums, and two newspaper accounts of the remarks of the Ceylonese and Israeli Ambassadors to the United States:

EXCERPTED REMARKS OF PROF. SELDON M. KRUGER IN INTRODUCING HIS EXCELLENCY, SIR S. S. R. GUNAWARDENE, CEYLONESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1960

A look at a map of the world in 1960 reveals the great changes that have taken place in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East during the last 20 years. More than 20 nations have won their independence and freedom since World War II. More than 50 percent of the world's population have become their own masters. For these new born nations the American people have a profound admiration—recalling their own struggle for independence and freedom. The bond of freedom is a strong unifying force. The nature of freedom and its maintenance does not require of all its advocates complete agreement on all issues. Rather, freedom draws strength from the diversity of different viewpoints.

The task is to find and strengthen political relationships based on mutual respect, as the underpinning of common economic, educational, and other endeavors. The stated goal of U.S. foreign policy is to offer a partnership which appeals to all free and independent men. During the next few weeks we shall be exploring "World Trouble Spots and the United States." This theme reflects our desire to inform ourselves of how U.S. foreign policy is viewed by others.

This evening's guest knows the mind of Asia and is one of the architects of Asian and Ceylonese independence. For more than 30 years he has served the cause of independence and freedom. Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and pleasure to present to you the Ceylonese Ambassador to the United States and United Nations, His Excellency, Sir Senerat Gunawardene.

[Excerpted from the Delhi (N.Y.) Delaware-Republican Express, Jan. 14, 1960]

CAPACITY CROWD HEARS CEYLON AMBASSADOR AT DELHI TECH

His Excellency, Sir Senerat Gunawardene, was speaker at the opening session of the forum series being held at the New York State University Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi. An audience of more than 600 filled the college auditorium to hear the distinguished speaker. Sir Senerat Gunawardene is U.S. Ambassador of Ceylon and permanent representative to the United Nations.

"World Trouble Spots and the United States," is the topic of the forum series. Ambassador Gunawardene began his talk by remarking that he had lived in the United States 6 years. It has been a period in which he learned that in no other country had he found people so generous, so understanding, so ready to show kindness. But he has also found the people of this country quite impatient with disagreements, too ready to emphasize the areas of disagreement. He assured the audience that there is more conformity in the world than they realize. It is the Americans who are nonconformists. He asked that they believe that in relation to the vast diversity of cultures in the world, that agrement in the realm of fundamentals is universal.

"I am happy," he said, "that now we in Asia, and you in America are in better agreement."

"Democracy and peace must be founded on the rights of the individual. America has a tremendous part to play in shaping the destiny of the world," he continued.

"Human understanding is a marvelous thing," said Ambassador Gunawardene. "The American ideals of freedom gave Asia and the countries of Africa the basis on which they have based their struggle for freedom. Understanding is more powerful than bombs."

"What have you done to promote this feeling of good will?" he asked. "Within the past 10 years Russia has spent 10 times as much on propaganda as the United States. They started their drive with cultural festivals, such as music festivals and youth conferences. They concentrated on Asia, Africa, and Central America. Young men and women coming from underprivileged areas found a paradise in their first impressions of Russia."

He revealed that the Government has been terribly remiss in its granting of scholarships to foreign students. Many communities have done their level best to welcome exchange students and teachers, but the total number is a pitiful handful compared with the 150,000 foreign students in London, and the estimated 300,000 in Moscow.

"Has the United States had one music festival, or one youth conference?" and he went on with the cryptic remark, that such meetings were much less expensive than rockets or bombs, and much more effective in promoting the human understanding needed for a peaceful world.

Ambassador Gunawardene also explored the field of economic aid. So long as ignorance, disease, and oppression exist in areas of the world, there is cause for war. For this reason economic aid should be given to those areas, but it should not be given to buy friends, or as a business transaction, but from pure humanitarianism. Here again Russia has the edge with her offers of aid and trade agreements. Goods bought and purchased by or from them at 2½ percent interest as against our 5½ force countries to deal with Russia.

He pleaded for intelligent self-interest on the part of America. "You have more food than you can ever want. What have you done about distribution to starving peoples? And machines, what are you ever going to do with all you make? See that countries are developed so they can buy those machines," he admonished.

Delhi Tech World Affairs Forums an Educational and Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the second speaker in the above-entitled forums was Israeli Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency, Avraham Harman.

EXCERPTED REMARKS OF DEAN WILLIAM F. KENNAUGH IN INTRODUCING HIS EXCELLENCY, AVRAHAM HARMAN, ISRAELI AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the second program in the series of the Delhi Institute forums. Before I introduce the speaker of the evening I should like to repeat some of the statements made at the previous session for the benefit of those who are attending the forum for the first time.

The forum series is sponsored jointly by the General Education Division under its chairman, Prof. James Armstrong and the Student Union under the guidance of Prof. Klare Sommers. The programs were conceived by Prof. Seldon Kruger of the Gen-

eral Education Division as a unique and practical way to bring students in our regular courses face to face with some of the real problems that exist in the world of politics. Thus, in an earlier forum series in connection with a course being taken by our students in American Government, officials of State and local governments appeared in this auditorium. The present series is presented in conjunction with Professor Kruker's course in international relations. During the course of this series we will have heard from the Ambassadors from Ceylon, Israel, Ghana, the United Arab Republic, and India. We are happy to be able to share these experiences with our friends and neighbors in Delhi and the surrounding communities.

I would be somewhat remiss if I did not point out at this juncture that in this current series we have leaned on the experience of a man who so successfully conducted the Andes forum for 2 years. That man is Mr. Ben Raymond, director of public relations of the college.

The theme running through this forum series is "World Trouble Spots and the United States". Now to some people the word "trouble" spells disaster and doom and is to be avoided at all costs. However to me it has always seemed that the word "trouble" can also be defined as "opportunity." First, it is an opportunity for the person or group in trouble to bring to bear on the problem the full extent of his or its human and material resources. At such times individuals and groups rise to full stature.

Second, trouble is an opportunity for friends and neighbors of the one in trouble to develop an understanding of the problem and an empathy for the one in trouble and to bring to bear their own human and material resources as a gesture of true friendliness and neighborliness.

And so tonight we, as friends and neighbors of the small and new nation of Israel will have an opportunity to acquire a better understanding of the problems of the Middle East. At this time it gives me the greatest pleasure to introduce to you a man who has served his government with distinction in many important posts. I introduce to you His Excellency the Honorable Avraham Harman, Ambassador to the United States from Israel.

[Excerpt from the Oneonta (N.Y.) Star, Jan. 23, 1960]

ISRAELI AMBASSADOR SAYS NATION SEEKS PEACE WITH ARABS—NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD SETTLE PROBLEMS

Over 600 persons heard Ambassador Avraham Harmon, of Israel, speak before the second meeting of the Delhi forums on Thursday night.

The Ambassador pointed out that if Israel's newly gained independence is to flourish it must have more industry and the "know-how" to work and expand such industry.

"After one gains independence," he pointed out, "there is a political and physical letdown. Once independence is attained, there is a sort of honeymoon period • • • our flag was raised for the first time • • • we were admitted to the United Nations. But still, what have we got? We cannot eat a flag, or live under it. One needs a roof."

In comparing the rebuilding of Israel with the birth of America, the Ambassador said that America was founded on virgin territory while Israel is building a new civilization on the ashes of a former great civilization.

"Unless Israel avails itself of all its resources, it will go to rack and ruin," he said.

The remainder of Ambassador Harman's address follows:

"The greater part of Israel is uncultivated and will remain so until we bring water to it. One of our problems is the conversion of the country's brackish water which is unsuited for agricultural uses. We have come a long way in reaching our agricultural objective, and are producing about 70 percent of our food needs. We are close to European markets for any surplus we may have."

"Israel is faced with two problems," the Ambassador said, "higher living conditions and a greater population. The major answer must lie in industry. Our two basic problems are the lack of raw materials, and the know-how.

"We have elements for great chemical expansion, both in copper and iron. We have a great many skilled workmen who have the know-how in developing our industrial diamonds industry, which has grown to $40 millions per year.

"A major internal problem is how to weld our mixed refugees from 20 lands, not into a standardized or uniform nation, but a unified nation. It is not easy. Our common language is Hebrew. We have our backs to the wall, or rather to the sea. We were embattled and besieged. This is our last opportunity for our people to protect its place in the sun. It is a great cohesion force." And he repeated, "Israel will not be destroyed."

"The big question is 'where do we and the Arabs go from here'? The present situation is not satisfactory. The world has been living in a twilight period, with neither peace nor war. Peace is a positive concept.

"We do not say that if you want to be a friend of Israel, you must not be a friend of the Arabs. Just as we demand the right of independence, they, the Arabs, also have the right of independence. We would like to see nonaggression pacts between Israel and the Arab Republic; an inspection of armaments by agreement, and thus save the resources we all need so badly.

"Negotiation is the only answer to the situation. We must all recognize the other man, and give and take, treating each other as equal. The key to the world situation is in the Middle East; and we are closer to using that key than we were a few years ago."

At the conclusion of the session in the Tech gymnasium, Ambassador Harman attended a reception, given in his honor, by the student union of the college.

Liberties Award for "Herblock"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, certainly one of the greatest political satirists of this era is Mr. Herbert Block, better known as "Herblock," the editorial cartoonist for the Washington Post.

Mr. Block's wit and cartooning ability are matched only by his courage and consistent defense of civil and constitutional liberties. This courage, known to many of us here in Washington, has been recognized this year by the New York Civil Liberties Union, which has awarded "Herblock" the 1959 Florina Lasker Award.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial dealing with this award and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 2, 1960]

LIBERTIES AWARD FOR "HERBLOCK"

Last year the Florina Lasker Award of $1,000 for consistent and outstanding courage and integrity in the defense of civil liberties went to five Negro students who stood fast in the face of taunts and dangers at Little Rock's Central High School. This year the award, which is administered by the New York Civil Liberties Union, goes to Herbert L. Block, editorial cartoonist for the Washington Post.

In these two contrasting choices is striking recognition of the fact that the battle for freedom must be waged on many fronts and that the contributions may vary greatly in origin and nature. The five Little Rock boys and girls are from among many hundreds of thousands of high school students over the country. Herblock, on the other hand, is in the front rank of cartoonists, syndicated in more than 200 newspapers and known literally around the world. More than 1 million copies of his pamphlet, "Herblock Looks at Communism," have been printed in many languages and distributed overseas.

If anyone has stood more strongly than Herblock against the erosion of the liberties of the individual in the years since World War II, his name does not come to mind. This bold, keen cartoonist has hit hard and often at the McCarthyites, the inquisitors, both private and governmental, the misguided, frightened conformists. He knows the folly of harassing special oaths, the evils of censorship, the wrongs in official suppression of information a self-governing people must weigh and act on. And he has told it all in his cartoons, as readers of the Post-Dispatch are aware.

Herblock was greatly missed during his recent heart illness and his friends take it as a happy omen that he is now back at his drawing board. We can wish for him nothing better than the fullest return of his great powers of ridicule, satire, exposure, and burning indignation.

Some Hurdles and Hassles of the 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by my good friend and former Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, of Hartsville, S.C., in the RECORD.

I hope that every Member of Congress will take a few minutes of his valuable time to read Mr. Wiggins' speech entitled "Some Hurdles and Hassles of the 1960's."

SOME HURDLES AND HASSLES OF THE 1960'S

(By A. L. M. Wiggins)

Following the current pattern of public discussion, I wish to present some of the

opportunities and hurdles of the 1960's. The general prosperity of recent years has diverted us from dealing with many of our most serious problems. We have swept them under the rug with the thought of getting around to them later on or that they might somehow go away. Recent developments at home and abroad bring into sharp focus the urgent necessity of not only facing these issues but of doing something about them.

My basic thesis is that in the coming decade our economy can and should move ahead at a rate that will serve the increasing needs of our growing population and that will maintain our world leadership. It calls for maximum growth in terms of productivity with reasonable stability in the value of the dollar.

WORLD AFFAIRS

The changing pattern brought on by the world revolution of the past half century presents today some clearly defined areas of probable developments in the years ahead. Within recent years, there has been a turnaround in the financial and economic affairs of many countries of the world. American aid to Western Europe, Japan and other countries under the Marshall plan has resulted in their vast capital expansion of modern productive facilities, utilizing the most modern techniques for efficient and economical operations and has made possible a substantial advance in their standards of living. With productive labor costs in many of these countries one-third of ours or less, they now enjoy a competitive advantage in world trade which once was ours.

The strengthening of European currencies with convertibility, plus a resolute containment of inflation and a rapid increase in productivity and exports have resulted in a favorable change in the balance of payments of most of these countries. The dollar and gold shortages of many European countries, which plagued them for years, have now become a dollar and gold deficit of payments for the United States. The large gifts and grants by this country, the maintenance of vast military installations throughout the world, the heavy investment by American capital in productive enterprises abroad and the reduced competitive position in world markets of many American industrial products have resulted in a net deficiency of our balance of payments in the past 2 years in excess of $7 billion and an outward flow of our gold supply of more than $3 billion. While this adverse flow is not an immediate threat to the dollar, the continuing loss of gold can reach a point where the integrity of the dollar, as well as the possibility of devaluation, might be seriously questioned abroad. How we handle this situation is extremely important to the economic development of this country and to the world.

The increased productivity and unity of effort of the six-nation Common Market of Europe, and the efforts of the European free trade area to solve mutual problems and the possibility of their eventual cooperation have vast potentialities in increased production, in improving standards of living and in increasing markets throughout the world. The hope is that the policies and programs of these unified areas will result in a high degree of cooperation with the United States and other nations on problems of world trade rather than become a serious hurdle.

Another challenge is the awakening of many undeveloped countries to their potentialities of improved living standards through increased productivity and better health. Such improvements, though slow, will not only increase their importance as producers but as consumers as well, thereby creating new markets for the production of other countries. The self-interest of the United States requires our continuing aid to these undeveloped countries.

We must also deal with the emerging economic power of Russia and its program of economic and political penetration of the free world.

The challenge presented to us is to increase productivity in the United States, and at costs that are competitive in world trade and, at the same time, maintain a stable dollar in which the world can continue to have confidence. Only in this way can we participate effectively in the growing international trade and maintain the strength of our position of world leadership.

INFLATION

Problems of the continuing erosion of the value of the dollar constitute a most serious hurdle. The great American Bernard Baruch makes the point that while inflation, like sin, is denounced regularly, unfortunately, like sin, it is also tolerated, encouraged, and even enjoyed by many. He calls inflation a cancer which is eating away our economic and financial health, undermining our security and spiritual strength and responsible for much of the burdens of taxation, of swollen prices, and of Government debt. He predicts that if we allow this malady to run unchecked, it will impoverish the people and destroy the Nation.

During the past decade, growth in this country, measured by various indices has been some 50 percent but of that 50 percent, one-half has been eaten up by inflation. In stable dollars our 10-year growth has been nearer 25 percent.

The present deficiency of investment funds in terms of current demand is caused, in part, by our failure to accumulate savings fast enough to meet investment and commercial needs in the inflated dollars required. Most significant is the reluctance of the investor to buy future dollars through the purchase of bonds bearing fixed interest when he lacks confidence in the value of the dollar he will receive in payment. The result is an unnatural diversion of savings into common stocks, in spite of interest rates that are 50 percent higher than average dividend income. No prudent person will buy a 10-year bond except at very high interest rates if he expects to lose one-fourth of the value of the dollars he will receive 10 years hence. This was what happened in the past decade.

A U.S. savings bond, which in many ways is our most important and popular investment security, that was purchased for $75 10 years ago, when cashed last year produced $100, an increase of $25. Of this $25, Federal income taxes took $5 and inflation took $19. The investor actually received $1 in purchasing power for the use of his $75 for 10 years. The same thing happened to our savings accounts, life insurance and other fixed dollar assets. While much of this dollar attrition was the result of the Korean war, it has continued at a creeping pace during the succeeding prosperous peacetime years.

It is estimated that in order to produce an annual increase of $1 of gross national product, an investment of $1.65 must be made. This means that if the GNP in this country is to increase to an annual rate of $750 billion by 1970, an investment of more that $400 billion will be required. A substantial part of this investment must be provided through loans to finance industrial expansion and public and private construction. Unless the saving and investing public is convinced that the dollars with which they will be repaid will be in reasonable relation to the value of the dollar invested, there will be an increasing unwillingness of investors to buy fixed dollar securities, even at higher rates of interest. Inflation discourages prudent saving and investment and contributes to speculative fever.

If our people are so little interested in the effects of inflation on our national economy that they are unwilling to accept the disciplines needed to preserve a reasonable stability of the value of the dollar and if they accept the inevitability of a continuing erosion of the dollar, the result eventually will be devaluation. If, year after year, the value of the dollar becomes worth less and less, it eventually becomes worthless. There is no reason to expect that the ultimate result of persistent inflation in this country will be any different from what has happened in other countries throughout history.

Although there are many theories about inflation, we know that increased costs, of which labor is the principal ingredient, result in increased prices; that increased demand, fed by easy monetary policies and superficial theories of abundant purchasing power, will pull prices up; and, that excessive increases in the money supply and credit cheapen the dollar and stunt real economic growth. We must not let our monetary policies be used to validate or support a continuing wage-price spiral. Many thoughtful people, including the President's economic advisers, are convinced that this country is headed for a severe "bust" if the wage-price spiral keeps on turning.

There is a cause for concern that while inflation seems to be increasingly unpopular in this country, the principal factors contributing to inflation, such as easy money, greater Government spending and spiraling wage and fringe benefits year after year, still have strong advocates who blindly pursue their objectives with reckless disregard for the ultimate consequences.

If the Federal Government spends more than its income and covers the difference by creating money or near money, such as short-term Government securities, inflationary pressures increase. No one has to be a student of finance to know that if the Federal Government must finance the refunding of its maturing obligations and its current needs in the short-term field and is excluded from the investment market for securities beyond 5 years, the pressure on the short-term market will, as it has, drive short-term interest rates ever higher. It is hard to believe that any Member of Congress would be willing to gamble with the national economy and the possibility of a serious financial crisis by trying to lock the huge national debt in a 5-year explosive prison.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

We have heard a lot about scandals in recent months but the most serious scandal directly involves the Federal Government itself. It is the failure of the U.S. Government to make payments on its huge debt. It is a disturbing thought that throughout the present generation of some 30 years, the solemn promise of the U.S. Government to pay has not meant what it said. Its promise to pay has been nothing more than a promise to renew, to refund, to revalue the debt, to reshuffle its creditors. What financial heritage of honor and integrity is this generation passing on to succeeding generations in creating and increasing an enormous Government debt and refusing to adopt a program to pay off any part of it, even in years of prosperity?

According to the budget estimates of the President, Federal Government revenues may exceed expenditures in fiscal 1961 by some $4 billion, which he would apply on the Government debt. This would be at least a token payment of slightly over 1 percent. Will there be a ground swell of resounding public approval of this honest and proper use of these funds? I sincerely hope so. But the spenders are gleeful over the prospect of handing out a billion here and another billion there. Taxpayers savor the possibility of getting a $20 per capita reduction in taxes. Shall we not show the good faith of our country by paying on the debt when we can?

In 4 years out of 5 over the past three decades, the Federal Government has paid out more than it received. Its greatest peacetime deficit of $12.5 billion occurred in fiscal 1959, a year of growth and national prosperity. Much of the financial strain and stress of today is a result of that fiscal disruption. It requires no financial seer or student of economics to understand that no institution and no government can continue to live beyond its income and disregard the integrity of its promises to pay without the eventual loss of confidence at home and abroad.

TAXES

The inequities and imbalance in our Federal tax structure have long been recognized as deterrents to economic growth. We have refused to come to grips with this problem. Our tax system is a product of war necessity which has been allowed to continue without substantial change. Present rates of taxes on personal income approach confiscation at the higher levels. Corporate income tax rates, when applied to overstated income as a result of inadequate depreciation charges, represent, in effect, a capital levy. Income taxes and other direct taxes levied by the Federal Government produce 84 percent of its income, the highest proportion of any major country in the world. The proportion in Canada is 59 percent and in Great Britain 55 percent. The result is that the ups and downs of our economy have an immediate and severe leverage effect on the Federal budget, particularly in a recession. Witness the $12.5 billion deficit in fiscal 1959 following the moderate and short 1957–58 recession. We must broaden the tax base for greater stability and remove the deterrents to investments and savings in our income tax structure if our economic growth in the 1960's is to match our aspirations.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

We should now determine and set the role of government in our economy for the coming decade as one of providing an environment in which the forces of a free, competitive private enterprise system can operate more effectively. It is a warning for us that while the Socialists of some of the European countries have renounced economic panaceas, have come to accept realistically the fruitfulness of private enterprise in their party declarations and are retreating from the deadening effects of state socialism, in the United States we continue to embrace the Socialist concept of enlarging the role and functions of government in our economy.

There are some so-called liberal Members of Congress and others of similar inclination who welcome the present tight money situation as an opportunity to enlarge the role of government by imposing selective credit controls which, in effect, would not only ration but control by bureaucratic determination the supply and availability of credit. The succeeding steps would be price controls, and then profit controls, and eventually wage controls. The basic philosophy of some so-called liberals is that government can operate the economy by laws and rules and regulations more effectively in the public interest than can the operation of a free, competitive private enterprise system. Many of them believe that a balanced budget is antisocial, that a greatly expanded Government spending program would accelerate economic growth. They confuse Government spending with economic growth. There are, of course, certain programs and purposes where the public interest requires the diversion from private spending to public spending such as for national defense and education. There are many other areas, however, in which government spending contributes little, if anything, to economic growth. Advocates of increased government spending present charts and graphs to show that a forced-draft annual growth of 5 to 6 percent in the national production generated through government spending would create a steamed-up prosperity. When compelled to take a stand on the resulting inflation, they speak glibly of reasonable and tolerable inflation, ignoring the simple fact that even a so-called mild inflation of 2 percent a year compounded would clip more than 20 percent from the value of the dollar in a single decade.

ORGANIZED LABOR

Recent events have brought the American people to a recognition of the power of organized labor in this country to affect the Nation's economy. Expanding business was brought to a suffocating slowdown by the strike in the steel industry. The danger of economic paralysis as the result of the threat of a new strike forced an acceptance of union demands. There is a little doubt that, even though immediate price increases may be avoided, the terms of the settlement in this large, basic industry will have an inflationary effect and are not in the interest of our economy as a whole.

A realization of the uncontrolled economic power of large labor organizations and the concentration of authority in their leaders to issue orders that can bring this country to its knees have caused increasing concern and even fear among thoughtful citizens.

There is a rising tide of indignation throughout the country over this concentration of authoritarian power and monopolistic control under which a few labor leaders in this country can, at their will, bring our national economy to a grinding stop. It has been the history of this country that whenever the operations of any segment of our economy had such power and used it for self-advantage and against the public interest, the people through government have stepped in and restrained the exercise of such power. Government regulation of railroads was imposed at a time when railroads had a monopoly of transportation. Antitrust laws were passed when business concentrations became so great as to threaten competition. Regulation of the issue and sale of securities was imposed when the public needed protection against the unscrupulous.

For some 30 years, Government has promoted the growth of unionism in the interest of the vast body of workers who were at a disadvantage in dealing with their employers. Union activities were granted immunities from laws under which the rest of our economy operates. The power to strike was accepted as a necessary instrument to enforce the rights of employees. Authority was given under which all workers in an industry could be forced to become members of a union, thus giving monopoly control to union leaders over their members. From these special privileges has arisen a concentration of uncontrolled economic power unequaled in our history.

For many years, it was thought that a reasonable growth of union power was in the public interest. It is now recognized that little, if any, consideration of the public interest is given by unions in their demands. It is notorious that many so-called collective bargaining negotiations are really nothing more than the submission of the demands of a union to employers and that there is no place at the table for a representative of the public interest. Some of these negotiations are merely a private deal in which employer and employee cut for themselves a bigger slice of the national economy and pass the costs on to the public in increased prices whenever possible.

The result is usually an increase in wages unrelated to increases in productivity plus additional so-called fringe benefits with more and more payments for time not worked and goods not produced. It is said that the fastest growing "occupation" in the United States is that of not working and being paid for it. Some industries are paying compensation to five employees for the productive time actually worked by four. So-called fringe benefits represent costs equal to 20 to 30 percent of the payroll and are still rising. While some of these benefits are desirable and proper, the additional costs are paid for in prices to the consumer.

Public realization of the concentration of the monopoly power of union leaders over their members under union shop contracts and their economic power to choke large segments of our economy to suffocation without any consideration of the public interest, have resulted in a widespread demand that Government take effective action to restrict present abuses of union power.

One plan suggested is for the arbitration of labor demands by Government arbitrators after all other efforts have failed. Another is that public factfinding boards be set up to recommend terms of settlement. Such plans have the merit that they might terminate strikes and force settlements but there is no assurance that the findings of such boards would be based upon considerations of the public interest.

It has also been suggested that in such cases, public representation should consist of judicial bodies set up by the Federal courts with statutory authority defining their scope and powers to disapprove any proposed terms of settlement they find to be adverse to the public interest. Under this proposal, recognition would be given to the superior claims of the public interest over all other considerations. No strike would be permitted over terms of settlement that were declined by such judicial body as being against the public interest.

Another suggestion is that a Federal court be established to which all proposed labor settlements could be appealed for a determination not for arbitration of the issues involved but for consideration of such terms as might affect the public interest.

In view of the serious effect of many labor settlements on the national economy and the coercive powers of the unions to enforce their demands, the time has come when the public interest should be represented in an effective manner in cases where the public interest is substantially involved.

Re House Concurrent Resolution 459

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that I was incorrectly listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 2 as having voted "present" rather than "aye" on House Concurrent Resolution 459. I have determined that my actual vote is correctly recorded in the Journal and I have been assured that the error in the RECORD of the proceedings on February 2 will be rectified in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I do indeed support House Concurrent Resolution 459. I am privileged to be associated with the splendid leadership being shown by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-

American Affairs in safeguarding the interests of the Congress in this important matter.

I quite agree that flying the Panamanian flag in the Panama Canal Zone would be a major change in policy and a variation in the traditional interpretation of the several treaties between the United States and Panama on the matter of sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

This matter of flying the Panamanian flag became a matter for consideration during the negotiation of the treaty of 1955 with Panama. If necessary it should become a matter for new treaty negotiations in which the ultimate approval role of the Congress is clearly set forth in article II, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

I appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of making my position clear on this important matter.

We Need More Color in Our Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most interesting proposal which I have received from a constituent.

The article's theme revolves around the practicality of giving our currency a new look and I think those who take the time to read it will perhaps be stimulated to think about an aspect of our paper money which heretofore has had little attention.

The article follows:

WE NEED MORE COLOR IN OUR CURRENCY
(By Michael Shuwarger)

It is surprising that we Americans who welcome periodic changes in almost everything around us have never raised a voice in protest against the eternal sameness of the product we handle most frequently—money currency. We look impatiently toward the unveiling of the new automobile styles, talk excitedly about the latest fashions, queue up for a look at a model house, but don't seem to mind it a bit that the color of our paper money has not changed for as many years as anyone can remember.

Ever since the first Treasury notes were issued in 1862 to finance the Civil War, the U.S. paper currency has always been green on one side. In 1928 the size of the bills was trimmed down to 6 5/16 by 2 11/16 inches, but the color has never been changed. True enough, our main interest in money is its purchasing power, not its visual appeal. Few of us, if any, look at it from the point of view of artistic satisfaction, although the skill and the imagination that enter into the engraving and printing of our dollar bills are on a par with the most elaborate works of art.

Much more important than the esthetic consideration is the need to increase the visual differences among the various currency denominations. At present all U.S. money, from the lowly dollar bill to the almost mythical $10,000 banknote, is green on one side and drab grey on the other. Such uniformity makes it necessary to examine closely every bill to avoid mistakes in counting money. We must look very carefully at every note to make sure that no $5 bill is paid out when only a dollar was intended. Errors directly traceable to the great similarity of the various denominations are considerable. In banking firms and other institutions where a tremendous turnover of paper currency is routine, the strain on the clerks counting money is always very heavy.

Why not keep the green color of the dollar bill as a bow to tradition, but make the $5 denomination, let us say, red, and the $10 one blue? We can use other colors to brighten up bills of higher value, for example, orange for $20, silver for $100, and shiny gold for a thousand-dollar note.

If the various denominations were distinguishable by colors, the sorting of money would no longer be an eye-blinding task. A bank teller could go through a wad of paper currency and quickly separate the various kinds of bills. It would be possible to glance into our wallets and without any effort pick out the denomination we want. There is also another benefit to be derived. The introduction of different colors into our money would make many counterfeiters unhappy. In the past the manufacturing of phony bills often involved no more than the raising of the value of the denomination, such as the changing of $1 to $10 by adding a zero. The forgers got away with it because few people can remember what men's portraits belong on different banknotes, and those who do hardly bother to look at the exact design. If a $10 bill were different in color from a $1 bill, the simple addition of a zero would no longer do the trick. The counterfeiters would have to design complete plates if they were to stay in business.

What possible objections could there be to a new look in our currency? Certainly there is nothing sacrosanct about the green color on all our folding money. No additional cost of printing new notes is involved, for old plates can be used, and it is quite obvious that blue or red ink costs no more than green.

Just a trifle more costly would be another possible improvement in our paper currency. A tiny perforation or an embossment somewhere on the note would make it possible to identify money by touch. This would be an immense boon to the blind or to the people with poor eyesight who are frequently swindled when dealing with conscienceless crooks.

In some foreign countries the distinction among the denominations is achieved through variations in size of different banknotes. The advantages of easy identification, moreover, are more than offset by the awkwardness of handling paper currency which is hard to fit into a billfold and is otherwise not easy to manage. The American system is much superior to most foreign currencies and could be made nearly perfect if the traditional greenbacks were to be joined by bluebacks, redbacks, and goldbacks.

Federal Dollars and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, traditionally the education of our children has been in the hands of local school boards. This is as it should be, because it gives the parents of our Nation the opportunity to keep a watchful eye on what is happening in the schools attended by their children.

Recently, however, there has been an insidious campaign to transfer this traditional responsibility from the State and local communities, where it belongs, to a Federal bureaucracy. The need for higher teachers salaries and the need for additional school facilities are the guises under which this campaign is being waged.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Federal Government paying teachers' salaries and am opposed to the federalization of our education system.

The Everett (Wash.) Daily Herald published an editorial January 21, which points out that Federal dollars is not the magic symbol that will bring quality education to our children. This newspaper speaks for a great many people in my hometown and the Second Congressional District. It is for this reason that I reprint this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

DOLLARS ALONE CANNOT GIVE SCHOOLS THINGS THEY WANT

The dollar sign is not the magic symbol that will bring quality education in the form of good teachers, good programs, and adequate facilities.

This is the conclusion reached in considering the action of the National Education Association in placing a flat billion-dollar-a-year price tag on what it conceives to be wrong with the classrooms across the country.

NEA takes the stand that pouring $4 billion into the schools over a 4-year period will solve all the problems. It has opened a new campaign in behalf of the Murray-Metcalf bill which advances the proposition that lavish largesse from the Public Treasury will obviate our school problems.

We will admit that education cannot come from a financial fairyland. But to assume that spending alone will provide all the answers needed is refusing to recognize the basic causes of educational shortcomings.

New classrooms, increases in salaries, additions to the present number of counselors will not improve teacher training.

Dollars alone cannot give educators, administrators, and teachers what it takes to carry out their work.

Dollars alone cannot shape human nature.

Raiding the Federal Treasury will in no way reimburse the local school districts, nor make it easier for them to meet the challenge of turning out students who are qualified to face the challenges they in turn face in higher education and through life.

When the NEA asks 700,000 teachers to apply pressure in behalf of the Murray-Metcalf bill it is a call to surrender their rights and the responsibilities of school boards and to place them all at the mercy of Federal bureaucracy.

It is merely seeking the easy way and the quickest way out. Federal control is the last element that should enter into the problems that are faced daily by school officials in every State of the Union.

Lewis M. Herrmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an out-

standing citizen and labor leader of my home State of New Jersey who has given much of his energies and fertile mind to the betterment of our Nation and its people.

He is Mr. Lewis M. Herrmann, of Newark, N.J.

It is a most auspicious day for giving recognition to Mr. Herrmann, for today he is celebrating his 75th birthday. For those of us who know Mr. Herrmann well, he is not today 75 years old, but, rather, he is 75 years young.

Additionally, the year 1960 is the 21st anniversary of Mr. Herrmann's pride and joy—the New Jersey Labor Herald, which enjoys the official endorsement of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor. Mr. Herrmann was the founder of this widely read publication and serves as its editor and publisher.

This evening members of the New Jersey congressional delegation will have the opportunity of personally extending birthday congratulations to Mr. Herrmann at the anual reception and dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce at a hotel here in Washington, D.C. Mr. Herrmann is a regular attendant at these get-togethers and I cite the fact just to give an indication of the wide interest he has in affairs of government and in the field of management and labor relations.

Throughout his very active life, Mr. Herrmann's accomplishments have been many, but I would like to call particular attention to one endeavor that might well be emulated in other areas of our Nation.

While serving as a member of the New Jersey State Assembly from 1947 to 1951, three terms, as a Republican representative from my home county of Essex, Mr. Herrmann sponsored legislation which created the Labor Institute at Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey. I believe the accomplishments of this institute, now known as the Institute of Management and Labor Relations, are well known throughout the Nation.

Mr. Herrmann's interest in the present and future of the institute continues to burn brightly. He is chairman of the institute's advisory council and is serving as chairman of a committee raising $550,000 for the erection of a labor center at Rutgers. The last report I heard was that the fundraising drive was nearing the $500,000 mark.

As the legislative sire of this institute, Mr. Herrmann can well look with great pride upon this accomplishment.

In recognition of his work, Rutgers University, on August 4, 1954, presented Mr. Herrmann with its "Award of Achievement Medal and Citation" for his "Service to Labor and Education." Then on August 14, 1956, the university gave Mr. Herrmann its "Special Award for Service to Labor and Education."

In paying this tribute to Mr. Herrmann, I would like to cite just a few more of the endeavors in which he has actively engaged and other awards that he has received. Some of these are:

Through appointment by President Eisenhower he serves as a member of the National Advisory Council for the U.S. Small Business Administration.

On September 6, 1959, he was presented the annual award of the National Labor Temple Fellowship for "Distinguished Service to Labor and the Nation."

In 1954, he was named the outstanding American Federation of Labor member in New Jersey and was presented with the award of merit at the New Jersey federation's annual banquet.

In World War I, Mr. Herrmann served as a sergeant of infantry in the U.S. Army, and during World War II, he headed a special War Department mission to the South Pacific combat area.

He serves as a member of the board of governors of the Northern New Jersey Multiple Sclerosis Society.

Mr. Herrmann has been commander of American Legion Post No. 104 and commander of the Atlantic County District, American Legion, and for 3 years was publicity director of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey.

For 15 terms Mr. Herrmann served as secretary-treasurer of the International Labor Press of America, and four times he was elected president of the Union Printers' League of New Jersey. He was a founder and president of the Eastern Labor Press Conference.

For 49 years Mr. Herrmann has been a member of the International Typographical Union, and for 44 years he has served as a delegate to the conventions of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor.

He is a member of the State Federation's executive council and serves as AFL-CIO national representative of the International Typographical Union of North America.

On behalf, therefore, of his many, many friends and admirers I would like to wish for his, his lovely wife, and family a great abundance of good health and continued good service in the years ahead.

Conservation of Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, most of us realize that a major domestic problem confronting us as a nation today is the conservation of our precious natural water resources.

The Congress has recognized this situation and has established programs and provided money to try to solve it.

There is both Federal and State responsibility in planning of this magnitude. A constant awareness of the task is not only desirable, but necessary. Education through publicity will accomplish this.

To that end I should like at this point in the RECORD to insert a splendid editorial contributed to the January Monthly Reporter of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by the Honorable PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska, my esteemed colleague on the Committee on Appropriations.

The editorial follows:

CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES

(By Hon. PHIL WEAVER, U.S. House of Representatives (Fifth, Nebraska), chairman, National Rivers and Harbors Congress Project Committee)

In the past half century the development of our greatest single natural resource, water, has been delayed and at times mismanaged at the national level because of two factors: (1) The lack of foresight to develop an orderly long-term program and, (2) the tendency by some to look upon this sort of development as political pork.

Those of us who have been deeply concerned with this major national problem have worked under a handicap because of this Topsy-like growth of a natural resource develoment program in the past. Because—in years past—there was no attempt at logical planning, the field of resource development at times was thrown open to political pressures.

Many interested in conservation and development of our water resources have long seen the need for an orderly development in this area. Their efforts in recent years have succeeding in bringing at least a degree of order. In the forefront of this fight has been the National Rivers and Harbors Congress with its wide basis of representation.

That congress, for instance, has evolved its projects committee to screen every new proposal, to determine its merits and, equally important, to determine where and how individual projects fit into the overall national picture. By this criterion alone the projects are assigned a priority. This approach has also been adopted in the House Committee on Appropriations' Public Works Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. Last year, for instance, more than a thousaid witnesses appeared before the committee to testify on proposed projects, many of them long authorized but dormant for lack of funds.

After studying this mass of testimony, both from the Executive and from individuals and associations, the committee developed a program which looked to the future as has perhaps no other program in recent years. It was a conservative program, a forward-looking one, and in which the confidence of the people could easily rest. It was a lean and muscular program, one from which every ounce of fat had been trimmed. We may be assured that the same approach will be used again this year by the committee.

It is to be hoped that both political parties at their July conventions will adopt a platform plank dealing forthrightly and honestly with this very important problem. Such a program, carefully worked out and looking to the future, would go a long way toward confounding those who level an accusing finger at water resources development and call it pork.

Statement of John J. Corcoran, Director, the American Legion National Rehabilitation Commission, Before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, February 2, 1960, on H.R 9378

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate this opportunity to express the views of the American Legion on current proposals to modify the procedure for investing the national service life insurance trust fund and the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund.

We are pleased that the chairman has seen fit to reopen this subject by the introduction of the bill, H.R. 9378. This measure would amend sections 720 and 755 of title 38, United States Code, so as to provide for the investment of both the national service life insurance fund and the U.S. Government life insurance fund in obligations bearing current rates of interest, subject to a floor of 3 percent per annum for the NSLI trust fund and 3½ percent per annum for the USGLI trust fund.

The existing section 720(b) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to invest and reinvest the NSLI fund, or any part thereof, in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and to sell such obligations for the purposes of the fund. Under section 755(b), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest the USGLI fund, or any part thereof, in interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or bonds of the Federal farm loan banks, and to sell such obligations and bonds for the purposes of the fund.

The rate of interest at which the respective funds are to be invested is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Early in 1941, the Secretary, with the approval of the President, determined to have the investments of the NSLI fund in special series of Treasury obligations and bear interest at the rate of 3 percent. This rate was selected on the basis of the fact that the National Service Life Insurance Act requires that the premium rates for such insurance shall be the net rates based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum. In 1944, the President approved a recommendation of the Secretary that the special obligations issued to the USGLI fund bear interest at the rate of 3½ percent inasmuch as the controlling law specifies that the basis of the calculation of the reserves and all other values under the USGLI policies shall be the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ percent.

Thus, since the years 1941 and 1944 respectively, these funds have been invested at 3 percent for the NSLI program and 3½ percent for the USGLI program. Currently, the NSLI fund is entirely invested in 5-year special 3-percent Treasury notes. The special obligations issued to the USGLI fund are in the form of 1-year, 3½-percent certificates of indebtedness.

It will be remembered that during the years when the market rates of interest were less than 3 percent, there was considerable criticism from certain circles that these fixed rates resulted in an unwarranted subsidy of the veterans' insurance trust funds by the taxpayers as a whole. In the period since the average rates of interest have been higher than 3 and 3½ percent, we note that these same voices have not come forward to complain that the trust funds are now subsidizing the public.

In effect, the chairman's bill, H.R. 9378, makes two important points which we are glad to endorse. First, by reason of its nature, any insurance trust fund must be administered in such manner as will guarantee its actuarial soundness. Secondly, public policy upholds the underlying concept of H.R. 9378; that the individuals concerned are entitled to a fair return on their investment.

We are particularly pleased that the bill would give statutory sanction to the floor of 3 and 3½ percent, respectively, for the interest rates applicable to investments of the NSLI and USGLI trust funds. The American Legion supports the judgment of the Treasury Department that Congress did not intend that the rates of interest for investment purposes should be less than the rates specified in the respective provisions of law for determining premium costs and for other purposes.

Also, it is our understanding that the Veterans Administration deems these rates of interest to be the safe minimums requisite to securing the actuarial soundness of the respective trust funds.

It is the American Legion's long-standing policy to support programs and procedures which will maintain the integrity of the NSLI and USGLI trust funds, and to oppose measures which may tend to jeopardize the integrity of such funds.

To insure compliance with this policy and in order that the organization's position with respect to the NSLI and USGLI programs will be in accord with sound insurance practices, all proposals for change in these programs are normally referred for consideration and recommendation to the American Legion Insurance Advisory Board. The wisdom of this practice has been demonstrated time and again inasmuch as the board is comprised of individuals who are experts in insurance matters.

We regret that our insurance advisory board has not had opportunity to consider the proposals under discussion here today. The board's annual meeting will not be held until the 27th and 28th of this month.

We have, however, consulted with Mr. Milo J. Warner, chairman of the insurance advisory board, and with Mr. Robert M. McCurdy, chairman of the national rehabilitation commission. Mr. Warner, a past national commander of the American Legion, is accompanying me today.

Specifically, we have discussed the provisions of H.R. 9378 and the proposal of the Treasury Department, recently reported in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD advanced by representatives of the Secretary of the Treasury in their appearance before this committee earlier today.

In our opinion, the Treasury proposal has considerable merit. In essence, it would retain the historic interest rates of 3 percent for NSLI fund investments and 3½ percent for USGLI fund investments as a floor, but provide for reinvestment of such funds at interest rates approaching current market yields.

Under the recommended formula, as we understand it, the special obligations issued to the funds would bear interest at a rate one one-half of 1 percent lower than a rate equal to the average market yield (computed as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue and adjusted to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent) borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 3 years from the end of such calendar month; provided that the special obligations isued to the USGLI fund shall be at rates not less than 3½ percent and the obligations issued to the NSLI fund shall be at rates not less than 3 percent.

The reduction of one-half of 1 percent below the current average interest rate would be in consideration of the guaranteed floor of 3 and 3½ percent for the respective funds.

We believe the principles inherent in this plan are fair to both the public and the veterans concerned. We are satisfied it would be acceptable to the individual NSLI and USGLI policyholders. Certainly, it should serve to help curb further criticisms should the average market rates of interest subsequently fall below 3½ or 3 percent.

The Treasury Department's plan for conversion to the recommended formula appears to be well-reasoned and in keeping with Veterans' Administration requirements relative to operation of the insurance programs.

On behalf of the American Legion, we respectfully urge the committee's careful consideration of the proposal to reinvest the veterans' insurance trust funds at a rate of interest one-half of 1 percent less than the current average market yields, subject to a minimum rate of 3 percent for the NSLI fund and 3½ percent for the USGLI fund.

Thank you for your interest in and attention to the views of the American Legion.

They'd Vote Red

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there has always been a question in my mind, and in the minds of many conscientious Members of this body, as well as many millions of responsible American citizens and taxpayers, as to the values and benefits gained from the vast amount of more than $70 billion poured into foreign-aid projects.

On this tremendous expenditure over the years, we are now paying close to $3 billion in annual interest charges alone, notwithstanding the principal that has been added to the national debt.

Various investigations conducted in connection with these programs have uncovered senseless waste, negligence, and outright graft on the part of some of the participants charged with allocation and distribution of funds and materials in foreign countries.

To take a case in point, the South American country of Bolivia has been the recipient of $128 million since 1954, to bolster their sagging economy. Today, they are in far worse shape than when our foreign-aid program was launched in that country.

The February 1 issue of the Omaha World-Herald, a leading Nebraska daily newspaper, carried an editorial on the subject of foreign-aid waste and extravagance in the country of Laos, southeast Asia. The article is entitled, "They'd Vote Red." The content is the result of a thorough investigation and report by a United Nations investigative unit into the expenditure of $225 million of American foreign-aid funds poured into that country since 1955, and the results attained therefrom. I need not remind you that it is tragic and the report speaks for itself.

With the permission of my colleagues to extend my remarks and include the editorial of the World-Herald in the RECORD, I commend to your attention this able piece of reporting in the public interest:

THEY'D VOTE RED

A United Nations investigative unit looked into the spending of $225 million in U.S.

foreign aid in Laos since 1955, and agreed it has not so far achieved significant results.

Jim Lucas, able correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, has an even more grim report from the scene. He writes:

"If free elections were held today in Laos, every qualified observer, including the American Embassy, concedes this hermit kingdom of southeast Asia would go Communist in a landslide."

In other words, the aid program has been such a disastrous failure we Americans can be thankful only that the people there have no chance to speak their minds about it.

What a commentary that is, not only on foreign aid but on the United States as the champion of free representative government.

In 5 years, says Mr. Lucas, Uncle Sam has invested almost four times the gross national product of Laos. And for what?

In 1955 Laos had no roads and still has none. It had no national communications system. There is still none. Laos was desperate for elementary schools and had only one high school. Uncle Sam built none, but spent a half-million dollars to start a university.

Laos lacked hospitals. It has one native doctor and three dentists. With $225 million spent, the foreign aiders never got around to building a hospital. Dr. Tom Dooley, with his few thousands of dollars from private charity, has done far more for medicine in Laos than has Uncle Sam with all his millions.

To create political stability, the foreign-aid planners gave Laos a 29,000-man army which has yet to prove it can fight but whose politically minded commanders assertedly connive to bring down every civilian government they oppose.

Things are supposed to be better now that wastrels and crooks have been fired from the Lao foreign-aid staff. There is much talk about the new team. Mr. Lucas and other observers absolve the present aid dispensers from blame for the unholy mess which now exists.

Nevertheless, all agree there is a political vacuum in that key southeast Asian country and at least one American correspondent says that in a free choice today the people of Laos would choose communism. Here foreign aid has betrayed America's interest and the cause of freedom. Short of treason, it would sarcely be possible to return a stronger indictment.

House Concurrent Resolution 459

SPEECH
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1960, House Concurrent Resolution 459 passed the House. This measure expressed the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama shall be made only pursuant to treaty.

In order to clarify my position with reference to this resolution, I want to say that I was in favor of its passage. I was present in the House Chamber during the major portion of the debate, but unfortunately I was called away before the vote was taken. If I had been able to be on the floor at the time the rollcall was taken, I would have voted "yea."

Loyalty Oaths and Disclaimer Affidavits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, most of the agitation about the loyalty oath and the disclaimer provision in the National Defense Education Act has come from legislators, educators, and school administrators.

The greatest beneficiaries of the act have had little opportunity to voice an opinion one way or another. In that regard, it is interesting to note a resolution adopted last month by the Senate of Associated Students of Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa.

I take this opportunity to include a copy of that resolution in the RECORD so that the Members will know that some of the students have voiced an opinion with respect to these provisions. The resolution follows:

LOYALTY OATHS AND DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVITS

The Senate of the Associated Students of Westmar College notes with approval the position taken by the 12th National Student Congress of the U.S. National Student Association and also the position taken by the National Executive Committee of USNSA in regard to loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits.

The Senate disapproves of loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits due to its belief in the following principles:

1. Loyalty is based upon ideals and cannot be legislated or created by slogans.

2. That, historically, loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits have been a source of much abuse.

3. That they do not serve their purpose. No subversive would have any qualms about taking a loyalty oath or signing a disclaimer affidavit. On the other hand, loyal Americans who refuse to sign on principle are singled out.

4. They are a threat to academic freedom, for:

(a) There is a danger that they will lead to more restrictive legislation;

(b) There is danger that their meaning may be expanded through interpretation;

(c) They imply that a student and/or faculty member is disloyal until he makes a positive statement expressing his loyalty. The requirement does not indicate a belief in the basic loyalty of American college students and/or faculty members;

(d) A student or faculty member's refusal to sign because of principle results in suspicion of disloyalty.

5. They often discriminate against college students or faculty members. In the instance of loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits required under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 college students are required to take the oaths whereas recipients of Federal aid under other programs (e.g., farmers) do not have to take oaths or sign disclaimer affidavits.

The Senate is particularly concerned with section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which requires loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits for student loans. The Senate strongly urges repeal of section 1001(f) of the act eliminating both the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit. Movements to repeal the loyalty oath that are now under way are encouraging but it is of utmost importance that the disclaimer affidavit provision be repealed also.

While the Senate feels it impractical for Westmar College to discontinue participation in the NDEA program in protest of section 1001(f) it notes with approval the position which the administration and the faculty of the college have taken against section 1001(f) as a result of the college's participation in the American Association of American Colleges.

The Senate mandates that copies of this resolution be sent to Members of the U.S. Congress from Iowa, to the Faculty Senate and to the national affairs vice president of the U.S. National Student Association.

The Senate recognizes the assistance of information obtained from USNSA in the preparation of this resolution.

The Southern Parents's Viewpoint on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have from Mrs. Joseph L. Dicks of Ormond Beach, Fla., a communication addressed to the Congress of the United States, in which she has earnestly and ably presented a plea to each Member of Congress for understanding of the southern parent's viewpoint on the so-called civil rights question.

In order that every Member of Congress may have an opportunity to read this communication, I ask consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The communication follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Proposed legislation, bearing the misnomer "civil rights," is now, or may soon be, before you. It is not to my own representatives I write concerning this legislation, for they are well aware of those things of which I speak, but it is to those Members of your body of whom I am not a constituent that I address these words, since the action you take on this proposed legislation probably affects me more than those constituents who elected you. Perhaps I am naive in doing so, but it seems incomprehensible that a Congress which has specifically granted control of public schools to some States, would, for a temporary political advantage, withdraw this privilege from the States of the South because of hate propaganda aimed at destroying public education in those States, as well as the peace and tranquillity of the people who live in them.

If you have been led to believe that resistance to integrated public schools in the South consists of a few leaders and extremists, and that parents will eventually accept such schools, you have been misinformed. These parents believe they have the constitutional right to guide their children in all matters concerning religion, education, and association, and in so doing, insist that their children be educated in a decent, wholesome atmosphere, free from sociological pressure, or the need for police protection. In exercising these rights concerning their children, they feel they deprive no citizen, of any race, color, or creed of the enjoyment of any citizenship rights to which they are entitled. The low moral and scholastic level of integrated public schools is well known to you, for you operate such schools in the District of Columbia. Your own record of the crime, disease, and low educational standard of these schools shows them to be a national disgrace.

Some of you Congressmen have recently made tours of Russia, but have you made tours of inspection of the South's public schools, both white and Negro, which you are now being asked to destroy? Do you know how many privately endowed white schools were absorbed into the public school systems of some States in order to educate southern children? And do you also know that in the schools of most southern communities Negroes furnish a large proportion of the pupils in the public schools while paying only a minute part of the school tax?

The southern white population has long been cognizant of the Negro's exhibited lack of initiative and ability, despite opportunities. Out of christian love and compassion it has largely fed, clothed, and educated the Negro in its midst, hoping that in time these people might eventually assume their responsibilities as citizens in a free society. Southern white parents, however, have also been cognizant of the Negro's moral characteristics and living habits, and they have no intention of allowing their children to be used as sacrificial offerings for purposes of social experimentation, whether in the name of brotherhood or civil rights. Should compliance with the Supreme Court's mandate be insisted upon, either by court orders or civil rights legislation, the public schools of the South will eventually be abandoned entirely, or else again reduced to the level of those free institutions of a few generations ago, patronized only by the shiftless and the indigent.

The continued exploitation of the race issue as a means of exacting some kind of retribution for the "sins of the South" is fast becoming irtolerable. It would seem that during the course of nearly a hundred years the American people could have learned that the South not only did not invent slavery but that slavery was a lucrative business plied by the slave traders of the North, and would cease to be the gullible victims of racial propagandists. If the South ever owed a debt to the Negro, which I doubt, that debt has long been paid in full. If any injustice has been done the Negro people, it has not been done by the white citizens among whom they have freely chosen to live for nearly a century. It was perpetrated by the Federal Government, when, for ulterior motives, and by illegal action, it bestowed upon them American citizenship, without first teaching them the duties and obligations imposed by that citizenship.

The cry for the Negro's equal opportunity is constantly heard through every avenue of communication. The many tax-free foundations and pressure groups, with their unlimited wealth, have seen to that. But have you Congressmen ever looked behind this smoke screen? Are you sure it is equal opportunity that is wanted, and not the fruits which others through equal opportunity have industriously acquired?

That you would have us, who reside in the South, believe the Constitution demands the surrender of public schools to a minority group which assumes little responsibility for their cost while sharing bountifully in their benefits, thereby denying a voice to those who built those schools and support them, is, indeed, to presume that we are as ignorant and provincial as our critics say of us. We are well aware that the hue and cry for "civil rights" is not a Constitutional matter, but a political maneuver, whereby it is proposed to sacrifice our children to procure votes for you and your political parties.

Despite the label of "anarchists," the South's pattern of resistance to school integration in the past has been that lawful resistance prophesied by our early patriots should there be a usurpation of powers by any branch of the Federal Government. There has been a "disquietude of the people," a "refusal to cooperate with the officers of the Union," the "frowns of the executive magistracy" of the States, as well as the "embarrassments created by legislative devices" in order to evade the consequences of such usurpation. I earnestly entreat each of you to put aside selfish motives in considering the grave proposals which may now come before you, lest those more drastic acts of resistance described by these men be brought about by oppressive civil rights legislation.

Surely, I need not echo the further words of our Nation's founders and ask "But what degree of madness" would ever drive you "to such an extremity."

Mrs. WESLEY O'NEALL DICKS,
Parent, Ormond Beach, Fla.

Running Against the Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, two separate newspaper articles happened to come across my desk at the same time which I feel are pertinent right now. They advise how we might save on the one hand, the cost to finance the huge national debt with a computation for Lebanon County, Pa., which is in my district, and the debt-free situation we strive for as exemplified by the community of Paxtang that is also in my congressional district. We might take a lesson from the people in Paxtang who can boast of being free of debt. They are on a pay-as-you-go program. There is no mortgage on the unborn of that community.

The two newspaper articles follow:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, Jan. 27, 1960]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO PROGRAMS KEEP PAXTANG FREE OF DEBT

(By Jerry Fitzpatrick)

Paxtang, a community of 2,000, is conservative, has low taxes and, rare as an unmortgaged split-level house, is free of debt.

Municipal and school district leaders cheerfully boast there isn't another community in the 2 dozen in Greater Harrisburg that can claim to be debt free.

The reason: "We've always been conservative here," say William A. Foreman and William S. Sanford, borough and school board secretary respectively.

"We never permitted our community facilities to lag. We operate on a 'pay-as-you-go' program, using good housekeeping."

The borough is out of debt to all intents and purposes. It has $14,000 in sewer bonds to pay off, but has sufficient money in the sewer sinking fund to cover the debt.

"We would pay that off now," Foreman states, "only we don't have the right of prepayment."

The 30-year bonds expire December 1, 1961. The sinking fund had $13,662.91 at the end of 1959, plus unfigured interest from bank savings. Another $900 will be appropriated to the fund from the budget at the end of this year.

The loan costs the borough $665 interest per year, at 4¾ percent.

The borough was one of the first suburban communities to get sewers, again illustrating the official conservative approach, claims Foreman.

The school district has had no indebtedness for about 10 years, Sanford points out. The second floor of the elementary school was renovated at that time.

True, the district is under rental agreement to the Central Dauphin Joint Schools Authority, but that is a function and a debt of the jointure and not the individual district.

There is little likelihood that the borough will get into debt in the foreseeable future.

Its streets are all paved, all have been resurfaced in recent years, are curbed, and are "in excellent condition." The borough has an active street improvement program.

The municipal building, erected in 1932, also is in good shape. Bonds on it were paid off last year.

The elementary school is old, but is in as good condition as any modern school and has met all State inspections, Sanford says. Four years ago the district spent $17,000—without going into debt—for modernizing the classrooms.

Taxes, as a result of the conservatism, are low. Borough taxes have remained at 18 mills for a decade. There is a 1-percent real estate transfer tax.

School district taxes are 36 mills, where they have remained since 1955. There also are $10 residence and $5 per capita taxes.

The residence and the transfer taxes are the only two enacted by the borough under the limitless "tax anything" law.

Despite low taxes, the "local effort" in school support is high compared to most communities because of high property valuation, Sanford relates.

Taxable assessed valuation is $2.4 million for the small community. The valuation includes the giant structures of the State headquarters for Nationwide Insurance Companies and the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Cooperative.

This has resulted in one of the lowest reimbursement ratios in the State from the Department of Public Instruction, the two men claim. In 1955 the ratio was the lowest in the State.

Apparently people find paying taxes in Paxtang a real joy.

Foreman, who had been school board secretary until 2 years ago, and Sanford related that "it is astounding, but each year we collect 99.9 percent of our realty taxes."

Most communities "consider themselves happy if they have only 10 percent outstanding by the end of the penalty period," they say.

Ninety percent of Paxtang's taxes comes in during the discount period.

Out of last year's school tax yield of $85,602.60, for example, only $14.40 is outstanding.

Paxtang, the two officers agree, "is a phenomenon."

[From the Lebanon (Pa.) Daily News, Jan. 28, 1960]

COSTS OF NATIONAL DEBT HIGH IN COUNTY

NEW YORK, January 28.—What price national debt? How much is it costing residents of Lebanon County in taxes each year to pay their portion of the interest charges alone on the debt?

From calculations made by the Tax Foundation, which keeps an eye on taxes and spending at all levels of government, the current interest charges average $51.48 per person for the entire population of the country.

It is nearly $1 a week, every week in the year for every inhabitant.

For Lebanon County residents, applying the average interest costs locally, it adds up to $4,556,000 a year.

The rate will go up in the next fiscal year to a new high of $53.71 per person. This

was indicated recently by President Eisenhower when he told Congress that the interest charges on the national debt, which were $8.1 billion a year ago, are now approaching $9.5 billion.

This rise of $1.4 billion, translated into more understandable terms, amounts to an increase in interest costs of $7.81 a year per person.

The Tax Foundation notes that, next to Defense Department expenditures, payments for interest on the debt will be the biggest costs to be met in the next fiscal year. They will exceed by far the outlays for veterans and for agriculture.

At the present time, the national debt stands at $291 billion, which is nearly $1,650 for every man, woman and child in the country.

If the residents of Lebanon County were to pay off their share of this obligation they would need the tidy sum of $146,025,000.

A glimmer of hope is seen in the President's announcement of a possible $4.2 billion budget surplus in fiscal 1961. If it is achieved, he said, it should be applied to reducing the debt.

A quick calculation shows that a reduction of this size would cut Lebanon County's portion of the debt by $2,190,000. Local interest costs would drop proportionately.

Some idea of how huge an amount is the $291 billion that represents the national debt comes from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. It points out that it is equal to the combined savings of the American people—in the form of savings accounts, life insurance and Government bonds.

Aberdeen, S. Dak., Indian Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the generous efforts of a group of Federal employees in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., Area Office of the Division of Indian Health in forming the Indian Health Employees Scholarship Fund which has made it possible for qualified students of Indian descent to obtain training in a health field.

The program was begun in September 1958 through the suggestion of Dr. J. H. Gerber, medical officer in charge when he learned insufficient funds were available for Indian students desirous of continuing their education in health programs beyond the high school level.

Gerber suggested that the employees in the Aberdeen Area Indian health program participate on a voluntary basis. Books containing 50-cent donation coupons were distributed to all employees in the area. At the end of the drive in December 1958 a total of $1,567.85 had been collected. In 1959, the total receipts were almost double that amount as a result of the employees donating their time, money, and energy in sponsoring several dances, bingo parties, and other fundraising activities throughout the area.

This operation is indeed unique among Federal employees and is indicative of their sincere interest in improving health conditions among the Indian people of South Dakota, as well as providing educational opportunities for them. I feel they should be commended for their efforts.

Payment-in-Kind Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this week it was my privilege and duty, as I saw it, to join with several of my Iowa colleagues in introducing payment-in-kind legislation to deal with the corn-surplus problem.

We feel that this forthright approach is the only way to cope with a full-blown dilemma which vitally affects the midwest economy. We see it as a three-pronged attack upon the problem. The legislation, when adopted, will (1) reduce current supplies of corn along with the staggering storage and handling charges thereon; (2) reduce current production of corn, and (3) establish an adequate reserve of corn in case of an emergency.

We trust that hearings can be held on this legislation so that a bill can come before Congress this session and put this plan into operation.

Payment-in-kind legislation has been proposed over the past several years. In the district I represent, two men have given a lot of thought to the problem—Dave Livingston of Washington, Iowa, and Frank Summers, of Milton, Iowa—both of them have circulated their plans quite freely.

This week I received a letter from Frank Summers calling my attention to his activities in promoting this type of approach over the past 4 years. He has printed a digest of these activities, and under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I request that this digest appear in the Appendix of the RECORD so that due credit will come to Mr. Summers:

SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM THIS YEAR 1960
(By Frank Summers)

Preface: This is a partial digest of Mr. Summers' prior printed documents, dated December 5, 1955; January 27, 1956; February 13, 1956; February 3, 1958, and February 17, 1959, all of which suggested the issue of negotiable warehouse certificates to farmers and/or stockmen (hereinafter referred to as farmer or farmers) for taking far more cropland out of production, in order to solve the problem of the burdensome surplus of corn, wheat, cotton and the like.

It is well settled that the major farm problem is to greatly reduce the increasing large surplus of agriculture commodities, so that they will not cast a very bearish influence on the markets, thus bearing prices down and down far below parity.

Following is a brief digest of said documents as to the increasing large surplus of corn and wheat.

If the productivity of the farmer's cornland would average about 60 bushels per acre, our Government could issue said farmer a negotiable warehouse certificate for 60 bushels per acre, for the additional cornland thus taken out of his allotted or base acres for this year 1960.

Likewise with wheat if the productivity of the farmer's wheatland would average about 20 bushels per acre, our Government could issue said farmer a negotiable warehouse certificate for 20 bushels per acre of the wheatland thus taken out of his allotted, base or growing wheat acres for this year 1960.

The farmer if he desired and it was practical could exchange said certificate for the actual corn and/or wheat direct from the CCC storage or warehouse.

Or if the farmer desired he could sell his certificate, at or near the market price, to another farmer, who then could exchange said certificate for the actual corn and/or wheat from CCC storage or elevator, if practicable.

Or if the farmer desired he could sell his certificate, at or near the market price, to his local dealer or elevator, who then in turn could pool said certificates thus purchased from a plurality of farmers, said dealer then could sell said certificates to his terminal grain dealer, elevator, or processor, just the same as if the actual corn and/or wheat had been handled.

By said plan the corn and/or wheat would end up mainly in the terminal grain dealer's elevator or processor, just the same as if the farmer had grown and sold the actual corn and/or wheat this year 1960, thus in many instances the grain would not be moved from the CCC storage or elevator in said sales.

As an illustrative example, if negotiable certificates were issued for, say, 400 million bushels of stored CCC corn, based on an average of 60 bushels per acre, this would take about 6,600,000 acres of average corn land out of production for this crop year 1960. This would decrease the combined corn crop and the CCC surplus corn for the 1960 crop year in the neighborhood of 800 million bushels.

Another illustrative example is, if negotiable certificates were issued for, say, 300 million bushels of stored CCC wheat based in an average of 20 bushels per acre, this would take about 15 million acres of average growing wheat out of production for this year 1960. In this instance it would be necessary for the farmers to clip, plow under, or disk the wheat before it matured into grain, in order to earn said certificates for this crop year 1960. This would decrease the combined wheat crop and the CCC surplus wheat in the neighborhood of 600 million bushels for this year 1960.

In order for the wheat farmers to qualify this year, 1960, for said certificates, it would be preferable for them to clip or disk effectively the growing wheat on the acres thus taken out of production, the wheat straw should be left laying on the ground, which would add organic matter and fertilizer to the land, and also tend to prevent erosion by wind and water.

Above illustrations and examples also applies likewise to cotton, peanuts, grain sorghums, tobacco, and the like, if said suggested plan was enacted into law, and properly administered, it would act as an automatic valve tending to keep production in line with demand, which would tend to raise farm prices or income up to par, or on a level with other classes of our economy.

It is submitted that said plan is the cheapest and the most effective way to solve the enormous increasing amount of the farm surpluses of corn, wheat, cotton, and the like, as it would not take any cash outlay by our Government, as the surplus stocks are already paid for, and further said stocks are fast deteriorating and it is costing our

Government over a million dollars a day for storage and expenses to keep said surpluses.

The quicker the farm problem is generally solved, the cheaper and easier it can be done, surely eventually it will have to be solved in the above manner, so why not this year 1960?

Probably over a million farm families have been and are being forced to sell their farm equipment and the like and leave the farm, because of the relatively fast decline in general prices of agriculture products. Which is throwing many million pieces of second-hand farm machinery on the market, and is being bought at relatively low prices by implement dealers and remaining farmers. Thus this is virtually stopping the sale of many million pieces of new farm machinery, such as tractors, combines, trucks, corn pickers, and the like.

It is apparent the majority of farmers in general want the farm problem solved this year 1960. Some people have stated that the increasing population might use up the surplus crops a decade or 10 years in the future. Such a possible solving the enormous surplus is absurd or ridiculous to several million farm families now living on the farm trying to have a home, and to make enough money for the necessities of health and life, and to educate their children and the like. Solving the surplus farm problem a decade or 10 years in the future, would be of no benefit whatever, to several million people living on the farms now. Even if the farm problem would be solved next year 1961, it would be far too late for many thousands of farm families.

Said plan would operate with, or in addition to price supports, the two-price system, production payments (the Brannan plan) and voluntary or legislated controls and the like.

It appears to be well settled that about 40 percent of the people of the United States, depend directly or indirectly, for their livelihood on agriculture.

Piecemeal legislation has not, and will not, solve the farm problems, but only prolong and increase them.

Said plan could be effectively and economically administered through the many ASC offices throughout the United States.

It will surely take a far greater period of prosperity (or so-called inflation) for all classes of our economy, if the enormous Federal debts are ever paid or even substantially reduced, especially in view of the constant threat of an atomic war hanging over our heads, with its terrific increasing military cost, in order to provide for the safety and security of our great Nation.

It follows, a bipartisan plea is most earnestly requested of our administration and Congress, to solve the farm problem this year 1960 on behalf of many millions of people who are depending directly and indirectly on agriculture, for their livelihood, and thus in general alleviate or stop the fast increasing hardships and/or insolvency of several million people.

The U.S. Flag in the Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mrs. Helen P. Lasell, national chairman, the U.S. Flag Committee, Jackson Heights, Long Island, N.Y., regarding the U.S. flag in the Panama Canal Zone. Mrs. Lasell's letter is dated January 23, 1960:

THE U.S. FLAG COMMITTEE,
January 23, 1960.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We write to thank you for your splendid work regarding our flag in the Panama Canal Zone. We wonder where the other Congressmen are, that more do not speak up, as you did?

Why are not our troops ordered to guard our flag and our rights there—just as they were ordered to take over Little Rock, to protect a few children attending the public schools?

We consider this just one more illustration of the sellout which has been going on, in Washington, for a number of years. Instead of being the strongest country, we are rapidly becoming the weakest, because any country is strong or weak, according to the people in it. Those in power today are not so concerned with protecting American citizens as they are to bringing about one world federation. And the prospects for 1960 are no better.

Sincerely,
THE U.S. FLAG COMMITTEE,
HELEN P. LASELL, *Chairman.*

Baring Reveals Use of False Technical Data in Third Street Highway Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Commerce, on January 27, 1960, in which I showed conclusively that the Bureau of Public Roads did falsify pertinent technical information in presenting its side of the picture to the John Blatnik committee investigating the selection of the routing of the Interstate Freeway System from the California State line through Reno and Sparks to Vista, Nev. As you know, the estimated cost of completing the Interstate Highway System pursuant to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and 1958 has now reached the gigantic figure of $39.8 billion. Since it is apparent that urban planning of the system is based on falsification of technical fact, the situation today should be of vital concern to every Member of Congress. The letter follows:

JANUARY 27, 1960.

Mr. FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On September 22, 1959, Mr. Robert E. Merriam, Deputy Assistant to the President, wrote to me outlining certain developments relating to the Interstate Highway System routes in the Reno, Nev., area. A copy of this letter is attached hereto. In that letter he concludes that the routing question in the Reno-Sparks area had received full and adequate consideration by the local and by the State authorities concerned, and that their findings and recommendations were after proper evaluation approved by the Bureau of Public Roads. I must take exception to the information furnished Mr. Merriam upon inquiry.

Let me here point out that charges of influence by the Bureau of Public Roads were not cleared by investigations of the John A. Blatnik Special Subcommittee hearing held in Reno on February 24, 25, and 26, 1959, but only confirmed.

The Blatnik subcommittee, page 17 of its report, did attach no sinister motives to the action of the Bureau in the above regard. (Approval of line J by the State of Nevada, the approval acquiesced in on February 21, 1957 by the Bureau of Public Roads, all in advance of public hearings, and dispatch of telegrams by the Bureau of Public Roads which contained statements obviously designed to influence action that accorded with earlier State and Bureau of Public Roads approval of line J.)

A part of this action to which the Blatnik Subcommittee did "attach no sinister motives" is so obviously illegal in the light of Title 23, United States Code, Highways, Section 128, and so clearly in conflict with the spirit of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States, that a paragraph from the Blatnik Report, page 17, is here quoted in its entirety:

"The statements contained in the telegrams addressed to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners from officials of the Bureau of Public Roads were obviously designed to influence action that accorded with earlier State and Bureau of Public Roads approval of line J. Certainly, a local body faced with a telegram that line J is the 'only location acceptable for the expenditure of Federal interstate funds' has little room for deliberation. It might also be noted that the Washoe County Board had earlier approved the route, prior to holding public hearings."

Again referring to Mr. Merriam's letter of September 22, 1959, I should like here to quote for your convenient reference the next to the last paragraph:

"While there does not appear to be any evidence justifying further consideration of this matter, I can assure you that if the State of Nevada and the city of Reno wishes to reconsider their recommendations, that the Department of Commerce, through the Bureau of Public Roads, will be willing to review any new factual information or competent engineering data pertinent to the establishment of the Interstate route in the Reno-Sparks area."

It is quite inconceivable that the Bureau of Public Roads would be requested to review any new factual information or competent engineering data pertinent to the establishment of the Interstate route in the Reno-Sparks area submitted to it by the Nevada State Highway Department, since it is that department, through its consultants, that is responsible for the transmission of so-called technical data in support of the route through the city of Reno.

The State Highway Department, and in turn the Bureau of Public Roads, shows a highly technical line or argument to support the Third Street program. Essentially, both the State Highway Department and the Bureau of Public Roads pretended to sympathize with the people of Reno in their need for a useful and desirable route from the local viewpoint and pretended to protect the interest of the United States by choice of an economical route, volume of traffic, use and service considered, while at the same time the Bureau was insisting upon the destructive and expensive Third Street route. The Bureau of Public Roads sustained this pretense by choosing to use the professional

engineering concept of benefit-cost ratio in an effort to prove its position.

Benefit-cost ratio is a measure of the economic value of a proposal which is determined by dividing the public benefit to be expected from the proposal by the cost of the proposal, if reduced to the same time period. The resultant figure is a numerical ratio—the benefit-cost ratio.

The people of Reno have not had the advantage of highly trained traffic and highway engineers on their side. All the qualified engineers were on the side of the Bureau of Public Roads, the State highway department, the county and city governments involved. The Blatnik subcommittee noted this unbalance of technical support and stated in its House Report No. 292 covering the Reno hearings, report dated April 23, 1959, that "In matters requiring technical knowledge, great reliance is placed on expert opinion." From kindergarten on into our adult life we are trained to be guided by the voice of technical knowledge and authority. However, the voice of expert opinion at the Reno hearing was an uncertain trumpet.

The Bureau of Public Roads testimony that the benefit-cost ratio of the Third Street Route would be 4.6 is false by its own data. The benefit-cost ratio concept chosen in this instance, as an instrument of deception to the people of Nevada and to the Congress of the United States, is remote from the experience of most people. It is so remote that the Chief Engineer of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads spent considerable time at the hearing describing what the benefit-cost ratio means.

The Blatnik subcommittee report gives this explanation on the bottom half of its page 10. With this explanation, and on the same page, various high benefit-cost ratios for each of the discussed alternate routes through Reno ranging from 4.6 to 7.0 were given, with the single exception of the Rim Route asked by the people. This Rim Route received a benefit-cost ratio of only 1.1 which, according to the second table on page 10 of the Blatnik subcommittee report, is admittedly a Bureau of Public Roads estimate.

Here the ingenuity of the deception practiced by the Bureau of Public Roads at the Blatnik hearing becomes apparent, when it is understood that investigation of the 1.1 Rim Route benefit-cost ratio reveals the figure is too nearly correct to warrant comment. Only when the 4.6 Third Street benefit-cost ratio figure is examined does the enormity of the deception on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads become evident. The Bureau's own supplied figures and estimated data presented to the Blatnik subcommittee revealed that the 4.6 benefit-cost ratio for the Third Street Route can be achieved only by using the absurdly high driving cost figure of 18.8 cents per mile for the present streets and present Highway Route 40. This statement has been checked and rechecked by competent engineers, some calculating independently of others.

The Bureau of Public Roads further impairs its integrity. This 18.8 cents exaggerated present operating cost figure will not give a 1.1 benefit-cost ratio for the Rim Route. One has to use a present operating cost figure about 5 cents lower per mile on the present streets to achieve a 1.1 benefit-cost ratio for the Rim Route. Any exaggeration of a present operating cost exaggerates the benefit to be expected from a proposed program.

The absurdity of alleging a 4.6 benefit-cost ratio for an urban Third Street route is further revealed by noting in the Detroit Metropolitan Area Traffic Study, part II, 1956, pages 101, 119, 131, 132, and 133, that an urban expressway has to carry about 50,000 vehicles per day to achieve even a 1.0 benefit-cost ratio. This is a situation in which the benefit only matches the cost.

Further inspection of the same pages shows that an urban expressway has to carry over 130,000 vehicles per day by 1975 to achieve a 3.4 benefit-cost ratio. Reno has possibly a somewhat lower freeway construction cost than more urban Detroit, and Reno's freeway is proposed to be less capacious. These factors would somewhat reduce the 130,000 traffic volume needed to provide the 3.4 benefit-cost ratio in Detroit. These same factors, however, would not reduce the needed traffic volume to a figure anywhere near as low as 16,400 vehicles per day given by the bureau of public roads for the Third Street route.

The 4.6 benefit-cost ratio is simply a false assumption that the benefit of the Third Street route would amount to 4.6 times its cost. The trick of inflating the benefit-cost ratio to push a proposal beyond its merit is old. This evil practice is revealed by the following quotation from the same Detroit Metropolitan Area Traffic Study, part II, page 118:

"The measures illustrated on map 30 were summed for the entire network and show that the benefits accruing to drivers actually assigned to expressways are 10 percent greater than the construction cost of the network. This 1.10 ratio of benefits to costs may seem low by comparison with many traffic reports issued in other places proposing to make such measurements."

Along with the theoretical economic desirability of an expressway proposal must be considered the esthetic, neighborhood, commercial and human factors involved. Cities are for people, not for abstract structures which do not attract people. The essence of Reno is the concentration of its attractions which can be reached, one from the other, by walking. The introduction of a structure to cut downtown Reno in two clearly reduces the attractiveness of the city to its citizens and to its visitors. This is true no matter how good the structure may be for vehicles. The proper determination of this route can be made only if factual technical and economic data are objectively considered.

To the extent that any charges alleging false technical data before the various deliberative bodies concerning an expressway route through Reno during the periods of deliberation remain unrefuted, confidence in the wisdom of their judgments is unjustified through possibly no fault of the members of such bodies.

The determinations of public bodies and constituted authorities are no more reliable than the information or opinions upon which they are based, and the best information can be useful only to the extent that it receives attention and objective evaluation. No valid determination of the best route location or method or traffic flow improvement for the Reno area has in fact yet been made. As a matter of fact, an objective and comprehensive study of tarffic improvement, social and economic impacts and community betterment has to date only been authorized by the Bureau of Public Roads for the city of Boston. What is authorized for one city is justified for every city.

Now that the facts concerning the false information about the Reno highway situation, as furnished the Blatnik subcommittee by the Bureau of Public Roads, have become known, the constituted authorities should not attempt to push ahead construction plans on any part of the California State line—Sparks freeway proposal, until true factual data can be properly evaluated and considered. Any such attempt to proceed hastily at this time must be carefully scrutinized and could be viewed as collusive action with the Bureau of Public Roads in its effort to accomplish a route selection through the use of false technical data.

I have accordingly introduced a bill in Congress—H.R. 9802, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a specified portion of a route on the Interstate System in Nevada, and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection with such such route. A copy of this bill is attached for your convenient reference.

The false technical prestige of the Bureau of Public Roads won the day with the Blatnik subcommittee and prepared the way for the uninformed and frequent attacks which have since been launched against me for my interest in the Reno highway situation. These attacks are false because their technical bases are false.

On October 22, 1959, in a document dated October 16, 1959, which is since the Blatnik hearings, I revealed the method by which the Bureau of Public Roads falsified the cost of operation on the present streets and on Highway Route 40 in Reno. This document had a large distribution. A copy was mailed to you. It is interesting to note that to date, it has been accepted without objection.

The issue at stake is much bigger than Reno; it is vastly bigger than Nevada; it is as big as the future of the United States of America. We investigate television and radio programs. While the President of the United States wonders how "the television industry could want to do these things to us," in matters of entertainment with only hundreds of thousands of dollars involved, the Bureau of Public Roads and some of the cooperating roadbuilding authorities and interests are deceiving us in matters of reality with millions of dollars involved in Reno and with billions of dollars involved throughout the United States.

The public must be given correct factual information on all matters of public consideration and correct factual information must be presented to our deliberative bodies by constituted authorities and their consultants. It is imperative that we improve the moral fiber at both public and private levels.

I am today writing this same letter to Mr. Merriam, with copy to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK. I feel certain that when Mr. BLATNIK learns through unrefuted charges that the Bureau of Public Roads has presented false technical information to his committee at the Reno hearings, his committee will wish to reexamine its attachment of "no sinister motives" to the action of the Bureau of Public Roads in the above regard.

I urge, Mr. Secretary, that you take immediate steps to put into effect the provisions of my bill H.R. 9802. I further urge that the approval of the Third Street Route through Reno and of line J from the State line to Lawtons be rescinded, as they were based on false technical facts, and the processes of locating a new route from the California State line to Vista, Nev., be immediately inaugurated, with the intent of securing the most economical system and at the same time meeting the objectives of the Interstate System.

I sincerely hope you will lend your fullest cooperation to the accomplishment of this end.

Respectfully,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

Contributions of Dr. David McGregor Cheney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and include therein a very fine article about the distinguished author, intellectual, and professor, my friend, Dr. David McGregor Cheney of Clinton, Mass., who has recently been elected a fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters, one of the highest honors which can be conferred upon a writer.

The ably written article from the Clinton Daily Item contains a very interesting summary of Dr. Cheney's contributions. There can be no question but that Dr. Cheney is one of the outstanding thinkers of our times. Dr. Cheney has won many honors in academic and literary circles. It would not be possible for me to do justice to the broad range of his intellectual interests and the significant work he has done in many fields. His well-trained, richly stored mind is a relevation to those who know him or his works. There is hardly a field of human learning to which he has not given assiduous, painstaking attention.

Perhaps his outstanding work is his "Index to Knowledge," a multivolume, new-type dictionary which applies modern scientific principles and meticulous research to the definitions and elaboration of the meaning of words. This monumental work has taken Dr. Cheney over 50 years to complete and it is now ready for publication.

Suprisingly enough, notwithstanding its magnificent scholarship, careful preparation and modern format, Dr. Cheny has been having difficulty getting it published principally because of the very high estimated costs incident to printing the several volumes which the work embraces.

Since it is something more than a dictionary and more useful than an encyclopedia, it obviously would have great value, not only in schools, colleges and educational institutions, but also in common usage. It is the kind of work that is vitally needed to facilitate general and specialized learning in educational institutions and by the public. It would be truly invaluable, and it should have been published long ago. Because of the cost and other factors involved and the size and magnitude of the work, private publishing concerns have not as yet undertaken it. However, it is to be hoped that, if it is not published by private interests, that some of the foundations, or even some of our Government agencies, would be willing to undertake to publish it at an early date.

I have been giving considerable time and attention to the matter of expediting publication of this great work and I hope that before long some affirmative results can be achieved so that the students and the people of this and future generations can be assured of having the benefit of this tremendously vital and significant intellectual project of Dr. Cheney's which should, if generally adopted, revolutionize education and learning in this country and exert beneficent influence in intellectual fields for many generations to come.

I take pleasure in heartily congratulating my valued friend, Dr. Cheney, and his gracious wife and helpmate, Gratia, upon this new award and richly deserved honor bestowed by the famous institute and wish for them continued success and happiness in all their endeavors, and in their personal lives, which have produced such great benefits to the intellectual world and to the Nation.

The article follows:

DR. CHENEY HONORED BY LITERARY SOCIETY

Dr. David M. Cheney, of 130 Prescott Street, Clinton, author and lexicographer, has been elected a fellow of the International Institute of Arts and Letters, one of the highest honors a writer can receive.

The election of Dr. Cheney adds to his other letters, the honorary, international degree of F.I.A.L. and makes him the 68th of the new group elected during the past year.

CONSTITUTION

The institute by its constitution elects only 760 fellows throughout the world, and to receive this honor, a vacancy must occur. Following World War II, many such vacancies had remained unfilled, and the society has been electing fellows throughout 1959.

Among those so honored have been college presidents, heads of departments at the universities, leaders in the fields of art, literature, science, music, the drama, movies, and executives whose contributions have been of worldwide significance.

The International Institute of Arts and Letters is for the world what the American, the British, and the French Institutes and academies are for these countries. Its avowed purpose is international cooperation in the cultivation of arts, letters, and sciences. It publishes brochures and books by its fellows. At the headquarters in Switzerland, there is an international art museum.

UNPUBLISHED INDEX

Cheney's still unpublished "Index to Knowledge," a new-type dictionary, has been estimated to be of such bulk it will fill 26 volumes of a thousand pages each. It is the first dictionary that not only defines the terms, but enables the consultant to find his right word or the information he seeks in a matter of seconds. It is estimated that the work contains about 1 million terms, and was the work of his leisure hours for more than 50 years.

Among Dr. Cheney's other works have been: "Son of Minos," a novel of the bronze age; first published in 1930 by Robert M. McBride & Co., of New York, with foreword by Burton Rascoe. Mr. Rascoe was formerly editor of the Bookman and literary editor of the New York Herald-Tribune. He was an authority on Greek literature, and indeed refused the chair in Greek offered him by Yale.

"Son of Minos" was twice recommended by the authoritative journal of English of the University of Chicago for use in schools and colleges, and was and is so used by many, including old English 22 at Harvard, Tufts, Brookline High, Lowell Teachers College, Bridgewater Teachers College, Andover, etc. A second edition was published in 1941 by Bruce Humphries, Inc., of Boston—and the book still lives.

HISTORICAL NOVEL

In 1942, Dr. Cheney's historical novel of the Third Crusade, "Bow Strings," was published, and was also recommended by the University of Chicago Journal. This book is now out of print.

Among his other works are the brochures, "The Madonna of Martha's Vineyard" and "A Collection of Crusoes," the latter being a reprint first appearing in the old New Bedford Standard and the Boston Sunday Globe. His story of the fighting in Flanders, sold under a pseudonym to the New York Times and appearing in two installments in its Sunday issues, was reprinted in Current History as one of the outstanding tales of the war, based on the actual adventures of a soldier in the Princess Pats, Romeo Houle. His newspaper work included feature stories in the New York Times, the old New York Herald, the Boston Sunday Globe, and numerous articles in Parade magazine of the Worcester Sunday Telegram, editorials, and in other years numerous verses.

Dr. Cheney was elected to "Who's Who in New England" in 1947; and to "Who's Who in the East" in 1951, where his biography is still to be read. He served on the English faculty of Tufts College for many years, and was during that period director of the bureaus of employment and publicity and faculty director of the Tufts Union. When radio was in its infancy he began broadcasting from old station WGI on Medford Hillside—before any commercial sets could be bought and when the broadcasting room was a little chamber only twice the length of a modern telephone booth. He was one of the first "radio uncles," and, as Uncle David, carried on for some years a children's period at WGI. When the burden of his other college duties made it advisable, he resigned, as "Uncle David," and was succeeded by Big Brother Bob Emery, who there began his distinguished career as an entertainer.

RADIO WORK

Dr. Cheney wrote one of the first literary compositions prepared especially for the radio, "The Golden Goblin, a Fantasy." Its popularity was such that, after being repeated 3 times, the little fantasy was published and some 10,000 copies sold. Music for one of the lyrics was written by Mrs. Leo R. Lewis, a well-known composer, and presented to Dr. Cheney—but the music has never been published, and Dr. Cheney plans to seek a publisher to revive the little booklet.

Dr. Cheney was educated at Clinton High School and left for Harvard before graduation. He had sold to Old St. Nicholas a short story in his sophomore year, and as a result was admitted to Harvard as a special student (at that time a unique occurrence) in 1904 without any examinations. In college he soon made the dean's list for scholarship, and while a student, by extra courses removed all his conditions, became a regular student at the close of his fourth year, and returned a fifth for his degree. He received his bachelor's degree in 1909 as of his class, 1908, with the old honor distinction in English, cum laude.

Mr. Cheney received his master's degree in history from Tufts College, in 1925. He taught advanced English composition at Harvard University for years, in association with the late Prof. Frank Wilson Cheney Hersey, in old English 22, an honor course. In 1941 he was appointed head of the course in advanced English composition, given by the colleges of Greater Boston as an extension course, under the direction of Harvard. This course was founded by the famed nature writer, Dallas Lore Sharpe, head then of the English department at Boston University. One of Dr. Cheney's predecessors in this work was the famed "Copey", Prof. Charles Townsend Copeland. The course counted for a degree in any college.

MANY BOOKS

Among the many books Dr. Cheney has edited have been Satyananda Roy's "My Boyhood in India," Dr. Meyer's "Seven Seals of Science" (used by many colleges, including M.I.T.), "Job Hunting and Getting," and Ruth Kilgour's beautifully illustrated and printed "A Pageant of Hats, Ancient and Modern" (Robert M. McBride & Co.) Mrs. Kilgour is the wife of Vernon Kilgour of West Boylston and formerly of Clinton.

For some years, Dr. Cheney conducted his own school for professional writers in Boston. During part of this period, he served as dean of the English department of Stanley College, which had given him the honorary degree of doctor of the art of oratory in recognition of his long teaching in Boston Public Library, and of his novel "Son of Minos."

Dr. Cheney married Miss Gratia B. Bryant in 1910, a cousin of William Jennings Bryan (her branch had added the "t"). Two children are living: Mrs. Walter Haynes Dunn, of Clinton, who sold her first poem to Good Housekeeping when only 20, and Mrs. Lewis Wellington Knaggs, of Traverse City, Mich., who sold her first poem to the Saturday Evening Post, stimulated by her sister's success, at 17.

There are six grandchildren: Walter Cheney Dunn, a freshman at Clark University; David MacGregor Dunn, president of the senior class at Clinton High School; Marcia Carol Dunn, of Clinton; David George Knaggs, Ann Marie Knaggs, and Robert Lewis Knaggs, of Traverse City.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroad: No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in my series of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles calling attention of Congress to the crisis on the commuter railroads, considerable stress has been placed on the obvious problems of safety and inconvenience to the commuters themselves.

There is, however, still another side to this issue—that of potential economic distress to a large, concentrated and prosperous interstate area served by the New Haven Railroad.

To highlight this particular side of the problem, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the Wilton, Conn., Democratic Town Committee with respect to the transportation problems created by the New Haven Railroad.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE WILTON DEMOCRATIC TOWN COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS CREATED BY THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD CO.

The New Haven train operation directly affects a large, concentrated and prosperous interstate area of which Wilton is a part. A concerted drive is necessary to correct conditions that any day may result in human disaster and, on a longer basis, severe economic distress. Every person in every community served by the New Haven is directly affected.

Twice daily the commuters are exposed to delay, discomfort and possibly injury or even death. The uncertainty of train arrival interferes drastically with business and, unless corrected, will compel these families to move away from Wilton to places nearer their jobs.

Local business in Wilton depends on the safe and reliable transportation of commuters from home to work and back. Our commercial enterprises are geared to this service.

All property values of every sort in Wilton are directly related to transportation and accessibility by rail. Removal of residents to places nearer their work will depress all values and leave the town less able to carry the heavy bond indebtedness incurred to provide schools for the present and anticipated population.

The breakdown of the New Haven's rail service thereby becomes an immediate threat to every resident of Wilton and its recovery is urgently necessary for the welfare of our town and all who live in it.

Moreover, this paralysis of service cannot be confined to the so-called commuter areas. A rotten spot soon and inevitably spreads over the whole apple. This problem not only requires statewide action but must enlist the attention of the whole of Connecticut.

The signs of this are plentiful. The rail service between Waterbury and Hartford has been suspended. The New Haven has declared that it will stop service on the Pittsfield line beyond Danbury. These are not commuter services. They affect the health and welfare of towns and cities all over the State.

There has been a great deal of talking and very little action while the situation deteriorated. It has reached a point where action can not be longer deferred.

Specifically, we ask examination by our public officials of the steps other threatened States and areas are taking, to develop plans for our protection and for area cooperation.

Massachusetts, having tried subsidy for the Old Colony branch of the New Haven, is investigating ways of taking over control and operating the line in the public interest.

Philadelphia is forming an Authority which will hire the Pennsylvania & Reading Railroads to run its trains under the Authority's control. If this becomes a subsidy, its use will at least be determined by public direction and in the public interest rather than by the railroad managements for their interest.

The Long Island Railroad has been transformed and, after its long and notorious failures, is apparently giving satisfactory service.

An alternative for the New Haven which should be investigated is enforced reorganization on the ground that the management has neither ability nor a program nor a desire to discharge its charter obligation of serving safely the public convenience and necessity. Mr. Alpert's seemingly single solution is to raise fares indefinitely, without a promise of giving better service, indicating that he is concerned only with the safety of railroad investors at the public's expense.

Other threatened or afflicted areas are more active in self-protection through their elected officials than ours is. They are providing ideas and programs which deserve to be studied.

We call on our Representative to call together all the Fairfield County members of the general assembly so that, as a group, they can persuade all other legislators that this is a statewide danger, a creeping paralysis which is already affecting them, requiring a statewide solution.

Transportation is a governmental obligation and is only delegated to private facilities in the belief that private enterprise is better able to keep the Nation's lifelines open with economy and efficiency. Whatever the cause of the disastrous plight of the New Haven, it must be eliminated and the service restored. The whole public must carry its proportionate share of the cost, properly protected, and this includes train riders, property owners, business enterprises, job holders, railway management, bondholders, stockholders, and perhaps even creditors.

Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a speech delivered by my good friend Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, chairman of the board of the Atlantic Coast Line and Louisville & Nashville Railroads.

I am certain that since we have several pieces of legislation pertaining to railroads pending before the Congress each Member would be interested in the statements contained in Mr. Wiggins' speech.

Mr. Wiggins has served as Under Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and has been one of our State and National leaders for a number of years. I hope every Member will take a few minutes of his precious time to read this speech:

RAILROADS

My comments on the railroad industry will be brief. I do not pretend to speak for the industry nor anyone else but will make some personal observations.

A logical conclusion seems to be that if the postwar deterioration of the railroad industry continues at its present pace without removal of the impossible handicaps under which railroads operate, some railroads are headed toward serious financial difficulties and the specter of the nationalization of the industry may rear its head by the end of the decade.

These handicaps are well known. They include (1) archaic, outmoded, and restrictive laws and regulations by Government—Federal, State, and local; (2) the competitive disadvantage of railroads in depending on user charges for their entire operating revenues while paying their full costs in competition with other forms of transportation that have the use of facilities and services and subsidies provided at the taxpayers' expense and are promoted and financed in part by Government agencies; and (3) operation under uneconomic contracts of employment that provide for payments for work not done and services not performed.

Railroads are regulated by both State and Federal Governments and have little freedom in pricing their services to reflect increasing costs. Competition with other modes of transportation, regulated and unregulated, imposes a ceiling on rates. With 65 percent of railroad operating expenses represented by labor costs, spiraling wages and increasing fringe benefits, along with uneconomic work rules and practices, have a devastating effect.

Here are some of the results of the past decade: (1) In spite of the general business prosperity in recent years and notwithstanding a net increase in property investment of over $4 billion, operating revenues of the railroads in 1958 were less than in 1948; (2) revenue ton-miles in 1948 of 638 billion had dropped to 552 billion in 1958; (3) revenue passengers decreased from 643 million to 380 million in the 11-year period; (4) net railway operating income in 1958 was only three-fourths of 1948; (5) the rate of return on investment in 1948 was 4.31 percent and in 1958 and 1959 the rate was about 2.75 percent; (6) average compensation per employee in 1948 was $3,594 and in 1958, $5,865, an increase of 63 percent; (7) in 1948, labor's

share of the earnings from direct railroad operations as related to capital's share was 82.7 percent and in 1958, 87 percent.[1] It is easy to see what the railroad situation will be if the trend of the past decade is projected through the 1960's.

I cannot believe that the American people will stand by and permit the railroad industry to go down the drain as private enterprise when all that is needed is equality of treatment of the railroads and equality of opportunity with other forms of transportation.

The U.S. Government recognizes the importance of rail transportation to other countries by making grants and loans to build, equip, and modernize their railroads. On the other hand, it is ironic that there is no executive agency of our Government that is primarily concerned with fostering policies to maintain a strong and effective railroad industry in this country. This fact becomes painfully apparent in the failure of the executive branch of Government to present an effective and adequate program to rehabilitate the railroad industry in congressional hearings that resulted in the Transportation Act of 1958. Other forms of transportation are fully and properly represented by agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The Interstate Commerce Commission cannot be the spokesman for the railroads. It is an independent, semijudicial body, responsible to Congress, having certain duties and functions affecting several forms of transportation but by its nature cannot help the railroads carry their fight for survival on a basis of equal treatment. Some agencies of Government actively oppose the railroads in hearings before the Commission in their efforts to obtain fair and equitable relief from inadequate compensation for services. Other departments go even further by pursuing a vigorous policy of diverting traffic from the railroads to other forms of transportation.

Clearly, the time has come for a reorganization of the various governmental agencies dealing with transportation, preserving the independence of the semijudicial bodies while bringing together the administrative and promotional agencies under a new department of Government headed by a Cabinet officer. Such department should include an agency or division charged with the specific responsibility of fostering equal treatment by Government of the Nation's essential railroad transportation system. A healthy, vigorous, and growing transportation system including the railroads is essential to sound economic growth in this country. Problems of unification and coordination as well as the difficulties presented in an industry that is regulated in part and unregulated in part can be served only by a unified department of Government devoted to the problems of transportation.

It may surprise you to know that while the railroads of the United States are suffering from financial malnutrition and inequitable treatment by Government, railroad facilities and operations in Russia are being multiplied with the result that the railroads of Russia in 1958 handled more ton-miles of traffic than all of the railroads of the United States combined.

Nor is it surprising that the common stock of some of the principal railroads in this country can be bought in the market for less than 15 cents on the dollar of their invested capital and many of the rest can be bought at from 30 to 50 cents on the dollar. Little wonder that railroad officers find difficulty justifying the borrowing of money at interest rates of 5 to 6 percent to make capital outlays when the average return on their investment is only 2.75 percent.

It has now become fairly obvious that the most effective, most economical, and most serviceable transportation can be provided only by more completely unified and integrated national transportation systems under unified corporate structures that will permit using the advantages of every mode and method of transportation. A revolution of thinking and a complete change of transportation law will be required to bring this about.

Railroad management has not been negligent in its efforts to promote efficiency, to effect economies, to improve services, and to meet competition. It has shown courage, ability, and vision. Vast expenditures for the dieselization of the railroads produced economies that saved many railroads from bankruptcy in the past decade. In spite of the difficulties of financing, capital investments for improvements of railroad plant and equipment exceeded $15 billion since the end of World War II. The railroads are utilizing the advantages of automation and of electronic equipment, installing pushbutton freight yards, multiplying trailer on freight car service, and are moving vigorously into the broad field of containerization. The possibilities of substantial savings by mergers are under study by a number of railroad managements. All that management needs is to be released from the shackles of impossible handicaps.

The handicap that represents a roadblock in utilizing modern equipment and methods to improve efficiency and reduce costs is the failure to modernize working rules and bases of compensation of employees to meet the technological advances of the railroad industry. Farsighted union leaders should recognize the necessity of utilizing the most modern techniques for reducing costs, improving service, and increasing productivity as the final resource out of which compensation of employees can come. It makes no sense for union leaders to vilify railroad managements in their efforts to strengthen the industry by programs to increase the productivity and the value of the services rendered by the employees. Based on a personal acquaintanceship with many railroad workers, I affirm that there is no finer group of employees and citizens in the country. They are honest, hard working, and loyal to the railroads by whom they are employed. Some of them are disturbed over the moral and ethical as well as the economic questions involved in some of the existing labor contracts. They want to do what is fair, and reasonable, and proper, in terms of their interests and of the railroads as well. They are looking for statesmanship in their leaders that will help strengthen the railroad industry. I am confident that in the course of time such leadership will emerge.

CONCLUSION

I have presented only a few of the hurdles and hassles of the 1960's that must be met if the growth of this country is to reach its highest potentials in the coming decade. There are, of course, many others that are significant and important.

What, then, should be our role in these developing contests of the 1960's? As business leaders, we believe that the operation of a free, competitive private enterprise system is the most productive and fruitful economic system the world has known and that its benefits are more widely distributed to more people than under any other system. As citizens, we believe that our system of democratic government with the protection of individual freedom is the most satisfying social and political system that man has been able to devise. We believe that both our economic and political systems must be grounded on integrity, honesty, and the recognition of the rights and the dignity of the individual human being.

Our first task is to increase our own knowledge of the operations and functioning of our economic system and see to it that such knowledge is transmitted to the public and particularly to the students in our schools and colleges. Although there is more information available today than ever before about the operations of our economy, there is collosal ignorance as to how it really functions and what gives it creative force. The essential nature of the market economy in which the consumer is the ultimate authority, is poorly understood. It is estimated that less than 5 percent of the students in schools are taught anything about the functioning of the private enterprise economic system and even that 5 percent receive only a smattering of knowledge. Even worse, they are being taught in many cases that the continued widespread improvement in the standards of living of the American people is not the product of our competitive private enterprise system but is the gift of a great and wise and benevolent Government. In all too many instances, they are being led to believe that a private profit system operating in a market economy is antagonistic to the interest of labor and of the consumer and that big government is their only protection.

Less than one-fourth of the graduates of colleges and universities receive any education in the field of economics. How can we expect to preserve our private enterprise system when the rising generation is largely ignorant of its functioning and of its essential contribution to the well-being and to the progress of the American people?

We should also ask ourselves, How can we expect our democratic system of government to promote a sound economy when it is so largely controlled by pressure groups that effectively use their political power to promote their own interests without regard to the public interest?

We should recognize that the final arbiter of the future of this Nation is public opinion expressing itself through political action. Here is a field in which business leadership is negligent, timid, and ignorant. Business leadership has failed to exercise the rights and duties of effective participation in democratic government through personal political action. It has surrendered the determination of policies and programs of Government to groups that are politically active and effective in seeking their own ends. Some of these powerful groups are dedicated to programs that are essentially socialistic and antiprivate enterprise. It is a lamentable fact that what we know as a capitalistic economy which derives its energizing force for growth and development from the savings and investment of millions of individuals has more detractors than supporters among the so-called liberal intellectuals.

The major challenge to the leaders in business, finance and industry in this country is to respond to their duties and opportunities by exercising their leadership in the field of public information to the end that the public will know and understand that our competitive, free enterprise system is the base from which springs the prosperity and well-being of the American people. They must then translate that philosophy into policies and programs of Government through effective personal political action. The year 1960 provides that opportunity.

Secretary of Commerce Mueller sums up the challenge to the American people in these words: "We stand at a crossroad in history. The American people are making

[1] The relative division of the sum of all salaries, wages, health and welfare charges, unemployment taxes—as representing labor—and net railway operating income as representing capital.

material and moral decisions that may well set the course of our Nation and our world for the remainder of the 20th century. Not only progress but survival itself is in the balance."

What Sensible Americans Ought Not To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article by George Todt. It appeared recently in the North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times:

In a recent address here, Harry Bridges has advised his cohorts to concentrate on three items in particular:

1. Insist on a summit meeting.
2. Send local delegations to the U.S.S.R.
3. Work tirelessly for disarmament.

Bridges' instructions are always interesting, if only to point up what sensible Americans ought not to do.

The question of disarmament is intriguing, of course—for many more reasons than may appear on the surface.

The predominant one is the fact that the Soviet Union talks of disarmament out of one corner of its mouth and, at the same time, prepares overtime for a destructive air-space-nuclear war of aggression.

It is impossible for any astute observer of the facts of this case to assume that the Reds' predilection for disarmament on its own terms can be aught than a cunning propaganda device to further its effective form of psychological warfare against the West.

We have been warned amply of this type of diversionary tactic by no less than Dimitri Manuilsky, former Soviet military chief of the United Nations Organization, who, speaking at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1931, prophesied:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we will need the element of surprise. The enemy will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them."

Manuilsky, now deceased, became chairman of the U.N. Security Council in 1949—which indicates that he was no small potato in the Red hierarchy. He knew what he was talking about. And 30 years from the date he spoke the lines just quoted would take us to 1961. How about that?

Unfortunately, the honeyed words of Ivan the Bear have already apparently taken their toll from the West. Most of our NATO allies in Western Europe have seized upon them to bring nearly to a halt their miserly contributions to our mutual security program.

Frankly, the effort put out by our talkative allies has been a miserable one when judged by any yardstick of measurement. Although the West Europeans were responsible for raising almost 500 army divisions in each of the two previous world wars, they profess to be unable to produce a couple of dozen today. They want us to do everything for them and they have almost milked the American taxpayer to death in the process. Recently there have been some official protests from our side.

Actually, it is time for Uncle Sam to put his foot down. It is patently impossible for America to fulfill her role as Warden of the Western Marches with her 180 millions of population while 300 millions of European allies sit on their backsides doing as little as possible. For the good of the latter, they must be weaned from our apron strings. And the sooner, the better.

What our Nation needs is a new and realistic look at the world situation—and we should put our allies on a firm quid pro quo basis exactly as Great Britain's brilliant Lord Castlereagh did in the days of the Napoleonic wars. The great Englishman played it this way: no quid pro quo, no money. Even prima donnas dance to this tune.

The modern American position in the same arena seems to have become: Take our money, and forget the quid pro quo if you wish to do so. As a matter of fact, our allies have apparently convinced our inept statesmen that it would amount to political blackmail if we were to attach any strings to our monetary grants. This is for the birds. Nobody deserves our money unless he renders us a service. Where is it?

The time has come for us to tell the Western European members of NATO to shoulder their own defense and to take care of the necessary aid to the underdeveloped nations our alliance is concerned with in the scheme of things today. Let them shoulder this portion of our burden—they are doing precious little of anything else.

As for the resultant savings, we should invest it in overwhelming air-space-nuclear supremacy which will give even the Reds pause in their diabolical plans to master the earth and its people.

Here at home, we should cut down on outdated ground and naval forces and concentrate on the most superlative air-space-nuclear qualitative weaponry which we can produce for ourselves. The future of free men and women on this planet may well depend on it. Can we afford to take chances?

Let the Republicans forget that Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, has been the foremost voice in this direction over past years—and get into the act of their own accord.

Let the Democrats stop making political hay so selfishly for themselves and bid correctly for bipartisan support on this great overriding issue of today.

And let the American people forget about partisan politics long enough to make sure they have the air-space-nuclear wherewithal to defend our flag against all comers in the future.

What better way than this to insure peace with justice in our time?

Adm. Husband E. Kimmel States His Position Regarding Relations Between the United States and Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter, dated January 17, 1960, which I received from Adm. Husband E. Kimmel, a distinguished Navy officer now in retirement, in which he expresses his views concerning the relations between the United States and Panama, with specific reference to the U.S. position in the Canal Zone. Admiral Kimmel's letter is reproduced here with his written permission:

JANUARY 17, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you very much indeed for sending me a copy of the address you delivered in the House on January 13, 1960, in regard to recent events in the Panama Canal Zone and their implications.

I hope your efforts to reverse the present policy of appeasement are successful. Unless this policy is reversed, the United States will lose control not only of the Panama Canal, but of the whole Caribbean area which in turn will lead to demands for further blackmail throughout Latin America and the world at large.

My best wishes for your success in this undertaking.

Most sincerely,

HUSBAND E. KIMMEL.

Renaissance International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the other day a leaflet of more than usual interest fell into my hands. It is a statement of purpose of a new intercultural organization known as Renaissance International, Inc., a nongovernmental, nonpolitical agency devoted to improving international understanding and friendship on a people-to-people basis.

Although Renaissance International is scarcely two months old, it has already attracted favorable comment by distinguished persons here and abroad. The first activity of the new organization will be an international seminar on world art to be held late in November 1960 here in Washington.

Because of its unique character and its devotion to the pursuit of excellence in all aspects of culture, I am taking the liberty of calling it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. From its statement of purpose and philosophy, I feel confident that it will make a significant contribution to the cultural life of the United States and other nations in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose of Renaissance International be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of purpose was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES OF RENAISSANCE INTERNATIONAL

AIMS

Renaissance International is a nonpolitical, cultural organization devoted to improving international understanding and

friendship on a people-to-people basis. It strives to safeguard and expand the basic concepts of freedom, liberty, and the dignity of the individual. It is dedicated to recapturing the Renaissance spirit in the 20th century: the pursuit of excellence in all human endeavors leading to genuine cultural values. It intends to establish facilities for social and academic meetings.

PHILOSOPHY

The philosophical framework for the organization was inspired by the ideas prevalent during the centuries of the European Renaissance from 1300 to 1600. Unprecedented scientific breakthroughs in recent years compare in many respects with discoveries of the 14th and 15th centuries. Once again we experience a need for pure research, discussion, self-criticism, and development of the arts, as well as the ardor for a more creative and abundant life. Culture determines a people's spiritual, mental, and material well-being. Excellence at all levels of achievement provides the base for culture. The self seeks instinctively for mastery and excellence—to nurture and encourage that mastery builds genuine culture. High individual performance is the mainspring of the dynamism to be emulated in the Renaissance philosophy.

MEMBERSHIP

Both sexes of any nationality may become members in RI. Each applicant will be judged by the degree of excellence achieved in his chosen field of endeavor. Election to membership will be for life.

PROGRAMS

RI plans to conduct international meetings on the arts, science, education, and philosophy. Initially, seminars will be held in Washington, D.C., and will consist of plenary sessions, lectures, and group dynamic discussions in special fields of interest. It is also planned to award fellowships in various fields to persons who have made outstanding contributions in the renaissance fields. In the overseas establishments, in addition to seminars, it is planned to offer daily programs featuring the finest in the arts, e.g. concerts, exhibits, and social events designed for the members' entertainment. The first Renaissance Society Conference is planned to examine a renaissance in world art through an international seminar to be conducted in Washington, D.C., in late November 1960. Artists, art students, professors, art collectors, and art historians, worldwide, will be invited to exchange ideas and information on the role of art in fostering international understanding and culture.

ORGANIZATION

Renaissance International, Inc., is a service corporation for the Renaissance Society. Stock may be purchased in Renaissance International, Inc., only as outlined in the offering circular. It is planned to build a society of about 10,000 international members.

FACILITIES

Initially, the society proposes to secure physical facilities in Washington, D.C., or in Rome, Italy. Subsequently, facilities may be established in Paris, London, and Frankfurt. Clubrooms will be decorated in the Renaissance motif. Original paintings, statuary, books, jewelry, and other objects d'art will be collected by the Society for display in its buildings; a restaurant, conference rooms, and other accommodations are projected. It is planned to contract for these facilities at the earliest practicable date.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Renaissance Society's advisory committee will consist of prominent persons of many nationalities recognized for their leadership qualities.

INFORMATION

A quarterly Renaissance Bulletin will be sent to all society members. It will contain programs of general interest in the fields of international communication, science, and education. The society maintains offices at 934 E Street NW., in Washington, D.C.

"Dead Hand at the Throttle"—The Damage to the Railroad Industry From Outmoded Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Daily News is entitled "Dead Hand at the Throttle." The dead hand refers to ancient Federal regulatory legislation which stifles the vital railroad industry.

While the editorial points out that repeal of these outmoded rules and regulations would not solve all of the problems plaguing this industry, it makes the telling point that relief would be a shot in the arm to the railroads and enable them to compete more fairly with other forms of transportation.

It is time to consider the problems of railroads now.

The editorial, which appeared February 2, 1960, follows:

DEAD HAND AT THE THROTTLE

A railroad strike could damage the country vastly more than even the 116-day steel shutdown. Negotiations between management and a number of the rail unions are continuing, but he pattern increasingly resembles the march of events which closed the steel mills. The two sides are far apart, with no sign of material concession by either.

The railroads say they can't pay the 12 to 14 percent pay increase demand by the unions and they raise the familiar issue of work rules. "Featherbedding," they say, is costing them $500 million a year.

Railroad men, meaning the crews which operate the trains, have traditionally been substantial citizens. There is, we think, much sympathy with their efforts to protect both their jobs and their pay scales.

On the other hand, the financial plight of the railroads is unquestioned. They have been plagued by punitive taxes and hog-tied with outmoded regulations which hamper their competition with other forms of transportation. The fact soon must be faced that there isn't much more blood in that turnip.

The situation as regards the locomotive engineers is near the breaking point. They have halted negotiations and will poll their 40,000 members on a strike. The firemen are in a similar position but have asked mediation. In all there are 711,000 railroad workers, rerpesented by 21 unions. A walkout by almost any of these could throw the others out of work and cause widespread further unemployment by halting the Nation's principal means of transportation.

Fortunately a strike cannot come abruptly. Under the Railway Labor Act, it must be delayed for 60 days while a factfinding board studies the controversy and makes recommendations. That would throw a strike—if there is to be one—sometime into the early summer.

Federal regulatory legislation, written when the rails were a virtual monopoly, keeps a dead hand on the throttle of this vital industry. Repeal of a lot of it would not magically solve all the railroads' troubles. But it would help. It would encourage aggressive managements to go after the business which would encourage investment in new equipment and provide workers a respectable wage.

Congress should give this matter serious attention while there still is time—rather than wait for an emergency requiring abrupt action to keep the trains moving.

No Housing Worries Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest there appeared an article about a housing development in the city of Portland, Oreg., pointing out some of the very fine things that have been done by private groups in providing housing for retired persons. The article's description of Willamette View Manor was a good one, and deservedly so. Portland is very proud of the work done to establish this apartment development for some of our senior citizens.

This effort by a distinguished Portland Methodist organization, standing alongside projected developments by other church and civic groups, is an outstanding example of what can be done by private citizens to meet the housing needs of retirees. It is a real credit to the State of Oregon, and to the dedicated people who have made it come true. To this extent, the Reader's Digest article was one which Portlanders could read with pride and approval.

However, the title of the article was extremely misleading and, taken at its face value, would have indicated a very incorrect picture of the housing situation in Portland as its affects retired people. The title was "No Housing Worries Here." That is simply not the case.

Mr. Gene Rossman, executive director of the Portland Housing Authority, has written to the Reader's Digest pointing out the serious housing problem which remains in Portland, in spite of the existence of Willamette View Manor, and other similar projects being developed or planned. A copy of his letter and an article which he prepared for the Digest was sent to me. Today I received a letter from Mr. Rossman informing me that his article had been returned by the Reader's Digest because it was not in line with the editorial requirements of Reader's Digest. It is unfortunate that this magazine should not feel free to print material correcting the false impressions which a prior article may have

given its readers. The conservative editorial policy of the Reader's Digest has long been sensed by most people but this admission that material showing that there is a housing shortage does not fit their editorial requirements is, in my experience, a uniquely frank one.

However, I do feel that the materials brought together by Mr. Rossman should be made available to the public, to combat the incorrect notion that there are no housing problems in Portland. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Rossman's letter to the Digest and the accompanying article at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

The letter and article follows:

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF
PORTLAND, OREG.,
Portland, Oreg., January 8, 1960.

MR. DEWITT WALLACE,
Editor, Reader's Digest,
Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WALLACE: Nothing could be further from the truth than the title of the story starting on page 193 of your January issue—"No Housing Worry Here."

From my vantage point as executive director of the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., I am in position to observe conditions, as they actually exist, that relate to the real problems on housing of a vast majority of our aging population in this area—and perhaps throughout the country.

Our recent physical survey of the private dwellings of Portland's more than 5,000 senior citizens who are recipients of old-age assistance alone revealed that over 75 percent of these oldsters are presently housed in critically substandard living quarters. The results of this survey were carried in the Nation's press and eventually encompassed three pages (14813–14815) of the August 18, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the U.S. Senate.

Attached is the story as I see it. I hope you will publish it, if only to keep the record straight. There is a housing worry here in Portland, Oreg.—a worry that has this responsible community really concerned.

This worry does not relate to the elderly who can afford to while away their golden years in beautiful, palatial retirement homes such as featured in your January issue. Our community's concern is that the less fortunate and by far greater proportion of our senior citizens may spend their declining days in dignity—housed in decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings.

Yes, Portland, Oreg., does have a housing worry—a problem that cannot be solved by such elaborate and expensive manors as the one you describe.

Sincerely,

GENE W. ROSSMAN,
Executive Director.

You don't have to be old to be poor, but it helps. Every passing day marks the 65th birthday for more than a thousand Americans most of whom have seen their earning capacity sharply reduced by on-rushing old age and their dwindling savings virtually wiped out by inflation, spiraling taxes, and the mounting cost of medical care.

In 1954, nearly half of the families headed by a person age 65 or older had a gross annual income of less than $2,000, and about two-thirds of all persons age 65 and living alone or with nonrelatives had an income of less than $1,000 a year. Subsequent surveys have indicated that the economic position of this country's aging population is progressively deteriorating.

"Fifteen million people in the United States are age 65 or over. Since 1900, the total population of the United States has doubled, but the number of persons 45 to 64 years of age has tripled, and the number age 65 and older has quadrupled"; these are statistics made public in January, 1957, by the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its "Fact Book on Aging." This report, although the latest of its kind, is now 3 years out of date, and nearly a million more people have since joined the ranks of the senior-citizen population of the United States.

While church and fraternal organizations are building Utopian retirement homes with built-in medical care for their elderly members of at least moderate wealth, what's to be done about housing and caring for the needy aging—a vast number of whom are living in disease-ridden, rotting slums?

A recent survey conducted by the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., revealed that of some 5,000 elderly persons who are recipients of old-age assistance in that city, more than 75 percent are presently housed in seriously substandard dwellings. Average gross monthly income of these senior citizens was determined to be $99.44. Doesn't approximately this same situation exist in almost every part of the country? Reports of similar surveys from other areas would so indicate.

While the 1959 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress plumps for larger unemployment benefits, more Federal aid for education, for medical research and scientific research, and while United Fund-Community Chest drives clamor for finances to aid youth movements and a variety of disease research programs—all worthy beneficiaries; who is really seeking a sound solution to the Nation's No. 1 internal economic and social problem: the housing and care of the indigent aged?

Our Nation's lawmakers are talking about generously expanded social security benefits in 1960—mainly of increasing the minimum pension from $33 per month to $40. What will this added $7 buy in terms of decent, safe and sanitary shelter, in terms of adequate food and clothing and proper medical care for our indigent oldsters whose numbers are multiplying so fast that last year's statistics are today woefully obsolete?

The fact that the United States pays out more than $2 billion a year in matching State and local aid to the needy aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children, is of small personal satisfaction to our growing population of senior citizens who face their golden years without funds or hope. Their meager share of the total welfare outlay gives them little expectation of spending their declining years in dignity.

Some say that people who don't have the fortitude and perseverance to save successfully for their declining years during their productive years do not deserve very much in the way of consideration. Yet how many of these less fortunate old people are hapless victims of our times, former productive citizens of considerable character and substance who have contributed their share, and more, in taxes, in community effort through church, fraternal, and civic activity, in service to their country in time of war? In the name of humanity, can their problem be ignored?

Portland, Oreg., does not presume to ignore their problem. On the drawing boards of the local housing authority are plans for a 10-story apartment house to provide 120 units of decent, safe, and sanitary housing accommodations for senior citizens of low income. The building will be located in downtown Portland near the present living quarters of the largest concentration of elderly persons on old-age assistance in the city. Such luxuries as glass-paneled shower stalls, featured by many private retirement homes for the well-to-do aged, will not be incorporated into this planned structure. Every effort will be made, however, to provide the basic safety and sanitation factors that will permit the aged tenants to live in comparative comfort and security—within the budgetary limitations imposed by the Federal Government. A review of the rentals presently paid by the 96 elderly tenants living in cottage-type permanent units of the Housing Authority of Portland shows the average monthly gross rent to be $32.57. Average gross monthly income of these tenants is $134.54. To be financially feasible, it would appear that—even with its Federal subsidy—this new project must charge a minimum rental of $45 per month. This will leave a pitifully small monthly balance from which the average tenant may be expected to meet the expense of barest necessities—food, clothing, and medical care.

Portland's public housing project for the elderly in the downtown area is being patterned closely after the very few similar projects already in successful operation throughout the Nation, notably in Cleveland, Ohio, and in New York City. A small area in the project will be made available for community-service activities, such as visiting nurses headquarters, TV room, crafts area, small library; but under Federal regulations these facilities may not be equipped or staffed through public-housing funds, and the local housing authority must rely upon contributions from local private and public agencies.

When completed, this new project will accommodate barely 3 percent of Portland's elderly persons who are recipients of old-age assistance alone and who are known to be presently residing in critically substandard living quarters. What about the other 97 percent? And what about the additional thousands of low-income elderly in the local area who are miserably subsisting on small pensions and/or social security and who are living in rundown family homes or walkup, cold-water flats?

Significantly, public awareness of this situation is being brought into sharp focus as such public works as Federal and State highway construction and local urban renewal development are displacing our indigent elderly at a rapid pace.

But what good is public awareness, really, when for lack of adequate Federal funds nothing substantial can be done to relocate these displaced, indigent oldsters in decent, safe, and sanitary living quarters at a price they can afford to pay.

Reports from other local public housing authorities throughout the Nation indicate that Portland's problem is not peculiar to this specific area, but exists to lesser or greater degree in metropolitan and rural areas all over the country. The main point is that local communities are unable to cope with it. It is a Federal problem.

According to recent news reports, Nikita S. Khrushchev seems to be currently taking time out from his saber-rattling to put his own house in order, to build economic security for his own people at home. Couldn't Uncle Sam take his hand off the holster for only a moment or two and divert just a few billions from "aid to foreigners" to "aid to our own aged"?

Birkett L. Williams Elected President of the National Automobile Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a Clevelander, I take great pleasure in di-

recting attention to the election of Mr. Birkett L. Williams, of my city, as president of the National Automobile Dealers Association at its annual meeting which is closing in Washington this week.

I first met Birkett L. Williams as a fellow member of the board of trustees of the Family Service Association of Cleveland, a united appeal organization, dedicated to the preservation of family unity in our community.

To Birkett Williams the obligations to the community come first. Clevelanders are thoroughly familiar with his work in the Red Cross, the Community Fund, the Boy Scouts, and Family Service Association, and a host of other civic organizations.

During World War II he served as OPA Director, an exacting assignment he carried out with dispatch and distinction. He also served a term as safety director of the city of Cleveland, a most difficult and demanding job which he handled with skill and with courage.

In the automotive trade in Cleveland, in Ohio, and throughout the Nation Birkett L. Williams is recognized as a symbol of business integrity in a business activity of tense and vigorous competition. For over 35 years as an automobile dealer in Cleveland he has developed and maintained the highest business standards of the industry.

Mr. Birkett L. Williams richly deserves the honor which the Nation's auto dealers have conferred upon him this week. The industry will be enriched by his inspiring leadership and his lasting contribution.

Lawyer-Pilots Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of the Congress the formation of the Lawyer-Pilots Association and am happy to note that its first national president is a resident of the first district of the State of New Jersey.

I have known personally several of the incorporators of this association and can attest to their civic-mindedness, their patriotism and their intense interest in all things pertaining to aviation.

The Lawyer-Pilots Association was incorporated as the Legal Eagles Association under an act of Legislature of the State of New Jersey, entitled "Title 15, of the Revised Statutes," and the several supplements thereto and acts amendatory thereof, being a corporation other than one for pecuniary profits.

The purposes for which this corporation is formed are to promote a spirit of fellowship within the legal profession for those having a pilot's interest in aviation; to promote general aviation safety; to promote cooperation with civilian agencies in times of emergencies and engaged in the welfare of our country; to assist in the drafting, interpretation and enforcement of laws affecting aviation in all of its phases; to study and attain more advanced proficiency and knowledge in the operation of aircraft; to stimulate aviation consciousness and acceptance in young men and women and to advance safe flying procedures.

The original incorporators were: Albert Rathblott, William G. Freeman, and the Honorable Alfred R. Pierce, all of Camden, N.J., Merrill Armour, of Washington, D.C.; Alfred L. Wolf and Frank Kingston Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Stuart M. Speiser, David C. Quinn and Howard G. Law, Jr., all of New York City.

The corporation held its first meeting on October 25, 1959, at the Concord Hotel, Monticello, N.Y., where the membership, by appropriate resolution, amended the certificate of incorporation to change the name Legal Eagles Association to the Lawyer-Pilots Association.

The first board of directors elected by the association were: Albert Rathblott, Camden, N.J.; Edwin Marger, Miami Beach, Fla.; Frank J. Docktor, Washington, Pa.; Lackland H. Bloom, St. Louis, Mo.; Herbert H. Freise, Walla Walla, Wash.; Margaret L. Lebair, Trenton, N.J.; Charles W. Sydnor, Sandston, Va.; Charles R. Conklin, Delta, Colo.; Robert N. Grosby, Norwalk, Conn.; Merrill Armour, Washington, D.C.; Somers T. Brown, Washington, D.C.; Don N. Kersten, Ft. Dodge, Iowa; Robert G. Lake, Pratt, Kans.; Ernest L. Bell III, Keene, N.H.; Howard G. Law, Jr., New York, N.Y.; Stuart M. Speiser, New York, N.Y.; Nicholas Zinni, Batavia, N.Y.; William A. Richards, Columbus, Ohio; John D. Starn, Fremont, Ohio; Jerry O. Stephens, Youngstown, Ohio; Dean L. Foote, Allentown, Pa.; Oliver N. Hormell, California, Pa.; Frank Kingston Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; Alfred L. Wolf, Philadelphia, Pa.; John A. Varone, Providence, R.I.; Sheldon N. Lelchuk, Miami Beach, Fla.; John W. Kitchen, Toledo, Ohio.

The officers of the corporation are: Albert Rathblott, national president; Edwin Marger, regional vice president, southeast region; Frank J. Docktor, regional vice president, northeast region; Lackland H. Bloom, regional vice president, central region; Hon. Herbert H. Freise, regional vice president, western region; Margaret L. LeBair, secretary; and Charles W. Sydnor, treasurer.

Membership in this association is open to all who are duly licensed lawyers and hold, or who have held, a valid pilot's certificate. Membership, for a term not exceeding 1 year from the date of the original application for membership, is available for duly licensed lawyers who hold a student's pilot certificate, with at least 5 hours of solo flight time.

The aim of the association basically concerns aviation safety and the democratic administration of the civil air regulations and appropriate statutes.

The association now has membership in 34 States and applications in process for membership in 12 additional States.

The States which now have members are as follows: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the Virgin Islands.

Applications are pending in Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Utah, and Vermont.

I wish the members well in their endeavors and am certain they will make definite contributions to the advancement of safe flying conditions and the progress of aviation in the United States.

Tax Benefits for Conservation Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been an unfortunate tax development affecting conservation organizations, including the Audubon Society with whose work and objectives most Members of Congress are familiar.

These conservation groups carry on outstanding programs to educate the public, safeguard our natural resources, and preserve the scientific, educational, and recreational areas of our country. Few, if any, will dispute the great work of these organizations, so much so that historically the Congress has granted special tax exemptions for conservation groups.

On the other hand, Congress has also sought to restrict abuses of special interest groups by curbing tax exemptions to those groups who among other things are attempting to influence legislation.

Current interpretations of this law are posing serious problems to conservation organizations although so far as I know no bona fide conservation group, certainly not the Audubon Society, devotes any substantial part of its activities to influencing legislation. Yet, if any activity of a conservation group can be identified as influencing legislation, for example, less than 5 percent in the case of a New England organization, the Internal Revenue Service may rule that the group is not entitled to the tax exemptions Congress has seen fit to grant.

Faced with this dilemna, conservation organizations must restrict their educational activities because this tax exemption is vitally important in insuring contributions without which few natural history or conservation groups could carry on. Thus those sound reasons which prompted the Congress to grant tax exemptions to conservation groups are being defeated.

In the light of this unfortunate situation, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today appropriate legislation to maintain tax-exemption benefits for nonprofit conservation organizations, presently entitled to such benefits under existing laws, even though some of their activities may include attempts to influence legislation. My bill would preserve for conservation groups tax benefits they now hold as distinterested spokesmen for the public interest in conservation matters.

The text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of charitable contribution) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The requirement of subparagraph (D) shall not apply in the case of any corporation, trust, chest, fund, or foundation whose principal purpose is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to list of exempt organizations) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" before "no part";

(2) by inserting "(B)" before "no substantial part", and inserting "(unless its principal purpose is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States)" after "the activities of which"; and

(3) by inserting "(C)" before "which does not participate".

SEC. 3. (a) Clause (ii) of section 2106(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of taxable estate) is amended by inserting after "no substantial part of the activities of which" the following: "(unless its principal purpose is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States)".

(b) Clause (iii) of such section 2106(a)(2)(A) is amended by striking out "no substantial part of the activities of such trustee or trustees, or of such fraternal society, order, or association," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "no substantial part of the activities of such trustee or trustees or of such fraternal society, order, or association (unless the principal purpose thereof is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States)".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2522(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable and similar gifts by citizens and residents) is amended by inserting after "no substantial part of the activities of which" the following: "(unless its principal purpose is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States)".

(b) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2522(b) of such Code (relating to charitable and similar gifts by nonresidents) are each amended by inserting after "no substantial part of the activities of which" the following: "(unless its principal purpose is to promote the conservation of natural resources in the United States)".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendment made by section 3 shall apply only with respect to the estates of individuals dying on or after such date. The amendments made by section 4 shall apply only with respect to gifts made in calendar years ending on or after such date.

"Dinner With Ike" Address of Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND 1951–59, "DINNER WITH IKE," RIVERSIDE, CALIF., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1960

In every presidential year a man who makes a party speech feels compelled, by custom if not by law, to make his address largely a recital of the triumphs of the administration, if his party is in power, or of the crimes of the administration, if it is out of power. But this year presents an unusual problem. Neither party is entirely in, nor entirely out, but half in and half out; and so it has been for 6 years.

In this unusual year, then, I propose to make an unusual speech, one that does not consist of a catalog of Republican triumphs, or of Democratic crimes for it is often the case that the overt acts of the administration, or of Congress, or of both, tell only half of the story of the times, perhaps much less than half.

Political whoop-la has its place in a campaign to stir up enthusiasm, but it is not with whoop-la that I propose to deal tonight. Rather, it is with the solid arguments of quiet and factual conversation.

For, proud as many of us are of the Republican Party and its accomplishments through the years, the tribute tonight is specifically to a man * * * a great leader of people, a great statesman in his own effective way, a great President of the United States.

For the party, there is glory enough in the fact that it gave to the country Dwight David Eisenhower.

For the times with which we have had to deal * * * and the conditions with which we have had to cope, we could have done nothing more magnificent.

There is precedence for this aptitude of the Republican Party to produce the man for a particularly trying—and especially dangerous—period of history.

Consider its achievements of exactly 100 years ago. Was all the legislation of the next 5 years, and all the administrative ability, and all the other services put together in one heap half as great a party triumph as having given the country Abraham Lincoln?

Do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to tell you that the modern President is another Lincoln, for the two men are different in many respects. But in one respect I maintain that they are exactly alike—each was the man for the times. Changing times call for men of different types, but the political party that presents to the country the kind of man that the times require has performed the greatest service that is within the power of a party.

I am not such a hidebound partisan as to denounce everything that was done in the 20 years preceding the first election of Dwight D. Eisenhower. They were extremely turbulent years, not in this country only, but throughout the world, and in such times a great many changes have to be made in great haste, which makes it morally certain that there will be great mistakes. So it was in the case of America, and yet, with all the mistakes, we made some definite and valuable political, social, and economic gains in that period.

But the more rapidly a country is advancing, the sooner comes the day when its first necessity is to pause, take stock, and correct the errors into which it is sure to have fallen. That is always a critical moment, for there are always those whose desire is to convert the pause into a retreat. It is extremely difficult to find a man with the rare combination of qualities required for that situation. He must be able to pause without taking a backward step. He must be ready also to move ahead when the time to move is ripe. He must be able to weed out errors without throwing away gains, and we have Scripture for it that to pull up tares without destroying wheat is an all but impossible task.

The first requirement, of course, is high intelligence, but it is only the first. Many a brilliant man would make a hopeless President. The second requirement is utter devotion to the country, but that is not all. There are sincere patriots who could not possibly lead the country anywhere except into trouble. The supreme requirement for such a situation as we faced in 1952 was neither brilliance nor patriotism, but the ability to command the confidence of the millions who must entrust their destinies to the President's hands. This elusive, indefinable quality Lincoln had, and Eisenhower has, and in that respect I do not hesitate to say that the Republican Party's gift to the country in 1952 is worthy to be compared to its gift in 1860.

Nor was this a service to the United States alone. After more than 30 years of practically incessant warfare—for even during the long armistice of 1919-39 there were small wars smouldering somewhere almost without cessation—the world was uneasily and laboriously adjusting itself to a new order when Eisenhower took the helm of our ship of state. It is impossible to overestimate the value, not to us alone but to all Western civilization, of having at the head of one of the two dominant military powers a man whose integrity was so far above suspicion that detraction itself could not attack it.

I hold high the values of diplomatic skill, of clever statecraft, of historical learning, of judgment of men, and all the other attributes that a successful political leader must have. Dwight Eisenhower is proficient in all of these. Yet when they have all been added together there is one thing bigger than the whole sum, and that thing is known to us by the one word "character." It is in this factor that the President stands head and shoulders above the vast majority of men in public—or private—life, and it is this that has given him the greater part of the power that he has wielded throughout the world.

I remind you that he, for 40 years a soldier by profession, and not only that, but one who in 1944 commanded the most gigantic assemblage of military power ever entrusted to a single officer, has for nearly 8 years exercised more power in the world than he had when he commanded the Normandy invasion, and that without touching the sword.

This is, I submit, one of the most remarkable records of all times, but it happens to have an illustrious precedent in American history. It is not the first, it is the second time that it has been accomplished in this country. At the very beginning of our national history, which was, like the present, a time of doubt, uncertainty, and difficult

adjustment to a new order of things, we raised to the highest office an American soldier who proved to be even greater in peace than he had been in war. But the solid rock on which this Nation was founded was not the intellectual brilliance, nor the profound learning, nor diplomatic skill, but the sheer character of George Washington

When one considers the magnitude of perils through which our country has been threading its way, it becomes evident that all the fine positive accomplishments of President Eisenhower are more than matched by his brilliant avoidance of appalling errors in the face of powerful forces that sought to thrust him into them. In a world bristling with hatred and suspicion, he did not lead us into war. In a world slowly recovering from the most damaging wars ever fought, he did not lead us into wild inflation. A wounded and outraged country, he did not permit to drift into ruinous self-pity and churlish solitude. Under severe provocation from an inveterate foe, he did not allow exasperation to betray him into rash action. Constantly harassed by those who foolishly dream of setting back the hands of the clock, he steadily required of America 20th-century action in a 20th-century world.

This is the leader who was the Republican Party's gift to the Nation at a critical moment in history. I do not say that it was the one greatest gift that a political party ever made. But I do assert that to find its equal, you must go back to Lincoln and Washington.

On that showing I am content to rest the party's case before the country and the world. Certainly there is plenty more to be said and in the course of the campaign it will be said; but all the rest is in the nature of what lawyers call corroborative testimony. The last, final proof of a party's value is not in its legislative brilliance, nor in its political skill. It is in the party's ability at a time of crisis to come up with a man with the qualities of mind and heart that enable him to meet that crisis.

Since no two crisis are ever exactly the same, a different type of leader is required each time. We did not need a Washington in 1860. We did not need a Lincoln in 1952. But we did need a Washington in 1789, we did need a Lincoln in 1860, and we did need an Eisenhower in 1952. The type of leadership required at any specific time is a detail. The test of a party is always to be ready with the man. The Republican Party met that test in 1952, which is its best possible claim to the confidence of the people.

And the leader of these momentous years is possessed of aonther magnificent gift * * * the ability to gather about him and to inspire other men of dedication, other men of faith in America and in the ways of freedom, other men who place the country above themselves * * * men, for example, like the late John Foster Dulles of cherished memory * * * men like Dulles' illustrious successor, Christian Herter * * * and men like the President's own partner in political campaigns and his aide and confidant in the complex affairs of modern government * * * RICHARD MILHAUS NIXON.

Yes, we have more than justified our existence as a political party and have established a valid claim to the trust of the people through the leadership that we have furnished to our country in times of past and present crisis.

And we are prepared to continue to do so in these times of continuing crisis.

As the campaign develops there will be time enough to go into secondary details. But at the start I maintain that we should go before the country reminding all Americans that today, as in the long ago, when the country faced difficulty and danger, we are the party that could and did bring to the conduct of public affairs one more warrior who is also "first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Hazleton (Pa.) National Bank Celebrates Its 70th Anniverary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory from the Hazleton Plain Speaker of Monday, February 1, 1960:

HAZLETON NATIONAL BANK, FOUNDED FEBRUARY 1, 1890, IS CELEBRATING ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY

The Hazleton National Bank is now celebrating its 70th anniversary.

Founded February 1, 1890, by an active and alert group of bankers and other businessmen, its growth over the years presents a cross section of the expansion and development of the city itself.

The original site of the banking house was on the south side of Broad Street, between, Laurel and Wyoming, almost opposite the present location at the northwestern corner of Broad and Laurel Streets. The site originally taken was the former location of the Hazleton Savings Bank, purchased by the Hazleton National Bank to house the new financial institution.

Twice the property was remodeled to accommodate the ever growing business of the Hazleton National Bank. The original side walls were retained through the two remodelings but Hazletonians remember best today the second alterations, vestiges of which remain in the front of the Singer Sewing Machine Co., which now occupies the premises vacated August 15, 1924, when the Hazleton National Bank main office moved into its present location.

FIRST PRESIDENT

The first president of the Hazleton National Bank was Augustus S. Van Wickle, coal operator, who produced anthracite at Milnesville, and at Coleraine in those earlier days.

The first vice president was Elliott P. Kisner, "sage of Kastanienwald," whose name lives in the first syllable of "Kis-Lyn" school created for delinquent boys as an outcome of the philanthropic activities. Mr. Kisner pushed aggressively through his long and busy life.

The original board of directors was E. L. Bullock, Beaver Brook coal operator; H. B. Conahan, hero of the Stockton mine disaster of 1868, prominent contractor, former select councilman and former city assessor; William Schwartz, leading merchant in those days; T. D. Jones, coal operator; A. M. Eby, civil war hero, who was cashier and secretary for many years; Elliott P. Kisner, E. A. Oberrender, of the Coxe coal mining official staff; A. S. Van Wickle, John E. Kern, prominent local resident; Dr. F. M. Brundage, Conyngham doctor who served as U.S. Consul to Aix La Chapelle, Germany; F. W. Cooper, son of a Harleigh coal operator; J. E. Roderick, State chief of the Bureau of Mines; Henry Knies, pioneer merchant; H. E. Sutherland, Hazleton stationer; A. M. Eby and William Lauderbach, founder of Lauderbach & Co.

EARLY DIRECTORS

From its inception, the Hazleton National Bank was fortunate in having the sound advice and business experience of leaders in the banking, industrial, and commercial life of Hazleton. Among those who served it as directors were Ario Pardee, Philip V. Weaver, Dr. H. B. Casselberry, John G. Kirschner, J. B. Hutchison, A. F. Wendel, J. Elmer Jones, Dr. Harry Keller, I. P. Pardee, and James Lee Pardee.

When the bank building at Laurel and Broad Streets was occupied in 1924, the official setup was: president, I. E. Pardee; vice presidents, Frank Pardee and James Lee Pardee; cashier, Bert E. Kunkle; assistant cashier, H. J. Swettman; directors, Frank Pardee, I. P. Pardee, Harry W. Jacobs, Bert E. Kunkle, James Lee Pardee, Dr. H. M. Keller, George B. Markle, Jr., John H. Wettstine, Benjamin F. Morse, John W. Crooks, Patrick J. Fynn, and John F. Reed.

The bank was incorporated with a capital of $100,000, but this was increased on September 1, 1906, to $200,000, and on November 1, 1923, to $500,000. On November 16, 1959, the capital was increased to the present figure of $750,000. The State banking department authorized the Hazelton National Bank on November 27, 1916, to conduct a trustee business, qualifying it to conduct this important community service and thus equipping it to care properly for all the banking needs of the steadily growing community.

PRESENT OFFICIAL FAMILY

Main office:

James F. Koch, president.

Robert S. Gicking, executive vice president and cashier.

William L. Morse, vice president.

John P. Brew, vice president and trust officer.

James F. Koch, Jr., and Robert K. Gicking, assistant vice presidents.

Rocco D. Fescina, Wilson F. Hill, Edward L. Miller and Robert T. Wagner, assistant cashiers.

Arnold Krause, assistant trust officer.

Michael Tomasko, auditor.

West End Branch, Robert F. Schmauch, branch manager.

Leighton Branch, Allen S. Mertz, assistant cashier.

Weatherly Branch, Wilbur D. Nyer, assistant cashier.

Weissport Branch, L. A. Bisbing, assistant cashier.

The present directors are: John P. Brew, George M. Chisnell, Arthur B. Deisroth, John M. Dyson, George E. Freeby, Robert S. Gicking, Joseph J. Humphries, Mahlon M. Kistler, James F. Koch, William L. Morse, Thomas H. Probert, and John W. Reidler.

FINANCIAL GROWTH

In July 1890, the year the bank had been started the previous February 1, deposits were $223,000, and 6 months later they had increased to $590,000. In the next few years they grew to past the million mark reaching $1,070,204.89 on January 1, 1894. On January 1, 1904, 10 years later, the deposits had grown to $2,162,747. Again up to 1924 the deposits had doubled, being on January 1, 1924, $4,763,694.45.

On January 1, this year, the report shows deposits of $28,067,557, and total assets of $31,043,064. This total did not include $4,440,750, incorporate trusts and $13,635,107 individual trusts.

An Open Letter to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is the right of every American to petition the leaders of his Government in behalf of projects or causes in which he believes. Mr. Juan Rivera, Sr., editor of the International, a newspaper printed six times per year in Presidio, Tex., has recently written an open letter to President Eisenhower. The letter to the President was published in the International and gives the Chief Executive certain recommendations in connection with desired projects in Presidio. Although Mr. Rivera's paper has subscribers in many States, I am not certain it will reach the President's eyes. Therefore, in order that the letter to President Eisenhower may reach official channels, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter at this point in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. President D. D. Eisenhower, you as our great President of the United States of America, who has been liberal in giving aid to foreign countries and in helping them build their cities after the wars.

I request and ask you, why don't you appropriate some money and improve this forgotten village of Presidio, Tex., which is 200 years back of prosperity and progress? This village is not corporated so therefore there is no local government to find ways and means to improve this old Presidio village.

This village hasn't got any payroll, as there isn't any industry of any kind, farmers and merchants can't finance any project for the good of the village because they all are just making a living and paying taxes including myself.

For the sake and health of Presidio citizens, I request a sewer system and a potable water system. The citizens that are able to install their own water system has got their own sewers to cesspools in their yards and as the terrain is sand and gravel probably the cesspool contents are seeping through the sand direct to their water system.

Mr. President I also request to please appropriate some money so that an emergency hospital be build in Presidio because Presidio is 60 miles from the railroad and about 150 miles from the nearest hospital.

Mr. President, if you are continuing with your foreign aid program, please appropriate some money to Presidio so that a flood control can be build in behalf of the farmers whose cotton harvests are in constant danger of Rio Grande floods every year.

Presidio really needs some of that foreign aid money and can use it to great advantage especially on the projects I have mentioned above. You don't know the condition of Presidio village until you come and see for yourself or send down a committee of inspection.

Mr. President, I want to let you know that Presidio village is the poorest in the United States of America, but its citizens have been complying with every State, country, and county tax law. In spite that we all just work for a living.

In 1935 and during the depression period the WPA built roads and schools all over the country and not a cent was spent in Presidio village to build the most important projects for the health and welfare of its citizens.

So therefore, Mr. President, this letter is a petition in the name of Presidio citizens, farmers, businessmen and merchants, and I beg you to please appropriate some cash to build at least those necessary projects I have above mentioned without delay.

Wishing you grant my important request, I beg to remain as ever,

Your most loyal citizen,

JUAN RIVERA, Sr., *Editor.*

Happy Groundhog Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the Remington News Letter published by the Remington Arms Co., Inc., J. P. Linduska, editor, of Bridgeport, Conn., entitled "Happy Groundhog Day":

HAPPY GROUNDHOG DAY

Come the heat and drought of late summer, he dozes in the cool confines of his burrow. That's estivation—of a sort. The winter he spends in deep sleep. That's hibernation. And on his own day in February he reveals the nature of spring weather to follow. That's long-range prognostication.

"But the groundhog's more than a prize sleeper and prophet," says Joe Linduska, director of public relations and wildlife management for Remington Arms Co. "He's a liability and an asset, nuisance vermin and prized game, a builder of homes for indigent rabbits and a razer of homes for indignant vacationers.

First off, he's a topflight engineer and a soils expert of no small skill. It's not often you'll find a drowned-out woodchuck den. They pick their sites carefully—well-drained sidehills with a view. And where they have a choice, they select their soil type with even greater wizardry. In Connecticut, a survey of woodchuck excavations showed they were unerring in the selection of sandy loam. The accuracy of their judgment in this department was short of amazing since the area was a patchwork of soil types.

After deciding on the place, time is no problem to a woodchuck. He has all summer and digs a little now and again as his mood moves him. Some are shiftless and settle for basement apartments of utility size with a single opening. Others are like folks converting old barns. They add a room here and a door there with the result that some deep-down dwellings are elaborate affairs. In Michigan one excavated den had over 56 feet of tunnel and 5 entrances. Some go down over 6 feet but the average maximum depth is nearer 4 feet.

A little superstructure appears desirable with the result that brush piles are favorite spots for a tunnel entrance. Abandoned buildings the same. And summer cottages frequently turn up with adjoining basements that weren't in the plans.

Like country folks in summertime, the woodchuck has lots of company, too—except his come in the dead of winter. Skunks, opossums and rabbits aplenty all drop in. But the proprietor doesn't mind—in fact, he doesn't even know they're there. He's in deep sleep in private quarters sealed off from the den proper. His normally rapid heart beat (up to 200 per minute) is slowed to a chug—chug of 4 to 5 beats per minute. And his body temperature is reduced, too, from a normal 37° C. to 8. It all tends to conserve energy during the long 6-months sleep and abstinence from food.

Dig out a woodchuck den in winter and you're likely to find most anything—anything, that is, except the owner and regular tenant. The hibernating cell is so skillfully sealed off that it's seldom you can spot it from the main tunnel. But skunks you'll find, sometimes a dozen or more, huddled together in deep sleep. Mostly they're all females.

Rabbits, too, will take to "holing-up" in rough weather. In Michigan a study was made to determine the extent of den use by cottontails. Ferrets were run through 181 woodchuck burrows and rabbit occupancy was correlated with temperatures. Below 12° F. "holing-up" was three times as prevalent as at temperatures above this level.

In spring—even early February in some places—groundhogs begin to surface. They breed soon after emerging from dens and 31 to 33 days later, they have 4 to 6 young 'uns. They eat, and lie in the sun, and eat and eat.

They're not what you'd call fussy eaters and will try most anything green. Alfalfa, clover, dandelions and my cantaloupes are favorite foods. Most any garden vegetable suits them fine—even onions.

For a burrowing critter that spends more than half his life underground you might expect him to be ungainly on the ground. He's not. Like the overweight executive type, his gait's a little ambling. But he can make good time under pressure. And he can shinny up trees and do a fair job of swimming. I've seen them—of all places—sitting on a fence post. And this summer we thought we had a beaver in one of our duck ponds. It turned out to be a well-larded 'chuck leisurely paddling across the 10-acre pool.

More than any other animal, the groundhog has led to the development of that special breed of rifleman—the "varminter." In advanced classes of this select school the challenge lies not in numbers bagged but in 'chuck to rifle distance. The result is stalking in reverse.

Upon spotting his quarry, the purist walks or drives away from it until it all but fades from the naked eye. Then he hauls it back up with a 10-power scope, and with sandbags and careful reckoning of wind, trajectory and other variables he squeezes, hoping for that shot he'll remember. First it's 400 yards, then 450—500—.

On a first exposure to the sport, mine came last spring, 550 yards if a foot. For a week I was elated. Then questioning glances forced an exact measurement. Well, it was still enough to add a convert to the cult.

Mikoyan Will Like It in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times this morning, I believe is self-explanatory. I should only like to add this footnote.

It is indeed lamentable that Deputy Premier Mikoyan can now do his nefarious work in Cuba only because of the added dignity that he acquired when he was invited to visit the United States last year. I had warned in my maiden speech before this Congress that the United States was making a tragic mistake in gracing this Communist conspirator with dignity by arranging various receptions in his honor during his visit to this country. By its actions, the administration has virtually put itself in a "straightjacket" and can today hardly warn the Cubans against the high price they must ultimately pay for any cooperation with the Soviet rulers when the administration, itself, has dignified the Soviet rulers in our own country.

Perhaps Mr. Mikoyan's work in Cuba will open the eyes of the formulators of our own American foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

MIKOYAN WILL LIKE IT IN CUBA

Russia's deputy premier, Anastas Mikoyan, will feel very much at home on his visit to Cuba this week to open the Scientific and Technical Exposition. He will find the sovietization of the country proceeding at a pace rivaling that of Russia, itself, after the 1917 Revolution. Confiscation of private property is moving rapidly, and the nationalization of industry and agriculture is well underway. Thought police are being installed and the entire population is being urged to inform on nonconformist neighbors. Courts are being subverted to serve the political needs of the Castro dictatorship. What's left of the free press is being systematically hounded and bullied toward subservience.

Now, quite evidently, a new phase of the sovietization program is in the making—the forging of strong economic and cultural ties between Cuba and the Soviet Empire. Mikoyan, a leading Russian trade expert, will discuss increased commerce, and presumably the stepping up of the exchange of Soviet and Cuban technical personnel—a process already in active motion. Along with Mikoyan, trade missions from other Iron Curtain countries are arriving in Cuba with attractive mutual trade proposals.

Thus, the prospect of a new Soviet satellite 90 miles south of our continental borders increases day by day. Perhaps next week Prime Minister Fidel Castro will entertain the notion of building a few Red missile bases—say, where the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo now stands.

In the light of all this, President Eisenhower's policy of turning the other cheek for the sake of the Cuban people, becomes more difficult each day. The time is near when a total fresh look will be needed lest our concern for the Cuban people become as academic as our concern for the people of Russia has been for the past 43 years.

Major Coal Mining Operations at Dupont, Pa., Gives Way to Strip Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was featured in the Dupont news section of the Pittston Sunday Dispatch of January 31, 1960:

STRIP MINING WIPING OUT LAST TRACE OF MAJOR COAL OPERATION—PENNSYLVANIA'S THOMAS SHAFT MADE JOBS FOR THOUSANDS FROM BOROUGH

One of the major mining operations, that employed hundreds of Dupont residents at its peak in the 1920's came to its end this past week after some 76 years of mining.

All the landmarks, buildings, and shafts and small gage railroads that were used for maintenance, repairs to mine cars and motors, and the transportation of coal from the mine to the breaker are completely gone from the area. The reason for their disappearannce was stripping work that began in the area this past week by the Kaminski Brothers Excavating Co., of Pittston Township.

The mining operation that disappeared from the scene last week was the Thomas Shaft Colliery of the Pennsylvania Coal Co., Dunmore. The colliery was located about one-half mile with the western boundary line of Dupont Borough, and will be remembered for a long time because at one time or another most everyone from Dupont who worked at mining worked at the Thomas Shaft Colliery.

PEAK IN THE 1920'S

Despite the fact that the colliery began operating sometime about 1884 it reached its peak production in the 1920's when it was estimated that some 2,000 workers were employed at the colliery with the majority of them from Dupont Burough. And to top it all 99 percent of the working force all worked steady day-shift. The other 1 percent can be accounted for by maintenance men who cared for mine pumps, firemen who attended the boilers in the firehouse, watchmen, and so on.

It was also estimated that the coal produced at the colliery and its subsidiary slopes amounted to nearly 5,000 tons daily, more or less.

SUBSIDIARY SLOPES

The colliery operated four subsidiary slopes that produced coal at full capacity in the 1920's, and employed hundreds of coal miners. The slopes were the Butler Slope, that was located some 2,000 feet west of the main mining shaft; the Pepe Slope, about 3,000 feet in a southeasterly direction from the main shaft; the Hennigan Slope, about 4,000 feet beyond the Pepe Slope in the same direction from the main shaft, and the Fernwood Slope, at New Boston Settlement.

All the slopes were served via small-gauge locomotive transportation that used two locomotives to transport the loaded and empty mine cars between all slopes of the colliery. The locomotives also supplied cars for the sandpits that operated in the Ziegler Grove area of Dupont.

Today the area around the old Pepe Slope is a built-up area and is occupied by the Comerford Outdoor Drive-in Theater, Charles Vullo Recapping Co. and the Custard Bar on route 315, better known as the Dupont-W.B. Highway.

The Old Hennigan Slope is covered by the Pennsylvania Turnpike right-of-way and its toll gate. The Fernwood is also covered by the turnpike right-of-way.

The Pepe Slope was last operated by the late Peter Minchello of Pittston and was abandoned in the late 1930's. The Hennigan Slope was last operated by the Volpe Coal Co. and was also abandoned in the late 1930's. The Fernwood Slope, last operated by the Sussex Coal Co., was also abandoned in the late 1930's. The Butler Slope was last operated by Barney Guzior Coal Co. and was abandoned just about 1 year ago.

LARGE UNDERGROUND AREA

Some of the mine chambers and heading roads in the mine workings were driven for miles in all directions. One particular road that travelled the longest distance in the Thomas Shaft working was Miller's Heading, driven by the late George Miller Brostowski of McLean street, Dupont. Miller's Heading began off Rock Plane and went in a westerly direction for 2 miles more or less. Some of the workers that walked Miller's Heading to get to their mine chambers say that they used to work under Yatesville Borough. Miller's Heading ended at Maryland Plane Slope. This Maryland Plane Slope had eight lifts or heading roads off in a left direction which were called the Balcony Road; Graveyard Road; Barber's Heading; Molley's Airway; Stanzaks; No. 6, 7 and 8 lifts, and all were driven for nearly another mile in a left direction. It is small wonder that the mineworkers of the shaft called it the Maryland Section of Thomas Shaft; with supplies on the miner's back it was like walking to the State of Maryland.

OTHER HEADINGS

From the shaft other roads led to Old Boston, the Creek section near the old Florence Colliery in Dupont, and to Jenkins Junction in Jenkins Township. The main heading leading to Old Boston and Jenkins Junction was called Ferrick Road and the heading leading to the Creek section was called the Creek Section Heading Road. The Creek Section was considered a prize section to work in. In the Creek section the late Tony Rose Adonizio got his first mining contract, and from there went on to form his own coal company.

UNDERGROUND MULE BARN

Not far from the shaft in a southern direction the mine had an underground mule barn where the mules were rested, fed, and watered before starting a new day of work hauling coal. The mules were only taken from the mines when they were hurt, or during a long period of idleness, or other restoration purposes as defined by the barn boss. When the electric mine motors started to replace the mules for hauling the mules were removed and sold and the mule barn was converted into a sanding and drying plant and motor barn.

MINE FOREMAN'S OFFICES

On many occasions in the past you may have heard someone wise crack that he was looking for a job washing windows in the mines. Well this occupation could have been fulfilled at the Thomas shaft, for the mine foreman's offices in the mines had many windows in them. Why they were put in it would be hard to say, but they were there. The mine foreman's office near the shaft was constructed from red brick. And all the mine roads or tunnels near the shaft were plastered with concrete and were whitewashed, and gave the appearance of subway tunnels in New York City.

OUTSIDE BUILDINGS

Getting back out from the mines, the outside buildings were kept immaculately clean, including a well-cut lawn with many flowers and shrubbery.

The main office building that was used by the mine superintendent employed around 20 clerks, whose occupation was preparing the mine payroll and other records of mining, had a lawn with flower beds trimmed and marked off with whitewashed rocks. The lawn had a 60-foot flagpole where Old Glory waved every day. The roads around the colliery and the road leading to Dupont was graded well and was covered with neat red ashes. Other buildings that were near the shaft were the electric shop, dual shifting shanties for the miners, a large car-repairing shop, a locomotive barn, dynamite supply houses, fan houses, and three engine houses.

All in all, the operation looked like a good-sized community.

FAMOUS BASEBALL TEAM

The Thomas Shaft Car Shop had a famous baseball team in the twenties. The team had a baseball field near the car shop and practiced daily during the lunch hour. The team featured Johnny Hughes, Tosh Mullins, Ernie Cochrane, Birdie Stahl and others.

Also located on the premises near the Thomas Shaft was its own reserve water reservoir—and it contained fish. Many of the local boys, who drove cows in the area, spent their time fishing and swimming at the water reserve when their cows were grazing in the pastures nearby.

Also located near the shaft was a large mule barn building, loading ramps and storing platforms for heavy equipment and motors. Fire hydrants with sheds built around them were at various locations.

OTHERS ALSO GONE

Other major mining operations that completely vanished from Dupont borough during the last 30 years were the "Big Shaft" of the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., between the Laurel Line tracks and the D. & H. Railroad, and the Florence Coal Co. that was located at the site of the Dupont Little League of today.

Looking at the site today one would never know that a major colliery once operated there. They would never dream that once upon a time the site was a thriving industrial operation for mining anthracite.

Whether it be man marches on or time marches on, regardless of who marches on the major coal mining operations of Dupont are gone. They are no longer with us—only the history remains.

Education and Adm. Hyman G. Rickover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Galveston (Tex.) Sunday News of January 31 carrier a thoughtful editorial which concerns our educational system in general and the opinions of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in particular. As a reflection of local interest and sentiment the editorial is worthy of close study and attention by the Congress and by others who may have a part in shaping the destinies of the youth of our land.

The editorial follows:

VOICE IN THE WILDERNESS

The many public declarations of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, "father of the U.S. atomic navy," on what he considers deficiencies in our country's education system have not been widely heeded by school authorities and the Nation at large.

Chosen as a member of the entourage of Vice President RICHARD NIXON on a visit to Russia last year, Admiral Rickover made some keen observations of the education systems in Russia and the satellite captive nations.

Already aware of the fact that the school systems of the advanced nations of Western Europe are far ahead of American schools in the basic studies of the arts, sciences and humanities, the admiral reported some startling news about the thoroughness of Soviet education in such fields as science and languages.

Rickover's report at first was widely hailed in America as highly worthy of note and it seemed for a time there would be swift action leading to corrective measures.

More recently, the admiral has observed that there has been no appreciable corrective action toward strengthening American education, particularly in the public schools.

He attributes the weaknesses in our system principally to nonacademic school activities such as sports and "made" teacherships in other fields that have little bearing on training the mind and equipping students with basic academic knowledge.

Admiral Rickover feels that the quickest approach toward strengthening our schools would come through the establishment by the Federal and State governments of permissive educational standards.

He points out that we have such standards for foods, drugs, cosmetics, communications, tobacco and liquor, railroads, airways, etc., so why not have them for education, which is vital to all progress and security?

Like so many progressive movements, educational progress stems from needs and demands at the grassroots. Once our Government leaders realize that our people will not remain satisfied to see our schools lagging behind those of other advanced nations, State and National permissive standards for education are likely to come into being.

One logical approach in strengthening the Nation's educational efficiency and prestige would appear to be through the organization of Rickover Education Clubs across the Nation. By working closely with PTA, other educational and civic groups, and with school officials, these clubs likely could bring the admiral's message to the action level.

Since there can be no solid refutation of Admiral Rickover's views and observations, it is high time they be heeded with a minimum of delay.

This keen Navy officer's genius as a practical scientific educator, organizer, and man of action are a matter of record. Let not his voice be that of one crying in a wilderness.

A Growing Sense of Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic strengths of a republic is the privilege of self-criticism enjoyed by its citizens. The ability to be objectively self-critical is as important to a nation and to its growth potential, as it is to an individual. So it has been proper, as I see it, for many of us to have been vocally concerned with what has been described as the strange sort of apathetic torpor that seemed to affect all 179 million of us Americans when first faced with the growing challenge of worldwide communism. It was almost as if we were all modern-day Rip Van Winkles, little caring that we were out of step with the times.

However, at the same time, I have been delighted in recent days to see the President so clearly point out the dangers of slipping from a mood of national self-criticism into one of national self-flagellation. We must never underestimate our strength nor our abilities, especially when that strength and those abilities are again channeled into the deep-flowing stream of a national purpose that finds its source in the creativeness and industry and spirit of a free people. So, it has seemed to me that, despite the continuous breast-beating of those whom the President called "political morticians," there is a steadily growing national awareness, beginning with the visit here of Khrushchev, of the true and serious nature of the Communist challenge, and of the resulting demand on all of us to respond, with the best that is in us, to the great motives for partnership that such challenge calls forth.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell remarked, at about the time of the steel settlement, that, "It has always been the pride of our people that we have been worthy of freedom." There is much food for thought in Mr. Mitchell's phrase, and I have hoped, with him, that out of the bitterness of that recent economic struggle both labor and management could somehow find the inspiration to seek new and better lines of communication with each other, in answer to one of those "motives for partnership" that I have just mentioned.

Accordingly, I have been pleased to note that certain construction employers and the heads of unions representing some 3 million building-trades workers are presently meeting at Bal Harbour, Fla., for the purpose of drawing up a tentative plan to bar all strikes in this multibillion-dollar industry. By working together, they hope to end the tremendous waste that has resulted in recent years in the halting of projects ranging from huge industrial plants to small homes by a succession of strikes involving one after another of the 18 construction unions. I do not know, of course, whether or not such a voluntary plan can be worked out but, if it is, it would be the longest step yet taken in any industry toward the type of labor-management cooperation long advocated by the President and Mr. Mitchell as a means of establishing industrial peace. So, despite the chill Washingtonian winds, my hat is off my balding head to the men meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla. May the balmy breezes there fan this spark of cooperation into a real fire of partnership that spreads across the Nation. This is the sort of thing so many of us here have been waiting and hoping for.

Returning now, Mr. Speaker, to my earlier thoughts about the dangers of a mood of national self-flagellation, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from yesterday's Wall Street Journal.

"ONCE IN A WHILE, REMEMBER—"

Twice within the past week President Eisenhower has remarked on a curious mood that so often overtakes this country. The ease with which we seem to pass from self-criticism into self-flagellation.

The President was speaking only of the missile program when he observed that we all shouldn't bow our heads in shame because achievement has not met every aspiration. The failures all acknowledged, there are still many accomplishments to be proud of in our brief 5 years of space exploration. But later he referred again to political morticians who exhibit breastbeating pessimism about the American system.

"Once in a while," he remarked, "we ought to remember that our country is not asleep, that it is not incapable of doing things."

Mr. Eisenhower, we may be sure, was not suggesting that the American people eschew self-criticism and relax in pious self-satisfactions; that can be insufferable in an individual and fatal to a nation. But so can morbid preoccupation with shortcomings.

Take the missile program, specifically. No one pretends, least of all Mr. Eisenhower, that it has accomplished every objective or denies that in some aspects it lags the Russian program. Insofar as this is a spur to effort, the criticism is both wise and necessary. But it is also wise not to forget what we have accomplished in much less time than the Russians. To forget that risks seriously misjudging what to do next or, worse, sinking into defeatism.

Or consider the recurring attitude toward our economic problems. That we could use more and better schools, hospitals and houses is true; so it is too that we ought to strive to grow, to remove the last pockets of poverty, to increase the material well-being of the whole country. But to listen to the constant laments about our inadequate growth rate, our substandard houses and our shortages of hospitals, the unwary might suppose that our whole economic system was a failure.

Surely once in a while we need to remind ourselves that if some houses are substandard it is America that has set the high standards; over the greater part of the globe our poorer houses would seem like palaces. To the whole world our growth rate, about which we bicker over percentage points, is a marvel and an aspiration. If anyone doubts it, let him imagine the gates opened to all who would come from the socialized nations of the world, including Russia.

And while we concern ourselves, quite properly, with the distance by which our achievement of equal opportunity for all may fall short of what we wish it to be, is it remiss to look with pride on the record of what we have actually accomplished? The truth is that those who belong to minority racial groups or minority religious groups, all around the world, look with envy at the political, economic, and social freedoms which we here take so for granted that we deplore the least infringement of them.

If we forget these things sometimes in our desire to reach higher, we not only do ourselves injustice. We also can do ourselves injury.

For one thing, a man overcome by feelings of inadequacy is an ineffective man; if, as a nation, we speak only of failure, others will come to accept our own valuation. And in that part of the cold war which is the struggle for men's minds it is as important that we not underestimate our strength as that we not become overprideful.

There is something else, more insidious. For if we let ourselves be blinded to all but failures and shortcomings, then by slow degrees we may come to think the American system, political and economic, is itself a failure. There are, indeed, those already who would have us think so; who point incessantly at what we have not yet achieved so as to persuade us to adopt other ways of ordering our economy and our society.

One of the things, surely, that has made this country is our capacity as a people for self-criticism. But surely, too, self-criticism includes the vision to see the accomplishments of America and why they have become the goals of other people. Once in a while, at least, we ought to remember.

Bart Greene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 persons, many of them colleagues of Bart Greene at the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity of New York, gathered on January 28 at the Hotel Shelburne, New York City, to pay tribute to Bart Greene, chairman of the License Bureau, upon his retirement from civil employment after nearly a half century of dedicated service. Noted public officials from each of New York's five boroughs were present to felicitate the guest of honor. Mr. Greene is a native-born East Sider and resides in the 19th Congressional District of New York.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD one of the tributes paid to him on the occasion of his retirement:

BART GREENE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

It was an Irish poet who once said, "A man with a vision shall go forth and conquer a crown."

Great indeed was the crown that was conquered by the Irish, who not only had the vision, but were the doers of deeds—men and women who had the courage born of faith and faith born of courage to make these dreams come true.

Humbly born on the East Side, Bart Greene, this Irish lad without advantages, but his own natural talents, stimulated by the spur of necessity, he rose to become an outstanding public servant.

Like the chorus of a mighty hymn of praise, it is gratifying to hear the granite words of loyalty, honesty, friendship, and humility voiced at this luncheon tribute in honor of Bart Greene.

These words come neither accidently nor incidently to a man of quiet goodness and sturdy faith whose many years of dedicated service is molded into the consciousness of his colleagues who love and honor him.

Bart Greene has just completed nearly a half century of public service.

How modestly, how patiently, he gave himself to all kinds of activities. To all he consecrated a ripeness of his spirit and wisdom.

No one loses by selfless service. As one candle lends its light to another, losing none of its luster, so those who serve unselfishly never lose in so doing.

It was from his Irish parents that he derived that glow of spirit and beauty of temperament that is so unique.

It is difficult within the limitation of a brief address to unfold the many facets in his career.

Whether we regard him as a sailor with a distinguished record on the U.S.S. *Kentucky*, as electrical instructor, as chairman of the license board, his record furnishes us with an example for emulation.

Bart Greene, your retirement is a loss that is shared by all of us. You are an inspiration to every man and woman in our department. You have brought honor to your city, and our city honors you.

May you enjoy many fruitful and healthful years. May your days be happy ones. May the spirit of friendship always be with us.

May I conclude with an ancient Irish prayer: May the road rise to meet you; may the wind be always at your back; may God hold you always in the hollow of His hand.

John W. Kemp, Wisconsin's Candidate for President's Trophy to Handicapped American of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, John W. Kemp of Milwaukee has been nominated by Wisconsin to receive the President's trophy as the "Handicapped American of the Year" for 1959.

The scope of John Kemp's activities, the list of his achievements, and his record of public service indicate that he is a vital, energetic citizen whose many accomplishments would seem to disqualify him from any competition to select a handicapped person.

Mr. Speaker for the last 8 years John Kemp has been confined to a wheelchair battling the progressive paralysis of multiple sclerosis—a handicap that began in 1942. Not only has he refused to allow multiple sclerosis to become a serious drawback in his own life, he has devoted tremendous energies to establish rehabilitation services and employment opportunities for others who are handicapped.

The establishment of both an intensive inpatient rehabilitation program and outpatient clinical facilities for Milwaukee multiple sclerosis patients resulted from Mr. Kemp's determined efforts and service on the Community Welfare Council and associated Red Feather agency committee assignments.

Mrs. Lucille Uhlig, executive director of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Milwaukee, Inc., told me that John Kemp is "an inspiration to those of us working daily with the handicapped, to patients who know him, and, should he be selected for the President's Trophy, his story and sparkling personality would rightly inspire all others across the States."

I agree completely with Mrs. Uhlig. It is my sincere conviction that the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped could find no better candidate than Mr. Kemp for the trophy which President Eisenhower will award May 5.

To conclude my remarks I offer for the RECORD a brief history of John Kemp's wonderful life story:

PROFILE IN INSPIRATION

John W. Kemp is assistant cashier of the Marine National Exchange Bank of Milwau-

kee, third largest bank in Wisconsin. He is also personnel manager of the Marine Bank and the Marine Corp., a holding company of five banks with the Marine Bank as principal member. He started at the Marine fresh out of high school as a messenger boy in 1934. For the last 18 years, since 1942, Jack Kemp has been handicapped by multiple sclerosis. For the last 8 years, he has been confined to a wheelchair.

Jack Kemp—now 44, married and the father of an 18-year-old daughter—was born in Sioux City, Iowa in 1915. If there is such a thing as the all-American boy, Jack was it. At West Allis Central High School in West Allis, Wis., Jack was president of his senior class, president of the glee club, member of the student council, star basketball player, you name it.

From high school, he went right to work as an executive trainee at the Marine Bank. While progressing through various departments of the Marine, Jack continued his education. Four years of business law, economics and accounting at the American Institute of Banking. Five years of accounting, economics, business management, psychology and psychological testing at the evening division of Marquette University.

Even though he was already a victim of multiple sclerosis, Jack became personnel manager of the Marine Bank in 1947 and was named an assistant cashier in 1954. Since the Marine Corp. was organized a year ago, he has been supervising personnel relations for all five member banks.

If businessmen have any doubt about employing the handicapped, let them consider the case of Jack Kemp. As personnel manager of the Marine Bank and the Marine Corp., he and his staff are responsible for the personnel functions of a group of over 500 employees. His duties include evaluation of departmental job needs, interviewing, personnel selection, training, salary administration, recruitment, administration of fringe benefits and health services, supervision of recreational activities and personal counseling.

What do these duties include specifically? Here are a few examples.

Jack's department faces the problem of understaffing and overstaffing. Growing departments—like the Marine's installment loan department which has tripled in size in the last 3 years—need enough good manpower to serve the public well. Jack supplies it.

Jack and his staff sift through over 600 applicants a year to fill some 60 jobs.

Jack's office gathers detailed information of the requirements of over 500 jobs—from executive offices, tellers, bookkeeping machine operators, secretarial and clerical help, janitorial personnel, to advertising, public relations, installment loan, mortgage and commercial lending officers—then fits the right person in the right job.

Jack supervises some 50 group training sessions a year at all levels, plus individual training sessions in specialized cases.

Jack's group evaluates each employee's performance at least once every 6 months, recommends merit salary increases within each job's salary range, recommends and acts on promotions.

His office maintains constant contact with colleges and universities to attract good young people to the Marine. Jack even makes field trips to colleges and universities interviewing likely prospects on campus.

The department manages the Marine's pension plan, group life insurances, group hospitalization and management's profit sharing plan.

Together with his staff, Jack runs Christmas parties, golf outings, and picnics at the drop of a hat.

Jack himself gives the benefit of his own understanding of problems—some trivial, some serious—to all those who ask.

The Marine Bank and the Marine Corp. are indeed fortunate to have Jack Kemp as their personnel manager. What's more, they know it.

This big a job, this much responsibility, might be enough for an ordinary man. But the word "enough" is not in Jack Kemp's dictionary. He devotes himself to extracurricular activities, to civic affairs, and community service with the same zest and enthusiasm that he gives to his job.

Since 1950, Jack has been chairman of the community chest campaign at the Marine Bank. In the last 9 years Jack has played a leading role in Marine contributions of $54,168 to the community chest. For the last 6 years the Marine Bank has been the first of over 3,500 Milwaukee companies to report over-the-top contributions.

He is presently a member of the community chest's budget committee, and is a regular campaigner for the American Red Cross. He has also worked for the Boy Scouts of America, the YMCA, and the March of Dimes.

Jack has been a member of the Kiwanis Club Speakers' Bureau for the last 2 years.

He is a past president of the American Institute of Banking, Milwaukee chapter, of which he is still an active member.

Jack is a member of the National Office Managers Association and has served on all of its committees during the past 6 years.

He headed the only fundraising campaign ever run in Milwaukee for multiple sclerosis. The campaign raised $40,000.

Currently Jack is vice president of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of Milwaukee—an organization with some 600 members. It's a good bet he'll be president next year.

If anything, multiple sclerosis has made Jack Kemp give more of himself—rather than less—to his company and to his community. But how does multiple sclerosis affect him personally, what is its effect on him physically?

Doctors diagnosed Jack's difficulty as multiple sclerosis in 1942. As the disease progressed, Jack went from one leg brace to two leg braces to canes. By 1948, when walking a block was all he could do, Jack went to Kabot-Kaiser Institute in Vallejo, Calif. He spent 9 months there.

"Physically, my stay at Kabot-Kaiser Institute did a lot for me," Jack says. "When I got back I could walk 15 or 16 blocks and I did it religiously every night.

"Mentally, I profited even more. When you see 150 people in all stages of multiple sclerosis—some even stretcher cases—you get an appreciation of other people's problems that lasts all your life. You find you just can't feel sorry for yourself."

That attitude is typically Kemp. He never takes credit, for the way he lives his life influences others. Instead, he prefers to give credit to others.

One of Jack's legs was always better than the other, but in 1952 he sprained the good leg. That put him in a wheelchair—and though the wheelchair has been a part of him ever since, it has not prevented Jack from enjoying the good things of life.

Jack and another bank employee drive to work together. Jack drives 3 days a week, his partner 2 days. He even drives on lengthy vacation trips, and people who drive with him had better be prepared to do 600 miles a day.

Jack fishes every chance he gets, and has a stack of pictures to prove the big ones don't get away.

He goes to every Marquette University basketball game at the Milwaukee Arena. He parks his wheelchair right back of the scorer's table, and cheers as loud as any student.

Jack sees at least half of the 77 home games the Milwaukee Braves play every year. And he manages from the grandstand just like everyone else.

Jack gets in and out of his car by himself, gets in and out of bed by himself.

"About the only thing I can't do for myself," he says, "is go up and down stairs."

He does push-ups on a wrestling mat in his home every night, and his appearance attests to his excellent physical condition.

Jack readily shows you pictures of his attractive wife, Bernadine, and his 18-year-old daughter, Jeanne—now a student in the School of Nursing at Marquette University—and he makes no attempt to mask his pride.

If this reads to you like the story of a regular guy, the kind of man you like to be with, the kind of man you like to meet for lunch, swap stories with, play poker with, trust with your secrets, call on for help—then you have gotten to know Jack Kemp. For Jack Kemp has never traded on his handicap. He seems so totally indifferent to it, that people who meet him and know him are hardly aware of his wheelchair.

True, Jack Kemp has multiple sclerosis. But Jack Kemp does not have a handicap. Ask anybody in Milwaukee. They'll tell you Jack Kemp is a man's man, who does most things better than most men.

Fidel Castro—Communism's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Charleston News and Courier, the Honorable Thomas R. Waring, on Castro—Communism's Best Friend in the Western Hemisphere:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 29, 1960]

A BAD NEIGHBOR

The U.S. State Department, which lavished sympathy on Chinese Communist "agrarian reformers" in the 1940's, is characteristically reluctant to challenge Cuba's Red regime.

Constantine Brown, syndicated columnist, has commented: "The State Department's diplomatic strategy seems to consist of what the French call 'cherchez midi a quatorze heures' (look for noon at 2 p.m.). That is to say, 'Do tomorrow what should have been done day before yesterday.'"

Barron's, a national business weekly, has added its voice to criticism of the State Department's policy on Cuba. It speaks of "the footless behest of the State Department which abhors any show of strength" as being the cause of the President's failure to act against Castro.

Perhaps the President believes he should not appear belligerent on the eve of his Latin American tour. If this is the case, we believe he is mistaken. No Latin American nation champions Castro's cause. Several of our good neighbors have asked for shares of the sugar quota Cuba now enjoys. The most damaging action the United States can take is to treat a bad neighbor as if it were a good one.

If Mr. Eisenhower hopes that the small nations of Latin America will rescue the United States from Castro, he misunderstands Latins. Living in a masculine culture, they admire boldness and strength. Latin America will not respect the United States if it behaves like Ferdinand the Bull.

Bobby Burns and Alex Duncan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored indeed to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt from the Clinton Daily Item entitled "In Honor of Burns' Birthday," written by my dear friend, Mr. Alexander Cameron Duncan, past president of St. Andrews Society, Clinton, Mass.

Mr. Duncan is a venerable and loyal citizen, a great American, who for many years has served our country with dedication and fidelity.

His unfailing remembrance of the birthday of the great Scottish Bard, Bobby Burns, is a source of inspiration to his many friends and his interesting remarks on the occasion invariably strike a note of appropriateness and lofty philosophy that deeply touches and impresses those privileged to read them.

Contemporary America could learn much from the homely, down-to-earth philosophy of Bobby Burns and the solid, deep-rooted, loyal citizenship of Alexander Cameron Duncan. I congratulate Mr. Duncan upon the splendidly written and impressive tribute to Scotland's illustrious poet, and wish for him many more years of good health and happiness and dedication to the immortal Burns. If we had more Alex Duncans in this country and world today, unalterably dedicated to the perpetuation of freedom and individual liberty, the cause of enlightened, democratic government would be much the better for it.

The article follows:

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, Jan. 9, 1960]

IN HONOR OF BURNS' BIRTHDAY

To the EDITOR:

At the risk of being accused of overstatement, I shall say that Scotland is the most fanatically democratic of all the democracies. Her fight for independence, begun under Wallace in the 13th century, finally succeeded under Bruce at Bannockburn in 1314. But it was not until John Knox cried out for the soul of Scotland that Scotland's true democracy flourished. When the Reformation took hold on the Scottish spirit, nothing could shake it. With the Kirk the school stood open to the humblest child in the land. The ploughman's son and the weaver's daughter were entitled not only to the Word of God in the common tongue, but also to the knowledge of the ages. Free education during the week and free worship of God on the Sabbath. These were the twin rights claimed by Scots for themselves and for their children. To defend them, they were not afraid to die. No wonder the heather is red—it was enriched by good blood.

There are valleys and glens still echoing the strains of the Psalm times beloved by all Scots. Scotland has always been characterized by a sturdy independence of spirit. Her cities and towns are still ruled by a town council. The citizens elect their own representatives. There could be no such thing in Scotland as a political machine.

The Scots have been at war off and on for 600 years, and the military tradition is still strong, especially in the Highland district. He would be a poor lad in the Highlands were he not at least a member of the Territorial Army. It is here that the Argyle and Sutherland Highlanders are recruited, and the Gordons, the Seaforths, the Camerons and the Black Watch battalions. Scotland abounds in military traditions. Her regiments are old with glorious histories.

But Scotland is more than the kilt, the bayonet, the bagpipes, Edinburgh Castle, and the 51st Division. Other traditions are just as strong and just as noteworthy.

In the Old World there is not another single region of comparable size that produces so many ships of such deadweight tonnage as the Clyde. "Clyde-built" has been a synonym for the best in shipbuilding. The shipyards of the Clydeside are busy now contributing to the United Nations much-needed tonnage for the transporting across the seven seas.

The Scot believes in God, in a God who will not do for him what he can do for himself. The Scot is willing to fight for principles, never weary in arguing about the rights of common man. He believes in these rights. He has fought for them in the past and he is willing to fight for them any time they are in danger. Every man is entitled to a fair chance. That is the Scottish creed.

Scotland is a small country, and in resources not a rich one. Because of lack of opportunities at home, her sons and daughters have left her shores to seek their fortunes elsewhere. They have been a source of strength to every land which received their allegiance. To give assistance to Scottish immigrants in need the St. Andrews Society was formed. But this love for the homeland has remained constant in the hearts of all their descendants, even in the remotest corner of the earth. As coals on the hearth need company if they are to retain their glow, so Scots need at times to brighten the glow of their affection for the homeland and for each other by the warmth of companionship.

And so it is that on St. Andrew's night they join together for this purpose, and Scots everywhere offer a prayer to God that He will bless and nourish the land which gave them life, as they nourish and defend the lands where they dwell.

ALEXANDER CAMERON DUNCAN,
Past President, St. Andrews Society.
CLINTON.

Desecrating Houses of Worship

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous concern of the House with the wave of anti-Semitic actions which have erupted in various parts of the world in recent weeks signifies to all nations the determination of Americans to prevent a development of any organized antireligious spirit. It has become evident to all of us that many of these demonstrations have been the result of irresponsible young people and lunatic group followers who have defaced synagogues, churches, institutions, and private homes with symbols of hatred.

We stand together to deplore any further development of these acts; however, we must point out the rather obvious fact that diabolical Communist influence could very well be responsible for these international incidents. Only international communism has the worldwide organization capable of producing these incidents in widely separated corners of the globe.

Mr. Speaker, certainly any revival of nazism that might be traced at this time must be immediately stamped out. As Americans, we want all the world to know that we will not tolerate any revival or resurgence of nazism, and furthermore we are giving demonstration to the world of our solidarity in opposing anti-Semitic feelings and, for that matter, attacking all trace of bigotry and intolerance.

The Fear of Dislike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which comments on a recent statement of Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, on what he called the growing cult of fear of being disliked.

The editorial appeared in the Evening World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., on Saturday, January 30, 1960, and read as follows:

THE FEAR OF DISLIKE

In a recent letter to his constituents, Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, deplored what he called the growing cult of fear of being disliked.

Mr. GROSS said this cult has its roots in the State Department. He said that an example of its strength is the definite move on the part of the State Department and others in Washington to yield to the mob demands and permit the flag of Panama to fly with the Stars and Stripes in the Canal Zone.

The Uncle Sam whom the world once knew and respected was a tall man in a high hat and striped pants, whose facial expression tended to severity. He minded his own business, and expected the rest of the world to do likewise. He didn't look as if he were trying to win a popularity contest.

That Uncle Sam was a greathearted man. The rest of the world knew he could be counted on any time there was a genuine need for help. It also knew that he could spot a phony or a blackmailer two oceans away, and for that it respected him.

Says Congressman GROSS:

"The wreckage of history is well marked with the tombstones of governments whose leaders suffered from the fear of being disliked. Let us be just and honest with Panama and every other nation, but let us yield not 1 inch to those who attempt to do violence to our sovereignty and self-respect."

We imagine the big majority of Americans will buy that.

Speech of Congressman Lane Before Revere (Mass.) Golden Age Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my speech before the Golden Age Club of Revere, Mass., on Sunday, January 31, 1960:

For thousands of years, man has considered it to be both a duty and a privilege to respect and protect the aged.

That is until the coming of the factory system, with its emphasis upon production to the exclusion of everything else.

When a person was unable to produce, due to disability or age, society promptly abandoned him and tried to salve its conscience by accusing him of failure to provide for a rainy day.

The wealthy of those days who had fattened on the labors of the average worker without thinking of their obligation to arrange for some form of security in return were slow to learn.

The serious and prolonged depression of the 1930's which threatened the very existense of our free enterprise system, shocked the Nation into action.

It was recognized that a week's pay alone was not sufficient compensation for a man's labors.

Something else was needed to provide income during periods of unemployment and disability and during old age.

It was then that the concept of social insurance became more than an academic question.

The depression taught us that no society can survive with millions of unemployed and millions of old people who are destitute of income.

Neither the WPA nor the municipal welfare programs, with their meager benefits financed entirely out of public revenues, could solve the problem.

Even business and industry began to see the light. When many millions of people are unable to buy, the economy as a whole is bound to suffer.

To remedy this situation, the Congress worked on social insurance legislation to be financed through taxes levied on the employer and the employee that would provide a modest but steady source of income to people after their working years were over.

By the broad term "social security" we mean such varied programs as aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, unemployment insurance, old-age assistance, and old-age and survivors insurance.

In speaking to the members of the Revere Golden Age Club, I shall confine myself to old-age assistance, old-age and survivors insurance, and the need for new legislation to provide medical and hospital benefits for our senior citizens.

Old-age assistance is local relief or welfare assistance, paid to the aged who are in need, and who do not qualify for old-age and survivors insurance. It is sometimes utilized to supplement the latter program where OASI benefits are too low.

Old-age assistance was intended to cover the gap until the old-age insurance program was developed to reach all the people of our Nation. Eventually, because nearly all people reaching old age will have worked in covered employment, or will have been married to one who was, old-age assistance would largely disappear, and would be replaced by old-age insurance which is a right and not a charity.

Money to buy the essentials of survival, such as food and shelter, is the most obvious and urgent need, but it is not the only one. Take the case of Jane Doe for example. She's the elderly widow who lives in a two-room walkup flat. Since her husband died 3 years ago, her health has steadily failed. More and more of her time has been spent within the four walls of her cramped little housekeeping rooms. As her savings ran low, less was drawn from them for food and needed medical care. Like a shroud, loneliness and irritation settled around her. Aid in addition to an old-age assistance check was necessary to help Mrs. Doe preserve and strengthen her physical and emotional health. It was essential to help her find some satisfying outlets for her energies and a way to share again in the life of her community.

The work of public welfare staffs directed toward achieving this broad goal of human well-being is what is generally known as social services in public assistance.

But the older people themselves, whether they are receiving public aid, or whether they have retired on the old-age insurance they have earned, are doing something about this problem.

The Revere Golden Age Club is proof of that fact.

On your own you have organized this group where people share the same interests and hobbies and find happiness in companionship.

Men and women who were too busy working and raising families during their younger years, finally reach the age when they are free to do the things that were postponed.

The golden age should be just that, not only in terms of the ripening years, but in the enjoyment of mature satisfaction as well.

A group of older people up my way frequently go off on a sight-seeing bus tour that takes thew to some special event, or to some beautiful or historic location that they missed during their working years. They have as much fun planning these tours as teenagers planning a school dance. And when the trip is over, they always look forward to the next one.

There should be more of these, and other pleasant activities for retired persons.

That will be possible when their benefits are increased.

As the social security taxes on payrolls inch upwards, it is only fair that the monthly checks to recipients should become more substantial.

For the intent of Congress ever since the first cautious start was made in the building of a true social security system, was not to provide the older people with enough income to pay for bread and clothing and shelter alone but with that extra income to do with as they pleased, giving them the freedom of choice that adds to human dignity.

The present benefits from old-age insurance are not enough for this purpose.

Slowly but inevitably they will be raised to close the cost-of-living gap.

But we also need fringe benefits for the older people, including special housing accommodations and provision for medical, hospital. and nursing-home care.

Last year, in a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee, in Washington, I supported H.R. 4700. This is the bill introduced by Congressman FORAND to amend the Social Security Act and to provide that persons eligible for old age and survivors' benefits shall also be eligible for medical and hospital benefits.

If and when this bill passes, it will mean that 60 days of hospitalization will be given in any 12-month period to those who have retired under OASI. The cost will be paid from this Federal trust fund to the hospital, physician, and nursing home which provides the services.

If the patient is transferred to a nursing home from a hospital, and if the services are for an illness or condition associated with that for which he received hospital services, an additional 60 days of nursing home care will be paid for from the trust fund. In no case shall the combined total exceed 120 days in any 12-month period.

This plan of health benefits would be of great help to older people who have difficulty in acquiring private insurance, and who often neglect themselves because they do not have the money to pay for medical services.

Social security is not doing the job when, as at present, it forces its so-called beneficiaries to seek public assistance with its degrading means test and when it fails to provide for medical and hospital care.

The Consumers' League of New York reports that the number of residents of that State who are 65 years of age and older, is approaching the 2 million mark. The league found that the relief costs to New York State can be reduced and much unnecessary suffering for the older citizens can be avoided if the earned retirement benefits under the program are increased, not only to keep pace with the rising cost of living, but to provide health insurance in addition to monthly benefit checks.

The mounting number of aged in our population, and the sharp rise in the cost of medical care will not permit the national conscience to evade its responsibilities to the older citizens.

The aged properly resent any questions by officials as to the resources of their children. They do not want anyone to contact their sons and daughters in an effort to find out what they can contribute to the support of their parents.

This is a matter of personal pride that should never be violated.

With this in mind; social security, pensions, and health insurance for the aged must be sufficient for their needs, and as a right to which they are entitled after their long years of work.

Through organizations like the Golden Age Club of Revere the general public is ever reminded that respect and protection for the aged of today, will entitle younger people to the same consideration when they in turn, become the senior citizens of tomorrow.

I do not want to leave you with the thought that I regard monthly checks, or insurance, as the complete answer.

By your own initiative in forming and supporting the Golden Age Club you have opened my eyes to the wonderful spirit of your members.

The ability to develop new programs for your own happiness and fulfillment is a quality that all your fellow Americans admire.

By this combination of Government programs and the programs organized by our retired citizens to make these the best years of their lives we shall build a social security that will be one of the real accomplishments of our civilization.

Fewer Farmers Hasn't Solved the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the following articles speak for themselves:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Dec. 30, 1959]

FEWER FARMERS HASN'T SOLVED INCOME PROBLEM

WASHINGTON.—A panel of agricultural economists agreed Tuesday that the mass movement away from farms has not fulfilled predictions that such a shift would solve agriculture's problem of declining income.

Instead, they said, the migration during the past quarter-century has created new problems for rural communities, for the individuals involved and for the cities to which the farm people have come.

Speaking at a meeting of the American Farm Economic Association, Dale E. Hathaway, of Michigan State University said, "there is no evidence that the migration has appreciably closed the gap that existed in per capita incomes of farm and nonfarm people."

"Most of the movement," he said, "has been from farms with few resources." Thus it did not leave behind income possibilities of consequence to divide among those remaining on the land.

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Dec. 27, 1959]

AMERICAN FARMER IS UNSUNG HERO

The unsung hero, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say the unrecognized victim, of the fight against inflation since the end of World War II has been the American farmer. A vast supply of relatively cheap food has offset the steadily climbing prices of other cost-of-living items.

The average American consumer spent 26.9 percent of his disposable income for food in 1947. In 1959 it is estimated that food took only 20.8 percent of the average consumer's disposable income.

Consumers' disposable income rose from $220 billion in 1947 to nearly $335 billion in 1959. Had food expenditures risen in the same proportion, the Nation's food bill this year would have been more than $90 billion instead of the less than $70 billion it is now estimated.

The addition of $20 billion to the cost of living would have tremendously increased the pressure of inflation. Many labor wage scales are tied by contract to the cost of living, so such additional costs would have given added impetus to the inflationary spiral.

Consumers have a real bargain in food. Using the 1947–49 average as 100, the index of retail food prices has gone up from 95.9 to only 116.1, while total disposable income has risen from 97.4 in 1947 to 148.2 in 1959.

The farmer, as we said, is the victim. His share of the consumer's food dollar has declined from 51 cents in 1947 to less than 38 cents at the close of this year. Farm marketing charges have increased about 40 percent since 1947.

Inflation and rising costs in other segments of the economy have the farmer in a bind. Prices paid by farmers for commodities used in production, interest, taxes, and wages have risen from 240 percent of the 1910–14 parity base period in 1947 to nearly 300 percent in 1959.

Meanwhile prices received for farm products have declined from 276 percent of the base period in 1947 to around 230 percent as 1959 draws to an end.

The plentiful supply of a wide variety of high-quality foods is the very foundation of our vast economic growth during the postwar period. Farmers who provided that food have not shared fully in the prosperity to which they have contributed so much.

Our vast agricultural production is a main source of this country's industrial, military, political and, we trust, spiritual leadership of the free world.

This very week the central committee of the Communist Party is meeting in Moscow to figure out ways to increase agricultural production in Russia. Khrushchev and his minions recognize Russian agriculture as the weak link in the Communist regime.

Viewed from that angle, the few billions a year spent in efforts to keep American agriculture in business are far from the "scandal" that certain groups brand the farm programs.

Admittedly the programs we have now aren't working very well. The need is to develop policies that will work. This Nation can well afford to make substantial expenditures to shore up agriculture, our basic industry.

Food-for-Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, although the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, popularly known as Public Law 480, was extended last year, there is still pending on the Senate Calendar a bill, S. 1711, which would transform it into a genuine food-for-peace program.

This measure was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] with sponsors from both parties. As one of these sponsors, I addressed the Senate in support of the food-for-peace program last August 24. It has wide and growing support, Mr. President.

Now an eloquent new voice has been raised in support of the food-for-peace program, with the publication in the February issue of Think magazine of an article written by CHESTER BOWLES entitled "Our Farm Surplus Can Be Their Daily Bread." From his experience as our Ambassador to India, Mr. BOWLES speaks with authority of the tremendous impact this program would have in the developing countries, and of the contribution it would make to the achievement of a peaceful world.

I ask that this fine article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FARM SURPLUS CAN BE THEIR DAILY BREAD

(By CHESTER BOWLES, U.S. Congressman, Connecticut)

It will be ironic indeed if history records that the free world died of its own fat. Yet this may happen unless we shake ourselves loose from the attitudes of mind we have developed about our so-called agricultural burden and see if for the wealth that it really is.

While much of the world is undernourished, the richness of our land, the industry of our farmers, the mechanization of our farming operations, the spectacular improvement in fertilizers, seed and pesticides and our new knowledge of the growth patterns of plants and livestock have combined to expand our agricultural productivity far beyond the hopes of our fathers. Our granaries, overflowing with wheat and feed grains, our abundant stocks of rice, milk products, fats, oils and cotton are major national assets that can and should be invested in the achievement of a better world.

Almost every country in the world is short of food and must import at great cost or allow its people to remain undernourished, a ready target for disease and disillusionment. Such conditions are a major stumbling block to political stability in the underdeveloped areas, where new governments are struggling to achieve higher standards of living.

In the meantime, the biggest single problem facing our Soviet competitors continues to be food production. Even more critical is the dilemma of the Communist regime in Peiping, which must feed 650 million people with only 1.7 acres of land for each family.

Yet here is the United States of America with its storage bins overflowing with abundance—wondering what in the world to do with it all.

Dramatic situations require dramatic actions.

Now is the time to build upon the experience gained through our postwar relief programs, the Marshall plan, the Mutual Security Act and, particularly, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Five years ago, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, known as Public Law 480, was set up to donate, barter, or sell America's agricultural surpluses through nonprofit voluntary American agencies.

By June 1959, 37 countries had bought U.S. agricultural products in exchange for their own currencies, with sales alone totaling over $5 billion. Care was taken, of course, that the farm commodities concerned came from supplies that exceeded an effective dollar demand in the United States and that the normal dollar export markets were protected.

As a result, tens of millions of people who would otherwise have gone hungry have been fed. And the foreign currencies involved have largely been turned into foreign loans for economic and social development projects. So our assistance is doing a double duty.

A typical sales agreement under this law is a complicated transaction. But basically, this is how the system works:

Suppose for example, that we should reach an agreement with the Government of Brazil to sell surplus wheat. It would cover the value and kinds of commodities to be financed, the period of time involved, safeguarding of usual markets and the assurance of use as intended, the exchange rate, and the highly important allocation of the foreign currencies among the many authorized purposes.

After the agreement is signed and the purchase authorized, banks in both countries must be designated and letters of commitment sent to the U.S. bank for reimbursement by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The foreign bank eventually pays the value of the sale by depositing local currency to the account of the U.S. Treasury rather than crediting dollars to the account of the designated U.S. bank.

Good as this program has been, it contains several basic deficiencies in law, in spirit, and in administration, most of which can be traced to the assumption that our agricultural abundance is really only a temporary surplus problem.

Almost all agricultural economists refute this narrow view. For the foreseeable future, the United States will continue to produce 6 to 10 percent more agricultural goods than can be sold through commercial chan-

nels. Long-range projections indicate that this surplus will persist for some years ahead.

At the same time, the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America cannot maintain their freedom unless they provide their people with greater opportunities and a better life. If all hopes for freedom disappear there, then the prospects for peace will grow dim throughout the entire world.

Our experience, as we have seen, established the guidelines. The underdeveloped nations have ample manpower to do the work that must be done. As their reserves of food and cotton fiber grow, they can pay the workers modest wages without driving up the prices of the basic commodities.

This means that by careful planning in partnership with these hard-pressed new nations, we can indirectly turn our surplus foods into new roads, schools, and factories—into healthier people capable of producing by their own labor new free societies that can ultimately take their rightful place among the more prosperous nations.

The sales of food and fiber which we have already made have accumulated a credit to the U.S. Treasury of some $2 billion of unused "soft currencies." Some say that this is the point at which to stop. On the contrary, it should be the beginning.

Some of these soft currencies generated by our food sales abroad should, of course, be put aside to cover the expenses of our missions in these countries. But the bulk of those currencies, paid by those who have bought the food locally, should be loaned back to pay the cost of local wages and local materials. Any good businessman would make his money work for him.

The law authorizes a number of uses for foreign currencies which, if imaginatively promoted, could turn our present program to far more productive use.

But these purposes are stated too restrictively in the current legislation, and additional limitations written into the law seriously weaken its scope. We can and should expand Public Law 480 commensurate with the tremendous opportunities actually facing us.

For instance, the need for more new schools and more teachers in all underdeveloped countries is enormous. People who are better nourished and better educated will find it much easier to summon the energy and abilities which are necessary for their own successful economic development.

Soft currencies can also be used to finance the publication of millions of good books in dozens of different languages to sell to idea-hungry Africans, Asians and Latin Americans for a few cents each.

Our agricultural abundance should, of course, continue to be given outright in cases of famine or disaster.

Admittedly, the situation is complicated by the fact that the United States is not the only free nation with high agricultural capacity. We must find a way to join hands with Canada and Australia and other food-exporting nations in using our agricultural abundance for the economic and social development of the free world.

At this early stage we probably must operate on a bilateral basis. But our long-range objective should be multilateral arrangements and the use of international agencies in achieving our common ends.

BANKS FOR FOOD

A forward step would be the storage abroad in United Food Banks of a major part of our food reserves. This idea has been developed and discussed before the United Nations and the U.S. Congress. At this session of Congress in 1960, thoughtful citizens throughout America should press for legislative action. It is morally wrong and politically stupid to allow our stored commodities to become a wasting asset.

We should undertake to store at least one half of our entire grain surpluses abroad in well protected U.S. food banks as a visible assurance against the traditional dangers of famine and disease, and as a dramatic demonstration of the willingness of the American people to see that no one starves while we have food to spare.

A look at the mechanics suggests that such a program would in fact save the American taxpayer considerable money. It now costs our Government 20 cents to store a bushel of grain for 1 year. Yet it costs only 38 cents to ship a bushel of grain to India or Iran. This means that in 2 years we can pay the full cost of each shipment and start to save money.

The total annual cost for storage, interest and handling charges on delivery of our stored grain is now $1 billion. If we shipped half of it to food banks in India, North Africa, Indonesia, the Middle East, Egypt and other countries with short or uncertain food supplies, and stored it at the expense of the recipient country in storage warehouses built by local currencies, the savings to us over the years would run into the billions.

So any way that you look at the question—from a moral, political or dollars and cents point of view—the setting up of these food banks makes sense.

We would want, of course, to make sure that they were well constructed so that the grain would be protected against spoilage and vermin. We would also need written agreements so that each government would draw on its grain reserves only in accordance with standards mutually agreed to.

Donation in case of actual failure of a harvest would, of course, have top priority. Grain from the food banks should also be available for donation or sale as a protection against soaring food prices if the recipient country encountered a critically inflationary situation due to general food shortages.

In judging world food needs we should look beyond the old colonial standards which were based on the amount of food required for a man just to go on existing, sitting under a tree, somehow getting by.

Substantially more food is required if he is to do a good day's work building a road, a school, a health clinic or an irrigation ditch. Under such circumstances the daily caloric requirement jumps from about 1,600 calories to 2,600 or 2,800.

This means that as people in the underdeveloped areas step up their programs of work and expansion which is what they are doing and must do, the daily caloric requirement for the same number of people, without consideration for the increase in population, jumps enormously.

For instance, the food needs of the new awakening India are such that her Government is trying to push her annual food grains production from 78 million tons to 110 million within the next 7 years. That is a formidable production goal, but the Indians are determined to reach it.

Let's hope that they succeed. But in the meantime, by building and stocking a network of food banks across India, we can help remove the immediate fear of hunger that undermines morale and leads to private food hoarding and speculation.

It is difficult to exaggerate the psychological impact of such action in India and other nations in similar circumstances. When we consider the schools, irrigation, and other development projects that can be financed with the local currencies paid for this food and fiber, the economic and political implications become doubly dramatic.

Most of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have always led a hand-to-mouth existence. In northern India, for instance, much depends each year on the winter rains. Some years they come and some years they don't.

Two years ago I rode through the Punjab when rains happened to come in abundance. For 200 miles we drove through groups of happy villagers singing, dancing, laughing and smiling. Now they knew that their crops would be good. For the new year there was no reason to fear that their children would go hungry.

PUT FOOD TO WORK

The benefits of the long-term, commonsense, businesslike use of our abundant supplies of food and fiber which I have outlined would accrue not only to people in the developing countries. It would also benefit our own farms and, indeed, all of us who can prosper over the long haul only as living standards rise and as new world markets open.

Yet the greatest benefit of all is the contribution of such a program to the achievement of a peaceful world. If we are ever to live in such a world, we must work and plan to build it.

If we continue to allow $10 billion in food and fiber reserves to lie idle in a hungry and impoverished world, we will fail to live up to our Judaeo-Christian heritage. We will also commit a political blunder that future generations of Americans will find it difficult to understand.

Let us hope that the administration and the Congress will recognize the challenge in the next few months and boldly act to meet it.

A Bill To Provide Medical Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time on the floor of the House of Representatives for the purpose of introducing legislation which will influence the number and help assure the quality of physicians for our growing population in the years ahead.

I ask the Members to ask themselves one simple question: Are you willing to entrust the health of the American people to proportionately fewer doctors of lesser competence, as compared with today? If your answer to that question is "No," as it must be, then I ask your interest and support in the bill which I place before you.

The facts that underlie this bill are hard, but not cold.

Some of our better medical schools are admitting students with a C average in their undergraduate work.

Ten years ago, 40 percent of the students accepted by medical schools had an A average in their undergraduate work; today, only 18 percent have an A average.

The number of applicants for medical school has declined by about one-third since 1950.

The present ratio of physicians to population is considered by experts to be the minimum essential for the protection of the people's health; yet the number of physicians graduated annually must be increased by 50 percent if that

ratio is to be maintained as our population reaches upward toward the 200 million mark.

The implications of such facts are perfectly obvious. We are threatened with a shortage of physicians. And we are already faced with a decline in the caliber of students entering medical schools.

It is equally obvious that no remedial action of consequence will take place unless the Federal Government acts in a positive and constructive way. With leadership and stimulus from Washington, the States and local institutions will carry their share of this grave national responsibility.

I therefore propose that the U.S. Public Health Service initiate a $10 million a year program of scholarships providing up to $2,500 per academic year to selected students in schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. The Federal funds would be matched by State funds, and State commissions would select those receiving scholarship assistance on the basis of ability and need.

I have spoken of the threatened shortage to which this bill is directed in terms of both number and quality.

Let me comment on the number question first.

The bill that I introduce today has an indirect relationship to the supply of physicians and dentists in the years ahead. By increasing the number and quality of applicants for medical and dental education, it will serve as a pressure on States and institutions to provide additional resources—either to create new schools, or to expand existing schools—so that the well qualified young men and women can study in their chosen field.

A much more direct way of increasing present enrollment—and thus the number of graduate physicians and dentists—is by the construction of new facilities. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I introduced legislation that would authorize matching Federal grants for the construction of facilities for medical and dental education, paralleling the existing and highly successful Public Health Service program of grants assisting in the construction of health research facilities. I regret to say that this vital legislation has not been enacted, and call upon my colleagues in the House, and especially those serving on the committee responsible for health legislation, to see that this 2d session does not come to a close without action that will stimulate the renovation and modernization of our existing medical, dental, and osteopathic schools, and—even more important in the long run—the creation of new schools.

I want my colleagues to know that I sought, but did not get, the support of the executive branch on this construction grant legislation. I shall not burden you with the details of my correspondence with the President. It followed a now-familiar pattern: the problem is recognized, somebody should do something about it, preferably not the Federal Government, but the matter is under study and may be accorded token support if the pressures are great enough. In the meantime, it would take nearly 10 years to build and graduate the first class from a new medical school, and present schools can barely keep up with their present enrollment and certainly cannot expand unless they get a kind of support they are not now getting.

I wonder if the American people a few years hence will understand if we today, knowing the facts, deliberately place their health in jeopardy by not planning and building facilities to train enough doctors to give them superior medical and dental care?

But the bill I introduce today is focused primarily on quality, not numbers.

All sorts of reasons are given why medical education and a medical career no longer attract as many qualified college students as they used to.

Some of these reasons are bound up in intangibles. There are those who would point to the increasingly materialistic point of view in our society, to the diminishing rewards in a life of service, to deterioration in the image of the physician today, to general failures of today's young people to accept responsibility to contribute something to our society instead of merely taking from it.

I cannot subscribe to these views. I have a fundamental faith in the innate strength of the American people in both an individual and a community sense. And I have a deep-rooted conviction that we can and will meet boldly the challenges that confront us as we stride into a decade that may well encompass the acid test of our democracy.

No—I believe it is factors that are far more real and immediate and practical that tend to influence some of our most promising young people against choosing to pursue careers in medicine and related fields.

One such factor is the factor of time. The average American finishes high school at age 17 or 18. If he has the interest and potential for higher education, and if he is considering medicine as a career, what does he see ahead of him? Four years of college, 4 years of medical school, a year of internship, 2 years of residency (if he wants to specialize—and most young physicians do—plus probably 2 years of military service under the doctor draft law. Thus the high-school student sees this choice of career as another 10–12 years of education before he can settle down to earning a living.

Related to the factor of time is the factor of money. The cost of a medical education to the individual and his family can be overwhelming. Those in modest circumstances, regardless of interest and capacity, will think long and hard before accepting the burden of such education. There are some scholarships and loan programs, of course. But they barely scratch the surface in terms of the need. At the end of medical school, about one-third of all graduates are at least $2,000 in debt. Some 17 percent have debts of $5,000 or more. This does not take into account the hardship and sacrifice of their families. Many married medical students—three-fifths of them marry before they graduate—owe their medical education to their wives, who must work to support the family throughout the long educational period. And even after finishing medical school the low income status continues during internship, residency training, and military service. For a great many families in the middle and low income groups, the financial prospect is too frightening to face, and the individual chooses another career in which the cost of education is less and the return on the investment more immediate.

In addition to time and money, there are other factors at work in the qualitative and numerical decline in applications for admission to medical and related schools.

One of these is quite personal: many young people want to settle down, marry, and have families while they are young. It is very hard to do this during the medical educational process unless there is a strong source of outside support.

Another factor is competing fields. As a matter of national policy, the United States has sought to give impetus to higher education in physics and other scientific fields, and significant support is available at graduate and postgraduate levels. Since similar support is not available for medical and dental students, it is understandable that many of the brightest young people choose to climb the rungs of the scientific career ladder.

Paradoxically, for those who do choose and remain in medicine, the need to make money once training is finally completed is so great that the less rewarding positions in fiscal terms—such as teaching, research, public health, and military medicine—often must be rejected, despite the individual's preference, because he simply must start to earn money and pay back his debts.

Since the health of the American people is one of our most precious national resources, it follows that we cannot let it be jeopardized by compromising on the number and quality of those who take care of the people's health.

The bill that I introduce is of course not the total answer. It is, however, a sound beginning, based on principles that assure the independence of individuals and of institutions, the integrity of States, and collaboration without control by the Federal Government.

The bill provides for scholarships of up to $2,500 per academic year to students in medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. State commissions would select recipients on the basis of their ability and their need for assistance. The commissions would also review the students performance annually to determine their eligibility to continue to receive the funds.

One-half the cost of the scholarships would be borne by the States. In order to receive Federal funds, each State would be required to submit to the Surgeon General an acceptable plan for administering the scholarship funds.

The bill authorizes an initial appropriation of $5 million for fiscal year 1961, and $10 million for the succeeding

nine fiscal years, to be allotted proportionately among the States on the basis of their populations between the ages 20–24 inclusive. The lesser authorization for the first year is to allow the States sufficient opportunity to initiate this program.

When matched with State funds, the $10 million in Federal funds would make it possible for 8,000 medical students to receive $2,500 scholarships each year. This means that—after the program has been in operation for some time, perhaps—one-fourth of all present medical school students would be partially financed under these scholarships.

I want to emphasize that the average expenditures of medical students are in excess of $3,000 a year, so a scholarship under this legislation does not cover the full cost of the individual student.

I seek your support of this bill. There is urgent need for it. The need is apparent in the facts obtained from medical school admissions offices. And it has been clearly recognized and forthrightly stated by a group of distinguished advisers to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. In their report, Physicians for a Growing America, the consultant group, chaired by Mr. Frank Bane, for many years the executive director of the Council of State Governments said:

> The Federal Government should establish educational grants-in-aid for medical students on the basis of merit and need, similar in value and proportionate in number to grants now made to graduate students in other fields of specialization. These educational grants should be available to students so that they could attend a medical school any place in the United States.

What my bill does, in effect, is to fulfill that statement of a most pressing need.

In this matter, as in the matter of the construction of new facilities for medical and related education, which I mentioned at the opening of my remarks, we simply cannot wait. We must act, and act now, if we are to begin to turn the tide toward keen competition for admission to medical schools and the gradual expansion of our graduating classes.

I feel this way about it.

As a nation, we have reason to be proud of what we have done in the 1950's to strengthen and broaden our research effort in the health sciences. Sound research porjects are virtually assured of long-term support, and we are investing sizable amounts of money in the development of research manpower and research facilities for an even more intensive search for new knowledge in the years ahead. Our patterns of research support are still imperfect. No way has yet been devised to provide career opportunities in health research that are stable, adequately remunerative, and professionally rewarding. Moreover, the universities, medical schools, and other research centers are desperate for operating funds that will strengthen them as institutions and permit them to achieve greater independence and exercise greater leadership as we face the intellectual, technological, and social challenges that surely confront us. I feel sure that these problems of research support can and will be solved.

As a Federal Government, we cannot discharge our responsibilities by supporting the research functions of nonfederal institutions but ignoring their capacity to perform their educational missions. Our experience in research demonstrates that the Federal Government can actively and broadly support university activity without domination, control, and interference. The same thing is true in medical and related education. We can assist the schools in constructing new and modernizing existing facilities. And we can assist deserving and needy students by defraying part of the high cost of extended specialized education that prepares them for lives of service to the people. We can do both of these within existing policies bearing on the relationship of the Federal Government to nonfederal institutions and to individual citizens, and we can do it without raising any of the ugly specters about Federal aid to medical education that are so often used as rationalizations for inaction.

The intent of the bill that I place before you is simply to place medical and dental education on a comparable status with advanced education in the sciences. We can do nothing to ease or shorten the strenuous course of study required to equip a young man or woman for competency in the medical professions. But we can and should take positive action to ease the intolerable financial burden which these young people must now shoulder in order to perform this service to humanity.

The Chaotic State of Highway Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, among the numerous means for increasing safe driving on the Nation's highways is that of adoption of the Uniform Vehicle Code by all States. The beneficial consequences would be many, the most important of which would be the elimination of the existing maze of confusing traffic laws encountered by a person driving from State to State. Adoption of the Uniform Code would not only enhance driving safety, but it would make it easier to deal with offenders on an interstate basis.

I have long supported these views. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicle Problems, of which I was chairman, strongly endorsed the Uniform Vehicle Code as a pattern for all States to follow. The rules of the road provisions of the code were embodied in New York law in 1957 following the joint committee's recommendations and approval by the State legislature.

Steps are now being taken in New York and other States to adopt further provisions of the code but the pace is beset with delays. The urgency of securing increased adoption of the code by the States is such that I have introduced a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to use its best efforts in promoting this development. The situation is critical enough to demand some such leadership on the Federal level.

A concise summation of the need for greater enactment of the Uniform Vehicle Code was set forth in an excellent article in the Washington Post of January 30. I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix at the conclusion of my remarks:

THE CHAOTIC STATE OF HIGHWAY LAW

The Chevy Chase Circle, on the outskirts of the Nation's Capital, happens to lie on the border between the District of Columbia and Maryland. To the interstate motorist this accident of geography might be of only incidental interest, but for one thing; according to D.C. law, the car in a traffic circle has the right of way. But in Maryland the car entering has the right of way.

History doesn't record whether two law-abiding drivers have ever played Alphonse and Gaston there, backing up traffic from Boston to Miami. But the Chevy Chase Circle does point up the countless contradictions, confusions and absurdities of law that are at once a nuisance and a hazard to the interstate driver—which means to practically everyone who drives at all.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This slightly overstates the actual situation, according to District Highway Director Harold Aitken. The conflict is one, not of regulation, but of sign placement. On the District side of the circle there are stop signs on connecting streets, thus giving traffic in the circle the right of way. On the Maryland side there are no signs, and consequently traffic entering the circle from the right—namely, the connecting streets—has the right of way.)

The maritime nations of the world long ago got together on a single set of traffic laws for the high seas. But the several States of our own indissoluble Union have not been so cooperative with regard to the Nation's ever more crowded highways, with the result that what is required in one State is often illegal in another.

The conflicts are annoying in matters such as parking, traffic signs and road markings; they are downright dangerous when right-of-way is involved, or passing and turning rules, or what to do when approaching a stopped schoolbus.

And the confusion is needless.

Way back in 1926, long before the tail fin was even a designer's dream, an officially appointed committee of experts sifted the traffic laws of all the States and, taking the best from each, drew up a uniform vehicle code. This has been constantly revised and kept up to date by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, now an arm of the White House Conference on Highway Safety.

But State legislatures have still held out. The New York Legislature, to its credit, in 1957 enacted the rules-of-the-road section of the uniform vehicle code practically verbatim. Wisconsin and Nevada have recently done the same, and a number of other States have been adopting parts of it in a piecemeal fashion.

A recent check, however, showed the rules of the road in 10 States still (after 34 years) not even in "substantial" agreement with the code, while many others differ in varying degrees. And 14 failed to conform even "substantially" on license requirements, an equal number on accident reports and on vehicle equipment, and 34 on periodic inspection requirements.

Getting together on the rules of the road clearly has first priority. But as long as a license to drive in one State is a license to drive in all, each has a direct interest in the others' in keeping unsafe vehicles out of interstate traffic.

One of the principal obstacles to extending reciprocity on traffic offenses has been the disparity among State laws. Get the laws in line with one another, and offenders can better be dealt with on an interstate basis.

Furthermore, we should consider the possibility of coordinating our traffic laws with those of other nations, with the volume of international travel rapidly increasing and with many travelers going by car.

Of first importance, however, is for all 50 of our own motorized United States to get together. The uniform vehicle code is written; it has been amply tested; it needs only to be adopted. Which means, simply, legislative action by States.

Since the advent of the automobile an estimated 60 million Americans have been killed or injured on the roads. In 1958, deaths totaled 36,700, injuries 2,825,000. A lot of these persons would be alive and uninjured today if all drivers on the same roads had a single set of rules to drive by. And 34 years is long enough, it seems to us, to have stalled on adopting those rules.

Deficiency Payments Plan Is Under Attack by Canadian Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, all of us are so concerned about the continuing farm problems in the United States we tend to forget, at times, that other countries also face serious farm problems in this postwar world. Canada, for example, which has experimented with a wide variety of agricultural programs is now having headaches with its latest experiment.

E. W. Keickhefer, editor of the Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., writes some interesting observations in his farm column which my colleagues may find it profitable to read. It deals with the farm problems of Canada.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS PLAN IS UNDER ATTACK BY CANADIAN FARMERS

(By E. W. (Kieck) Kieckhefer)

Trouble is brewing in Canada over the new program to give hog raisers and egg producers deficiency payments instead of straight price supports.

Under the new system, the Canadian Government makes a limited deficiency payment to farmers if the 12-month national average price falls below a determined "fair" price.

The egg program has been in effect for several months. The hog program began just last month.

One of the Conservative government's own supporters denounced the plan in a party caucus last week and there were attacks upon it also at the meetings of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture at Toronto. Farmers claim the plan is not giving them adequate income insurance.

Grade A egg prices were down to 15 cents a dozen at Winnipeg last week and grade C eggs were down to 7 cents a dozen. Grade A hogs were selling for $18.75 and sows mostly $10 to $11.

Agriculture Minister Harkness in a speech to Commons in Ottawa said the system meant producers were guaranteed a support price for the year, to the extent that their average return fell below the guaranteed price.

The payment, he explained, was not guaranteed on each individual sale. Such payments, he said, would be "hopelessly expensive" and there would be no incentive for the farmer to get the best possible price for his products.

Harkness said that because of the Government's program marketings of hogs and eggs will be lower this year and as a result there may be some decline in the farmers' gross income. All Government efforts were designed to give the farmers a fair share of the national income, he added, but it never claimed it had completely succeeded in doing so.

Colonel Griffin Reports on the Soviet Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the editor and publisher of the Monterey Peninsula Herald, Mr. Allen Griffin, spent 36 days in the Soviet Union during August and September 1959, observing the Soviet Russian scene. Since he made a similar trip in 1931, his impressions of developments in this vast land over the past generation are important to a thoroughgoing understanding of the direction of world communism.

Mr. Griffin founded his newspaper in 1921 and has been its publisher ever since. At the same time, he has had a distinguished career in the public service, both as a civilian and as a soldier. He served in both world wars, as a captain in the infantry in World War I and as a colonel commanding the 13th Infantry Regiment of the 8th Infantry Division in World War, II. He has received medals too numerous to mention; but I would at least like to cite the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Croix de Guerre (France). One of his many civilian public offices was that of Director of the Far East Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration held in 1950–51.

Colonel Griffin has reported to his readers in a series of articles which appeared in his paper during October and November 1959. These 20 articles were later reprinted in booklet form. I am sorry that the length of the booklet precludes my entering all of it into the Appendix of the RECORD so that my colleagues could share all the experiences, observations, thoughts, and conclusions of Colonel Griffin. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix the last two articles which summarize these thoughts. We would do well to heed Allen Griffin's warning contained therein never to let our guard down or underestimate our adversary.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW THOUGHTS IN SUMMARY—PART 2

However fascinating the subject is to the author, a newspaper series devoted to one area over the period of one visit must come to an end. It hasn't a captive audience; and there are doubtless not a few people who are disappointed and provoked that these articles have failed to confirm their rosy or complacent points of view.

A summary, even if partially repetitious, of certain thoughts and observations may be pertinent in the conclusion:

The capabilities of the Russian people should never be underestimated. Russian names occur again and again in the stories of American music and art, science and invention, scholarship and business enterprise. The same is true in France, and it is true in England. These have been the countries most hospitable to Russian talent, perhaps France more than any.

These people of Russian and, in some instances, Russian-Jewish derivation, have made substantial, sometimes sensational, contributions to the national civilizations in which they have found a home and could freely develop their talents and genius. I cannot help but believe that if this great and now well-awakened nation were given a reasonable degree of self-expression and self-realization, it would contribute vastly in every field of human endeavor, including those that are the tests of quality of civilization.

That, however, requires the strong, spicy breath of free air from the outside. It requires free travel, free expression, absence of fear that something one might dare to say or write or paint would bring disaster. Communism cannot stand that freedom.

Communism is always on guard, always fearful of the poison of liberty and of dangerous thoughts, always ready to clamp down savage restrictions. The machinery for prevention, intervention, and control has been perfected. The people have accepted it.

Only in the fields where the power of the state is materially and materialistically advanced is there freedom—freedom to work within all possible state assistance in such fields. And great rewards.

Russian art, literature, architecture, and philosophy might similarly "go for the moon" if the people were given freedom in those areas of civilized life. That, of course, is impossible.

For a long period the American people believed that quality and quantity of production, and efficiency of output were inherently impossible under communism. Genius in these fields, it was asserted, could flower only under free enterprise.

Perhaps after some 40 years of communism it is still too early to tell; but I am decidedly inclined to believe that communism, even though it is a horror to the human spirit and to civilized growth, has great capabilities of efficiency. It has proved it. It can undertake and accomplish gigantic developments of almost every kind (an exception might be made in agriculture) with great daring, brilliant foresight, scientific planning, accuracy

of detail, and—enterprise itself. It has done so. It is doing so.

Despite what we call lack of incentive, communism can turn out highly efficient male and female workers. I have seen them efficiently working—a great change since my visit to Russia in 1931.

I also believe that Soviet managerial capacity has been developed with extraordinary success, that managers are given great latitude in innovating improvements, and that there is every reason to believe that the Soviet state can produce vastly more for its people any time the hard core, the combat elements, of the Communist Party are willing to spoil the people just a little—and at the same time be a fierce competitor of the West.

This is a terrific ant society. Let us not minimize its power just because we prefer grasshoppers.

In dealing with these people there are things we should not forget, not even for a minute, no matter how tumultuous and sincere the welcomes.

In communism there is no honor, except the honor of undeviating, unquestioning service to communism. There is no conscience except the conscience demanded by communism. There is no real trust in anybody, not in anybody, except the sort of general trust of the people in the state and its hierarchy, which is the result of indoctrination from the cradle to the grave.

In communism the ambitious men climb more ruthlessly on the shoulders of their rivals and associates than in any area of capitalism today excepting the labor movement.

The brutality of this ambition, personified by those who were clever and ruthless enough to survive the purges, by the demotion of Malenkov when he wanted the people to have more commodities, by the rise of Khrushchev and the ruin of Zhukov, and countless other cases among the higher-ups, is repeated down the scale through the lesser echelons of the ambitious.

It is an error to believe that the drive of ambition does not continue, whatever the type of government. It is merely diverted to different fields that may require different talents. And if the field is a sort of jungle, then it seizes upon the law of the jungle to be successful and powerful there.

If there is one thing I would especially stress—and it is something one feels almost physically when visiting Russia—it is that communism depends upon combat. Its nature is combat-minded; its disposition is toward violence. It must fight, outside and inside. It must have enemies. It must provoke the worry in the public mind that the nation has enemies bent upon its destruction and upon their deprivation of all that they value. This is systematically and constantly done.

Within, it must fight, too. It must fight religion always. It must fight spies and saboteurs. It must be suspicious of the factory that fails to make its quota, of the factory worker who complains about the speedup. It must fight for more wheat, more steel, more cotton, more coal, more bricks, more cement. Banners, radio programs, television shows, lectures, exhortations—fight, fight, fight. I don't see how a people can stand it, but the Russian people do.

To carry on this fight, the Soviet Government and the Communist Party that runs the Soviet Government must falsify history, including its own history. It must falsify its reports of conditions in other countries. It must storm, rant, scream, condemn, vituperate. This is a highly developed technique. It is indispensable to Communist power at home. It has been successful. It has made mental robots out of most of the people of a great race.

THOUGHTS IN SUMMARY—PART II

Khrushchev scored a great propaganda point by constant reiteration of his claim that he is going to beat the United States economically and that Russians will have everything that Americans have "and more." For some strange reason we seem to have been awed by that claim.

Can Russia beat us economically?

Unless we ruin ourselves by sloth, gangsterism, depravity, loss of moral convictions, or labor-management relations like those exemplified by the steel strike (anarchy), the Russian people will never catch up with the material well-being of the American people, let alone with the other things that we should hold at least as dear.

Moreover, they will never catch up with the well-being of the French, the Danes and other Scandinavians, the Dutch, Belgians, Luxembourgers, West Germans. If the Italians were permitted to export their surplus population, the Communist Russians would never catch up with them, either. The conception is absurd.

In civilized living and culture, in the sharing of the amenities of life by people generally, it is impossible for the people of the Russian state to catch up with the present position of the West until at least 50 years after communism as we know it has been abolished. It isn't size and volume that do the job, as every Luxembourger knows. Why didn't we say as much to N. K. when he was here?

However, in volume of production and also in capacity to do us economic damage, the Russians can go a long way—and they will.

In tons of coal produced annually, in steel, aluminum, cement, various manufactured products (we can hasten that by giving them credits for machine tools), new railroad and new highway mileage—in these and other things they can and will outproduce us on an annual basis. That does not mean that in any foreseeable future they will have more for their people than we have for our people, excepting—area.

RELY ON PRODUCTION

The Russians require an immense production to pick their country up out of the rut of underdevelopment, to fill in the immense gaps; whereas we among the developed countries have a great deal of our material job accomplished (except in schools, parks, certain public achievements).

What we mostly expand today, apart from our requirements for war materials, is production directly for the people—hard and soft consumers' goods and the means to produce them. The Soviets could and should do a great deal of that; but they are occupied first with the task of preparing for war, any kind of war.

American audiences who heard N. K. boast "We will surpass you" (knowing as he did that our freedom of communications would make his voice ring round the world) should not merely have smiled; they should have laughed like Cossacks.

The people of Russia immensely enjoyed N. K.'s challenges made right to our smug faces (they believed him, too) and they enjoyed his reports, especially the sarcasm in them, after his visit to the United States, when he toured Siberia in the manner of a triumphant bullfighter circling the ring after a great performance.

However, what Khrushchev sees in "peaceful coexistence" and "competition" is something the ordinary Russian people don't see. There is a tremendous elasticity of production and of distribution potential in the regimented Soviet state. And the "hard core," the men who create and approve the budgets before they are ever submitted to the figurehead supreme congress control the spigots.

Among other things, peaceful coexistence is a war to destroy capitalism by undermining its markets and creating chaos in world trade. It is entirely unlike capitalist competition, however, subsidized the latter might be. The Soviets gave the warning (like the warning of Korea) 2 years ago when they dumped aluminum on the world market at a cut of 2 cents a pound. And this was aluminum sorely needed for consumers' goods for the Russian people.

Meanwhile no one is competing for the trade of the Russian people. The Soviet Government at every budget determines what the trade is going to be. It determines just how much added benefit it is willing to give to the Russian people in the coming year, just as it determines their wages and salaries. Cleverly it adds limited benefits. It can always say the people have more, and prove it. And just a little more satisfies these well-trained seals.

If it becomes desirable in an era of peaceful coexistence to dump 10 million splendid electric razors (with adaptors) on the world market, it can be done; or 15 million tons of steel, millions of tons of cement, tens of millions of board feet of lumber. Name it, and if it is one of the resources included in the vast wealth of this heartland of Eurasia, a Communist government can prepare for the event without anyone knowing about it and execute it at a timely moment in its unceasing war on capitalism.

Therefore the Communists, with their complete control of productive means and labor and vast natural resources can do us immense injury and plan to do so. I think that is what N. K. really meant when he said he would "bury" us. He said it. He meant it. The mayor of Los Angeles did right in reminding him of it, because whatever the means to be employed it is his objective in life. This is combat. He is a Communist.

And so, when we give him the horselaugh in one respect, we of the Western World had better get together with our planning, to meet this other challenge that might in time greatly reduce our well-being. It will be inexcusable if we are ever caught by surprise.

About trade with Russia—I believe we should. But I also believe that we should demand cash on the line—not one cent of credit—and that we should not sell machine tools. We should push for the sale of consumers' goods.

I definitely had the impression that the Russian people sincerely believed N.K. is trying to save the world from the danger of war and that his program is unassailable by men of good will.

Moreover, I believe that Khrushchev himself is sincere, because he is a good Communist and therefore believes that "peaceful coexistence" is a condition whereby all the advantages accrue to the Communist—by common agreement, too. In the summit conference at Yalta, his former boss got all he wanted, by common agreement. No consideration for "the other fellow" has ever warped N.K.'s good judgment, not even when "the other fellow" was a devout (but possibly disagreeing) fellow-Communist.

In the field of disarmament Khrushchev wants an agreement for the abolition of nuclear warfare in any form. That's what the big shooting-off-at-the-mouth is all about. Despite Soviet missile advantages, we still retain sufficient capability to wreak havoc upon Russia. The Soviets want the Air Force and Navy disarmed of these weapons.

While the Russians, completely secure as they are from land attack, have perfected their vast army and handsomely reequipped it, the United States on the other hand has only a token army left today, underequipped, undermanned, softened by pampering,

suffering from loss of morale. This has been our major folly. Let us pray it will not be a disaster.

No wonder the Russians want nuclear disarmament completely. They have the largest, magnificiently trained and equipped army of modern times. They have always known that war is won by the men who take and hold the ground.

I think the "spirit of Camp David" (antoher phrase invented by N.K.) is a wonderful thing.

We should have a lot of conferences, and talk and talk and talk. We, too, should learn how to make 4-, 6-, 8-hour speeches. Our filibusterers in the Senate know how. I am all for filibustering war.

In the business of giving something up, we have made many concessions, some of them tragic betrayals of whole nations, since 1944. The biggest thing we ever did was to get the Russians to keep their agreement to get out of Austria, even though Austria paid a terribly big bill for it. The only concession Russia has made is N.K.'s "concession" not to rush the illegal sequestration and ruination of Berlin.

Constantly we seem at first to be stunned and tongueties at Communist verbal affronts. It is a weak habit for us to remain in a posture of uneasy defense. We, too, have challenges to hurl, bitter truths to state; and these need not be merely recriminations. But on the other hand, we should be the first to invoke the "spirit of Camp David" when a breathing spell permits it. N. K. is an expert at "gamesmanship." If we realize that, we can have our fun too. The adversary will respect us for it.

TENSIONS

The matter of world tensions has been enormously overrated and then blow up out of all proportions by the Communists. It is folly for us to accept their definition of tensions and to react to them like puppets on strings. The entire idea of tensions has been their invention, thrown before the world and inflamed whenever the Communists have been planning new incidents and new grabs.

For our part, we should disavow tensions and publicly and repeatedly beg "our friends, the Russians," to relax and enjoy this wonderful life on earth—and take some of the pressure off of their people and their sanitariums. We should invite them to join us in smelling the flowers.

So far as concessions are concerned, that is a matter of close weighing on the scales. And let us remember that we are dealing with people utterly without the moral and fairplay standards that at least theoretically guide our lives and conduct. That is the one "freedom" that they enjoy and it makes them the most dangerous and deadly traders in world history.

It is stupid to underestimate the power of Soviet Russia. It is suicidal to be afraid of it. It will be a tragedy if we fail to take the measurements of this adversary. That will be a study without end in our time.

Foreign Exports in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a report compiled by the House Committee on Agriculture on U.S. agricultural exports to Western Europe. This is the report of the study group that visited major countries of Western Europe last fall for the purpose of trying to determine why U.S. exports of agricultural commodities are lagging when the demand for agriculutral imports is increasing. I feel that this report is a most comprehensive analysis as to the shortcomings of our present export operations, and goes far in recommending a solution to this problem. It is my feeling that every Member of Congress should read this report and that the public, generally speaking, should be enlightened. Therefore, my reason for inserting it in the daily proceedings of the House.

The report follows:

U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO WESTERN EUROPE—A REPORT ON THE COMPETITIVE POSITION OF U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IN THE HARD CURRENCY COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Attached hereto is the report of the study group which at your instruction visited the major countries of Western Europe last fall for the purpose of trying to determine, if possible, why U.S. exports of agricultural commodities to the hard currency countries of Western Europe are apparently losing some of their competitive position at a time when the demand for agricultural imports into those countries is increasing.

If the report appears to deal almost entirely with the negative aspects of our export program, this is unavoidable, since the very nature of the inquiry was to find out what is wrong with our existing programs and efforts to export agricultural commodities to these countries.

There are some affirmative aspects to this picture and I would mention specifically as an example the excellent trade development programs which are being carried on in several European countries by U.S. trade groups in cooperation with our Government; the work which is being done by the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation to develop our export markets; participation in trade and agricultural fairs to acquaint European importers with our products; and the excellent work which is being done by most of our agricultural attachés in their relationships with the governments to which they are accredited and with local trade groups and importers.

In presenting this report as the Member of Congress responsible for conducting this study, I want to state that the findings and conclusions of the report are not mine alone but are shared by the other two members of the study group: Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and Mr. John J. Heimburger, general counsel of the House Agriculture Committee. Their contribution to this study was indispensable. The report presented herewith is a combined finding and recommendation based upon thorough discussion by the whole group of all the information available to it.

Sincerely yours,

CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress.

U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO WESTERN EUROPE

U.S. agricultural exports declined 14 percent, or $653 million, during the calendar year, 1958. More than half this loss was in our trade with five Western European countries. Our exports to United Kingdom dropped 18 percent in 1958 as compared with 1957. Shipments to West Germany were down 30 percent, to the Netherlands 14 percent, Italy 34 percent, and Belgium down 30 percent.

During this same period, imports of agricultural commodities from the Soviet bloc increased substantially, and these five countries entered into or specifically extended more than a score of trade agreements with Soviet bloc countries contemplating the importation of additional agricultural commodities.

At the outset it should be stated that a large part of the dollar decrease in agricultural trade with the United States was the result of an unrealistic export cotton pricing policy in the crop year 1957–58, which resulted in the foreign shipment of only 2,894,000 bales of American cotton during that year compared to 5,958,000 bales the previous year. With cotton now priced more competitively, there appears to have been a moderate overall increase in our exports to Europe in the calendar year 1959.

Nevertheless, even when these factors are taken into consideration, the export situation is disturbing. The economy of Western Europe is being rapidly reestablished. Consumer incomes and purchasing power are reaching new record levels. There is a growing demand for agricultural imports and the United States is not participating to full advantage in this increased trade. The Soviet bloc, on the other hand, has declared its intention of moving into this trade area and is making substantial headway.

The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture considered this situation to be such as to warrant the assignment of a special study group to go to Western Europe and explore the specific question: "What can the United States do to increase its agricultural exports to this area?"

NATURE OF INQUIRY

The group visited West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, Holland, and the United Kingdom. In addition, it discussed the trade situation in detail with our agricultural attachés from Switzerland and Austria. In each of the countries visited the group discussed the agricultural trade of that country with our agricultural attaché and the Embassy staff, with representatives of the trade, including both importers and U.S. trade representatives, and with local governmental officials. The conclusions represented here are those arrived at by the group as the result of all of these discussions.

It is to be emphasized that we did not engage in original investigation, having neither the time nor the facilities for such an operation. The matters reported here are based on the opinions, observations, and statements of the best informed persons in the countries we visited. We believe that they do represent the conditions respecting our exports and that there is in possession of the Department of Agriculture ample factual detail to support the reports made to us.

It is to be emphasized, also, that this is essentially a negative report, trying to point out what is wrong with our export programs and procedures. This was our assignment. The report, therefore, makes little mention of the positive factors in our export program which we recognize do exist and to which we want to give full credit and approval. These include: some excellent trade development programs being carried on jointly by U.S. commodity groups and our Foreign Agricultural Service; serious efforts on the part of

the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association to develop European export markets; aggressive and intelligent export sales programs being carried out by several commodity groups—notably the U.S. poultry industry; effective promotion at trade fairs and agricultural exhibits; and, last but not least, the effective work being done by our agricultural attachés and their staffs with the governments to which they are accredited and with trade groups within those countries.

It is to be remembered, also, that when you ask the question "What is wrong with our export programs?", you will get from importers all the accumulated gripes and complaints they can think of—some of which may be genuine, and some of which may be merely tactics to obtain better terms in future business. We believe that we have properly discounted this latter factor.

EUROPE AS A MARKET FOR AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Europe, including the United Kingdom, is today the most important market in the world for agricultural exports. It will become an even more important market as economic growth and technological development increase purchasing power and consumer demand. The area is not self-sufficient in many agricultural commodities and in overall agricultural production. As economic growth continues, Europe will need to import increasing quantities of many agricultural commodities.

The agricultural import market in Europe today is highly competitive. It is a buyers' market. Producing areas in all parts of the world are bidding for the European market, and the United States is not maintaining a competitive position commensurate with its long-run interests. If present export policies and procedures are permitted to continue, we will not share fully in the increased agricultural exports to Europe, and we probably will lose some of the markets we now enjoy.

Several of the U.S. products such as feed grains, dressed poultry, and frozen fruits which have a good potential for increased sales are not well known to European buyers. If U.S. producers are to share fully in the future growth of the European market they must develop merchandising programs in the European countries. The merchandising programs should acquaint the end users with the capabilities of the products and should promote such changes in trade practices as will permit U.S. products to be fully competitive with similar products from other countries on a price, quality, and continuous availability basis.

Since it may take some time for private trade organizations to develop the needed merchandising programs for those products in Government stocks, the Commodity Credit Corporation might well assist the private trade in developing effective European merchandising programs.

It was the conclusion of the study group that representatives of U.S. producers or of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be available at trade fairs to promote the placing of orders if U.S. products are featured in the exhibits. U.S. producers should have aggressive merchandising representatives in Europe who, working with and through the private trade, would obtain a larger share of the expanding European market.

GOVERNMENTAL RESTRICTIONS

Virtually all countries (including the United States) have some governmental restrictions against the volume and kinds of agricultural commodities which may be imported. The existence of such restrictions in several of the countries discussed in this report has been an important factor in the volume of our agricultural trade in certain commodities. These restrictions are not discussed in this report because they are outside the scope of our inquiry which was centered on finding out what we, ourselves, can do to improve our agricultural trade position in Western Europe. It was gratifying to find that many of these restrictions, particularly those associated with the dollar shortage following World War II, have been removed or modified. Where such restrictions still discriminate unfairly against U.S. agricultural commodities, it is to be hoped and assumed that our agricultural attachés and diplomatic missions will continue their efforts to bring about their removal.

SHORTCOMINGS OF OUR PRESENT EXPORT OPERATIONS

Throughout our discussions we constantly asked the questions: "How can our present export operations be improved? Why are we losing markets to other producing countries?" Almost without exception we received these major reasons for the U.S. inability to compete effectively in the European market:

(1) Lack of quality, condition, and dependability of U.S. imports: It was shocking to us to hear almost all persons interviewed give this as their first reason for our failure to compete more effectively on the European market. The casual attitude of many of our exporters with respect to the quality, condition, and dependability of exports to Europe is destroying markets rather than building them.

(2) Lack of an effective sales force: While other nations and their exporters are maintaining active sales forces in the major markets of Europe, we found that many American commodity groups and individual commodities have no sales representatives in many European countries. Economic growth is creating import markets in Europe which American exporters are simply failing to take advantage of, by not making a sufficiently serious and aggressive effort to sell products from the United States.

(3) Price: In some instances American commodities are priced out of the European market. Where the price is determined by the amount or the effectiveness of a government subsidy, it is absurd that this subsidy should not be established at a level which will permit American products to compete effectively in the European market with the frequently subsidized commodities of other countries. The spectacular example in this respect is, of course, the failure to price our cotton competitively during the 1958–59 marketing year.

(4) Lack of flexibility in our export operations: Because of the economic recovery and the currency stability which has been achieved by the Western European countries, virtually all are now ineligible for foreign currency purchases of our farm commodities under title I of Public Law 480. If we are to compete on even terms with other countries, however, we must offer more flexibility in trading than is possible now. Other countries in the European market are offering bilateral trade agreements, barter deals, two- and three-way exchanges, extended credit, sales on consignment, and other devices to encourage trade. As far as our Government is concerned, however, American commodities delivered into the European market must now be sold on the "cash on the barrelhead" basis. Since we have determined that these countries are now able to pay dollars for their imports, our only offer is cash sales for dollars and we are doing little or nothing on a governmental basis, to make possible the kind of flexibility in trading offered by other countries.

(5) Uncertainty of U.S. policies: There is a general feeling of uncertainty regarding U.S. export policies and programs. European importers have a feeling that they cannot rely on the United States as a continuing and dependable source of agricultural commodities on predictable terms. A major part of this uncertainty must be attributed to government, but a substantial portion may be traced to the attitude of the trade itself, which has looked upon Europe as a residual for occasional surpluses rather than as a substantial market for long-term export operations.

WHEAT

All European countries produce wheat and collectively they normally produce about three-quarters of their total requirements. Most European wheat, however, is of a soft variety which requires a certain quantity of hard wheat admixture to make an acceptable flour. The wheat market in Europe, therefore, is specifically a quality market. Unfortunately, the experience of European importers leads them to believe that they can be less sure of obtaining the quality wheat they want from the United States than from almost any other producing country. The following comment is typical:

When we buy a cargo of Canadian wheat, we can be confident that the wheat we will receive will be the grade we have ordered or better and that the protein content will be up to specification. When we buy a cargo of U.S. wheat, we can never be sure what we will get but we can assume that it will be at the very bottom of the permissible grade and possibly even lower.

Too many exporters, it would appear, are international traders who are after a quick profit rather than a long-term market for American wheat. Wheat that may have rated at the top of the grade when it left the elevator in Kansas City or Buffalo may be "slugged" when it is loaded into the boat until it barely meets the lowest specifications of the grade it is represented to be. This kind of procedure would seem to raise a question about the whole departmental policy of making CCC sales through private trade. If the CCC has high-quality wheat to sell, it should be able to dispose of that wheat with assurance that it will reach the buyer without adulteration or deterioration in quality and will assist in building, instead of destroying, future markets for American wheat.

An interesting part of this problem is that our wheat exports to Europe are largely in the hands of big, international grain dealers who operate throughout the world and who would just as soon sell wheat from Canada, Australia, or Argentina, as wheat from the United States. In fact, several of our largest wheat exporters are not even U.S. companies and, for various reasons, would probably prefer at times to deal in grain from another country than from the United States. Somehow, producers and others interested in selling U.S. wheat must be more active in Europe and in tailoring U.S. wheat exports to European needs.

Although the Department of Agriculture has for several years been concerned with this problem of quality in U.S. wheat exports to Europe, too little progress has been made in its solution. If the problem cannot be solved by tighter grade requirements or more stringent export inspection, the Department should make whatever recommendations for new legislation appear to be necessary. We can build our long-term wheat markets in Europe only by giving European buyers an assurance of dependable and continuing quality and they have no such assurance under our present export methods.

COTTON

Price and the uncertainty of Government policies are apparently the No. 1 handicap to the United States maintaining its competitive position in cotton exports to Europe. In the marketing year 1958–59, American cotton was priced 5 to 7 cents above the world market. This was a result of the action of the Department of Agriculture in establishing the export subsidy. In the current marketing year, a more realistic

export subsidy has been established and U.S. cotton is more nearly competitive in European markets. Most of those to whom the group talked in Europe, however, felt that the cotton subsidy should be established on a day-to-day basis, as in the case of grains, rather than on a preannounced, established price. Since virtually every other cotton-producing country operates its export programs with some type of governmental subsidy or assistance, it is hard to understand why the United States should not adopt the policy of making its cotton competitive with all other cotton on world markets on a day-to-day basis.

Although there were fewer complaints about cotton quality than there were about the quality of wheat, such complaints were not entirely absent. It is difficult for many European buyers to understand why U.S. cotton could not be sold on the basis of Government grades and staples instead of on the basis of the exporter's private grading system. They point out that a cotton user needs to be able to depend on the grade and staple of the product he is buying, since his operations are usually set up to accommodate a certain type of cotton. Where cotton is purchased on a private grade, instead of on established U.S. grades and staples, the buyer not only may be disappointed in the quality of cotton he receives, but he finds it extremely difficult to secure a price adjustment.

To some extent our cotton export trade to Europe also suffers, as does wheat, from the domination of the market by a few large, international companies. Some of these companies not only operate as brokers and exporters in other countries but have actual proprietary interest in cotton produced in other countries and would, presumably, be more eager to sell their own cotton from some other area than cotton from the United States.

FEED GRAINS

Europe is an expanding market for feed grains. As consumer incomes increase, there is a growing demand for livestock products, which in turn requires additional feed grains. Some of this demand will be met by expanded production in Europe but there will remain, apparently, a very significant and a growing feed grain import market. Whether the United States obtains its share of this market will apparently depend on three things: (1) Market development to create demands specifically for the grains we produce, (2) the quality of the grains we send to Europe, and (3) a real sales effort on the part of U.S. feed grain producers and exporters. If the selling is left exclusively to the large international grain traders, it can be assumed that their efforts to sell feed grains produced in other areas of the world will be at least as great as their efforts to sell feed grains produced in the United States. We cannot escape the conclusion that if U.S. producers of corn, grain sorghums, and other feed grains want to take advantage of the growing market for these commodities in Europe, they must get their own salesmen into the European market areas and keep them there.

They must also see that the quality of their product is maintained. A specific example of the importance of this is to be found in the United Kingdom, where a brand new broiler industry is creating a demand for corn and other feed grains. Within the past 2 or 3 years enterprising Britishers have started in the United Kingdom a broiler production industry patterned directly after the highly efficient broiler production operations in the United States. The wide acceptance of this product is indicated by the fact that in London the traditional fish and chips shops have virtually disappeared and have been replaced by chicken huts and similar restaurants specializing in broilers.

U.S. corn is priced competitively on the world market and we have had a very favorable position on imports of corn into the United Kingdom. This position is being seriously jeopardized, however, by the poor quality and condition of some of the corn which has been shipped to this area. We were told of several shipments of corn which arrived in the United Kingdom in such condition as to be virtually unfit for any use. Apparently, perfectly good hard yellow corn of low moisture content had been mixed at the seaport with enough corn of high moisture content to bring the total down to the very bottom of tolerance for the grade. During the ocean voyage the wet corn had so deteriorated the whole shipment that it was virtually useless on arrival. This may represent a quick profit for the exporter but it is not the way to maintain and expand a market of great importance which can be ours if we will provide a quality product at a competitive price.

SOYBEANS AND GRAIN SORGHUMS

Although classified among the feed grains, soybeans, and grain sorghums require special mention. Some excellent market development work has been done on both these commodities by the Grain Sorghum Producers Association and the Soybean Council of America. In every country we were told, however, that these promotional efforts might in large part be wasted as far as American producers are concerned because there are virtually no salesmen in Europe trying to make sales of these particular commodities. The main thing that is needed, we were told repeatedly, is more salesmen spending their full time in Europe, familiar with the needs and the buying practices of European importers, and able to advise them how to use our products to the best advantage, with sales books in their pockets ready to take advantage of the promotional endeavors of the industry organizations. Perhaps an export sales cooperative, such as is maintained by tobacco producers, would be helpful in this situation.

Questions of quality have also been raised in connection with American soybeans. In the past 2 years, soybeans from Red China have moved into Europe in increasing volume. Comparing these imports with those from the United States, one Government official had this to say:

There have been difficulties with U.S. contracts for soybeans recently, both as regards the quality of the supplies (Manchurian beans are said to have up to 1 percent higher oil content than American) and also as regards the amount of adulteration or admixture. A further point is that Manchurian suppliers are very forthright about allowances for such things as excessive moisture content or reduced oil yield, whereas the American shippers take a very unyielding attitude toward claims under these headings.

DRY EDIBLE BEANS

Another commodity in which the lack of salesmen in Europe is apparently seriously hurting our competitive position is that of dry edible beans. Although the United States consistently produces an exportable surplus of dry edible beans and although Europe is a substantial market for such beans, we were informed that there is not in the whole of Europe one single salesman devoting his time exclusively to the sale of American beans into the European market.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Europe is the largest consumer of citrus fruits in the world, exceeding the United States in every category except grapefruit. Because of the shipping distance involved, it is difficult for the United States to compete pricewise in the European market. It is apparent, therefore, that in these commodities emphasis must be placed on quality, condition, and reliability of supply. It is equally evident that our exporters have not been devoting enough attention to these factors. In virtually every country we visited, there were reports of American fruits arriving at their destination in poor condition. Citrus fruits arriving with as much as 36 percent rot in the shipment were reported, for example.

With respect to fruits and vegetables, an authoritative publication sums the situation up in the following words:

Not only have foreign (other than United States) competitive supplies been increasing and improving in quality, but foreign exporters have been directing more attention to marketing problems. They have increasingly offered advertising, scheduled selling on a consignment basis, panel arrangements, or other devices to gain or maintain a foothold in foreign markets. With even larger supplies promised in the future, the competitive race for a share of the world market in horticultural products is very great indeed.

The U.S. industry will be forced to meet these competitive problems by increasing efforts toward maintaining high standards of quality and condition for products exported to oversea markets. Prior to the war, U.S. products often were unusual in maintaining consistent standards, but in recent years the quality of some competing products has improved relatively more than that of U.S. items.

PROCESSED FOODS

Europe is just beginning to experience the same kind of revolution in the retailing and the home handling of food that has taken place in the United States in the past generation. Supermarkets and self-service stores are just beginning to appear in Europe and their acceptance and development there will probably be comparable to that in the United States. Many homes are experiencing the advantages of mechanical refrigeration, including freezing compartments, for the first time. As these developments take place there will be a growing shift on the part of consumers to prepacked and processed foods. In the opinion of those most familiar with the subject, there will be a substantial market for American processed foods but the extent of this market will depend almost entirely on the quality and dependability of these food products.

Our market will not be improved, for example, by instances of unreliability such as one reported to us. A German importer contracted for a very substantial order of canned green beans from a U.S. processor and had the entire shipment sold to his customers. When the shipment arrived, however, there were only two-thirds as many cases as he had ordered so that he had the unenviable (and unprofitable) job of canceling one-third of the sales he had made.

American processed foods have had a high reputation in Europe for quality and dependability. Since most of them must sell in the retail market at higher prices than local products, it is essential that their reputation of premium quality be maintained if they are to keep their place in this rapidly expanding market.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Quality and condition of exports: That the Department of Agriculture undertake an immediate study to reevaluate its progress to date and to determine what more can be done to improve the quality, conditions, and reliability of U.S. exports of agricultural commodities to the European area. It should consider stricter grade standards, more rigid export inspection, the requirement that commodities exported under Government subsidy be exported on Government grade only, and better procedure than now exists for the filing of complaints by foreign importers and for price adjustments on the basis of such complaints when justified. We believe the Department has available to it now ample data on which to base its studies and that it should promptly take such action as can be taken administratively and recommend to Congress any additional action requiring new legislation.

2. Price: pricing of those commodities which are exported under Government sub-

sidy should be done in such a manner that the commodities are fully competitive on the European market with similar commodities from other areas. More care should also be exercised that the quality of the commodities exported is the same quality on which the exporter receives his subsidy.

3. Government sales force: The various laws relating to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities require that sales shall be made insofar as practicable through the established channels of private trade. The Department of Agriculture has interpreted these provisions to require that all sales shall be made in this manner. There has been established in the Department of Agriculture and Office of General Sales Manager to assist in disposing of these surplus commodities but because of the policy of making all sales through private trade, the office has been relatively inactive.

The lack of private salesmen for certain American commodities in the European area has been commented on in this report. In order to fill this gap and at the same time not violate the legislative provisions regarding sales through private trade channels, it is recommended that the Department of Agriculture consider setting up a sales system somewhat along the following lines:

(1) Establish at strategic locations in Europe representatives of the Office of the General Sales Manager to work directly with importers and the trade to develop possible sales of those commodities which are in surplus.

(2) Establish teletype or other means of rapid communication between each salesman and the sales manager's office.

(3) Notify the U.S. private trade in each commodity of the arrangement being set up and establish a list of exporters who indicate their willingness to pay for collect telegrams informing them of sales opportunities.

(4) When the European representative of the Sales Manager's Office finds a possible sale for a surplus agricultural commodity, he could transmit this immediately to Washington where it could be sent out simultaneously to all of those in the trade who had indicated their interest and willingness to pay for such telegrams.

(5) Specific sales offers could then be made directly by the American exporter to the potential buyer in the foreign country.

This proposal was outlined to several of our agricultural attachés in Europe and opinion was divided as to whether or not it would be helpful and workable in their particular countries in moving our agricultural commodities. At least, we feel it merits the most careful consideration by the Department of Agriculture.

4. Flexibility in sales terms.—Since the close of World War II, our agricultural exports to Europe have been stimulated by various Government programs, including shipments under the Marshall plan and the Mutual Security Act, sales for local currency under title I of Public Law 480, and barters strategic and other materials. The countries of Western Europe have achieved an economic and monetary stability where they are no longer considered generally eligible for sales under title I of Public Law 480. At the same time, most of them have been ruled ineligible for Government-sponsored barter contracts with respect to most of our surplus commodities. The result is that, except for such terms or trading agreements as private exporters may enter into with private importers in the other country, our export sales to Europe are virtually on a cash dollar basis. As has been pointed out, in this highly competitive market where other producing countries are offering bilateral exchanges, barter, sales on consignment, and other trade concessions, this cash on delivery policy can be a serious handicap to the maintenance of our competitive position in this market. It is recommended that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State give serious study to this problem with a view to inaugurating or reestablishing governmental programs which will permit American exporters to compete on a more nearly equal basis with exporters from other countries.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Fiscal and Monetary Policies in the Changing Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Fiscal and Monetary Policies in the Changing Economy," delivered by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] at the midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, at the Commodore Hotel, in New York City, on December 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES IN A CHANGING ECONOMY

(Address by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, to the midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, Commodore Hotel, New York, N.Y., December 8, 1959)

It is a pleasure to meet today with the representatives of the mutual savings banks of the country which have been doing such a fine job of promoting thrift in the areas they serve.

It is also a pleasure again to see your able executive vice president, Grover Ensley, and your counsel, Bill McKenna. I have enjoyed working with both of them while I have been a Member of the Senate. Grover, incidentally, is a part-time constituent of mine, for when you allow him a vacation, he retires to a beautiful spot which he owns on the Shenandoah River in Virginia. Bill, of course, was for a long time counsel of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I now have the honor of being chairman.

I was interested in learning from them more about the institutions which you represent and the important function they perform in the Nation's economy, even though your banks are located in only 17 of the 50 States. I was glad to find that your deposits are continuing to grow rapidly, just about doubling each decade. That is a record of which you can be proud, particularly when it is considered that it was the small savings of many individuals which accounted for your present $35 billion of deposits, and your $1½ billion of home mortgages recorded in 1 year.

Although my State of Virginit has no mutual savings banks, I was interested to learn that at the end of the third quarter of 1957 your institutions had invested over $277 million in Virginia home mortgages. Those investments have benefited both the borrowers and the lenders, for I am sure you have found Virginia mortgages to be good risks.

As chairman of the Senate committee which has jurisdiction over housing matters, I am appreciative of the stabilizing influence you exercise on a rather unstable industry—homebuilding—by your large investments all over the country in FHA and VA mortgages.

My subject is a broad one, and, of course, I could not do it justice in the time which is allotted to me. I can merely sketch some of my views on proper fiscal and monetary policies in a changing economy.

One of the significant changes in our economy is that which is implicit in our population growth. It has been predicted that our population will increase by 25 to 30 million during the next decade, and optimistic estimates are that employment will rise by 12 or 13 million, in the same period, an increase of 20 percent. To provide a proper economic climate for these changes will require intelligence and statesmanship of the highest order.

Our economy is a dynamic one because it is relatively free. The freedom which our private enterprise system provides, whereby economic decisions are made by millions of persons throughout the country, gives us a vitality which is the envy of the world. At the same time, this freedom carries with it the obligation of self-restraint, calling for sacrifice in many directions.

With respect to our international responsibilities, the changes which have occurred over the last 2 years have been striking. Although the United States has had a virtually continuous deficit in its external payments since 1949, the deficits in 1958 and 1959 have been over two and one-half times as large as those of the first 8 years of this period. In 1958, as a result of transactions with the United States, foreigners acquired $3.4 billion in gold and liquid dollar assets. Of this amount, $2.3 billion was in the form of gold. So far this year, transfers of gold and dollars have been at an annual rate of around $4 billion. However, the gold portion of these transfers has been markedly smaller than in 1958.

This change in economic conditions requires corresponding changes in our policy. Shortly after World War II, it became clear that our allies had suffered such appalling losses that they could not get back on their feet without an aid program from the United States—and this in spite of the great agencies created by the Bretton Woods Agreements—the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank. Therefore, in the spring of 1947, at Natural Bridge, Va., I made a speech advocating aid for our World War allies, sending a copy of that speech to the Secretary of State. The following June, Gen. George Marshall developed that theme in his now famous Harvard speech and the United States embarked upon an aid program to close the dollar gap. A bipartisan majority of the Congress wrote the program into law. It was carried out with some mistakes and considerable waste, but, fortunately, with success. Now that the recipients of that rehabilitation program are back on their feet, with strong and vigorous productive capacities, appropriations for foreign aid should be materially reduced.

The deficit in our external payments, while not alarming, demands attention. The fact that most of the European nations are now in sound financial condition is itself cause for gratification rather than for alarm. But this is a change in the economy of the free world which we can disregard only at our peril. The continuation of large deficits in our budget could lead to a lessening of confidence in the dollar as a reserve currency by those foreign governments and individuals who currently hold $16 billion in short-term dollar claims. I rate the preservation of a stable dollar as second only in importance to the preservation of peace.

In my judgment, several major steps should be taken to end the current unfavorable balance of payments.

First, we must make sure that other NATO nations bear their full share of the necessary aid to underdeveloped countries and their full share of the costs of defending the free world. We have taken some steps in this direction—we have increased the proportion of development aid which goes through international organizations, such as the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation, where other countries put up two-thirds of the capital, and by reducing the direct foreign aid programs, where we put up all of the funds. This change is possible because the European nations and Japan are now in a position to bear a larger share of the costs of these programs.

Another essential ingredient in the adjustment of our balance of payments situation is to raise our exports sufficiently, relative to imports, to cover more adequately than heretofore Government payments of $5 billion to $6 billion a year for grants, loans, and military expenditures abroad, and private capital outflows in excess of $2 billion a year.

It is important especially to our farmers that we correct our unfavorable balance of payments by increasing our exports rather than by reducing our imports.

As a member for 10 years of the House Ways and Means Committee, it was my privilege to participate in the initial efforts to substitute, for the trade-throttling Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, the program of mutually beneficial reciprocal foreign trade which is associated with the name of Cordell Hull. My interest has continued ever since, and the program has been successful over the years although it has been modified to meet changes in conditions. With the change in our balance of trade, the continuation of that program will require the best efforts of all of us who believe that trade wars lead to shooting wars and who also believe in putting the general welfare first.

Minority pressure groups today, armed with the change in our balance of payments situation which I have heretofore described, will argue that we must resort to protectionist devices. I disagree, but if we are to continue our mutually beneficial trade programs, nations with whom we negotiated agreements must be required to live up to them, hardship cases must be recognized, and we must exercise more discipline and greater restraint in our domestic monetary and fiscal policies.

A large part of the world is again in competition with us for foreign markets. The European common market is becoming a trading market comparable to our own and a new outer market is being organized. At the same time the Soviet bloc has warned us through Khrushchev, who recently said: "We declare war upon you—in the peaceful field of trade."

Our international trade position is directly related to our domestic economy. Our ability to win the trade war, which Khrushchev has declared, and to hold our share of

the world's trade, will depend upon our producing goods and services which can successfully meet foreign competition. This, in turn, depends upon confidence in the dollar abroad and control of inflation at home.

As indicated, our domestic economy is a changing one, and the policies applicable to it must accommodate to those changes.

In the fall and winter of 1957 and the spring of 1958, we were suffering from a recession, with substantial numbers of unemployed and a substantial decline in our industrial production, gross national product, and national income. But from the middle of 1958 to the middle of 1959 all of these measures of our national wealth rose rapidly, and by June 1959 had exceeded the previous peaks. The wholesale and retail price indexes continued their inexorable rise during all of this period, as they had through virtually the entire postwar period. And if the prices of farm products and foods had not fallen since the spring of 1958 by over 10 percent the increases in the overall wholesale and consumer price indexes would have been much more significant.

The longest steel work stoppage on record interrupted the recovery that started in the spring of 1958. Through last September, its effect was confined for the most part to the industries involved in the strike. However, as the strike continued into October, its secondary effects were much more widespread, and by early November the total number out of work because of the direct and indirect effects of the strike approached 1 million.

With output in steel and related industries sharply curtailed, industrial production in October was nearly 5 percent below the prestrike peak in June. In November, with steel production up sharply, it is expected that the total index will show some rise, despite curtailments in steel-consuming industries.

Gross national product declined $6 billion, or over 1 percent, in the third quarter of 1959 due principally to a shift from building up to liquidation of steel stocks. Total business inventories declined at an annual rate of $1 billion during the quarter, in contrast with a $10 billion increase in the second quarter.

Despite these developments, income and consumer spending held up well. Between June and October, personal income declined less than 1 percent. Most other types of income were stable or above that period.

The national economy is beginning to recover from the contraction caused by the steel strike. Following reactivation of the major steel plants on November 7, production climbed rapidly and was scheduled at nearly 80 percent of capacity for the week of November 15. Workers in related industries, such as foundries and coal mines, are being recalled to their jobs. Workers in other steel-consuming industries will not be recalled insubstantial numbers for some time yet, because of the time required to refill the pipelines in the steel-fabricating process.

In spite of the aberration caused by the steel strike, our principal long-term economic problem both within this country and with respect to our international balance of payments is the control of inflation. It seems quite likely that, in the long run, the net effect of the steel strike will be additional pressures on the wage-price spiral.

The most important single element in this struggle against inflation is the balancing of the Federal budget. Last year, fiscal 1959, ended with a record setting peacetime budget deficit of $12½ billion. This year, fiscal 1960, an anticipated balance has, by the steel strike, been turned into a probable deficit of $500 million. For the next fiscal year, incidentally an election year, we hear of new and expanded programs which would add billions of expenditures. Many of the proposed new programs, and many of the proposed increases in existing programs, will be supported by large segments of the country, and many of them will have considerable inherent merit. But in spite of this strong support and their possible merit, these programs must be weighed in the scales of monetary and fiscal policy. They must not be approved unless we are prepared to pay for them by taxation, and then only if it can be demonstrated that the resources involved can be better utilized in those programs than in the private uses to which the resources would be put were they not preempted by taxation. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I shall fight for a balanced budget for fiscal 1961 but my present feeling is that it will be an uphill fight.

The monumental task of managing our existing debt will remain with us. The Treasury, faced with the problem of refinancing about $75 billion a year, must have greater flexibility with respect to interest rates and maturities in order that more of this debt may be placed on longer terms with less pressure upon the money market.

We must continue to support the Federal Reserve System in its policy of monetary restraint. No group should be more aware than yours of the fact that monetary policy must be flexible and that the creation of new money or bank check money should be with relation to the necessary money work to be done. We must resist the efforts of those who would convert our central bank into an arm of the Treasury, affording a market for a huge debt, regardless of other demands for money, and regardless of the price, or interest, which the market will pay for that debt.

"Nations," said a popular political leader 27 years ago, "have been wrecked on the rocks of a loose fiscal policy." Revolution and dictatorship are the end products of uncontrolled inflation. In my opinion any discussion of fiscal policies becomes meaningless unless it includes the perpetuity of our personal freedom. Therefore, I hope you will not think that I am talking partisan politics when I say that the preservation of States rights is as important to the North and the rest of the Nation as it is to the South—the keystone of the arch of constitutional liberty.

Marched About 60 Miles in March-of-Dimes Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I enclose articles from the Daily Reflector under the title "Marched About 60 Miles in March-of-Dimes Project."

Eighteen men who participated in this marching event so that little children could walk are to be congratulated for the great effort they made and the contribution they are making to one of the Nation's most outstanding and worthy causes.

The articles follow:

[From the Greenville (N.C.) Daily Reflector, Jan. 15, 1960]

MARCHED ABOUT 60 MILES IN MARCH-OF-DIMES PROJECT

East Carolina College Air Force ROTC officials believed this morning the local school's precision drill team "set a record for ROTC drills teams" in their 12½-hour marching stint that ended close to midnight last night and raised some $520 for the current March of Dimes campaign.

The 18-man team began its "marchathon" yesterday morning on Third Street in front of the Pitt County Courthouse at 11:30 after announcing it would continue to go through its paces as long as contributions to the annual charity campaign came in at the rate of 10 cents per second.

After 3 hours of precision drilling, the money count revealed the rate of contribution was less than $50 per hour, but the cadets insisted upon continuing the gruelling pace that amounted to an estimated 60 miles for the 12-plus hours.

Under the direction of T. Sgt. Thomas E. Winstead, of Wilson, the drill team continued its round-the-clock march in spite of official suggestions that it come to a halt.

Each member of the team contributed $1 to the campaign, comprising the largest cash donation of the afternoon. A pair of $50 contributions boosted the morale of the marching students about 9 o'clock following a 4-hour drought, Sergeant Winstead told the Daily Reflector.

The students, accustomed to marching some 10 hours per week, were allowed 5-minute breaks upon completion of each hour's drilling. During these brief rest periods, cadets sat on the Third Street curbing and rubbed blistered and aching feet.

At the members' requests, the short rest periods were discontinued toward the end of the 12-hour hike because "our feet hurt worse when we stop."

Sergeant Winstead voiced disappointment at the rate of contribution. "We certainly expected better results," he said. Other ECC ROTC officials believed contributions might still be on the way. The air science office on the campus will remain available for contributions to be phoned in (PL 2-6101, extension 258).

According to the air science office this morning, the local drill team got to bed around 1:30 this morning only to rise again at 4:30 to travel to Langley Field, Va., for an orientation visit to that U.S. airbase. Drill team members were accompanied by other AFROTC cadets at ECC.

Sergeant Winstead was "very proud of the entire cadets corps at the college—very proud of them." He emphasized, it was "not their idea to stop, I'm making them quit."

The same members that began the marathon hike were still marching at the end. Only four were forced to leave the ranks because severe foot blisters prevented further marching.

DIDN'T WANT TO GIVE UP
(By Henry Howard)

Yesterday, about 1.4 million steps pounded Third Street in front of the courthouse here. Probably more steps in 1 day than it had ever seen.

Sixteen East Carolina College Air Force ROTC cadets and their leader comprised a sharpstepping drill team that vowed to march continuously as long as contributions to the March of Dimes fundraising campaigns rolled in.

The initial plan was to march as long as donations to the tune of 10 cents per second piled up. The march began. Contributions very slow.

At the end of 3 hours of constant drilling, tabulations showed the men had marched about 2½ hours on credit. Still the cadets marched.

Spectators gathered in small numbers off and on throughout the afternoon as a microphone picked up the sound of the heavy boots rhythmically pounding the street.

At one point, the team drilled for something like 4 hours without a single donation, a sergeant said. Then morale was boosted by a pair of extra nice gifts. The marching continued.

Cadets gratefully rested and hungrily consumed provided refreshments during the 5-minute breaks allowed after each hour of constant drilling. They sat along the curbing during the afternoon and rubbed tired and sore feet.

Doggedly, they continued the long grind. Around 6 o'clock, they paused a quarter-hour for a quick meal of sandwiches. The march continued.

At 9 o'clock, the sergeant reported he'd suggested the "marchathon" come to a halt. The boys wouldn't hear of it. They were operating in the red but were determined not to give up. At that point, they'd traveled some 45 miles.

The "Angel Flight," a group of ECC coeds, stayed with the drill team and kept coffee hot as the night grew colder. Still the cadets marched.

As the end of the 12th hour approached, the sergeant prepared to call a halt to the drilling. He stressed, "It's not their idea to stop, I'm making them do it."

During the last few hours of the marathon march, the cadets decided against the hourly 5-minute rests. Our feet hurt worse when we stop," one of them explained.

As 11:30 p.m. arrived the drill team came to a halt. All but four of the original team were still standing. Those four marched faithful until blistered feet prohibited another step.

The sergeant believed the boys set a record.

Harry S. Truman's Love of Home and Family, by Rev. Baxton Bryant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently all Texans were very proud and pleased to have former President Harry Truman as a visitor in our State. He had several speaking engagements, all of which were extremely well attended, and all of which received warm response from Texans.

On Sunday, October 18, 1959, President Truman was lay speaker at a special layman's day service at the Elmwood Methodist Church in Dallas. In writing the program for that service, the church's minister, Rev. Baxton Bryant, wrote a tribute to President Truman which every American should read. While all Americans know of President Truman's political success and governmental achievements, few pause to reflect the sound character and solid family basis upon which his successes rest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the tribute published in the Elmwood, Dallas, Tex., Methodist Church program for October 18, 1959, under the title "Welcome, Mr. President."

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT

History in person comes to Elmwood Methodist Church today. We would be honored to have any President or ex-President of the United States to visit our church, but it would be impossible to find one who has contributed so much to the making of a better world than Harry Truman. History has already been kind to Mr. Truman, but it is our faith that an evaluation removed from partisan prejudices and personal emotions will record him a place alongside America's greatest Presidents. I count it a great personal joy to share my pulpit with this great man and here are some of the reasons.

U.N. mainstay: The lack of Harry Truman's signature could have kept the U.N. from coming into being, and with it gave to the world, a forum where the nations of the world could sit down and talk instead of fight. While the U.N. was still in its infancy, he made it a force to be reckoned with by sending American troops to defend a free Korea.

A new America: Our world changed from a selfish, isolationist nation hiding behind an outdated Monroe doctrine to a caring, sharing concern for people who love freedom around the world, under the Truman doctrine. A free, independent Turkey and Greece stand as grateful, first witnesses to this new America of world responsibility.

Feeds a starving enemy: While many of us were still filled with hate toward our enemy, it was our President that led the way in showing Christian forgiveness and compassion. It was his program that fed the starving children of our enemies, helped them rebuild their homes, factories, and cities. As a result, some of our strongest allies today were enemies yesterday. This is christianity at work on an international basis.

Friend of underdog: Our distinguished guest has always been for the underdog, regardless of race, color, or creed. He dared to challenge America to truly be "a land of the free." He accepted literally the first two words of the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father," and preached a stronger sermon on brotherhood than most of our prejudices could accept. Someday, when race tensions will be no more, and every man will stand with equal dignity and pride in his own race, this great man will have helped an unwilling nation reach its greatest height, a nation where a man will not be judged by the color of his skin, but by what he is, and what he has to offer in service to God and humanity.

Love of home and family: Since Mr. Truman became world renowed, we have been privileged to get a glimpse of four living generations of his family. They are four generations filled with character and family devotion. Grandmother Truman won the hearts of a sorrowing nation with her humble statement on the death of President Roosevelt, and her son's elevation to the highest office in the land, "I cannot really be glad my son is President because I am sorry that President Roosevelt is dead. If he had been voted in, I would be out waving a flag, but it does not seem right to be very happy or wave any flags now. Harry will get along. I knew Harry would be all right after I heard him give his speech this morning. I heard every word of it but Mary, my daughter, is going to read it to me. Everyone who heard him talk this morning will know he is sincere and will do what is best."

Every mother would be happy to have a son treat her as Harry Truman treated his mother. Divorce courts and marriage counseling bureaus would disappear if all marriages were like the Trumans. Every daughter would adore a daddy who had the spunk to speak up for her, even if he was President of the United States. It would be a great joy for fathers if all daughters had the beauty of character that Margaret Truman Daniel possesses. Mrs. Bess Wallace Truman graced the White House and the world with her humble Christian virtues. Margaret has now presented her parents with two lovely grandchildren, and grandparents would do well to follow the former President in his lively, loving, sensible attitude toward his grandchildren. Living in a glass house for all to see, not one word of gossip ever touched this entire family relationship.

He was human: He never once denied being human. Since there was only one perfect being, he, like the rest of us, has ofttimes been human. That is why we are in church today, seeking strength greater than our own, to help us be more than we are. On this layman's day in our land, we are privileged to have one who has been about the Master's business in the community of nations. Mr. President, we welcome you to our pulpit.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Adoption of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the Council of the City of Philadelphia:

RESOLUTION 23

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress, the Governor and the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to take cognizance that the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States will be celebrated in Philadelphia in 1962, and to appoint committees at their respective levels to join with the city of Philadelphia in appropriately planning for this auspicious event

Whereas the Constitution of the United States has become known throughout the world as a document of transcending importance, setting forth the basis of this Government and defining the rights, privileges and duties that have made American citizenship one of the most prized possessions of all time; and

Whereas this document, consisting originally of a preamble and seven articles, was drafted in Philadelphia and approved unanimously by George Washington and the delegates of the various States in convention assembled in this city on September 17, 1787; and

Whereas the Constitution, with its amendments and interpretations, has become not only the supreme law of the land, but a document of fundamental human rights worthy to be emulated by peoples everywhere, and stands as a monument to the legitimate aspirations of mankind; and

Whereas preparations by the city of Philadelphia are now underway for the observ-

ance of the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution in this city in 1962; therefore

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States, the Congress, the Governor, and the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to take due cognizance that the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States will be celebrated in Philadelphia in 1962, by appointing committees to join with the city of Philadelphia in planning the appropriate observance of this auspicious anniversary.

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, the Governor of Pennsylvania, and the members of the Pennsylvania State Legislature.

U.S. Foreign Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a recent radio broadcast, program No. 269, by Wayne Poucher, radio minister for Life Lines, a patriotic religious-education movement.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID

As Joseph Stalin moved toward power in the Soviet Union, he wrote a book entitled "Marxism and the National Colonial Question."

In this book Stalin said: "It is essential that the advanced countries should render aid, real and prolonged, to the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development. Otherwise, it will be impossible to bring about the peaceful coexistence of the various nations and peoples within a single economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."

It is amazing that in its foreign aid program the United States is following Stalin's advice to the letter.

From the very beginning Stalin, Khrushchev, and the other dictators in the Kremlin have been determined that the United States and its form of capitalism pay for its own death and burial. The mistaken would have us believe that America's only hope for survival in the cold war is the continuance of this backbreaking and economy-ruining foreign aid program. In reality, the facts prove directly the opposite.

Thoughtful men have returned from trips to Europe confounded by the growing lack of confidence throughout the world in the American dollar. Our foreign aid dollars have built industries and the economies of the nations receiving them to the point where they are now driving us from the world market. We are not only pricing ourselves out of business but are also financing foreign governments and their nationalized industries to compete further with us.

The American dollar is no longer the powerful weapon it once was. The situation is brought sharply home to the American tourist who visits Canada. When he lays down $1 for exchange in Canadian money, he gets back not 100 cents but from 93 to 95 cents. Yet the mistaken continue to say the United States is well able to hand out our natural resources and national fortune for every cause, no matter how minor, no matter how remote.

Foreign aid, which has built the nationalized industries of our allies, has brought about the flight of gold from this country and with it the inflationary spiral which threatens everything in our land. With inflation and near-confiscatory income taxes, a man who made $5,000 in 1939 would now have to earn $13,500 to live as well as he did just before the war. The American wage earner cannot longer maintain his standard of productivity and living and at the same time pay for the great giveaway to foreign countries.

The longer a man does not have to work for his keep, the less likely he is ever to get back to his lathe. The longer foreign aid is continued, the longer will people expect the handouts to keep coming.

There is another ironic twist to the whole foreign aid business which the mistaken blur and distort. The United States has shelled out many billions of dollars in foreign aid funds to nations—friendly, unfriendly, and on the fence—to help them get their financial houses in order. Yet, for the United States to give out those billions, the Government was forced to borrow the money to make it possible for other nations to balance their budgets. If it were not so serious, it would be almost laughable.

The multiplied billions of dollars are gone. But where is the good will we were to reap from handing them over?

More than a 100 years ago Karl Marx, the father of communism, predicted that the capitalistic countries could be forced to spend themselves into bankruptcy and ruin. But force does not seem to be necessary when it comes to the disastrous foreign aid programs of the United States. Without the use of force year after year the money is voted away.

The mistaken will keep right on screaming that foreign aid is our duty because we have so much. But the facts prove the opposite. If we are to save ourselves, we must get our own house in order—for who among the nations we have helped can be counted on to come to our rescue when we call for a lifeline?

J. B. Hardy, 50 Years Owner and Editor of the Thomaston (Ga.) Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. J. B. Hardy, editor of the Thomaston (Ga.) Times, celebrated his 50th anniversary as owner and editor of that newspaper. Mr. Hardy is an outstanding civic leader and has devoted many years of service to the community in which he lives.

In the February 4, 1960, issue of the Thomaston Times there appeared a front page editorial, entitled "Times' Editor Hardy Completes 50 Years On Job." This editorial was written by Mr. Leon Smith. Mr. Smith's article points out in detail Mr. Hardy's record and accomplishments.

The front page editorial, which appeared February 4, 1960, follows:

TIMES' EDITOR HARDY COMPLETES 50 YEARS ON JOB

(By Leon Smith)

On February 1, 1910, a young newspaperman came into Thomaston and took over as the owner and editor of the Thomaston Times "on a temporary basis" and 50 years later finds that the temporary arrangement is one of the longest on record.

J. B. Hardy celebrated his 50th anniversary Monday as editor of the Thomaston Times and the mechanical and editorial staff gathered around the press Thursday morning to surprise the boss with a 50-candle anniversary cake as he received the first paper off the press.

And we can predict, as this is written in advance, that the same man who handed him the first paper off the press 50 years ago will be handing him the first one off today. That man is Walter H. Jenkins, the mechanical superintendent of the newspaper plant who was on the job when Mr. Hardy arrived in Thomaston 50 years ago.

Editor Hardy came to Thomaston 50 years ago from Barnesville to take over the Times which had finally gone into bankruptcy after a succession of editors. "It looked like a good business deal that I could hold on to for a little while and then let go at a profit," he recalled in a casual conversation the other day. "But I found Thomaston to be a good business town and it has continued to be good," he added.

So Thomaston became home to Mr. Hardy who was reared on a farm near Monticello. "I've chopped cotton and picked cotton but my daddy would have to get me out from under the dinner table to get me back into the field," he has recalled of his childhood days. After finishing high school at Monticello, he went to Gainesville to work with his brother on the Gainesville News. Later he moved to Barnesville to work with another brother on the Barnesville News-Gazette and it was there he heard about the newspaper being for sale in Thomaston.

The Times and its predecessors date back to 1869 so its plain to see that Editor Hardy has guided the Thomaston newspaper for more than half its existence.

And as editor of the Times he has been responsible for much of the progress made in this community. The late R. E. Chatfield always credited Mr. Hardy's persistent editorials about wood buildings around the square with moving him to erect the two-story store and office building which is known as the Chatfield building and is occupied by City Drug Co. and other businesses and offices today.

The Upson County courthouse was the most modern structure that Mr. Hardy found when he came to Thomaston and the present-day structure was 2 years old when he arrived here. The population of Thomaston was about 1,500 and the original unit of Thomaston mills was only a few years old. The Waymanville cotton mill was still in production and Upson County was a leading agricultural county. Thomaston was also, about that time, the second largest mule trading center in Georgia.

Progress has rolled on in the 50 years since 1910 and much of it came at the editorial insistence of the man who now looks back on a half century as editor. Wooden sidewalks was all that seperated one from the mud 50 years ago and Mr. Hardy has seen the paving of practically all of Thomaston's streets and miles of sidewalks.

During 50 years in the editor's chair, Mr. Hardy has guided his readers in many political campaigns and attests to the fact that local politics has always been clean. Although he always has felt that politics and business, particularly the newspaper business, don't mix, he was persuaded to run one time for state representative and his defeat only strengthened his belief.

Editor Hardy practiced what he preached about progress. Although he found the newspaper plant modern upon arrival here (it had a mechanical typesetting machine even at that time), he continued to upgrade it through the years. The Times was one of the first weeklies in Georgia to buy an Intertype machine and now boasts three Linotypes in addition to much other modern equipment.

The editor back in the early days didn't restrict his efforts to polished editorials, advertising, and coverage of the news events of the community. On occasions he has single-handedly got out the Times.

It was the Times that first mentioned a modern hospital for Thomaston and Upson County and Mr. Hardy, again willing to do more than give suggestions about progress, became chairman of the hospital authority that secured the funds and constructed the million-dollar Upson County Hospital. And, incidentally, he still serves as chairman of the hospital authority.

Looking back on 50 years in Thomaston, Editor Hardy believes that the one person who made the most contributions to the community in his half century here was the late R. E. Hightower whose guiding genuis led Thomaston Mills on a half-century of progress by which the entire community benefited. "But Mr. Hightower was more interested in the mills. He made many other worthwhile contributions to the community," Mr. Hardy has been heard to say.

A venture in which Mr. Hightower and Editor Hardy were a part of was construction of Hotel Upson by a stock company.

The Times, through the guidance of its editor, has always provided a spark of encouragement for better schools and better education. Again, the editor was not content to suggest and sit idly by for others to do the work. He served on the Thomaston Board of Education and was at one time chairman of that body.

Always willing to further religion through the columns of the Times, Editor Hardy also has been a leading figure in the progress of the First Baptist Church. He served for many years as Sunday school superintendent, an active deacon, and was chairman of the building committee which constructed the main unit of the existing church.

In recent years, Mr. Hardy was the first to recognize the fact that Thomaston was about to lose its place on the map if bypassed by U.S. Highway 19. He alerted the community to this fact and the editorial columns of the Times became a main instrument in securing the million-dollar project now under construction. In other community and civic endeavors he has devoted years of service to the Thomaston Kiwanis Club of which he is a charter member. And this group rose to its feet Tuesday to give him a standing ovation in recognition of 50 years as editor of the Times. With a balanced view toward work-health-education-religion-recreation, Mr. Hardy has made his contribution to each, serving the latter with years as an officer of the Thomaston Country Club.

Realizing that a newspaper can be a strong voice of influence only if it is a properly conducted business, Mr. Hardy has guided it through 50 years of financial responsibility—the last 20-odd years with the assistance of his partner, S. J. Carswell. Although many of his predecessors failed financially and Thomaston came many times dangerously near being without a newspaper, it has never faltered in the 50 years he has been at the helm. "I immediately found 50 years ago that Thomaston was a good business town and it has continued to be so," he commented.

Together with his publishing partner, Editor Hardy has provided Thomaston with a Tuesday newspaper since 1945 and was instrumental in organizing the Thomaston Broadcasting Co. which he now serves as president. Mr. Hardy is also president of the Thomaston Federal Savings & Loan Association—a financial institution dedicated to two principles which he has always advocated editorially—homeownership and thrift.

A half century of service to his community behind him, Editor Hardy still maintains a keen interest in the progress of Thomaston and Upson County and his advice and experience is still being shared with the readers.

Nixon as President—Statesman or Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech given by Mr. Harold Clancey, managing editor of the Boston Traveler, at the Ford Hall Forum in Boston last October.

These remarks are part of a debate with Mr. James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, on the question, "NIXON as President—Statesman or Politician."

Mr. Clancey is not only an able journalist but also a serious student of government and politics, and therefore his statement on the question is mighty well put. It is an extremely articulate refutation of some of the myths which have been created about the Vice President's political career.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The words "statesman" and "politician" are perfectly clear to me. A statesman is a good guy. A politician is a not-so-good guy. Now, I dote on goodness, in others, and oppose sin, in others, so I necessarily always vote for statesmen. Thus, you see, by inescapably logic, a statesman is one for whom I vote—such as RICHARD M. NIXON.

Well, that settles tonight's question. Seriously, I wish it did. The program links my name with the word "conservative." Exactly what that means is not clear. But that won't stop a lot of people from being against it. Ford Hall Forum audiences usually are receptive to those who call themselves "liberals." I am opposed by Mr. Wechsler (James Wechsler, editor, New York Post), who calls himself a liberal, and who is a professional persuader infinitely more experienced and resourceful than I.

To preserve tidiness, the issues are narrowed by a formal question: "NIXON as President—statesman or politician" That rules out any bickering over New England versus Manhattan clam chowder. Everything else is fair game.

So, in that setting, I am here to justify Mr. NIXON'S entire life. I must prove him a statesman—not by comparison with other human beings—but by measuring him against abstract standards of perfection: perfect integrity, perfect wisdom, perfect truth. To what extent is he short of total goodness? NIXON—compared with God. They have given me an entire 30 minutes in which to do this.

Are there any questions?

OVERALL RECORD

Mr. NIXON is a Republican. If that doesn't lose you, there's still some hope. But his overall record is repugnant to extremists. It is the record of one who prefers the middle-of-the-road to the ditches on either side.

He has been deeply interested in international affairs since he served on the Herter Committee in his first term. He is widely traveled and personally acquainted with most of the world's statesmen. He has always been for liberal foreign aid. He supported the United Nations and he defended the Voice of America when it was under attack in this country. These things distress the isolationists.

On the other hand, he does not view the UN as a supra state to which we should surrender our sovereignty. He prefers temporary foreign alliances to permanent partnerships. These views annoy those who would trade our independence for a vote on a committee. He battled Mr. Truman's Far East policy, which irritated some on the far left, and supported Mr. Truman's controversial aid to Greece and the decision to send troops into Korea, which angered the right wingers.

Nationally, he would strive for a balanced budget, which horrifies the A.D.A., but thinks it should be balanced in 4-year cycles, which maddens those McKinley Republicans to whom it is an annual obsession. He has favored reforms to eliminate labor racketeers and restrain labor bosses and to give more rights and powers to rank and file union members.

That antagonizes one extreme group. He fought to extend social security to the 12 million workers not previously covered and to increase unemployment benefits.

That antagonized the opposite group. He favored reduced excess profits taxes to provide business incentive and foster depreciation rates to encourage expansion of plants and equipment and provide additional jobs. His purpose is to produce a climate conducive to volume production—risking lower prices to attract more sales—and thus steadily improving the standard of living.

WHAT THE RECORD REFLECTS

This record reflects a philosophy—a faith that our system can achieve the wide distribution and resultant prosperity which is the theoretical justification of socialism. That, with social conscience for the infirm and the unfortunate, and equal opportunity for the able, we can achieve the classless society which is the illusory promise of communism. And that we can do these things without sacrificing our individuality and our freedoms to all-powerful big brother government—to the state central—which is the price demanded by both communism and socialism.

THREE-WAY EXPERIENCE

To this political creed NIXON brings vast experience in government, diplomacy, and politics. Becoming Vice President has been, historically, somewhat like falling down an elevator shaft: A flurry of excitement when you first step in, then—oblivion. NIXON is the first to be an assistant President. He has attended all meetings of the Security Council and the Cabinet and presided over them in the President's absence. He has been the chief liaison of the administration with the Senate and House. As President of the Senate he has been praised by LYNDON JOHNSON for his fairness to the Democrats in his rulings and special appointments.

It is a safe statement that no man in our history has had such opportunity to learn the job of being President. Not even his bitterest enemy denies that he has worked hard at it.

Now Mr. NIXON is opposed by several groups for various reasons. I have talked with many helpful and intelligent persons

whose political philosophies differ from his. I have neither the arrogance nor the inclination to insist they must be wrong. In such matters, we can only believe. History must judge.

But he is also opposed by an almost incredible collection of political beatniks. For instance, there are the compulsive reformers and social experimenters of the New Deal whose little hands are idle right now. There are the Democratic professionals: they can't forget that 20-year banquet and they think of NIXON as the waiter who presented the check and began to turn out the lights.

And he is the favorite wax doll of a group of cruel and arrogant pinstickers, a certain mutual-admiration society of writers and journalists sometimes referred to in the trade as "the Cult." They parlayed their considerable talents to positions of eminence by logrolling, promoting, and publicizing each other doggedly. When one spoke or wrote the others cried in disciplined chorus: "That's great!" or "That's profound!" or "That's art!" And so they arose, in everascending spirals of reciprocal advertising, furiously backslapping one another to prominence. As with all propagandists, they came in time to believe in their own snake-oil—their own legend of infallibility.

HISS CASE CHALLENGE

In the Alger Hiss case NIXON challenged the snap-judgment of this intellectual mafia. He compounded that heresy by being right—to their public humiliation. They have been dedicated to his destruction ever since.

Finally, there is a group that seems to hate him for no reason at all—except, I suppose, that they have to hate somebody. Arguing with these people is like trying to sell plowshares to the Hatfields and the McCoys. They just like what they're doing. Yet, it is also a sort of game—nightmarish, but, once you have learned the rules, weirdly fascinating.

They'll say to you: "NIXON? Why, he's a reactionary. He's a hypocrite." This is pronounced with complete assurance in a where-have-you-been tone of voice. Out will come a copy of one of Mr. Wechsler's editorials to show NIXON is a tool of the special interests. Out comes an issue of the New Republic and it says, right there, that NIXON entered politics as the handpicked candidate of a group of California bankers and oil millionaires. (And the phony wasn't even a Republican.) "There," you'll be told, "for heavens sake, son get with it."

Well, he's right—that the charges have been printed. And you still hear them repeated. But assume you do some research yourself. You will find NIXON was picked from among several interviewed by a committee of 100 Republicans. They had advertised in 26 newspapers looking for a new candidate. They had lost five consecutive elections to Democrats and they were tired of it—which shows how vicious those Republicans can be. There were some wealthy men in the group, possibly as wealthy as F. D. R. or Stevenson or Harriman. But the majority were in the middle-income and even low-income bracket.

INVESTIGATIONS

The New York Times and the Saturday Evening Post, intrigued by the sinister generalizations applied to the group, investigated the members and described the committee as a representative cross-section of California Republicans. Every day of NIXON'S life has been turned over with smutty fingers, trying to find something, anything, that would blacken him and that would stick. They have cross-examined his teachers, schoolmates, shipmates, friends, neighbors, and casual business acquaintances. They have culled every speech, every bit of writing, even—so help me—papers he wrote for schoolboy debates. They have twisted, distorted, taken out of context, invented, fabricated and lied—but they haven't been able to prove a single act of wrongdoing, a single compromising transaction or a single specially favored millionaire.

As to the nonsense about NIXON'S party affiliation—the carefully planted myth that he became a Republican just to seize the opportunity to run in 1946—it is a plain and simple lie. He was a registered Republican as early as 1938 and even voted as a Republican by absentee ballot during the war.

So, back you go to demand more convincing evidence. Do you know what he'll say? He'll say: "Oh—so you're one of those." At which point he may give you a narrow and knowing look and walk off and leave you. And that, believe me, is not a bad thing at all. Or he may say: "Well—I see you've missed the whole point. NIXON is a reactionary at heart, but he doesn't vote like a reactionary. Therefore, he's a hyprocrite. Think, son."

Now, keep the etiquette in mind: You must not counter by complaining that the facts he gave you earlier were inaccurate. In this game, that's a foul. You're penalized half the field of argument and you may become, at the player's option, a NIXON-trained seal. That costs even more points than being one of those. Therefore, when they show you the newspaper story about his fat legal fees, don't mention the fact that he has refused to accept any law business since election to his first public office.

FACT AND THE FANTASTIC

When they show you the column about those fantastic fees he gets for speaking, be still. Don't remark that it is a documented fact that every cent he earns in this fashion goes directly to Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish charities.

When they show you the exposé of all his expensive furnishings selected by his high-priced interior decorator. Just swallow. Chances are you never saw the retraction anyway—it was lost amid the noise of the next blast of untruths. And people forget. The particulars fade in a world too busy with today's headlines and today's concerns. All that remains is a hazy recollection of unpleasantries.

The psychology is to create, in time, the feeling: "I don't like NIXON. I don't exactly know why. I just don't." That is the epitaph of the politically punch-drunk brain after it has been washed and put on the shelf with all the judgment pressed out of it.

Back in 1952, corruption in government was a major issue. There was a scandal a day about the RFC, the Revenue Bureau, the 5-percenters, disposal of surplus. The Nation was talking about such things as Harry Vaughan, deep freezes and natural pastel mink coats. NIXON was demanding an end to the mess in Washington. Somebody had to do something to divert attention—and somebody did: Mr. Wechsler, a member of the have-gun-will-travel wing of the ADA, went to work on a story which was dull and uninteresting as written by NEA columnist Peter Edson. Many ignored Edson's story. Some papers ran it inside. No one was excited.

Then, more than 24 hours after Edson's complete and accurate story had been mailed to his hundreds of client newspapers, the New York Post revealed NIXON slush fund. The headline read:: "Secret Rich Men's Trust Fund Keeps NIXON in Style Far Beyond His Salary." The story exposed a "millionaires" club devoted exclusively to the financial comfort of Senator Richard Nixon. Every statement I have quoted was, of course, later proved a complete, barefaced lie. But, this was really playing the game. It was the biggest ground gainer pulled that year by the team's stab-in-the-backfield.

DEPENDS ON WHOSE FUND

There was panic. California investigated. The GOP called in Price-Waterhouse accounting firm and more than a score of top attorneys. Some, thinking nervously of November, urged Eisenhower to drop NIXON without waiting for the evidence. Pro-Stevenson advisers said Eisenhower should do it for his own good—Macy helping Gimbels. For the 10,000th time Stassen offered himself as vice president. Warren reportedly was willin'. And, oh, what a chorus from the journalistic assassins. There they stood, the turtlenecked sweaters and blackjacks out of sight, rolling their eyes heavenward in shock of the infamy of man.

Mr. Stevenson was silent, nervous, perhaps, but silent. Later, it came out that he had had two funds as governor of Illinois. One was explained. The other—allegedly consisting of some $100,000 raised from persons doing business with the State while he was in office—has never been denied or explained. I do not seek here to imply by snide innuendo that Mr. Stevenson misused any money or became the tool of his contributors. My purpose is to note again the hypocritical double standard. Funds immediately ceased to be important after the Stevenson revelation. It is a foul to mention it.

So the line of attack switched: NIXON'S telecast had "been arranged by an advertising agency." Of course, every radio or television program by any candidate is arranged by an advertising agency which contracts for the time. The whole thing had been "carefully rehearsed." Actually, NIXON did no rehearsal. He arrived 15 minutes before the show began. Asked whether he would sit or stand he said he didn't know. He was in the middle of a sentence when it ended.

His remark that his wife had only a "good Republican cloth coat" was objectionable on two grounds: First, it was disconcertingly true. Second, it recalled memories of the mink coats of the Truman administration—and that's a foul. And he mentioned his only present—a dog named Checkers. When FDR made his speech about his dog—Fala—that was statesmanship. When NIXON mentioned his—why it was undignified.

NO LACK OF LIES

Well, it never stops: A story revealed how NIXON had vacationed in Havana, losing heavily at roulette, the bill paid by those millionaires (who should have been going broke about that time). It was a complete lie. They hadn't paid. He hadn't been on vacation. He had not been to Havana.

There was the story revealing that he and his wife had taken a pauper's oath in California shortly before making a downpayment on a house. The State of California began an immediate investigation since the implication was criminal—that they had committed perjury and defrauded their creditors. This was another vicious libel: the Richard Nixon who had signed the oath was a different and unrelated person. The retraction was buried on the end of a column published on a Saturday when circulation is smallest.

Then a column told of the existence of a letter that could ruin NIXON'S career. It was a letter from an oil millionaire indicating NIXON was on his payroll. Later, it was proved a transparent and amateurish forgery. What is the reaction of the professional NIXON-hater when his evidence is proved fraudulent? He'll say: "So it wasn't true that NIXON was a liar and a thief and a fake and a defrauder and a perjurer and a man who sold his high office for money—but how can you defend a smear artist like NIXON?"

FACTS ON TRUMAN

You've heard the indignant assertion that NIXON called Harry Truman a traitor. Ask

your informant: "When?" It is a fiction contrived by political propaganda. However, for the record: NIXON never said it.

I do not say that NIXON has always spoken with the precision and the exactitude of fine shading necessary in a mathematical formula. In politics, nobody can; nobody ever has. The language of politics is traditionally and inevitably the language of hyperbole, of oversimplification, of the catch-phrase and the slogan.

Everybody knows it was not, literally, "Hoover's depression." The Republican Party was no more the "Party of economic royalists" than the Democratic Party was the "Party of treason." (The latter, incidentally, was said by McCarthy, not by NIXON.)

But the Democrats hung the albatross of the depression around the neck of the GOP and tied Teapot Dome to its tail. It didn't matter that most of the elephant's heart was pure. The GOP, while in power, had appointed to high positions men who proved corrupt. And, while in power, the Republicans had been inexcusably blind and soft toward financial manipulators and crap-shooters who sabotaged our economy. With the power went the responsibility. And how they howled for the Republican scalp.

WHAT THEY IGNORED

Mr. Wechsler was just a boy howler in that age. The age is gone. The boy remains. Now he howls in anguish instead of rage because NIXON insists the Democratic Party be blamed for corrupt appointees and softness toward the subversion which occurred while it was in power. Who is to demand a different standard for donkeys than for elephants—except, of course, a donkey? No, NIXON didn't call Mr. Truman a traitor. But Mr. Truman called Mr. NIXON a liar and an anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic S.O.B. The hypocrites snickered, applauded, and said: "Give 'em hell, Harry." As to the "lie," it was later proved NIXON was correct and Mr. Truman's memory faulty.

A prince of the Catholic Church and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith vigorously and emphatically cleared NIXON of the charge of bigotry.

And if we now must regard as unbecoming the mention in a speech of any dog, other than Fala, I submit NIXON's use of checkers has more dignity than Mr. Truman's S.O.B.

Now, finally—is Mr. NIXON a politician? Of course he is. An astute and experienced politician. Yet tonight we use the words disjunctively—statesman or politician? That implies that a statesman must not be a politician, that he must exercise his statesmanship in a political vacuum. That is like separating love and marriage. Even those who find it attractive find it impractical.

And it isn't history. Take Abraham Lincoln: He was a Republican, but he has been dead a long time. That means he meets even the Democratic National Committee's definition of a good Republican. If he had not been a very resourceful politician he would have been split like a rail by his political opponents. Perhaps, then John Wilkes Booth might have died decently of boredom and senility during a benefit recitation at the Lambs Club.

JUNGLE OF PRACTICAL POLITICS

But other bits of history—somewhat more important—would also have been radically and terribly different. FDR is regularly—the disenchanted might say ritualistically—extolled as a statesman by many. Indeed, in the several temples of the A.D.A. across the land his is the Book of Genesis. Yet he had to guide his program through the jungle of practical politics. No one can contend he made it through the bush on soul-power alone. Any President must be a politician to win his party's support. He must be a politician to get elected. He must be a politician to implement his program. He must, in the long haul, be a better politician than his foes if he is to survive, much less succeed.

A President, to be a statesman, must first be a politician. One of the failures of democracy is that we never know how often we lose the service of men who would rather be right than be President—men with the right idea, but without the political talent or instinct for its practical achievement. And democracy also fails when the presidency is debased by the slick salesman of the empty package, the man with no idea except politics—the man who would rather be President than be right.

Yet, we survive such failures.

We survive because there comes along, more often than the cynics suspect or the angry partisans admit, a man who can be both right and President: a man whose idea is right for the time and who is a sufficiently capable politician to achieve it. This is the miracle that makes democracy work. RICHARD M. NIXON, is, I submit, such a man.

Justification for the Tax-Exemption Provisions Applying to Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a letter, statement, and survey from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C., concerning the justification for the tax-exemption provisions applying to cooperatives.

Mr. Burger's letter as well as his statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, with supporting data, follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., February 4, 1960.

Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the increasing inroads of discount houses, co-oprs, etc., in our overall economy, of course, it goes without saying that this is making it harder and harder for efficient independent business to exist.

The co-op action, earlier in our Nation's economy was probably long overdue, but apparently the privilege is being abused by tax concessions.

The opinion of the increasing membership of the federation in your congressional district is embodied in the repeated polls on the subject matter. Your office has received these ballots.

Therefore, I would deem it a necessity that the attached statement appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Thanking you for your cooperation, and with highest regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C., before Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives)

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740-742 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

We are a national organization composed exclusively of small, independent business and professional people. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in our country. We have membership representation in Federation chapters in almost all of the Nation's congressional districts, including Alaska and Hawaii.

Our members directly determine our stands on legislation, through their majority votes in polls we take among them in our publication, the Mandate. We take such polls about once each month. In each poll we state the issue, and offer the strongest factual arguments on both sides of the question, ourselves remaining neutral, and permitting members to make up their own minds. Our members receive their Mandates through the mails, read them, and then vote and sign their ballots in the privacy of their homes and offices. We do not see or touch these ballots at any point. Members channel them to their Congressmen through their district chairmen, who are local federation members they select to head up each chapter. At the same time that chairmen forward the signed ballots to Congressmen, they report the overall results to us. The sum of tabulations received from chairmen in our more than 2,500 chapters across the country determines our stand.

I might say that the personal signatures on each ballot, the fact that all ballots are voted privately, is authentication of opinions sent to Congressmen. And I might add further, that verification of our polls can be found in the files of chairmen reports we maintain at our headquarters at Burlingame, Calif. We are the only organization of our kind in the country.

As to the business at hand, I am here today to tell you how our members feel about the tax status of one of their principal forms of competition * * * our country's cooperatives. My credentials are the following five polls we have taken among our members on this subject during the past 4 years. Note, please, that I am taking great care to show each poll in its entirety, so far as is physically possible. I am not doing this to clutter the record, but rather to be as fair as possible with both you and our members.

As to these polls:

In May of 1956 we polled our members as follows:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 221]

"Are you for or against Treasury Department plans being considered to tax cooperatives on money they allocate for patronage refunds but which they do not actually pay out to members?"

Argument for: "Co-ops are not required to pay taxes on that part of their income set aside for dividends. They are not required to distribute these dividends as they declare them. The co-op member on the other hand is required to pay tax on dividends allocated but not paid. But he doesn't always do so. This permits the co-ops themselves to allocate money for dividend payments, then use the money tax-free for financing. But private business must pay full taxes on all earnings. This gives co-ops a great advantage over private businessmen."

Argument against: "This is just another potshot on co-ops. Cooperative members are required by law to pay taxes on money

allocated to them, whether or not they receive the cash. Thus Government is assured tax income on these, the same way it's assured tax on corporate dividends. But more, such a ruling could be pointless. Nothing could stop co-ops from paying dividends in cash, or stop members from returning this money to them after tax. Business must remember its tax breaks: greater ability to build rainy day reserves, tax cuts."

The following Mandate we reported the result of this poll:

Following is the national summary of votes cast on issues carried in "The Mandate" No. 221. This summary has been forwarded to Members of Congress, to members of the permanent Senate Small Business Committee, to members of the House Small Business Committee, to other interested congressional committees, members of administrative Government and Government agencies.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. Limit foreign aid to military assistance only	61	31	8
2. Treasury plans to tax co-ops on dividends allocated but not paid to members	91	6	3
3. H.R. 9398. Repeal labor union antitrust exemptions	90	8	2
4. S. 3516. Antitrust fines for business executives who promote monopoly damage	76	16	8
5. H.R. 10613. 10 percent across-the-board income tax cut	66	29	5

In November of 1956, we polled our members again, as follows:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 225]

"Are you for or against action by Congress to compel cooperatives to pay full Federal corporation taxes on all their profits?"

Argument for: "Fully taxed corporations, many of them small firms, suffer injurious, unfair competition from cooperatives. Reason is found in the co-ops' preferred tax standing. Corporations must pay a corporate income tax on all profits; then stockholders must pay a personal income tax on dividends received. But the co-op must pay a corporate income tax on only those profits left after dividends are distributed, and even then may issue certificates to members, and keep the cash itself for tax-free operating capital. No wonder the tremendous growth of cooperatives these past years. All the more reason for Congress to move swiftly to correct the situation. Incidentally, corrective action by Congress could net Government at least $500 million more taxes."

Argument against: "This is an unfair proposal and has but one aim: complete destruction of co-ops. By and large co-ops now pay taxes on the same basis as partnerships, which despite their corporate form of organization is what they really are. In a partnership owners pay a tax once on their share of profits. In a co-op members are the partner-owners and must pay a personal income tax on their share of the profits, represented in patronage refunds. But since the co-ops are incorporated they are required to pay a corporate tax on all profits not distributed to members, and this they do. To make them pay a corporate tax on all profits before refunds would be as unfair as to make partners pay a corporate tax on profits before taking their cuts out of the business."

The following Mandate we reported the result of this poll:

Following is the national summary of votes cast on issues carried in "The Mandate" No. 225. This summary has been forwarded to Members of Congress, to Members of the permanent Senate Small Business Committee, to Members of the House Small Business Committee, to other interested Congressional Committees, members of Administrative Government and Government agencies.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. Congress make tax cuts first business in 1957 session	78	17	5
2. Congress compel cooperatives to pay full taxes on earnings	92	6	2
3. Congress compel large firms planning to merge to tell antitrust agencies in advance	75	20	5
4. Congress further strengthen our tariff laws	65	24	11
5. Congress reduce social security and withholding reports business must make to Government	81	15	4

In September of 1957, we again polled our members, as follows:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 233]

H.R. 501. Tax co-op organizations: "compel cooperatives to pay Federal income tax on all their earnings, including so-called patronage refunds" (Representative MASON, of Illinois).

Argument for: "Fully taxed corporations, many of them small firms, suffer injurious, unfair competition from cooperatives. Reason is found in the co-op's preferred tax standing. Corporations mus pay a corporate income tax on all profits; then stockholders must pay a personal income tax on dividends received. But the co-op must pay a corporate income tax on only those profits after dividends are distributed, and even then they may issue certificates to members, and keep the cash itself for tax-free operating capital. No wonder the tremendous growth by co-ops these past years."

Argument against: "This is an unfair proposal and has but one aim: complete destruction of co-ops. By and large co-ops now pay taxes on the same basis as partnerships, which despite their corporate form of organization, is really what they are, in a partnership owners pay a tax on their share of the profits, represented in patronage refunds. But since the co-ops are incorporated they are required to pay a corporate tax on all profits not distributed to members, which they do. To make them pay a corporate tax on all profits before refunds would be as unfair as to make partners pay a corporate tax on profits."

The results of this poll were reported, as follows, in the next mandate:

Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 233. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government for their information.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. H.R. 2815. Ceiling on imports	63	27	10
2. Business damage suits against labor unions	95	3	2
3. H.R. 501. Tax cooperatives	90	7	3
4. H. Res. 413. For a permanent House Small Business Committee	88	7	5
5. H.R. 9307. Restrict picketing	94	4	2

In October of 1958, we polled our members as follows:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 243]

Tax Cooperatives: "Are you for or against action by Congress to compel cooperatives to pay Federal income tax on all their earnings before they deduct anything for patronage refunds?"

Argument for: "Thirty percent of the first $25,000 of your corporate income (or 20 percent or more if you're not incorporated) * * * that's the bite that Uncle Sam takes out of your business income. But he doesn't take a thin dime in taxes from any cooperative that goes through the motions of paying patronage refunds to its customers, but keeps the actual cash involved. Estimates are that this dodge permits co-ops to retain upwards of several hundred million dollars yearly in tax-free money for expansion and modernization. This gives them a tremendous unfair advantage over you * * * and this bill would correct the situation."

Argument against: "Co-ops are taxed differently from other business because they are different. They're not in business to make a profit for themselves. Their customers, who are their owners, are the profit-takers when they receive patronage refunds. They are required to pay a tax on these refunds (their profits), when they receive them. And they do pay these taxes. Moreover, all this talk about tax equality. There are tax differences between corporations, partnerships, individual proprietorships * * * because these business form are different. Why differences for them, and not for co-ops?"

The results of this poll are found in the following Mandate:

Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 243. This has been sent to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government, for their information.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. Break up union monopolies	96	3	1
2. Higher taxes on gasoline	29	67	4
3. Tax cooperatives	88	9	3
4. Bigger depreciation on used machinery and equipment	80	14	6
5. Make House Small Business Committee permanent in Congress	93	4	3

In April of 1959, we again polled our members:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 247]

H.R. 199. Tax cooperatives: "This bill would require cooperatives to pay taxes on all their earnings, just like all other corporations" (Representative MASON, of Illinois.

Argument for H.R. 199: "30 cents out of every gross profit dollar is the size of the bite Uncle Sam takes out of your earnings if you're a small corporation. Twenty cents is the bite he takes if you're a really small unincorporated operator. But not so with your cooperative competitors. The law lets them distribute their earnings (in the form of paper I O U's), but keep the money tax-free for business expansions and other competitive purposes. Co-op patrons are supposed to pay a tax on these paper remittances, but don't do so until they get the money. You can bet this gives co-ops a big jump on you. The bill would correct this."

Argument against H.R. 199: "Co-ops are taxed differently from other firms because they are different. They're not aiming to make a profit for themselves. Their customers, who are their owners, are the profit-takers when they receive patronage funds. They are required to pay a tax on these refunds (their profits) when they receive them. And they do pay these taxes. Moreover, this talk about tax equality is a phony. There are tax differences between corporations, partnerships, individual proprietorships because these business forms are different. Why should they be different, but not co-ops?"

The results of this poll, reported in the following Mandate:

Here's the national summary of votes on issues in Mandate 247. This has been sent

to all Congressmen and Senators, all congressional committees, and all agencies and individuals in the executive branch of our Government, for their information.

[In percent]

	For	Against	No vote
1. H.R. 3141. Repeal the 10-percent telephone excise tax	72	24	4
2. S. 442, H.R. 2325. Require advance notice on mergers	74	19	7
3. H.R. 199. Tax cooperatives	93	5	2
4. H.R. 718. Close loopholes in surplus property sale laws	91	5	4
5. H.R. 1823. Provide broader local control of labor disputes	85	9	6

In December of 1959, we again polled our members:

[The Mandate, Bulletin No. 253]

H.R. 7875. Taxing of co-op income: "Require co-ops (a) to pay patronage refunds in cash or by interest bearing notes to members each year, and (b) to pay taxes like all other businesses on all remaining earnings (Representative Simpson of Pennsylvania)."

Co-ops can declare refunds, but withhold payment from members. They can keep the cash tax-free and give members simple IOUSs. Members pay no tax on those I O U's until they get the cash.

Argument for H.R. 7875: "According to law, co-ops are supposed, each year, either to make cash refunds to their members or give them certificates representing promised cash refunds. In either case, co-op members are supposed to pay taxes currently on these. But the courts have held it illegal for the Government to require payment of taxes on certificates representing payment promised in the future. This leaves the door wide open for co-ops to withhold cash payment of refunds, issue tax-free common IOUs instead, and hold their earnings, entirely tax free, for expansion."

Argument against H.R. 7875: "Just another effort to pester cooperatives. If Congress thinks the courts have usurped its legislative powers in providing that co-op members do not have to pay taxes currently on the ordinary certificates received in place of cash refunds, then let Congress take the ball into its own hands and pass a law overturning the court decision. One thing that people overlook is that even though taxes may not be paid currently, sooner or later they are paid, because sooner or later co-op members receive the cash dividends."

The results of that poll showed:

	Percent
For	89
Against	7
No vote	4

Note, if you will, the fact that in each of the foregoing polls approximately 9 out of every 10 Federation members who signed and sent their ballots to their Congressmen favored proposals to tighten up the taxing of cooperatives. Note this almost unanimous expression, as contrasted with the sharply divided opinions on many of the other issues presented for their vote.

Of course, it is impossible for us to discuss with you the reasoning used by these members in each of their votes.

But we can tell you that many of our members are in situations where they are required to compete with cooperatives. A short list of some of the items handled by cooperatives should give you some idea of the scope of this competition: tires, oil and petroleum products, feed, fertilizer, clothing, food, farm-building materials, furniture, homebuilding materials, farm machinery, electrical appliances.

To give you some idea of how our members see this competition, and the part that the cooperative tax status plays in it, we quote from two of the many letters received from our members:

The first, a tire dealer, wrote to us in February of 1958:

"I would like to call your attention to a condition that is becoming more prevalent in the area, causing increasing loss of sales to all local tire dealers. It seems that the G.L.F., a so-called farmer's cooperative, has sold a considerable amount of tires under their brand name of Unico. During the past winter season their sales of snow tires far surpassed all previous records—and they have been so encouraged by the results that I understand they are now prepared to conduct an even more vigorous campaign to corner more of the market.

"Their very favorable tax position enables them to sell new tires for less than the cost of a quality retread, and because of this price feature all the associated dealers I have in the outlying areas have been unable to sell any tires except in the case of an emergency.

"I am not too familiar with the structure of a cooperative but I do not think they are supposed to run newspaper ads repeatedly to the general public, especially with banner headlines claiming 'Buy As the Farmer Does and Save On Taxes' etc. They are no longer restricting sales of their products to so-called members."

The second, a Southern businessman, wrote to us in September of 1959:

"While at home, indisposed for the day from my office, I thought I would write you a personal letter.

"Several months ago I wrote to my Senator with reference to my deep concern on the tremendous gains cooperatives are making. They pay no taxes, this is a serious situation.

"Just because I am writing you sir, in long hand, please don't discount my contents, for it is written to you earnestly and with concern.

"My Senator graciously answered my letter, telling me that this item was being worked on.

"Let me give you an example. The Farm Bureau Coop is located a stone throw from my place of business. I am an independent businessman. Own a small corporation.

"I strictly sell supplies to mushroom growers. Farm Bureau Co-op—an organization formed to sell farmers decided to handle and sell mushroom supplies and my business declined 30 percent. In fact, I had to release my key man, I paid him $112.75 per week.

"Do you know who hired him? My neighbor, Farm Bureau Co-op:

"Fortunately, I have some other legitimate income for last year with Farm Bureau selling at ridiculous prices, caused much of my business to go to them. I cannot compete with these kind of organizations—why does and do our lawmakers permit this to persist?

"Don't you realize what this does to the small businessman? Just like the writer? I either have to lose money or get out of business—and it will probably be the latter for Farm Bureau pays no taxes.

"Tell me, I have asked my legal counsel but they seem not to know—the Farm Bureau Co-op's—were they not originated to sell only the farmer? This I am in accord with, the farmer deserves a break. But, sir, tell me, can they expand their business by within law and sell to another facet, the mushroom growers, who are not farmers? There should be some way to stop this evil to the standard American business practice. Are they represented by lobbies? If so, why so strong to overpower our lawmakers.

"This situation is a serious one and I trust something can be done. It seems unjust in truly our great country that we permit such practices to go on and every lawmaker with 'God given sense' knows co-operatives are not fair competition to the the independent businessman. Reason—because they are not taxed and can sell anything for a small margin above cost."

And we can tell you that our members know these things about the tax status of co-operatives:

1. That generally, co-operatives are not required to pay any Federal income tax on that part of their yearly earnings which they distribute to their members and patrons in the form of refunds * * * but that co-operatives can satisfy this requirement by merely issuing certificates to their members, promising to pay at a later date, and then withhold the cash covered by these certificates, entirely tax free.

2. That while patrons and members of co-operatives are supposed to pay a Federal personal income tax on all refunds they receive, the courts have ruled that they need not pay such tax on certificates until such time as they get the cash these papers represent.

3. That this situation theoretically makes it possible for cooperatives to arrange things so that no one has to pay any Federal income tax on any part of their yearly earnings * * * and that this gives them an opportunity to build up entirely tax-free funds of capital.

Frankly, I do not know the extent to which cooperatives are making use of this tax avoidance procedure. I have seen figures which put it up in the tens to hundreds of millions of dollars. But I do think it is obvious that to the extent they are making use of it, they are gaining a definite competitive financing advantage over their fully taxpaying business competitors, which advantage is more important than ever during this time of tight money and high interest, this time which is bearing so heavily on independent businessmen.

Believe me, during this period when direct and indirect taxes are constantly rising, at Federal, State, and local levels, it gives me no pleasure to come before you and ask that you do something that will add to the burdens being carried by any of our people. However, I do believe that this cooperative tax situation involves a basic, harmful inequity * * * and on behalf of our members, and in line with their majority opinion in the signed mandate votes which they have sent to their Congressmen, I do earnestly ask that you take action to require that cooperatives be required to pay up their Federal income taxes each year, just like all other businesses with whom they compete. My position is, and the position of the people I represent is, that every form of business enterprise in competition with other business enterprises should all receive the same treatment and be on an equal basis before all laws—taxes or otherwise.

We do not ask more, because we have no aim to injure or destroy cooperatives. In truth, all we are asking is that they be required to stand on their own two feet taxwise in their competition with others. In simple justice, we cannot ask less.

Milwaukee Wins Title as Safest Big U.S. City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the task of promoting ever-greater safety on the Nation's highways is one of the great problems facing the country domestically. Today there are

about 70 million automobiles on U.S. highways.

While this great stream of traffic is of tremendous value for commercial and pleasure travelers, it is also regrettably a real hazard to human life. Annually, nearly 40,000 people are killed in automobile accidents. In addition, the value of property is approximately $1.8 billion. All costs, including medical, wages lost, insurance and property damage, are estimated to be about $5.4 billion.

Throughout the country constructive efforts have been made at the local, State, and National levels to promote highway safety. Unfortunately, these efforts have not yet had the desirable results, despite all the safeguards—including building better, safer highways, and putting more safety devices on automobiles. The major responsibility, however, still rests upon the driver behind the steering wheel.

In view of the catastrophic toll of lost lives, as well as property damage, still occurring on our roadways, it is always gratifying to find examples of communities making progress toward greater safety. Recently, for example, the National Safety Council revealed that Milwaukee, Wis., in 1959, established the best safety record of any city in the United States of more than 350,000 population.

This fine community, and the individual citizens responsible, deserve commendation for their constructive record to reduce the hazards on their highways and streets; their efforts, I believe, are worthy of emulation elsewhere. At this time, unanimous consent to have an article from the Milwaukee Journal entitled "Milwaukee Wins Title as Safest Big U.S. City"—forwarded to me by Mr. B. L. Corbett, managing director of the Milwaukee Safety Commission—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE WINS TITLE AS SAFEST BIG U.S. CITY—FIGURES SHOW ONLY 1.5 DEATHS FOR EACH 10,000 AUTOS; STATE TOLL ALSO DIPS

Milwaukee in 1959 had the best traffic safety record of any city in the United States with more than 350,000 population, the National Safety Council revealed Friday.

Ratings were on the basis of deaths per 10,000 registered vehicles. Milwaukee was first in its population class (500,000 to 750,000) with a low of 1.5. Seattle, with 1.9, and Buffalo, with 2.2 were runners-up in Milwaukee's population group.

Milwaukee's 1.5 ranking was bettered only by cities with fewer than 350,000 population. Comparable big city ratings:

More than 1 million—Detroit, 2.8; Los Angeles, 2.9; Chicago, 3.

750,000 to 1 million—St. Louis, 2.7; Washington, 2.7; San Francisco, 2.9.

350,000 to 500,000—Denver, 1.9; Portland, Oreg., 2.1; San Antonio, 2.3.

Wichita, Kans., topped the 200,000-350,000 group with a 0.7 rating. Leading cities in smaller population groups had 0 ratings.

Although there were 800 more traffic deaths in 1959 than there were in 1958, the council reported that the mileage death rate (number of deaths per 100 million vehicle miles) was at a record low of 5.4. The 1959 death toll of 37,800 was 900 below the 1957 figure and almost 2,000 fewer than in 1956.

Highway travel reached an alltime high of 695 billion miles last year, the council said. In addition to those killed in traffic mishaps, 1,400,000 persons suffered disabling injuries, and the cost of accidents was estimated at $5,800 million.

Wisconsin was one of 17 States that had fewer traffic accidents in 1959 than it had in 1958. For the entire year, 140 cities maintained perfect traffic records. The largest was Evanston, Ill. (76,200).

Chronically Distressed Labor Markets Suffering From Substantial Labor Surpluses for Long Periods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fact sheet compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee with offices at 99 University Place, New York City, which points up the need for passage by the Congress in this session of the Area Redevelopment Act, which passed the Senate during the last session and is now pending before the House Rules Committee:

FACT SHEET NO. 37A—CHRONICALLY DISTRESSED LABOR MARKETS SUFFERING FROM SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUSES FOR LONG PERIODS

The principal characteristics of the unemployment in the chronically distressed communities is that the substantial labor surplus continues to fester for long periods of time. Recovery is not quick. On the contrary it stays for long periods. Even where the labor market later is graduated out of the distressed condition, it now takes long periods of time for the improvement to occur. More often than not the advance takes place because of the outmigration of people and the reinvigoration of some of the existing enterprises. But where these alternatives are not easily available, the recovery is slow in coming. It now takes a decade or two of the most aggressive action and then may not be successful. The community may have failed to redevelop itself properly.

Evidence of the length of the time of the substantial surplus is provided by the following table which enumerates the time of the start of the most recent period of continuous substantial labor surplus.

Date of start of last period of substantial surplus	Total	Distressed labor markets		Number with prior period of substantial labor surplus
		Major	Smaller	
1951	1	1	0	0
1952	18	6	12	0
1953	8	1	17	0
1954	10	1	9	1
1955	11	0	11	1
1956	17	1	16	5
1957	75	15	60	30
1958 (October or before)	26	7	19	8
Total	166	32	144	45

Significant is the fact that some labor markets with more recent starting dates for their chronic distress had suffered prior periods of substantial labor surpluses. The revival was short lived and these communities fell back again into the category of chronically distressed.

Farmers' Week Address by Hon. Philip A. Hart, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Thursday evening, at the Michigan State University, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] delivered a speech in connection with the celebration of Farmers' Week. While he himself had to remain here to vote on the school aid bill, his remarks were delivered via film. His penetrating statements on the farm program should be preserved in yet another and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in full in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, DEMOCRAT OF MICHIGAN, AT THE ANNUAL FARM MANAGEMENT BANQUET HELD DURING FARMERS WEEK, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, THURSDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 4, 1960

Farmers Week is one of the rich traditions of our great State. It has served well, not only the good farmers of Michigan but our whole economic community. Again we meet here on the Michigan State University campus, the most appropriate setting for this conference in all of Michigan. No longer is MSU thought of as preeminent in the agricultural education field alone. Its contribution in all the disciplines long has been acknowledged. But tonight I want to report that which is no surprise—the quality of its agricultural faculty is conceded by everyone with whom I have had contact in Washington. First hand I can testify to the willingness of that agricultural faculty to help me. I take this opportunity publicly to thank them for their help and patience with this agriculture student.

Some 16 months ago, during the campaign for the U.S. Senate, I came to MSU and delivered a speech on agricultural policy. As the radio soap operas put it, time passed. I was elected to the Senate—just a year ago. Within days of the opening of the Senate, the freshmen were assigned to their committees. For the first time in 35 years, Michigan had a Senator on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—it was HART. And I was afraid to look at that speech I had made. I hope all future officeholders profit from my experience, and when they campaign beyond their fields of experience, they had better realize that suddenly they may have to answer the question, just as I did: "Well, what are you going to do about the farm program now?"

Dean Cowden and his staff of able professors know a lot about freshmen. They know they take awhile to settle down and do their studying. So, as in all institutions of higher learning, where there is great tolerance but ever-present hope for their potential, ways are devised to make freshmen study. It's

called semester exams, and the cramming that is done for these exams is one of the great techniques of the American educational system.

There is a similar problem and a similar method in the Congress. Cramming comes on the day before the committee opens hearings on a basic farm bill. The examination occurs when the roll is called. It is a yes or no vote. Just like some yes or no college exams, some of the questions are so involved they seem to require more than just yes or no answers. Incidentally, when that roll is called in the Senate Agriculture Committee, it is a great advantage to come from a State with a diversity of agricultural and forestry interests such as we have in Michigan. I don't have to answer the roll for cotton, rice, tobacco, wheat, dairy, citrus fruits, or corn and hogs. Every man on the committee, I am sure, seeks what is best for the whole country, but if your State's chief economy is one basic crop, you can expect to find that crop's best interest looking mighty like the whole country's best interest.

Perhaps my baptism of fire came on the wheat bill last year. I discovered that not only did thousands of Michigan's farmers grow wheat, but that there were different kinds of wheat. The kind we grow in Michigan is in high demand and is not in the great storage bins as the surplus which is the Nation's worry. One of our great troubles is the failure of the press, slick and daily, to make this fact clear in their call to arms against the wheat glut.

A fellow named Mr. Yankus also kept my life interesting. But even though the bills we sent to the House and to the President would have made Mr. Yankus' life easier had he stayed with us in the United States, and would have protected our 15-acre wheat farmers in Michigan, the administration and the President worked hard against both the bills—the one that would have cut 20 percent in exchange for an 80 percent price support, and finally the 25 percent cut in exchange for 90 percent parity supports.

Well, we are back working on the wheat this week—the opening hearing was on Wednesday—and all I can say is that I will do my best for soft white winter Michigan wheat, as well as for a program that will bring some order to a situation seriously out of balance. Here again, because Michigan is a State with diversified farming, I do not feel the same kind of duty which one would feel if he represented one of the great wheat areas.

Fortunately, I am not a candidate this year for any office. I do not come to you with a farm program. But there will be plenty of those who will do just that this year, and tonight I want to discuss some of the criteria—the tests—by which we might evaluate the 1960 farm programs proposed by the avowed and the unavowed candidates, not to mention by the major farm organizations of our Nation. What are the questions we should ask about any farm program?

Eight separate questions or measurements have occurred to me as I have done my cramming on my assignment, and I mention them not in any necessary priority or order:

First, will the farm program enable farmers to share in the proceeds of their own increased productivity, as well as the increased national prosperity which the future should hold for all our people?

In recent years farmers have not gained from their increased productivity. On the contrary, their income has been reduced. Michigan's farmers are no exception. To the extent that legislation will be a factor in this participation in productivity, the difficulty and limitations have been illustrated in the contrast between the work I have done on the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and my work on the Agriculture Committee.

When Congress is concerned with the nature of automobile financing or pricing, it is a simple matter to have the officials of the three or four firms that produce over 90 percent of the Nation's automobiles appear before the committee. Contrast this with the impossibility of hearing from the over 2 million farmers who produce 90 percent of our feed and fiber.

When the demand for automobiles or steel was not particularly good during the 1958 recession, the assembly lines were slowed or stopped, and the steel mills went on short shifts. As everyone knows, the farmer cannot do this. All those with farms here tonight could not significantly affect the food or fiber by substantially cutting their production—not even all the farmers in Michigan could achieve a meaningful measure of reduced national production if they should cut farm production in half next year.

The individual farmer, regardless of the level of price, cannot significantly affect overall output; on the contrary every pressure upon him is to utilize his production resources to the fullest. This would seem to say that a national farm program that does not recognize the need to influence orderly changes in overall farm production and work to do just that, is inadequate.

A second measure to ask: Does the farm program make a contribution to our foreign policy; does it advance the cause of world peace and the growth of less developed nations? Does it at least avoid conflict with or harmful effects upon the United States relations with other nations? This general topic may seem far away, but specific actions involving these issues confront us every day. Will the revision and extension of the Sugar Act—a program from which we might learn much in dealing with basic commodities—will this extension help or aggravate our relations with Cuba? Will our overseas sales of wheat affect the economy of our neighbors in Canada? Clearly yes. Then how do we reconcile conflicting claims? These are not insignificant questions; but even more basic is the fact that tonight over two-thirds of the people of the world will go to bed hungry. The population of the world is twice that of a hundred years ago; the population explosion indicates that it may well double againin just 40 years. Who here tonight is blind to the enormous impact, in terms of world stability, of this contrast of hunger among many and abundance in the hands of a few? Certainly, any farm program must be measured against the fact of the total world population—peoples far beyond our 50 States.

Thirdly, does the program contribute to the wisest use of the Nation's total human and natural resources and to our maximum growth? Committing too much of our resources to agriculture—or to any segment of our economy—would mean a shortage of resources for other needs, such as schools, roads, forests, recreation areas, hospitals, etc. True not all of our resources are transferable. But many are, including people, and the very best National and State programs are needed effectively to meet the demands on our resources.

The fourth is one which, when stated, is obvious: Does the farm program provide an adequate food supply for the American consumer, both now and in the future when needs will be greater and capabilities more uncertain. This seems so obvious I suspect it sometimes is completely overlooked.

There are those who look at the surpluses of today and scoff at the idea that there is any need for conservation and reclamation programs. In my book, nothing could be more dangerous or more shortsighted. Population estimates for the United States in 50 years indicate we must produce sufficient food and fiber for 370 million persons here at home—more than twice our population today.

But not only will our agricultural production have to meet the demands of our increased population; the USDA, in studies just completed for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, indicates that some 80 million acres of our best cropland will have disappeared by that time, mostly as a result of the expansion of our cities and other factors well known to you. The Department has also projected the addition of only 25 million acres through reclamation and related practices in that same period. Research in new techniques, increased irrigation in areas where irrigation has been only an experiment, and vastly expanded conservation practices and programs are needed to meet the demands of tomorrow. It is foolhardy to use the existence of surplus production now as an argument for throttling and restricting our conservation and research programs for future decades.

The fifth question: Will the proposed farm programs reward the farmers for their work and managerial skills on a scale comparable to those of other persons in the economy? It is on this point that so much of the debate revolves when programs come before the Senate Agriculture Committee—particularly those concerned with our basic price-supported commodities.

The question constantly before the Senate Agriculture Committee, when it considers the role of government in supporting or controlling the production of a basic commodity, is: What will happen to the farmer's receipts and to his income? It is the answer to this question which most effectively establishes the limits and the extent of approaches to be considered.

There has been much debate about pulling Government out of agriculture, or "freeing agriculture"; the idea being that we should "free" agriculture from Government intervention. In terms of this fifth measurement, is this "freeing agriculture" a realistic alternative? Last year, frankly, I was not sure. As the public pressures and mail mounted—generated by magazine stories of payments to corporate farms of hundreds of thousands of dollars—and as budget costs continued to mount, I often felt that this was the only direction in which to move. At least one of the results of this concern was our vote putting a ceiling of $50,000 on support payments. No more millionaires by way of USDA checks.

But the answer as to what the economic results would be if we really "freed" agriculture—removing controls and support—was not clear in my mind. I thing it was not clear to some of the old hands, either. For this reason I welcomed the initiative taken by Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, in requesting that agriculture economists of the USDA, in cooperation with economists from our leading colleges of agriculture, undertake a study based on the following suppositions, necessarily present in any "freeing agriculture" move:

"What would be the probable market supplies and prices of farm products and the probable aggregate farm output and level of farm prices for the period 1960–65, assuming all production controls except those on tobacco were removed and assuming price supports were maintained at levels which would permit an orderly reduction, over a 7–10 year period, of the current excessive stocks of storeable farm products."

In plain language, what would happen to farm prices and farm income with virtually free production and marketing of agricultural commodities?

The study and report are now available—received by the committee just 2 weeks ago. Here are some of the results—and remember,

this is not from those who want to prove or disprove a program, but from the experts who made the analysis without trying to prove or disprove, support or undermine, specific programs or proposals. The highlights are these, and I am assured thay are on the conservative side:

Net farm income would drop to $7 billion by 1965, a drop of 46 percent from 1958; average commodity prices would be 90 cents for a bushel of wheat; 80 cents for a bushel of corn; $15 per 100 pounds of beef cattle; $11.20 per 100 pounds for hogs; $3.60 per 100 pounds for milk at wholesale; 29 cents for a dozen eggs; 15 cents a pound for broilers.

And even more startling is the fact that the overall drop in net farm income would be occurring while the overall income of individuals is estimated to increase 22 percent by the year 1965.

Yes, a right, proper, and very key question to ask concerning any farm program is: What happens to the income of the farmers? I believe the answer to this question puts very definite limits on the acceptance of some of the proposed programs. We now have the conclusions of our best agricultural economists; we now see the extreme economic effect on farmers' income from an absence of some type of controls or support.

As we look for new methods of production control, I, for one, will be sympathetic to suggestions to abandon acreage controls and move toward systems based on specific units of production. Hopefully, we can return many of the decisions on these controls to the farmers themselves.

In our Nation we have always supported a system of agriculture consistent with our ideas of individual private ownership. Family farms have been an important and continuing part of our Nation's life. Thus, the sixth point I would make is that a farm program must result in a system of agriculture providing to the fullest extent possible freedom of individual management and ownership, and supporting family-sized units in the traditions of our Nation. These historic concepts today are being challenged, are said to be outmoded, and will continually be attacked from many quarters. The price that would be paid for abandoning these principles would be very high indeed. To have a meaningful program must it not be geared in two directions—the commercial farm and the low income farmer? Needs and aspirations of one differ from the other. Our farm programs should reflect these differences. The distinctions between programs designed to help rural low-income families, through rural development programs, the family-type commercial farm, and the corporate-owned commercial farm are often blurred. We need a vastly expanded rural development effort along the lines of the area redevelopment bill which passed the Senate last year and is now in the House. The family-type commercial farm must be provided with adequate credit, managerial and technical resources.

My seventh question in measuring: Is the cost of the program, both to the Treasury and directly to the consumer, reasonable, and will it be distributed fairly? American consumers are willing to pay for their groceries and farm products if they are assured the farmer is sharing equitably and fairly in the abundance of our Nation's wealth. Certainly this question of what is fair, how much is equitable, is a reasonable area for political debate. The programs you will hear discussed in the months ahead will place much emphasis on what is proper, and how these costs will be reduced. Perhaps the most disturbing facts brought to light recently on this point are the evidences of excessive storage costs disclosed by the Agriculture Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator SYMINGTON, investigating the CCC. We can all profit from the careful and responsible work that he has undertaken.

Last question: Does the proposed program contribute to the permanent solution of the problem or is it a temporary palliative which will make more difficult a long-run solution?

For any one farm program fully to meet all of these criteria, I am confident would be impossible. Our Government works because we have built into our system the means by which each of us may express his thoughts and viewpoints as to which of these eight points are of the greatest necessity and demand the most immediate attention. This is the true political process. I do not pretend to have the answers, but I believe the process can and will work if we all continue to study and probe for the answers.

Slogans, catch-words, and slick phrases, are not going to be the building blocks for a satisfactory farm program. Tonight, I can assure you only of my intention to measure the programs which come before me, acting for you in the U.S. Senate, by these standards; to ask these questions of each new proposal. And I promise to continue my own education with the able support and advice of the staff of this College of Agriculture, which has never yet failed to further the farm education of your freshman Senator.

Thank you for this opportunity to be with you tonight.

Concern Over Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the visit to Cuba by Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan is further concrete proof of the deadly serious Russian wooing of our neighboring American republics. Combining this fact with the intensifying anti-U.S. campaign of the Castro regime, we face a situation fraught with danger to the security of this hemisphere. I have long been concerned with Communist influence south of our border, and now feel justified in my early warnings against an unqualified embracing of Fidel Castro. While the Cuban Premier seems to have turned his back irrevocably on this country, we can only hope that more stable elements may somehow reverse the Cuban drift toward communism.

I am reminded of my rather extensive exchange of views on Castro and U.S. hemispheric policy, with the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER]. I trust that the more recent turn of events in Cuba have dissuaded him from some of his prior viewpoints, particularly regarding Castro. We wonder what is the gentleman's present reaction to the Red-lining, dictatorial Castro, whose cause he so ardently espoused and championed. Of late, we have not heard much from the gentleman as to his present attitude toward Latin American policy. I don't know whether it is due to lack of pride in his efforts on behalf of Castro, or whether the explanation lies in the gentleman's preoccupation with the Far East.

During the recess Time magazine carried an article on our irrepressible colleague's tour of the Western Pacific. My friend's talent for stirring controversy did not seem to have failed him on this sojourn. He injected himself with characteristic vigor into the myriad of delicate problems facing American policymakers in this critical area of the world. Time reports on the results of the gentleman's latest venture in personal diplomacy. I have asked that this Time article of November 30, 1959, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE CONGRESS

THE SCRUTABLE OCCIDENTAL

There will always be a whooping crane, Deo volente. And there will probably always be a whooping Congressman. This migratory species is recognized by its raucous cry and by its frequent fumbling, bumbling, free-loading flights to exotic lands, where it lays eggs of oddest shapes. A splended example of this rara avis is CHARLES ORLANDO PORTER, 40, Democratic Congressman from Oregon's Fourth District, who returned last week from a factfinding flight through the islands along the Asian littoral, a flight that created more embarrassment and consternation than a plague of gooney birds.

Oregon-born (Klamath Falls) Harvardman (1941) CHARLIE PORTER, a World War II Air Corps ground officer, settled down quietly on the lowly House Post Office and Civil Service Committee after his election in 1956. But like others of the species, he soon discovered that international affairs could bring him fame of a sort and big headlines back home. The discovery came when he commendably tried to find out what had happened to one of his constituents, Pilot Gerald Lester Murphy. Murphy disappeared and was reported murdered after telling how he piloted a plane that carried Basque Scholar Jesús de Galíndez to an appointment with death in the Dominican Republic (Time, Apr. 2, 1956, et seq.).

Murphy was never found, but CHARLIE PORTER found his role. After declaring war on Dominican Dictator Rafael Trujillo, he next turned his attention to seething Cuba. When Fidel Castro invited a group of U.S. Congressmen to Havana on an expenses-paid inspection tour, only PORTER and Harlem's ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, another have-tux Congressman, accepted. But Castro turned out to be a disappointment ("I've urged him from the first to shave his beard," says PORTER), and PORTER thereupon looked around for new worlds to explore.

Battle of Formosa: The Orient seemed promising. PORTER, an outspoken advocate of recognition of Red China, decided to go to Red Peking. When the State Department repeatedly refused to validate his passport, PORTER sued Secretary of State Christian Herter, charging violation of congressional rights—but prudently trimmed his travel plans to include only Formosa, Japan and Okinawa. His official mission was to interview civilian employees abroad and report back to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the state of their morale, but PORTER clearly had bigger things in mind. Just before his takeoff early this month, he proclaimed that Nationalist China's president "Chiang Kai-shek should be sent to an old soldiers' home, preferably one with barbed wire around it," and sneeringly referred to the Chinese Nationalist Armed Forces as a "rubber dagger" and a "toothless tiger."

On his arrival in Tokyo CHARLIE PORTER was understandably hesitant about going on to Formosa. At his request, Ambassador Douglas MacArthur, II, made some discreet inquiries, assured PORTER that he was still welcome. He was. Although Chiang was, unsurprisingly, too preoccupied to see him, the top officials of the Nationalist Government turned out to greet PORTER at a dinner at the home of the U.S. chargé d'affaires, on the day of his arrival. Sensing a certain strain in the air, PORTER opened the conversation jovially: "I suppose that if I convince you of my point of view, you'll all be shot." A glacial silence descended on the party, and PORTER returned to Tokyo next day.

Battle of the Embassy: Back in Japan, PORTER got in a row with able U.S. Ambassador MacArthur at a private meeting. Calling in the press later, PORTER charged, among other things, that MacArthur had attacked his position on Red China and had promised to debate the issue back in the United States. Not so, retorted MacArthur; he has never suggested a debate. "PORTER said I was being unfriendly and uncooperative," said MacArthur. He said, "I will take care of you." Retorted PORTER as he prepared to fly home: "I still say MacArthur challenged me to a public debate, but the Ambassador's excess of adrenalin unfortunately has clouded his vision and memory."

In the wake of PORTER's memorable trip, his proposed recognition of Red China met with stony nonrecognition in the two places most concerned. "Crude interference in China's internal affairs," cried Radio Peiping. "Preposterous," said Hong Kong's pro-Nationalist newspaper, Shih Pao: "Our American friends should soberly think of the damage done to U.S. good will abroad by PORTER's shallow views."

Praise for Release of Surplus Food by the Men's Sodality of the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Vice President has been kind enough to turn over to me a letter he received from the president of the Men's Sodality of the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola in New York City, praising Congress for its action in the last session in releasing surplus food for the world's hungry.

Mr. James P. McCarthy's letter is an eloquent enunciation of America's responsibilities in this area, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to call it to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have this fine letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN'S SODALITY OF OUR LADY,
CHURCH OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA,
New York, N.Y., December 7, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President,
Washington, D.C.

HON. DEAR SIR: Keenly aware of our responsibility, as a Nation, to assist our less fortunate neighbors throughout the world, the Men's Sodality of the Church of St. Ignatious Loyola wish to thank the Congress for having authorized our Government to again release our surpluses of food and to extend aid to the world's less developed countries. The people in need have a human dignity which they should be able to maintain.

President Eisenhower, during his speech on October 14 of this year, stated among other things, that there will always be many demands for the elimination of human indignities, of starvation, ill health, and suffering; with the result that all nations must continue to contribute their proportionate share in solving this problem.

We know that the Congress is well aware of this situation, and of the necessity of our contributing yearly a substantial amount of our surpluses to the needy peoples of the world. This in turn would eliminate the cost of building new granaries and save storage bills now being paid by the United States.

Assuring the Congress our thanks and appreciation for your efforts herein.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES P. MCCARTHY,
President.

Frank DeLucia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in an era when the media of mass communication appears to be continuously fascinated by the misdeeds of society's antagonists, the true heroes of our time—the men and women who exhibit a sense of civic responsibility and concern for their fellowmen—are, too often, ignored and their acts go unnoticed. And yet, it is to these people that we must look if our civilization is to sustain our finest ideals and provide that wonderful world of which we all dream. I wish to call the attention of this House to one such man.

His name is Frank DeLucia. Mr. DeLucia drives a tractor trailer for the Adley Express Co., of New Haven, Conn. On January 14 he received the American Trucking Association's Pro Merits Medal, the trucking industry's highest award for heroism. In 1947 and 1948 Mr. DeLucia was named Driver of the Year by the Motor Transport Association of Connecticut. The events which have prompted the selection of Mr. DeLucia for these distinctions fully substantiate my appraisal of him as a remarkable citizen and a true hero of our contemporary times.

The Pro Meritis Award was presented by Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, in acknowledgment of the courage Mr. DeLucia displayed on October 11, 1958. While driving his truck on that date, Mr. DeLucia spotted a car which had crashed into a power utility pole in Stratford, Conn. The pole had broken, dropping high tension wires which trapped the driver and set the car afire.

Despite the extreme danger of being electrocuted, Mr. DeLucia secured a stick of wood and used it to remove the live wires from the car. Then he helped the injured woman, Anna Celone, of Milford, Conn., from the blazing vehicle and covered her with his coat to prevent shock.

After calling the Stratford police for an ambulance, Mr. DeLucia returned to the scene of the accident and put out the fire with an extinguisher which he carried in his truck.

In a letter written to the Adley Express Co., Mrs. Celone, who suffered three fractured ribs and a cut knee in the accident, said that if Mr. DeLucia had not come to her assistance when he did, she "would probably have been electrocuted."

To win the title of Driver of the Year which the Connecticut Motor Transport Association bestowed upon him in 1947 and 1948, Mr. DeLucia performed several acts of courtesy and safety. His deeds included removing an automobile from a garage threatened by fire, and towing a stalled car carrying an 8-year-old girl to a doctor.

In 1950 Mr. DeLucia exhibited his fine sense of civic responsibility when he encountered a drunken driver who was weaving across four lanes of a highway near Langhorne, Pa., on August 19, 1950. Mr. DeLucia lit a flare and held it out the window of his cab to warn motorists behind him of the danger. He then followed the car until it struck an oncoming tractor trailer truck. Due to his efforts, the driver and the occupants of the car were held at the scene until the police arrived. Later it was discovered that the car had been stolen.

Mr. DeLucia, who has been driving trucks since he was 16 years old, has an impressive safety record. He has driven an estimated 700,000 miles in the last 14 years without a single chargeable accident.

I am proud to salute Mr. Frank DeLucia, a neighbor in my community. Our Nation is a better place to live because of his wonderful deeds.

The Loyalty Affidavit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is heartening that President Eisenhower has recommended elimination of the unwarranted loyalty affidavit now required by students as a condition for receiving aid under the National Defense Education Act. I still am hopeful that the Senate, during this session, will have a chance to vote again on the removal of this unnecessary provision. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on this subject, entitled "Useless Affidavit," published in the Honolulu Advertiser of January 31 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USELESS AFFIDAVIT

Somewhat lost in the shuffle recently was President Eisenhower's recommendation to Congress to eliminate the affidavit of disavowal from the Federal student loan program.

To participate in the program students not only have to sign loyalty oaths but also affidavits stating they neither believe in nor support any subversive organizations.

Many leading universities have quit the loan program in protest, charging the affidavit singles out students as a special group for suspicion and mistrust. They have also stated the affidavit really accomplishes nothing.

Other than noting that the affidavit isn't clear as to just what is considered a subversive organization, the regents of the University of Hawaii have had nothing to say about it.

But now with the President four-square against it, perhaps our regents would want to add their belated opposition to an unnecessary and useless requirement.

The President said, "the affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels it is being singled out for this requirement."

We'd like to see our regents join the disapproving segment of the educational community of which the President spoke, add their voice to the demand that Congress get rid of the affidavit.

Stranglehold on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, all of the midwestern press has not swallowed the Benson line. The Des Moines Register, Wednesday, February 3, 1960, had an editorial which will be educational and helpful reading to all those who are trying to understand the problems in food production today.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial's closing statement is particularly significant:

Benson talks about farm programs as a stranglehold, but we believe many farmers would consider a 30-percent drop in net income even more of a stranglehold.

Mr. Speaker, we must write a farm bill which recognizes that the economic life of agriculture is at stake under our existing farm laws.

We must recognize the importance of the family farm before it has been completely removed from the scene.

We must recognize that more is at stake than money.

We must recognize the tremendous sociological advantages which family farm life has meant to America.

We must do it now—this year.

The editorial follows:

STRANGLEHOLD ON AGRICULTURE

In a recent leaflet for the Committee for Constitutional Government, Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson argued strongly for further reduction of farm price supports and for the elimination of what he called the Government "stranglehold" on agriculture.

"We have made some progress toward sounder farm programs, but it has been limited and painfully slow. The agricultural acts of 1954, 1956, and 1958 provided only a fraction of the program we asked for and what farmers need. * * * The new corn program is a step in the right direction. * * * We must give freedom back to the farmers. We must get rid of Government's stranglehold on agriculture."

This kind of language does not contribute to thoughtful discussion of farm policy issues. We are not aware of any stranglehold the Government has over agriculture. Producers of some crops have been restricted by marketing quotas—but only after having voted these restrictions on themselves by a two-thirds majority.

Whether quotas are a wise policy is a debatable question, but talk about giving freedom back to farmers and strangleholds is sheer emotionalism and does not lead to sound thinking. Benson's policy proposals ought to be considered on their merits and in the light of the facts.

It happens that the Department of Agriculture has just completed an excellent study of the probable effects of Benson proposals. The study was made by civil service economists in the Department at the request of Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Senator ELLENDER asked the Department to make projections of probable supplies and prices of important farm products for the period 1960 to 1965 under two assumed conditions: First, that all production controls other than those on tobacco were removed (except that there would be 30 million acres of cropland in the soil bank), and second, that price supports were lowered to such levels as would permit an orderly reduction of stocks to "normal" over a 10-year period. For example, it was assumed that the stocks of wheat would be reduced from 1.5 billion bushels as of 1960 to about 450 million bushels in 1965.

Under such conditions, the USDA economists figure that farm production as a whole in 1965 would increase to about 20 percent above the 1955–57 average. Livestock output would increase 25 percent.

Here are some of the price changes that would be expected under these conditions: Corn would drop to 80 cents a bushel by 1965, wheat to 90 cents, cattle to $15 and hogs to $11.20.

The effect on farm income would be very severe. The larger volume of marketings would result in cash receipts about the same as in the 1955–57 years, even though prices were lower. But net income would fall considerably because of higher production costs.

The USDA did not estimate net income for 1965, but an advisory committee of State agricultural college economists did. The committee assumed that nonfarm prices remained the same, but they calculated that total costs would advance because of more use of fertilizer, chemicals and other production items for a larger output.

Their conclusion was that net farm income would fall from about 10 billion dollars estimated for 1960 to 7 billion in 1965.

A similar study by the Agricultural Adjustment Center at Iowa State University at Ames reached even gloomier conclusions. The Iowa State researchers assumed no reduction in grain stocks, but they arrived at a higher estimate of grain output. So the estimates of total feed available for livestock were not far apart.

Here we have studies by two authoritative research groups indicating that a virtual disaster would overtake agriculture if a policy of free markets were established.

Benson talks about farm programs as a "stranglehold". But we believe many farmers would consider a 30-percent drop in net farm income even more of a stranglehold.

The Cost of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful editors of my State is Harold W. Card, publisher of the Webster (S. Dak.) Reporter and Farmer.

In the January 28 issue of his newspaper, Mr. Card comments editorially on a subject which is of some interest to most of the Members of this body and should be of equal interest to the public as a whole, "The Cost of Politics."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COST OF POLITICS

(By Harold W. Card)

An Associated Press dispatch from Minneapolis Tuesday announced that Democratic leaders in Minnesota have started a campaign to raise $65,000 to help finance the primary election campaign in Wisconsin of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, aspirant for the Democratic presidential nomination. It is estimated that the Wisconsin campaign will cost $100,000.

All of which induces reflection upon the high cost of politics these days, and raises the query of how political campaigns can best be conducted and financed on national and State levels.

It is important, of course, in a democracy that no insuperable financial barriers be permitted to entrance of candidates into campaigns for political office.

However, when such large sums are required, they may easily, and often do, open the gate to large contributions from wealthy people and organizations whose motives may be, and sometimes are, questionable, with regard to influencing governmental policies or appointments. It has been commonly said in times past, that appointments to ambassadorships to foreign countries are often based by both political parties, not so much on the fitness of the applicant as by the amount of his, or her, contribution to the party's campaign fund.

With campaign costs so high, the situation reaches a point where none but the very wealthy can afford to run for high public office, unless he accepts, and in fact encourages, contributions from those who have an axe to grind and who may later demand repayment of the political debt.

An alternative, which is being tried by leaders of both political parties, is an effort to raise campaign funds from the rank and file of the party members. This is done by political dinners, maybe at $100 to $1,000 per plate in the higher echelons, and $5, $10, and $25 dinners on the lower levels. The smaller price dinners are frequently mere peanuts so far as raising sufficient funds are concerned.

Still other methods have been proposed. These include an assessment upon every

voter, somewhat like a poll tax, which would be paid along with taxes, and apportioned to the political party of his expressed preference. A variation of the same idea is that the Government itself should finance election campaigns, with adequate safeguards, and that these should include political forums with opposing candidates appearing on the same platform to expound their views. Such a system would involve considerable Government control and might be open to abuses. It is also subject to criticism as being contrary to the American way.

Another variation of the above proposal, with some merit, is to penalize the nonvoter by invoking a cash penalty for failure to vote, and to earmark this money for political party activities.

It is unlikely that any of these will find ready acceptance either among party leaders, candidates, or the people themselves. But the cost of political campaigns, the rising trend of public apathy and citizen nonparticipation in voting and selection of candidates, are alarming and call for sober study. We who oppose communism and one-party government need to improve our own system if we hope to continue our "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Gloom in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more beautiful to a midwesterner than the sight of a field of corn which foretells the prospect of a bumper crop. But in these times there is nothing so misleading. While Nebraska has been blessed with bountiful harvests the past 2 years, the farmers' income falls. There is all too much proof of the inability of the farmer, despite his ever-increasing skill in his job of food production, to get a fair and reasonable return on his investment and his labor.

Farm auctions have always presented a memorable scene and often were significant of a man's retirement from his life's labor—a full life—and a well-earned retirement. But today this scene is often bitter. Young, able, well-educated men who have worked hard and know their business well are being driven from the farm. Too often they are men who should and would like to be the food producers of tomorrow.

We of the Middle West are familiar with this problem. But the dismal future of agriculture at the present time has attracted others who take the time to take a look.

Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention an article in the January 30, 1960, issue of Business Week and under unanimous consent include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

This is the season when the bark of the auctioneer shatters the snow-wrapped calm of the Great Plains. It's a between-crops season for balancing the books—for figuring out how far last year's marketings will cover old debts and new needs, for guessing whether this year's marketings will let you come out ahead. Sometimes, the reckoning leads to a bitter choice: selling out.

This year, the cry of the auctioneering is rasping out loud and strong. "I don't have an open date until March," says Rex Young, of Plattsmouth, Nebr., in a voice roughened by 49 years of sales.

It's a hard decision for a farmer to sell out of farming and into a new way of life; complex forces are driving him to make the choice increasingly. Man, government, the elements all enter into the picture.

Take the fairly typical Corn Belt State of Nebraska. There, Dr. Everett Peterson, agricultural economist at the University of Nebraska, found an unusual atmosphere of pessimism after making a round of farms. "Land prices have hit their high so let's cash in while we can," is the attitude he found.

Business Week's Measure of Personal Income, noting the month-to-month changes in the economy, is just beginning to record the new atmosphere. In October, Nebraska's income fell below the year-before month for the first time in 1959. In November, it fell again. Retail sales recorded by the university fell in November to even with the year-before month, after running ahead all year by 5 percent to 18 percent.

Superficially, the 1959 drop in farm income could be blamed for all the gloom. But this would not be accurate; long term, 1959 was not too bad a farm year for Nebraska. It merely looks bad compared to bumper 1958.

Peterson estimates that 1959 cash receipts from farm marketings were $1,102 million, a drop of 12 percent below the U.S. Agriculture Department figures for the year before. Presumably, when figures are available, they will show an even worse drop in net income, because of rising costs.

Crops did more of the damage than livestock; cash receipts for crops were off 16 percent, to $392 million. Of Nebraska's two major cash crops, wheat took the licking—not corn. Nationwide, the 1959 wheat crop was down 25 percent from record 1958; in Nebraska the drop was 38 percent. Three factors hit the State: too little moisture at planting time, a severe winter, and plant diseases late in the season.

Corn was another story. Nationwide, the crop set a record, 16 percent above 1958, while Nebraska's corn was up 24 percent. Even with prices off slightly, the big output helped offset the decline in cash from wheat.

Nebraska's cash marketings from livestock went off 9 percent—to $710 million—with drops in both cattle and hogs. Greater marketings of cattle—much more important than hogs in Nebraska—failed to offset price drops in two categories. Late in the year, prices for feeder cattle, especially calves and heifers, fell steeply, while all year long there was a gradual decline in the prices that Nebraska's farmers could get for the cattle they fed themselves.

As for hogs, Nebraska suffered along with other States from the easily predictable cycle: With feed cheap, they raised too many hogs; then the tremendous marketings drove prices down so far that the increased sales were of little help.

Many farmers have decided to give up, after studying these short-term trends against the larger backdrop of the years. Dry-land (no irrigation) farmers were haunted by the 1955–56 drought, and feared another coming after rainfall that was excellent in 1958 and not too bad in 1959. Those who irrigate feared further drops in the price of corn as their costs go up. Particularly in eastern Nebraska, corn farmers are pinched between softening prices and demand reduced by cuts in the pig crop. Wheat farmers worried lest their acreage allotments be cut still further.

Farmers in Nebraska—unlike more industrialized States such as Illinois or even Iowa—have scant opportunities to eke out farm income with factory jobs. Omaha does claim 15 new factories since the war—the biggest, a 4,200-worker Western Electric plant—but that's only one a year and Omaha is remote from most of the State.

Omaha and the nearby State capital, Lincoln, are the only really bright spots in the State, with government and university payrolls to fatten out their scattering of factories. Their retail stores attract hinterland customers.

What's more, Omaha and Lincoln have gained from the defense switch to missiles from aircraft, which has brought so much woe elsewhere. Omaha is headquarters for the Strategic Air Command—with 9,100 personnel, including 1,200 civilians; and a $15-million Atlas missile base is being built. This spring, contracts are expected to be let for a $36-million Atlas base at Lincoln.

Address by Hon. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, at Dedication of Temple Adath Israel, Evansville, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, all of us from time to time are called upon to speak before various civic, business, and religious groups. This is a privilege of our public office, and one which we accept with pleasure and pride. I was particularly impressed by a speech delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], when he spoke at the dedication of Temple Adath Israel in Evansville, Ind., last January 10.

In his talk, Senator HARTKE used as his theme, "Only in America." It is most inspirational and, I feel certain, will be of interest and value to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Senator HARTKE of Indiana before Temple Adath Israel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION SPEECH, TEMPLE ADATH ISRAEL, EVANSVILLE, IND.

When I thought about coming home today to help dedicate this Jewish house of worship, I thought it could all best be summed up with the title of the best seller by Harry Golden. Of course, you know the title well—"Only in America". I am told this was a favorite expression among the Jewish people who had not been long in this blessed land, having arrived shortly before from countries ravaged by starvation, privation and pogroms.

The comment "only in America" was used to describe the thousands of phenomena which these immigrants found chiefly freedom. Today it is apropos once more.

You seen before you something which could indeed happen only in America. I stand before you as the cantor does on the Jewish High Holy days when he says, "Behold here am I, in deep humility."

I came from a small coal-mining town. My parents were of very modest means. I learned the meaning of hard work at an early age. But I got a chance to go to col-

lege, and then law school. You folks helped make me mayor at 36 and U.S. Senator at 39. Only in America could this happen.

Only in America could a poor boy from a Lutheran family find college training first in a Methodist institution and then in a State institution and then be invited to help dedicate a Jewish temple. Only in America could a Jewish congregation buy its temple location from the Catholic Church which obtained it originally from the State. Only in America could we look in one direction and see three great Catholic institutions as neighbors and then look in the other direction and see two Protestant institutions as neighbors—all while we dedicate a Jewish institution.

The words of the Psalmist are appropriate: "Then said they among the nations: 'The Lord hath done great things with these.' The Lord hath done great things with us; We are rejoiced."

Only in America do we see full flowering of the kind of life in keeping with the Mosaic Code of laws and of justice. Only here do we have the kind of daily lives and the kind of government that is in keeping with not only this code, but with the concept of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

In deed, the Judeo-Christian concept of religion and the American concept of government carry similar goals and similar roads to these goals. The Goverment makes and carries out laws based to a great degree on the laws of Moses. But government of the kind we know in the United States of America is more than laws. It is a way of life.

So religion is more than ritual, more than buildings, more than rules and regulations. Religion, too, is a way of life.

True religion teaches living with dignity, righteousness and charity, fostering justice, peace, and brotherhood. This is God's way, we are taught.

Our kind of government could not exist without the same principles. This is what gives it morality and a sense of justice. The principles of equality of opportunity, human dignity, God-given rights are embodied in the earliest documents of this Republic. Every schoolboy knows that every great leader of this Nation has reaffirmed faith in God in almost every lasting address.

Anyone who has attended sessions of city council, the State legislature, or Congress knows that each is opened with a prayer. Every official in our land swears by his God that he will faithfully carry out the duties of his office in accord with the Constitution. Everywhere you go in this land you find that the country and all its divisions are rooted in belief in God.

It has been a source of joy and strength to find a capable and understanding Chaplain in the Senate. It has been inspirational for me to meet on Wednesdays with other Senators for breakfast and Christian meditation and discussion.

Yet, a country so grounded and whose leaders are so grounded in religion has no official religion. Only in America and few other lands is there full recognition of God and His word without an official religion. Here in America we take full and official and legal cognizance that every man is free to worship as he sees fit.

As I see it, part of the greatness of America stems from our collective belief—our nondenominational belief in God—and our dedication to protection of separate beliefs. The men who forged this unique concept of government have lighted the way along which the country has traveled, is traveling, and will travel.

From them we draw inspiration and knowledge. And this is the true role of history—to provide guidance and an example. James Madison, sometimes called the father of the Constitution, said that "to suppose that any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without any virtue in the people is a chimerical idea." Chimerical is his word. It means unreal or imaginary.

George Washington said it is not realistic to believe that good government is possible without people whose thoughts are rooted in morality and decency. He said: "Virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government."

Of course, we do not always live up to our ideals. But, so long as citizens are well trained in the principles of morality and government, those principles of the Mosaic Code, wrongs will inevitably be righted.

This is the true purpose of the edifice we dedicate here today. It is to carry on that unbroken chain of Judaism and its teachings which started with Father Abraham and has passed from generation to generation and which includes Jesus of Nazareth. It is to teach the lofty ideals of the Judeo-Christian belief—brotherhood, justice. It is to teach the Ten Commandments and the other moral codes of religion upon which man has not been able to improve in many hundreds of years of trying.

So long as Temple Adath Israel of Evansville, Ind., and thousands of churches and synagogues like it throughout this land can teach the ancient truths and beliefs and morals of the Bible and the prophets, rabbis, teachers, and disciples, the system we cherish in this country will live.

This is more than a house of worship. It is, as the synagogues have also long been known—a house of teachings, a meeting house, a house of God. The Jewish tradition of strong family ties is legendary. Without it how could a religion and a people have survived so much for so long? It is a bedrock upon which sturdy foundations have been built.

So it is no wonder to the thinking man that this temple of a modest congregation in a medium-sized city contains not only a beautiful sanctuary combining the traditional with the modern, but also many fine classrooms, a youth recreation center, an auditorium-gym combination. You are trying to keep on the traditions of learning which has become synonymous with the Jewish people.

Citizens so educated not only pass on to future generations the great traditions and knowledge of a great people, they are also essential to continuing this great country of ours. Without citizens of the future trained in the teachings of Judaism and Christianity, imbued with a spirit of basic morality, there is no future for this country.

Jefferson once wrote: "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves. And, if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

Madison put it this way: "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance."

In our way of doing things, religious knowledge—to know God, to understand Him, to fear Him as a son fears his father, to walk in His ways—is important knowledge because it gives meaning and depth, because it provides the morality the Nation needs to exist in its tradition.

Knowledge such as is taught in this building is truly the only hope we have of governing ourselves in the American way. It must govern the ignorance of godlessness and immorality. Therefore, it must be taught.

Thus, this temple is not alone the symbol of a religion. It is not alone the symbol of a community wherein Catholic, Protestant, and Jew are neighbors and like it. It is a fountainhead of knowledge and morality of the kind which has sustained not only the Jewish people, but the Judeo-Christian way and, indeed, the American way.

Milk Price War in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. D. C. Scott Daniel, executive vice president of the National Independent Dairies Association, addressed to the editor of the Dairy Record of Minneapolis, Minn., which was printed in that organ of the dairy industry in its February 3, 1960, edition, as follows:

EXPLAINS NIDA POSITION

EDITOR, DAIRY RECORD:

We note in your January 27 issue a story under the heading "Indianapolis Milk Pricing Probe," and feel that you are entitled to further information in connection with that matter. The independent dairymen in Indiapolis and the surrounding area appealed to their Congressman and NIDA for assistance in connection with a price war which was in progress in the Indianapolis area. Mr. Brooks Robertson, chief investigator for the House Small Business Committee was present along with Congressman RANDALL S. HARMON and myself. This was not a public hearing, but only a preliminary investigation to determine whether or not Federal laws were being violated.

Members of the local press appeared at the meeting, and it was explained to them that the meeting was not a public hearing, but only for the purpose of obtaining information from the independent dairymen who had called the meeting. I made no reference to personal security, but I did say that the small dairymen present did not want to discuss the matter in public, because of their fear of reprisals by financially powerful concerns. From my experience in similar situations in other sections of the Nation, I felt that their position was a proper one and so informed the representatives of the press, telling them that I would be glad to discuss the matter with them after the meeting. Having been a trial attorney for the Federal Government for many years, I do not know of any time that a preliminary investigation of this type was made in public. On the question of reprisals I am enclosing herewith a statement made by Representative BYRON JOHNSON of Colorado, on the floor of the House of Representatives on August 17, 1959.

With regard to the price war in Indiana, we found that milk was being advertised and sold for as low as 39 cents per gallon, and were informed that the price paid by the processor to the producer for a quart of milk was 10.6 cents. Thus, milk costing the processor 42.4 cents per gallon was being sold at 39 cents per gallon. In our judgment this is a clear violation of antitrust law. Such sales below cost, if permitted to continue, in our judgment, would certainly tend to destroy the businesses of the independent dairymen, who must be dependent upon the localized areas in which they operate for their trade. We think it follows that, if the local dairy concerns are forced out of business, the farmer-producers would be seriously injured, for it would be a simple matter for the large chains, both grocery and dairy, to bring in milk from distant markets. Further, if the local dairymen are forced out of the market and the dairy industry is monopolized, the consumers would be placed at the mercy of the monopolists. In view of the testimony that has been brought out by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee with regard to the

exorbitant profits charged where drug concerns have monopolies, we are satisfied that the consumers of Indiana, or any other State of the Union, do not want the industry which produces and distributes the most important of food items to become monopolized.

Small business is the backbone of our free and competitive enterprise system, and, therefore, it is imperative that small businessmen remain in the marketplace in the dairy industry. The small dairymen in Indiana, I am sure, only ask that competition be fair—based on service, efficiency, and quality of product. They do not ask any special favors, nor do they seek exorbitant prices—only a reasonable profit on the products which they sell. No small-business concern can continue to operate if it is compelled to sell its products at prices which are below cost. If the practices which were brought to our attention in Indianapolis are violative of Federal laws, and in our judgment they are, appropriate action should be brought by the Federal Government to bring them to a halt.

D. C. DANIEL,
Executive Vice President, National Independent Dairies Association, Washington.

The U.S. Savings Bond Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the problem of to raise or not to raise interest rates on Government bonds has been before this body for some months, and is of surpassing importance to our economy.

Former Congressman Howard Buffett, of Nebraska, has stated the case plainly and concisely, in Human Events, and I invite my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read this article.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this document printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Human Events, Dec. 30, 1959]

THE U.S. SAVINGS BOND TRAGEDY

(By the Honorable Howard Buffett, trustee for the Americans for Constitutional Action; former Republican Congressman, State of Nebraska)

The scrimmage between the administration and the democratic majority in Congress over interest rates on Government bonds last session focused temporary attention on U.S. savings bonds. The Democrats, smarting with resentment over many defeats, used the request for higher bond interest rates as a scapegoat for their general frustration. But they finally relented on savings bonds only, and gave congressional approval to a raise in that rate to 4¼ percent from the previous 3.26 top. The Treasury promptly boosted the savings bond interest to 3.75 percent, retroactive to June 1, 1959.

Despite furious verbal exchanges, both sides generally avoided any talk or action that would bring into public view the investment record of savings bonds. That subject was strictly taboo.

Savings bonds were first offered in 1935. From the beginning the Treasury pulled out all the stops in glorifying the merits of these securities. In the early years the claim was made that "U.S. savings bonds are the safest investment in the world today."

While current advertising often takes a less superlative tone, even now the Treasury could hardly be accused of moderation in its sales promotion. Certainly it cannot be denied that the methods used have brought impressive results. An estimated 40 million Americans, mainly of the small income group, are the owners of over $40 billion worth of U.S. savings bonds.

The bond sales record of the Treasury stands in sharp contrast to the investment record to the bondholders. Technically, savings bonds have been absolutely "safe," just as the advertising claimed. Every investor in them has gotten his dollars back on demand plus interest from zero to 3.26 percent, depending on how long he held the bonds.

But this repayment performance tells only part of the story. For it is shocking, yet true, that since 1939 no large group of Americans has been hurt worse financially than that which placed its nest egg in savings bonds.

Depending on the date the bonds were bought, up to 50 percent or even more of the funds these bondholders loaned to their Government have been destroyed by the rotting of the dollar. The total loss in the purchasing power of the principal and interest has been well over $21 billion, a gigantic sum even in these days of colossal spending.

During this same period, of course, all holders of fixed dollar obligations suffered similar losses. Without minimizing their losses, it is our purpose here to examine the facts and circumstances surrounding the specific disaster to those who had directly entrusted the Government with their savings.

Fair play, to this special category of 40 million thrifty citizens, has been entirely within the control of successive Administrations and Congresses. It is the Government that created the inflation that has raised the cost of living 100 percent since 1939. Likewise, it is the Government that fixes the dollar income of the various groups paid out of the U.S. Treasury.

So it is instructive to learn how Congress has treated not only savings bondholders, but also several other groups whose income is determined by the lawmakers. Then it will be possible to decide whether or not savings bondholders have been treated fairly.

For this purpose four groupings, each of which depends directly on Congress for income increases to offset the rising cost of living, have been selected. The list is short, but representative.

1. U.S. Congress (Members of the Senate and House of Representatives): For each $100 paid a member of Congress in 1940, he or she now receives $225, partly tax-free. In addition, fringe benefits have been boosted. Thus his income has been increased upward of 125 percent.

2. Federal Civil Service employees: For each $100 of salary an average median grade of civil service employee received in 1944 (earlier figures not readily available), an employee having comparable stature today receives $249. His income has been increased 149 percent.

3. Social security recipients: For each $100 that a retired single worker received in 1940 from the social security system, he may now receive $211. This is an increase of 111 percent. Moreover, this income is Federal tax-free, in contrast with savings bond income, which is fully taxable under the Federal income tax law.

4. ADC beneficiaries: This grouping consists of families receiving payments under the aid-to-dependent-children legislation. Using national average figures, for each $100 paid to an ADC family in 1942, a similar family in 1959 may receive $296 in Governmental payments. This is an increase of 196 percent. (Note: The 1942 payment formula was different, so an exact comparison is impossible. The figures used here, and on the other groups, are calculated to achieve a fair comparison, and are based on statistics supplied by the Library of Congress Reference Department. Also, some payments vary according to correlative legislation and contributions by the various States.)

5. U.S. savings bondholders: For each $100 of interest paid or accrued in 1942, the amount paid or accrued (before the recent boost) had been raised by Congress to $139. The percentage increase to the savings bondholders' income was thus 30 percent between 1939 and 1959. (All savings bonds had to be held to maturity to get the interest rates used in this comparison.)

In tabulating the foregoing comparison, every effort has been made to present a fair and complete picture. Like all statistics, these can easily be distorted to present a different conclusion.

Nevertheless, the overall situation they reveal is clear. In the first place, they show that successive administrations and Congresses have been thoroughly aware of the rising cost of living. Second, they show that the Government has taken prompt and vigorous action to protect and preserve living standards for various other groups whose income comes direct from the U.S. Treasury.

The boost in income for the other groups listed ran from 111 percent to 196 percent, compared with a 30 percent increase for bondholders—and even that much only if the bondholder held his savings bonds to their stated maturity.

Are savings bondholders a class of second-rate citizens, entitled to less consideration than the other groupings mentioned? If an affirmative answer to this question exists, it could explain the harsh discrimination of which these Americans have been the victims.

However, a careful examination of characteristics common to most savings bondholders discloses no qualities that could possibly justify such unequal treatment.

Indeed, savings bondholders would seem to be just the opposite of a second-rate group. This is made clear when the following attributes, common to most of them, are considered:

They have by voluntary act shown a superior degree of trust in the Government.

They have been the most responsive to patriotic appeals by Government for financial support.

Despite low incomes, they have demonstrated the stamina to forgo comforts now in order to be self-supporting in their declining years.

They possess the industry and self-restraint to have achieved frugality in their personal finances.

Is there any item in this list of qualities that justifies a Federal policy of spoliation of these thrifty and patriotic people? If so, it would be revealing to hear it explained.

There is another characteristic of most of these bondholders which, while not a plus item, certainly does them no discredit. It is that the great majority of them are, as reported by the Treasury, in the low income group. This means that they can least afford to lose. Yet so far the Government has caused them to be among those who have lost the most from inflation.

It would be sobering to conclude that these better citizens have experienced unfair treatment simply because thy wre not organizd into a pressure group.

But, despite the proven cruel injustice suffered by savings bondholders, it is not now proposed that Government put escalator

clauses or cost-of-living bonuses on these bonds. Such a course would seem to have much equity in it, but it does not strike at the cause of the injustice. Such practices are frequent in the final stages of a runious inflation, and the protection they provide is largely illusory.

While no action can be expected that will temper the loss already suffered, the Government could put into effect interest rates on outstanding bonds in line with current money rates. This would mean considerably higher payments than the boost of one-half of 1 percent just announced by the Treasury.

The only real hope for savings bondholders is the reestablishment of a sound dollar. Tragically for America, that goal seems as far distant as ever, despite the belated and modest efforts made in that direction this year by President Eisenhower.

In the background there is a political aspect of this problem that should not be overlooked. The integrity of our electoral system ultimately depends on the preservation of economic independence by the small and middle income citizens. Unless this grouping can exist without Government subsidies, the term "free elections" can and will become a mockery. The savings bonds episode is the most devastating blow this segment of our electorate has ever been dealt.

Despite the obvious disaster of this situation, there is a lesson of transcendent value that can be gained from it.

Indeed the terrible loss suffered could be worth its cost if our people would learn from this episode that Government is not benevolent, is not humanitarian, is not filled with compassion for low income people.

If the delusion that Government ever truly embraces such noble attributes could be revealed for the mirage that it is, then this sad chapter in governmental finance could pave the way for a recovery of public understanding of the perils of the State.

The story of U.S. savings bonds should teach us that most political talk professing deep concern for the little people is nothing more than oratory designed to catch votes.

The learning of that lesson in all its ramifications could bring about a revitalized America—equal to the challenges of the modern world, both at home and abroad.

Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I am placing in the hopper today a report of the work accomplished by this committee during the year 1959.

During the course of committee hearings, as the report points out, it has become increasingly apparent that the threat to our security from international communism is growing each day. It is urgent that each Member of Congress become aware and familiar with the operations of the Communist conspiracy, and I heartily recommend the committee's annual report as background material for study.

The Racial Problem Is Not a Southern Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the so-called racial problem is not a Southern problem. In many urban centers of the country the friction and tension is unbelievable when compared with our Southern communities, where the two race have existed in harmony and cooperation throughout the years.

One crucial reason for this lies in the attitudes of the local colored leaders.

A significant editorial discussing a problem which should be of concern to every American, white or colored, Southern or Northern, was published on January 29, 1960, in the Daily Journal of Tupelo, Miss., an excellent and forward-looking newspaper in my home State. It is short, but very timely. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGROES LOSE AS LEADERS DESERT THEIR RACE

About a year ago this column emphasized that it has become increasingly important for capable Negro leaders to stick with their own people and help guide them toward higher education and moral standards rather than deserting their race at the first opportunity to mix with whites.

At that time we received several letters questioning our viewpoint and expressing the opinion that it is only just and proper that the more capable Negroes should break away from their old neighbors and try to win a place among whites.

Months have gone by, however, and at last evidence is beginning to appear which indicates that our view may, after all, have been basically correct.

For around the country informed Negroes are beginning to see what the loss of potential leaders is doing to their race.

And they suspect that there is more than a little hyprocrisy involved in the effort of many above-average Negroes to get away from their old friends to make new associations among whites.

How strong this feeling among thoughtful Negroes has become is indicated by an editorial in the Chicago Defender, one of the Nation's more widely read Negro newspapers.

Said that paper regarding the eagerness of the more capable, better educated Negroes to get away from their old associates at the first posible opportunity:

"Most of our so-called Negro leaders have integrated and then slammed the door behind them, leaving us outside.

"Such so-called leaders abandon their own people in order to protect their investment in their education and in their newly acquired social standing."

At a recent meeting of Negro professional people held in Chicago to discuss the need for lifting the standards of their people, one colored social worker commented that Negroes are now having to depend on whites for leadership in nearly every field of progress.

Then she added significantly: "There is a difference between Negro leaders and leaders of Negroes. The former are inclined to integrate and seek their progress among whites, while leaving Negroes to get along as best they can.

"Actually, among those who call themselves Negro leaders in Chicago, there is a notable desire to get as far away as possible from being considered leaders of the Negro people."

In other words, they want to do their leading among whites, not among those of their own race who need them most.

As a result of this desertion of their race by intelligent, educated, capable Negroes, colored people in cities like Chicago are being left virtually leaderless.

And without Negro leaders who could guide them to higher standards, they are slipping backward into a way of life far worse than they knew in the communities from which they came.

One of the latest reports of the Chicago crime rate in various major categories running from 5 to 72 times as great among Negro residents as among whites.

And there is little likelihood of improvement until the city's Negro leaders begin to remain among their old friends and help improve their standards rather than moving out to mix with whites the moment they complete their education.

We believe that one of the major reasons Negroes in this area are making real progress in many of the most important realms of human development while every big city is developing its own version of a crime jungle is the fact that here many of our most capable Negroes return home to serve their own people as teachers, as Scout leaders, in farm improvement, etc., rather than taking advantage of the first possible chance to get away from their old associates.

And any community which thus encourages the return of its more capable Negro leaders to guide their people to higher standards of work, education, and morality will, we believe, develop better relations between the races and build a higher degree of prosperity for white and colored alike than the community where the chief goal of capable Negroes is to get as far away as they can from the less-educated colored people around them.

The National Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, an election in each State recently was conducted by a commercial firm, Florists Telegraph Delivery Association, Inc., for the purpose of aiding in the selection of the national flower.

The results of the poll in Mississippi showed that the rose was preferred by a majority of those voting. Placing second in the total State vote was the beautiful magnolia, my State's official flower. This result might have come about since Mississippi is referred to as "the Magnolia State."

However, Mississippi, the land of hospitality and charm, has bounteous wealth of other flowers which contribute to the pleasure of living there, one of which is the camellia, or japonica, which flourishes particularly well in the district

I represent. An editorial in the Laurel Leader-Call of January 26, entitled "Our National Flower," predicts the spread of the camellia about our Nation. The editorial follows:

OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Congress has the immediate job of picking our national flower. Congressional committees have just received the result of a nationwide poll by the Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association which shows the rose to be the favorite.

As a matter of fact, the rose turned out to be a 2 to 1 favorite over its closest competitor, the carnation.

Mississippi went along with 47 other States in selecting the rose. Colorado and Hawaii placed the carnation first.

The runners-up were, in order, the chrysanthemum, lily-of-the-valley, orchid, tulip, gladiolus, camellia, black-eyed Susan, mountain laurel, geranium, magnolia, goldenrod, rhododendron, daffodil, peony, shasta daisy, grass, corn tassel, marigold, and a varied assortment of others.

It's easy to see why the rose won. It can be grown well practically everywhere in the United States. It's easily identified and easy to cultivate.

Years ago roses came in four basic colors—red, white, yellow, and pink. Now they come in all sorts of colors, even purple and orange.

The garden writers of America have just been polled by the American Association of Nurserymen to determine the best roses introduced within the past 15 years.

The roses voted best, were in order, Queen Elizabeth, Tiffany, Kordes Perfecta, Spartan, Montezuma, Ivory Fashion, Circus, White Knight, Pink Peace, Jiminy Cricket, and Angel Wings. The first two are pink—the Queen Elizabeth being a clear pink grandiflora and the Tiffany an orchid pink hybrid tea.

While the rose will probably continue to be the ruling favorite for many years due to the ability to grow it practically anywhere, the camellia is certain to increase swiftly in popularity. This is evidenced by the fact that it currently stands eighth in popularity and is gaining daily. Camellia fanciers have grown by the thousands since World War II. The proper climate has a lot to do with camellia culture and and this is why there are so many camellia clubs in the South and in California. But new and more hardy varieties of camellias are being developed daily and this means that camellia culture is extending further northward. The Japanese have also taught us recently how to cultivate camellias so they can be grown successfully in metropolitan apartments, something exceedingly difficult to do with the rose.

Yet the rose is now so widely spread it is unlikely the camellia will topple it from its place of honor for years to come.

So it now looks like we'll have the rose as our national flower.

How American Business Can Recapture Its Pioneering Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Louis E. Wolfson, a leading American industrialist and chairman of the board of Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp., which was delivered before the Executives' Club of Chicago, October 16, 1959.

I commend this address to the consideration of all Members of Congress and to industry and labor alike. Mr. Wolfson sets forth in clear terms the challenge facing our country. He points out the necessity of surpassing the Soviet challenge. He recites some of the excellent programs of several American industries to train young people for future leadership. He points out what American industry and labor can do and expresses confidence that the challenge will be met with new vitality and American enterprise.

I have been advised by the Public Printer that the address will make approximately 3¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at an estimated cost of $263.25.

Notwithstanding this cost, I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW AMERICAN BUSINESS CAN RECAPTURE ITS PIONEERING SPIRIT

(By Louis E. Wolfson)

I want to discuss with you a subject of concern to me and every American businessman interested in our country's welfare: How can American business recapture its pioneering spirit, end the threat of conformity and meet the challenge it faces?

The hard fact is that American business leadership no longer emphasizes the pioneering spirit which helped build this Nation. At the same time, much as we hate to admit it, Soviet Russia has embraced pioneering and it is making her powerful. We have now had time to appraise Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit. You may recall how often he reminded us his nation was first to hit the moon and first in other pioneering achievements. Russia's moon-shot was dramatic, but behind it, there is the story of an economic contest even more basic to this nation's future.

The head of our Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles, last spring pointed out that Russia grew in 30 years from a relatively backward position into the second largest industrialized nation in the world. She has made this spectacular advance because her people want to tread new paths, are eager to innovate and to progress.

If we are to meet the perils implicit in the growing strength of the nation opposed to our concepts, we Americans must ensure that the pioneering spirit is recaptured in every phase of our national life. This applies particularly to our business structure, for it is basic to our national well-being.

How can we bring this about?

THERE ARE PRACTICAL WAYS

Most people, businessmen included, think of pioneering as serving the national welfare in a narrow way. For them, all roads to new frontiers now lie only through science and technology.

In newspapers the country over, you will find corporate advertisements pleading for scientists and engineers with creative, pioneering ability. They promise such men every opportunity to develop their own ideas; offer them every corporate resource. They emphasize exploration and opening of new fields of science, even at the cost of short-term failures along the way.

As do all Americans, I applaud this encouragement to scientific progress. We must give science even greater emphasis than it is now receiving if America and the free world are to survive the Soviet threat. Leaders in science who bemoan the lack of creativity in their field and stress the need for increasing the number of creative scientists deserve our interest and backing.

But science alone cannot solve all our problems. We must equally encourage the same spirit of pioneering and venture throughout our business structure. It is ironic that while business admires and pleads for creativity and pioneering in science, it increasingly discourages these same qualities in other areas.

In too many firms, business discourages the executive from pioneering and exploring. Instead, business presses him increasingly into a mold of conformity. In the interest of orderly procedure, business more, and more encourages, if not orders him, to do as others have done before him. Business too often looks askance at originality and initiative. Businessmen often talk about the need for "new blood," but they generally want it to run to the same blood type. A recent article in Nation's Business pinpoints this attitude. It suggested that rugged individualists are unwanted. Business actually wants, the writer says, "creative conformists who are proven profit makers with vision."

This is, of course, a generalization only. In discussions and correspondence I have been conducting with presidents of representative leading American companies, many recognize the dangers of the conformity trend. They tell me they see the urgent need for pioneering at all levels of business. They agree it can be accomplished. Others express reservations. Much as they want men with creative initiative, they question their possibly disruptive influence on orderly procedures and on the efficiency of a business organization.

My recent survey also shows—and my own experience confirms—that there are practical ways of combining individual initiative with the chain of command necessary in a business organization. This is done without making a cult of nonconformity or sacrificing necessary discipline and control. Such partnership gives new strength to America's economic structure, restoring vitality to American business and in that way to America. Never in history did this Nation need it more.

In the final analysis, the success of every business depends on individuals. We can gain our objectives only by infusing every individual throughout an organization with pioneering viewpoints and attitudes toward matters both within and outside their company. All our top policymaking executives should have the pioneering spirit. The same holds true for all members of the organization—our production force, our clerical aides, our stenographic pool.

We at Merritt-Chapman & Scott know such attitudes pay off. To cite one instance, no bridge would link upper and lower Michigan across the wide Straits of Mackinac today—on foundations built by Merritt's construction department—if it had not been for men with creative daring who refused to believe it was "the bridge that couldn't be built." Nor would the world's first nuclear-powered passenger-cargo vessel, the NS *Savannah*, have been built by our New York Shipbuilding Corp., had it not been made possible by men of vision.

In a talk at Louisville last year I said that "robot executives" constitute a growing threat to American industry. These are the men—and I am sure they are well known to you—who are reluctant to attempt anything not well established by precedent. They fear to venture into new paths or to encourage

fresh ideas by others. No matter how successful their patterns of conformity, their attitude blocks the venturesome progress of business growth on which the United States must rely, in great part, for its survival.

As Canada Dry's president, Roy W. Moore, Jr., observed to me, too many executives tend to follow the road proved safe, rather than the dynamic approach of self-reliance, individualism, and initiative. I agree with him. Such men are the ones who encourage the dangerous philosophy that a job is more important than a man. Instead of regarding a job specification writeup as simply an orderly way of noting aptitudes and skills that a man needs for a particular position, they try to fit people rigidly to impersonal job specifications and end by manufacturing more robots and robot executives.

RESTRAINTS ON INITIATIVE

As a case in point, a young business school graduate recently wrote to me to complain about the stock answers he had received from a number of companies in response to his application for a job. One said, in part:

"At the present time we are unable to locate a suitable opening for your particular background. Your qualifications are very acceptable, and we are sorry our present openings do not match them satisfactorily."

The young man closed by saying somewhat bitterly:

"What employee with any kind of ambition wants a job to 'suit his qualifications perfectly'? If he has any pioneer spirit whatsoever, he will use his interest and abilities to do any job."

I said at Louisville that business education at graduate and undergraduate levels should orient its training of students to emphasize qualities of initiative and pioneering. Business should then use these men, so that we may regain the dynamic spirit American business has sacrificed in its emphasis on conformity.

Considerable exciting and encouraging comment poured in on me following my remarks on the threat to initiative posed by the conformist pattern. Evidently many more people than you would imagine worry about the problem. Educators, for example, told me their schools are trying to attract and educate brilliant young men, but many of them wondered if business is not too deep in the rut of conformity to make good use of them. One educator said the so-called "hard-boiled" businessman restrains all nonconformity, "becomes about as solidified in his thinking as a hard-boiled egg, and presses his employees in the same kind of mold."

Many businessmen, on the other hand, wanted to learn how corporations could successfully encourage creative men within a necessarily disciplined organization. This interest and their questions set me off trying to find some answers.

In talking to you today, I will describe some actions being carried on in a number of companies to solve this difficult problem. I shall draw on my own experience as a corporation head, on the literature on the subject, on personal discussions and on recent widespread correspondence with leading American industrialists. I appreciate the keen interest the latter took in sharing their experience with me. I only wish time allowed me to cover more completely the many stimulating ideas they gave me. Top executives of Canada Dry, General Aniline & Film, B. F. Goodrich, Westinghouse Air Brake, Worthington Corp., Wyandotte Chemicals, and others, provided me with valuable facts.

SOCIAL SCIENCES GIVE AID

First, I will touch on current studies carried on by leaders in academic and social science circles, working alone and with business leadership. Then I will suggest yardsticks by which the executive can measure himself and his corporation before proceeding. Next, I will touch on personnel selection. Finally, I will offer examples of how some companies, my own included, stimulate and reward creativity through incompany and extramural activities and incentives. All this, I hope, will encourage you to move ahead.

One fact impressed me particularly. Whatever their field, businessmen have the highest respect for laboratory research and new product development. They recognize that the future of business depends on it. Findings about human personality and how it functions often arouse skepticism, however. The term "social sciences" raise questions of doubt. Yet as businessmen we should be as willing to accept the aid of the social sciences as we do the physical sciences. Social scientists are constantly discovering new facts about our greatest business asset—people. We should be as willing to adopt such findings as we are the newest chemical or electronic discovery.

Today the problm of creativity and initiative is getting a thorough going-over from educators, social scientists and students. Universities carry on research. Academic-business conferences try to bridge the gap between the two fields. Profit and nonprofit research organizations constantly produce new methods studies.

THREE BASIC CONCLUSIONS

A few high spots in this activity illustrate the diversity and thoroughness of this present-day research.

Dr. Morris I. Stein, associate professor of psychology at the University of Chicago, has worked out practical measurements to evaluate individual creativity and to assess a corporation's environmental factors as an influence on creative work.

In another project, a class of students at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration spent many months on a 300-page study, "Individual Creativity and the Corporation." Its case histories serve a useful purpose for any companies that may care to use them.

The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior at Ann Arbor came to valuable conclusions recently. Among others, it encouraged use of tests for measuring creativity; it outlined steps management can take to increase originality through organizing groups within the corporation to counteract conformity. It suggested participation in decisionmaking to change the direction of group goals and conformity pressures. The foundation's conclusions are worth reading and acting on.

The Arthur D. Little research organization at Cambridge, Mass., has worked on this business problem of adjusting the structured organization to the need for constructive individualism. Many corporations apply their findings.

Publications on the subject increase in numbers. From all this research, we draw three basic conclusions:

First—many barriers—social, business and individual—block the road to meeting our goals. Society exerts strong pressure against nonconformists. Society tags as nonconformists those who question things as they are.

The bigness of American business, an essential element of its efficiency, also makes it difficult to bring about change within itself. Business leans heavily on systematizing, standardization, and unquestioned authority. All make for resistance to change. Rather than appear to deviate, the individual himself, assuming protective coloring, fears to appear better than average, to be a dreamer, to be different. And it's hard to make a man think imaginatively when he has been trained to follow routine.

As one executive wrote to me: "As companies grow bigger, efficiency is increased by having general rules that apply to everyone. But then such uniformity, however, useful to efficiency, is death to creativity. * * * By its very nature, bigness tends toward averages, and unfortunately in the case of thinking ability, the average is too close to mediocrity." What we must do is find ways to preserve the advantages of bigness while at the same time we overcome its stultifying effect on individual initiative.

Second—no one easy or universal way stimulates constructive individualism in business. No one rule of thumb accomplishes the result wanted.

Too many businessmen, unfortunately, believe the problem of superimposing individual initiative on the organizational pattern can be solved by some single approach. They rely on a magic method—perhaps on personnel selection, a suggestion box. Or they place their full reliance on decentralization. Each has its virtues. But remaking an organization's attitudes, thinking, and action is more difficult. It requires a many-sided approach and stems from a broad program. And even then every step may not yield the desired result.

Third—most important, a company that tries to break conformist patterns must make certain of the attitude of the top man or men. Top management must first want to stimulate initiative. These men must want it so much that they will move to change the administrative climate of their organization from top to bottom. The desire to stimulate initiative must permeate the whole organization. Only top management's attitude and action can bring this about.

One corporation does this in a unique way. Grant G. Simmons, Jr., president of the Simmons Co., wrote me they rather pride themselves "on having at least one or two 'pikes' in the pond—strong men of spiny and frequently unpopular personalities who keep the other organizational fish all stirred up." As this comment suggests, the individual with different ideas often risks unpopularity.

SEVEN QUESTIONS FOR EXECUTIVES

In considering the problem, it might be a good idea first of all for each of us to analyze ourself and our company's attitudes. Ask yourself these seven questions:

1. Are you willing to take a calculated risk on a good new idea, or do you feel more secure if you wait for someone else to try it first?

Too much of business is run by people who will try something new only after someone else has proved it feasible and profitable. Timidity means slow death to American business.

2. Are you as receptive to new ideas from your subordinates as you are eager to have your ideas accepted by those above you? Or do you discourage ideas from below with the thought that it's better to let well enough alone?

Distrust of originality discourages individuals from independent thought and action.

3. Do you encourage a man to suggest ideas beyond the scope of his own work?

Initiative dies when new ideas are discouraged because "that's another man's department." Many businesses have developed intergroup communications so that the various departments are eager to cooperate and exchange ideas.

4. Are you ready to assume equal responsibility for the failure of a new idea suggested by others? Or is a man penalized for a suggestion that doesn't work out?

If the latter is true, don't expect anyone to risk job suicide by volunteering ideas.

5. Do you give credit to others for a successful idea, or claim it as your own?

Too many bosses make it standard practice to take credit for the ideas of those under them.

6. Are you prepared to judge the creative ability of a present or potential employee

strictly on his merits, regardless of race, color, or creed?

Only through conscious elimination of bias can we enable every individual to contribute to his fullest. This, in turn, will develop the available work force in the United States to its maximum potential, with consequent benefit to business and society.

7. Last, but far from least, are you as venturesome and receptive to pioneering ideas now as you were when you were "on the way up?"

No business, or nation, can stand still. We must move forward or eventually lose ground. I thought of that again when, in a telecast of that now famous kitchen debate in Moscow, I saw Soviet Premier Khrushchev flap his hand at Vice President NIXON and say, "We'll wave as we pass you by."

Now let us look at some methods that are in use to help solve our problem.

Some industries rely primarily on the careful selection of personnel. In every instance, personnel departments should keep abreast of the latest applicable findings of the social sciences. Today's selection tools still need refining, but are definitely helpful pending further progress. The 1958 Ann Arbor Conference made this point in listing eight tests for individual originality which, in its judgment, management can use as a supplement to other information.

THOROUGH PERSONNEL SELECTION

Above all, make sure your employment office understands your instructions. Personnel departments usually hire the kind of people they think the top brass really wants, regardless of official pronouncements. You must make it clear, by deed as well as word, that company management wants to hire creative persons.

Also, accept as a fact that you will not find the ideal person for every position. Despite all available tests to determine the right man for each job, the supply for such people simply is not enough to go around. But if you select key executive personnel with sufficient care, they can, by example, progressively develop the needed environment for encouraging constructive individualism.

And constructive individualists do need encouragement. Without it, they lose their push and drive. Often what looks like laziness is lack of motivation. Many times I have seen men of great potential failing to do their best work just because of that lack. Nothing is more disturbing to me, and I am sure this is true of other businessmen as well, than to see innate talent going to waste. Their failure is the company's loss as well as their own.

As this suggests, the initial selection of personnel is only half the problem. After you have your people on the job, you must constantly encourage further development of the qualities you want. Industry uses a number of methods to do this. This entire field is so new, however, and so rapidly developing, that there is as yet no set pattern of classification. Therefore, I have worked out my own categories and offer them to you merely as several approaches for your further study.

SIX DIFFERENT APPROACHES

1. A number of companies use management consultants to seek solutions of company problems through discussion, exchange of opinion and suggestions for new policies and practices. To name a few, such companies include General Aniline & Film, Koppers Co. and Allied Chemical. Some organizations use committees at many policy and operational levels to foster individual initiative. I favor such committees, if they do not get too involved in their own functioning and don't deteriorate into yes-men groups.

2. Conferences and training courses are used effectively by many companies to further constructive individualism. They vary in subject matter from courses on problem findings to creative thinking. For instance, at the United States Steel Corp.'s Gary plant, a trainee program divides the men into small groups of eight. They go into the plant to study and observe a problem situation involving costs, working conditions, or whatever. They work out specific ways to better the situation. Trainees thereby gain the experience of putting their own solutions into action terms, certainly a sound approach. United States Steel points out that this is just one of the many training programs the company has implemented.

Polaroid utilizes an independent "Office of Career Growth." Organizationally, it works completely independent of any other line or staff executive, and of the personnel office. This office helps the individual realize his greatest potential and usefulness to the company. It gives him information on employment opportunities and skills needed within the organization. It meets head on the current disposition of many businesses to keep the good man where he is. "Don't move him. He's doing a good job." How long he will continue to do a good job is another question.

Worthington Corp. encourages the continuing development of the individual by a self-development activity that includes on-job coaching and training, special assignment, committee work, reading programs, etc. Basic elements of this program embrace personal inventory and self-examination.

One company brought to my attention a twist on this idea many of us might adopt to advantage. The American Alcolac Corp. requires every professional and managerial organization member to write a semiannual or annual letter to his respective boss, outlining his objectives, embodying suggestions for changes and improvements, and outlining future plans for his own work. Initially required every 6 months, the time interval is eventually lengthened to about 1 year for executives who have been with the company for some time. This seems to me a new challenging way of developing what we want.

McCormick & Co., Inc., Baltimore, where multiple management originated in 1932 has the junior board of executives approach, which develops a feeling of belonging, free self-expression, and opportunity to advance by merit. Of the 19 men now serving on the company's senior board of directors, elected by the stockholders, 15 served on the company's junior board, factory board, or sales boards.

General Electric originated a creative engineering program as a training method. In the first 6 months, they teach the men a creative philosophy and try to develop the individual's creative ability. They stress fundamental engineering concepts, materials and processing, and the presentation of ideas and human relations. Before the first half of the course is over, each student creates an original idea, works it out on paper, and builds a working model. GE reports that graduates of this program continue to develop new processes and patentable ideas at an average rate almost three times that of nongraduates. The company aims this plan specifically to further creative engineering. It applies, it seems to me, to trainees of every kind.

3. American Brake Shoe innovates with top-to-bottom delegation of authority, a more daring approach. The company bases its philosophy on "freedom to fail," defined as "freedom to act, to take risks, to make decisions—and to do so without fear of the consequences."

American Brake Shoe calls it "bottom-up management." It delegates authority to many throughout the organization. Not only top and lower echelon executives, but also rank-and-file people solve problems. Foremen, for instance, help negotiate union contracts. The company does not penalize a man for failure if he has sincerely and intelligently tried to innovate a new idea.

I am greatly intrigued by this method. Obviously, decentralization must go with this approach—something which I support.

Operation creativity

4. The Kimberly-Clark Corp. offers a good example in the "banker idea" as one facet of the company's program to encourage creativity. "Operation Creativity," as they call it, establishes a reserve bank of men of diverse backgrounds who act as a team to solve problems. None of them are specialists, though they may consult specialists if they feel it desirable. This small group works on any problems its members believe important. It has its own budget, laboratory, and machine shop. I can see the value of such a plan, but also two questions. How many companies can afford to support such a unit? And might it result in a creative elite so powerful in prestige as to discourage individual initiative in others?

5. A fifth method, "brainstorming," stems from the advertising field, where it was used as a problem-buster. A group of men throw out ideas about a problem, with no critical comment at all. The theory is that group members stimulate each other's creativeness. Later, suggestions are evaluated and weeded out. Advocates maintain "brainstorming" supplements individual problem-solving. I think thoughtful study by men pounding their brains in solitude is more productive than this kind of group titillation.

6. Under the heading of "incentive and reward," Remington Rand gives the old-time suggestion box a new dimension. Its suggestion plan administrator encourages suggestions and helps sell them to management. This is considered a major advance in stimulating in-company innovations. Only one limitation applies: The would-be innovator must have his idea pretty well developed before he comes to the suggestion plan administrator.

My short listing just touches on the infinite variety of methods used in in-company programs to recapture individual initiative. According to general consensus and my own thinking, the most important factor for effectiveness, as I noted earlier, is the kind of support the program receives from the chief executive officer; the degree to which he develops a corporate climate that encourages an exchange of ideas at all levels, free communication, and delegation of authority. He must be willing not only to spend time and effort to study and adapt the experience of other businesses to his needs, but also to use what the social scientists have found out about how to deal with people. He must give both theory and experience a fair trial in his day-to-day business operations. He must take into account the desires of the individual for recognition, encouragement and understanding, for reasonable security and a chance to advance.

Extramural activities, or outtraining, cover the last broad category of activities for review in the brief time permitted.

We all realize increasingly that in business administration specialist skills alone are not enough. Top executives must be men of the broadest knowledge and understanding. It is obvious that, with the increasing complexity of business and society, an increasingly higher degree of judgment is demanded at every level. As F. R. Kappel, president of American Telephone & Telegraph, summed it up, "We need the most in creative imagination, ability to take on new assignments and selective judgment."

LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Some larger corporations encourage executive attendance for long or short periods at leading universities and colleges on company

time and expense. The Bell Telephone System, for example, sends top executives for an extended study of the humanities to widen their perspective. IBM has worked with New York University's Work Simplification Round Table. However, expense and the crippling effect of executive absences rules out such projects for most businesses.

Some companies pay all or part of tuition fees for approved after-hours study courses. Some require courses to be job related. Others do not. Western Electric, for instance, refunds up to $250 a year tuition for study at accredited colleges when the courses relate to the employee's present job, or to one he might reasonably hope to hold. At Merritt-Chapman & Scott, we encourage both job related and nonjob related courses by subsidy, and have been encouraged in turn by the enthusiastic response of our junior and middle management executives to this program. I look for great expansion in this area.

Finally, let me tell you about a few other activities at Merritt-Chapman & Scott designed to recapture the pioneering spirit. Our experience at Merritt has shown us that by conscious effort we can develop increased initiative. We are therefore constantly exploring new ways to offer the needed encouragements and incentives. Our program is built around what I have described earlier as a receptive climate. Prove to the people of your organization you welcome new ideas, and you will get them—at all levels.

The performance record of Merritt's junior executive council, established 2 years ago as part of our long-range management training and development program, is a case in point. The council, comprised of junior executives, represents all the administrative and operational divisions based at our headquarters offices. One sentence describes it: To develop original thinking, and to train young executives to decisionmaking of their own. They study and submit proposals they consider of potential benefit to the company, either new ideas or improvement of existing methods.

The council has full latitude to study existing corporate procedures and to recommend changes or innovations. A committee of the council first analyzes each situation thoroughly, and then the group analyzes it. A management steering committee, composed of senior executives, gets the proposals that survive this preliminary examination, and determines whether they merit further study.

When it gets the green light, the junior executive council further studies the projects with potential promise and comes back with a definite recommendation for management consideration. Inevitably, some of these proposals turn out to have flaws or to be impractical. In those instances the steering committee reviews the basic facts and explains them to the council.

AN INNOVATOR'S RESPONSIBILITY

The percentage of workable fresh ideas that have developed is encouraging. More important, the council members have grown increasingly mature and independent in their judgment. In 2 years, the council has reviewed a wide range of recommended proposals, from technical to administrative. Of about 30 proposals studied, the group developed 10 in detail for submission to management. Management has adopted five in various forms and is considering several others.

In this process, our junior executives have received a more thorough insight into the overall operations of the company than they could in the department where they work. More thorough understanding of the responsibilities that are tied up with the formulation of new ideas has resulted.

This point I emphasize strongly—the innovator and independent thinker must be instilled with an awareness of his responsibilities. Many businessmen feel he is a disruptive force. We have found in most cases that we can adjust the creative individual to work harmoniously with others without losing his pioneering drive. And that is the heart of the matter. While the individual necessarily originates new fresh ideas, they remain only ideas unless accepted by others. They can succeed only through group effort. A business organization in turn must stagnate if it insists on a conformist pattern and rejects as nonconformists those who would do things differently. Neither can succeed without the other.

STRONG ECONOMY OUR BASIC DEFENSE

To sum up, we face the most urgent challenge in our history. In dramtic fashion, the public thinks of both challenge and defense in terms of competing scientists perfecting intercontinental missiles and other weapons. Actually, our business economy is a far more basic bulwark and defensive weapon, both for our own Nation and for the free world. This is because we are an industrial society. Industry is the very heartland of our social fabric. On industry's well-being depends the economic well-being of all those varied elements of our national life. Together they make our Nation great and strong. Without the taxes industry pays and the wages and dividends it disburses, scientific pioneering would be irreparably slowed. Without them we would be unable to forge protective weapons with the speed and in the quantity needed.

Even on the lesser personal security plane, every American has a tremendous stake in a continued strong economy. Many men plan ahead carefully for their future security and the security of their families. But if the economy weakens, what becomes of a man's savings, of pension funds, of investments—of all the personal anchors to windward?

Therefore, from every standpoint, as businessmen we have an obligation to utilize maximum originality and pioneering in all phases of our day-to-day business operations in order to continue American leadership and a healthy economy. Unfortunately, it has become an increasing habit to describe a good part of our day-to-day operations as "routine business." Nothing in our business world should ever be regarded as completely "routine." The business world must keep pace with the pioneering spirit so dramatically evident in our science and technology. Every new technological advance demands, in fact, a broader range of view by our business executives, whatever their sphere of activity.

This need becomes increasingly acute. The past 45 years, since World War I began, have brought startling scientific developments. Our limited imaginations cannot attempt a forecast of what the next 45 years will bring. Our executives of coming generations, whether now in business or in school, must be encouraged to be pioneers and not robots.

We must revitalize a key American resource badly neglected—the individual in the business structure. We need to replace robot executives with constructive individualists. We must adjust the needs of the business organization for orderly procedures with society's need for individual initiative. American enterprise must permit the individual to make his fullest possible contribution, rather than relegate him to the role of a well-oiled automaton. By doing so, we can recapture the pioneering spirit that made America.

This is our challenge as businessmen. When I spoke on this subject in Louisville last November, the outlook was depressing to me. Increasingly and almost unconsciously, we were slipping deeper into a pattern of robot conformity, with little prospect of change in direction.

From my many talks since then with outstanding businessmen and educators, I now believe a great number of people in many fields recognize the seriousness of the problem. They are trying to overcome it. I am confident that a determined move is growing to erase the robot weakness and inject new vitality into American enterprise. You as businessmen can help this effort. I urge you to give it your thought and constructive leadership.

The Golden Anniversary of the Forest Products Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a native of the State of Washington, I have watched many a logging truck pass by to satisfy the hunger of our great timber industries. Some of the trucks carry only one log, and require a special guide car to warn motorists that a wider than highway limit load is following. Others may carry a load equivalent to several small trees. The species include Douglas-fir, western hemlock, sitka spruce, ponderosa pine, white pine, white firs, cedars, lodgepole pine and many other lesser known varieties.

I have long marveled at the great variety of products made from these logs which vary so widely in size and type of wood. It is evident that the Forest Products Laboratory, which does our Federal utilization research on wood, has dealt with a broad and complex field during these past 50 years.

The timber industries are not the only ones who benefit from work of the laboratory. During the past few years the laboratory has collaborated with the Agricultural Research Service in improving the engineering design of palletized field boxes used for harvesting apples and other crops. Some excellent designs have already been developed through this joint effort.

I am also grateful to the laboratory for the advances it has made in use of wood in the home. The warmth of wood makes it a favorite material in home construction. The development of better finishes and paints for wood, better ways to protect wood from insects, decay and fire, and more economical ways of using wood for the structural parts of the home are of great value to all home owners and prospective builders.

I subscribe to the principle of "wise use" expounded by the Forest Service. The development of economic processes to use all of the products of the forest should be an important part of the job. I am sure that the Forest Service can rise to the challenge in its Forest Products Laboratory.

I wish to join with my colleagues in saluting the internationally famous Forest Products Laboratory on its 50th anniversary.

Questionnaire on Public Questions Submitted to People of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, recently I sent questionnaires to 27,000 North Dakota people. This represents about 1 out of every 10 voters in North Dakota. They reached every voting precinct in the State. The return of the questionnaires was amazingly good and, when completed, there will be approximately 7,000 replies.

I ask unanimous consent to have the results of the questionnaires printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questionnaires and returns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 5,697 questionnaires tabulated to date (from a total of 27,000 mailed to North Dakota people) represent a good cross section of views. It should be noted, however, that there was a higher proportionate return from farmers than nonfarmers. Every effort was made to describe the major farm proposals pending in Congress fairly and accurately in the small space available. "F" where used means farmers; "NF" means nonfarmers.

1. Do you think that foreign aid should be: Abolished? 803. Continued with present amount of funds? 1,687. Continued with greatly decreased funds? 2,607.

2. Do you favor legislation to provide Federal aid to education? Yes, 3,033; no, 2,116.

3. If you plan to vote Republican this year, which of the following would be your choice for President? Nixon, 2,132; Rockefeller, 1,371.

4. If you plan to vote Democrat, which of the following would be your choice for President? Humphrey, 2,249; Kennedy, 782; Stevenson, 248; Symington, 381.

5. If the following were nominated for President, which one in each group would be your choice? (All candidates listed alphabetically.) Humphrey, F, 2,329; NF, 529; total, 2,848; Nixon, F, 940; NF, 875; total, 1,815. Kennedy, F, 1,451; NF, 468; total, 1,919; Nixon, F, 1,123; NF, 837; total, 1,960. Nixon, F, 1,200; NF, 918; total, 1,118; Stevenson, F, 1,243; NF, 376; total, 1,619. Rockefeller, F, 1,492; NF, 935; total, 2,427; Stevenson, F, 1,033; NF, 309; total, 1,342.

6. (The bracketed comments on the following farm measure did not appear on the original questionnaire.)

(a) Abolish all price support programs and controls? [Many commented that these programs should be abolished gradually.] Yes, F, 607; NF, 564; total, 1,171. No, F, 3,203; NF, 1,023; total, 4,226.

(b) Provide high price supports and marketing quotas for every commodity a farmer produces, with stiff penalties for violation of marketing quotas? Under this proposal price supports would be based on direct production payments for each commodity. [This is basically the farmers union program.] Approve, F, 2,048; NF, 543; total, 2,591. Disapprove, F, 1,224; NF, 732; total, 1,956.

(c) Abolish present mandatory 75 percent of parity price supports for wheat and dairy commodities; elimination of the 15-acre provision; elimination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas; price supports for wheat based on the support level for corn (which is primarily based on a 3-year market price average) with adjustments for differences in quality, etc.? According to testimony of proponents, this would result in price supports of approximately $1.10 to $1.20 a bushel. [This is a brief outline of the American Farm Bureau Federation program as it appeared in the December 21, 1959 issue of the American Farm Bureau News.]

Approve: F, 632; NF, 389; total, 1021; disapprove: F, 2735; NF, 804; total, 3539.

(d) Provide price supports for wheat at 100 percent of parity (presently $2.36 a bushel for that portion of the farmers' production which is consumed within the United States. (This would be about half of his production.) For the other half, the producer could receive the market price or whatever minimum price support the Congress might provide. Proponents claim that under this program acreage allotments or quotas soon could be eliminated. [This is the Young proposal as contained in Senate bill 892. It is substantially the program sponsored by the National Grange and the National Association of Wheat Growers.] Approve: F, 2861; NF, 941; total, 3802; disapprove: F, 643; NF, 395; total, 1038.

7. If it would appear impossible for Congress to agree on any new farm legislation, would you approve modifying the present program to make it more workable until a new one could be enacted? This would envision some further cut in production, reducing the present 15-acre exemption to 12 acres or less, and stiffer penalties for violation of quotas. Approve: F, 2615; NF, 1021; total, 3636; disapprove: F, 751; NF, 381; total, 1132.

8. Do you approve of the soil bank program? Yes: F, 1365; NF, 446; total, 1811; No: F, 2354; NF 1263; total, 3617.

Unsettled Conditions in East Coast Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, February 4, 1960, I addressed your House with reference to the unsettled conditions in our east coast shipyards. On Friday, February 5, 1960, the Department of the Navy informed me by telephone that it was the intention of the Navy to remove from the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s Fore River Shipyard the cruiser *Springfield—CLG–7*—to the Boston Naval Shipyard.

This step by the Department of the Navy indicates the urgency of bringing about a settlement of the present strike.

The failure of the present administration to take affirmative steps on this matter are very apparent. I need not remind the membership of Congress that contract agreements between Bethlehem and the shipbuilding unions expired July 31, 1959. On September 3, 1959, many Members of Congress including myself addressed Congress and warned of the impending strike.

Two weeks have gone by since the strike began. Eighteen thousand persons are idle along the east coast. Thirteen thousand persons in my congressional district are idle. Work on the nuclear vessels, the *Long Beach* and nuclear powered frigates have come to a halt. Our shipbuilding program for defense is seriously impaired.

This morning I received a letter from the Department of the Navy confirming the telephone message of last Friday. For the RECORD I wish to include this letter for the edification of the Members of Congress.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1960.

The Honorable JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BURKE: This is in reply to your letter of January 27, 1960, asking if it is true that the Navy is considering the removal of some ships now under construction at the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s Fore River Shipyard and stating your strong opposition to any such action at this time.

At the present time, the only ship the Navy has considered removing from the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s Fore River Yard is *Springfield (CLG–7)*. Removal of this ship came under consideration as soon as the Navy learned of the strike impending there and later commenced on January 22, 1960.

Springfield is within 3 to 4 percent of completion. There is an urgent operational requirement for this Terrier missile ship as an addition to the Navy's striking power. In view of this immediate requirement for *Springfield*, the Navy took steps to determine, as far as possible, how long the strike might reasonably be expected to last. The Navy has been unable to obtain any reasonable assurance that the strike will end in an acceptable period of time. Accordingly, we have indicated to the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the union our intention to move *Springfield* on about February 15, 1960, unless the strike has been settled by that time, or unless the company and the union are able to agree by that time on terms under which the ship can be completed in Bethlehem's yard even though the strike continues. Both the company and the union have agreed to cooperate in moving *Springfield* if neither of these alternatives transpires. It is planned to move the ship to the Boston Naval Shipyard, which recently completed the similar conversion of *Providence* and where outfitting can proceed at the same time the ship is completed.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. MOORE, Jr.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Acting Chief of Bureau.

Responsibility for Deficiencies of Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Leland Du Vall, a member of the staff of the Arkansas Gazette, is one of the most discerning critics of our agricultural programs that it is my good fortune to know.

Recently in one of his columns he has reduced this very complex problem to its

bare essentials. Very succinctly he has presented the facts so that anyone may understand them and how and why the administration policies have resulted in waste and confusion in our agricultural programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 31, 1960]

IKE MUST ACCEPT BLAME FOR WOES OF FARM PROGRAM

(By Leland DuVall)

Since the Eisenhower administration assumed responsibility in 1953 for the operation of the farm program it has attempted to maintain the attitude of an innocent bystander who could not be blamed for what was happening to agriculture. All criticism was turned aside with the explanation that Congress would not give Secretary of Agriculture Benson the necessary weapons with which to deal with surpluses and low prices.

The "don't blame me" attitude is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain.

After all, Mr. Benson has headed the Department for 7 years and during that period virtually all the farm laws have been changed so that they conform more nearly to his philosophy. Surpluses have climbed steadily and—for some reason which Department spokesmen have neglected to explain—the accumulation is highest where the laws are closest to the Benson theories.

It is true, of course, that none of the laws are exactly what Benson recommended—no production controls and little or no price supports—but some of them are getting close. Where this has happened, surpluses are building faster than in commodities where tighter controls have been maintained.

This would seem to indicate that when Congress refused to go all the way with the Benson philosophy it was simply saving the Secretary from his own folly. Corn provides a good example.

Under the law in effect during the early part of Mr. Benson's tenure, corn farmers in the commercial areas had the option of planting within their base acreage and receiving price supports or ignoring the base acreage and receiving no assurance that the loans would be available. The law was flexible and the Secretary was permitted to administer it in such a way that "noncompliance" corn might be accepted as collateral for loans. Under these conditions, the carryover from the 1952 crop was around 500,000 bushels, a level that was neither big nor burdensome. Actually, a reserve of this amount could be justified on the ground that it provided insurance against drought or crop failure from other causes. The support rate for compliance corn had been at 90 percent of parity.

In 1954, when Mr. Eisenhower was in firm control of a Republican Congress, the idea of loans at 90 percent of parity (in exchange for compliance with planting restrictions) was traded for the sliding scale. This was supposed to be the answer, since it would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce loan rates and destroy the "incentive" for excessive production.

Administrative rulings, rather than an act of Congress, resulted in making loans available on noncompliance corn (where farmers ignored their base acreage). Obviously this stimulated, rather than discouraged, surplus production. Some farmers continued to observe, voluntarily, their corn bases in order to qualify for the slightly higher loans.

The Benson theory was followed rather closely in writing the new corn law. It removed all acreage restrictions and set the support rate at a percentage of the market average for the past 3 years, rather than on a parity basis. It was a long step toward the "freedom to produce" Mr. Benson had been advocating. According to the theory, farmers were supposed to gear their output of corn to market needs.

Somehow, it did not quite work out that way. Farmers harvested nearly 4,400 million bushels of corn last year, a volume far above any previous record and some 35 percent higher than the 10-year average. By no stretch of the imagination could this be blamed on the laws Mr. Benson "inherited" when he took office.

Production, of course, is not an accurate measure of surpluses. One key to the Benson theory is that "freedom to produce" will result in increased sales. If the higher corn production could be moved into markets in sufficient volume, the situation would not be so bad. Unfortunately, it did not quite work out that way.

The Crop Reporting Service revealed Friday that 4,453 million bushels of corn were stored in all positions on January 1. Stocks of corn on farms were reported at 3,094 million bushels or about 15 percent higher than the amount 1 year earlier. The corn on hand January 1 amounted to some 526 million bushels more than stocks 1 year earlier. This, it should be noted, was more than the total carryover the first year Mr. Benson was in office. January 1 stocks have set a new record each year since 1954—the year when Mr. Benson began getting his first farm policies into operation.

The acreage reserve of the soil bank helped delay the accumulation of surpluses, but it did not solve any problems permanently.

Cotton and the other basic crops moved a little more slowly toward the free market, but they are following the pattern. The new cotton law is almost certain to rebuild surpluses—held down by the acreage reserve and by vigorous export programs—and drive prices still lower.

The keystone in Mr. Benson's reasoning is the assumption that free production and lower prices will result in a larger sales volume (because of cheaper prices) and thus give the farmer a bigger gross income. It has not worked out that way.

The theory of unhampered competition assumes that a producer will move freely from one commodity to another or from one industry to another. Under these conditions, production resources would be concentrated in the industries and in commodities within an industry where the possibility for profit was greatest.

Climates, soils, and other natural conditions have always restricted farmers to a limited list of crops. A farmer in the Arkansas Delta, for example, was never free to substitute wheat for cotton on a 1-year notice simply because there happened to be a greater surplus of cotton than wheat.

In modern mechanized farming the restrictions are more rigid than ever before. Agriculture now requires huge investments in machines designed to do a limited number of jobs. A farmer who owns one or more mechanical cotton pickers finds himself—because of the huge investment—restricted to a particular kind of farming. The same is true of all types of farming.

Farmers drift out of agriculture because of economic pressures, but the move always means a sacrifice in the sale of equipment.

The misuse of the word "incentive" in connection with commodity loans also creates confusion. So long as a man remains on the farm, he is under compulsion to operate at full capacity, regardless of the price level. So long as the capacity to produce is above the effective demand—a condition that is essential to the health of the whole economy—there will be surpluses. Production controls, administered wisely, can hold these surpluses within a reasonable level.

The volume of surpluses is bound to get out of hand when the administration is more interested in avoiding political blame and creating the illusion that it is innocent of mistakes than it is in assuming its responsibilities to the Nation.

Cranberries, Caponettes, Heptachlor—and More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the hint of a threat to the public health will make a headline any day of the week. It would seem that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is guided more by this premise than by public responsibility in his succession of pronouncements on chemicals used in agriculture.

Secretary Flemming attempted a seasonal Madison Avenue-type coup in the cranberry fiasco. Cranberry farmers, relatively few in number, apparently were evaluated as politically expendable, whereas tobacco farmers, who might be disadvantaged by firm action based on other findings of Mr. Flemming's department, could be expected to make more effective protests.

Let this be understood, Mr. Speaker, the farmer—if such there be—who knowingly would send to market grain, vegetables, meat, or any other food product carrying a chemical taint dangerous to the health of the consumer, would meet the most severe opprobrium of the agricultural community. What disturbs farmers today, however, is the irresponsibility of the press conference pronouncement in a paneled room in Washington whereby Mr. Flemming, by a few sentences, heedlessly can disrupt farming practices, which, a few moments before, were recognized as legitimate and safe.

All the American farmer asks is reasonable evidence, reasonable notice, and reasonable consideration in readjusting his practices to conform to new findings, provided such findings are based on indisputable scientific fact. This he has not been given. He has been made the "fall guy" in a publicity maneuver in which evidence of a minimal threat has been magnified into scare headlines.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include two editorials.

[From the Virginia Farm Bureau News, January 1960]

ON CRANBERRIES AND CAPONETTES

Every time a Russian sputnik probes into the stratosphere, there are a good many people in our country who must let out a carefully muffled and camouflaged howl of glee. For them it means security—it guarantees the continuous flow of billions into the pockets of those who are even remotely associated with our efforts to win the sput-

nik race. A sputnik kisses the moon and up go the howls for new or expanded Federal aid for everything under the sun—public schools, institutions of higher learning, public housing, highways, and hottentots.

But it's difficult for Mr. Flemming, Secretary of U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare, to capitalize on the fearsome sputnik as fully as he would like. So he proceeds to develop a few of his own. His agents find a few cranberries that may have been contaminated by the use of a weed killer. The weed killer in question is said to be capable of causing cancer in mice. Although proof seems to be lacking as to just how many tons of cranberries would need to be consumed in order to produce cancer in man, does this deter Mr. Flemming in his blurb that all but ruined the cranberry industry? Not on your life. Mr. Flemming had to have his sputnik, too. If, in fact, the cranberries in question were known to be harmful, he might easily have quietly issued a stop-sale order on the suspected berries, removed them from the market and that would have been the end of it. Uncontaminated berries would then have gone their merry way onto millions of turkey-graced tables, adding immeasurably to the enjoyment of said turkey and to the prosperity of cranberry growers. But, then, Mr. Flemming would not have had his sputnik and a sputnik he had to have. For sputniks have a way of frightening people, and frightened people demand larger appropriations for those who protect them.

But cranberries are seasonal. Some people probably never eat them. Mr. Flemming needed a more permanent type of sputnik—one that would cause year-round uneasiness on the part of a lot of people.

And there was poultry. In a few instances, producers were making use of a hormone called stilbestrol in producing a specialty line known as caponettes. Under certain conditions, the drug is said to be capable of causing cancer of the breast in men. We have never known of a case, but if this is true, Mr. Flemming might easily have forbidden the further use of the drug, issued a stop-sale order on birds produced by the use of it, and people would have continued to eat poultry and be happy ever after. Did Mr. Flemming follow this course of action recommended by leaders in industry and in other Government agencies? Indeed not. Mr. Flemming had found a sputnik—so he damns another industry with suspicion. We, too, are entitled to our suspicions. We suspect Mr. Flemming of pure, unadulterated chicanery.

If the purpose is public protection, why wait until suspected materials have already been used before sounding off to consumers on possible dangers? Why not first advise growers and producers that foods produced by the use of unapproved materials cannot be offered for sale to consumers? It would appear that, to Mr. Flemming, the protection of the public is purely a secondary matter. To heck with the horse—so long as Mr. Flemming gets the price of a golden, diamond-studded padlock with which to lock the door.

Might we suggest that a boot through the door for Mr. Flemming would be more appropriate.

[From Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, Feb. 1, 1960]

POLITICAL QUACKERY—FOOD AND DRUG LAWS NEED A DOSE OF COMMONSENSE

At a hearing of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, solemn lawmakers last week debated what historians one day, in a footnote perhaps, will describe as the great lipstick crisis. According to Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, the health of the women of America is threatened by synthetic coloring agents which are used to produce such desirable shades as boldface purple and striking pink. In an effort to rebut her testimony, harassed spokesmen of the industry sought refuge in the facts, notably, that in order to suffer ill effects, a person would have to swallow 100 lipsticks per day. As might be expected, however, the attractive solon (who, by all accounts, was wearing a suspiciously light, bright lip rouge herself) had the last word. While a woman naturally wants a product which best matches her complexion and outfit, Representative SULLIVAN asserted ringingly, she gladly will sacrifice beauty for safety.

However, bizarre it might have seemed elsewhere on Capitol Hill, this crusading spirit was peculiarly fitting to the time and place. For the hearings on color additives have brought out in full force, from legislative and executive branches alike, officials who fairly might be described as health zealots. In their misguided view, the Government must go far beyond its time-honored role of establishing reasonable, scientific standards for determining the safety of substances used in food and drugs. Instead, in the guise of protecting the public from a dread disease, it should be empowered to take whatever measures it deems necessary or politic. The end is certainly laudable; everyone is against cancer and all the other ills to which the flesh is heir. The proposed means, however, are unmistakably suspect; for they would open the door to all kinds of bureaucratic abuse, the threat of which was underscored recently in cases involving, among other things, caponettes and cranberries. They are based not on knowledge, but on the lack of it. Perhaps worst of all, in a realm once distinguished for careful, objective inquiry, such a change of policy would substitute prejudice and superstition for scientific truth.

Such risks are not mere theory; since 1958, when Congress passed various amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, they have been all too real. In official language, the legislation was designed "to protect the health of consumers by requiring manufacturers of food additives and food processors to pretest any potentially unsafe substances which are to be added to food; and to advance food technology by permitting the use of food additives at safe levels." The product of protracted discussions between Government (as represented by the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Agriculture) and industry, the measure by and large was sane and sensible. At the last minute, however, an unwelcome rider, the Delaney amendment, was affixed to the bill. As interpreted by FDA and its politically conscious superiors in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this proviso has been used to ban outright, and wholly without regard to the rule of reason, any food additive "found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal." Sentiment in favor of a similar prohibition for color additives has been mounting fast.

In emotional and political terms, the Delaney amendment has a powerful appeal. By any other yardstick, however, it is a foolish and mischievous piece of legislation. To begin with, it has bestowed sweeping powers upon an agency which, the evidence suggests, is not immune to arbitrary action. Thus the Food and Drug Administration recently discovered that a synthetic hormone known as stilbestrol, which is used, among other purposes, to spur the growth of chickens, caused cancer when fed to rats in excessive amounts. FDA promptly cracked down on the poultry raisers, halting their output at the taxpayer's expense. However, it continued to allow the same substance to be used to fatten cattle and sheep, as well as in doctors' prescriptions. The degree of concern over public safety, it appears, tends to vary with political pressures.

In carrying out its mandate, moreover, FDA scarcely has proven a model of scientific objectivity. The agency has shown an unbecoming penchant for publicity, a trait which has brought it into disrepute not only with farmers and manufacturers, but also with professional associations of doctors and lawyers. Moreover, in screening substances for their carcinogenic (cancer-inducing) qualities, its researchers have leaned heavily on experimentation with mice, a technique which, in the view of some independent experts (notably one at the Sloan-Kettering Institute), is open to serious challenge. It also has bowed to the groundless prejudice, so popular among lawmakers, that artificial substances are apt to be more deleterious to health than natural ones (in fact, sunshine and eggs, to name two, have been found to be cancer-inducing).

Finally, in its recent rulings, the agency has shown an appalling disregard for the simple precepts of commonsense, to say nothing of the scientific method. In order to suffer ill effects from tainted cranberries, a person would have to eat 15,000 pounds a day. To run a risk from lipstick, as noted, a woman would have to consume 100. Here, then, is a triumph of superstition over science. Here, cloaked in an emotion-packed crusade against a terrible plague, is bureaucracy gone hogwild.

In the process, the rights of thousands of people have been trampled. What is at stake, however, involves far more than poultry farms or cranberry bogs. For in the hands of ambitious politicos, Federal food and drug laws have become a palpable threat to the advance of food technology, without which this Nation never could have moved from the farm to the city, and upon which, if anything, its dependence is likely to grow. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which looks askance at the hanky-panky now going on at FDA, "We cannot continue to produce adequate amounts of safe and wholesome foods without chemicals. Abandoning their use would result in an immediate decline in the quantity and overall quality of our food supply and cause a rapid rise in prices paid by consumers." The United States needs—and over the years has enjoyed—protection against genuine enemies of its health and welfare. Now, to paraphrase an old French saying, it needs to be protected against its so-called friends.

Interest Rate Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the prominent economist, Gardiner Means, which appeared on February 5 in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post of Feb. 5, 1960]

INTEREST RATE ISSUES

Your January 31 editorial on Government interest rates troubles me. It seems to imply that because long terms could now be sold at a lower current interest rate than short terms, their interest cost to the Amer-

ican public would be less. This would be a very shortsighted view.

In historical perspective, interest rates are now high and we can reasonably expect prosperous periods in the future when interest rates will be much lower. To issue long terms at 4½ percent or more can commit the public to high rates for 30 or 40 years. The temporary payment of a somewhat higher short-term rate will allow refunding to wait until long-term rates are lower.

At no time in the last 40 years has the Government paid more than 4 percent on its long-term issues. It has not even used the power to pay 4¼ percent.

I cannot imagine a competent financial counselor advising a big, solvent corporation to refund its short debt into long terms at the present time in the light of the high current rates, the long history of lower rates and the known policy of tight money.

It seems to me that the 4¼ percent limit is a sound and needed protection of the public interest. There is always the danger that an administration, whether Republican or Democratic, will, through poor judgment or through too close association with the financial community, saddle the public with 30 or 40 years of unnecessarily high interest charges. It would seem to be a legitimate exercise of congressional responsibility and wisdom to guard against this danger by setting a limit so that refunding into long terms can only be done when long-term rates are below 4½ percent.

That the danger is real is suggested by the history of the last few years. The present administration came into office with the announced intention of (1) bringing about higher interest rates, and (2) refunding the Government debt into longer terms. Both objectives made some sense at the time, particularly the latter because of the intention to bring about higher interest rates.

However, the administration worked on the first and not the second, so that today interest rates are high while the average duration of the public debt is shorter than 7 years ago. The sudden urge to be active in refunding the debt for a long period to come, at high rates, can hardly help but raise the question of why, in the light of the inaction during the last 7 years.

GARDINER C. MEANS.

VIENNA, VA.

Resolution by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas the Senate Interior Committee was instrumental in having a study made for the ultimate use and development of our National Forests entitled "Program for the National Forest"; and

Whereas the Northern California County Supervisors' Association is in accord with this study and program; and

Whereas the administration has endorsed this long-range program, but postponed any appropriation of funds; and

Whereas the application of this study would be extremely beneficial to Shasta County, to the State of California, and to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, That it compliments the Honorable Senator CLAIR ENGLE for his work on this program and does hereby support the program and appropriations requested by Senator ENGLE to carry out said program.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Shasta, State of California, at a regular meeting thereof on the 25th day of January 1960.

LEE S. FOSTER,
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Shasta, State of California.

Attest:

A. RAY TAYLOR,
County Clerk and ex-Officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

Tour by Three Senators of Soviet Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was privileged recently to meet with the Interior and the Public Works Committees, to hear the report of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine, and the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, on their findings about the progress of the Soviet Union in the field of hydroelectric power development. They made an intensive study in a 6-week, 13,000-mile trip last fall.

An account of this trip was contained in the publication I. F. Stone's Weekly of January 18, 1960. This account reflects the great importance of this study, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE U.S. POWER TRUST WISHES RUSSIA WOULD KEEP ITS IRON CURTAIN SHUT TIGHT—TOUR BY THREE SENATORS OF SOVIET DAMS SPARKS PUBLIC POWER FIGHT HERE

One U.S. industry which wishes that Russia would stop lifting the Iron Curtain is the private electric power industry. It fears a glimpse of Soviet progress in this field will stimulate public power in this country. Power interests have opened an attack on a dramatic report made public January 4 by three liberal Democratic Senators on the giant progress in the U.S.S.R. (and China) in hydroelectric power development.[1] The three, Moss of Utah, GRUENING of Alaska, and MUSKIE of Maine made a 12,500-mile trip through the Soviet Union last fall.

Perhaps the most important story about the trip is only hinted at in the report. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs published a preliminary report at the end of 1957 on the work being done in the U.S.S.R. and China in power development. In the middle of 1958 the Senate unanimously passed a resolution directing the Interior and Public Works Committees to make a joint study. Arrangements were made under the Soviet-American exchange program for a visit of inspection to dams and powerplants in U.S.S.R. in the fall of 1958 by a delegation to include representatives of the two Senate committees, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority and interested private organizations.

INTERIOR RAISED OBJECTIONS

Interior Department, which has been under the influence of private power interests since the Republicans took over in 1953, began to throw up bureaucratic roadblocks. It objected that two representatives of public power interests would be included in the trip—Clyde Ellis of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and Alex Radin of the American Public Power Association. While Interior held up the exchange, the Edison Electric Institute, general staff of the power trust, hastily sent two delegations, the first to European Russia, the second to Siberia, turning in two grudging reports. It took an angry series of letters from Senator FULBRIGHT to the State Department before the way could finally be cleared for a Senate delegation to make the visit last fall. The original plan, which would also have allowed TVA, Army Engineers and Federal Power Commission to have a look at Soviet projects, is still on the shelf.

The three Senators took with them, along with Ellis and Radin, two Truman administration officials with wide experience in hydroelectric development, former U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation Michael W. Straus, and former Assistant Commissioner Harvey McPhail. Their 175-page report, ignored or buried in the press, gives a vivid picture of the enormous dams being erected in the Soviet world. "The Soviet power program," it concludes, "has produced the largest hydroelectric stations in the world, yielding the greatest project volumes of electricity from the largest generators connected by the longest transmission lines operating at highest voltage."

CHINA BUILDING THE BIGGEST DAM OF ALL

The visiting Senators saw Kuybyshev Dam which when completed in 1958 took from Grand Coulee the title of world's largest; Stalingrad Dam, already operating, which will be bigger than Kuybyshev when completed in 1961; and Bratsk Dam at Lake Baikal (with more water than all our Great Lakes combined) which will be bigger yet. They were told of the work begun on Krasnoyarsk which will surpass Bratsk and of an even more grandiose project underway in China.

There the Chinese Communists, utilizing plans first drawn up by John Savage of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation during World War II, are building a dam at the Ichang Gorge on the Yangtze River which "will be 12 to 20 times the size of Grand Coulee" when completed. The report hints at the need for a "similar" study of what is going on in China. It would be good if our first official exchange of visits with Peiping were centered about so fundamental and constructive an activity as hydroelectric power.

The United States is still far ahead of the U.S.S.R. We have 142 million installed kilowatts compared with the Soviet's 53 million. But the Senate committee says the Russians could overtake us by 1975 unless we speed up or they slow down. The Senate report is discreetly silent on one point—the way in which dog-in-the-manger private power monopolies restrict development in the country. But Senator BENNETT in an attack issued so swiftly he could hardly have had time to read the full report, says that "reading be-

[1] Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., report pursuant to S. Res. 248, 85th Cong., 2d sess., U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Public Works.

tween the lines, it is clear that the committee staff believes expansion of our public power program is the key to our future in the power field."

POWER GOING TO WASTE AT GRAND COULEE

The problem is not simply one of expansion but of more fully using existing facilities. The report touched a sensitive point when it said the Soviet is extending its grid system until eventually it will cover the whole U.S.S.R. "The efficiency and economy of shifting peak powerloads over a geographic area that embraces seven time zones from Leningrad to Vladivostok," the report says, "is apparent to any housewife whose lights have dimmed at dinnertime when electrical use is heavy. The Soviet plan is in sharp contrast with the absence of planned or actual transcontinental transmission interties in the United States and the lack even of local interties in many parts of the United States." These intertics enable surplus power quickly to be switched from one area to another to take advantage of the fact that peak usage varies from one section to another.

In this country private power companies have fought grid system expansion, fearing it would lead to greater public control and ownership. In fact a major battle is brewing at this very session over proposals to build transmission lines which would make surplus Bonneville power from Grand Coulee available in California's Central Valley.

The private companies are fighting a rearguard action to delay or control any such interchange. They blocked action at the last session, and Interior Department is helping them. The Senate report may figure in the coming debate. BENNETT already attacks it for the startling recommendation that the Federal Government "embark on a massive program to build transmission lines to interconnect Federal projects." Though the report speaks of interchanging private power as well, BENNETT says: "Quite clearly the committee wishes to push us far down the road toward complete nationalization of power transmission facilities."

ATOM BETTER FOR WAR THAN PEACE

"Construction of the limited number of atom plants in this country has fallen behind schedule. * * * The costs of the plants have soared. * * * Even abroad, where power costs are generally higher, the pace of atomic power development has been discouragingly slow."—New York Times economic survey, January 11.

"Also in the U.S.S.R. as in the United States, atomic power is not expected to supply significant amounts of power during the next few years. The U.S.S.R. regards conventional sources, both thermal and hydro as more economic and expeditious."—Senate report on Soviet power projects.

A Fractional Voice in National Politics Is No Substitute for Municipal Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate added presidential votes for Washingtonians to a proposed constitutional amendment—already overloaded with miscellany—and approved the resulting hodgepodge by the necessary two-thirds rollcall. For this constitutional amendment to become law, it must be approved by two-thirds in the House and be ratified by three-fourths of the States. Regarding the Senate-passed plan the Washington (D.C.) Daily News said editorially, on February 5:

Everyone here wants to vote for President (many now do so as absentees from their respective States), but such restricted extension of the suffrage is not even a faltering first step toward home rule, which consists of control of public affairs in one's hometown—not a fractional voice in national politics.

This newspaper favors national suffrage for the District's citizens but is under no delusion that this means municipal self-government. It gives us nothing to say with ballots about the taxes we must pay for local services, management of schools, or control of police power, and so on.

If spokesmen, in their arguments, do not keep this distinction clearly in mind as they plead with Congress for both national suffrage and local autonomy, our town is in danger of getting neither.

Since coming to the Congress I have been deeply concerned about the numerous problems facing our voteless Nation's Capital. The serious lack of cultural facilities in the District of Columbia, so serious that the staid New York Times has been moved several times to call the Nation's Capital a "hick town," has been a subject in which I have been particularly interested. But, whether the need is for a dynamic drive for a sorely needed National Cultural Center; or to save the historic Patent Office Building to house the century-old National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery after the administration recommended it be razed in order that the site could be used for a parking lot; or for improvement of the District of Columbia General Hospital and the ending of unjustified politically motivated attacks upon it—underlying all is the necessity for restoring to the citizens of our great National Capital the fundamental right to manage their own municipal affairs; namely, home rule.

Unfortunately some confusion has been injected into the fight to obtain home rule for the fine citizens of the District of Columbia. The fact of the matter is that there are some who would deliberately confuse an attempt to secure national suffrage by amending the Constitution with municipal self-government. I have found no better analysis of the enormous difference between these two avenues to suffrage than the editorial appearing in the Scripps-Howard newspaper, the Washington (D.C.) Daily News to which I referred earlier.

Because of the intense interest in home rule for our Nation's Capital, I include this editorial for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 5, 1960]

THIS ISN'T HOME RULE

As in previous campaigns for home rule during the last dozen years, so many proposals get made that the separation of actual home rule and the proposals at issue become fuzzy to the busy citizen.

This week the Senate added presidential votes for Washingtonians to a proposed constitutional amendment—already overloaded with miscellany—and approved the resulting hodge-podge by the necessary two-thirds rollcall.

For the pending constitutional amendment to become law, it still must win not only two-thirds approval of the House, but ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Everyone here wants to vote for President (many now do so as absentees from their respective States), but such restricted extension of the suffrage is not even a faltering first step toward home rule, which consists of control of public affairs in one's hometown—not a fractional voice in national politics.

This newspaper favors national suffrage for the District's citizens but is under no delusion that this means municipal self-government. It gies us nothing to say with ballots about the taxes we must pay for local services, management of schools, or control of police power, and so on.

If spokesmen, in their arguments, do not keep this distinction clearly in mind as they plead with Congress for both national suffrage and local autonomy, our town is in danger of getting neither.

Practical Opportunities for Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD for the information of all the Members and the interested public a speech which the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, made on February 3, 1960, before the Freedom Forum in Oklahoma City, Okla., entitled "Practical Opportunities for Tax Reduction." Due to the widespread and, indeed, intense interest in the subject of Chairman MILLS' speech, I commend it to my colleagues in the House.

The speech follows:

PRACTICAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR TAX REDUCTION THE BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

(Remarks of Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, before the Freedom Forum, Oklahoma City)

My invitation was to talk about practical opportunities for tax reduction. In doing so, the logical place to start is with the budget and expenditures.

Some may feel that the predicted $4.2 billion surplus for fiscal 1961 means we will have a general tax cut this year. I do not believe this will or should happen, as things now appear.

In the first place, there is a question as to whether we will really have a $4.2 billion surplus as the President predicted. Budget estimating is a risky business. You may remember that only 2 years ago the President predicted a surplus for fiscal year 1959 and we ended with a $12.4 billion deficit.

A Federal budget is not written on a clean slate. A part of it is a guess as to the size of expenditures under preexisting laws. A good example is payments to veterans. The

total cost for any year is simply a matter of how many eligible veterans there are using these provisions.

In the area of agriculture, the estimate of the cost of the support commitments in the law is a guess as to such things as the weather, good or bad crop conditions, and market demand.

The accuracy of the $9.6 billion estimate for interest on the Federal debt depends largely on future business conditions and on the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve Board. The estimate of interest costs for the current fiscal year is now approximately $1.2 billion above the budget prediction made just 1 year ago.

The expenditure forecast can miss actual spending quite widely due to unpredictable factors.

Another uncertainty as to the budget surplus is that the budget assumes that all the President's legislative recommendations will be enacted. This, I dare say, never happens. Again this year the expenditures carry a postal deficit, for example, which is reduced by $554 million on the assumption that the Congress will act on the recommendation to increase postal rates. This increase was specifically voted down last year and will not, in my opinion, pass this year.

The most difficult prediction problem in the budget is forecasting revenue. This involves business conditions 18 months in advance. Compared to other recent economic outlook studies, the President's outlook appears moderately optimistic although certainly within the realm of possibility. A somewhat slower growth in the economy than he predicts could easily mean budget receipts of less than the figure in the budget document.

Although we should strive to attain it, we can by no means be sure of a $4.2 billion surplus. It is, nevertheless, timely to discuss priorities for action if we should become convinced that it or something close to it will occur.

Many urge that first priority should be given to increased expenditures such as for defense, education, housing, highways, etc. The Congress is now reviewing the missile lag and our capability for limited war. There will be much debate in the Congress in this and other areas of expenditures.

If the receipts estimate should prove to be accurate and if the Congress does not vote significant changes in recommended expenditures, we then face the question of priority between tax reduction and debt reduction. As I stated, I do not think an immediate general tax cut can be justified. Nor do I believe that our citizens will be dissatisfied with a $4 billion surplus being applied to debt reduction. The economic outlook underlying the budget forecast is essentially a continuation of the inflationary situation which has beset us now for quite a few years. A budget surplus is an effective way of dealing with this inflationary pressure and is at present a basic requirement.

I have always urged that we plan our tax and expenditure programs to produce surpluses in good years to approximately meet the deficits of recession years. Much of the trouble that we are experiencing today in my opinion arises because we have not followed such a plan in the past. In fact, we have operated fiscal policy in such a way as to produce surpluses in only 4 of the last 29 years.

What are the prospects for tax reduction through expenditure limitations over the longer run?

As I stated legislation calling for large continuing expenditures is already on the books. Here are a few examples. We have commitments for highway expenditures running into the mid-1970's. Outstanding commitments for public works, public housing, and community improvement amount at the present time to some $17 billion. The commitment to future veterans benefits and Government retirement payments at the present time amounts to something more than $350 billion.

In spite of these known commitments and if expenditures are prevented from rising as rapidly as tax revenues rise in a growing economy, some reduction in tax rates can be enacted through this action alone. But such reduction in my opinion cannot be enacted in anticipation of freezing or reducing expenditure levels, but only after those conditions have materialized.

TAX REFORM

I will now turn from a consideration of the budget outlook as a basis for tax reduction to the possibility of tax reform that can provide a reduction in rates.

It is my view that tax reform is always timely provided equitable and desirable proposals which are practical of enactment can be developed. The Congress should periodically review the operation of our tax system and the relative burdens imposed on our citizens in order to assure the fair sharing of the burden of necessary taxation.

All too often, however, tax revision or reform programs have resulted primarily in enactment of legislative proposals for special tax relief, or, for the elimination of so-called discriminations by the extension of the application of existing relief provisions to additional taxpayer groups. Frequently these programs have resulted in provisions which were designed to meet some special social or economic need existing at the time of their enactment. Once entrenched in the law, such provisions have proven to be self-perpetuating and self-proliferating and have been retained and expanded even though changing times may have eliminated the social or economic objectives which were their initial justification. Historically, therefore, tax revision and reform programs have more often than not resulted in what has been aptly termed an erosion or a narrowing of the tax base. This, in turn, has resulted in the consequent necessity of imposing high tax rates in order to obtain the revenues needed to meet the costs of Government operation.

In my opinion, our tax rates are too high and they have a strong tendency to blunt incentives and stifle economic growth. As you know, a large part of our present Internal Revenue Code, including its high rate structure, had its origins during wartime when concern over economic growth was not a factor which had to be considered, and it still persists today in virtually the same form though its adverse impact upon incentives and economic growth and stability in a peacetime economy is becoming increasingly evident.

There is general agreement that in order for this country to maintain its economic strength domestically and to continue in its dominant position in today's world, our rate of economic growth in the next decade must exceed that of any previous decade in history. As a part of achieving this objective there must be a substantial revision of our war-engendered and revenue-inspired tax system in view of the strong doubt that such growth can be attained under our present tax system. This is particularly true under our present high rate structure, which, because of its rates and the unevenness of its application, limits initiative and causes tax considerations to override business decisions which would otherwise be dictated by the signals of the market place.

Although it is my firm conviction that the basic purpose of taxation is to raise revenues required to meet the costs of government, gearing tax revision and reform to the objective of economic growth and stability is in no way inconsistent with this viewpoint. It is obvious that when the cost of Federal Government accounts for approximately one-fifth of the total activity of the economy, we cannot ignore the economic impact of taxes.

With these factors in mind, the Committee on Ways and Means has under way an inquiry into the operation of our tax system under today's economy.

It is my view that the major objective of tax reform is a reduction in our stultifying tax rates and that this may not be possible to the extent required except through broadening the tax base. In arriving at this objective we must strive to develop a tax system that is characterized by fairness and equity in the distribution of tax burdens; that is conducive to the attainment of a desired rate of economic growth in the years ahead; that is neutral in economic impact and interferes as little as possible with the operation of the free market mechanism in directing resources into the most productive uses; and that affords greater ease of taxpayer compliance and governmental administration.

The first phase looking toward this end was initiated by a 5-week period of panel discussions before the committee late last fall. These discussions were designed to present an appraisal of our present income tax system in the light of the objectives that I have just mentioned and particular attention was given to the various provisions of the income tax law which serve either to narrow the tax base or to provide differential treatment for items included in such base, in order to permit a reevaluation of their original social or economic justifications for inclusion in the code in light of conditions as they exist today.

As I pointed out in my statement at the conclusion of these discussions, some of the suggestions appear to offer some practical possibilities; others do not. There must be an assessment of the various issues from the standpoint of their effect on fairness among taxpayers, on revenues, on economic growth, on economic stability, and on ability to pay. Before there can be any resolution of the issues raised by these panel discussions, there must be a considerable amount of study of all the problems involved.

One of the proposals advanced by some panelists is the concept of imputed rent. This concept, which is primarily an economic concept, rather than a tax concept, would impute as income to a homeowner the net rental value of his house and is included in the Department of Commerce's figures of annual total personal income. It was discussed in connection with a consideration of exclusions and deductions from income. Some panelists proposed that the deductions presently allowed for interest on home mortgages and for real estate taxes should be offset by the inclusion of the related imputed rent in gross income. Alternatively, it was suggested that the failure to include imputed rent in gross income was sufficient justification for a denial of these deductions. The discussions developed that there are serious questions as to constitutionality, administrative feasibility and desirability that far outweigh any economic concept for including this in the tax base.

There were a number of other suggestions made by the panelists which would broaden the tax base by including in income certain cash payments which are presently exempt from tax, such as veterans' disability pensions. These items are income in the broad economic sense and their exemption from tax is a preference. However, their inclusion in the tax base, as a practical matter, would not increase net revenues that could be used for rate reduction since the effective reduction in the amount of such payments that would result from making them taxable would very likely be offset by a compensating increase in the amount of such payments in order to maintain the status quo of the recipients. This is a case where theoretically the elimina-

tion of a preference might lead to greater fairness and equity among taxpayers but as a practical matter there would be no increase of revenue available for reduction in tax rates in end result since any revenue gains would most likely be offset by increased appropriation expenditures.

A like proposal for expanding the tax base was one that would include social security benefit payments in income but would allow employees a current deduction for the amount of their contributions to this system.

Under present law, as you know, an employer's share of social security contributions made for the benefit of his employees is deductible, and hence exempt from tax, even though the full amount of the social security benefit received by an employee upon disability or retirement is also exempt. Thus, no tax is ever paid on the funds used by an employer to make these contributions—either by the employer or by the employee. Here again fairness and equity might be considered to call for the elimination of this preference; however, such elimination would give rise to demands for an increase in social security benefits to offset any additional taxes imposed on the beneficiary. Analysis of the suggestion in this context indicates, in addition, that the combination of including the social security benefits in the base and exclusion of all contributions at the time made to the fund would actually produce less net revenue. It is highly questionable, therefore, whether the adoption of this proposal would result in any overall improvement.

These types of suggestions as well as some others made by some of the panelists for revising the law are really not the type of changes which are basically needed in my opinion in connection with tax reform. They are either impossible of administration or else would make no contribution by their inclusion in the base to rate reduction.

Suggestions were also made for broadening the tax base by curtailing or eliminating a number of the personal deductions that are presently allowed in computing taxable income. In this area there was no firm agreement among the panelists as to which of the various deductions now existing could be eliminated, but I believe that all agreed that some of the deductions should not be eliminated. Whereas it may be that all of the deductions now accorded to taxpayers cannot be justified, as I believe, it is equally true that some of these deductions do accomplish social or economic objectives. This area, like all other areas, if viewed strictly from the standpoint of tax policy, including ease of taxpayer compliance and administration, would present no real difficulty of decision, but before action can finally be taken all other factors must be weighed. I have often pointed out what could happen to the rate structure if they were eliminated, but I have reached no final conclusion as to which of these should or can be eliminated.

In the area of business deductions, you as businessmen interested in depreciation allowances will probably be pleased to learn that the majority of the panel of experts that discussed this subject were in favor of increased, rather than decreased, depreciation allowances. Among other things, it was suggested that this be accomplished by accelerating depreciation deductions through shortening depreciable lives, increasing the allowable depreciation rates, or allowing larger initial writeoffs in the year of acquisition. Proponents of these accelerated depreciation proposals would also provide ordinary income treatment rather than capital gain treatment to the proceeds received on the ultimate disposition of rapidly depreciated assets.

The panel of experts on the subject of depreciation presented compelling arguments as to the adverse effect of present depreciation policies on the growth of our economy and on the ability of our manufacturers to compete in either the domestic or world markets with their foreign competitors. In this connection, let me reiterate what I have said earlier; that is, that in my view, gearing tax reform to the objective of economic growth is not inconsistent with the basic purpose of taxation, the raising of revenue. However, the advantages of the adoption of liberalized depreciation rules and the resultant effect on revenues must be balanced against the distortion that would inevitably result in the distribution of the total tax burden among other sectors of the economy. It is conflicting factors such as these that the committee must weigh in its overall consideration of a program of tax revision and reform.

I regret that time does not permit me to refer to all the topics covered in the panel discussions.

The Committee on Ways and Means in my opinion has been impressed with the magnitude of the job of reaching a sound judgment with respect to what changes should be made in our income tax structure and in the manner in which changes should be made in those areas which do appear to offer some practical possibility of achievement.

As I have said many times before, constructive tax reform cannot be accomplished overnight in view of the extreme care and thoroughgoing analysis that must be given to the various proposals that have been made. However, evidence was presented to the committee that certainly justifies our maximum efforts in this undertaking. For example, it is stated that the elimination of the major preferences and differentials presently contained in the Internal Revenue Code would permit a 30-percent across-the-board reduction in rates without sacrificing present revenues.

This would mean that the present individual rate scale that starts at 20 percent and progresses to a maximum of 91 percent could be reduced to about 14 percent and 64 percent respectively. Even if only some of these preferences and differentials were eliminated, the evidence indicated that we could have a 20-percent rate reduction across the board and thus have a minimum 16-percent rate and a maximum 73-percent rate without jeopardizing the revenues. Similar percentage reductions could also be expected in corporate income tax rates.

It should also be pointed out that during the course of the panel discussions the committee not only looked to possible changes in the law itself but also to the whole broad area of administration of the existing provisions of the code to determine whether there are areas wherein collections of revenues can be improved. Some witnesses pointed out the possibility that as much as $28 billion of personal income presently subject to tax might be escaping taxation. This would represent, in terms of revenue, perhaps as much as $5 billion. If this were found to be true, and if this amount of revenue could be collected and thus added to a $4 billion surplus that is in the future available to be so used, we could reduce rates by almost 20-percent across the board.

While a reduction in rates is the primary objective of the revision and reform study of the committee, we are seeking at the same time a system with greater simplicity, greater ease of compliance, and better enforcement procedures. The balancing of these with the other factors that I have mentioned precludes our coming up with overall revision legislation promptly.

Should it develop that expenditures can be reduced, I would agree with those who contend that this is the easier and most expeditious way to achieve prompt tax rate reduction. However, to produce a fair and equitable tax system that is easy to enforce and that is conducive to sustained economic growth is a much more difficult and time-consuming task, particularly if revenue requirements continue at their present or even higher levels. The attainment of such a system, in my opinion, will require more than merely its sponsorship by a committee of the Congress. It can be realized only by the full and active support of the public generally and businessmen such as you in particular.

The Argument Against Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, thoughtful and conscientious Americans from all walks of life, and of all races, creeds, and religions, at one time or another have asked themselves whether they believed in capital punishment. Many of these citizens have revolted against the practice of legal executions. Others have decided that capital punishment is a necessary penalty for certain criminals convicted of certain heinous crimes

Much has been written on the subject, both pro and con.

Our courtrooms echo with arguments supporting both the State and the defense. Law-enforcement groups have argued the question, as have religious groups. Indeed, the issue is most controversial.

I was particularly impressed by an article which appeared in the January 1960 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. The article contained the closing argument of Joe W. Henry, Jr., of the Tennessee State Bar, Pulaski, Tenn., in defense of Wash Jones, accused of murder. It is a brilliant argument, the most scholarly I have ever read against legal executions.

Mr. President, I feel certain that Mr. Henry's argument will be of interest and of value to many Members of the Senate. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD many parts of the article as it appeared in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VERSUS WASH JONES: THE CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENSE

(By Joe W. Henry, Jr., of the Tennessee Bar)

May it please the court: 53 years ago, in a bleak and barren and God-forsaken building on the banks of the Cumberland River at 5 o'clock in the morning, a Negro man, made in God's own image, bearing the name of Julius Morgan, and from Dyer County, Tenn., became the first citizen of our State to be legally murdered by electrocution.

Two years later, on July 8, 1918, the second kilowatt killing was conducted. This time the hapless victim was one, J. D. Williams, a Negro citizen, of Giles County.

The third time the stench of searing and scorched human flesh came out of our penitentiary was that same July day in 1918, when Eddie Olsup met his Maker at the hands of the civilized State of Tennessee and in order to preserve the peace and dignity of the State. He, too, was from Giles County.

In all, 123 persons have walked that last mile.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have turned our backs upon the command of the decalogue: Thou shalt not kill.

One hundred and twenty three times we have arrogated to ourselves the right to destroy the image of God on earth.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have disputed the sacred idea that no man is beyond redemption.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have reverted to our primitive and savage origin bred in generations in the jungle.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have closed the door on a man's life and sent him to his Maker with a crime on his soul and guilt in his heart and denied him his God-given right to repentance, redemption, and forgiveness.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have usurped the divine authority of Heaven.

One hundred and twenty-three prosecutors have sung their hymns of hate as hapless human beings prepared to hang down their heads and die.

One hundred and twenty-three times we have proclaimed to the world that State government has no obligation to be civilized.

Who were these 123 men?

Their names are unimportant, but I have a list that shows them all—the roll of horror.

One cannot look at this yellow sheet—significantly it is yellow—the color denoting cowardice, the color of the Army's dishonorable discharge, the color that describes the worst fever known to man, the color that describes the jacket of the pestiferous hornet, the color that describes the worst brand of journalism—one cannot look at it without thinking of all the widows and orphans we have made, of all the tears that were shed in their memory and of the God who loved them, but who was thrust from their hearts by the cold hand of vengeance.

Ten men and two women sit upon this jury. Five of you owe your spiritual allegiance to the Methodist Church; two to the Church of Christ; two to the Cumberland Presbyterian, and one to the Baptist Church.

All of you stated on your examination that you believed in God, that you accepted Jesus Christ as your personal Savior, that you subscribed to the precepts of the Christian religion, believed in the set of ethical standards proclaimed by Christ, believed in a future system of rewards and punishment, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting.

In short, you are Christians and civilized citizens.

You have all—some reluctantly—expressed your belief in capital punishment.

As you follow my argument, I ask that you search your souls in an effort to arrive at a rational and Christian conclusion based upon a fresh look at the evidence.

I ask that you erase from your minds any opinion that you may have on capital punishment until I have presented the case against capital punishment and have reviewed the issues and separated superstition from fact.

ESSENTIALS OF PUNISHMENT

It is generally accepted that there are three esssential ingredients of all punishment. All must be present and if any one is missing the punishment is defective.

First, the punishment of the offender;

Second, the rehabilitation of the offender and his restoration to useful and productive citizenship;

Third, the protection of society by deterring others from the commission of like offenses.

We may dispose summarily, and without discussion, of the first two, because I will readily admit that death by electrocution definitely fulfills the essential ingredient of punishment. I am sure that the district attorney and his associate, likewise, will concede that death is fairly permanent and when the penalty of death is imposed rehabilitation and restoration are impossible. Thus, it is, at the very outset, one of the essentials of punishment is missing.

DETERRENCE

This leaves for consideration the major ingredient and the one that completely overshadows the first two, i.e., deterrence. Does the death penalty serve as a warning to others? Does it keep them from committing similar crimes?

There are those who contend that we are living in an age when we have witnessed more brutality and slaughter than all our ancestors since the birth of Christ; that this is perhaps why we don't worry too much about the death of one man, that we have become inoculated to brutality and immune to human suffering.

My whole being rebels at any such philosophy. I am morally persuaded that throughout the history of time each generation has been successively better and upon the rungs of its progress we are steadily climbing the ladder that ultimately leads to a perfect order of existence.

Men of good will recognize it to be incontestably true that we are our brothers' keepers and just as a pebble cannot be thrown into the ocean without disturbing every drop of water in the sea, so one man cannot be abandoned and sacrificed upon the altar of society's sometimes unreasonable demands without disturbing all mankind.

Yes, we have made great progress.

Throughout the recorded history of time the human race has devised many and varied means of punishing those guilty of infractions of good order, and while we have not reached perfection, our progress has been praiseworthy.

There was a time when society thought that criminals should be beheaded, burned, boiled or buried alive; when men were strangled, stoned, skinned, or starved to death; when they were torn asunder by trees fastened to their limbs, or devoured by wild beasts; when they were forced to drink poison, crucified, or drowned; when they were chopped in two while still alive, or eaten alive by insects or sewn in a bag with snakes—all of this in the name of justice and all because it was "the law of the state."

As odious and savage as these practices sound to us today, let's face the fact that a hundred years from now when capital punishment has long vanished from the American scene as it has in most of the other civilized countries of the world—electrocution will be listed as another barbarous punishment along with drawing and quartering—for I submit to you any punishment that takes the very life of a human being is barbarous, cruel, un-Christian, and uncivilized and a throwback to the Dark Ages.

Time was when pigs, horses, and cattle were tried and executed for murder. It was the law of the state.

In 1474, a rooster was tried for the heinous and unnatural crime of laying an egg and sentenced, together with the egg, to be burned at the stake. It was the law of the state.

There is another, in 1801 of a British child being hanged for stealing a spoon. It was the law of the state.

There is a recorded case in England of a 9-year-old girl being hanged for stealing 2 pennies worth of salt. It was the law of the state.

There is another in 1748 of a boy of 10 who was executed for murder. It was the law of the state.

There is the case of the 12-year-old American boy who was hanged for stealing a sheep. It was the law of the state.

I am sickened every time I hear a prosecutor apologetically asking for the death penalty and offering the pitiful excuse "It's the law of the State."

In England during the reign of Henry VIII, there were over two hundred crimes, ranging from shooting rabbits to associating with gypsies for which the death penalty was exacted and during this period, to the shame and disgrace of our mother country, 72,000 Englishmen were executed. This, however, did not seem to deter Englishmen from committing crimes.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, 19,000 Englishmen were executed but the crime rate continued to rise.

No doubt bloody Queen Mary was actuated by the noblest motives, but for all the blood she drew, crime continued unabated in Merry England.

Peter I, Tsar of Russia, issued an edict against men wearing beards and, in order to enforce it, in 1728, put to death 8,000 Russians, and yet today we can hardly think of a Russian without a bearded image flashing before our eyes.

There was a time in England when pickpockets were hanged and when the public hangings took place the pickpockets gathered and picked the pockets of those who came to witness the execution.

The death penalty did not deter the 7,000 people in America who committed murders, in 1958.

Crime has a tendency to beget crime, and bizarre punishments have always adversely affected law enforcement.

One of the most famous of all English hangmen was John Price, who was himself hanged for murder, as was Hangman Dennis and Mr. Hespel.

Then there is the interesting story of a former head hangman at the Oklahoma State Prison, who was tried for murder himself on no less than four occasions.

Ordinary prudence and common judgment would tell us that if the imposition of the death penalty is to operate as a deterrent, executions must be performed publicly so that all may see what a horrible and hideous fate awaits the wrongdoer. Criminals should have front seats; it should be carried on television; movies should be made; the penalty made more brutal, and sheer, stark terror should be stricken into the heart of all the people so that they, in heat of passion, or while temporarily insane, will stop and think of the gruesome fate that is theirs.

Nonjustifiable murders can take only two forms:

First, those in heat of passion.

Second, those premeditated and planned.

In the first group the murderer has lost all reason and all control of his faculties and, therefore, the consequences of his deed do not enter his mind.

In the second group, the murderer thinks he has planned the perfect crime and will not be apprehended, and so he gives no thought to punishment.

Again, where is the deterrence?

The State of Delaware has just become the eighth State to outlaw capital punishment. A California legislative committee reported in 1957:

"A worldwide survey shows that nowhere has the abolition of the death penalty led to an increase in the number of homicides."

In the face of these and numerous other studies, and against all the evidence to the contrary, there are those who still insist

that the death penalty is a deterrent and that its abolition would result in an increase in crime.

Let's take a look at the record.

The death penalty has been abolished in the following countries of Europe: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, West Germany; of South and Central America: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Puerto Rico, Uruguay, Venezuela; elsewhere: Greenland, Iceland, Israel, New Zealand, and Turkey.

In the United States it has been abolished in: Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Alaska, Delaware, and Hawaii.

In all of the foreign countries, for which I have the figures, their murder rate went down after the abolition.

In the United States during the 10-year period 1931–40, the average rate of murders was 8.1 per 100,000, whereas, in the States that did not have capital punishment, the rate was only 2.3 or only one-fourth as high.

It is significant that the State of Maine, which abolished capital punishment in 1887 after an innocent man was executed, has one of the lowest murder rates in the United States, whereas Georgia with 14 crimes for which the death penalty may be exacted, has the highest murder rate in the Nation.

So much for the argument that capital punishment serves to deter others from the commission of crimes. The record completely refutes this argument.

CONVICTIONS BY MISTAKE

To me, one of the most compelling arguments against capital punishment is the possibility of mistake. Moreover, every lawyer and judge knows that bold, bald, unblushing perjury all too frequently stalks into our courts and makes a mockery of that intangible commodity we call justice.

All America has harked to the saga of Tom Dooley, the folk song imploring a gay blade headed for the gallows to hang his head in shame before he was executed, but I wonder how many know that the song was written about a North Carolina man named Tom Dula, who was convicted of murdering a young lady acquaintance and was hanged because it was the law of the State.

Unfortunately for Tom Dula it was a number of years later before the real murderer confessed.

So many times have the innocent been mistakenly convicted or wrongfully convicted on what later developed to be perjured testimony that a number of books have been written about numerous of these cases.

BIBLICAL PRECEDENTS

Then, there are the great cases of recorded history where, even though it was the law, the death penalty was not inflicted.

God, Himself, set the first precedent. Cain gazed upon the beaten and bleeding body of his own brother. The denunciation of Heaven was ringing in his ears. He expected to find vengeance at every hand. But God did not visit capital punishment on him. Instead, He banished him from society, placed a mark upon him—a mark of his crime, but also a mark that would warn the rest of mankind against his destruction. This was the judgment of Almighty God in dealing with the first murderer and I submit that it is exempt from any possibility of error.

Then, there is the case of David, who was responsible for the death of Uriah the Hittite, and who was not executed but continued, in spite of his heinous crime, to grow in favor with God and man and the holy writ tells us that he was "a man after God's own heart."

The case of Moses is in point—Moses who slew the Egyptian in a fit of anger and who became a fugitive from justice, and yet, God sought him out and, from the burning bush to the heights of Pisgah, from the Red Sea to the mountain peak whence he was taken by God to survey the promised land from Dan to Beersheba, he, a murderer, was the right hand of God Almighty.

What if David and Moses had been executed because "It is the law of the state?"

THE NOACHIN LAWS

Those who urge the continuance of capital punishment forget all these things. Instead, their delight is in quoting from obsolete scripture, taken out of context and bodily lifted from the circumstances surrounding their utterance. Just as patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel, so the Bible is the favorite stamping ground of those who enjoy quoting scripture for their own purpose. With fiendish glee and triumphant manner they turn to the ninth chapter and sixth verse of the Book of Genesis and chant: "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

But circumstances alter cases. Let us look at the circumstances under which this law was laid down. The world had gotten so evil that God repented that He had made man (Genesis 6: 6), the great flood came, the former race of mankind with all their laws and customs had been swept away and destroyed by the waters of death.

In gratitude, the little family of Noah gathered about the altar and received the seven precepts or laws, we know them as the Noachin laws, for their government. They were few in number and temporary in nature. They embraced only the subjects necessary in their peculiar situations.

All of these seven laws were aimed at repopulating a destroyed earth. Two of the seven laws read "be ye fruitful and multiply." The little family of Noah was a germ from which all the future nations of the earth were to vegetate. Every possible care therefore had to be taken for its preservation. So the right was expressly given directly by God to take away the life of its members, there being no other possible means of effectuating the purposes of Heaven in their preservation. But no such direct and divine authority has been given the 3½ million people of Tennessee.

THE MOSAIC LAW

Then, there are those who look to the Mosaic law and cite it as authority to show that God's power over life and death has been committed to His creatures. They overlook a number of significant factors. First of all, the law delivered to Moses amid the fire and flame and the smoke at Mount Sinai was divided into three parts—moral, political, and judicial. The moral law, the Ten Commandments, is universal in its operation and perpetual in its obligation. But the political and judicial laws are only of interest from a standpoint of Biblical history. They constituted a civil and criminal code for the government of the Jews only.

Their authority commanding the infliction of capital punishment is no more binding on a Christian nation than the laws of the Medes and the Persians, or of the various tribes that were driven from Canaan by the sword of the Lord and of Gideon.

Strong measures were needed to bring the headstrong, moody, and murmuring people of the children of Israel across the wilderness. Every student of the Bible knows how they taxed the combined authority of both God and Moses. Never before or since has there been such a rebellious tribe of people and never were such extraordinary measures required to keep a nation in subjection. Even as Moses was on the mountain, receiving these very laws amidst the most sublime and awful and awesome demonstrations of the power and grandeur of God, this wayward people set themselves to dancing, in idolatrous worship, around an image made of gold.

I wish that time permitted me to delve more deeply into this with you, but it does not.

THE LAW OF CHRIST

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, centuries after the Mosiac Law and almost 2,000 years ago, a solitary wayfarer walked the shores of the Sea of Galilee, healing the sick and casting out the demons that possessed the mentally ill. Persecuted by the mighty Roman Empire, crucified by the edict of a court composed of His own countrymen, denied thrice by one of His trusted disciples in His hour of greatest need, and betrayed by the traitorous deed of another, mocked, spat upon and ridiculed, He, a victim of capital punishment, died the most ignominious death known to His day, and yet He was not deterred and His teachings of faith, hope, charity, courage, and love have endured unto this day and wherever free men have instituted free government, the very cornerstone has been the ethical standards taught by Jesus of Nazareth.

There are those who forget:

The mild benevolence of His precepts,

The meekness of His spirit,

The philanthropy that breathes in all His words,

The golden rule which He established,

The Christian charity which He taught.

When they quote the Bible as a sanction for the death penalty, they pervert the spirit of His holy and merciful religion.

If I were inclined to support my opinion by arguments drawn from religion, the whole New Testament would be my text, for if it teaches anything, it teaches the forgiveness of sin and, therefore, a system of reform rather than extirpation.

Since so many of you are Methodists, as am I, may I read the position of our church from its official discipline:

"We stand for the application of redemptive principle to the treatment for offenders against the law * * * for this reason we deplore the use of capital punishment."

HOW THE STATE KILLS

You have been told in great detail just precisely how Wash Jones killed and murdered Wes Howard. Now let us see how the State of Tennessee would kill and murder Wash Jones.

At about 5:20 in the afternoon of the eve of the execution the prisoner is shaved, bathed, and his head is clipped. He must be clean so that it is unnecessary to bathe his body after the electrocution. His head must be clipped so they can apply the electrode.

Then they give him a new shirt and a new pair of pants, without a belt, and shoes without laces. No belt and no shoe laces. After all he must not hang or strangle himself and cheat the chair.

Next, the minister of his choice visits him to offer whatever words of assurance and solace he can conjure up.

Then the condemned man is given an opportunity to eat a hearty meal of his choice.

Then his family is permitted to visit with him until midnight. Then at about 10 minutes to 5 the warden and the guards and the execution party come and they start to walk the last mile down the dimlit corridor, which leads to the chamber of horrors to the electric chair.

They place him in the chair, roll up his trouser legs in order to clamp the electrode to his right leg. Then to his clipped head they clamp the other electrode.

Then they ask him for his last words. Only the prisoner, the warden and God are present in the room. The warden is doing his statutory duty, the prisoner paying his debt to society and as to him, I am sure he feels that God has forgotten him.

Then they place the mask upon his face—not for his benefit, but to keep the witnesses

from looking upon the hideous countenance of the dying man as his facial features contort in pain and agony.

The warden looks through the little window at the man who throws the switch—$25 the State pays for his service—the warden has his stop watch in his hands and upon his signal the switch is thrown. Then, there comes the sound from the electrician's niche—a sound like that that comes from an X-ray machine, a crackle, a whine, a buzz as 2,300 volts, for 30 seconds and then 500 for 1½ minutes are sent circulating through his body as it convulsively jerks and writhes.

And then when his body has cooled off enough to touch, the physician applies his stethoscope and pronounces him dead.

He is then placed in cold storage—in a deep freeze—because the State does not embalm. Now another name is added to the yellow list—the roll of horror—the State has got another pound of flesh. But it is the law of the State.

I ask you in the name of all that is sacred and holy, how can such a spectacle as this ever magnify the law or make it honorable or preserve the peace and dignity of the State?

And they say that Wash Jones killed in cold blood.

Wash didn't lock Wes Howard in a room, keep him there for weeks and months, announce ahead of time the date and time of his death and leave the condemned man to die a thousand deaths.

Ladies and gentlemen, you and you alone can send Wash Jones to the electric chair. There can be no division of responsibility, you can never say that the rest overpowered you. It must be your deliberate, cool, premeditated act. It takes your vote.

I plead for human consideration, for charity, for mercy. Man was truly created in God's image, but humane treatment of our fellow man is necessary in order that the divine image may not be obscured.

I hope and pray that the Tennessee Legislature will at this session veto this unconscionable decree of blood and write for the State, as the State has written for its citizens, the injunction—at once rational, scriptural, salutary and humanitarian: "Thou shalt not kill."

Cotton Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading the following article about the National Cotton Council which appeared in the February 4 edition of the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation.

This is a very timely article which tells what the National Cotton Council is doing for the industry. It is written by Mr. Gerald L. Dearing, who is the market editor. Mr. Dearing is very close to this situation and has prepared this splendid article which follows:

COTTON COMMENT—WHAT IS THE NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL?—IT'S A DREAM COME TRUE, A UNITED INDUSTRY WORKING FOR ITS OWN SALVATION

(By Gerald L. Dearing)

DALLAS, February 3.—What is this National Cotton Council that brings together the six segments of the industry in a meeting to develop greater use of cotton, better production and marketing methods and greater understanding of the problems of all in the industry?

The answers can be found in the reports of the staff and the membership committees which will be aired here the balance of this week as a preliminary to the meeting of the delegate membership Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Staff members began arriving here Wednesday and by Thursday the committee members will have started their informal discussions which will precede the committee meetings on Friday and Saturday.

WORK ILLUSTRATED

The farflung activities of the council are illustrated by banners in Japanese stores proclaiming National Cotton Week, a project in Mexico to speed the time required for breeding new varieties of cotton, a process that promises all-cotton stretch socks, and a panorama of "5,000 Years of Cotton Fashions" showing in stores across the country.

The central organization of the raw cotton industry represents fulfillment of a dream of the late Oscar Johnston, of Scott, Miss. It unites producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, and spinners. They're dedicated to a common goal—increasing consumption of United States cotton, cottonseed, and their products.

At a time when cotton was selling for less than a dime a pound, synthetics and other competitors were beginning to make a serious bid for traditional markets, and spirits of the industry were at a low ebb, the farmer-statesman called a few leaders together. Recognizing the conflicts in interests and areas, he reasoned, at the same time, that there was one point on which all could agree: The necessity for expanding markets for cotton and its products.

GOALS OUTLINED

He pointed out that hope for accomplishment of this goal rested in research and promotion. Research objectives were twofold: (1) Increased efficiency, with a consequent lowering of production, marketing, processing, and manufacturing costs, thus making cotton more competitive pricewise; (2) improvement of lint, seed, and their products, thereby making cotton more competitive quality-wise. Promotion should employ modern techniques to create consumer demand for cotton products at home and overseas, thus stimulating sales and consumption.

Mr. Johnston's reasoning made sense and led to organization of the Cotton Council in late 1938 and early 1939. The council today is a representative body composed of 245 delegates selected by the Nation's cotton farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, spinners, and cottonseed crushers through their own State or regional organizations.

Each branch, voting separately, must approve every council recommendation by a two-thirds majority, thus assuring unity of purpose and action.

VOLUNTARY FINANCING

The council is financed voluntarily. Producers pay 20 cents per bale, collected by participating gins. Cotton manufacturers pay 10 cents per bale; cottonseed oil mills, 7½ cents per ton of seed; merchants, 3 cents per bale, and warehousemen, 1 cent per bale. Collections are realized on about two-thirds of the crop.

There are four program divisions of the National Cotton Council—production and marketing, utilization research, sales promotion, and foreign trade. The executive vice president is responsible for general operation and legislative and other activities not covered by the program divisions. Overseas programs are under supervision of Cotton Council International.

Research and its application to attain higher quality and lower costs in producing, processing, and marketing raw cotton—from seed breeding to the cotton mill—are embodied in the program of the council's production and marketing division.

Market studies, development of new products, and improving efficiency and quality of fiber and textile processing from mill to consumer are the concern of the utilization research division. Sales promotion at home and abroad is carried out by the sales promotion and foreign trade divisions.

PROGRESS IS SHOWN

Many of the key leaders who worked with Oscar Johnston are attending the council's meeting here. They look back on two decades of unparalleled yields—up to nearly a bale per acre—more than a third of cotton production fully mechanized, dramatic promotional programs in the United States and 14 foreign countries, wash and wear, and other textile miracles. Through its research and promotion programs the council has spearheaded such developments.

The programs have received international acclaim but, more important, have infused the cotton industry with a new spirit. It has confidence in the merits of its products and their response to research and promotion.

Cotton has maintained its position as the most widely used fiber—accounting for about two-thirds of the total fiber consumption. With increasing population, rising living standards, and a consequent growing demand for fiber, the potential for increased consumption is bright. Through the National Cotton Council, the industry is pressing aggressively toward achievement of this potential.

What Can We Pay for Plenty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by my friend, Harley Libby. It appeared in the October 15, 1959, issue of the Oregon Farmer. His comments are thought provoking and deserve close attention.

I have known the author for a long time; he has a strong and keen mind, the sort that is needed today with respect to the farm problem.

The article follows:

WHAT CAN WE PAY FOR PLENTY?

(By Harley Libby)

So much has been said about our farm problems and about subsidies and surpluses that one hesitates to make any addition. But operating on the assumption that TV commercials can't all be wrong and that constant repetition does bear fruit, I offer the following with the hope that it may stimulate some serious thinking.

THE COST OF OUR ABUNDANCE

True, the problems of plenty are real and must be dealt with realistically.

We would do well to decide, first of all, that life is much more kind to people in a land of plenty. To know freedom from hunger and cold should be counted as a blessing and not a cross to bear.

No sound-thinking person believes that we can ever achieve an exactly balanced program of production-to-need. Then, isn't it better that the balance be on the side of

abundance and that we do have a reasonable food bank to insure against hunger?

And should we not apply business thinking and write off the cost of that insured security as we might car, life, or fire insurance?

But surpluses beyond reason do present a real challenge. What have we done about them? Not enough, surely.

The National Farmers Union has long advocated a unit measure of bushels, tons, etc., rather than heavily fertilized acres as the proper measure for production quotas, and a broadening of the basics. It has also asked for a definite dollar-and-cent limitation on price supports to any one producer.

The purpose for both: (1) To discourage overproduction; (2) to stop channeling so much acreage into the few protected crops; (3) to prevent undue individual benefits.

To date Congress, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the national administration have all failed to take a firm stand.

Senator NEUBERGER'S proposed food for peace plan calling for the use of surpluses to feed the hungry peoples of the world certainly has merit. (Incidentally, I was pleased to note the Oregon Farmer's support for this suggestion.) To date we have seemingly preferred to send money and munitions, writing the cost off to national security. Would not food to the hungry create equal good will—and much less suspicion? And wouldn't that be a living demonstration of international humanitarianism and also a contribution to national security?

Likewise, the Oregon Wheat League is to be commended for its excellent work in the field of expanding uses of surplus commodity.

FOOD STAMP FUTURE

The food stamp plan, embodied in a bill by Senator WAYNE MORSE, could also well meet a domestic need and present both a saving and an outlet. With our abundance of food, why have we hesitated so long? Surely we would not seriously disrupt our trade economy by supplying food we cannot sell to those who have no money to buy.

The school lunch program has been an excellent example, not only of food distribution to the right people, but of food promotion. Teachers and those who do the actual contact work in the schools can tell of the increased taste for milk and vegetables so necessary to young growing bodies. (Just think what the brewing industry would give for such an opportunity.)

These programs should become more universal. They will certainly show long-range dividends in national health.

THE SOIL BANK IDEA

The soil bank idea, based on the theory that it is better to store fertility against future needs than to store excess surpluses, makes sense. As enacted into law, it has been badly abused but the necessary "teeth" have now been added.

Many people find it difficult to reconcile the soil bank program with the activities of the reclamation service in bringing in new acres, or with the USDA's regular requests for more money for research for increased yields, to realize the hope of 100 bushels-per-acre wheat, for example. Or with the USDA's advice to further mechanize and to apply expensive fertilizers in greater abundance.

The advice is theirs and I leave the answer to them.

EIGHTY PERCENT PROSPERITY

Most discussions and articles on the farm problem, particularly if they come from departments which live by legislative appropriations, avoid the matter of what farmers actually receive for their production.

The critics are often more inclined to describe glowingly the growth of vertical integration and the glories of expanded farm operations. In their enthusiasm they temporarily forget what is happening to the countless thousands of farm families without farms that most surely go hand in hand with the growth of vertical integration, contract farming and the decrease of market opportunities.

When the ills of the shrinking farm dollars are discussed they are often cheerfully blamed onto the fickle fancies of the consumer whose changing demands increase cost.

No one denies the changes, but let us look at this last one carefully and put part of the blame where it properly belongs.

The manufacturers, processors and distributors who do fancy packaging and costly duplication in a competitive struggle to capture more and more of the profit in the consumer's dollar must also share responsibility.

It was not consumers who demanded five name brand bread deliveries at the corner grocery—and of loaves costing 30 cents plus and containing some 3 cents worth of wheat each, for example.

Nor was it you and I who asked for atomic age fishfin fenders and double-jointed tail lights that sent the cost of cars, repairs and insurance to new heights.

It is well past the time that economists and farm advisers, including our own U.S. Department of Agriculture, need to become farm price conscious. It is time we all join in better acquainting the consuming public with what part of the dollar the farmer actually receives for his commodity at the farm.

Those who would advise should know that there are many young farmers today who face near bankruptcy in a losing struggle. It takes more than efficiency to pay for expensive modern farm machinery at a 100 percent plus parity price with farm commodities sold on an 80 percent of parity market.

It is time to come down to earth and realize that any farmer, regardless of size or volume or efficiency, who produces and markets a commodity at less than the cost of production has about as much chance as a woodpecker above timberline to share in the national prosperity.

It is a small and doubtful honor to be able to prove that by efficiency you were the farmer in your community who lost the least.

PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT

Sometimes I wonder if in our zest to deal with statistics and in our eagerness to enthuse about bigness, we haven't forgotten the human factor that gives all others purpose—the people themselves.

Enough has been said in recent years to inform everyone that the farms of this Nation and the families that live on them are becoming fewer and fewer.

Always, and properly, there has been a constant and voluntary departure of members of the farm families to enter other fields, to find employment.

Recently, however, that trend has become an exodus, and certainly not all voluntary. Nor are they all young, employable people. We are informed that about 75 percent of our young people today leave the land, and that about 50 percent of them are working today in organized labor.

Certainly we cannot hold this against them. They are our children. We have done our best to teach them the value of organization. We know that if labor today was as loosely organized as farmers, laborers too would be working for an 80 percent of parity paycheck.

Labor rallied well to meet the revolution of automation in industry by demanding—and receiving—better wages and shorter hours. We as farmers met the challenge of mechanization by producing more and more for less and less.

REWARD FOR EFFICIENCY

We seek no protective wall around inefficiency. Efficiency, good management and industry are entitled to their just rewards. We know some people will prosper more than others in any vocation.

But many farmers would still remain upon the land, knowing that their economic returns would be a little lower than if they went to the city. They are following a chosen way of life and they would willingly exchange the opportunity to "eat a little higher on the hog" for the many fine intangible benefits of family life on the farm.

But this does not mean that these people should be crowded off into migrant labor status, by an unfair economic set-up. They are entitled to a fair price for their production. These family farm people are truly the salt of the earth. They believe in the land and what it can do. They live on, and from, the soil, in a partnership with God and nature. If democracy is ever put to the test for final existence, it is here in these country homes that its roots will be found most deeply inbedded and where it will live the longest.

LET'S SUM THIS UP

Freedom from hunger and cold is a blessing. We had best recognize it as such and write off its costs as we would any other sound insurance program.

Excessive surpluses are a challenge but can be made manageable by a varied attack. Production must be controlled to reasonably meet the needs of the day. But production should be limited by intelligent controls—not by ruinous prices.

Any farm program that does not plan for an equitable price for commodities to the producer renders little economic service to American agriculture.

People are important. They should come neither last nor least. They create the problems and the necessity for answers. Any solution that allows human values to become submerged in economic issues his missed its basic purpose.

FARM INCOME DOWN

Net farm income nationally for the first three quarters of 1959 was down sharply from the similar period of 1958, according to the USDA's current farm income situation report. (And many weren't getting rich in 1958.)

Income for the first 9 months of 1959 was reported as approximately $11,500 million; this was $1,500 million under the 1958 period—a decline of 12 percent. However, it was still 4½ percent above the recession year of 1957.

This year's January-August total of cash receipts from livestock and products was 4 percent less than last year's. Although prices averaged higher for cattle, they were substantially lower for hogs, broilers and eggs.

Total crop receipts in the first 8 months of 1959, however, were reported as about the same as 1958. Receipts from corn, oranges, and tobacco were up considerably; but they were offset by a sharp drop in receipts from sorghum, grain, and wheat.

Hoard's Dairyman: 75 Years of Service to Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to relate the story of Hoard's Dairyman, a magazine which has served

the interests of dairy farmers from the time it was founded in Fort Atkinson 75 years ago in 1885. This semimonthly publication, read avidly by more than 330,000 dairy farmers in every State as well as in every English-speaking country, is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. Throughout its history Hoard's Dairyman has had only three publishers—the magazine's founder who is best known as the father of American dairying, the late William D. Hoard, and his son, the late Frank W. Hoard, who headed the firm in 1918 following his father's death, and his grandson, William D. Hoard, Jr., who has been the firm's president since 1939. This illustrious magazine is edited by W. D. Knox, son of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable Victor A. Knox, of Michigan. The Hoard's Dairyman story, as told in "Hilltop Decision," the magazine's anniversary booklet, follows:

THE YEAR IS 1871

A July sun bakes down on the rolling Wisconsin countryside. Up a dirt road a covered buggy leaves a low drift of dust which slowly settles, waiting to be stirred again by the next horse-and-buggy traveler.

But this solitary buggy carries a tall Lincolnesque figure, who, in the next few hours, will make a decision which will affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in his State and eventually the Nation.

As he nears the crest of the hill, his mind is occupied with the day-to-day problems of any smalltown weekly newspaper editor with a growing family. Since moving West from his upper New York State farm home, life's road has been rough. Only long, dedicated hours have kept his pioneering publishing venture in the black. But this is the lot of the pioneer and he accepts it, taking a satisfying bonus in the personal inner rewards to those who serve their fellow man.

When his bay mare slows at the top of the hill, the driver eases his rig to a stop and his horse settles with a sigh of relief. From this hill, William Dempster Hoard can view his adopted State. He sees all around him fields of wheat rapidly ripening in rolling fields.

But the stands are thin.

In fact, the yields have been falling each successive year.

On the next hill to the north is an abandoned set of farm buildings, now owned by the bank as the former owner gave up and moved farther west to new land.

There are other farms like this in the area.

Why should this be so?

An uneasy doubt enters the editor's thinking. His logical mind explores the possible causes.

Low fertility and the chinchbug have taken their toll. Wheat yields in recent years have dropped to a low of 8 bushels per acre.

Maybe those who left were poor farmers, incapable of success in farming.

But he knew many of them and this was not true.

There must be a more fundamental reason.

Hoard finds it in his childhood memories and his rudimentary knowledge of geology. This is glacial soil. These Wisconsin farms really rest on a thin foundation of topsoil, not at all like that of the unglaciated prairie land of Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa.

Then Hoard recalls how farmers in New York State had mined their fields with continuous wheat, too. The dairy cow had been the salvation of many of those neighboring farms. The healing power of her grassland and the humus and fertility of her droppings had revived tired acres, made them bear again as they had when broken from virgin timber.

As Hoard's horse dozes in the July sun, the lanky editor is lost in thought. The outline of an editorial begins to form in his mind. But it is more than an editorial. This should be an editorial campaign in his weekly newspaper, the Jefferson County Union. In fact, the need is so great he could devote his life to no greater cause.

And thus a crusade was born.

From that day forward, Hoard became the apostle of the dairy cow for a permanent, prosperous, soil-conserving agriculture. He was to live to be honored nationally and internationally, be cited as the "father of American dairying," and be quoted generations after his passing.

In the beginning, however, Hoard's crusade fell on unreceptive ears. Tradition-bound farmers, in the well-worn seasonal rut of plowing, planting, and harvesting wheat, wanted no part of the year-round chores which were the obligation of the dairy husbandman. The passive resistance of these stolid Nordic farmers would have chilled the enthusiasm of anyone less dedicated than Hoard.

But time and economics were the editor's allies. As crop income dwindled, more of the farmers listened to Hoard. Though questioned and challenged at his every appearance, Hoard's arguments dented the crust of farming habit and a few dairy cows began to appear on the hills and in the valleys of Jefferson County.

This new type of agriculture brought with it a demand for information. Feeding, breeding, and management of the dairy cow, and marketing of milk and cream were foreign to the lives of these new dairymen. Hoard filled his paper with the knowledge he had gained in his native New York and drew liberally on the advice of a few advanced dairymen in the East and even in Europe. A prodigious reader, Hoard combed every farm periodical and corresponded with anyone and everyone who gave promise of providing the most reliable information available.

His crusade rapidly outgrew his country weekly. In 1885 a national dairy farm magazine was launched. To supplement the power of the written word, he took to the speaker's platform to fulfill engagements throughout the land. His training for the ministry as a young man helped him become known as one of the greatest speakers of his time, a period characterized in history as an era of colorful speakers and leaders of men.

It should be remembered that when Hoard began his crusade America's dairy industry was not unlike that which still prevails in many countries of the world. On city streets, wagons carried battered cans of warm milk. A tin dipper was used to fill the housewives' pans and pitchers. Among the millions of multiplying bacteria in the milk were tubercle bacilli, Brucella abortus, and many other human health hazards. Butter made from sour cream was of varying quality and often adulterated with beef tallow and vegetable fats.

These were the challenges before Hoard. In the beginning he little realized the magnitude of the task he had undertaken. As dairy farming expanded, however, he came to grips with the tangled problems of sanitation, health, and marketing as well as those of dairy husbandry. All of his mental and physical resources were thrown into the struggle to build what has become the largest and most stable part of American agriculture.

Great men have come and gone but rare is the man who has lived on as Hoard. Today, almost nine decades after that hilltop decision, his crusade carries on through Hoard's Dairyman, the magazine he founded 75 years ago. A son and now a grandson have, in successive generations, added materially the luster of the name and the quality of the service to man.

A $10 billion dairy industry today serves all Americans the highest quality dairy foods available to any people on earth. Nowhere else in the world can be found such quality and safety in this most nearly perfect food—and nowhere can it be found in such abundance.

The beneficient creature which Hoard, his son, and grandson championed has healed the soil sores of a continent, from the thin, glaciated soils of the North to the eroded red gullies of the South.

In this year 1960, nearly a century following the hilltop decision, let us review briefly the great service rendered by the "father of American dairying," and his lengthened shadow, Hoard's Dairyman.

Don't Sell MATS Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Don't Sell MATS Short" which appeared in the News-Democrat of Belleville, Ill., on Wednesday, February 3, 1960:

DON'T SELL MATS SHORT

A local spokesman for the scheduled commercial airlines would begrudge the Military Air Transport Service commendation for its noteworthy safety achievement of 1959. MATS succeeded in racking up a perfect year without one fatality, in fact without even a casualty. Day before yesterday we made editorial note of this accomplishment. Today, in the Forum, we are printing a letter from the airlines' representative who takes us to task for our remarks.

Although our critic does not directly challenge the lament that "MATS is handicapped by an overage and obsecent air fleet, sorely needful of replacement by swift jet transports," the left-handed inference is that anything spent toward modernizing MATS equipment would entail astronomical waste by duplication.

Says he, "We might keep in mind that all these new (commercial) jet aircraft are in the military reserve and are ready and willing to go into the service of our country in case of a general war. In fact, on 24-hour notice they would be turned over to the Government under the CRAF (Civil Reserve Air Fleet) plan."

It is specious, of course, to confuse CRAF with any military connotation. And to say that these planes and aircrews are to be "turned over to the Government" is an overstatement.

As its name clearly states, CRAF is a civil gesture, and as such its value when the chips are down is severely curtailed. Military airmen can be, and regularly are, commanded into combat. There is no authority, however, to order or compel a civilian flier to take such risks. This much is a foregone conclusion: CRAF would fly in the service of our country up to a point—to be determined by individual restriction, by the Air Transport Association and the Air Line Pilots Union—

and you can be sure that point would be well insulated by long distance from any combat or contaminated area.

That is the agreement on CRAF, and the Defense Department entered into this compromise with its eyes wide open and, we suspect, with its back to the wall.

CRAF is nothing more than a crisis extension of the peacetime carrier augmentation program for which Congress is guaranteeing the scheduled airlines some $85 million this fiscal year whether that much service is needed or not.

That's even lusher than going after civilian business, which is a legitimate province of the airlines. But it also helps explain why the airlines' propaganda mill is working round the clock and shooting every angle to undercut and put MATS on the hummer.

This ruthless campaign of greed must not succeed. Only yesterday, Gen. Thomas Power, chief of our Strategic Air Command, again reiterated his grim warning of U.S. vulnerability to Russian missile assault.

We pin our hopes for survival on SAC. It is the invincible "deterrent striking power of the United States" which Vice President NIXON referred to in Chicago the other day. And MATS is a vital part of it all. For without MATS, SAC is not a mobile striking force. Its mission is to haul in all the hardware of war needed to keep SAC's giant B-52 bombers hammering the enemy.

It's cutting it too thin for safety, expecting MATS' lumbering old piston-engined junkers to sustain the prodigious needs of the B-52's.

Certainly CRAF offers no solution, since all its jet DC-8's and Boeing 707s are strictly passenger planes.

MATS' assignment is logistic support—transporting freight as well as all airborne troops. Commercial passenger planes are totally unsuited for the job. They are designed to carry people, not cargo. Their floors aren't stressed to support the enormous weight. Nor could these passenger planes taken off the scheduled airline runs be remodeled at the last minute when time is of the essence.

It is imperative that the MATS goal of air fleet modernization be vigorously and promptly implemented. Pray let us not be diverted by red herrings or siren songs, for our national survival in the critical years ahead might well hinge on what we do now.

The Heart of the Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "The Heart of the Struggle" appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 5. This article brings out a fact that many Americans in and out of Congress seem to overlook, namely, that in our zeal to outdo the Russians we may simply be emulating them. In other words, if we cannot beat them we will join them, as the old saying goes.

If we do indeed simply become a monolithic state opposing another such state, we have lost not only a battle but a war. From the quotes in this article, the President seems fully aware of this danger. If we cannot survive and still provide our people with the abundant life and the goods and services they require, then we are indeed in a sad plight. This I will never believe, and I am sure that the vast majority of our people will never believe it or submit to such an end to our great Republic.

The article follows:

THE HEART OF THE STRUGGLE

The condition confronting the United States in the world is both philosophical and practical—a question of survival of values and a question of just plain survival. To both questions President Eisenhower the other day addressed himself.

Queried at his press conference about rapid Russian progress in missiles and space rockets, he recalled the early day of World War II, how we were almost overawed by Hitler's blitzkrieg successes. "Why, of course, we talked about this great efficiency.

"This is dictatorship. If you take our country and make it an armed camp and regiment it, why, for a while you can—you might do it with great morale, too, if you could get people steamed up like you did in wars * * * you might do this thing * * * in very greater tempo than we now are doing it."

And—make no mistake about it—turning America into a garrison state is what a great many people are really talking about today even if they rarely put it that way. They would spend without stint on all kinds of arms; but more than that, they would drastically change the priorities of national life and make the Government the governor of those priorities so as to match the totalitarian efficiency of the Soviet system.

They are right if what is wanted is to match and surpass that kind of efficiency, for that kind of efficiency must be centrally regimented and reach down into every aspect of life—just as the Soviets, in the President's words, pick a potential athlete and make it a national responsibility to make him the best in the world if they can.

The price, to be sure, is the loss of precisely those human values which distinguish our society from Communist society (and which distinguish man from the beasts of the field).

So the philosopher might ask, What does it profit a nation to survive and lose its free soul? The pragmatist can retort, What does it profit a nation if it doesn't survive to enjoy its freedom?

But those are not the real questions. First, as to the alleged virtues of the garrison state, we all know what happened to Hitler's vaunted totalitarian efficiency when the West took countermeasures.

Are we today, then, doing enough in the way of practical military countermeasures? To answer that it is necessary to ask what it is we are trying to do. We are not trying to mobilize a military force with which to conquer the Communist world (we, not the Communists, are the true believers in peaceful coexistence in the sense of live and let live). We are trying to keep in being and constantly improve a military force so powerful that the Soviets will not push the button for fear of the devastation it would bring upon themselves in retaliation.

What is needed to deter the enemy is not the same as what is needed to launch a total attack on him. Mr. Eisenhower put it cogently: "What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate. A deterrent has no added power, once it has become completely adequate, for compelling the respect of any potential opponent for your deterrent and, therefore, to make him act prudently."

Obviously the deterrent cannot remain static; for continuing adequacy its technology must constantly improve. If it should be improving now at a faster rate, the remedy is not to be found merely in more money. Noting appropriations of nearly $7 billion a year for missiles alone, the President said this "is getting close to the point where money itself will not bring * * any quicker development." In any case, no one denies that the technology of the deterrent is constantly improving.

When vocal politicians and commentators glibly say the national priority should be on survival instead of tail fins, they are missing the point that the free society is able to provide the people with both the means of survival and material abundance. But they are missing the further point that free consumer choice is merely an expression of political liberty.

And that is the point of the cold war. To turn to a garrison state is too high a price and, as a practical matter, an unnecessary price. It is to give the Soviets victory without a shot being fired or an effort made to preserve the philosophical values which are the heart of the struggle.

Treasury Tap Proposed To Speed Home Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there is currently pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee a new $1 billion spending program, the so-called emergency home ownership bill. An article in the Washington Post of February 6, 1960, rather aptly describes the proposal.

The article follows:

TREASURY TAP PROPOSED TO SPEED HOME SALES

(By Vincent J. Burke)

An alliance of strange political bedfellows is trying to persuade Congress to tap the Treasury for $1 billion to make it easier to sell new houses in the lower-price range.

The administration is opposed.

In the forefront of the fight for the legislation is the liberal wing of organized labor, the liberally oriented Americans for Democratic Action, and one segment of the usually conservative business community—the homebuilding industry.

During a weeklong hearing by a House banking subcommittee a parade of homebuilders, including a spokesman for a national association of pre-fab builders, endorsed the proposal. None opposed it.

The national association of home builders—in which there is a dispute over the merits of the plan—restricted itself to a policy statement adopted unanimously at its Chicago meeting which gave conditional endorsement to the proposal.

The association said it favored other measures to relieve the pinch on mortgage credit. In the absence of such measures, it said it would "as a last resort" favor tapping the Treasury for a large amount of mortgage funds.

The disputed plan would give the homebuilding industry a shot in the arm by applying the principles of the farm price support program to new FHA-insured and GI mortgages of $13,800 or less.

Government-backed mortgages today aren't worth 100 cents on the dollars because:

Interest rates are limited to 5¼ percent on mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans'

Administration and to 5¾ percent on FHA-insured mortgages.

The sharp rise in the cost of borrowing money during the past year enables lenders to get much higher interest on other loans, including conventional-type mortgages.

As a result, a lender today is reluctant to invest in a Government-backed mortgage, unless he can get it at a discount.

Discounts in many areas average 3 or 4 percent and in some areas range as high as 8 percent, which is equivalent to an additional 1 percent in mortgage interest. A $13,800 mortgage discounted at 8 percent sells for $12,716.

Under Government regulations, the builder is supposed to absorb the discount out of his profits.

Builders are complaining that the profits aren't that big and therefore many persons who would otherwise buy houses this year under the Government's low downpayment programs, won't get a chance to do so.

The disputed plan, advanced by the builders with strong labor backing, is designed to resolve this impasse. It would enable a lender to put up $13,800 for a $13,800 mortgage, secure in the knowledge that he could promptly resell the mortgage to the Federal National Mortgage Association for $13,800.

Regardless of the mortgage's market value, the agency would be required to pay 100 cents on the dollar for it. The excess over the actual market value would amount to a subsidy. Homebuilders contend it shouldn't be called that because the Treasury eventually will get the $1 billion back as the mortgages are paid off.

In any event, the plan would provide low downpayment financing for 70,000 to 80,000 homes.

Homebuilders last year built a near-record 1,341,000 privately financed homes. Everybody agrees housing starts will drop in 1960. Forecasts generally range from 1,100,000 to 1,200,000 new starts.

Backers of the emergency housing bill contend it is needed to cushion the impending cut in housing starts and avoid threat of a recession. Foes contend that inflation is the real danger and injection now of a Federal stimulant for housing would raise the price of houses.

Address by Hon. G. Mennen Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks of the distinguished Governor of the great State of Michigan, the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, to the Michigan State Chamber of Commerce in the Civic Center in Lansing, Mich., on December 9, 1959.

Those who want to hear a moderate, conservative expression of the situation in Michigan today owe it to themselves to read the remarks of our Governor.

The remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, MICHIGAN STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CIVIC CENTER, LANSING, MICH., DECEMBER 9, 1959

It is a very good thing, in my opinion, that you have determined to organize a Michigan State Chamber of Commerce. I offer you my fullest cooperation and the cooperation of the State government.

The State has been endeavoring, as you know, to do what it can through the department of economic development to encourage a broader and more soundly based economy. This agency has always had outstanding business leadership. But the Department is understaffed, undersupported, and its efforts have been sabotaged for political purposes. I hope we have seen the end of that sort of thing, and I welcome the chamber of commerce as a coworker in the cause to which the department of economic development is dedicated.

It is not quite clear to me what is expected of me here today. I read in some of the papers that there was going to be a tax debate between Senator Beadle and myself. One of the papers said Senator Beadle and I were going to "square off" for a battle.

Let me assure you that I am not going to debate, square off with, or battle my good friend, Senator Beadle. I have sincere respect for him. I feel sure that, if it had been left to him and me, this whole tax question could have been settled long ago, and the State would not be in the fix it is in today. But, unfortunately, neither he nor I is in personal control of the situation, and the last thing I want to do is to engage in any fruitless debate or recriminations.

Therefore, I propose to discuss with you three points: first, I want to try to put our tax problem in its historic perspective. Secondly, I would like to talk frankly with you about the subject of economy and its application to this question. And third, I want to speak briefly about Michigan's economic future. Then, as I understand the program, questions will be in order, and I will be happy to do my best to answer any that are addressed to me.

First, let us take a look at the historic background of our present tax problem.

Michigan's tax problem did not originate in the last couple of years. It has its beginnings in 1932 when the people of Michigan enacted the 15-mill limitation amendment on property tax levies. This amounted to a basic decision by the voters that future tax needs for education, in particular, would have to be met from State taxes, not from local taxes on property.

The 15-mill limitation put the cities and school districts into an inevitable financial squeeze. By 1945, their situation had become desperate. At the same time, the State was rolling in money. Wartime and postwar buying had ballooned sales tax revenues and shortage of manpower and materials had made it impossible to engage in the expansion of State buildings and services which everybody knew would be needed. The State treasury had a surplus of some $80 million, while the schools and cities were starving.

At least in part for the purpose of getting some of this embarrassing and tempting surplus out of sight, the legislature put $50 million of it aside for emergency aid to veterans. This is the origin of the famous Veterans Trust Fund which has been an issue in the tax controversy of the last year. And that is why I have never believed it was wrong for the State, in an hour of great need, to borrow that $50 million of sales tax money, contributed by all the taxpayers, and to use it temporarily with no loss to veterans in order to prevent the public disaster which has happened to us.

The establishment of the Veterans Trust Fund, removing $50 million of the State's surplus from the hungry hands of the schools and cities, did not quiet their demands. In 1946 the people, in response to those demands, adopted the sales tax diversion amendment. As later amended, this section of our Constitution requires the State to return to schools, municipalities, and townships five-sixths of the revenues the State collects from our basic tax, the sales tax.

The people, I believe, were justified in that decision. When repeal of the sales tax amendment was attempted in 1948, I opposed repeal and supported diversion. The money thus channeled from the State treasury to local schools, cities, and townships, has by and large been used for good and necessary purposes. Without that money, property taxes would have gone out of sight in the last 10 years.

The mistake was not in the people's decision to reclaim five-sixths of the sales tax; the mistake has been in the legislature's refusal to recognize that this money was irrevocably lost to the State treasury and would have to be replaced. In a 10-year period, sales tax diversion cost the State treasury more than $2,125 million. The average annual cost has been more than $210 million, and in the fiscal year 1958–59 the drain on the State treasury was $247 million.

It is obvious that, if the State had retained this money, there would be no State tax problem. It was also obvious from the beginning that the State would not be able to meet its own obligations unless a new tax program sufficient to offset all or most of this sales tax loss was adopted. Both my predecessors, Governor Kelly and the late Governor Sigler, warned that the State could not make ends meet unless the money drained away by the diversion amendment was somehow replaced with new income.

Yet for 11 years the legislature has persistently refused to levy the taxes necessary to replenish the State treasury. Some new taxes have been enacted, of course, or we would have gone broke as early as 1953. But the total annual yield of all new revenue measures adopted since 1949, exclusive of earmarked and special purpose taxes, is about $150 million. The difference between this figure and the current loss of nearly $250 million from sales tax diversion is very close to our deficit of $95.4 million as of June 30, 1959. That is no coincidence.

This is the real origin of Michigan's financial crisis. It is a lot easier and simpler, I know, to lay our troubles at the doorstep of some individual. It is a lot better politics to say, as the Wall Street Journal recently said, that Michigan is in trouble because Governor Williams spent all its money on wild welfare schemes. That may be good politics, but it results in mighty bad government, as we have all seen in the last 11 months.

Responsible people in both political parties recognize the situation as I have described it. Mr. Bagwell, the titular head of the Republican Party, has not agreed with me on many things, as you all know. But we did agree last winter that Michigan needed a personal and corporate income tax, and we did agree again this fall that a so-called payroll tax would be the best solution at the moment. Unfortunately, the power in this matter does not lie in the hands of responsible people in either political party. Since last May, when the Republican Senators broke a commitment to release the Veterans Trust Fund reserve, and thus forced a payless payday upon us, irresponsibility has been in the saddle.

Where do we stand today?

In simple terms, we face another year of deficit financing, delay in payment of bills costing us about $5,000 per day in discounts alone, mounting deficits, and continued cash crisis. The dominant majority in the State legislature appears to have made its decision. It will not make any adequate provision for the support of State services, the payment of overdue bills, and the retirement of the deficit, during the coming year. A program of nuisance taxes, to produce about one-third of our needs, has been adopted by the Senate, and is under consideration by the House. This irresponsible

program cannot be sponsored but will not be blocked by Democrats, and it will not be vetoed by the Governor if it is passed. We will take whatever revenues the legislature will give us, and do the best we can to keep the State's head above water until we get some responsible action.

The taxes now under consideration in the legislature are, of course, entirely repugnant to me. But the alternative to accepting them is financial chaos. Even a miserable tax program like the one we appear to be about to get is better, under present circumstances, than no tax program at all. The Republican Senators who are calling the turns have served notice they will not adopt anything else—so if the nuisance tax program fails it probably means no tax program until next spring. In either case, the decision of the Senators is for continued insolvency.

Now let us turn briefly to the subject of so-called economy. This follows naturally from what I have been saying about taxes, because many citizens mistakenly suppose that economy is an alternative to a tax program. I am often criticized for not giving more lip-service to the cause of economy, and I concede that it might be better public relations on my part to pose as the great saver, sitting on the lid of the budget, than to recognize the facts of our financial life as frankly as I have.

The facts which I have frankly recognized and perhaps too frankly promulgated are these:

First, the government of Michigan in the last 10 years has practiced economy effectively and constantly. There is always room for improvement, and we are constantly trying to improve the frugality and efficiency of the State's operations. But in comparison with other States, we show up very well in the practice of economy with the public funds.

Secondly, there is no way in which savings, desirable as they are in themselves, can be made in sufficient amounts to meet our massive financial problem. Our operations are already too tight to allow any room for sizable cutbacks without actually suspending essential government activities. Little cutbacks damage efficiency without making a dent in the deficit.

These two facts can be demonstrated to anyone who is willing to listen. For example, let us ask whether Michigan's government is a wastrel government as some of our critics have claimed. Look at the facts. The percentage increase in State government general expenditures in the last 10 years in Michigan was 97.7 percent. Does that figure cause you to gasp in dismay? Well, then, look at some of the other States. California's expenditures in the same period increased 222.8 percent under a long succession of Republican Governors. Ohio increased its costs 202.3 percent, Massachusetts 200.6 percent, Indiana 153.7 percent, and so on. The truth is that, under this alleged regime of reckless spending here in Michigan, our costs in the last 10 years increased less percentagewise than the costs of 46 other States. These figures are from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Is Michigan's public payroll overloaded? Again look at the facts. In 1957, the last year for which we have complete figures, the State of Michigan had 4 employees for each thousand of population, as compared with an average of 5.4 employees per thousand in the 48 States as a whole.

Is Michigan a debt-ridden State? Look at the Census Bureau figures again. In gross long-term debt outstanding, Michigan ranks 25th among the States of the Union.

Is Michigan a welfare State? In February 1959 Census Bureau figures show Michigan 34th among the States on a per capita basis in combined State and local expenditures for public welfare purposes.

Is Michigan a high-tax State? Most of you, I venture, would say it is. But the Census Bureau, in its report of last February, ranked Michigan 31st among the States in relationship of State and local taxes to personal income, and 12th among the States in per capita State and local taxes, regardless of income. The dollar figures are these: Michigan State and local taxes take $83.54 per thousand dollars of personal income, compared with a median of $88.51 for 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Have Michigan's budgets been extravagant? Let's look at the record. In the last 10 years the State agencies requested appropriations totaling $6.6 billion. I reduced these requests to recommendations which I made to the legislature totaling $5.8 billion, an average cut of 12 percent. The legislature actually appropriated $5.77 billion, a further cut of less than 1 percent from the total of my recommendations.

When a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature come within 1 percent of agreement on State expenditures, I think it indicates that there was an an effective effort to hold those expenditures to the necessary minimum.

Now, it seems to me that we should be telling this story to the Nation, rather than allowing the reputation of our State to be destroyed by half-truths and falsehoods. Let me cite, as an example, a Wall Street Journal story praising the State of North Carolina for establishing a department of administration and saving 2 percent of the appropriations made over a 2-year period by their legislature. That's fine, and I salute North Carolina for that achievement. But the fact is that North Carolina's Department of Administration has patterned after the Michigan Department of Administration, established 12 years ago. And the further fact is that Michigan, over a 10-year period, has saved nearly 2.4 percent of the appropriations made by the legislature and turned the money back to the treasury.

North Carolina gets praise for saving $11 million in 2 years. Michigan has saved $75 million over 10 years and gets held up before the Nation as a spendthrift State that finally went broke. It seems to me this is a fertile field for a State chamber of commerce to work in. Maybe the Wall Street Journal will listen to you, where it won't listen to me.

Michigan's record for economy and efficiency has been grossly underpublicized. A few of the things we have done to save money are newsworthy. For example, the records center we established in 1951 is saving the State about $250,000 a year in space for storage of inactive but essential State records. If these records were to be stored in convential filing cabinets, they would completely fill five of the six floors of the Lewis Cass State office building.

But for every item of this kind there are literally hundreds of undramatic examples of economy nobody ever hears about. More than $4,000 a month is being saved by using existing State-owned gas pumps to service State-owned cars, instead of buying gas at commercial stations. A change in the type of paper used for official stationery is saving $10,000 a year. Eight hundred dollars has been saved on a new process for issuing cosmetology licenses. In 5 years about $200,000 has been saved on paint for highway markings. There are scores of examples of this kind.

These things are being done all the time and the State's record for zealously seeking out economical methods of operation can be matched, I believe, with the record of any private business firm.

Let me point here to a fact which may not have occurred to some of you. Democratic government, by its nature, has no built-in yardstick of profit and loss to determine its efficiency. Therefore, government can never be judged in the same balance by which private business is judged. Highways make no profits, mental hospitals make no profits, universities make no profits.

The test of a business is whether it gains or loses. If it loses money, it should fold up. The test of a mental hospital is whether it cares for all who need its care, and whether it has sufficient staff to get patients cured and out of its walls, rather than just keeping them in. To talk of holding the costs of a private business below its income makes good sense. To talk of holding Government costs below existing income frequently makes no sense, because the function of government is not to maintain a favorable margin between income and outgo, but to serve the needs of the people. If the income is not sufficient to meet those needs, whether they be roads, hospitals, schools, sewers, atomic submarines or ballistic missiles, the economic thing to do is to increase government's income, not to reduce its expenditures.

By inversion, this is one of the strongest arguments against socialism. If government owns all business, the yardstick of profit disappears, and the economy either becomes uneconomic, or it does violence to human rights in the effort to be economic. The Soviet system will work—but it will work either with immense waste which comes out of the hides of the people, or with massive coercion and deprivation which destroys the freedom of the people. Let us try to keep these distinctions between the objectives of government and private business clear in our minds, and we will have fewer groundless disagreements and semantic arguments.

Now let me address myself to the second point I mentioned—the impossibility of making sufficient reductions in expenditures to meet our financial problem. The reason for this is simple: the bulk of our costs are in areas which cannot be cut—mental hospitals, roads, welfare and education. Where cuts in services could be made, as for example in reduction of State police or regulatory agencies, the savings would be insignificant as compared with the deficit.

In 1957–58 we spent 79.6 percent of all State purpose expenditures for highways, education, welfare, and mental health. Not one of these can be cut. Highway funds, of course, are constitutionally earmarked and cannot be used for any other purpose. Welfare costs are determined by economic conditions. Cutting education or mental health would mean closing a college or university or shutting down a mental hospital if any significant savings were to be achieved.

If we canceled our entire budget for conservation, recreation and agriculture in 1957–58, we would have saved only $22 million, less than one-fourth of our present deficit. If we had wiped out the State police and the prison system, we would have saved $43 million, about half the total of our present pile of unpaid bills. Our whole general government cost—the executive, legislature, secretary of State, treasury, department of administration, and so on—cost a little over $31 million, and if we fired 20 percent of all the employees in these agencies we would save only about $6 million against a $100 million deficit.

You can add it any way you want to, there is no fat in the State's budget which would be thick enough to offset the shortage of income. I will give any one of you the facts about where State money goes and how much goes to each purpose, and challenge you to find a way to make any reduction significant to our present problem, without wrecking some essential activity of the government.

One more point: some people ask this question—if the population of Michigan is going up so rapidly, and thus increasing costs, why don't our revenues from existing

taxes go up accordingly, and thus meet our costs? That might well have happened if our population increase was entirely the result of adult immigration. But the trouble is that so many of our new citizens are children, who ordinarily do not pay taxes. In the same approximate period when our population was increasing overall by about 21 percent, the number of Michigan citizens under the age of 20 increased by 42 percent. Each year the number of children in our schools increases by 65,000 to 70,000. The added cost of educating these children far exceeds any added tax revenues which may result from adding them to the Michigan community.

Perhaps I have belabored this subject of cost cutting because I feel that many of you are deeply interested in it. Let me assure you that economy will continue to be the objective of my administration and, equally, that I will continue to speak the truth about this subject—that costs simply cannot be cut sufficiently to meet our financial problem.

Let me conclude by pointing to some of the brighter aspects of Michigan's picture. It is not all dark, by any means.

We have two basic problems. One is this State financial deadlock and the other is the failure of the automobile industry, since 1954, to provide the number of jobs it provided in years past.

The first problem is a political one. There is no reason for our troubles of the last year except the refusal of a legislative majority to face up to hard decisions. This can and will be corrected. No matter how long the State Senate may stall in its effort to operate without money, the time will come when it, or a succeeding Senate, must face the problem and solve it.

As you know, it has been and still is my conviction that the best solution would be a corporate and personal income tax. This program, developed after an 18-month study by a citizens' committee working with a legislative committee, would have solved our problem on a permanent basis. It would, also, have permitted substantial tax relief for many segments of business from the present business activities tax, the corporation franchise tax and from at least a portion of the local personal property tax.

In this connection, I would urge that each of you read an article on State taxes in the December issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "Watch the Taxes Closest to Home." This is a condensation of a longer study published in Fortune magazine. The authors, two eminent tax authorities, say flatly that the States must come to the enactment of personal and corporate income taxes in addition to sales taxes.

That, I believe, is what Michigan will ultimately come to, and the only question is how much damage we must suffer before we get a legislature with the courage to face the issue.

The second major problem of Michigan is a complex economic one. It results from three main factors—the loss of defense contracts because of the switch to missiles, electronic devices, and aircraft; the natural and inevitable decentralization of automobile manufacture; and the advent of automation and other new technologies which reduce the need for unskilled labor. These things are not in themselves bad. All we need to do is to recognize the economic changes involved and take intelligent action to turn them to the good of all our people. With effort and planning, we can build new industries to replace the losses we have suffered through economic change.

Michigan has every reason to look with confidence to the future. We have the natural resources, the people, the location, the know-how for a new period of prosperity and progress. It is the literal truth that investments, private or public, in Michigan's future cannot lose. The United States News recently projected population changes and concluded that by the year 2000—and that is only 40 years away—there will be 9 million people living in the Detroit metropolitan area, and nearly 20 million in Michigan.

One does not need to be a professor of economics to realize what that means in terms of the service industries, growth of real estate values, the expansion of opportunity. And nobody needs to be a prophet to realize the immense problems this growth will bring with it. We cannot face a future of these proportions with a little, narrow-minded, selfish 19th century philosophy. We must bring to that future the same breadth of vision that inspired Henry Ford when he instituted the $5 day, the same confidence that changed this State from a community of farms and wagon factories to the world's greatest industrial complex.

We cannot face this future without the active and civic-minded leadership of our businessmen. It is my sincere hope that we will be able to look back 10 years from now and say that this kind of leadership really began to take form and meaning on the 9th of December 1959.

Pittston's Saddest Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was featured in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of June 28, 1959, written by Mr. James J. Corrigan, of Wilkes-Barre, who has made a large number of impressive contributions to the history of my district through his research and writings of the important events that have transpired in that section of Pennsylvania over the years:

SIXTY-THREE YEARS AGO TODAY—PITTSTON'S SADDEST SUNDAY—58 MEN NEVER FINISHED SHIFT IN THE TWIN SHAFT—NOT ONE OF TRAPPED ESCAPED AND NO BODY WAS EVER RECOVERED

(By James J. Corrigan)

Exactly 63 years ago today, on Sunday, June 28, 1896, occurred the anthracite mining industry's third greatest underground tragedy—the twin shaft disaster at Upper Pittston, in a section known as Pittston Junction.

At approximately 3 o'clock on that tragic Sunday morning, an extensive area of overlying strata in the twin shaft workings of the Newton Coal Mining Co. unexpectedly subsided and entombed 58 workers who were engaged in setting up timber to support the roof and in removing a pump. Not one of the trapped workers escaped, nor was any of the bodies ever recovered.

To that date, 1896, only one more tragic anthracite mining disaster had occurred—the Avondale catastrophe at Plymouth in 1869 when the lives of 110 workers literally were snuffed out by asphyxiation as the result of a burning mine shaft, the sole outlet to the surface for the doomed.

Anthracite's second of its only too numerous calamities happened 40 years ago this month. On June 5, 1919, an explosion of powder and dynamite in a train of cars carrying men and boys to work at the Baltimore Tunnel, east end, cost the lives of 92 men.

EVERYTHING WAS QUIET

At the twin shaft, a fissure was discovered above the mine workings in February, 1896, 4 months prior to the tragedy, the break allowing water to enter the mine. But, according to a report of H. McDonald, State anthracite mine inspector for the district, "not in sufficient quantity to create any anxiety or apprehension of danger." After several inspections of the mine, he said: "I did not see or hear any unusual disturbance of the overlying strata or the pillars. Everything was quiet."

Notwithstanding Inspector McDonald's close scrutiny of the mine, he was aroused about 4 o'clock on the fatal Sunday morning to be told that an explosion had occurred at the twin shaft. On his hurried arrival at the shaft, he was surprised to learn that, not an explosion, but a large cave-in, had occurred. McDonald still further was astonished on being informed that a large gang of men had been at work all night (Saturday and Sunday morning) setting up timber in an effort to halt a "squeeze," or a general settling down of the rock overlying a mine. This was a foreboding of the impending tragedy.

As the Sabbath dawn lengthened, news of the cave-in and entombment spread rapidly in the Greater Pittston area. A scene typical of all mine disasters unfolded. Kin of the 58 entombed, sobbing, despairing, yet hoping for a miracle, clung to the disaster site with uncontrollable grief; returning to their empty homes only after stark awareness that their loved ones were doomed in their underground place of livelihood.

This is the substance of the State mine inspector's report on the twin shaft disaster at Pittston Junction:

RESCUE WAS IMPOSSIBLE

It would be impossible to give an idea adequately of the danger that attended the work of attempted recovery of the workers alive, or their bodies. The pillars were crushing within 50 feet of the bottom of the shaft. It was impossible to get near the workers, owing to the crushing of the roof all around them.

Work in the slope was pushed vigorously day and night until July 29. The workmen then refused to continue work as their danger, of roof collapsing, was continually increasing, as the timbers were constantly settling and there was grave danger that the rock above the timbers might give way, crushing the timbers and closing the opening, thus making it impossible for the rescuers to escape.

Officials of the Newton Coal Mining Co. had deemed it advisable to assemble for conference at Pittston on July 24 all of the mine inspectors in the anthracite region as well as all of the superintendents of the neighboring coal companies, to consider the feasibility of continuing rescue attempt operations. A notable assembly of anthracite mining experts conferred. Following the conference it was announced:

"After a thorough examination of the mines and maps of the property mined from the Twin Shaft, the unanimous expression of opinion by this committee is that they were surprised at the progress made, taking into consideration the condition of the mines, the continuance of the squeeze, the presence of an enormous quantity of gas, and the fact that no explosives could be used in prosecuting the work. Their judgment is that everything possible had been done, and is being done, to reach the bodies of the entombed men.

WILLING TO SPEND MONEY

"The officials of the Newton Coal Mining Co. stated that they were desirous of receiv-

ing from the committee assembled any suggestions concerning the matter, and expressed a willingness to expend any amount of money necessary to recover the bodies.

"Deep regret was expressed by all present at the apparent impossibility of ever finding the bodies."

On July 1, Gov. Daniel H. Hastings had appointed Edward Roderick, William Stein and Edward Brennan, State anthracite mine inspectors, as a commission to investigate the Twin Shaft tragedy of June 28.

This official commission convened at Pittston on July 8, concluded taking testimony on July 17 and submitted its report to Governor Hastings on September 24. After lengthily going into the cause of the disaster—a squeeze, as has been shown—the commission recommended certain safety legislation for enactment into the State's coal mining laws.

An efficient Twin Shaft Relief Fund hastily was organized and chartered. Approximately $80,000 contributed to the fund from all over the Nation was distributed among about 150 widows, orphans and other dependents of Twin Shaft victims.

First Kindergarten Established in Watertown, Wis., by Mrs. Carl Schurz Over 100 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin, and particularly those of Watertown, my home town, point with considerable pride to the fact that the first kindergarten to be established in the United States was opened in Watertown in 1856 by Mrs. Carl Schurz, wife of the German revolutionary. Any attempt to alter this fact or to forget it is viewed as heresy by my Wisconsin compatriots. In order to nip in the bud any such heretical views which may have outrun the following column in the Milwaukee Journal on January 24, 1960, I am placing it in the RECORD for your attention:

ON WISCONSIN—SHEBOYGAN, BOSTON ERR—FIRST KINDERGARTEN IN UNITED STATES OUT HERE

Here is something that comes close to treason in Wisconsin. A leading and respected journal—the Sheboygan Press—has sought to deprive our fair State of one of its real claims to everlasting glory.

"The year 1960," the Press has proclaimed editorially, "marks the 100th anniversary of the first kindergarten established in the United States. The kindergarten was opened in Boston in 1860 by Elizabeth Peabody."

Miss Peabody did establish a kindergarten very early in Boston. One authority gives the date as 1867 rather than 1860. She was responsible for much of the original drive to interest others, to improve kindergarten practices, to get new kindergartens started.

Every loyal and learned son and daughter of Wisconsin, however, must know that the very first kindergarten in the United States was opened at Watertown by Mrs. Carl Schurz, wife of the German revolutionary, American soldier, and statesman. The year was 1856.

It didn't last long, for Carl Schurz and his wife left Watertown soon after and by 1859 were in Boston. There Mrs. Schurz met Miss Peabody and told her about kindergartens in Germany and Watertown, Wis. Miss Peabody was so impressed by this and by Mrs. Schurz's enthusiasm—plus the good behavior of a Schurz child trained in the Schurz kindergarten—that she decided to start a "children's garden" herself.

So let Boston, if it wishes, celebrate 1860 as the centenary of the "first" American kindergarten founded by Miss Peabody. We are smug in our knowledge that the history books and Americana encyclopedia will uphold Wisconsin's prior claim on behalf of Mrs. Schurz.

Politics and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the so-called aid to education bill which has just passed the other legislative body has been branded by the Philadelphia Inquirer as a "political monstrosity" and I think even the proponents of Federal aid must recognize it as simply a political device to put the administration in a bad light.

As one who has consistently opposed educational aid out of the Federal Treasury I believe that I have been reflecting the sentiments of the majority of my constituents. To me the idea of tapping the Federal till at a time when we are staggering under a national debt approaching $300 billion is the sheerest demagoguery since quite obviously any outlay for additional Federal aid would have to be with borrowed money. And to assume that such school aid would not have to be ultimately extracted from the pockets of local taxpayers is to ignore a basic fact just as it ignores the fact that Pennsylvania will always pay into such a program more than she will receive as grants-in-aid.

Returning to the Inquirer editorial, we are struck with this analysis since it coincides so exactly with our own thinking:

The Democratic bill that has emerged from the Senate is not only exorbitant in the amount of proposed expenditures but nonsensical in the suggested method for distributing the funds.

In the first year dollars would be handed out in reckless handfuls without matching funds required by recipient States and with virtually no restrictions on the use of the money. It could even be spent for teachers' salaries—an open invitation to communities which are shirking their duty in this respect to be even more neglectful.

And then the Inquirer goes on to identify the entire maneuver as simply the rawest partisan politics in these words:

The school aid farce enacted on the Senate floor—with Democratic cast, script and direction—is unfortunately only the first of many such political productions intended to embarrass the Eisenhower administration and bewilder the voters in this national election year. There will be equally ridiculous bills on housing, agriculture and in other fields.

Thus warned, those of us who have a concern for the financial solvency of the Nation must be on our guard and stand undismayed in the face of the attacks that will be leveled at us by those who compose the Federal aid to education lobby. And in the ensuing battle it will be no small comfort to know that organizations like the National Chamber of Commerce and the Farm Bureau Federation will be lending their assistance toward stemming these raids on the Treasury.

The Inquirer editorial, appearing in its issue of February 6, 1960, is included as a part of these remarks:

POLITICAL SABOTAGE OF SCHOOL AID

The political monstrosity that was passed by the Senate this week as a so-called school aid bill gives aid to no one and obstructs the enactment of bona fide school legislation.

This bill was pushed to Senate passage by the Democratic majority for purposes not even remotely associated with education.

The object is to confuse the school issue and make the Eisenhower administration appear opposed to Federal aid.

The strategy is to send to the White House an aid-to-education bill so obnoxious that President Eisenhower will veto it for the good of the country.

The effect, the Democrats hope, will be to identify the Republican administration in the minds of the voters as a foe of better education when, in fact, Mr. Eisenhower has taken the lead in advocating a sound, constructive school aid program.

Expenditure of $1,834 million in the next 2 years is proposed in the Senate bill, more than three times the amount sought by the President for school aid purposes in the same period of time. It's a wonder the Democrats didn't suggest a spending program of $5 billion, or maybe $10 billion. As long as they are dealing in absurdities they may as well do a complete job of it.

Money is needed, desperately, to expand school facilities and improve education standards. If Democrats would join Republicans in support of a bipartisan Federal aid program reasonable in cost and scope, real progress could be made toward correcting deficiencies in public school systems that do a grave injustice to children and endanger the national security.

The Democratic bill that has emerged from the Senate is not only exorbitant in the amount of proposed expenditure but nonsensical in the suggested method for distributing the funds.

In the first year dollars would be handed out in reckless handfuls without matching funds required by recipient States and with virtually no restrictions on the use of the money. It could even be spent for teachers' salaries, an open invitation to communities which are shirking their duty in this respect to be even more neglectful.

A sound school aid program should be an incentive for States and communities to face up to their responsibilities in the field of public education, with Federal assistance channeled principally to impoverished areas where assistance is most needed.

The school aid farce enacted on the Senate floor—with Democratic cast, script, and direction—is unfortunately only the first of many such political productions intended to embarrass the Eisenhower administration and bewilder the voters in this national election year. There will be equally ridiculous

bills on housing, agriculture, and in other fields.

We doubt very much that the political hocus-pocus by the Democrats will fool many voters. The cloud of partisanship around the school aid bill passed by the Senate is readily discernible.

The tragedy lies in this reckless disregard of the country's education needs by Democratic Party leaders who evidently are more interested in acquiring political advantage for themselves than better schools for the youngsters of America.

This Is No Time To Give Away Our Rights in the Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thoughtful editorial on the Panama Canal crisis published in the January 25, 1960, issue of the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Independent, as follows:

THIS IS NO TIME TO GIVE AWAY OUR RIGHTS IN THE CANAL ZONE

We are in for more trouble in the vital Panama Canal area.

Dictator Nasser of Egypt who found us ready to help when he grabbed the Suez Canal is getting ready to help Panama grab our canal in payment for our stupidity.

Nasser is opening a consulate in Panama, preparatory to exchanging ambassadors with the money-hungry leaders of the Panamanian Republic. He will send canal experts, undercover agents and agitators and other veterans of Egypt's successful drive to take the Suez Canal.

This effort to take the canal from Uncle Sam ties in with Castro's efforts to force us out of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay which guards our interests in the Caribbean, including the vital canal.

Now comes a report to a Senate subcommittee of a university study group which recommends that we turn the canal over to hemisphere council composed of 20 American republics including Castro's Cuba.

Unless Uncle Sam is getting a bad case of softening of the brain, this Nation which built the canal and has every legal right to it will keep it and run it in the future as in the past. And the same goes for the vital naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

If the administration up in Washington decides to give the canal away to keep the "peace" during the 1960 election, as it decided the British should give away the important Suez to keep the peace during the 1956 election, this Nation is in for rough sledding.

Already we have learned from Washington that maybe we should allow the Panamanian flag to fly in the Canal Zone and grant additional money to the republic to keep them happy and preserve the great togetherness. Such an action would be bowing to blackmail tactics and this would bring more such antics as the disorders which occurred recently in Panama.

There is just one answer to the problems of the Canal Zone and Guantanamo Bay and that is to enforce our rights and stand by our guns. We should tell the Communist stooges in Panama and in Cuba that the only way to get these two vital installations is to take them by force of arms and that Uncle Sam will be there to see that they learn a lesson, once and for all.

In its relative youth America dealt firmly with the Barbary pirates who sought to take that which did not belong to them. Isn't it time we started using the same attitude toward the pirates of today, be they Castros or Nassers?

The least we can do is to stand up and hold on to what is rightfully ours. We cannot give in to blackmail or blackmail will destroy us.

We like the attitude and the concern shown by St. Petersburg Post No. 14, American Legion, which has started to demonstrate some grassroots concern about the Panama Canal.

In a recent letter to Vice President NIXON the local post said:

"We believe that if we permit the Panamanian Government to fly its flag in this very strategic area (Canal Zone) it would be a sign of weakness, that it would lead to unwarranted demands on the part of Communists in Panama, and that ultimately a demand for Panamanian ownership would be made, just as Nasser demanded in the case of the Suez Canal."

The reply from NIXON gave the post no definite promises but it did confirm the idea of allowing the Panamanian flag to fly in Canal Zone "is being considered in light of treaty situation."

The treaty situation is exactly the same now that it has always been. The treaty gives us all the rights of a sovereign in the area, and if we are wise, we will preserve those rights. This is no time to start giving away rights and privileges, even in an election year when expedience might cause us to pay dearly for a temporary mess of friendship pottage.

Safety Record of MATS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Enviable Safety Record" which appeared in the News-Democrat of Belleville, Ill., on Wednesday, February 3, 1960:

ENVIABLE SAFETY RECORD

So alarming is the crash rash that bedevils America's commercial aviation industry that Congress has turned attention to the waning safety.

Last year 294 persons died in crashes of scheduled U.S. airlines, almost 50 percent more than the 1958 record. And 1960, now only a month underway, bids fair to outstrip the dismal 1959 showing if the deterioration continues.

In startling contrast is the perfect year just wound up by the globe-girdling Military Air Transport Service: Not one fatality, not even one injury, in the 240 million passenger miles flown during 1959.

This is the outstanding achievement of our national defense strategic airlift.

It betokens a lot of know-how, especially inasmuch as MATS is handicapped by an over-age and obsolescent air fleet, sorely needful of replacement by swift modern jet transports.

Establishment of National Goals Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the establishment of a National Goals Commission—as proposed by President Eisenhower in the 1959 state of the Union message—represents, I believe, a constructive effort toward promoting domestic progress and creating ever-improved national and international policies for the future.

In these fast-changing times, the Nation needs constantly to keep its eye on targets ahead, to crystallize objectives, and to streamline efforts to channel brainpower, manpower, and resources toward achieving essential goals.

The field is broad and complex. The major objectives can be attained only by concerted action of citizens, private enterprise, and local, State, and National Governments. Maximum progress can be achieved only by careful long-range planning.

The years ahead will be filled with problems, opportunities, and challenges.

Our Nation and its system of Government and, indeed, the whole free world are facing a threat to their survival from the international Communist conspiracy.

Our Nation will experience tremendous growth and expansion. It is estimated that by 1970, for example, there will be 33 million more Americans—14 million more workers, 13 million more in school—totaling 210 million. The increased population will require expansion of business and industry, more goods and services, and the development of domestic and international policies to deal with the problems arising in a shrunken world. All of these and other developments require the crystallization of long-range national goals, in order to help meet the growing needs in the years ahead.

The National Goals Commission has, I believe, one of the great opportunities, as well as responsibilities, to make a real contribution to our national effort to build a better, brighter future for our people.

Yesterday's New York Times contains an article which lists the splendid group of well-qualified persons appointed by President Eisenhower to serve on the National Goals Commission. Today, the Times has published an editorial, "A Call for Greatness" reflecting upon some of the challenges which will be faced by the Commission.

Because I believe that the establishment of the Commission represents a constructive step toward laying a sounder foundation for an ever-greater future for our country, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1960]

PRESIDENT FILLS HIS "GOALS" PANEL—NAMES NINE MEMBERS AND CALLS FOR PROGRAM TO MEET THE "GREAT ISSUES" OF ERA

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—President Eisenhower gave his Commission on National Goals its franchise today.

In doing so, he called upon the Commission to "identify the great issues of our generation and describe our objectives in these various areas."

In effect, the President also told the 11-man Commission that it was to pursue its inquiry and arrive at its conclusions without reference to his own views or those held by the heads of executive departments of the Government.

In a letter to Dr. Henry M. Wriston, the Commission's Chairman, the President said that he hoped the panel would "develop a broad outline of coordinated national policies and programs for the next decade and longer."

"I should like to emphasize my desire," the President went on, "that the inquiry be conducted free of any direct connection with me or other portions of the Federal Government."

In making public this letter, the President also announced that the membership of the panel had been completed.

Three days ago the President named Dr. Wriston as Chairman and Frank Pace, Jr., as Vice Chairman. Dr. Wriston is president emeritus of Brown University. Mr. Pace, who served under former President Harry S. Truman as Secretary of the Army and Director of the Budget, is now chairman of the General Dynamics Corp.

The nine other members are:

Dr. James R. Killian Jr., chairman of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross; Clark Kerr, president of the University of California; Learned Hand of New York, retired judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; Edwin D. Canham, editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Also, Colgate W. Darden, Jr., former president of the University of Virginia and former Governor of Virginia; James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and former Ambassador to West Germany; George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; Crawford H. Greenwalt, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.

PLAN ANNOUNCED IN 1959

President Eisenhower announced his intention of creating the National Goals Commission in his state of the Union Message in January 1959. He put Robert E. Merriam, one of his assistants, in charge of finding a chairman and members and also the private foundations to provide the financing.

The 13 months' delay has been occasioned by the difficulties that Mr. Merriam encountered in carrying out both parts of his assignment.

It was only a week ago that the Commission membership was completed.

The failure to get financial support from private foundations, according to officials in the foundations, was attributable to the fact that Mr. Merriam was unable to supply a prospectus that satisfied the foundations on what the committee was expected to do.

The White House announcement today did not mention financing. However, it was understood that the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation would put up part of the money; there were also reports, which could not be confirmed, that the Ford Foundation had agreed to pay part of the cost.

Mrs. Anne W. Wheaton, associate White House Press Secretary, said that the Commission would announce its Executive Director, William P. Bundy, a son-in-law of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, is expected to get the post.

In a memorandum to the Commission, the President also said:

"It is no wonder that a Nation so recently thrust into a position of world leadership is sometimes bewildered by its new role."

In this situation, the President declared, "the Commission has the opportunity to sound a call for greatness to a resolute people, in the best tradition of our Founding Fathers."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1960]

A CALL FOR GREATNESS

In what could be a historic step in the development of our free institutions, President Eisenhower has named a distinguished group of private citizens, under Dr. Henry M. Wriston's leadership, to a Commission on National Goals. The President has defined the group's task as that of sounding "a call for greatness to a resolute people."

Greatness for a nation like ours in this era of unprecedented rapidity of change and unprecedented challenges to freedom must be composed of many elements. In terms of our basic values the search for greatness must be in important part the search for greater liberty and greater dignity of every individual in our society.

In setting goals for a still greater future America the Wriston Commission will have to point the way to elimination of those barriers which still prevent large numbers of our fellow citizens from realizing their full potentialities. The elimination of discrimination based on color, on race, on religion, on national origin, or even on sex must obviously be one of our prime aims. And high on our priority list must certainly also be a radical improvement in the quality and quantity of the education available to our people, for education in a democracy is the magic key which opens the door of opportunity for maximum development of each individual's capabilities.

Since the economic power of our Nation is central in determining what we can do as a nation and how well we can live as individuals, the Wriston Commission will have to pay close attention to our possibilities in this area. Fortunately, a good start has been made in this field by the earlier work of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Clearly something like a 4- or 5-percent average annual gain in our total output is needed if we are to meet the problem posed by our rapidly growing population, by the requirements of defense and of financing the needed rapid expansion of scientific research, and by our moral obligations to the hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings in underdeveloped nations that are now beginning the industrialization process. And to get this rapid economic growth we need major gains in productivity and substantial reductions in production costs, essential improvements in our economy which are required also to meet the challenge of ever-increasing competition on world markets.

Even this brief résumé of some of the key areas to which the Wriston Commission must devote its attention makes clear how complex are the problems it faces. But even more complex than setting American goals for greatness is the task of implementing those goals. The Wriston Commission has not, and we may be sure does not want, the power to order our people to do anything. Obviously what President Eisenhower has in mind is the belief that if the call to greatness is sounded by such a distinguished group our democratic political system has the potentialities for responding to the call.

To lay down the goals for a better and still greater America is to give our Nation a sense of purpose and a sense of direction which enlightened and vigorous political leadership can then use to mobilize our people toward the attainment of those goals.

Stored Foodstuffs and Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of us are very much concerned about the possibility of adequate foodstuffs in the event of a nuclear attack upon this country. Such an attack, however horrible in its comprehension, might occur, and the article which follows, by Dr. J. R. Neller of the University of Florida Agricultural Experiment Station in Gainesville, Fla., gives us some very interesting information about this problem.

I noted with a great deal of interest that Dr. Neller recommends that the present levels of stored foodstuffs should be carefully maintained. This statement emphasizes the feeling shared by many of my colleagues that our surplus food is a blessing rather than a curse. I hope that a study, as recommended by Dr. Neller, can be made as a possible means for improving the storage of our foodstuff against fallout contamination.

The complete article by Dr. Neller follows:

[From Science, Jan. 1, 1960]

STORED FOODSTUFFS AND FALLOUT

(By J. R. Neller)

Because of the high concentration of radioactive fallout in bombed areas after a nuclear attack, soils would be contaminated and crops could not be grown for a considerable period. The effects of this critical period of possible starvation could be mitigated by utilization of so-called surplus grains, milk, and egg products from storage. The shelters that house the foodstuffs would keep them from being contaminated by strontium 90 and other long-lived radioisotopes. These storage structures could be decontaminated far more easily and more quickly than the soils on which crops would have to be grown.

Much attention is being given to the problem of the accumulation of large supplies of surplus grains, milk, and egg products in storage in this country, and to the cost of maintaining the proper storage conditions to insure against spoilage. Granted that these costs are high, such surpluses nevertheless constitute the cheapest kind of insurance against possible starvation periods that would follow an atomic holocaust. In fact, protective storage of foodstuffs seems to be the only means of alleviating, at least to some extent, critical food shortages in contaminated regions.

The normal production of foodstuffs would probably be suddenly and completely cut off in extensive areas beneath bomb bursts. Data are at hand that show how long the present stored surpluses would supply the population. These data show that they would be consumed in a comparatively short time, even when rationed at a bare maintenance level.

For these reasons the present levels of stored foodstuffs should be carefully main-

tained. More than that, a study should be made of possible means of improving storage against fallout contamination. In addition, consideration should be given to the advisability of increasing the stored amounts of some foodstuffs and possibly decreasing others. Maintaining reserves of fiber materials should also be considered, particularly of materials needed for clothing.

Panamanian-United States Relations

SPEECH
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Panama has requested the right to fly the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone. This request has been under consideration in the executive branch, where it has apparently received mixed reactions. Up to the present time, there has been no formal and final decision. The pending resolution is most timely. The action we take on this resolution today will enable the executive branch to take cognizance of the views of the Congress before acting on the request by Panama. I believe that it would be a serious mistake to permit the Panamanian flag to be flown over the Canal Zone. Since the first U.S. treaty with Panama in 1903, ours is the only flag which has flown over the Canal Zone, where by treaty we exercise in perpetuity all the rights, power, and authority we would possess and exercise if the United States were sovereign.

The treaty language is not ambiguous. It is clear and to the point. It spells out that in the Canal Zone the United States has all the rights, power, and authority that the United States "would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority."

I am convinced that this resolution is urgently necessary. It is the result of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs on the flag question. The subcommittee did not formally pass on the wisdom of granting this request by Panama, although several members, including myself, were ready to vote in the negative. The resolution reflects the unanimous subcommittee view that it would constitute a major deviation from traditional treaty interpretation and that the executive branch should be enjoined from arrogating to itself the authority to bypass the joint approval requirements of our constitutional treatymaking process.

Although the issues seem clear to those of us who have followed and participated in the subcommittee hearings, I know that there are some very able and conscientious men who entertain doubts about the propriety of the Congress adopting a sense resolution on such a a matter.

Such misgivings were not overlooked by the subcommittee, nor were they ignored by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs which confirmed the subcommittee's action with but one dissenting vote. This resolution is before the House as the result of the mature judgment of those who carefully weighed the testimony and considered the conflicting views of a number of qualified witnesses, both official and private.

The views of those opposed to the resolution may be summarized as falling broadly within the following seven categories:

First. Changing conditions in Panama require flexibility of action in the Department of State and the resolution would prove a burdensome interefer-ence.

Second. The resolution may infringe on the constitutional power and duty of the President to conduct our foreign affairs.

Third. The resolution embarks the United States on a dangerous precedent in shackling executive prerogative and could lead to the necessity of congressional reapproval of every treaty situation which presents a novel point.

Fourth. The resolution raises, without answering, questions concerning the nature and definition of traditional treaty interpretation.

Fifth. That flying the Panamanian flag would be of no real consequence to our position there and would constitute a harmless and costless gesture of good will.

Sixth. That authorizing Panama to fly its flag would be an exercise, not a denial of our control.

Seventh. The resolution unjustifiably assumes flying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone could be a dangerous first step to other and more important rights.

Let us examine these points, one by one.

First, to hold that changing conditions require flexibility of action is plausible, but highly specious. Compromise can be good, but if carried to the extreme of surrender of a right, can be the worst solution for an exigency. Flexibility should always be held within reasonable and authorized limits. The proposal to fly the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone is very definitely not within the authorized limits of our traditional interpretation of the treaty.

Second, the resolution does not deprive the Executive of any of its constitutional power and duty to conduct our foreign affairs. The resolution simply reminds the Executive that it has a partner in the treaty process who should be consulted before changes are made.

Third, the resolution would not lead to the necessity of congressional reapproval of every treaty situation which presents a novel point. I think the debate today has made abundantly clear that it is aimed at averting actions which would have the effect of improperly bypassing the Congress.

Fourth, the point that the resolution raises unanswered questions concerning the nature and definition of traditional interpretation is not likely to be raised by those who have studied the history of our treaty negotiations with Panama. Records of the 1955 treaty negotiations show that at that time our State Department held a strong negative view on the flag question and was vitally concerned with preserving our sole right to fly the flag over the Canal Zone.

Fifth, the view that flying the Panamanian flag would be of no real consequence is not shared by Panamanians, who are fully aware of its significance as a preeminently important symbol of sovereignty.

Sixth, granting Panama permission to fly the flag would not be an exercise of control. It would be a surrender of a symbol of control that could not easily be revoked.

Seventh, I fear that those who believe the resolution unjustifiably assume that flying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone could be a dangerous first step to other and more important rights are either unaware of the total demands of Panama, or have mistakenly discounted their real significance.

Actually, it is not so much that there would follow additional demands. We have now, and have had for some time, demands for further surrenders. To grant the flag request will unquestionably give encouragement for a renewal of a long chain of demands by Panama of additional rights.

The Republic of Panama has officially already urged a number of concessions, all of which were unequivocally rejected by the United States during the 1955 treaty negotiations. They were denied as being in conflict with the basic rights of the United States under provisions of the 1903 treaty with Panama. They are:

First. That the Panamanian flag be flown as well as the U.S. flag in the Canal Zone, including on vessels.

Second. That Spanish be the official language in the Canal Zone along with the English language.

Third. That foreign consuls in the Canal Zone be accredited by Panama rather than by the United States.

Fourth. That Panamanian citizens before Canal Zone courts be tried by mixed tribunals, American and Panamanian judges.

Fifth. That Panamanian postage be used on all mail matter dispatched from the Canal Zone.

Sixth. That the United States wholly recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these official demands constitute the best answer to those who feel that granting the flag request would not lead to further demands.

I find it somewhat appalling to realize the extent to which our present foreign policy is tinged here and there with attempts at appeasement when what we should do is stand firm on maintaining our rights.

Some people, disgusted by the unjustified vilifications, criticisms and recent mob violence directed against the United States, are seriously proposing the advisability of placing the Panama Canal under some form of international control. I am opposed to such an abdica-

tion of our rights and responsibilities. If in the remote future, however, conditions should become so changed and altered that the logical course would narrow down to a form of international control, I wish to point out that our authority and power of decision would have been impaired, if not completely negated by an earlier surrender on the flag issue.

When the executive branch took a strong stand in 1955 against flying the Panamanian flag in the zone, it inferred that the Congress would be consulted before taking any action which might be regarded as receding from the position of our sovereignty in that area. To yield on this point would be construed by many as a sign of appeasement and weakness and could result in erosion of our control as a matter or right. I cannot believe that in the long run the majority of Panamanians will head the exhortation of those unfriendly to us, whether they come from Castro, from Nasser, or from the Kremlin. We have an abiding friendship for the people of Panama, whose independence we sponsored and guaranteed. We must maintain a firm basis for our mutual friendship, esteem and trust. We must not embark on any course that would involve a double meaning, and that is just what granting the flag request would do. The proponents in the United States would treat it as a token gesture; the Panamanians would accept it for its true value and be justifiably provoked by our efforts to minimize it.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of preserving our basic treaty rights, for the sake of avoiding needless future misunderstandings, and for the sake of truly promoting our mutual friendship with Panama, I urge the immediate adoption of this resolution.

Resolutions of North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the Board of Directors of the North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives.

This is a great organization of farmers and their views are the views of most of the farmers of my State.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

We note that recommendations have been made for further enlarging the soil bank and we respectfully urge Congress to carefully and completely study and evaluate the effects any further increase in the soil bank will have on the whole economic life of all citizens of a preponderantly agricultural State such as North Dakota, before the soil bank is further increased.

RESOLUTION 2

We condemn the plans and proposals to increase or eliminate the ceiling on interest rates paid by the Government on Federal financing and further, we condemn all proposals to increase the interest rate on REA loans, and we urge our congressional delegation to oppose all moves in that diection.

RESOLUTION 3—SLACK WATER NAVIGATION

Since slack water navigation is deemed by many people to be a necessity downstream from the mainstem dams in the Missouri River, for the reason that navigation and power irrigation uses for water do not coincide; we have, therefore, in the past, requested that a study be made of slack water navigation in this area with an eye to conserving water for more provident and beneficial uses upstream.

In his budget message, President Eisenhower has included an item of only $10,000 to make such a study. However, the Corps of Engineers has stated that at least $300,000 would be needed to make an adequate study.

Since it appears that slack water navigation would solve both the irrigation power needs for water as well as those of navigation, we believe that it is in the best interests of the Nation to have this study made as soon as possible.

Therefore, we, the board of directors of the North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives, do hereby resolve that we ask the Congress to appropriate the full amount of $300,000 needed by the Corps of Engineers to make a study of slack water navigation on the lower Missouri.

And we further resolve to ask Congress that these funds be granted as soon as possible in order that the study can start without undue, costly delay.

A Sound Civil Rights Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Berkshire Eagle, in Pittsfield, Mass., dated January 29 and which I believe to be very important and timely:

A SOUND CIVIL RIGHTS PLAN

The stickiest political question confronting the 1960 session of Congress is how to frame a meaningful civil rights bill that will be at least slightly acceptable to the South. This, of course, is a perennial problem; but in a national election year it has particular political urgency. Neither party dares go before the electorate without a current civil rights record to point to.

Until this week, the picture on Capitol Hill was confused and not at all encouraging. The only specific proposal before Congress was a plan suggested by the President's Civil Rights Commission for appointment of Federal registrars to deal with situations in which Southern Negroes are systematically restrained from voting in national elections. Whatever its virtues, this plan was badly undercut by the President himself, who indicated some weeks ago that he doubts its constitutionality.

In the midst of this confusion, a new proposal has now been brought forward by Vice President Nixon's friend and protegé, Attorney General William P. Rogers. The Rogers plan is a substitute for the Civil Rights Commission's plan, but it goes considerably farther in several important respects. It nonetheless appears to have the blessings of the White House, and it offers a sane and practical rallying point for liberals of both parties.

The basic feature of the Rogers plan is that it would be administered by the Federal courts rather than by the Civil Rights Commission. It provides for appointment of "voting referees" by the Federal courts in localities where civil suits brought by the U.S. Justice Department have exposed a consistent pattern of discrimination against prospective Negro voters. The "voting referees" would then be authorized to certify as eligible voters persons in that locality who had previously been unable to register because of race, color or religion.

Unlike the Federal registrars proposed in the Civil Rights Commission plan, these voting referees would be empowered to qualify voters for State as well as Federal elections. They would also be empowered to see that qualified Negroes are actually permitted to vote as well as to register. And most important of all, any local election official who tried to prevent a person from voting, after that person had been declared eligible by a Federal referee, would be subject to prosecution for contempt of court at a nonjury trial.

This proposal is no panacea. Because the judicial process is necessarily slow, and because each locality in which the plan is invoked would be subject to separate legal action, the benefits it would bring would obviously come slowly. But it nevertheless would represent a big new step in the right direction. And it would take effective account of the fact that the right to vote is the right from which all other civil rights for southern Negroes must eventually spring.

In sum, the Rogers plan is one that deserves firm support not only from President Eisenhower, who has too often limited himself to vague platitudes on the civil rights question, but from liberals of both parties. Who gets the credit for a workable civil rights bill this year is a lot less important than that a workable bill be passed.

What Is Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, each year the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronic Industries Association, in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, sponsors the Voice of Democracy contest among high school students. In my opinion, they render an outstanding public service by conducting these contests as a means to stimulate American youth to think about the meaning of our form of government in our own lives and to communicate their ideas to others. Winning essays are selected by a panel of judges, after which the top essayist for each State comes to Washington on a 4-day, all expenses paid, trip. Their activities here

will begin on Sunday, February 21, the eve of George Washington's birthday, and be climaxed by a national awards program on Wednesday, February 24.

The North Dakota winner in the 1959–60 Voice of Democracy contest is Miss Bonnie Nelson of rural route No. 2, Mandan, N. Dak. She has written an excellent article on what she herself found democracy to mean, and I am proud to commend it to the House of Representatives.

The article follows:

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

One Saturday afternoon, while sitting at home, I began thinking of the essay I should write for "The Voice of Democracy" contest. It occurred to me that if someone asked me, "What is democracy?" how would I answer? The more I thought of this, the more I began to realize that I couldn't define it with just a word, a sentence, or even a paragraph. Finally, I came to a rather frightening realization that I couldn't really answer that question. So I began my search for the answer to "What is democracy?"

I found that democracy is the foundation upon which this United States of America rests. It is the very basis of our system of government. I went on with my research and dug out the history of our democracy.

The United States was not always democratic. In 1776 it was under the tyrannical rule of an English king. The quest for democracy prompted the drafting of the Declaration of Independence. Democracy is the groundwork that our Constitution was built upon; the search for it steered men through the Revolution and led Washington and his handful of bloody and battered men across the Delaware. Was this democracy? No, it was the base of our democracy, but this wasn't the elusive definition that I was looking for.

I went on with my search and came to the battles fought for freedom's sake. There was the French and Indian War, the War of 1812, and finally, as the awful culmination of man's desire for equality—the Civil War. That was the bloody and horrible price we had to pay.

As I read further I came to World Wars I and II, and then to the Korean conflict. What did I discover? That we—as a nation—had upheld our rights and our freedoms. We had protected our democracy. But, where is this democracy? What is this invisible object that many have paid the supreme sacrifice for? We have fought with words, bullets, and prayer. We have maintained our right to practice democracy.

I went to bed that night with democracy ringing in my ears. It was still there when I awoke the next morning and dressed for church. After church, while I mingled with the people, I heard men discussing who would be the man to fill North Dakota's vacancy in the Senate. The merits and demerits of a number of people were being discussed. Continuing on, I came to a cluster of people talking about the sermon they had heard that morning. All speaking their minds freely. Arriving downtown, I began looking at store windows, and suddenly it struck me. Why, of course, this is democracy—the people. I had seen it all that morning, just as I did every other day. Democracy is all around me. There is free enterprise; the refinery upon the hill and the stores lining the streets. Free political discussion; unrestrained, heated, and sometimes very critical and controversial. And my church—there it was, for anyone to worship in.

Here, then, was democracy. Democracy had been surrounding me everywhere, but I had been too blind to see it.

I felt better now, but I still wasn't satisfied. I asked myself, "What, to me, is the most important facet of democracy?"

There it was again—"to me"—the individualistic point of view. Democracy is opinion, rights, beliefs, and freedom.

But I think the aspect of democracy that is most important and indispensable, is the side of democracy born in the soul of every human being, regardless of the color of his skin, or where he makes his home: the right to worship his God whenever and wherever he wishes.

Now when I think of democracy, I don't necessarily picture legal documents and history books; I picture the little church around the corner. The children coming to Sunday school, and later on, their parents bringing, not sending them, to church.

Democracy is what you see every Sunday morning in front of the churches, cathedrals, and synagogues, and hear within their walls. This, to me, is its most important phase. It is that part of democracy that is within a man's soul—it can be neither destroyed nor enslaved.

Now, I was fully satisfied. I knew what democracy was. I now knew how I would answer the query, "What is democracy?" Democracy is Main Street, U.S.A.

World War I Veterans' Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Harold E. Stearley, commander of the Veterans of World War I, Barracks No. 1178, Brazil, Ind., sets out in the following letter to the editor of the Indianapolis Star, true facts regarding the plight of the vast majority of World War I veterans. Congress has completely overlooked legislation which would give the rapidly dwindling ranks of World War I veterans proper recognition for the services and sacrifices they endured during their youthful years. Some of these veterans' education and established businesses were completely terminated by reason of military service at that time.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS' NEEDS

(By Harold E. Stearley, commander, Veterans World War I, Barracks No. 1178, Brazil, Ind.)

It needs to be brought to the attention of the powers-that-be that ever since 1917 the World War I veteran has been working at a financial and physical disadvantage * * * It now is more than apparent to all, who will but stop and consider, that the World War I veteran, in order to stay in the present-day economic race, must have a monthly return of at least $100 a month from the Government (no strings attached) in order that he or she may make that long last mile (outside the breadline).

Ten thousand eight hundred World War I men are dying every month, 360 every day, 15 every hour, 1 every 4 minutes. Most are going to an early grave from worry for lack of proper food, clothing and shelter. * * * Whenever a pension for veterans of World War I is mentioned in Congress, invariably certain propagandists attempt to stampede the taxpayers by citing astronomical cost projections.

Let us consider a case in point. In 1959 this barracks had a membership of 119. During said year we lost seven members by death. It is reasonable to assume that this death rate will increase each year as the years go by; but even with the same annual death rate within 17 years our membership will be entirely used up; and the same ratio is bound to apply to the entire national membership.

By 1976 any World War I man will be living on borrowed time. It naturally follows that the cost of this proposed pension will be reduced 6 percent the first year in effect; 12 percent the second year and, therefore, by 1976 only 6 percent of these men will be still living and the cost of said pension will have been reduced 94 percent. These facts and figures are arrived at by simple arithmetic. It is impossible for the propagandists to juggle the above figures.

We would like to call it to the attention of the powers-that-be that the majority of World War I men cannot qualify for social security, and the remainder can draw only a token amount per month. They were born 20 years too soon.

Brazil Barracks No. 1178, therefore, wishes to respectfully request the legislative and executive departments of the Government of the United States to immediately enact special World War I pension legislation along the same lines as that enacted for the Grand Army of the Republic and for the Spanish-American War veterans.

Battle Lines: 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, January 30, 1960:

BATTLE LINES: 1960

Conservatism—a label that the Republican Party has worn for as many years as anybody can remember—had its face scrubbed by Vice President NIXON in his kickoff speech of the 1960 campaign. The result should be of great benefit to the Republicans who go to the people in the fall elections.

In his Chicago speech, NIXON, as top spokesman for the 1960 brigade of GOP candidates, restated the party's devotion to basic principles (and drew the campaign battle lines) in these words:

"We Republicans have unshakable faith that the way to achieve [America's] goals is by the free choice of millions of individual consumers, by the productive efforts of free management and labor, and by local and State action wherever possible—supplemented when necessary but not supplanted by the Federal Government.

"The philosophy of most of our opponents is just the opposite. They claim that the road to progress has to be paved with bigger government, more spending and higher tax bills for the people to pay.

"For 20 years Democratic administrations promised to give the American people the economic abundance and prosperity that the people, stimulated by 7 years of Republican faith in freedom, have in great measure now achieved for themselves. And as long as they are left free of arbitrary controls, the American people will continue to achieve greater and greater abundance with fair shares for everyone."

There will, thus, be no change in the party's attachment to Government frugality and

concern for keeping Government's hands as far as possible off the processes of everyday economic life.

But conservatism, in the old sense, went out the window when the Vice President turned to world affairs:

"We offer partnership, our advice and assistance in helping peoples everywhere to achieve the economic progress which is essential if they are to have better food and housing and health than they presently enjoy. * * * Let our mission in the world today be to extend to all mankind not just the ideal but the fact of freedom—by preserving and protecting and defending it, by helping others achieve it, by offering our own example of a free society at work."

And domestically, he set targets for increased protection for the aged, the unemployed and the disabled to match, we should think, anything the Democrats may propose—and certainly a more forthright civil rights program than they will find it convenient to match.

Extremists of the right and left will quarrel vigorously with parts of the program. The majority of thoughtful moderates will find, we think, that it boils down to a simple logical proposition: The Nation's obligations to improve the well-being of its people and help build a durable peace in the world can best be met by the unequaled energies of our free system.

Call it liberal conservatism, conservative liberalism, or plain commonsense—we think it is cut to the pattern of the space age.

Reduction and Stricter Control of Importation of Beef and Other Red Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the Kansas Legislature, calling upon the Congress, the U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything within their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats.

The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Tariff Commission to reduce and control the importation of beef and other red meats from foreign countries and to establish smaller quotas and other controls on such imports

Whereas the expanding imports of beef and other red meats on the hoof and in the frozen or processed form pose a very serious threat to the domestic cattle and livestock industries of this country; and

Whereas such imports into this country of beef and other red meats are currently expanding at a rate which is altogether out of proportion to any justifiable need and at the present time such imports constitute at least 10 percent of our domestic consumption of beef and other red meats; and

Whereas the domestic livestock producers of this country have for some time been expending their own funds to expand the national market for beef and other red meats and if imports of these commodities are not further restricted any expansion in said national market will result only in providing foreign competitors with a most attractive market at the expense of the American producers; and

Whereas the feeding of grain to cattle and livestock by the domestic cattle and livestock industries provides the principal means of solving the burdensome feed-grain surplus now depressing the total agricultural market; and

Whereas a reasonable restriction on imports of beef and other red meats would provide a means of reducing this feed-grain surplus, as then Americans would consume American-fed beef and livestock rather than that fed in foreign countries; and

Whereas the further prosperity and strength of this country is in a large measure dependent upon a prosperous and growing domestic agricultural economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States, U.S. Tariff Commission, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to do everything within their respective powers to bring about a reduction and stricter control of the importation of beef and other red meats in any form from any foreign country and to establish smaller quotas for the importation of the same, such quotas to be predetermined on an annual basis, thus providing American beef and livestock producers with the needed protection and vital encouragement necessary for the maintenance and welfare of their own industry, and helping insure the future prosperity and strength of this country; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President and Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States and to the Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body.

FEBRUARY 2, 1960.

JESS TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 4, 1960.

PAUL P. WIMSETT,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Late Honorable John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I received the news of the passing of the late Honorable John J. O'Connor. To those who knew him, he has left behind him a true and deep spirit of admiration, not only for his personal integrity, but as one who with courage undaunted in the face of adversity, remained intellectually vigorous and high spirited until the last, never losing the hope of combating his illness and returning to the work he loved, that of helping his fellow men. This spirit of survival and good humor until the last is truly worthy of the man that the late John O'Connor was.

Many things could be said in superfluity of the individual activities of such a man, but it is the spirit of the man which held forth through his many undertakings and which endeared him to his friends. To his family and loved ones, I extend my deepest sorrow and the comfort that this fine person lived life to his fullest capacity, never suffering defeat even to the last, but merely passing into the fuller life for which he strived, and one which he deserved.

President's New Reconstruction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the February 15, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report discussing the President's proposal for the enactment of legislation to police elections. As the article so clearly states, this new proposition brings back memories of the force bills of the reconstruction days following the War Between the States. As was once said, "he who fails to remember the past is condemned to live it again." The operation of the reconstruction force bills in New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and other States outside the South should serve as a warning to all who would support this new revolutionary proposal.

The article follows:

HERE'S THE LATEST PLAN FOR CRACKING DOWN ON SOUTH

Judges in Federal courts, already wrestling with the problem of integrating races in schools, may soon be given the added job of policing elections.

President Eisenhower wants to set up machinery that can be used to assure that Negroes in Southern States are allowed to register and vote in State, local, and national elections. This machinery would be operated by judges in Federal courts with the help of so-called voting referees.

To the South, this proposal brings up memories of the "force bills" of Reconstruction days after the Civil War. Once before, back in 1871, the Federal Government passed a law to police voting, but only in elections for Members of Congress. This law was administered by election supervisors appointed by the Federal courts. Their powers, however, were abused by politicians in the big cities of the North, and the act was repealed in 1894.

At the present time, the plan is to bring Federal power to bear to protect or assure voting rights with more safeguards against abuse than were contained in previous legislation.

The plan, as being offered to Congress with White House backing, proceeds in methodical steps.

FIRST, A COMPLAINT

A Negro in the South, for example, complains that he is not permitted to vote, although qualified. If the Department of Justice, which gets the complaint, decides that it has merit, suit is brought in Federal court under the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

The suit is heard before a judge, without a jury. If the court finds that voting rights have been denied because of race or color, and that there has been a pattern of such deprivation, a U.S. voting referee is appointed to continue the investigation. The referee is authorized to receive complaints from any other persons in that State who claim to have been deprived of their voting rights.

After holding hearings and listening to evidence, the referee sends his findings to the Federal court where the case was originally opened. The judge accepts the referee's report, "unless clearly erroneous," and puts the findings in the form of a decree listing the names of those kept from voting because of race or color.

Voting certificates are issued to every person named in the decree. Copies of the decree are served on all election officials of the State by the U.S. Attorney General's Office. Any State official who refuses to honor the decree faces action for contempt.

FOR A LOOPHOLE: A PLUG

In the South, some voting registrars in various States have resigned, leaving their positions unfilled. This effectively blocked efforts of some Negroes to register and vote for the first time.

The administration's proposal would plug this loophole by providing that, if a voting registrar resigns and no successor is named, any act of the registrar which constitutes a deprivation of voting rights should be considered an act of the State, and the State may then be sued in Federal court.

HOW OLD LAW WORKED

The "force bill" repealed by Congress in 1894 was not linked to race or color. It was based on the constitutional power of Congress to regulate its own Members.

Under the force bill, so-called supervisors of elections were appointed by Federal courts, which then stepped out of the picture. These appointments could be made if two or more citizens in towns with a population of more than 20,000 requested to have "guarded and scrutinized" the registration of voters for any congressional election, or the election itself.

The supervisors were empowered to challenge the qualifications of anyone seeking to register, and to mark the registration lists in such ways as to detect irregularities.

In elections, the supervisors were authorized to challenge any voters and to count the ballots. Federal marshals assisted the supervisors. Interference with these officials was made a criminal offense.

The supervisors reported to a chief supervisor on the fairness of an election. If irregularities were found, the chief supervisor had authority to hold hearings, take testimony and issue subpenas. Results of such investigations were to be filed with the clerk of the House of Representatives.

IN THE SOUTH: LITTLE EFFECT

History records failure of the Federal election law in the South. Federal authorities tried thousands of times to prosecute violations of the act, but few convictions resulted.

In South Carolina, for example, there were 1,392 indictments, but only 114 convictions under the election law.

One-party control by the Democrats made enforcement extremely difficult. Moreover, as the Ku Klux Klan gained strength, it severely restricted voting by Negroes and northern carpetbaggers.

TROUBLE IN THE NORTH

It was in the big cities of the North that the Federal election law had the most impact. Democrats in Congress charged that Republican Party machines in the North deputized criminals, drunks, and armed thugs as marshals, and used them to keep Democratic voters from the polls.

In 1876, of 5,001 Federal deputy marshals appointed to protect voting rights, 4,194—more than 80 percent—were appointed in the three northern States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. One election supervisor in New York City drew fees totaling $145,000 for his services.

In 1892, a special investigating committee of the House of Representatives went to New York City to observe the presidential election. A majority report written by the three Democratic members recommended repeal of the election law because it has "failed to produce any good results in the direction of the purity of elections or the protection of the ballot box."

The law was used, the majority report said, "only as part of the machinery of a party to compensate voters who are friendly to it, and to frighten from the polls the voters of the opposing party."

BRIGADE OF TROOPS

In House debate on a move to repeal the law in September 1893, Representative John C. Black, Democrat, of Illinois, described the use of Federal marshals in the 1892 election in Chicago:

"Early in the morning of that day, or rather in the shades of the preceding night, the supervisors and deputy marshals were arrayed, and there came 3,786 of them, more than a full brigade of such troops as they were.

"They were drawn from the alleys, this militia of oppression. They were drawn from the slums, this battalion of bummers * * * and thus they stood, armed and equipped for their service, to protect the election in the city of Chicago, and in the great State of Illinois."

In the Republican minority report, it was said that Federal supervisors and marshals were needed to combat ballot-box stuffing and the issuance of fraudulent naturalization certificates by Democratic Party machines.

With Democrats in control of Congress, the force bill regulating voting was repealed in 1894.

OPPOSITION IN SOUTH

Despite the differences between the old reconstruction law and the administration's new proposal, Democratic opposition in the South remains strong.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, has called the plan for establishing referees "bait in a new election year for a second reconstruction era which would throw into Federal receivership the election machinery not only of the Southern States, but also of all 50 States."

"Now we are asked," said Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, "to repeat the mistake which Congress made nearly 100 years ago."

With these objections and the record of past experience in mind, Congress, in the weeks ahead, must decide whether it wants to hand over to Federal control the problem of policing voting rights of Negroes in the South.

NATO: Its Second Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very thoughtful article by Dr. Howard White, of the department of government, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, on the problems facing NATO as we enter the second decade of the alliance.

Dr. White was a delegate to the Atlantic Congress held in London last June and participated in by about 650 delegates from the NATO nations and was an observer at the fifth NATO parliamentarians' conference held in Washington last November.

The article follows:

NATO: ITS SECOND DECADE

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, was born in the cold fear that gripped Western Europe after the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia in 1948. NATO was created as a military alliance in 1949. Western Europe was only beginning to recover from war's devastation. The Communists were the largest political party in Italy and France. They were stirring up discontent among the impoverished peoples of Western Europe. If civil wars were started, Russian troops in Eastern Germany and other satellites could readily come to the aid of their Communist comrades. Collective action by the nations of Western Europe, aided mightily by men and equipment from the United States and Canada, was promised by the treaty which created NATO. There was an imperative need for mutual protection, then.

Now, NATO has entered its second decade. Western Europe is prosperous. Industry, commerce, agriculture have surpassed prewar levels. Living standards are higher and are still rising. The fear of Communist aggression against the West is receding, fostered by Khrushchev's soothing propaganda. Although in its meeting in Paris last month NATO's Council repeated its annual call for speedy attainment of NATO's goal of 30 ground divisions, governments of member states continue to stall on meeting their obligations. Secretary Herter's reminder to their Foreign and Defense Ministers that our commitment to maintain troops in Europe was made on the assumption of an integrated defense system of adequate size, seems to have left them unmoved. If Europeans are unconcerned, why should we maintain armed forces so far from our shores? Shall our soldiers come home?

France stands out as the chief obstacle to attaining a military force of the nature and size planned for NATO. Even before De Gaulle returned to power, practically all of the French troops assigned to NATO had been withdrawn to wage war in Algeria. Last year, he withdrew naval contingents from NATO command and denied French air bases for U.S. air forces equipped with atomic weapons. De Gaulle contends that an integrated military force under supernational command is dead. The grandeur of France permits no recognition of a higher authority than his.

Before condemning De Gaulle's perhaps misguided attempt to restore the grandeur of France, we should look further into NATO's defensive strategy. Even if the recommended 30 divisions were in being, integrated, and fully equipped, they would only be NATO's shield. They could hold off Russia's 175 divisions only a short time. They are only a shield. The sword is the U.S. Strategic Air Command, assisted by British forces. Neither of these nor the forces eventually to be armed with intercontinental ballistic missiles are integrated under NATO's Supreme Headquarter's Command. Do you blame the French for insisting upon a position corresponding to that of their allies? And if the larger powers will not let their forces be completely integrated under NATO's command, why should the smaller nations hasten to do what they are asked to do?

Perhaps nothing shows more clearly how precarious is the NATO alliance than the split over the policy for West Berlin. Adenauer and De Gaulle oppose negotiating with Khrushchev over the status of West Berlin. Macmillan seems to have persuaded Eisenhower that some concessions, such as reducing the number of troops stationed there, will not impair the military position of the West. Our Government seems to ignore the warning by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson that any concession to Khrushchev brings closer to realization his often-announced objective: the withdrawal of foreign troops from oversea bases. Some of our generals are suggesting that when intercontinental ballistic missiles become operations we will not need to maintain our troops in Europe. Already, we have agreed to withdraw from our bases in Morocco. If our armies are brought home, is it reasonable to expect that the sword will flash out to avenge attack on any of the other 14 members of NATO? If you think we would go to their defense, you are more optimistic than I am.

NATO members are divided three ways over trade policy. The European Economic Community, the Common Market countries, comprise West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg. They form a customs union with a common external tariff and common trading policy toward the rest of the world. They are more than a customs union. They plan integration generally in economic matters, even to establishing a common currency. They think that they are taking the first step toward political unification of Europe, toward establishing the United States of Europe. Opposing the Common Market is a new group, the European Free Trade Association, the so-called outer seven: Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugual, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. They propose to abolish all trade barriers among themselves, but will leave each country free to deal independently with all other countries. This division between NATO members is not primarily economic. Germany exports more to the seven than to her Common Market partners. The Common Market leaders have worked on the assumption that political union must come with economic union. The outer seven believe that politics and economics can be kept separate. The third group comprises the two transatlantic NATO members: Canada and the United States. Why should these two countries remain in a military alliance if they are excluded from the economic benefits to free trade with Allies? Possibly a workable arrangement will be made at a meeting in Paris this week.

Trade policy is not the only economic issue disrupting the alliance. There is the question whether the other prospering NATO members will join the United States in giving financial and technical assistance to underdeveloped nations, which have been able to fend off Russian domination, largely due to aid from the United States. Obviously, this calls for an extension of NATO, functionally as well as grographically. Already, as a military alliance, NATO has spread beyond the North Atlantic to Italy, Greece, and Turkey. Greece and Turkey, as well as the struggling nations of southern Asia and the emerging states of Africa, need help from the economically stronger NATO members. NATO's Secretary General Paul-Henri Spank has said that "It is in the underdeveloped parts of the world that the decisive struggle" with the Communist world will be waged. Time and again has Khrushchev challenged us to economic competition in place of a military conflict. Verbally, the challenge has been accepted. The NATO Council at its December meeting in Paris agreed upon a 10-year program to branch out into economic and scientific cooperation—without any relaxation in military defense.

Genuine cooperation in fiancial and economic aid to underdeveloped countries as well as in producing weapons for their own defense is imperative. The drain on our gold reserve—over $4 billion in 1959—cannot long be tolerated. Secretary Herter made it plain to the NATO Council that unless Europe does more to meet NATO commitments militarily and helps shoulder the burden of technical and financial aid to underdeveloped nations, the United States will not be doing it much longer.

The evidence I have presented: Failure of the allies to maintain an adequate, integrated military shield and sword; disagreement over the status of West Berlin; over a common trade policy looking toward closer political as well as economic union; and over aid to less developed peoples—this evidence seems to warrant the conclusion that NATO's second decade will either be its last or, if it endures, it will have to grow into a political federation, an economic union, and a military alliance with an integrated defensive force.

From Paris where the NATO Council met last month came the report that the cracks in NATO's structure are widening. "The North Atlantic allies are engaging in what has been very much the look of the old game of power politics. Rivalries and hostilities are more and more nakedly exhibited—Franco-German alliance on the continent versus the British-led group on the periphery"—the United States and Canada on the sidelines: Canada unwilling to offend its senior partner and the United States girding for its quadrennial campaign to choose a President.

Most observant, thoughtful men and women in NATO lands have become aware of the degeneration of "the most powerful peacetime alliance in the history of the Atlantic community." Illustrative of their concern was the Atlantic Congress which met in London last June. Almost 650 delegates from 14 of the 15 member states spent 6 busy days and nights in subcommittee, committee, and plenary sessions, devising what they thought should be NATO's program for its second decade. The Congress adopted the declaration that "The time is ripe for these nations to build an Atlantic community with responsibilities extending to military, political, economic, social, and scientific fields." The building of such a community was left to the national governments which should "convene" a special conference of leading citizens to examine exhaustively means of attaining greater unity."

Last November, the fifth NATO Parliamentarian's Conference assembled in Washington, the first time it has met on this side of the Atlantic. NATO Parliamentarians are a cross-section of majority and minority parties in their national legislatures. They cannot act to bind their governments. However, since they had initiated the proposal for the Atlantic Congress and many of them had been active in its deliberations, their sessions in Washington were largely devoted to considering ways and means for carrying into effect the recommendations of the Congress.

They unanimously recommended that a conference of not more than 100 representative citizens be assembled at the earliest possible date and for whatever length of time is required to examine exhaustively and recommend how greater cooperation and unity of purpose within the Atlantic community may best be developed. The delegates seemed confident that their national legislatures would soon provide for this special conference. Our own Congress may act within the next 2 months.

The NATO Parliamentarians adopted two important resolutions from the Economic Committee of which Senator Javits was chairman. One warned against letting the six states in the Common Market and the Outer Seven develop into antagonistic groups. It called upon the governments to "work to assure the development of harmonious relations between member countries of NATO and the creation of conditions which would serve to expand international trade." The other resolution emphatically declared "that the accelerated development of the less-developed areas is a proper and desirable concern of the NATO countries"; and "that acceptable progress in the further development of the less developed areas requires the NATO countries and other more developed countries to do more than they are doing now to help accelerate such further development. * * *."

The direction for development during NATO's second decade has been pointed out. Will the citizens and their governments move in that direction? Either we will, or all will fall under the domination of a powerful nation with unfaltering faith in its Communist mission.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of February 6, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, FEBRUARY 6, 1960

TAXATION OF COOPERATIVES

What should be done about cooperatives' taxation? At present co-ops can escape Federal taxation completely while corporations are taxed twice—once as a corporation (30 percent first $25,000 of profit, 52 percent all above $25,000) and again when what's left is distributed to stockholders, each of whom pays personal income tax according to his bracket. Yet both co-ops and corporations engage in many of the same business activities.

Co-ops originated from the voluntary banding together of farmers who wanted to strengthen their bargaining position in sales of their products and the purchase of needed supplies. Despite the legitimate aim of farmers, the tax inequity of the present situation is recognized and admitted by all but a few of the most extreme farm organizations. In 1951 Congress tried to remedy the situation by passing legislation to tax all co-op income a single time either at the co-op level retained earnings) or the co-op patron. However, the courts have rendered the legislation ineffective inasmuch as the certificates of value frequently issued by the co-ops were ruled nontaxable to the patron since they weren't money. Certificates were issued as representative of a patron's investment and earnings in the co-op. The earnings were left in the co-op for growth purposes. Result—this double-jointed problem demanded answer—how to tax the noncash certificate and how to tax the retained earnings of co-ops which weren't distributed? The demands came from corporation personnel and stockholders who saw huge co-ops spring up, engaged in manufacturing, distribution, and processing in such widely divergent fields as oil production, cotton processing, fertilizer manufacture—all grown big by tax-free retained earnings. By contrast, corporations,

must pay at least half their earnings in Federal income taxes.

The Ways and Means Committee hearings concluded this week were but one of a series over several years without legislative action. Approximately 50 witnesses testified this week, representing divergent viewpoints, including business, government, private citizens, agriculture and various associations. Some of the views differed greatly and warrant study

Arguments advanced in behalf of co-ops

1. "Tax co-ops only once, to either the co-op or the patron, but not both; noncash allocations to patron must be reported as taxable income by patrons." (W. E. Rumble, National Federation of Grain Co-ops.)

2. "Spell out the intent of the 1951 law so there are no loopholes." (E. S. Sietton, Minnesota Association of Co-ops.)

3. "Co-op businesses enjoy no tax advantage over their competitors. On the contrary, co-op businesses pay all taxes under the same law and at the same rates as do their competitors. Exceptions are minor in nature." (Jerry Voorhis, Co-op League of U.S.A.)

4. "Co-ops have spread into other fields in only a mipor degree—any inequity that may exist by reason of the corporation double tax should be relieved by gradual elimination of the double tax and not by extending it to co-ops." (M. R. Garstan, National Milk Producers Federation.)

5. "The co-op is merely a vehicle—there should be a single tax and at the patrons' level." (Wilmer Smith and Horace Smith, Texas.)

6. "Our farmers co-ops have not been able to achieve the size that is necessary." (F. V. Heinkel, Missouri Farmers Association.)

7. "We are opposed to enactment of legislation classifying co-op savings as corporation profits." (John Baker, National Farmers Union.)

Arguments in behalf of business

1. "Co-ops do all the things their non-co-op competitors (corporations) do; co-ops enjoy the benefits of corporate citizenship; co-ops should share the cost of government." (Roswell Magill, Grain and Feed Dealers National Association.)

2. "Co-op tax privileges should be ended for three reasons: (a) It's inequitable; there's discrimination between sources of revenue, and unwarranted competitive advantage; (b) It's uneconomic, hurting Nation overall since other taxpayers must make up the difference, and is monopolistic; (c) Loss of revenue to Government."—Dr. R. T. Patterson, National Tax Equality Association.

3. "All organizations engaging in business should be taxed equally—co-ops should be taxed on retained earnings besides cash distribution."—John White, Council of State Chambers of Commerce and American Cotton Shippers Association.

4. "Co-ops have U.S. Treasury funds as capital with cotton as collateral—selective control of cotton results in overvalued cotton inventories owned by the CCC."—R. W. Williamson, American Cotton Shippers Association.

5. "Of the $66 million net savings of the Southern States Cooperative, only $17 million was paid to patrons, leaving $49 million for business expansion free of income taxes."—J. Howell, Southern States Industrial Council.

6. "Ninety percent of people polled wanted co-ops to be taxed equally with corporations."—George Burger, National Federation of Independent Business.

7. "We do feel it our duty to request that the difference in the tax laws concerning our company and co-ops be corrected. It is unfair."—Harold Garner, President, International Chemical Workers Union, Local 644 (AFL-CIO), Henderson, Ky., Spencer Chemical Co.

8. "All net savings and income of farmer co-ops should be subject to a single Federal income tax."—Charles Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation.

9. "Wealthy landowners not only get the lion's share of the price-support money and acreage allotments, but they are indeed the principal beneficiaries on the income tax exemption accorded farm co-ops."—A. L. Reed, Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries.

The alternative proposals suggested as solutions

1. Rumble suggestion, proposed by co-ops, that net earnings or savings of co-ops are to be taxed only once and then to either the co-op or the patron but not both. Noncash allocations are to be reported as income by patrons. (Disadvantage here is that patron must pay tax when not getting any money.)

2. Simpson bill (Treasury bill)—H.R. 7875: Tax co-ops retained earnings but do not tax at co-op level the cash distributions or 3-year 4 percent promise-to-pay-certificates (both of which are reported for tax by patron).

3. Davis bill H.R. 3848 assesses the entire tax to the co-op itself, then extends a tax credit to the patron when he receives a co-op distribution. His tax credit is equal to the tax paid by the co-op on the member's share of the earnings.

4. Cash compromise: Co-ops to be taxed as corporations on retained earnings, except all cash pay-outs are to be fully deductible from co-op tax but taxable individually to patrons.

5. Mason bill H.R. 199: Co-ops to be taxed just like corporations.

For my part, I dislike as much as anyone the double taxation of corporations today. Therefore, I dislike extending it to co-ops but in equity and in the interest of consistency, I see no alternative.

The entire controversy surrounding co-op corporation taxation is another demonstration of too heavy a tax load and the effort made to avoid it. The real answer is reduced Federal Government spending which would make possible sound tax reduction. My continued efforts directed toward these twin goals of less spending and lower taxes should please both cooperatives and corporations.

What will be done by the Ways and Means Committee and Congress? Well, it's an election year. More than ever, Members of Congress will respond to the demands of the more vocal constituents (sometimes, facts to the contrary notwithstanding). As always, it's up to the people, even on occasion, to providing the leadership. Yet, I am sure that a substantial majority of Members of Congress recognize the need for immediate legislative action.

What Is National Greatness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star:

WHAT IS NATIONAL GREATNESS?

Vice President NIXON gave us all something to think seriously about the other day. He complained about people who are saying that the United States is becoming a second-rate power. Maybe we are. Maybe we have never been a first-rate power. It depends, dosn't it, on how you define power rating among nations. And that is what we ought to do some serious thinking about.

Does wealth make us a great power? If it does, we have enjoyed the top rating for many years. We have taken a big piece of a continent, rich in natural resources, and squeezed wealth in fabulous amounts from it. Half of this has been luck—the natural resources. The other half—the development of them—we can take some pride in. But does this wealth make us a first-rate power?

Or shall we measure our greatness by our ability to defend ourselves from attack? It is in this area that the big debate is now raging. The Soviet Union forged ahead of us in the last decade in missile development. Some experts think we are now too vulnerable to consider ourselves the top military power in the world. And with the constant development of nuclear weapons, the time may soon come when no nation can be secure from attack.

Is the measure of greatness connected with the willingness to give aid to other nations? If it is, we should be the topranking nation. Since World War II, our generosity in this respect has added up to nearly $100 billion. But there is doubt, not only at home but abroad, whether the world equates generosity and greatness.

Idealists say the true measure of greatness is in the way we live. Are our moral standards high, is there justice for all in the land, do minorities have the same rights and privileges as the majority, do we give things of the mind and spirit at least equal status with material things? Doubt surrounds the answers to these questions.

If you think about these things a while, you may get a new slant on Mr. NIXON's complaint.

The question may not be, "Are we becoming a second-rate power?" but "By what standard have we ever been a first-rate power?"

Chinese Communists Are Having Trouble With the Courage and Character of Chinese Scholar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report from the Chinese News Service, an information service of the Republic of China. It is refreshing to read of a Chinese scholar who subscribes to Communist economic theory but refuses to bow to Communist tyranny over the human mind. There are many more such scholars and their protest will grow. The report follows:

RED UNIVERSITY HEAD REFUSES TO ADMIT ERROR

The puppet Peiping regime's much-publicized campaign of catching up with Britain in industrial production is meaningless; what determines the standard of living of the British and Chinese on the mainland is output per capita rather than the total output. These obvious truths have been pointed up by an outspoken, fearless, U.S.-educated Chinese scholar on the mainland in a lengthy

article in the November issue of the Communist periodical New Construction. He is the controversial, 76-year-old rightist President of Peking University, Dr. Ma Yin-chu.

Discredited by the Chinese Communists since the publication of his non-Marxist theories on population control in 1957, the Columbia University educated economist insists that if the catch-up-with-Britain drive had any meaning, mainland China's production must be at least 10 times that of Britain. He repeats his old contention that the constantly increasing population on mainland China makes it impossible to improve people's standard of living. He writes: "More people give rise to more ideological problems, more living problems, more work evasions, more bureaucracy and more idle labor."

Ma's article is meant to be an answer to the Communist writers who criticized his book "My Economic Theory, Philosophical Thought and Political Standing," published in 1958. His article has caused a sensation in Peiping not merely because of his scholarly, well-reasoned counter-criticism of the Red regime's economic blunders but because of his daring refusal to admit his errors and his sharp attack on the ignorance of Communist writers. A fearless man, he declares: "I am nearly 80 and am aware that I am outnumbered. I will accept the challenge single-handed and fight until I die. I will never capitulate to those critics who are bent on bringing others to submission by force and not by reason." He resents name calling, distortion, meaningless words, empty talks, and eight-legged essays.

Ma says his friends have advised him to retreat and admit error, lest his political position be jeopardized. But he retorts: "One should be brave to correct mistakes, adhere to truth and bear all consequences, even if such actions are harmful to one's private interest or one's life." He adds: "I am infinitely grateful for the advice prompted by sincere friendship, but I cannot accept it. I feel that this is not a political but a purely scientific question. In scientific matters the more they are discussed the more they are clarified. One should not do what a Chinese proverb says: 'The wise man preserves his life and retreats 90 miles.'"

Castigating his Communist critics as bandwagon climbers, the elderly educator writes: "Communists should behave courageously, maintain the truth and proceed from reality and not bend with the wind. It is always necessary to learn how to make progress and to go ahead manfully. Some comrades do not follow the direction of progress, but go the way the wind blows. They watch what others are doing and do the same without considering whether his action is right or wrong. Thus these comrades act in a ridiculous way."

"Why do these comrades bend with the wind?" Ma asks. "The trouble is that they want to be progressive, and are afraid that they will be considered as backward. Without looking at the circumstances, they just want to dash to the front. Some do it because of vanity; others do it because of a desire to show off. Such an effort to dash to the front is not in keeping with the Communist party's slogan: 'Gather all the strength and go upstream.' Members of the Communist party must work sincerely for the people and not for vanity. We have to act in accordance with reality and not like weather cocks." He hopes his 10,400 students at Peking University would face reality in their future career and meet criticism without abject surrender.

Dr. Ma maintains that he is a Marxist. He is also a member of the Chinese Communist Academy of Sciences, a deputy chairman of the Chinese Communist Soviet friendship association. Being the president of one of the leading universities in Peiping since 1951, he admits that he owes his position and even his life to a top Communist friend in the Red hierarchy, believed to be Chou-En-lai.

Poison in Our Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the editor of the Prevention magazine at Emmaus, Pa., in support of the legislation introduced by Representative DAVID S. KING, brings out some pertinent facts pertaining to the future health of the American people:

GOOD LEGISLATION ON CHEMICALS IN FOOD

Recently introduced into Congress was a bill and a joint resolution which should have the support of every Prevention reader.

The bill is numbered H.R. 9150. It proposes a law for establishing a commission to conduct an impartial and scientific study and investigation to determine the effects on the public health of the practice of adding various chemicals to water supplies and food products.

The joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 523, is to prohibit officers and employees of the United States from treating communal water supplies with fluoride compounds until a report from the Commission on Food and Water Contamination shall have been submitted to the Congress of the United States.

These important pieces of legislation were presented by Representative DAVID S. KING, of Utah, who made an excellent speech in the House on the day after he presented the bill. He said, among other things:

"When the American housewife wheels her cart around the supermarket, she is only dimly aware, if at all, that it is almost impossible for her to purchase any article of food that has not had chemicals, bleaches, preservatives, additives, dyes, adulteratives and other foreign substances added to it. Until last year, the law was so worded that any new chemical compound which was not a known poison could be added to any food for consumption and the burden then fell on the Food and Drug Administration to prove that these foreign substances were deleterious to human health. This proof was difficult to adduce, from a legal point of view, even when immediate toxicity could be demonstrated. But it was almost impossible to do when the toxicity of the chemical compound was of such a nature that it could not be detected until after the expiration of many years. Because of the outstanding work of the Delaney Commission, the food additive amendment was passed last year which requires food processors to submit to the FDA the results of their tests on new chemical compounds. But the law is still filled with loopholes.

"It seems to me that it takes only a slight leap of the imagination on the part of the American housewife to grasp the proposition that where the incidence of degenerative diseases such as cancer, arteriosclerosis, and degenerative heart disease suddenly increases, and, apparently, for no known reason, and where it is shown that contemporaneously with such increase there occurs a phenomenal increase in the total amount of chemical compounds consumed, then there may well exist a casual connection between these two phenomena. I am quite aware of the fallacy of oversimplification, and I fully recognize the probability of a multiplicity of causes in any phenomenon as complex as disease. What I do say, however, is that the ever-increasing scientific evidence renders it highly probable that the invariable concurrence of disease and body contamination by the consumption of toxic chemicals is more than coincidental.

"It is apparent that this entire subject requires a thorough investigation. The health, and maybe even the survival, of the American Nation is at stake. Our laws on nutrition are loose and inadequately drawn. Public knowledge is fragmentary and riddled with misinformation and discarded dogmas. The means of disseminating information on this subject are inadequate."

We think this is one of the finest statements we have ever seen on the perils we all face from chemicals in food and water. It is well hidden in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. How many of the folks in your town or city will ever know of its existence? How many will ever know that such a law has been proposed?

WORK FOR THE PASSAGE OF THIS GOOD LEGISLATION

There is one sure way that you can help them find out about it. Very few people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but almost everybody reads the daily paper. And most people take time to read the "Letters to the Editor" column. If you feel strongly that you want to be better protected against chemicals in food and water by stronger and more easily enforced Federal legislation, write a letter to the editor of your local newspaper. Say anything you want to say, so long as you state only facts that you know to be true. We think it would be good policy to quote some or all of the words of Representatives KING as we have quoted them above.

Ask your townspeople to write to their Congressman urging him to support Representative KING's proposed law. Give the number of the bill—H.R. 9150 and the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 523.

Give the name of your Representative so that everyone will know where to write. (Your newspaper can tell you his name if you do not know it.) His address is House Office Building, Washington, D.C. He wants to hear from the folks back home. How else can he know what you want him to do in Washington?

Let's have a letter, at least one letter, to the editor on the page of every newspaper in the United States. Now is our chance to be heard—and to be in favor of something rather than always being against. We are 100 percent in favor of this legislation.

Chief Judge John W. Murphy, Former Member of Congress, Honored at Testimonial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Friday, February 5, 1960, which comments upon the honor bestowed upon

Chief Judge John W. Murphy, of the middle district of Pennsylvania, at a testimonial dinner held last Saturday evening. Judge Murphy, a native of my district, has had a long and distinguished career and it was my pleasure to be one of the many who honored Judge Murphy at Saturday evening's dinner. I know that many Member of this body remember Judge Murphy during his tenure for three terms as the Representative of Pennsylvania's 10th Congressional District and will be happy to learn of the latest recognition extended to a former colleague.

The editorial follows:

DINNER FOR U.S. JURIST

The fact that reservations for the testimonial dinner to Chief Judge John W. Murphy, of the Middle District of Pennsylvania, at Fox Hill Country Club on Saturday night, were quickly exhausted and scores of friends and well-wishers will be disappointed because accommodations were not available for them is an impressive tribute in itself to the Federal jurist who was born at Avoca and now makes his home at Scranton.

Judge Murphy was serving his third term in Congress when he was named to the U.S. bench in 1946. He was advanced to chief judge when Albert Watson retired in 1955 and a vacancy was created. For 7 years, Judge Murphy served in the office of the Lackawanna County district attorney. He has had a distinguished career of public service, although he still is in his prime.

Like so many self-made men of the area, Judge Murphy, 1 of 12 children, started his climb up the ladder of success in an anthracite breaker. He rounded out his formal education at the University of Pennsylvania which awarded him the degree of bachelor of science in 1926 and bachelor of laws in 1929.

Judge Murphy is endowed with a warm personality as well as broad experience and learning in the law to equip him for the duties of the important post he now holds. The pride of Greater Pittston in his achievements is understandable, although his name long has been linked with Scranton and Lackawanna County.

Trujilloland: A Private Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the December 26, 1959, issue of the Nation:

TRUJILLO: MORE CROESUS THAN CAESAR

(By J. I. Jimenes-Grullón)

MERIDA, VENEZUELA.—Latin America has suffered from many dictatorships, but all were almost exclusively political. The case of Trujillo is different. He usurped power and then, gradually, took over the national economy. For him the State is an instrument at the service of his boundless ambition for wealth. It could be said he is more Croesus than Caesar and that, psychologically, he is more gangster than politician.

Much has been written about the terrorism of his 30-year-old regime—the suppression of civil rights and liberties, the mass murders perpetrated upon helpless peasants, the assassinations Trujillo has engineered not only on his own soil, but in the United States and Cuba. Much less is known of the extent to which the dictator has turned a whole country into a private estate.

More than 70 percent of the Dominican Republic's sugar plantations, and 60 persent of all other agricultural land, belong to him or to his family. Similar figures are applicable to the nation's small industry. Exact statistics are impossible to ascertain; indeed, it is even impossible to separate what belongs to the state from what belongs to Trujillo—both form a single entity. The judiciary and legislative arms of the government are under his thumb, and both operate to assure the steady growth of the ruler's fortune, already estimated at more than $500 million.

The country's tax system is ideally geared to protect Trujillo's monopolies. According to the Anuario Estadistico (Yearly Statistics Bulletin) of the Dominican Republic, in 1954 revenues from direct taxes amounted to $13,599,489.63, while indirect taxes totaled more than 6 times as much—$83,492,918.03. It is not the property owners who bear the tax burden, but the great mass of the people, whose poverty thus becomes a double burden.

At least 75 percent, perhaps more, of the Dominican Republic's gainfully employed population work for Trujillo directly or indirectly—directly in one of his agricultural, industrial, or commercial enterprises, indirectly as members of the government bureaucracy. One result of this economic monopoly is to strangle private enterprise; and this phenomenon, combined with the growth of population, results in turn in an increase of unemployment. Already 40 percent of the country's employables are without jobs, a fact which increases the dictator's power over his people. For, to get work, the people must turn to him. Trujillo controls not only the natural, but also the labor resources of the country—a situation unique in Europe and the Americas.

One begins to understand, now, how Trujillo's tyranny has managed to survive. He has coupled the ruthless use of violence with an equally ruthless manipulation of man's instinct for survival; his people, to eat, must submit to him. And to these two factors, a third must be added: the dictator's seeming immunity on the international scene. Despite his persistent violation of international accords—notably the Human Rights Convention—he has never been criticized officially by any of the great democracies. The United States, ignoring the crimes which Trujillo has committed on its soil, continues to maintain cordial relations with him in the name of nonintervention.

Despite these circumstances, Trujillo's opposition is growing. The exile-engineered invasion of the Dominican Republic last June, even though abortive, forced the dictator into an arms purchase program that is threatening the economy of the regime. This, in turn, has increased the misery of the people; the per capita income, recently estimated by the United Nations at $137, has suffered a further drop. Were the democracies, in protest against Trujillo's repeated violations of international accords, to break diplomatic relations with him and to declare an economic boycott against his regime, it is doubtful that the dictator could outlast the morrow.

As the South Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a new book stating the South's position in the segregation-integration controversy has just come off the press. Written by Mr. William D. Workman, a Columbia, S.C., newspaperman, and published by Devin-Adair, "The Case for the South" has been reviewed by Richard Whalen in the February 13, 1960, issue of National Review. With the thought that Mr. Workman's book and Mr. Whalen's review will be of interest to thoughtful people in all sections of the country, I insert the review in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith under leave heretofore granted:

AS THE SOUTH SEES IT

(By Richard Whalen)

Immediately following the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases in May of 1954, the jubilant evangels of integration were supremely confident. The South, they asserted, would submit quitely to the new sociology. A month after the decision, Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel of the NAACP, set September of 1955 as the target date for abolishing segregation in all public schools throughout the United States.

That timetable seemed accurate enough in the early days. Washington, D.C., set out to become the "Nation's showplace" of integrated education. The Border States, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, fell into line. To be sure, there was some foot-dragging in such places as Clinton, Tenn., and Sturgis, Ky., but the NAACP and the northern press laid the blame on rabble-rousing John Kasper and Company. The South would obey, the law of the land would prevail, chorused the integration-minded. But it soon became obvious that the South would not obey. How grossly outsiders misjudged the southern temper may be seen by the fact that, after years of turmoil and mounting bitterness, all but 175,000 of some 3 million Negro children in the South will observe the sixth anniversary of the Court's decision in segregated schools. Nearly three-fourths of the biracial school districts ruled unconstitutional in 1954 remain unchanged today.

Observers from afar, in the vocal North especially, are dismayed by the white South's granitic resistance to desegregation. But their outcries betray ignorance. Almost 6 years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, those outside the South are coming to discover fiercely held convictions on the other side of a momentous question long presented as one-sided. And before they cram change down unwilling throats, would-be revolutionists should pause to determine why their hopeful dreams of swift victory are broken.

"The Case for the South" (Devin-Adair, $5) provides a lucid answer. As spokesman for an embattled one-fourth of the Nation, William D. Workman, a Columbia, S.C., newspaperman, has prepared a lively brief. If his case is not airtight, it is certainly challenging. Especially necessary is his debunking of the widely held notion that "merely a handful of recalcitrant, ignorant, and misguided individuals stand in the way of wholesale racial intermingling in the

South." On the contrary, writes Workman, "for every hate-mongering crackpot or 'bullyboy' who hits the headlines with an act of brutality or of utter stupidity, there are literally thousands of solid, substantial citizens whose opposition to enforced integration is as constant and steadfast as it is peaceable."

One of the doleful results of new sectional antagonism is the belief of many northerners (tutored by Tennessee Williams and William Faulkner) that southerners are "lawless." Like many in Dixie, Mr. Workman takes the 10th amendment seriously. His contention is that "the clash is not between the people and the law, but between two opposing sets of laws—those of the central government and those of the local government." In the southern view, segregated schools, in the absence of a specific prohibition, are constitutional. Moreover, they are made essential by the social geography of the South.

Whatever they may think of the southern conception of the Constitution, northerners and westerners must acknowledge that the South is different. It is too little understood that, in many areas of the South, acceptance of integration would mean the mingling of a handful of white children and a multitude of Negro children. Further, the Negro children of the South Carolina low country and the Mississippi Delta (through no fault of their own) differ markedly from the clean, well-mannered Negro children who add a touch of democratic color to schools in northern suburbs. The reluctance of white parents to send their children to essentially Negro schools is humanly understandable, if not in accord with the precepts of modern sociology.

At the heart of southern resistance to integration is the belief that the schools are woven into the social fabric of the community; that a tear in the classroom may rip apart everything. What the white southerner wishes to hold together is a society in which his moral and cultural standards prevail. Against bombast from the press and scolding from the pulpit, he steadfastly argues that status cannot be conferred; it must be earned. To buttress his argument that the Negro has not earned the right to be treated as an equal, the white southerner marshals impassive statistics on Negro illegitimacy, crime and insolvency.

But the case for the South, when offered in black and white, adds up to a fatal weakness. Granted, the Negro, as a race, does not measure up to the white standard, but what of the growing Negro middle class? The Negro white-collar worker, who has achieved middle-class rank by great exertion, is excluded as ruthlessly from white schools and society as the shiftless Negro fieldhand. To his credit, Workman rises above the storm of North-South calumny and acknowledges that "the white man has provided no place in the southern order of things" for the Negro middle class. He writes: "The white southerner can contribute importantly to the easing of segregation tenseness, and to the ultimate adjustment of the racial problem itself, by the simple expedient—the word is used deliberately—of extending to the Negro southerner a larger and more adequate share of personal dignity and decency."

The Negro middle class is the key to future race relations in the South—and the North as well. Negro leaders, if they see the wall of white resistance transformed into a gate of acceptance, may assert themselves more effectively in dealing with the social and moral problems of the Negro community.

Understandably, the center of attention in the desegregation controversy has been the Negro, whose involvement is dramatic and immediate. But white men, North and South, are equally involved. It is a truism that interracial lines of communication are all but broken in the South; but the lines of intersectional communication between white men are almost nonexistent. Beneath the indignation of northern hypocrisy and political expediency, there is in "The Case for the South" an appeal for a North-South dialog which reasonable men will approach without blind self-righteousness.

It is sadly ironic, paradoxical indeed, that the South should feel itself excluded and unheeded, unable to make its voice heard, for the voice of modern American literature is distinctly southern. Out of the "Sahara of the Bozart" mapped by Mencken have come the literary giants of our time. While journalists traveled south to upbraid the supposed Yahoos, men of ideas sent north the ingredients of culture. One group of southerners is especially important: the poets and critics who met, by happy coincidence, at Vanderbilt University in the 1920's. In "The Fugitive Group" (Louisiana State University Press, $5), Louise S. Cowan traces the common creative roots of such men as John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Donald Davidson, Robert Penn Warren and Merrill Moore, who made—without self-consciousness—of their regional heritage a profoundly influential art. In the Fugitive, their little magazine, these civilized young men sowed the seeds of the toweringly dominant new poetry and new criticism. In the 1930's, the leading spirits of the Nashville group styled themselves "Agrarians" and telling protested the dehumanizing inroads of industrialism in a manifesto, "I'll Take My Stand."

By their talent and intellect, these southerners stirred a renascence that has brought their region unchallenged literary supremacy. The civilizing role of the South in the past three decades makes ludicrous the glib libels of the neoabolitionists, whose regions have given to American culture the hipster and beatnik. Defamed from without, caught in its own contradictions, the South will yet be heard, for in contrast to much of the United States it has something important to say. Its genius may be, as fugitive-agrarian Donald Davidson has written, that "it offers its people belief rather than doubt, conviction rather than skepticism, loyalty rather than distrust."

Raising Interest Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement relating to the need for congressional action raising interest ceilings on long-term Government securities:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN OF NEW YORK, RELATING TO THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION RAISING INTEREST CEILINGS ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT SECURITIES FEBRUARY 8, 1960

The continued existence of the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling strikes directly at the pocketbook of the average American. As a taxpayer, he must bear the cost of the highly uneconomical management of our huge national debt that results from the Treasury Department being forced to do all of its financing on short-term securities at high interest rates. Conservatively estimated, this is costing the taxpayer about a half billion dollars a year. As a man who wants to buy an automobile, he is hurt by the stiff competition that arises from the Treasury being forced to do all of its borrowing in this way. As a consumer, he may be hurt by still further increases in the cost of living, because the concentration of all Treasury borrowing on very short-term securities, which are very close to being money, has much the same effect as creation of money by running the printing press. If this archaic and harmful restriction is not removed, it is the average American citizen who will be hurt—and hurt badly.

The question of whether the Congress will act responsibly with respect to the interest rate ceiling is much broader than the question of the ceiling itself; it is a question of whether this Nation will return to the discredited and highly dangerous cheap money policies of the past. The demagogs can cry out against high interest rates, but the only alternative they can offer is simply to create more and more money to try to bring interest rates down. This can only lead to debasement of the currency, inflation, and all of the hardship and misery that a depreciating currency entails. If this great Nation were to embark on such a program it would inevitably weaken, and perhaps destroy this country's position of leadership in the free world.

This is no idle theory; it is a lesson of history, testified to by the countless instances in which fiscal recklessness and irresponsibility have led to economic ruin.

Castro's Cuba Versus Human Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a synopsis of an address delivered by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., associate editor of World Affairs, before the faculty and student body of the visitation Academy for Young Ladies, Frederick, Md. This Visitation Academy has been a center of sanctity and knowledge for many years. Consequently, it is inspiring to know that, at a time when some journalists and educators were bewildered by the course of events in Cuba, the instructors and students in this historic and celebrated institution were well aware of the facts. Now almost everybody knows that the stakes in the Caribbean are freedom and decency, principles that must be upheld against the criminal conspiracy controlled by the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raul. Those who acted as press agents for Fidel Castro can see the folly of their action. In matters of this nature it is important to be able to interpret human character and to size up the trend of events. Father Thorning did this in the National interest. The article referred is included at this point:

REV. DR. THORNING DECLARES CASTRO POLICIES THREATEN PRO-U.S. NATIONS

Delivering his first talk after participation in the initial jet flight by Pan American World Airways to the Caribbean, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and a specialist on inter-American history, de-

cleared before the faculty and study body of the Visitation Academy here that "turmoil will continue throughout the American Mediterranean as long as Fidel Castro's blood-stained tyranny is permitted to serve as a staging area for new invasions of nations friendly to the United States."

HAITI ALERT

The Maryland educator, author, and diplomat added:

"The people and Government of Haiti are on the alert for fresh aggressions from Cuba. Officers of the U.S. Marine Corps in this Republic are training members of the Haitian armed forces in the most modern techniques of ground fighting, recognizing that only hand-to-hand combat will be able to defend the island against Castro units now being taught guerrilla warfare tactics by Gen. Alberto Bayo, the latter a veteran of the Spanish civil war.

"In the meantime, the Cuban telephone operators, most of them girls who formerly were fanatical supporters of the Castro dictatorship, now put through calls after reminding their clients that 'Hubert Matos is innocent.' Major Matos was the Castro commander who was fired and jailed by the 'supreme chief of the revolution' for warning against Marxist-Leninist domination of the present regime in Cuba.

MANY DISAGREE

"Moreover, Castro's demand that his followers engage in wholesale espionage and deletion of citizens who disagree with him has revolted decent elements in the population. This is identified by all groups in the Caribbean as a most vicious police-state technique. Many spies and informers are simply venting personal spite against fellow citizens that they dislike, or whose property they covet. The rights of God and man are being trampled in the dust."

Rev. Mother Mary De Chantel and Sister Claire Joseph, directress of studies presided at the gathering here.

Fifty Years of Progress in Scouting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my privilege to attend the breakfast meeting, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. This meeting was built around the thesis of report to the Nation of this great organization of the youth of America.

As I viewed and heard cross sections of youth of this Nation, I forgot for the moment some of the cynical viewpoints which are being expressed, daily, about the teenagers of this generation.

Having just participated in committee hearings in various areas of the United States which emphasized the traffic in filth overwhelming our newsstands, our mails, and in too many instances, our entertainment world, it was like a breath of fresh life to attend the memorable meeting.

Realizing that in these 50 Explorer Scouts, America does have strong and dedicated leadership among our youth to meet the swelling tide of indecency and excesses of all kinds gives me a renewed faith and feeling of confidence that America is competent to meet its many distressing problems and developments.

The positive contributions which the Boy Scouts have made and are making toward the betterment of our society give us this faith. The BSA is a living, evolving organization. The founding of the Boy Scouts in 1910 was followed by the Cub Scouts, the Sea, Air, and Senior Scouts, and finally the Explorer Scouts. Each one of these programs was created as a result of careful study, to meet a definite need. This, in itself, illustrates the vitality of the scouting program, the ability not only to recognize a need but to create a program to solve that need.

Today, the need for the Boy Scout organization is even greater than it has been in the past. Transmission of obscene literature through the mails is only one example of the many ingenious methods utilized by unscrupulous operators in attempting to corrupt our youth. The Boy Scouts in establishing the Explorer Scouts both recognize and meet their responsibility. They provided a program through which older boys can further develop their skills and initiative.

I feel certain that we have not yet witnessed the full development of the Boy Scouts of America. The future holds many challenges for our youth. I am sure that the Boy Scout organization will meet these challenges just as they have met those of the past.

I am pleased to include the remarks of William R. Henry, an Explorer Scout chosen to represent Maine in making the BSA's 50th Anniversary Report to the Nation. Bill Henry is truly representative of the many intelligent, aggressive young Americans who are active in the scouting movement. It is with special pride that I take this method of paying well-deserved tribute to this neighbor of mine from Cape Elizabeth, Maine:

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS IN SCOUTING

(By William R. Henry)

During the past 50 years there have been tremendous advancements in science, math, and history. This is also true of scouting. From February 8, 1910, when Lord Baden-Powell started scouting to this present day, there have been many changes and improvements. When Lord Baden-Powell started this movement, there were many rivals in the same field. Those in this Nation were united into one organization under the name of the Boy Scouts of America. This was a great step in the Americas since Scouting was rapidly spreading to all corners of the globe.

This was an improvement in itself, but there was still no program for the younger boys. Again Lord Baden-Powell came to the rescue of boys. He devised a plan for Cub Scouts in 1916 and his ideas were accepted in 1919. This gave the boy who wanted to be a half Scout until he was of age, an opportunity to be a full member of the Scouting movement.

After I had been a Cub Scout for a short time, I said to myself, "Bill, you are going to become an Eagle Scout someday." I feel that Cub Scouting helps the young boy into the Boy Scout program and gives him the drive to advance. I know that it did that for me.

With these advancements, scouting was almost complete. Even then there was one thing lacking. What about the older boys? What were they going to do? They are not allowed to work very much because the child labor laws restrict it. Should they roam the streets and get into trouble? The National Scout Office didn't think so. Sea scouting, air scouting, and senior scouting was developed to take care of this problem. They were a great improvement, but there were still many more improvements to come. In 1949, the National Executive Board devised an exploring program for boys of the age 14. This program continued until 1959, when the University of Michigan made a study of teenagers and the things that they would like to obtain from a program. As a result of the Michigan study, the new Explorer program went into effect.

I feel that the new Explorer emblem is a symbol of these 50 years of achievement, and I also think that it prophesies the future of all scouting. The emblem is three circles, two prisms which meet at infinity, and the traditional fleur-de-lis of scouting. The three circles around the Explorer of his American heritage and stand for his enviroment. The fleur-de-lis is symbolic of Scouting. The prisms depict duty to God. I feel that this emblem of circles, prisms, and the fleur-de-lis is a dynamic image of the progress of the past and that which will certainly be made in the future.

I feel that the new exploring program is the crowning achievement of the past half-century. It is the result of tremendous effort and drive on the part of its creators, and will help boys when they are at the most critical age.

Arthur A. Schuck, the chief Scout executive, has said, "The record of the past has been written. But no movement can rest on its past—the very word 'movement' suggests progression."

"Mortgage" on United States—$750 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there has been certain conjecture about what to do with the estimated $4.2-billion surplus referred to by the President of the United States in his state of the Union address. There are many who believe that we should embark on additional spending programs without regard to an obligation to practice fiscal responsibility. I believe the American people would like us to work toward the day when their heavily overburdened tax load may experience substantial relief and the national debt be substantially reduced and paid off.

In this connection, I include an article by the Director of the Budget as it appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of February 15, 1960, which is worthy of serious reflection on the part of all of us:

"MORTGAGE" ON UNITED STATES—$750 BILLION

(By Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget Bureau)

In the last decade, from fiscal year 1950 to fiscal year 1960, for the Federal Government alone:

Total Federal taxes and receipts show a rise from $36.5 billion to $78.6 billion—an increase of 115 percent;

Expenditures for agricultural programs have increased from $2.8 billion to $5.1 billion—a rise of 85 percent;

Expenditures for natural resources rose from $1.2 billion to $1.8 billion—a growth of 50 percent;

Expenditures for public health went up from $244 million in 1951 to $850 million in 1960—an increase of 250 percent;

Expenditures for major national security rose from $13 billion in 1950 to $45.6 billion in 1960, an increase of 250 percent;

Expenditures for interest on the public debt increased from $5.7 billion in 1950 to $9.3 billion in 1960—an increase of about 60 percent.

Here is one more statistic: The Federal Government in fiscal year 1961 will spend $79.8 billion. Now, if you add up what we will have spent on interest on the public debt from 1950 through 1960, it comes out to $75 billion—almost enough to cover all our expenditures for the next full fiscal year. That's a high price to pay for years of spending more than we took in.

I ask you to realize that, when you look only at the budget for 1 year at a time, you see only the visible portion of the iceberg; the dangerous part of it is under water. The brutal truth is that we have made our job unnecessarily and grievously difficult; and, further, that there are pressures at work on all sides to drive us deeper into the hole.

Fact No. 1 is that the Federal Government is piling up c.o.d.'s for the future at an astounding pace:

It will cost over $30 billion to complete the Interstate Highway System.

Federal civil public-works projects already started will require expenditures after 1961 of about $7 billion before they are completed.

The Federal Government is committed to contribute $5.5 billion in the future for public housing.

Merchant marine subsidies and ship replacement constitute a Federal liability of $4.3 billion.

These and a variety of other obligations, when added to huge, unexpended balances in the defense program, total $98 billion of commitments for future Federal spending.

In one sense, and standing alone, this is not too bad, for most of these expenditures will add to the Nation's assets. But this isn't all.

Fact No. 2 is this: Even if this session of the Congress doesn't add any new programs to the budget, the level of Federal spending is going to go up. The reason is that there are built-in increases in existing programs which are now producing a continuing upcurve in expenditures.

The catalog of built-in increases covers such programs as outer space, civil aviation, merchant shipping, urban renewal, science education, medical research, public assistance, loans to underdeveloped countries, and veterans' pensions. Interest on the public debt will run still higher, and the farm program may cost more and more, unless we get realistic legislation on both. Defense technology is putting increasing pressure on expenditures.

Now, for 1961 alone, these built-in increases amount to over $2 billion; that's why this budget is up over 1960. For 1962 there are already built-in increases of a billion dollars.

Of course, there are few built-in decreases, because Government programs seem almost invulnerable to reduction or elimination.

Fact No. 3 is that our present national debt of $290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. Here are some items it doesn't include: Our already accrued liability for military retirement is about $30 billion. Our unfunded present accrual for retirement benefits for civilian Government employees is almost $28 billion. On top of that, future pensions, compensation and other benefits voted to veterans will cost about $300 billion. Now, the $290 billion of current public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion of c.o.d.'s, adds to the almost incredible total of nearly $750 billion.

That is the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future—on ourselves and our children—beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare and commerce. Is it any wonder that your President pleads for a sense of proportion, for a limit on compulsive spending, for a passion for responsibility?

Fact No. 4 is that the pressures for new spending programs are increasing in intensity. In the last session of the Congress alone, there were 20 major spending bills introduced in the House, along with 20 others in the Senate, for new programs which altogether priced out to more than $326 billion over an average period of 5 years. If these bills were passed as their sponsors want them, they would add $50 to $60 billion a year to our present spending.

This is the bleak situation we will do well to contemplate when irresponsible groups ridicule $80-billion budgets as austere and reactionary, and when we are asked to believe that we can have more spending and tax cuts and prosperity for everyone, all in the same breath. The false theory that we could spend ourselves into prosperity was supposed to have died 20 years ago.

Haven't we been chasing our tails around that one just about long enough?

Why Not Use the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the New York Times ran an important editorial on the subject of the Connally amendment. The editorial was reprinted in the February 4 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

WHY NOT USE THE COURT?

For nearly a decade and a half there has been an International Court of Justice, under United Nations auspices. For many years before World War II began a somewhat similar body, authorized by the League of Nations, and called the Permanent Court of International Justice, also sat in the red brick Peace Palace at The Hague. The trouble with the present Court, as with the former, is that no nation has to take a case before it and that the decisions it does render are not enforceable.

The United States complained to the Court in 1952 about a Russian attack on one of our airplanes off the coast of Japan and Russian treatment of a U.S. air crew forced down in Hungary in 1954. In each case the Russians contended we were at fault and that no Court inquiry was necessary. The Court then held it had no jurisdiction. A case that kept the court pleasantly occupied last year had to do with 35 acres of land in dispute between the Netherlands and Belgium under agreements of 1839 and 1843.

This country, in line with action taken by some other countries, ratified the Statute of the Court in 1946 with a reservation that we would decide for ourselves whether or not a case was within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. Within the last year or two the Eisenhower administration has been concerned with getting this, the so-called Connally amendment, repealed. The President urged repeal a year ago and again this year in his state of the Union message. This week Secretary of State Herter and Attorney General Rogers have appeared before a Senate committee to support Senator HUMPHREY'S repeal resolution. Whatever may be the nervous fears of some of our still surviving isolationists, there really is no great danger that we will have to go to The Hague to explain the segregation situation in Little Rock, defend a tariff on wool or argue the restrictions on immigration.

If we believe in government by law at home, there is no reason why we should not sustain the rule of law throughout the world. We will have plenty of sovereignty left after the 15 elderly gentlemen at The Hague have done all that they possibly could to deal with any complaint that might be brought into Court against our country.

Summing Up and Looking Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial about the Boy Scouts, 5 million strong, who are celebrating the 50th anniversary of their organization's founding, February 8, 1910. The editorial appeared in the Boston Traveler on February 6, 1960, and reads as follows:

SUMMING UP AND LOOKING AHEAD

On a miserable day in London half a century ago, a Chicago newspaper publisher, William D. Boyce, was hurrying to keep a business appointment when he lost his way in the fog.

As he stood still in the confusion trying to get his bearings, a youth approached, offered to help and soon guided him to the address he sought.

Along with his thanks, Boyce proffered a shilling tip, but it was refused. With a smile and a salute, the lad vanished into the fog, saying:

"I'm a Boy Scout, sir. We don't take tips for doing good turns."

Boyce never learned who the Boy Scout was, but he made it his business to learn enough about British scouting to found the Boy Scouts of America on February 8, 1910, a short time after he returned to this country.

In the intervening 50 years, upward of 33 million men and boys have participated in the American Boy Scout movement, all pledged to do a good turn every day.

They were boys from every kind of home—rich and poor, farm and city—from every race, color, and creed—Catholic, Jewish, Protestant.

And across the decades they have been linked by one universal code that prescribes loyalty to country, reverence to God, and helpfulness to all fellow human beings.

For the record of good citizenship, good deeds, and wholesome living they have amassed, today's 5 million active American

Scouts and millions of old alumni deserve the Nation's praise, as they celebrate their Golden Anniversary.

They'll surely receive a fitting round of congratulations in a week-long program of birthday ceremonies that begin with special religious services tomorrow and will include citations by mayors, Governors, and even the President of the United States.

In some families three generations of Scouts—son, father, and grandfather—will be taking part in festivities that pay tribute to the organization from its beginning.

Growth was gradual in the early years of scouting when clubs and group activities for young people were nowhere near as common as they are today.

It took time for the appeal of that unique combination of close companionship, high ideals and the rugged outdoor life that characterizes the Boy Scout movement to spread among the Nation's teenagers.

But almost from the start scouting got a sharp impetus from what came to be known as National Good Turns, in which all Boy Scouts participated.

The first one came in 1912 when the members worked for a safe and sane Fourth of July.

World War I gave Scouts a tremendous opportunity to serve their country and they made the most of it.

They took orders for some $200 million in Liberty bonds and war stamps. They collected tons of fruit pits that were used in the filtering material for early gas masks. They distributed literature for the Government, ran errands and completed myriad projects to conserve fuel and food. Not the least of these was cultivating thousands of victory gardens.

Such patriotic outlets for lads to young to take up arms attracted so many members to the Boy Scouts that by 1919 their ranks numbered 462,000.

Growth during the organization's second decade was hardly less spectacular, with distant travel and unusual adventure as part of an expanding program of fun, skill and public service.

It was during the 1920's that American Sea Scouts and Eagle Scouts went on various scientific expeditions to the Arctic, the Antarctic and Africa. And U.S. delegates attended international Scout jamborees in England and Denmark.

The opportunities of scouting had come to hold a good deal more than learning to light a fire by rubbing two sticks together or earning a merit badge by tying knots. More even than learning to be a good U.S. citizen and a good friend to other American boys.

As the international aspects of the movement grew—there are now about 8 million Scouts in 67 free countries—individual members began to develop an awareness of the interdependence of nations and of men.

Our boys not only went abroad to become friends with foreigners, they received boys from strange lands as guests in the United States.

As their scope increased, their numbers did too, so that on their 25th birthday in 1935 they were pushing 1 million.

The great depression and World War II gave American Boy Scouts chances for unusual service to their country and fellow citizens. They were the backbone of many wartime collection drives for scrap metal, rubber and paper. And they performed a wide range of distribution and courier chores for the Government.

Again their membership leaped ahead to 2,580,000 by 1949, stimulated not only by the desire to help in emergencies but by a lowering of the age limit for membership.

Scout leaders at local and national levels have been particularly apt at readying and encouraging their young charges to worthwhile public endeavor.

Their motto is "Be Prepared" and on the whole, they live up to it remarkably well in helping out in such community disasters as fire, flood and storm.

In the past decade, while doubling their numbers, they have twice taken on a countrywide task of enormous proportions and significance.

In the presidential campaigns of 1952 and 1956 they cooperated with the Freedoms Foundation in a nonpartisan get-out-the-vote drive. The Scouts hung registration reminders on 30 million doorknobs and distributed a million posters. They plan to perform a similar national good turn in 1960.

But for their special service to the Nation in this Golden Jubilee year the Boy Scouts will emphasize conservation—spreading the message of preserving America's natural resources.

Of all its assets, none is more to be cherished than the vigor, the courage, the hope and the high purpose of the 5 million American Scouts. May their tribe and their troops increase.

The Federal Fair Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress I opposed H.R. 1253, the Harris Federal fair trade bill. The bill would have vested in the hands of manufacturers the power to control prices, not only on the manufacturer level but also on the wholesale and retail levels of distribution—in fact, from the plant gates until the time it reached the hands of the ultimate consumer. The bill would permit those who control the prices to deal ruthlessly with retailers and wholesales who did not follow their high fixed prices.

According to reputable economists, who are unanimously opposed to fair trade, this specific bill would cost consumers $10 billion a year.

Proponents of this iniquitous legislation did not make any complaint of unfairly high and improper manufacturer and wholesale prices. The principal sponsors of this legislation are the National Association of Retail Druggists, wholesale drug associations, and some of the big drug manufacturers.

The hearings being conducted by the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER in the U.S. Senate have revealed some additional and shocking reasons why the enactment of fair trade is not in the public interest. These hearings have shown conclusively that fair trade is a danger even beyond that anticipated by the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and every Government agency which uniformly opposed it as a "pro tanto repeal of the antitrust laws." This legislation would authorize complete price fixing in the drug and pharmaceutical line, where factory prices are already fixed exorbitantly high by big drug manufacturers.

Here are some examples of gouging practices which have been engaged in by large pharmaceutical manufacturers, according to hearings conducted by the Kefauver committee, which are good reasons for defeat of fair trade legislation. Enactment of such legislation would place still further power to gouge consumers in the hands of those now fixing manufacturer prices at exorbitant levels:

First. A large pharmaceutical house bought female sex hormones for 14 cents a gram and sold them to druggists for $15 a gram, an increase of over 10,000 percent.

Second. The same large pharmaceutical house sells an arthritis wonder drug in Britain for $7.35 per hundred tablets, while U.S. customers are charged $17.90, 2½ times as much.

Third. Steroid compounds are sold for markups of 1,000 to 8,000 percent by manufacturers to wholesalers. The defense is made by manufacturers that this markup finances research. However, Dr. Philip Berke, vice president of Formet Labs in New Jersey, a small bulk manufacturer of steroids, said that his firm could supply "the steroid needs of the world" on an investment of $5 million.

Fourth. A large firm markets an antiarthritic drug for $17.90 per 100 tablets, while competitors market the same for $4, $6.75, $6.95, or $12. The smaller firms say that they can do this because of low promotional budgets.

Fifth. Another large drug house markets a drug, which costs 3.05 cents a tablet to produce, for 17.9 cents a tablet. Small competitors are able to sell the same drug at prices ranging from 4 cents to 12 cents a tablet, oftentimes buying the substance in bulk from the first large manufacturer and then processing it into tablets.

The Military Medical Supply Agency asked for bids and bought the same drug for 4.15 cents and later for 2.09 cents.

The Veterans' Administration negotiated a purchase of the same drug, prednisone, for 13.6 cents and later bought it by bid for 3.85 cents and in another instance for 2.2 cents a tablet.

Prices of other miracle drugs, pharmaceuticals, steroids, and other substances necessary to the health and welfare of our people are being raised to astronomical price heights by greedy persons who are profiting unduly from the misery of our sick and aged.

Remember, the prices I cite are only prices to wholesalers and the ultimate price may actually be 50 percent to 200 percent higher by the time the commodity in question reaches the ultimate consumer through the retail outlet.

To place in the hands of such ruthless, greedy persons the vast power over the whole price structure by enactment of a Federal fair trade law would be a mistake which cannot be made by the Congress charged with protecting the public interest.

Enactment of a Federal fair trade statute would mean precisely such power and would be dangerous to our economy and to our people beyond telling.

Passage of a Federal fair trade statute would permit other industries, such as hardware, appliances, food, clothing, soft goods, auto accessories, gasoline and oil to adopt the pricing practices prevalent in the drug industry.

Protecting Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, when this House considers H.R. 3610, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, it will be taking up legislation vital to the continued progress and growth of this country. The importance of our natural resources should be unquestioned; the protection and rehabilitation of the water supply unchallenged. I supported this bill a year ago when it first passed the House; I shall support the conference bill.

Connecticut, as a busy and growing industrial State, is well aware of the importance of its streams. I have been particularly interested in a provision of the bill which would permit communities to team up to control pollution and still qualify for grants. I have in mind an instance in which four communities—New Britain, Berlin, Cromwell, and Middletown—have studied mutual efforts in a difficult situation and projected plans even crossing county lines.

The importance of our watersheds is being brought home forcefully to all our people. Two of the most interesting statements in this respect recently came to my attention in the Farmington Valley Herald, a newspaper in my district, which printed the winning essays in a contest sponsored by the Farmington River Watershed Association. These essays are by Laura Deming and Tony Wallace, Jr., respectively, the former of Farmington High School and the latter of Simsbury.

I commend these students on their excellent statements.

It is Federal aid in pollution control which will enable cities to treat their municipal sewage problems. A year ago, a survey of progress in Connecticut showed that no municipal projects had been gotten underway in the preceding 12 months without Federal aid available within the appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert these essays at this point in the RECORD:

CONSERVATION AND THE FARMINGTON MEADOW

(By Laura Deming, first prize)

One small part of the Farmington River watershed is the Farmington meadow. This meadow, containing a great variety of land: swamps, forests, grasslands, and rich farmland, has played an important part in the history of Farmington; and today, when undeveloped land is becoming more and more valuable, this area remains an important part of the town.

A refuge for wildlife, the meadow supports deer, rabbits, skunks, squirrels and many other small animals as well as fowl. A common sight to many are the blackbirds, meadow larks, and other birds which fill the air with songs as they flit over the fields of corn and hay. From early spring until late fall, the clanking of plows, tractors, and other farm equipment is heard. The gentle lowing of cattle resounds near the banks of the river. The lonesome whistle of the freight trains is heard twice daily, as well as the honking of automobiles speeding past the meadow.

This beautiful meadow serves a purpose in the delicately balanced plan of Nature, a plan which man has often upset. The grassland provides food for the cattle; the forests feed the wildlife; and the rich topsoil produces food for mankind. If any one of these areas is destroyed, the balance will be upset, and man will ultimately suffer.

During the past generations conservation was not considered as important as it is now, for the land was not so valuable. With the great demand for housing, however, land has been developed at an astounding rate, and it is becoming more and more difficult to preserve some land in its natural state.

The Farmington meadow has not been excessively maltreated; therefore because it is in good condition, the main problem of conservation lies not in restoration, but in finding effective ways to protect the land.

Fires, which can do vast damage in a short period of time, are caused mainly by carelessness. A second thought, before pitching that cigarette from the car window, or a last check on that campfire, could have saved acres of forest and grass from destruction. Smokey the Bear and his few words of advice should be heeded by all.

Floods, part of that mysterious plan of nature, are, to some extent, beneficial to the land. Frequent or severe floods, however, can cause considerable damage by destroying valuable topsoil and other natural resources.

The banks of the Farmington River are quite low in the meadow area; thus flooding is very common. Perhaps excavation of the river bed would alleviate the condition somewhat. Dams on the tributaries of the river might also improve the situation, but these are costly to build and maintain, and tend to cause flooding upstream.

Junkyards, lumberyards and other sources of loose objects which can be washed downstream with the current and jam in narrow channels should be removed from the river banks. Bridges, which constrict the flow of water and other obstructions in the water or on the banks, which tend to slow the speed of the current, should be removed or remodeled. These changes will allow the water to flow more quickly and evenly into the Connecticut River.

Pollution of the river causes death to the fish as well as to grass and other vegetation which are flooded. Modern sewerage systems have been installed in several communities in the Farmington River watershed and soon Farmington will be one of the several. When the other towns in the watershed also meet this requirement, damage done by pollution to the meadow and all other areas in the Farmington River Valley will be greatly decreased.

In this era of a rapidly expanding population, undeveloped land is becoming more valuable; therefore, the problem of conservation has increased tremendously in importance. If the Farmington meadow is to retain its beauty, the citizens of Farmington and the other towns in the Farmington River Watershed must work together, for it is only by total cooperation that the Farmington River Valley will be a place in which it will be a joy to live and work.

THE FARMINGTON RIVER VALLEY—OUR PRESENT AND FUTURE

(By Tony Wallace, Jr., runner-up)

Connecticut is the fastest growing State in the Northeast; and during the next 20 years it is estimated that the State's population will grow by 38 percent. One of the most rapidly growing areas in Connecticut is the Farmington Valley, which is expected to grow twice as fast as the State as a whole between now and 1975. This rapid growth of population makes it extremely important for us to begin to conserve our natural resources now, if we expect to be able to handle the thousands of additional people, homes, factories, stores and other businesses on the same amount of land. To do this, we must consider the following resources of our valley:

Land: The valley is made up of 609 square miles of which one-fourth is in Massachusetts and the balance in Connecticut. Two-thirds of the total land area of the valley is wooded; yet, most of this is level enough to build upon. This means that there is enough space for population growth, providing it is properly regulated. Fortunately for us, all but the four smallest towns are protected by zoning laws, so we can be certain that zoning will control some of the growth.

Where zoning does not exist, every effort should be made by the people to create zoning commissions in order for all the towns to have this protection. Needless to say, sound planning should precede all zoning in order for us to have the best possible valley.

Forests: Our forests are important to us for several basic reasons First, they provide beauty to our towns and countryside; and, secondly, they help to control floods, soil erosion, and silting.

Since our valley attracts people because they like to live here, it is important that we save much of our forests in order to keep our natural beauty and good living opportunities.

The threat of floods every spring also makes it essential for us not to destroy the trees. In fact, in addition to saving much of our present tree cover, we should reforest areas where soil is now being washed away by heavy rains and flooding, thus insuring the preservation of our woodlands.

Water: Water is our most important natural resource. Without an adequate supply of water (quantity and quality), we would be unable to maintain our present economy, let alone attract new industries and people to the valley.

The Farmington River water is used principally for domestic supply. About 500,000 people are served by water utilities which use the Farmington River. It is expected, however, that the use of this water will triple within the next 40 years.

Although pollution is not a serious problem in the Farmington River or its tributaries, there are some 250 pollution sources which should be cleared up if we are to make the best possible use of this valuable resource. This means that some of our cities must treat their municipal sewage, some industries will have to clean their industrial waste, and a number of homeowners must do likewise. When this is done, we will have clean water for greater recreational uses. At the present time, we do not have enough water facilities in the valley for such outdoor sports as swimming, boating, and fishing. To meet these needs, we should also give thought to creating artificial lakes, which can be made after the pollution problem is solved.

One other important source of water is our ground water supply about which very little is known. Here is another place where we can plan on the future by encouraging towns and the State to set up engineering

studies to learn more about the availability, source and supply of these waters.

Fish and wildlife: To meet the growing needs of our expanding population, we must develop wildlife protection, production, and educational programs, where such programs have proved successful, on all farms and forest lands of the valley; encouragement of stream flow regulations for better fish habits; and develop a junior conservation camp for the training and education of young people of the valley in proper conservation practices.

Summary: The natural resources of the valley belong to all the people and we must therefore work together. There is no easy cure-all for many problems of resource protection and development; however, if all citizens in our towns and cities in the valley make a combined effort to work on the problems which I have outlined, we can be certain that our valley will always be the most beautiful and enjoyable place in the world.

Nonacquiescence Isn't Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include an editorial which appeared in today's New York Herald-Tribune, entitled "Nonacquiescence Isn't Enough."

This editorial strikes very hard at the core of the problem in the Near East. It points out that the fundamental problem is the consistent refusal by the United Arab Republic to recognize the status of the State of Israel.

It also becomes very discouraging to those of us who are interested, as we all should be, that we have been strangely inactive compared to our conduct shortly after the Sinai campaign.

The editorial very accurately indicates that you cannot treat the sympton of a disease by totally ignoring the cause thereof, and unless and until this administration shows at least one-tenth of the leadership in making it crystal clear to Mr. Nasser that international agreements must be observed that it showed when it aligned recently with the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic against our allies, then there is no hope for the situation.

The editorial follows:

NONACQUIESCENCE ISN'T ENOUGH

Now that comparative tranquility has been restored to the Israel-Syria border in the neighborhood of Tawafik, reporters are being invited to view the scene from both sides, scanning the terrain with binoculars, observing distant figures moving about, and recording their impressions. It's an interesting but not a very revelatory pastime. For the questions of what happened at Tawafik, of who fired the first shots, and who really owns the little stretch of farmland, are rather trivial.

Similarly, any determinations that may be made on the spot by the United Nations Mixed Armistice Commission will be relatively unimportant, too. For the answers to the strife and struggle that erupt intermittently along the Arab borders with Israel cannot be found purely locally, any more than the stopping of Israel cargoes in the Suez Canal can be ascribed to the whims of the customs guards at Port Said.

Both the fighting on the Syrian frontier and the blockade in the Suez Canal are, of course, symptomatic of the state of war which the Arabs maintain against Israel. To treat the symptoms while ignoring the underlying disease is poor practice medically, and in this case, at least, it doesn't seem to be working very much better diplomatically.

Nor is it encouraging to note that the initiatives of U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold have failed to achieve any improvement. Mr. Hammarskjold is understood to have labored diligently to persuade President Nasser, of the U.A.R., to ameliorate his blockade of the Suez Canal—this being one case in which responsibility for illegal action is clear cut and indisputable. Yet the results have been nil. Speaking about the Suez situation at a press conference last week, Mr. Hammarskjold said: "The fact that certain attitudes of member governments are not adjusted to what, from my point of view, is the United Nations line does not mean any acquiescence either from the United Nations or from the Secretary General."

That is about as close as Mr. Hammarskjold customarily gets to being critical. Yet it is becoming increasingly evident that mere nonacquiescence by the U.N. isn't enough to solve the underlying problems in the Middle East, and may not be enough to prevent a recurrence of a flareup at least as big as the Sinai war of 1956. Surely the U.N. has a more important function to perform today than trying to figure out who did what at Tawafik.

Col. Glenn T. Eagleston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and outstanding officers of the Armed Forces is Col. Glenn T. Eagleston. I am sure you will agree that every Member of Congress is proud of his brilliant record and services performed by him for the American people in Okinawa. Most certainly this man should be recommended for the Legion of Merit citation and I submit the following statement and briefing, sent to me by my good lifelong friend, Homer C. Sellers, which clearly shows that Colonel Eagleston is deserving of more recognition than the Legion of Merit:

KADENA AIRBASE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM,
DECEMBER 10, 1959

Col. Glenn T. Eagleston, commander, 6313th Airbase Wing, APO 239, San Francisco, Calif., has been recognized by the High Commissioner of the Ryuku Islands as having one of the most effective community relations and people-to-people programs on Okinawa. The island of Okinawa is divided into 13 regions, with the major military installation located within that area having the responsibility of representing all U.S. military forces with the local citizens. This representation is conducted through the Koza City Regional Committee, Ryukyuan-American Community Relations Advisory Council. The committee is composed of the mayor and eight officials of Koza City, the USMC commander of Camp Koza, and Colonel Eagleston as chairman.

Colonel Eagleston's success is based on the fact that every assigned individual, unit, or organization, is expected and encouraged to be an ambassador of American ideals; and the "Keystone of the Pacific" (Kadena AB) base is a meeting place where Okinawan educators, civic leaders, editors, and public officials are encouraged to meet with him or staff members on all matters involving intercommunity good will. All projects are closely coordinated with the USMC Camp Koza commander and maximum effort has been expended by him and the USMC in completing major construction and grading projects. Colonel Eagleston insists upon Mayor Chojo Oyama and other city officials utilizing their permanent passes to the base for visits with him. The president of the Koza City Chamber of Commerce and its members have made him honorary president because of his interest in the local economy. Qualified businessmen of Koza City are encouraged to submit bids on all government contracts for equipment and services. Military dependents have every opportuity to promulgate and foster projects and programs of great interest to their Okinawan counterparts.

Colonel Eagleston has insured the continued success of his people-to-people projects and programs by organizing an NCO Advisory Council composed of 10 senior noncommissioner officers and civilians who personally advise him on all facets of community relations. A requisite for membership is to volunteer to encourage maximum participation by all personnel in civic, youth, health, educational, recreational, and other community-level activities. He has a staff member during his absence to attend monthly meetings with the Koza City officials who takes immediate action on all matters that affect the prevention and promotion of harmonious relations. Squadron and unit commanders are duly recognized for their effective civic responsibilities during reporting periods. The "Keystone of the Pacific" base sponsors maximum tours for civic groups, students, and other organizations. Special events, such as Friendship Week, Ryukyuan-American carnivals, Library Week, Operations Friendship, and intercommunity sports receive maximum support and encouragement.

Specifically, Colonel Eagleston and members of his command have received recognition from Ryukyuan officials and governmental agencies for the following activities:

The 10 elementary and secondary schools of Koza City are being sponsored by squadrons or units on Kadena Air Base. This adoption is considered to be one of his most influential community-level-type programs in that the assigned personnel of these respective squadrons are determined to have the finest school on the island. They are utilizing off-duty time to build sidewalks, paint, repair windows, and roof; conduct music appreciation courses; show Japanese language movies on government, education, sports, and the United States; contribute condemned or surplus athletic equipment to form athletic and sports teams; schedule and host on-base tours that include American homes, the base exchange, libraries, chapel, and commissary; arrange for Okinawan students to participate in the American dependent school program through the PTA meetings; arrange for TV programs that include Okinawan teachers and educators; collect clothing for the needy; grading of school grounds; and individual or collective participation in their athletic and other school celebrations.

Donation of condemned or surplus buildings to Koza City schools greatly improve their educational facilities and permit more deserving Okinawan students to enroll.

Japanese language news editors have and are participating in our committee meetings; are included in social and official luncheons; and have been encouraged to help him in seeking recognition for the many Okinawans and American military personnel who successfully complete worthwhile projects in behalf of the Ryukyuans.

Military dependents on base are encouraged to personally invite Okinawan families into their homes for a first-hand observation of American customs, living habits, and hospitality. These visits include family picnics, church functions, sports, and youth activities such as dancing and roller skating.

Educators—teachers and principals—are attending PTA meetings for firsthand information on teacher-parent-student participation, who are adopting this practice in the Okinawan schools.

The American handshake is the accepted custom with all Koza City officials during visits and meetings. The chief of police, for instance, has requested and received instructions on the military salute.

The postmaster, banker, chief of police, and other public servants have visited similar activities on Kadena Air Base to study supervision, management practices, and to coordinate intercommunity procedures. The postmaster, for instance, was utilizing the same principles as established by Admiral Perry until 1958. Businessmen and merchants are also encouraged to study American methods.

Permanent base passes and open mess honorary memberships have been extended to the Koza City officials and other Okinawans who are interested in fostering good will between the communities.

Medical facilities and services on Kadena Air Base have been made available on occasions which won the gratitude of every citizen in Koza City. Professional and technical assistance have been provided by the flight surgeon for the first health cleanup program ever conducted in Koza City.

English language classes have been organized for teachers, merchants, and on base employees.

The effectiveness of the NCO Advisory Council and the squadron and organizational commanders permits Colonel Eagleston to utilize them as his representative to many of the Koza City official functions. The Okinawans accept these delegates without reservation.

Crosswalks, water drains, and street-lighting projects have contributed greatly to the safety of the Ryukyuan pedestrian, schoolchildren, and military motorist and sanitation standards. The base was highly effective in its efforts with governmental agencies to provide Koza City with water.

The NCO and the Airmen's Open Messes have made time deposits of over $200,000 with the Bank of the Ryukyus. This action permitted the banking facility to extend vitally needed loans to deserving Okinawan merchants who have improved facilities, services, and merchandise that benefit Americans. Americans are now opening personal accounts with all locally established banks.

The 1958 Ryukyuan-American Welfare Carnival was considered a success by all concerned. This activity included over 83 American and Ryukyuan concessionaires; all U.S. military forces on Okinawa participated in one form or another; over 200,000 people attended during the 3-day event; and an equal amount of the $32,000 net profits was earmarked for local welfare programs.

The 1959 Ryukyuan-American Godo (Friendship) Festival included over 150 Americans and Ryukyuan concessionaires who catered to an estimated 225,000 people for the 3 days. The prime objective of fostering and promoting friendship was accomplished and the Ryukyuans received over $14,000 of the profits for welfare projects.

The "Operation Friendship" project provided American-type Santa Claus gifts of toys, school kits to over 22,000 children in December 1958. A similar project will be conducted in December 1959 with an estimated 26,000 children and adults participating in the Christmas activities. "Operation Friendship" is financed entirely through the efforts of our airmen, officers, civilians, and their dependents, at a cost of approximately $9,000 per year.

The Wives Clubs on Kadena Air Base have made financial contributions, totaling more than $14,000, to many worthwhile Ryukyuan projects. Okinawan ladies are participating in club functions and visiting with individual members.

A Ryukuan-American friendship center is over 85 percent completed, which has been made possible only through the efforts of Colonel Eagleston. The Government agency responsible for programing for cultural centers on Okinawa could not program adequate construction and administration funds for this facility that had been only a suggestion for over 4 years. Colonel Eagleston will be long remembered by the Koza City citizens for making this center a reality. Over $30,000 has been earmarked from the above carnival and festival projects, including a $16,300 contribution from the High Commissioner's funds.

A scholarship program has been established by the Protestant Chaplain Fund which is used to send deserving and qualified Ryukyuan high school graduates to Japanese universities of their choice. All expenses for a 4-year course of study are paid for and the recipient must only give his word that upon completion of his schooling he will return to Okinawa to work in his chosen field. The cost is $400 per year per student. To date, over $8,000 has been contributed to this student aid program. One medical doctor, one school administrator, and four clergymen are now busily working at their vocations on Okinawa as a result of this practical demonstration of neighborliness. There are seven sudents currently enrolled in Japan universities. Aside from the financial assistance, from chapel-sponsored activities, which totaled over $15,000 in 1 year, the program has other facets that contribute to good community relations. The young people of the Chapel meet with their counterparts for social affairs. Students from the University of the Ryukyus are entertained. Groups of Americans visit the school for the deaf, dumb, and the blind children and provide parties for them. The lepers of the leper colony are entertained and provided with comfort articles. The orphanages are visited and children are given tours of the base. The old folks are provided with reading materials and movies. All are friends and neighbors. The chapel program contributes to good community relations.

The 558th Air Force Band has presented many concerts to the Okinawan schools in Koza City and surrounding towns. Students are encouraged to participate by leading the band or playing musical instruments.

Following the Ishikawa-Okinawa tragedy in 1959, involving an American plane crash, a committee was established by the Americans and before the day was over funds, clothing and household utilities were collected and delivered to care for the needy families. Approximately $5,000 was collected through volunteer contributions; over 5 tons of used clothing and foodstuffs were collected; a complete whirlpool bath was purchased and installed in the Koza City Hospital to assist in the treatment of children suffering from burns; each child in the hospital received kits of toothpaste, toothbrush, wash towel, clothing, comic books, fruit, etc. At the conclusion of this project 25 huts were moved, renovated, and completely furnished, providing homes for those who were left homeless as a result of the incident. This is another instance of good neighborliness.

In addition to all of the welfare projects for the local community, during the 1959 Taiwan disaster, the personnel of the base, within 1 week, contributed 21 tons of rice, 5 tons of flour, and 4 tons of used clothing.

A special American-Ryukyuan Friendship Week was observed the last week in May 1959, at which time over 4,000 Ryukyuans visited homes on the base of Americans, and at the same time great numbers of Americans were granted the privilege of visiting the homes of their Ryukyuan friends.

The Sturgis High School, Sturgis, Ky., has agreed to organize a "pen pal" club and become affiliated with the Chuo High School, Koza City, Okinawa. This activity will permit the Okinawan students to practice and utilize the English language training, which they receive approximately 14 hours of each week.

The Governor of Kentucky, A. B. Chandler, has awarded the mayor of Koza City a "Kentucky Colonel" certificate for outstanding services rendered in the promotion of good will between the Ryukyuans and Americans. Mayor Chojo Oyama is considered to be the first Okinawan ever to receive this award from the Governor of Kentucky.

Correspondence and arrangements have been made with USCAR to provide the Koza Health Center and Koza Hospital with vitally needed surplus medical equipment and supplies; motor vehicles (cars and trucks) for official transportation and use within the street department; and other equipment that can be utilized in community relations projects.

A blood bank system has been arranged with the Koza Hospital for emergency operations. Donors are military personnel assigned to the squadrons on Kadena Airbase.

Japanese citizens and dignitaries visiting with the Koza City officials are given a VIP tour of Kadena Airbase, luncheons at the clubs when appropriate, and a factual briefing on our people-to-people program with the Okinawans.

The civilian personnel officer, Kadena Airbase, is vice chairman of the American-Ryukyuan Vocational Training Council, which is composed of representatives from USCAR, Army, Navy, Air Force, and USMC, and from the Plans and Statistics, Economic, Education, and Labor Departments of GRI. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Ryukyuan Chamber of Commerce, and the University of Ryukyus are also represented on the above council. The purpose of this council is to encourage the development of improved school programs, private training programs, and community training programs. A survey of over 100,000 Ryukyuan workers has been conducted and serves as a guide for individual employers to select and train for occupations in which there are existing or anticipated shortages. Many compliments have been received on the manner in which this council serves the Ryukyuan citizens, the local economy, and the manner in which Ryukyuan employees are being utilized in Government and military organizations.

Colonel Eagleston has completed many other people-to-people projects that have won for him and the U.S. military forces the heartfelt gratitude of thousands of Okinawan friends and neighbors. He desires to see Koza City sponsored by a sister city in the United States; exchange of many students and visitors; a library for the blind; maximum support of orphanages; closer relationships between the Okinawan and American students through correspondence; and many other community-level activities.

Boy Scouts of America 50th Anniversary—Hampden Council No. 234 Also Celebrates Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all America tips its hat today to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. I take pride in noting that Hampden Council No. 234, with its headquarters in my congressional district, also celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. Both events were marked by an impressive banquet held in the Springfield, Mass., auditorium on January 27, 1960. I was highly honored to be asked to deliver the anniversary address. But, more significantly, I was privileged to witness the presentation of honors and awards to scouts, scout leaders, and distinguished citizens for their outstanding contributions to and in behalf of scoutdom.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the program, the list of recipients of special honors, and my address.

The address, program, and list of recipients follow:

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

When I was first asked to come here to partcipate in this event, I felt then, and I know now that my talents would not be equal to the task. For this is no ordinary, run-of-the-mill, routine occasion—the kind of event that people in public life experience so much and too often. No. This gathering is something extraordinary—an episode that happens infrequently and the only time it will occur in the history of this great organization.

You honor me indeed to invite me to be a part of it. I appreciate very deeply your gracious request. I welcome it enthusiastically.

All of us gather here tonight to mark the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America—the golden jubilee of Scoutdom. But as we look back at the pages of Scout history, we can say with certainty that every year has been a golden year.

What a glorious history it has been. No other youth movement has caught on so fast * * * none has succeeded as well. None will endure as long.

My friends, this is not just happenstance. It is so because of the very nature of the movement—the bedrock upon which it is built. Its whole activity appeals to the finer instincts of youth and adult. Its entire program is geared to building a better boy—trained to the true values of physical strength, mental alertness—and moral straightness. Its total concern is attuned to the Scout doing his duty to his God and his country. On this basis and in this atmosphere, it is no wonder that it developed into the magnificent organization that opens its golden door on February 8, 1960.

It all started with Lord Baden-Powell, British military hero, author and artist. This remarkable human being drew on his vast and interesting experiences to shape the "Boy Scout theme" in the first Boy Scout camp the world had ever known on Brownsea Island, off the southern coast of England in 1907. The germ of scoutdom was planted in the United States by a newspaper and magazine publisher, William D. Boyce. A good deed—a simple one—by an English Boy Scout, guiding this visiting American through a dense London fog, was the spark that ignited Boyce's interest. He talked to and learned from the chief Scout himself, Baden-Powell, the aims and program of scouting. He came back to America to spread the idea. With his friends, Colin H. Livingstone, Edgar Robinson and other people in the Nation's Capital, Boyce established the Boys Scouts of America on February 8, 1910.

How it has flourished over the past years is emphatically told by the figures—58,456 troops—3,288,446 cubs, scouts, and explorers—1,271,702 adult volunteers. Think of it. Some 5,000,000 people in the Boy Scouts of America alone. And from the time of its birth, some 30,000,000 people of the United States have participated in the movement.

The impact that this great group has had on the American way of life can never be measured. You will find that their influence has been, and is being felt in every facet of the American scene. The contributions that they have made and are now making in building a better Nation: A stronger country: A healthier America—these contributions can be noted through the history of your Boy Scout movement. The pages of your membership are emblazoned with the names of great and dedicated Americans who have served this Nation courageously and devotedly in peace and in war—Presidents, Governors, Senators, Representatives, university presidents and educators, religious leaders, generals and privates in the Armed Forces—in business and in industry, labor and agriculture, the arts and sciences—the whole gamut of American life on the National, State, and local levels.

All of this gives eloquent testimony to the worth, the value, the untold influence of scoutdom.

Scoutdom succeeds because into it go the hopes, the aspirations, the thrills, the good, the deeds of millions. It offers the things that young people strive for, that boys want, when they are given the opportunity and the leadership.

The scout oath, its 12 laws, the motto and scout slogan, all add up to a code that can and does produce the best in the character of human mind, body and soul. Scoutdom is built on lasting values, something like the very nature of the Nation itself. This country was not solely built by its majestic mountains, its tumbling waterfalls and streams, its racing rivers, its rockbound coasts, its magnificent plains, docile and beautiful harbors. It did not, alone, come to life with its teeming cities, shaded towns and villages and its almost infinite wealth of natural resources. No! A nation is not built merely of brick, mortar, and timber to fall in the first storm. Rather it is built and bound together by the hopes and fears, the love and the labor of millions of men and women seeking a way to the infinite.

So it is with Scouting. It is based upon the combined and patient labor of millions of men and women determined that American boys, no matter where they live, shall have the opportunities that spell faith, hope, and love.

To you, the leaders of the Scouting movement, go the grateful thanks of the Nation. Without your enthusiasm, your zeal, your devotion to this movement, it could not succeed, expand, and prosper. In assisting the young to grow, you grow yourselves. In giving of your ability, your time and efforts, I know you have felt the sense of giving to yourself. How true Walt Whitman's words, "The gift is to the giver and comes back most to him."

With the challenge that faces our existence on all fronts—adversaries from without and decay from within—you cannot relax the steady and tremendous work that is yours to continue to educate our youth in the business of scouting and responsibility. You have taught and are teaching much of our youth to love and respect our country, in making the individual boy conscious of his obligation to his patrol, his troop, to his community, State, and Nation, you have instilled in him at an early age the kind of responsibility that our country needs if it is to last and survive in this atomic, hydrogen, missile, and space age.

With prejudice, hatred, and fear, youth delinquency seemingly running rampant in many parts of the world, as well as in our own great land, the need for the program you offer is perhaps greater today than every before.

The task that lives before the leaders of the Scout program is great. Yet heavy and difficult assignments are ofttimes reduced to featherweight from the shear joy of the job and the knowledge that it must be done. What greater happiness can be experienced than that of helping your fellow man—particularly the youth—to offer a chance, to provide the means and the toops to develop their talents, to learn of and enjoy the world about them. And this, all tending toward building a good boy for today, a better man for the morrow.

May I say that only you—and people like you throughout the land and in freedom loving countries across the world—only you can make this plan work. Volunteers, completely unsefish people, dedicated to love of people, of country and of God. You are the reason why the Boy Scout movement does and can succeed.

Oh, there have been other youth movements that have been tried and tested. We know of some of them in the past and some of the present—youth movements predicated upon government conscription and controlled by paid hirelings of the state to inculcate hate, arrogance and love of war into the impressionable youthful mind and character.

Many of you can recall, as I vividly do, the documentary films on the Nazi youth movement made prior to World War II. Mere boys, the same kind and age of those you have trained, being mentally framed to love war, hand-to-hand combat, gas warfare, how to shoot, how to kill.

This was their youth movement and many within a few years went off to war—confident, proud, arrogant. I remember seeing many of them as captives at the end of war—bitter disillusionment written on their faces. Their entire training, as mere youths, had been geared to the vicious doctrine that they were the master race and the only good was to conquer and to rule.

In defeat, they were lost—aimless. They had nothing in which to believe and little will or capacity to turn elsewhere. Their souls and their minds had been wrenched from them. What a pity to behold.

And today, we can be sure that the youth movements behind the Iron Curtain—in Russia and her satellites—though, perhaps playing down the war games, are engaged in a massive propaganda program. This effort is scaled to the task of educating through young peoples organizations the supremacy of the state—that communism is to rule the world—that any means justifies the end—that religion is the opiate of the people. Relentlessly pounded into fertile youthful minds is the theme the people exist for the state—not the state for the people. The state is all—the state is everything. And they are continually being told that they can and will bury us.

Well, this is what can happen and has happened when the State controls youth organ-

izations. The boys and girls become mere pawns in the scheme of the political masters.

Thank the founders, and the long list of Scout leaders, that this cannot happen to your movement. By its very nature, the Boy Scouts of America could not decay to this end. From the beginning, it was made certain that no Government funds were wanted to maintain and support scouting—for such funds too often lead to political and State interference.

But most of all, it cannot happen because of the hundreds of thousands of unpaid, intensely interested volunteers who want to run their own shop and abhor the thought of being told what to do, when to do it and if it can be done at all.

As I flew here this afternoon and watched the great sprawling cities of Baltimore and Philadelphia and New York below, I thought of the values that made America and what must be done to preserve it—the tremendously significant part that the Boy Scouts of America have played in the role of building this Nation, and what scoutdom must do in the present and the future. It seems to me that your chief Scout executive, Arthur A. Shuck, summed up the job:

"You must go forward with scoutdom aggressively * * * as you do so, you must keep in mind that tremendous parade of youth growing up in the years before you, and safeguard the future of our country by adequately training our boys in those things that make for the spiritual minded, dedicated citizen who will, in turn, guarantee the future freedom, not only of America but of thet world. This is the goal to which the Boy Scouts of America stand dedicated."

With this goal in mind, the Boy Scouts of America can look ahead to the next 50 years secure in the knowledge that is is doing its part in the development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight, to be citizens of character, with high spiritual ideals and motives. This is not just a desirable thing, but is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as the leader of the free world.

I close with my congratulations and again express the thanks of the people of America to Hampden Council, Boy Scouts of America, for its service of 50 years to the youth of our community.

I am also privileged to bring to this great gathering, the greetings of the honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States.

BOY SCOUT BANQUET PROGRAM, HAMPDEN COUNCIL NO. 234, JANUARY 27, 1960

Opening ceremony.

Invocation by Rev. Leslie H. Johnson, D.D., Protestant Scout chaplain, pastor, Wesley Church.

Dinner.

Introduction by Toastmaster Charles M. Healey, Jr., council commissioner.

"Facing the Next Fifty," by A. Lionel Lawrence, council president.

Eagle badge presentation by Lee V. D. Schermerhorn, council advancement chairman.

Training achievement by Andrew F. Fitzhugh, council leadership training chairman—Arrowhead honor, den mother's award, scouter's award, scouter's key.

Special recognition by Russell G. Exley, scout executive.

Woodbadge presentation by Harry W. Blodgett, director, Horace A. Moses Scout Reservation.

Silver Beaver Award for Distinguished Service.

Address by Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND.

Closing ceremony.

SILVER BEAVER AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

William R. Falconer, Jr., Leon J. Carman, Eugene Ouimet, Melvin D. Southworth.

WOODBADGE INTERNATIONAL TRAINING AWARD

Alexander Hryniewicz, scoutmaster, troop 163; Roger D. Ball, scoutmaster, troop 18; John Redman, scoutmaster, troop 173; Warren LaBorde, assistant scoutmaster, troop 173; J. Arthur Baron, chairman, Chicopee Health and Safety Committee; Harold Guyton, scoutmaster, troop 89.

SCOUT AWARDS

Receiving the Arrowhead Honor for outstanding commissioner service to the units of the Hampden Council, Boy Scouts of America, and upon completion of the required years of service plus local and national training courses were the following: Algonquin district, Horace "Doc" Ashline, of Feeding Hills; Nipmuck district, Rudolph Longtin, of Springfield; King Philip District, David Katz, of Springfield.

The Scouters key, a formal recognition of successful youth leadership plus attendance at district, council, national training courses, and roundtables were the following Scouters: Frederick M. Converse of Troop 41 of Springfield; Wilfred Thivierge of Troop 150 of Chicopee; Earl Nugent of Troop 48 of Springfield; Adrian LaPointe of Cub Scout Pack 100 of Westfield; Edward Whittemore of Troop 63 of Springfield; Arthur Kingston of Troop 300 of Chicopee; William Luke, neighborhood commissioner of Westover Air Force Base; Donald Rice of Cub Scout Pack 34 of Springfield; Ludger Morin of Troop 149 of Chicopee Falls; Charles McCall, neighborhood commissioner of Westover Air Force Base; Richard Gour of Troop 54 of Springfield; Douglas Taylor of Troop 21 of Springfield; Gerald LaPalme of Troop 358 of Ludlow; Julian Pomfrey of Troop 101 of Westfield; Frank Nowatka of Cub Scout Pack 124 of Westfield; Michael F. Regan of Cub Scout Pack 141 of Chicopee; Fred Held of Cub Scout Pack 143 of Westover Field; Alex Johnson, neighborhood commissioner of Westover; Robert Kaczman of Troop 108 of Westfield.

Receiving the Scouters Award, recognition in the adult field of leadership: Kenneth Boggs of Troop 48 of Springfield; Frank Biza of Troop 89 of Agawam; Richard Gingras of Troop 89 of Agawam; Basil Pederzani of Troop 89 of Agawam; Frank Pinio of Troop 89 of Agawam; Woodrow Roberts of Troop 89 of Agawam; Kenneth Howe of Troop 161 of Palmer; Edgar Canty of Pack and Troop 141 of Chicopee; Julius Thal of Troop 32 of Springfield; Albert Domainque of Pack 56 of Springfield; Robert Pollard of Pack 173 of Sixteen Acres; John Parent of Troop 18 of Sixteen Acres; Charles Amos of Troop 182 of Ludlow; Arthur Sattler of Troop 117 of Westfield; Alton Foote of Troop 4 of Indian Orchard; Kenneth Walcott of Troop 150 of Chicopee; Fred Schultz of Troop 150 of Chicopee; Charles Agen of Troop 181 of Ludlow; Armand Gamache of Troop 180 of Ludlow; Sam Fine of Troop 21 of Springfield; Romeo Meunier of Troop 54 of Springfield.

"Den Mothers Award," symbol of trained dedicated leadership for youth; Pack 4 of Indian Orchard, Jeanne Sas, Isabelle Jambora, Marie Fay, Mary Dodge; Pack 161 of Palmer, Louise Ball, Pauline Santucci; Pack 140 of Westover Air Force Base, Frances Held; Pack 56 of Springfield, Mrs. George Dwyer, Esther Grolcau, Mildred Domainque, Evelyn Surprenant, Anne Denis, Alice Hamre; Pack 48 of Springfield, Rose LaBonte; Pack 54 of Springfield, Edith Guevin; Pack 102 of Westfield, Audrey Grant; Pack 52 of Springfield, Margaret Mikesh; Pack 173 of Sixteen Acres, Betty Plouffe; Pack 131 of Chicopee, Vera Paci; Pack 124 of Westfield, Ina Berggren; Pack 15 of Springfield, Mrs. Henry Stebbins; Pack 182 of Ludlow, Barbara LaPalme; Pack 83 of West Springfield, Iris Stefnowich; Pack 87 of West Springfield, Beulah Russell; Pack 150 of Chicopee, Mrs. Wilfred Thivierge; Pack 27 of Springfield, Dolores Mungert; Pack 107 of Westfield, Elizabeth Ann Regan; Pack 34 of Springfield, Mrs. Jean Stratton; Pack 78 of Feeding Hills, Elaine Roberts; Pack 15 of Springfield, Mrs. Herve Pondrice; Pack 7 of Brimfield, Jean McGann; Pack 21 of Springfield, Myrtle Picard.

West Virginia University—Symbol of Hope for a Great Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, throughout West Virginia this week, citizens are observing the 93d birthday of our great State university, which was founded on February 7, 1867.

The founding of West Virginia University at Morgantown is of special interest to Members of Congress because an act of Congress enabled my State to begin the development of its first great university.

On July 2, 1862, Congress passed the Land Grant (Morrill) Act—an example of how Federal aid without Federal control can be used to stimulate the growth of education. This is a timely example as we consider current proposals to strengthen our educational system through Federal aid. The Morrill Act spurred the development of great State universities through our land.

The tremendous achievements flowing from this act of Congress dramatize the dynamic role Federal aid can play in strengthening our educational system. As an example, let us look behind the magical door which the Morrill Act opened for higher education in West Virginia.

When the Agricultural College of West Virginia opened in 1867, there were 2 buildings, 6 faculty members and 122 students. The college was valued at $137,000. Its name was changed to West Virginia University the following year.

From this modest beginning, a great university has emerged. Today West Virginia University has 35 buildings on 3 campuses totaling 480 acres. The faculty and staff have increased to 1,800. And the student body has grown from 122 to 6,000 students in 6 colleges and many schools. The overall value of the university is estimated at $100 million.

West Virginia University has made tremendous strides under the outstanding leadership of its dynamic young president, Dr. Elvis Stahr.

One of the world's most modern medical centers will be completed this summer at a cost of $30 million on a new, 145-acre university campus. This magnificent West Virginia University Medical Center, an outstanding architectural achievement, is the first 4-year medical and dental school in the State's history.

Another new university campus is rising near the medical center. A large building for the College of Engineering and two classroom-office buildings and a greenhouse for the College of Agriculture are under construction at a cost of $10 million.

But the heart of any great university is its faculty. In practically every field, West Virginia University faculty members have distinguished themselves through their research and imagination. And, among State universities, West Virginia University is among the leaders in the proportion of its alumni who are included in "Who's Who in America."

In 93 years of tremendous expansion, West Virginia University has not lost one of its greatest assets—it's campus and the community of Morgantown—which the board of visitors of the old Agricultural College described to Gov. Arthur I. Boreman in 1867 as:

Unsurpassed for health, good order and morality. The view and scenery, embracing mountain, river, forests and farms, are exceedingly attractive and picturesque.

This description adequately fits most of West Virginia, which is indeed one of our country's most scenic States. Despite the distorted picture which an itinerant writer for the Saturday Evening Post tried to present, West Virginia is on the threshold of tremendous economic expansion. I am convinced that my State will grow and prosper in the years ahead as its university has in the past 93 years. West Virginia University symbolizes the State's hope and promise of dynamic growth in the future. Its graduates, and those of our great State colleges, will provide the imaginative leadership which West Virginia's great future demands.

Castro's Cuba—By Robert Taber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when Robert Taber writes about Cuba he knows what he is talking about, which is more than you can say for many of the commentators today whether they are political, editorial, or something else.

American journalism has a long way to go before you can say that it is adequately covering news events in Latin America.

"The talk of punishing Cuba by cutting the sugar quota is," according to Taber, "nonsense." He points out that in a large measure Cuba sugar is U.S. owned and that it is indispensable, as has been demonstrated in two world wars.

"To threaten economic sanctions against the Cuban Government is to invite retaliation," Taber points out, mentioning that Cuba could easily double its sugar production and dump "a vast and ruinous surplus on the world market in defiance of all existing marketing agreements."

Under a previous consent I am including the text of Robert Taber's article in the Nation for January 23, 1960 ,entitled "Castro's Cuba," which follows this biographical note which appeared at the beginning of the article:

CASTRO'S CUBA

(By Robert Taber)

As a CBS newsman, Robert Taber was an eyewitness to the Cuban revolution during four critical periods; in April 1957, he spent 3 weeks with Castro in the Sierra Maestra, and was the first newsman to do a radio-TV interview with the revolutionary leader; he was again in Oriente Province during the total war phase of the fighting in the spring of 1958; in the summer of that year, he spent 2 months with Fidel's brother, Raul, watching the guerrilla fighting in northern Oriente; and a year ago he witnessed Fidel's triumphant entry into Havana. He has since returned to Cuba several times doing research for a forthcoming book, M-26: Biography of a Revolution. The following article is based on materials from the book.—EDITOR.

In "Our Man in Havana," novelist Graham Greene wrote a farce about a debt-ridden British vacuum-cleaner dealer in Havana, who was recruited as an intelligence agent for his country. Lacking information of the sort required by his employers, the dealer began to invent it. In due course, he filed a report about a mysterious concrete platform being constructed, he asserted, in the remote, rebel-controlled mountains of eastern Cuba. Then, when pressed by his superiors for more details, he was reduced, in desperation, to drawing plans of a gigantic secret weapon, which he said was being installed on the mysterious platform in the mountains. His model and source of inspiration: a streamlined vacuum-cleaner attachment among his wares.

Greene presented this, of course, as gentle satire, spoofing the puerile but deadly serious and occasionally frightening preoccupation of the great powers with the cloak-and-dagger fantasies of their "cold war." What the novelist did not consider, perhaps, was that such fantasies can be made credible once they are put in the frame of reference of propaganda to which people have already been conditioned.

Thus, David Santner, in the Hearst headline service newspaper column "Washington Window," of November 12, 1959:

"Are Red Russian military technicians helping the anti-American Castro Cuban Government to build a missile base?

"There is a gigantic concrete 'emplacement' in Camaguey Province in Cuba, nearing completion. It is marked 'off limits' by the Cuban authorities and it is heavily guarded by Castro soldiery.

"This much our intelligence agents know, but no more."

The Hearst columnist goes on to say that there is evidence that small arms were smuggled ashore from Russian submarines during the struggle against Batista, adding that there is, however "no corroboration to date of the new Cuban regime having received any missiles," i.e., from the Soviet Union.

The plain inference is that the Cubans have received Soviet missiles, smuggled ashore from Russian submarines, and that this will soon be corroborated.

Presumably, no one has yet plagiarized our man in Havana to the extent of sending drawings of vacuum-cleaner attachments to our Central Intelligence Agency in Washington. However, much of the reportage on the Cuban scene during the past year supports the suspicion that even this might not be too much to anticipate.

The fact is that the "gigantic concrete emplacement" mystery of the Hearst newspapers differs only in degree, certainly not in kind, from the great bulk of what has been reported in the press and on radio and TV in the United States concerning the Cuban revolution since Dictator Fulgencio Batista's precipitate flight from Havana on New Year's Day, 1959. We have witnessed a virulent press campaign, concocted of ignorance, half-truths, name calling, connotative misdirection, and outright fabrication, all tending to erode the first bright image of the revolution and to discredit its leadership.

COMMENTS WHICH DON'T ENDEAR

One must concede at once that the Cuban revolutionaries themselves have provided, gratis, a great deal of the ammunition which has been hurled against them. Fidel Castro's off-the-cuff remark that in the event of United States military intervention in Cuba "* * * 20,000 gringos would die" was scarcely calculated to endear him to the North American press or people. He has added a great many provocations to this initial one since last January. Oratorical intemperance, a Cuban flair for exaggeration, and a failure to take account of other people's prejudices, have all contributed to damaging misunderstandings.

It is barely possible that a more adroit public relations effort vis-a-vis the United States might have eased some of the strain. But one must instantly add that no amount of oil spread on troubled waters could have ameliorated the underlying conflict of interests of which the surface storm of propaganda is merely symptomatic. Nor could clever press relations long have concealed this paramount fact: The Cuban revolution was and is, above all, a Cuban declaration of independence from the United States.

This is what made it certain that Fidel Castro's U.S. press notices would be mostly unfavorable. They could not have been otherwise.

LET'S FACE REALITY

In order to understand the nature of the conflict, one must consider briefly the status of the island before the revolution, and then proceed to review the developments of the past year.

From Cuba's founding as a republic in 1903 until December 31, 1958, when the Batista regime abruptly collapsed, the country was for every practical purpose a U.S. colony, captive both economically and politically. Its first constitution gave the United States the privilege of intervening in Cuban affairs, both internal and external—a privilege invoked more than once under the detested Platt amendment, which was not abrogated until 1934. Cuba's trade treaties were written in Washington and Wall Street. The greater part of its resources—sugar, mineral rights, public-utility concessions, cattle lands—were controlled by U.S. capital. In such circumstances, it can scarcely be doubted that the succession of rapacious professional politicos who ruled Cuba during most of the half century or so of its republican existence were necessarily the caretakers of a vast amount of American, rather than Cuban, wealth. And whatever else he may have been, the dictator who fled to Santo Domingo on the first day of 1959 was one of these—a discredited, dispossessed custodian of the Yankee dollar.

A sizable part of the Cuban business community—the small merchants and the economic nationalists of finance and industry—

had opposed Batista and made common cause with Fidel Castro's bearded revolutionaries for reasons of their own. But to the extent that these Cuban businessmen understood the radical fidelista program, set forth in all its essential details as early as 1953, they were wary of him. At best, they wished him only a limited success—that is, they hoped that he would serve as a cat's-paw to destroy the Batista regime but that he would subsequently be forced to accept a "liberal" coalition government representing their interests. If worst came to worst, they felt, it would probably be possible to "do business" with Castro, very much as business had been done with other nominally popular governments in the past.

Fortune magazine, discussing the question of agrarian reform under the Castro government in its September 1959 issue, put the matter very well:

"If the rich, powerful, and normally cynical Cubans began to be disquieted by the realization that giving land to somebody involved taking it from somebody else (i.e., themselves), they didn't raise the point. Some prominent citizens thought that the new hero was merely making appropriate noble noises, and that when the excitement subsided he would give them the cordial and cooperative government they liked."

That impression certainly prevailed among the rich, powerful, and normally cynical American with a stake in Cuba, and no doubt was shared by Washington as well.

These cynics were soon disappointed. Even before Fidel had reached Havana, the "noble noises" of the fidelistas were echoed by the crash of revolutionary rifles as the first and worst of some 550 war criminals, notorious torturers and mass murderers of the Batista regime died before firing squads.

At the outset, Castro installed a politically "equidistant" government in the presidential palace in Havana. Only a few of its members were actual revolutionaries. However, any hope that the conservatives of the new Cabinet would soon restore "business as usual" was speedily dashed by the realization that the provisional government was not, in fact, governing. The administration of state affairs, like the trial and execution of the war criminals and the reorganization of the armed forces, remained in the hands of Fidel Castro and his supporters.

A month after Batista's overthrow, Fidel accepted nominal as well as actual authority by becoming Prime Minister. The Cabinet was reorganized, and the long-promised social revolution got underway.

CUBA IS REDISCOVERED

A horrendous outcry had already arisen in the U.S. press in reaction to the war-crimes trials, which were seen as a portent of the intransigent radicalism of the Castro movement.

The island of Cuba, of slight interest to the newspaper-reading public during 7 years of struggle against the Batista dictatorship, was suddenly rediscovered only "90 miles off our shores, site of the American naval base that guards our southern defenses, anchor of our defense of the Panama Canal, and key to the future of Latin America. * * *" An army of American journalists flocked to Havana, and torrents of sensational, adjective-packed prose—more than had been written during the two preceding years of civil war—began to flow back. Members of Congress took up the cry. Republican Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, perceived "the spectacle of a bearded monster stalking through Cuba." Representative WAYNE HAYS, possibly better informed about the sugar-beet industry of his own Ohio than about Cuban affairs, demanded to know what the State Department intended to do to calm Castro down, before he depopulates Cuba. Time magazine informed its reader that the fidelistas were taking revenge on a conquered foe, and listed among typical victims the name of Alejandro Garcia Olayon, a naval officer accused of having roasted six persons alive, and of having supervised the slaughter of some 300 persons, after an abortive uprising in Cienfuegos in 1957.

The campaign abated somewhat as understanding dawned that the revolutionary tribunals, although following a code of Cuban rather than Anglo-Saxon juridical procedure, were administrating strict justice, that there was no slightest question as to the guilt of those condemned, and that all sectors of the Cuban population, as well as the Catholic clergy itself, stood amazed at the furore of foreign criticism. Perhaps it was perceived, too, that the revolutionary government did not seem to be doing anything so revolutionary in its first month in office that it would seriously jeopardize the $850 million of private U.S. investment capital in Cuba.

Fidel's accession to the Premiership in February signaled an important consolidation of power by the fidelista movement. To quote The New York Times of February 22:

"The action of Fidel Castro in personally taking over the office of the Premier of the Republic of Cuba reflects his recognition of the fact that the people accept him as their supreme leader. The truth is that they regard him as not only Premier in the Government of Dr. Manuel Urrutia, whom he proclaimed President, but as the very Government itself."

Precisely so. It does not follow, however, that opposition to the revolutionary process had ended, as we shall see.

In mid-April, the Cuban Premier made a visit to the United States that seemed, briefly, to promise improved relations with Washington. But friendly gestures were no substitute for deeds; basic conflicts of interest, both economic and political, proved irreconcilable, and the rapproachement failed to take. Cuba had embarked on a revolutionary course from which there has been, to date, no turning.

CUBA CHOOSES ITS OWN PATH

On the political plane, Castro made it clear that his government had no intention of following, in blind submission, Washington's lead in the cold war. He said that although his revolutionary movement was "not Red, but olive green" (a reference to the color of the revolutionary uniform), it did not intend to persecute the Cuban Communists of the Partido Socialista Popular. With regard to the island's foreign policy, he said that Cuba would choose its own path, both politically and in its commercial relations with other countries. U.S. interference in matters related to Cuban defense—specifically the question of some British aircraft which Cuba sought to buy and the State Department persuaded Britain not to sell—subsequently produced the statement that if the island could not satisfy its needs in the West, it would do so "elsewhere," i.e., in the Communist countries, if need be.

In the United Nations, where Batista's representative, Nuñez Portuondo, had been considered the bellwether of the U.S. solid Latin American bloc, Cuba broke the united front for the first time by abstaining from voting on a U.S. proposal to postpone debate for another year on the question of seating Communist China.

A mere glance at the bare bones of the fidelista economic program is sufficient to disclose the reasons for the attraction that it originally exerted on the economic nationalists in Cuban business and banking circles. The same facts and figures reveal as well, however, the basis of future opposition to the movement on the part of other, larger and more powerful, economic interests in Cuba and in the United States.

The promised diversification of agriculture meant that Cuba could hope to stop spending $20 million annually on Texas and Louisiana rice, and even greater sums on U.S. canned food products and bottled beverages, and produce its own. Protective tariffs and government aid to fledgling native industries promised to create both higher employment and an expansion of domestic markets, based on the increased purchasing power of a more productive labor force. Agrarian reform, to turn half a million squatters and itinerant agricultural workers into prosperous small farmers, held out the same hope of greater general prosperity and a better distribution of the nation's wealth.

NEW PATHS FOUND

And all of these measures, as well as others in prospect, signified something else of great importance: an end to the flight of capital, principally in the form of sugar profits, that had been flowing from Cuba by the hundreds of millions of dollars over the years, never to return.

If it seems paradoxical to say that sugar was the island's principal source of income and at the same time an incubus on the Cuban people, it is because a simple fact has not been considered: fully 40 percent of the Nation's sugar production, with an annual value of more than $600 million, was firmly in the hands of the U.S. corporations in 1958. (In the past, the percentage had risen as high as 70.) An additional 10 to 20 percent was controlled by Canadian, Spanish, and other foreign interests. Thus less than half of a product accounting for nearly two-thirds of Cuba's national income, and fully 80 percent of her export, was actually controlled by Cubans. And even the profits accruing to the Cuban sugar barons did not remain in Cuba: most of the return was banked or invested abroad.

The same conditions applied with respect to the great cattle ranches, to the Nation's mineral wealth (90 percent in American hands), to its oil (owned entirely by British and American corporations), to its public utilities (80 percent American-owned).

The importance of such facts cannot be exaggerated. They are the essence of economic colonialism, which requires neither a colonial office nor a colonial army to maintain itself when native politicians gladly serve as overseers at lower wages.

At bottom, economic colonialism has its basis in the same circumstance as feudalism: the monopoly control of a nation's wealth, in the one instance by foreigners, in the other by an obligarchy of one's own wealthy and powerful countrymen.

Cuba suffered from the two afflictions at once. Until the agrarian reform, fewer than 8 percent of the property holdings in Cuba accounted for nearly 75 percent of all cultivated land. That is to say, three-quarters of the agricultural resources of an agricultural country the size of England, and with a population half again that of Ireland, was in the hands of a few dozen wealthy Cuban families and giant U.S.-owned sugar and cattle corporations.

THE REAL STORY EMERGES

The social consequences of such a maldistribution of wealth are obvious enough. Cuba's illiteracy rate was one of the highest in the hemisphere, 33.5 percent. A million Cuban women and children had never worn shoes. Half a million campesinos had never tasted milk, or meat. More than a million had never had even the most rudimentary medical care. Thousands of guajiros in the Sierra Maesta were as isolated from the rest of the nation as though they lived on an island in the Pacific, without roads, communications, or any contact with the outside world.

Where was the sound economy, the prosperous nation, of which Batista's American public-relations agents used to boast? The sugar corporations were prosperous. The great cattle ranchers were prosperous. But who was paying the bill?

Felipe Pazos, one of the prominent bankers of the anti-Batista movement, has said that graft on public works alone during 7 years of the Batista administration came close to $500 million on a total public-works budget of less than $800 million. Cost estimates were customarily doubled, and the rakeoff apportioned among the thieves. Such practices extended into every aspect of the nation's economic life. A report written by Robert Alden in the New York Times of January 5, 1958, described "the agent of the government, the man with the outstretched palm who is the key figure in the large-scale corruption in Cuba":

"The owner of a small food store says: 'I pay $2 to the "collector" every time I pull the shutter of my shop in the morning. I pay $2 when I pull it down at night.'

"The taxicab driver pays the 'collector' $1 for the right to stay at his taxi stand for 3 hours, and, depending on their volume of business, a precise scale of payment is exacted from each of thousands of street vendors."

In February 1958, it was estimated that nearly 27,000 Cubans lived on the proceeds of gambling; 11,500 lived by or on prostitution; 5,000 lived by begging (Report of the Cuban National Council of Economy, 1958). The collector extracted tribute from them all.

The money lost on the Havana gaming tables by American tourists lined Batista's pockets and those of American gangsters in Las Vegas, Cleveland, and New York. Corporation taxes were low, for the benefit of foreign investors, and the Cuban latifundistas paid more in bribes than in taxes. The tax on an annual income of $1 million never exceeded 10 percent, and even this was seldom paid. But the middle classes groaned under taxation, and the working classes sweated to pay for imported rice, beans, and canned goods; the United States enjoyed a trade with Cuba which ran to more than $10 million a month in its own favor.

Of the total Cuban labor force of 2,204,000, some 361,000 persons were wholly unemployed throughout 1957; 150,000 were employed only part of the time; 154,000 were engaged in unremunerated labor—e.g., as domestic servants, working for their meals and lodgings. Of 1,539,000 Cubans gainfully employed, 954,000 earned less than $75 a month in a nation where the peso was on a par with the dollar and had even less purchasing power in Havana than in New York.

The nation's free gold and dollar reserves, depleted by assaults on the Treasury and an unfavorable trade balance with the United States, were down to $110,000 by the end of December 1958. The incoming government was faced with a current deficit of more than $50 million and a national indebtedness of close to $1.5 billion.

ABUSES ARE ABOLISHED

The revolutionary provisional government, coming to power in January, abolished the worst of the abuses of the Batista regime at a single stroke.

Thousands of Government sinecures were eliminated, along with the subsidies which had been paid, for political reasons, to most Cuban newspapers and to many Cuban journalists.

A ministry for the recovery of stolen property set to work to recover millions of dollars in cash and more millions in property illegally acquired under past regimes. Scores of contractors who had accepted kickbacks on public-works contracts were forced to disgorge their illicit gains, and the estates of former government officials, acquired dishonestly, were confiscated by the state.

Home and apartment rentals were reduced 30 to 50 percent, bringing dwelling rentals to what were considered more reasonable levels and at the same time injecting a considerable amount of fresh capital into the economy at the consumer level. The effect was much the same for Cuban wage earners as though they had received a sizable increase in pay, and the benefits were immediately felt, also, by thousands of retail merchants.

Mortgage rates were reduced in order to provide relief for the smaller landlords.

Under a cabinet decree, owners of idle property in urban areas were compelled to build on their vacant lots, or to put them up for sale to builders, in an effort to create employment, to end real estate speculation and to provide desperately needed urban space for industrial development.

Tax laws were revised to reduce the number of different taxes by about two-thirds and to provide a more equitable distribution of the taxload. Collections were rigorously enforced, and thousands of tax dodgers now found themselves paying not only current but past taxes, which they had thought to evade. (Of 30,000 members of Havana's 12 most exclusive clubs, it was found that only 6,000 had ever even filed tax returns.)

Although there was some grumbling, principally among landlords whose rentals were reduced, the reaction to the first reforms of the new government was generally favorable. The business classes had asked for honest government, and they discovered that they were getting it "for almost the first time," said The New York Times correspondent Herbert Matthews, "since Columbus discovered the island."

It quickly became evident, however, that the provisional government had no intention of stopping at this point.

CHANGES INSTITUTED

The big U.S.-owned utility companies were next to feel the effects of reform. Government intervenors were installed to oversee the affairs of the Compañía Cubana de Electricidad, a $300 million subsidiary of the American & Foreign Power Corp., supplying 90 percent of Cuba's electrical power. After an inspection of the books, the company was ordered to extend its rural service and to reduce its rates by 30 percent.

The books of the Cuban Telephone Co., a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, representing a $115 million investment, were also examined. Rate increases which had been granted by the Batista government were abolished, and the company was ordered to improve its notoriously inadequate and inefficient service.

The government had already armed itself with authority to impose controls on currency and imports, to halt the flight of Cuban capital and to restore a lopsided balance of payments. Within the first few months of the new administration, imports were reduced by more than 30 percent, the curbs being applied primarily to noneessential goods—e.g., bottled alcoholic beverages and television sets. Since Cuba had been the world's sixth greatest market for U.S. manufactured and agricultural products, it is not surprising that there should have been repercussions. The worst fears of U.S. investors were confirmed in June, with the promulgation of the agrarian reform law.

The distribution of idle Government landholdings to landless campesinos had already begun. Guajiros in the Sierra Maestra who had lived for generations on land nominally owned by absentee landlords under ancient Spanish grants had also been assured of title to their plots. The next step—under the agrarian reform law—was to invoke the provisions of the Cuban Constitution of 1940 which, although never enforced, had strictly forbidden the holding of latifundios, i.e., more than a thousand acres in a single property.

Exceptions were permitted in the new law to allow maximum holdings of 3,316 acres in rice and cattle lands—where it could be demonstrated that such holdings would be in the interest of more efficient production.

Holdings beyond the legal maximums were subject to expropriation, the land so acquired by the State to be distributed among Cuba's 700,000 landless peasants, with preference to be given to the sharecroppers or squatters actually living on the expropriated property. Each family was assured of 2 caballerias (66⅔ acres) gratis, and the privilege of purchasing 3 additional caballerias.

The law forbade the ownership of sugarcane holdings by mill owners, the purpose being to break up the large monopolies in the interest of the peasants and small cane growers. Ownership of Cuban land by foreigners, whether acquired by purchase or inheritance, was forbidden, and likewise the ownership of land by stock companies in which foreigners might hold shares.

The owners were shocked by the compensation offered for the property to be expropriated: 20-year Government bonds bearing 4½-percent interest. Although they had for many years enjoyed extremely low taxation as the result of minimal assessments, they were now dismayed to learn that expropriation payments would be based on these same evaluations.

AGRARIAN REFORMS DENOUNCED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The American press was prompt to denounce the agrarian reform as confiscatory. The complaints of the sugar cartel were translated into the language most familiar to the American newspaper-reading public: the land-reform program was a Kremlin-inspired plot to destroy free enterprise. In Washington, there was talk of reducing the Cuban sugar quota, an idea particularly appealing to the sugar Senators of Louisiana and to those legislators with an interest in Hawaiian and Puerto Rican cane sugar or U.S. beet sugar. (The question comes up for action in the current session of Congress.)

Altogether, nearly 2 million acres of cane land owned by or controlled by U.S. interests was marked for expropriation, final action being deferred until after the 1959–60 zafra, or winter harvest, so as not to interfere with sugar production. The first of the big American-owned cattle ranches to be expropriated, the 33,500-acre King Ranch in Camaguey, was formally seized by the Agrarian Reform Institute on November 15. The total extent of other American-owned ranches and other holdings marked for expropriation is thought to be about a million acres.

In Havana, the Government launched what was viewed as another shaft aimed at U.S. business interests: a 5-percent tax on the value of minerals extracted by mining companies, and a 25-percent tax on the value of minerals or ores exported from Cuba. A subsequent measure brought the oil deposits of the island under the control of the industrial division of the Agrarian Reform Institute.

When, in November, the Havana Government suddenly and without explanation replaced Dr. Felipe Pazos as president of the Cuban National Bank with one of the most radical of the Cuban revolutionary leaders, Dr. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, it was felt that the worst had indeed come to the worst.

It is easily possible to trace a rough correspondence between the policy decisions and actions of the revolutionary government and the rise and fall of the decibel level of the anti-Castro propaganda campaign in the United States and elsewhere.

The journalistic image of Fidel Castro varied, even during the struggle against Batista, in ratio to the assessment made of his intentions and capabilities in financial and diplomatic quarters. One saw, in succession, the romantic bourgeois hero (supported by the "best elements" of Cuban society), the potentially dangerous fanatic ("Burn the cane! After Batista we will have a zafra of liberty!"), the bearded leader of what Senator ELLENDER called "a bunch of bandits, burning sugar plantations."

By the end of the first month of fidelista control, the international wire services and their clients in the United States were in full cry against the new government, and it was difficult to distinguish the "liberal" journals—which had hitherto viewed Castro with cautious sympathy—from the most reactionary. The burden of the wave of criticism was humanitarian concern for the "victims" of the revolutionary tribunals, but the underlying preoccupation was apparent in speculation as to the probable economic orientation of the new regime.

As early as January—Fidel's first month in power—U.S. News & World Report, among other conservative journals, was inquiring as to the possibility of a dictatorship taking shape in Cuba, and it may be significant that, during the same period, Associated Press Analyst William Ryan, for one, perceived the clear possibility of U.S. intervention to save Cuba from chaos.

COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD SCARE

In May, with the beginning of the "Communist beachhead" scare, initiated on television and echoed by the Hearst press, there was renewed talk of intervention, this time to save Cuba not from chaos but from communism. United Press International's vice president, Lyle C. Wilson, speculated that Communists probably would "take over" the Cuban Government, and predicted that in such a circumstance "the United States would promptly apply force to prevent the Reds from getting a foothold in the island Republic," adding: "The United States wouldn't tolerate communism in our back yard."

The attempts of the Havana Government to cope with the increasingly disruptive conspiracies of counterrevolutionary elements both inside and outside of Cuba during the summer and fall of 1959 simply provided more fuel for the anti-Castro press campaign. The technique employed to discredit the revolutionary leadership is illustrated in the following excerpts from Newsweek magazine's edition of November 9:

"The revolutionary tribunals are coming back, and so are the firing squads. The mob has shouted its approval of Premier Fidel Castro's plan to arm the peasants and the workers. * * * They are not a bloodthirsty people, these Habaneras who keep crying 'to the firing squad.' The trouble is that they've been so brainwashed that whatever Castro says they automatically believe."

Who is trying to brainwash whom—and with what object? To be evaluated properly, the above quotation should be compared with another, published about the same time, from Hearst Columnist David Sentner:

"WASHINGTON.—The United States must immediately lead a movement by the Organization of American States and the U.N. for the replacement of the Communist-dominated Castro regime in Cuba. Otherwise within 6 to 8 months, many other Latin American nations will follow the Castro pattern and confiscate all American property.

"So predicts Dr. Emilio Nuñez Portuondo, former U.N. Security Council President and distinguished Cuban diplomat."

Sentner does not trouble to identify the "distinguished Cuban diplomat" as Batista's former United Nations representative or as the so-called "intellectual leader" of the anti-Castro batistianos-in-exile with headquarters in Ciudad Trujillo. However, he does say that the Castro regime has placed "a big deathprice" on Nuñez Portuondo's head, and goes on to quote him at length concerning an alleged plot, instigated by Moscow and Peiping, to "communize" Cuba.

It is not too difficult to see the relationship between the Newsweek article and the Hearst columnist's interview with Nuñez Portuondo. The one, painting a lurid picture of an evil, tyrannical, menacing regime, prepares U.S. public opinion for what the other bluntly proposes: an overt military attack on that same regime in the name of humanity, or self-defense, or something equally moral.

Thus it would seem that Fidel Castro's apprehensions with regard to the possibility of foreign intervention, dismissed in the American press as mere ranting or evidence of paranoia, could have some basis. And hence the preoccupation in Havana with counterrevolutionary conspiracies, both at home and abroad: The possibility of a successful counter-revolution in Cuba at the present time is so remote as to be nonexistent. On the other hand, the existence of a counterrevolutionary force, small but well financed, with a firm base in Santo Domingo, powerful backing in the United States and a manpower pool of former Batista soldiers, policemen and displaced petty officials in Cuba itself, does pose a serious threat to the revolution.

It was, after all, the fidelistas themselves who demonstrated how much confusion could be sown, and how much damage done to an economy, by a handful of fanatics.

But this is to discuss the lesser evil. The real danger lies in the use of to which the appearance of a counterrevolution could be put—if the United States were inclined to intervene in Cuba. A widespread, lasting campaign of terrorism, endangering American lives and property, would most certainly produce a ringing appeal for outside aid, in which Cuban conservatives would join. And although Washington—recalling the worldwide political repercussions of its thinly disguised intervention in Guatemala in 1954—would not be anxious to follow the same course again, it is easy to see how Nuñez Portuondo's plan might be adopted, i.e., United States military intervention under the aegis of the Organization of American States.

WHAT IS JUSTIFIED?

How much of the sound and fury of the U.S. press campaign, with its incessant theme of Communist "infiltration" in the Caribbean, has been justified by the actual developments of the first year of revolutionary government in Cuba?

From the point of view of the great Cuban landowners, the import-export bankers, the sugar cartel, the immediate dollar interests threatened, no doubt all of it is justified. From a more liberal, not to say more humane, position, very little indeed.

The picture of a Cuba dominated by Moscow or Peiping is not supported by a nose count of Communists in its government or in the armed forces. Their number is negligible, their influence minimal. Nor do the results of last year's union elections vindicate the notion of significant Communist influence in the ranks of organized labor. In the 500,000-member Sugar Workers Federation, to cite an instance, Communist candidates were elected in only 8 of 243 locals. Not a single Communist was elected to the executive board of the Confederation of Cuban Workers.

The revival of the revolutionary tribunals in October was the Castro government's answer to a series of counterrevolutionary threats dating back to August, when an invasion from Santo Domingo was aborted with the capture of a planeload of arms sent by Dominican Dictator Rafael Trujillo. The civil courts, rubber stamps for the Batista regime, had not yet been sufficiently reorganized to cope with any large number of trials or to dispense the speedy justice which would serve as a deterrent to further insurrection.

Further conflicts of ideology and interest are inevitable. It would be remarkable if a far-reaching social and economic revolution could be achieved in any country without such conflicts.

Fidel Castro is by no means above criticism. He has leaned far too heavily on his own political gifts, his personal influence, his oratorical skill, to solve the pressing problems with which he has been confronted. The result has been an appearance of demagogy which has alienated many of his erstwhile supporters and awakened deep concern even in the most liberal quarters.

The question remains whether it would have been possible to implement the program which has given the Cuban masses their first glimpse of hope, and the island the first honest government in its history, by less arbitrary, more conventional methods. One concludes, however reluctantly: no.

The history of half a century of parliamentary procedure and ballot-box representation provides almost overwhelming evidence of the simple fact that political democracy is meaningless without a generous measure of economic democracy. The introduction of the ballot box in Cuba heralded nothing more than an exchange of absentee landlords, Spanish for American, and the rise of a class of scavenging professional politicians whose hire was the loot of a rampant spoils system and whose ultimate effect was to pave the way for the ultimate disaster: Batista. It is certainly not surprising that Fidel Castro considers a public-opinion poll or a show of hands in the park in front of the Presidential Palace a relatively satisfactory substitute for national elections. Nor is it surprising that the great mass of the people in Cuba today show little interest in the subject.

WHAT ABOUT ELECTIONS?

The Cuban conservatives who are presently calling for elections are precisely those individuals who have had the most experience at manipulating the electoral process for their own private ends. It is most improbable that any candidate opposed to the fidelista program, or not endorsed by the revolutionary movement, could win an election in Cuba at this time. But there is no doubt, either, that an election campaign would serve as a sounding board for the spokesmen of powerful reactionary interests, would sow confusion, and help to revive a counterrevolutionary effort not yet fully under control. It would profoundly dishearten the Cuban man in the street who has learned through half a century to equate the ballot box with the pistol, the dishonest peso, and the privileged few who have been the exponents, practitioners, and principal beneficiaries of Cuban elections.

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Certainly a great deal is at stake for the Cuban people. The organization of some 500 agricultural cooperatives, the construction of hundreds of schools, hospitals and low-cost housing units, early evidence of a new economic independence signaled by increasing production of rice and other staples, all indicate how great the stake really is.

For the United States, too, the stake is high, regardless of how such questions as the matter of compensation for expropriated U.S. properties are worked out. Cuba is the focal point of a manifestation that seems certain to spread farther in the hemisphere, and the United States can hardly afford to be indifferent. To cite a relevant passage by Herbert Matthews in the New York Times:

"About one-quarter of all our exports go to Latin America and one-third of our imports come from the area. United States private investments in Latin America now reach the amazing total of about $9.5 billion. * * * At every point it has to be said: 'If we did not have Latin America on our side, our situation would be desperate. To be denied the products and markets of Latin America would reduce the United States to being a second-rate nation and

cause a devastating reduction in our standard of living. * * * Latin American raw materials are essential to our existence as a world power. A friendly Latin America is necessary to our military security.'"

Apparently this, and not the mere dollar investment in Cuba, big as it may be, is the heart of the matter. The question remaining is—what to do about it?

It was the end of World War II that marked the close of the colonial period and the beginning of a wave of profound political, social, and economic change throughout the world. In every instance, the essential drives are the same: for independence, self-determination, economic emancipation, social justice.

In the underdeveloped agricultural nations—and that defines most, if not all, of the American republics—the essential first step toward freedom is agrarian reform. To withhold that is to withhold everything. To attempt to defend a dying feudalism is to face not the risk, but the certainty, sooner or later, of losing—everything.

"Whether history will record Cuba's Fidel Castro as an earnest patriot or a fellow-traveling adventurer," writes our former Ambasador to India, Chester Bowles, "is anybody's guess. But one fact is already clear. His land-reform program * * * is dutiably in line Latin American sentiment."

It is perhaps natural that the powerful interests threatened by social and economic change in Cuba and elsewhere should try to stem the tide. But it is not well advised, and it would be a pity if their influence were to prevail in Washington.

THE FALLACY IN CUTTING THE SUGAR QUOTA

Talk of punishing Cuba by cutting the sugar quota is nonsense. Cuba is not merely the world's major sugar producer, but virtually the only sugar-producing country that does not consume the bulk of what it produces. Cuban sugar supplies the need of the entire eastern third of the United States, and it is a vital supply, price-supported not merely because it is in large measure U.S.-owned, but because it is indispensable, as has been demonstrated in two World Wars. To threaten economic sanctions against the Cuban Government is to invite retaliation: e.g., Cuba could easily double its sugar production and dump a vast and ruinous surplus on the world market in defiance of all existing marketing agreements.

Fidel Castro remains as much the symbol of revolution—and of hope—in Latin America at large as he was for Cuba during the long struggle in the mountains of Oriente. The same forces that produced the Cuban revolution are at play throughout the hemisphere; the same aspirations that kindled the imagination of the guajiros of the Sierra Maestra and the bank clerks of Havana in 1957 is stirring in the hearts of the cane cutters of Santo Domingo and the bank clerks of Lima in 1960. There is no doubt that the Cuban revolution has accelerated the revolutionary process greatly, and perhaps has given it a shape that it never had before. It was no coincidence, but a warning, that Panamanian rioters storming into the Panama Canal Zone in December should have adopted "Viva Fidel Castro" as their battle cry.

Former Ambassador Bowles, urging a realistic compromise with the inevitable, advises:

"We can adjust ourselves in advance to the certainty that reason will not always prevail, that injustices will almost surely occur, and that the short-term price paid for long-term stability will often appear exorbitant.

"Above all, let us not lose sight of the essential issue. The real choice in Latin America, as in Asia and Africa, is citizenship or serfdom, hope or despair, orderly political growth or bloody upheaval. Our failure to understand this choice, or to support the vital new elements which are striving to assert leadership, would be catastrophic."

What Bowles has to say is worth considering. The Congress, preparing to set the new sugar quota, might well think it over, and so might the State Department, before proceeding to implement the firmer policy toward Cuba that was announced only last week.

There's Gold in Those Mountains of Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I included a significant article by Columnist Dickson Preston, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, which emanated from Washington.

Mr. Preston points up one of the glaring deficiencies of our farm program; namely, the inordinately high cost of storage and the unconscionable profits made by those who are storing our surplus grains.

Senator SYMINGTON pointed out that if the cost of storing and handling Government grain, estimated at over a half-billions dollars for the current year, could be reduced by just 1 cent a bushel the result in savings to the taxpayer would amount to $25 million a year.

The article follows:

THERE'S GOLD IN THOSE MOUNTAINS OF GRAIN

(By Dickson Preston)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Senator Stuart SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, shook his head in astonishment. In 30 years as industrialist, Government official and Senator, he said, he'd never heard of anything quite like it.

A parade of witnesses had been testifying, under oath, that their profits ranged from 69 to 167 percent a year simply for storing part of the mountains of grain acquired by the Government under the farm surplus program.

What's more, they have been granted special enticements—such as fast tax writeoffs and other concessions—to persuade them to enter this profitable business.

And many storage operators, it turns out, don't even risk their own capital. They borrow money from Uncle Sam (through the Small Business Administration), use it to build storage facilities, and then lease the space back to the Government.

All this while Governmet-owned bins, built to store grain at low cost, stand empty throughout the West.

Senator SYMINGTON was presiding at an agriculture subcommittee hearing called to find out whether the Agriculture Department is wasting the taxpayers' money by paying too much to store the gigantic grain surplus.

"We all have a concept of what a fair profit is," said the Senator, who made $1 million or so in the steel and electrical businesses before getting into politics. "These are the highest by far that I've ever seen. What we want to know is why?"

He pointed out that if the cost of storing and handling Government grain—estimated at $587 million for 1960—could be reduced by just 1 cent a bushel, the result would save taxpayers $25 million a year.

Senator SYMINGTON also read into the record an ad mailed to elevator operators last May by Hugo Blumstengel, a steel storage bin salesman of Kansas City.

"Are you passing up Uncle Sam's gravy train?" the ad asked, asserting that some dealers were getting back their original investment in 1 year and making fat profits after that. "There's gold in them there mountains of grain."

Evidence put before the committee showed Mr. Blumstengel's ad was no exaggeration. Most of the figures were verified by General Accounting Office audits.

Ivan Summa, manager of the Farmers Cooperative Grain Co. of Archer, Iowa, said his costs in the period auditcd by GAO were 11.2 cents a bushel, his Government payment 18.98 cents, his net profit 7.78 cents. Allowing for possible loss due to spoilage or shrinking, that figured out to 69 percent.

"That's a pretty good profit, isn't it?" Senator SYMINGTON asked. "The automobile industry figures its profit at about 5 percent, the airplane industry at 3 percent."

Food—The 1959 Yearbook of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Government publications I have seen in recent years was the 1959 Yearbook of Agriculture—"Food." The Department of Agriculture is to be congratulated on this fine achievement.

Recently one of my constituents, Mrs. Gerald Reinker, of South Euclid, Ohio, who received a copy of "Food," wrote to say how delighted she has been with the valuable information contained in this book. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share Mrs. Reinker's letter with my colleagues:

SOUTH EUCLID, OHIO,
January 19, 1960.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: Several months ago, in answer to my request, I received from you a copy of "1959 Yearbook of Agriculture, Food." I can't tell you how delighted I have been with the valuable information it contains. Although I haven't yet found the time to thoroughly read each section, I find myself referring to it so often that it has found a permanent and prominent place in my kitchen.

I think American women are becoming increasingly aware of the important role of good nutrition in relation to their family's health and well-being. This edition is an excellent handbook for those who, like myself, haven't the time for formal educational courses; but who, nevertheless, love our husbands and children enough to want the assurance that we are doing the best job possible of meeting their nutritional needs.

In particular, I find the comprehensive list of foods and their nutritional values a marvelous aid in preparing my menus. It is the first chart I have been able to find that includes foods less commonly served

as well as the more popular, and also evaluates the available nutrients in foods not only in terms of popular-sized portions, but also according to the manner of preparation (an important consideration).

My very sincerest thanks, Mrs. BOLTON, for your discerning taste in recommending this fine edition, and for forwarding me a copy. I should also like to thank you for the book on child care which arrived shortly after our second child was born. After 1 year, it looks considerably worn. It has been very much appreciated by both my husband and myself.

May I also extend my family's best wishes for a happy, healthy and prosperous New Year to you and your family.

Yours sincerely,

JANE REINKER,
Mrs. Gerald Reinker.

H.R. 755–3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning is was the pleasure of several Members of this Congress, including myself, to attend the 50th anniversary breakfast of the Boy Scouts of America, and there take part in ceremonies marking the golden jubilee of this youth movement which has meant so much to our Nation.

We were particularly impressed with the 50 young men, among them Robert Floyd Hoel, of Hutchinson, Minn.—Scouts all—who represented the 50 States of the Union. Certainly they epitomized the finest type of embryonic citizens. It is gratifying to know that our Nation can count of them as the leaders of tomorrow.

Though there were only 50 of these Scouts present, they represented an alumni of over 31 million men and boys who have been associated with the movement since its formation here in our Nation's Capital 50 years ago. They also represent, in a most admirable way, the 5,043,000 boys and men who are currently active in the programs of scouting.

It is significant to note that these large figures mean much more than cold statistics. They represent a concrete measurement of the effectiveness of our American way of doing things. Much credit must go to the 1,300,000 men and women who give dedicated service as volunteer leaders of this movement, and to the 3,500 men who have dedicated their lives to career service as Scout executives.

The Boy Scouts of America have a very dynamic program. Its Cub Scout program, its Boy Scout program, and its Explorer program give to boys the things they want—fun, adventure, and romance. But it gives to the Nation of the future new generations of young men trained in the finest precepts of citizenship. This movement has a program with a purpose.

When the movement got underway it was dedicated to training boys in citizenship, building citizenship, developing self-reliance, and forming good character. It has done this, and done it effectively.

Through its virile and appealing program built around the lore of scouting, with its rich outdoor activities, it exposes boys to the highest type of men as scoutmasters and leaders. And as it goes about this program involvement, it exposes these boys, and their leaders, to one of the finest codes of ethics ever developed—the Scout oath. I would have that oath repeated here for inclusion in this RECORD, not only for what it means to growing boys, but for what it means as a guide for adults in their performance of day-to-day duties in business and Government:

On my honor, I will do my best; to do my duty to God and my country; to obey the Scout law; to help other people at all times; and to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

The Honorable Speaker SAM RAYBURN, along with Congressman CARL VINSON and Senator CARL HAYDEN were in the 64th Congress which granted a charter to the Boy Scouts of America in 1916. Mr. RAYBURN wrote of the event in the February issue of Scouting magazine. As a tribute to Scouting I would ask that the article be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

H.R. 755–3

(By the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives)

The summer of 1916 was a hectic time for the U.S. Government.

South of our border an outlaw named Pancho Villa caused armed clashes to occur. Submarine warfare in the Atlantic Ocean threatened our neutrality, and President Woodrow Wilson has demanded that Germany abandon this practice.

The 64th Congress was hurriedly enacting emergency defense legislation. On June 3, the National Defense Act increased the size of the Regular Army to 186,000 men, provided for a federalized National Guard of 424,800, established civilian training camps, and Reserve Officers' Training Corps at colleges and universities, and authorized the purchase of maintenance of airships.

Domestic legislation under consideration included establishment of the National Park Service; a bill providing a standard 8-hour day for most railroad workers; a $5 million Federal good roads bill; the Farm Loan Act, creating a land bank system for loans to farmers; a Child Labor Act; a new Revenue Act that would double the normal rate of income tax.

Congress would soon pass the Jones Act that guaranteed Philippine independence when the islands demonstrated ability to govern themselves.

This busy 64th Congress also found time to pass a bill known as H.R. 755–3.

SIGNED WITH CEREMONY

On June 15, 1916, President Wilson, who was nominated the next day for a second term, approved H.R. 755–3. This bill granted a Federal charter to the Boy Scouts of America, thereby giving a legal foundation for Scouting as a permanent program for boys. Here was protection that could be secured by no other means.

In 1916 it was rare for the President to make a ceremony of signing bills. However, Woodrow Wilson had a great interest in the Scouting movement and was its honorary president. He made an exception for H.R. 755–3 and signed the bill, surrounded by a group of Eagle Scouts and officers and members of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America.

The President presented the pen he had used to Colin Livingstone, national council president. Besides Mr. Livingstone, Paul Sieman, Washington attorney for the Boy Scouts of America, and scores of other prominent citizens had sought this legislation for years.

TWO YEARS OF SPADEWORK

The bill for Federal incorporation had been introduced in the House in 1914 by Representative Charles C. Carlin of Virginia and in 1915 in the Senate by Senator John K. Shields of Tennessee.

The House Judiciary Committee had made an exhaustive analysis of the Boy Scouts of America, as well as other organizations of a similar character. The committee had reported the bill favorably to the House on February 7, 1916, where it had been passed by unanimous consent. The Senate had approved it in the same manner and it then went to the President for signature.

PRESTIGE PLUS PROTECTION

Those familiar with legislation by our Congress know how difficult it is to secure Federal incorporation. That this bill passed in both House and Senate without a dissenting vote during a period when demands on our lawmakers were greater than ever before is significant of the high regard our National Government had for the Boy Scout movement.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee shows that Congress fully appreciated Scouting's value and recognized that its development and promise of usefulness to the future of the country warranted Federal protection.

H.R. 755–3 gives protection to the Boy Scouts of America from the claims of organizations having in their programs none of the features that distinguishes Scouting from all other programs for boys. It also prevents the use of the words "Boy Scouts," without authorization, by persons or concerns who may endeavor to commercialize on the Scout-created interest of boys.

The law also protects the uniforms and emblems of the movement. Some imitations of Scout insignia had appeared, and the Federal law prevented further imitations from destroying the meaning of the Scout uniform and emblems.

RESPONSIBILITY REQUIRED

The act charged the incorporators with the responsibility of drafting a constitution and bylaws to make the provisions of the new law effective. It also required the Boy Scouts of America to submit an annual report to Congress. On February 26, 1917, a National Constitution and bylaws was adopted, covering the fundamentals of Scouting and definitely stating its principles, policies, and methods, and providing for its administration in a democratic and businesslike manner.

Thus, the 64th Congress helped lay the foundations for the Boy Scout movement in our country—foundations so firm as to guarantee its permanency as a potential factor for the development of America's citizens.

I was a Member of that 64th Congress, serving my 2d term as representative of the 4th Congressional District of Texas, an office I still hold. The 64th Congress included two other Members of the current 86th Congress—CARL HAYDEN, in 1916 a Representative from Arizona and now Senator from that State, serving as President pro tempore of the Senate, and chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations; and CARL VINSON, in 1916 serving as a Repre-

sentative from Georgia, holds that office and is chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives.

My fellow Congressmen and I are indeed proud of the part we had in laying Scouting's foundation. The results of the bill known as H.R. 755–3 will certainly continue to bless our Nation with outstanding citizens for generations to come.

In section 3 of that bill these words appear:

"That the purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organization and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in Scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts."

As the Boy Scouts of America celebrate its 50th birthday, let me remind you that the purpose for which the charter was granted continues as your vital service to our beloved America.

A father takes particular pride in successful accomplishments of his son, and it is with that feeling that we recognize the important things that Scouting has done, not only since the Federal charter was granted but in its whole life span of 50 years.

The Scout movement now has an active membership of over 5 million boys and men of all races and creeds, and an alumni consisting of over 31 million. With 130,000 Scouting units sponsored by 83,000 local churches, schools, civic bodies, farm organizations and citizens groups, this movement fully justifies the support of this Congress and the citizenry of an appreciative Nation.

Freedom of Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a bill I introduced today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income.

The Internal Revenue Service recently published a regulation which attempts to define the type of "ordinary and necessary" business expense that may be deductible for Federal tax purposes when such expenses involve so-called legislative activities. This regulation, which was published on December 29, 1959, holds that business expenses are not a justified tax expense if for "lobbying purposes, or the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes (including the support of or opposition to any candidate for public office), or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) relating to any of the foregoing purposes."

These broad, ambiguous terms are not defined in the regulation and therefore there are no guidelines either for the Government or for affected taxpayers to determine what type of activities in this area may be covered. Because of these ambiguities, there is widespread concern that such administrative interpretation may have the effect of inhibiting freedom of expression of views on matters of government.

With the ever expanding impact of government activities, at all levels of government, in the daily lives of our citizens, any action that may curtail the freedom of expression of views on such matters should be examined very carefully. Our Constitution expressly guarantees the rights of free speech and a free press and the right to petition the Congress. The tax laws should not be invoked as an indirect means of curtailing any of these basic freedoms of expression.

The Congress should immediately undertake a review of the problems raised by this regulation for it appears that the only appropriate clarification can come through congressional action. Any action of the Government that affects a person's business or right to do business should be a permissible tax expense. Congress should express this philosophy in clarifying legislation that makes it absolutely clear that it is the "sharply defined national policy" to encourage and not to repress freedom of expression.

Sewer Problem Acute in Five Area Villages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun of October 21, 1959:

SEWER PROBLEM ACUTE IN FIVE AREA VILLAGES

(By Sig Gissler)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Water pollution has reached alarming proportions in the United States. Here is the third in a series of articles examining the interlocked pollution-water supply problem of the national regional and local level.)

Methods of handling sewage in Lake County range from the good to the ghastly.

Some municipalities are served by modern sewage collection networks and treatment plants. Some aren't.

Of special concern are the roughly 140,000 residents (about half the county's population) who rely on individual septic tanks—hundreds of which are faulty, odor-producing and a menace to health.

In some areas of the county, filth-infested outhouses are in use.

A preliminary study by the Lake County Regional Planning Commission shows that of the county's 36 municipalities five have neither a central sewer or water system.

They are Indian Creek, Island Lake, Kildeer, Long Grove, and Barrington Hills.

PARTIALLY SERVED

But this is only part of the story. Many other municipalities are only partially served by central water and sewer facilities.

The Round Lake Sanitary District is a case study in the vexing problem of domestic waste disposal that is clouding life in suburbia from coast to coast.

The district—comprised of Round Lake, Round Lake Beach, Round Lake Park, Hainesville, and Indian Hill—has had a rocky financial history dating almost to its inception in 1946.

In recent months, two bond issues to pay for vast improvement of the district's treatment plant were turned down at the polls by lopsided majorities.

These election setbacks forced the district to reject a Round Lake Beach application to connect its new sewer lines to the already overloaded disposal plant.

DISTRICT SUED

Round Lake Beach immediately sued the district, charging that "everything inside our village is becoming saturated with human waste."

The circuit court ruled in favor of Round Lake Beach. Since it was a court ruling, the district is able to legally issue—without a referendum—bonds sufficient to abate the nuisance.

While this may solve Round Lake Beach's problem—at least temporarily—the overall pollution problem in that area of the county is far from solved.

The reason is that the district's plant is operating at only 68 percent efficiency. Under normal circumstances this wouldn't be too bad. However, the plant's treated sewage ends up in the Chain O' Lakes.

"A conventional plant is not good enough when the effluent goes into recreational waters," explains John Morris, the Lake County Health Department chief sanitary engineer.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Contamination of the Chain O' Lakes, if it gets out of hand, could have a tremendously adverse economic impact as well as pose a health danger.

The Chain O' Lakes is a resort area. Its annual business runs into millions of dollars. But it must have clean water to prosper.

Consequently, unbridled pollution would severely dislocate the resort economy.

Not all is black in the area, however. The village of Fox Lake, for instance, is ready to start work on a modern treatment plant.

In addition, the county now has an ordinance requiring that all toilets must be sealed on cruisers and other small craft using Lake County lakes. Enforcement is not yet complete, but it's getting better.

To what extent is the county's health in jeopardy?

The new Lake County Health Department has not been in existence long enough to do a definitive study, but certain facts seem to be fairly well established.

Preliminary testing of streams and lakes reveals that the county's water (which constitutes about 5 percent of the county's area) does not generally show an alarming level of pollution.

TAKES TIME

"But we don't want to jump to conclusions," cautions Dr. Arthur Baker, department director. "It takes time to discover a trend one way or the other."

Dr. Baker said two or three bodies of water did show a higher level of contamination "than there should have been."

The Des Plaines River, for example, shows indications of dangerous contamination in some spots.

The county's yardstick of pollution is the traditional "coliform count." A high count

indicates the presence of organisms which could cause diseases, such as typhoid fever.

The trouble is that coliform count is a crude indicator, only one of many factors that must be considered in determining harmful levels of pollution.

It is analogous to our time honored economic barometers, such as the auto industry. If auto sales drop, we worry. But it doesn't necessarily mean that a depression is upon us.

Likewise, a high coliform count does not necessarily mean a typhoid epidemic is imminent.

Have any illnesses been traced directly to pollution?

TWO TYPHOID CASES

There were two cases of typhoid this year. But neither could be linked to pollution, Dr. Baker said.

However, there have been some virus ailments and one limited outbreak of dysentery which the department feels could have been avoided if better sewage conditions existed.

Hence, Dr. Baker prefers to view the county's pollution problem as a very real potential threat. Whether the hazard intensifies will depend greatly on how the county reacts to disposal problems in the future.

One of the biggest future dangers is the faulty septic tank. As of now, the health department is only partly satisfied with the way this hazard is being attacked.

Let's Be Generous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial on H.R. 2412, to grant service connection to all veterans of 1898–1902, which appeared in the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes on February 4, 1960:

LET'S BE GENEROUS

On January 25 three representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans appeared in behalf of H.R. 2412, a bill which would grant service connection to all veterans of 1898–1902 in order to give them the same priority for hospitalization as is given to the service-connected veterans of later wars.

H.R. 2412 was introduced last year by Representative BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois, one of the three Representatives of the Spanish-American War referred to and the last remaining veteran of those campaigns now in the Congress of the United States.

They offered their reasons as to why this legislation should be enacted. In view of the circumstances under which they served, we came to the conclusion that these reasons were adequate.

The other two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans were Judge John White, a past commander in chief of the USWV from Texas, and John U. Shroyer, of Pennsylvania, also a past head of the USWV. Shroyer is chairman of the USWV National Committee on Legislation and Its Administration, and Judge White is vice chairman. As they were testifying, their present commander in chief, W. Ross Duke, was dying at his home in Wichita Falls, Tex.

Judge White spoke first and he declared that, while there were still many veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection who felt that their financial condition made it possible to seek private treatment or hospitalization, there were thousands of others who were unable to meet the financial need of medical or hospital care and that these men were left to wait assignment to a Veterans' Administration hospital until beds were available under the present law and that while awaiting such hospital care they died. Judge White suggested that the delay of 1 hour might mean the difference between life and death.

Chairman Shroyer dealt with the practical side on the need for the enactment of H.R. 2412 and stated to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs which was holding the hearings on the bill that the suggestion that the passage of the measure might set up a precedent for the veterans of future wars was merely theoretical and that it might be well to meet each situation as it arose. He pointed out the fact that when a bonus for veterans of World War I was first proposed there was an outcry against the possible cost and the declaration by those more interested in tax payments than gratitude that the passage of such a bill would bankrupt the country.

Chairman Shroyer continued to say that the passage of the World War I bonus did not bankrupt the country but that, rather, the country had gone on to higher peaks of prosperity.

As was to be expected, the representatives of the Veterans' Administration who appeared before the House Committee stated bluntly that the VA—that means the present national administration—opposed the bill.

Also, as was to be expected, they brought up the question of a possible precedent being established. They offered figures showing the possible hospital need by 1970 as far as World War I veterans was concerned. Their presentation was purely statistical—nothing humanitarian—merely cold figures dealing only with costs.

In his discussion of the need for care under H.R. 2412 and the cost of such care, Chairman Shroyer of the USWV presented figures which he had received from the Veterans' Administration on the very morning of his appearance before the House committee, showing that there were some 39,000 veterans of the Spanish-American War now on the pension rolls.

In its presentation of statistics the Veterans' Administration representative disagreed with this figure—the VA's most recent figure— and stated that there were many more Spanish War veterans now alive. This we do not dispute but undoubtedly the VA is taking into consideration in this estimate the veterans of the Spanish-American War who remained in service and were eventually retired. This group would not need consideration under H.R. 2412 as their retirement benefits grant them hospitalization in Army and Naval Hospitals, as the case may be.

As we have written earlier in this editorial Judge White explained how a delay of an hour in a veteran's hospitalization might mean the difference between life and death. He was asked by a member of the committee just how a difference of an hour might be important. The answer is obvious. Fifteen minutes of appropriate treatment might save a man's life. Further delay might mean death.

But there is more to it than this question of just 1 hour before hospital care can be rendered. In its discussion of the manner in which the VA takes care of the Spanish War veterans the VA representative discussed a 3-month survey of applications for hospital care made by such veterans. The figures showed that in this period approximately only 3 percent of the applicants were made to wait an appreciable time before they were hospitalized.

Well, from our experience, the VA must have chosen the best 3 months in the lives of the remaining Spanish War veterans. Our experience over many years is much to the contrary. Almost every week we receive letters saying that a Spanish-American War veteran had applied for needed hospitalization but was told he must await his turn until a bed was found available. During this waiting time extending for weeks and sometimes months, the veteran died. These are not figures but straightforward declarations from those who lost their loved ones while waiting for that available bed.

The Economy Act of March 20, 1933, cut off pensions from practically all veterans of the Spanish-American War. In August 1935 these benefits were restored with a special message from President Franklin D. Roosevelt, approving the bill and pointing out the fact that due to the conditions under which this group served they were in a distinct class and therefore entitled to generous consideration.

Congress later, recognizing the situation under which these men served, granted them service connection for all disabilities for outpatient treatment. If this action was wise, and we feel certain it was, then we see no reason why it should not be extended to hospitalization, thus affording immediate care to our remaining survivors of a long, bloody but fruitful war insofar as the United States is concerned.

Approximately a year ago, we discussed the reasons why H.R. 2412 should be enacted into law. We described the hardships which these men suffered—their lack of proper food or medical care and the failure to maintain records of the diseases or injuries they incurred during the bitter tropical campaigns.

Now we recall the last century but thinly and we are certain that most of the members of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs are equally unfamiliar with the hardships these men suffered, but we do recall the embalmed beef scandals and the scarecrows of men who returned from the Cuban campaign.

We are firmly convinced that despite administration opposition to H.R. 2412 a sympathetic and understanding Congress will see to it that these survivors of the war which, as a matter of fact, put us on the map in world affairs, will be granted this last piece of relief as is seemly from a grateful people.

The Connally Amendment—World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Louisiana Society, Sons of the American Revolution, February 1960, in opposition to Senate Resolution 94, calling for the repeal of the Connally amendment. I feel the members of this organization represent those vitally interested in the preservation of our country and I urge consideration of the resolution. It is as follows:

At a meeting of the board of governors of the Louisiana Society, Sons of the American Revolution, held on the 3d day of February, 1960, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the International Court of Justice, referred to as the World Court, was

created by charter of the United Nations as amended; and

"Whereas the charter and statute have been approved by the U.S. Senate, and executed as a treaty, which instrument is now the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas after the Senate ratified the United Nations Charter, there was much agitation from internationalists to get out Nation under the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court; and

"Whereas Senator WAYNE MORSE introduced a resolution in the U.S. Senate in 1945, a similar resolution being introduced in the Congress by then Congressman Christian Herter (now Secretary of State), in December 1945; and

"Whereas the Morse resolution was adopted on August 2, 1945, with an amendment thereto by Senator Connally, providing that the United States would retain authority to determine which matters concerning the United States of America, are within its sole and national jurisdiction; and

"Whereas Senator HUMPHREY has introduced, in the Senate, Senate Resolution 94 to repeal the Connally amendment; and

"Whereas the World Court is composed of 14 judges, only one being from the United States and two from Communist countries, one from Russia, and one from Poland, who constitute the members of that Court, along with the other 11: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Louisiana Society, Sons of the American Revolution go on record opposing the adoption of Senate Resolution 94, in that it would scrap our State and National sovereignty and place the United States of America under a world government, in which one hundred and seventy million Americans would virtually have no control, and will automatically relegate the Constitution of the United States of America to second place, giving to the World Court exclusive authority to determine any matter effecting the rights of citizens, and the Government of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That all loyal Americans be requested to express their views to their respective Senators and Representatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Senators ELLENDER and LONG of Louisiana; all Louisiana Congressmen; the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution; the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; the press, radio, and television stations of this city.

"S. O. LANDRY."

Senator Lyndon Johnson Gives Leadership to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD two articles pertaining to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. One of these is a brief article by the noted columnist Drew Pearson, which appeared in the New York Mirror on February 5, 1960; the other, an article by Alan L. Otten, published on the same date in the Wall Street Journal.

On a previous occasion I had stated that "Senator JOHNSON should not be stigmatized as carrying the banner of any particular State. When he speaks, he speaks for and on behalf of our great Nation." As majority leader of the Senate he attends to his arduous duties in that greatest of all deliberative bodies, often extending over many long hours every day.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has no time for long and extensive trips which would take him away from his duties in the Senate and jeopardize the flow of important legislation. He stays close to the grindstone to guide such legislation, particularly at this critical juncture in our Nation's history. Only occasionally is he able to get away for a few days to address an important gathering, and that is usually done over the weekend. His duties in the Senate in behalf of all the people come first, regardless of what his personal aspirations may be. This is a mark of true and responsible leadership.

The two articles cited above read as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, Feb. 5, 1960]

SENATE DUTIES COME FIRST WITH LYNDON

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, February 4.—At Albuquerque, N. Mex., today, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, is expected to make a qualified announcement of his availability for the Democratic nomination.

Though most people consider JOHNSON a candidate, inside fact is that even to his close friend, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, LYNDON has not confided his definite intentions. Nor has he to his good friend, former Senator Earle Clements, of Kentucky, who already has pledged about 400 delegates for the tall Texan.

LYNDON's predicament is that if he becomes a candidate he can't very well remain in Washington to handle his duties as Senate majority leader. And, whether you agree with JOHNSON or not, this is something he takes very seriously. He takes pride in the job and works at it about 18 hours a day.

If he becomes an announced candidate he'll have to leave the exacting grind of the Senate to make a series of speeches all over the country. Most people don't realize it, but Senator JACK KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is almost never in the Senate any more, and won't be until after the presidential primaries. JOHNSON doesn't want to be in a similar position. That's why only a qualified hat will be tossed in the ring.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1960]

JOHNSON PRESSES DRIVE FOR NATIONAL BACKING IN PRESIDENTIAL RACE—HE OPENS SPEAKING TOUR OF WEST, NORTH TODAY, PUSHES TOUGHER CIVIL RIGHTS LAW—LABOR, ADA HURDLES HIGH

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—During the next 10 days LYNDON JOHNSON will be launching his first big drive to dash out of Dixie, on a trail he hopes will lead to the White House.

Today in Albuquerque the Senate majority leader will make a big I-know-the-problems-of-the-West oration, an open bid for support of politicos gathered at the Western States Democratic conference. He'll follow this quickly with speeches in Indianapolis and other cities.

A week from Monday the Texas will summon up for Senate debate—and probable eventual passage—a new civil rights bill, in a major attempt to get northern liberal backing.

Thus will Mr. JOHNSON attempt to break out of the southern type casting that is the major barrier between him and the Democratic nomination. Most observers don't think he'll be able to hurdle it; but they agree that if any southerner can do it any time in the next decade, Mr. JOHNSON is the one.

"Do I think he'll be nominated?" one New Dealing House Democratic leader asks rhetorically. "No. Do I think he might be? I sure do."

OUT TO BE THE KING

Top Democrats and Republicans today are taking LYNDON far more seriously than even a few weeks ago. Originally, his movements in the direction of the Los Angeles convention this July were interpreted as an attempt to amass enough votes to have a decisive voice in the choice of the nominee and the party platform. Today politicians unquestioningly take for granted he is aiming for top spot himself. "He's out to be the king, not the kingmaker," says one party official.

Barring some unexpected development, Mr. JOHNSON will go to the Los Angeles convention with either the largest or second largest bloc of first ballot votes. He'll have a minimum of 400 first-ballot votes out of the 1,521 total, and may go considerably higher. "We'll be over 500 on the second ballot, no matter how the primaries go," a Johnson lieutenant says confidently. Only Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, could do better in early balloting.

But the guaranteed bloc of Johnson delegates underlines his problem: Practically every one of them comes from the South and such border States as Oklahoma and Kentucky. This makes him not merely a regional candidate; it makes him the candidate of a region whose views are anathema to crusading New Dealers in New York, California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Illinois and other States with big blocs of convention delegates.

"I can run happily and safely with any of the men being mentioned for the nomination except LYNDON," says one Northern Democratic Senator up for reelection. He and many other northern and far western Democrats fear that Negroes will instinctively oppose JOHNSON as a southerner, that union men will automatically bolt him as a conservative on labor matters, that liberals generally will immediately recall his votes for legislation favoring oil and gas interests.

FLIRTATION TO COURTSHIP

Hence the importance to JOHNSON of winning support outside the South. Hence JOHNSON's quiet wooing in recent weeks of northern, western, and midwestern Democratic leaders—a flirtation that now will become full-scale courtship. What he would like to do is put together—as he frequently has in the Senate—a southern-western Democratic coalition, with just enough northern and midwestern support to give his drive a truly national flavor.

Mr. JOHNSON already has some surprising non-southern individual backers. They include, naturally enough, a good many Senators—relative liberals such as MANSFIELD, of Montana, ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and relative conservatives such as FREAR, of Delaware, HARTKE, of Indiana, and DODD, of Connecticut. A sprinkling of northern House Members such as ROONEY and ANFUSO of New York, BARR, of Indiana, and BREEDING, of Kansas, have spoken out for him, and Harlem's ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, though favoring Mr. SYMINGTON or Mr. HUMPHREY, calls the majority leader "our strongest possible candidate." Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has helped out on legislative and speechwriting chores, and former New York Governor Averell Harriman has said kind words. Comparatively few delegate votes flow from this collection of names, but JOHNSON aids cite them as evidence that northerners and westerners can be wooed and won.

At Albuquerque, where other senatorial aspirants for the White House will follow him

to the speaking stand like so many cattle up for auction, Mr. JOHNSON will present himself not as a southerner but as a westerner, who has supported every western resource development project and who helped put through the tough Hells Canyon Dam building bill in the face of heavy administration opposition. From Albuquerque, he'll fly to speak tomorrow night in a Midwest city, Indianapolis. Sunday he will go to Nashville to try nailing down the Tennessee delegation in a private talk with Governor Ellington. During the next 6 weeks, he'll make speeches in West Virginia, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho, and Utah.

IMPORTANCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

But Mr. JOHNSON's attempt to break out of the southern stereotype and to win over liberal support depends less on travel and talk than on his backing of a strong civil rights bill. In recent forays into Chicago and New York, he stressed heavily his role in passing the 1957 civil rights measure. Now he'll follow with a 1960 model. This, together with prospective Senate approval of Federal aid to education, minimum wage expansion, social security liberalization, and other welfare measures will be strong selling points to liberal audiences, JOHNSON strategists state.

If he goes too far, especially in the civil rights field, the Senator could alienate his southern supporters. This is a risk he believes he must take.

The southern barrier has been insuperable in the past. Why does anyone think Mr. JOHNSON can overcome it now?

Largely because of the man's own character and his record in the Senate. During the past 6 years, he and House Speaker RAYBURN, a fellow-Texan and Mr. JOHNSON's prime booster for the Presidency, have put through a legislative program that, while far short of many Democrats' desires, has been impressive. The two Texans claim that it was their course, midway between the Eisenhower administration with the extreme liberal Democratic wing, that brought about the Democratic congressional victories in 1954, 1956, and 1958.

HE TOWERS OVER EVERYONE

"I don't know whether we can nominate him," says one Arkansas Democrat, "but he's the only man we've got that can win. He towers over everyone else in the party."

Most Washington observers concede Mr. JOHNSON to be a tireless driver, an adroit parliamentarian, an outstanding horse-trader, an expert maneuverer. He has played the Senate like a musical instrument, frequently putting through bills that no one thought could be passed and blocking others that looked like sure things. "Start with 450 convention votes and add his maneuvering ability, and there's no telling where he can go," one Democratic critic concedes.

Like most candidates, Mr. JOHNSON tends to change his political complexion somewhat to suit his audiences. At northern liberal gatherings he stresses that he was an ardent admirer of Roosevelt, attacks Wall Street domination of the Republican Party, calls for increased spending on space or defense or resource development or farm programs. Before a chamber of commerce meeting, he'll talk about the need for meeting the Russian challenge as a united nation, free from partisanship. Most often, he pictures himself as a middle-of-the-roader; he'll couple in one speech a call for more spending on various projects with a pledge to cut the administration's budget and pay off part of the debt.

Leader LYNDON has spent considerable time of late cultivating such old party professionals as Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania; Mayor Daley, of Chicago; New York Tammany boss De Sapio. "LYNDON gets along well with the pros," an aide comments. "They recognize him as one of them; they know he talks their language, and would keep on talking it once he got in the White House."

The Johnson forces intend to use all the time-honored methods of lining up convention delegates. The vice-presidential nomination has been discreetly dangled before California Governor Brown, New Jersey Governor Meyner, New York City Mayor Wagner and others who, for religious, geographical or other reasons, can find little hope for themselves in the Kennedy camp.

IF JACK SLIPS

Much of the Johnson strategy is tied to hope that Senator KENNEDY will suffer defeat at the hands of Senator HUMPHREY in the Wisconsin primary. "If JACK slips in the primaries, there will be no stopping LYNDON," declares one lieutenant. Yet the Johnson forces also talk longingly about a possible Johnson-Kennedy ticket. Declares one, his eyes lighting up: "That would put together the old coalition of F.D.R.—the South, the West, and the Catholics in the big cities of the North."

If the plusses are substantial, so, too, are the minuses. Mr. JOHNSON may try hard to break the southern image, but how well will he succeed? Many northern and western political leaders, even those sympathetic to Mr. JOHNSON, may well decide their own futures if their own States forbid taking a chance on him.

This will particularly be true in States with large Negro voting blocs. More northern and western Democrats are likely to oppose him as too conservative on a wide variety of domestic issues. Mr. JOHNSON's aides claim his votes on labor bills are as liberal as those of Senators SYMINGTON or KENNEDY, but labor leaders regard him as far less acceptable. Unions have been playing up a letter he wrote last summer stressing his past votes for strong regulatory legislation against improper labor practices. The United Mine Workers Journal headlined a story: "Senate Boss JOHNSON Goes on the (Anti-Labor) Record."

While some Democrats saw virtue in Mr. JOHNSON's efforts to compromise with the Eisenhower administration on airports, housing and many other programs in the last few years, many others saw it as betrayal of Congressional election victories. One northerner caustically says LYNDON will go down in history as "the great homogenizer."

The Americans for Democratic Action blasts the Johnson-Rayburn leadership as sterile. While Senators KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, and HUMPHREY scored 100 percent on the A.D.A. voting chart for 1959 Mr. JOHNSON scored only 58 percent.

"A.D.A.-ers, union officials and Negro leaders may not have the votes to put a candidate across at the convention," says one Democratic lawmaker, "but they sure have the votes to block a man."

But even those opposed to Mr. JOHNSON are now taking him very seriously. "I've underestimated this guy for the past 20 years," says one old opponent. "I'm not making the same mistake this time."

Resolution by General Court of Massachusetts on World War I Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution memorializing Congress to grant pensions to World War I veterans comparable to those granted to veterans of wars prior to World War I:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO GRANTS TO VETERANS OF AMERICAN WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I

Whereas it has been the national policy of the United States to grant assistance to its war veterans in their declining years by a pension, all in consideration of their military services in defense of our country; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to Veterans of World War I by the United States; and

Whereas the United States has been and is aiding many foreign countries in restoring their economy; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension to Veterans of World War I comparable to grants to Veterans of American wars prior to World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives of the United States.

House of Representatives, adopted, January 15, 1960.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In Senate, adopted in concurrence, January 28, 1960.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Attest:

JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Carlo Bianchi and Company Versus the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed when I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the extension of remarks of my colleague from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. I made inquiry of the Department of Justice concerning these charges and have received the following reply:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1960.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: In reply to your inquiry regarding the statement of Mr. SANTANGELO, of New York, contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, January 27, 1960, at page 1293, I am pleased to submit the following comments:

In view of the fact that Mr. SANTANGELO's statement criticizes the Department of Justice for its handling of the case of *Carlo Bianchi and Company* v. *The United States*, Court of Claims Docket No. 406-54, I believe it appropriate to call attention to some

major misstatements of fact contained in his statement.

Mr. SANTANGELO's assertions that, after the Government was held liable in this case by the Court of Claims, the court will not now permit the Department to introduce any testimony with respect to damages, that the Government has been defaulted on the issue of damages and that as a consequence the United States has been held liable in the amount of $680,066, were not correct.

The court has not ruled that the Government may not submit any testimony on damages, has not defaulted the Government, and has not held it liable for $680,066 or any other amount. The fact is that the Government attorney handling this case is presently on the West coast preparatory to offering before the Commissioner at a scheduled hearing commencing February 8, in San Jose, Calif., the testimony of one of the Government's most important witnesses, the resident engineer on the project.

A misunderstanding did arise between the Commissioner and the Government attorney regarding the time and place of presenting the Government's evidence and the court did deny a motion of the Government for leave to submit additional testimony on the basis of the situation then existing. However, in the event the Department of Justice concludes, after the taking of testimony later this month in California, that the Government's interest will require additional proof, it proposes to apply to the court at that time for leave to do so and we have no reason to believe that, in the event of such a reasonable application, the court will not permit the Government to present additional testimony on the issue of damages.

I have confidence in the competence and industry of the trial attorney handling this case who, under difficult circumstances with a heavy caseload, has handled an extremely complex and involved matter in an able manner and I cannot avoid the conclusion that Mr. SANTANGELO's remarks criticizing this lawyer were unjust.

For your information, Mr. SANTANGELO was informed of these facts in my letter to him of February 3, 1960.

Sincerely,

GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB,
Assistant Attorney General.

Are the People So Dumb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, which appears in the U.S. News & World Report of February 15, 1960, is respectfully called to the attention of my colleagues. It contains some very enlightening comments worthy of our serious consideration at this time and in the days ahead:

ARE THE PEOPLE SO DUMB?

(By David Lawrence)

Are the current speeches of some of the would-be presidential candidates an indication of how they size up the intelligence of the electorate?

Perhaps they are following the advice of the late Harry Hopkins of New Deal fame when he said: "The people are too damn dumb to understand."

Judging by the headlines, several of the candidates and their supporters in Congress are portraying America as helpless and without leadership.

Presumably we are already licked by the Soviet Union—in science, in interplanetary travel, in education, in rocketry, in missiles, and in general prestige throughout the world.

Presumably we must spend more billions for defense, more billions for schools and education, more billions for housing, and more billions for "social needs."

Presumably the people aren't concerned at all about inflation and do not want to hear mention of such things as balancing the Federal budget or paying off the national debt.

We read political speeches that talk of our poverty amidst plenty or of our lack of economic growth.

The cry is for something called positive leadership and for what are termed "bold and imaginative ideas." The call is for an end to budgetary considerations in making national or international policy.

Some of these illusions stem from the isolated strata in which the modern intellectual travels. He worships at the altar of theory and abstraction. To him, for example, a Communist who conspires to overthrow our Government is just a man with a political belief different from our own.

Other illusions cherished by some of the political candidates are that the American people are lazy-minded, that they read newspapers superficially—mostly headlines—and don't keep up with what's going on. Much of the political strategy seems to be based on the theory that the people are easily aroused to vote against an administration just because it doesn't spend money for pet projects envisaged by the spenders.

Then there are other candidates who insist that America is losing her leadership in the world and that this can best be remedied by giving someone in the opposite party a chance to lead the world. What they seem to have quickly forgotten is that cheering crowds, unprecedented in numbers, greeted the President on his recent trip to Europe, Asia, and Africa—everywhere Mr. Eisenhower was acclaimed as the champion of American freedom and democracy.

Yet we are told that American prestige is at a low ebb and that we are not winning friends throughout the world.

Lately the politicians have turned to another alleged weakness. They imply that the United States is about to be destroyed by enemy missiles—unless more and more billions are spent for defense. Or else it is asserted that, no matter what America does, it can't catch up with the Russians because they have a big lead.

The average man is expected to believe that his high wages, his comforts—his high standard of living—are a sign of softness, and that he must somehow deny himself all such things, pay higher taxes, and give the spenders a chance to spend more billions.

This isn't an alluring prospect for the voters, but some of the political liberals imply that even if the American does enjoy a species of contentment he now must be persuaded to give it up and accept a life of hardship and heavier taxation.

How will the voter size up the political candidates of 1960?

Is the average voter actually as much concerned as he is supposed to be with a photogenic smile or a new kind of haircut, or with the hand-shaking or baby-kissing propensities of the candidates?

What the voters basically want to find out is whether a candidate has integrity, and whether he has commonsense plus courage.

The mere avowal by a candidate that he wishes to be President may satisfy his own ego, but it doesn't necessarily mean he has the judgment and the ability to deal objectively and sensibly with the vital questions that will surely confront the next President of the United States.

A candidate's record is important, but it isn't always indicative of what he will do if given full responsibility to direct the destiny of the Nation.

A candidate is still a symbol of party government.

The American people, for the most part, judge a political party by its performance, and if it has been reasonably successful it is continued in power. If it has made a mess in Washington, the administration is ousted from power.

But, in the final analysis, the people have sense enough to decide whether they are being led into war or whether they are being led along the paths of peace and toward a steadily improving economic life. Most voters aren't as dumb as the politicians think.

The "Big Spender" Myth Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that Congress in the last session cut the President's spending requests by some $2 billion, many partisans and propagandists seeking political gain have deliberately or in ignorance, misrepresented the facts concerning the expenditures of taxpayers' money by calling Members of Congress reckless spenders.

It appears that many of our people are unaware of the fact that Congress has nothing to do with the preparation of the budget, a function wholly within the executive department; that Congress has no authority to spend, but can only authorize expenditures; that only the President can spend or withhold funds authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I voted to cut the President's budget in an effort to balance expenditures with income, believing that the Congress should authorize what is absolutely necessary for our Nation's protection and survival, but that we should not authorize or spend 1 red cent for waste or extravagance.

Mr. Speaker, under previous leave, I include the following tables from the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1959. These figures compiled or verified by the Bureau of the Budget show cuts by Congress of the President's request for appropriation and new obligational authority known as back-door spending by a total of $2,580,410,093.

Bills providing appropriations and other new obligational authority, 86th Cong., 1st sess.

TABLE I. APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
	1959 SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 5916	2d Supplemental	$2,864,954,526	Mar. 20	$2,479,522,494	Mar. 24	$2,657,402,994	$2,900,799,370	Apr. 18	$2,820,040,054	Apr. 30	$2,843,902,805	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990	May 20	86-30
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS														
	SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 7978	Supplemental	888,931,417	June 26	632,568,845	June 29	609,843,845	1,218,090,535	July 31	1,076,186,108	Aug. 3	1,076,186,108	977,345,608	−240,744,947	Sept. 1	86-213
H.J. Res. 439	Temporary (July)		June 25		June 30			June 30		June 30				July 1	86-76
H.J. Res. 475	Temporary (August)		July 24		July 29			July 29		July 29				July 31	86-118
H.J. Res. 510	Temporary (September)				Aug. 31					Aug. 31				Sept. 3	86-224
	REGULAR														
H.R. 5676	District of Columbia	(246,698,000)	Mar. 13	(237,186,112)	Mar. 16	(237,186,112)	(245,990,000)	May 21	(241,569,402	May 28	(241,702,402)	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)	July 23	86-104
	Federal payment	34,218,000		27,218,000		27,218,000	34,218,000		29,218,000		29,351,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000		
H.R. 6805	Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	Mar. 18	4,628,097,000	Mar. 20	4,628,097,000	4,688,327,000	May 21	4,663,158,600	May 28	4,664,027,600	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000	June 11	86-39
H.R. 6915	Interior	491,101,400	Mar. 20	472,198,800	Mar. 23	472,198,800	491,101,400	June 5	487,211,025	June 8	487,211,025	481,809,100	−9,292,300	June 23	86-60
H.R. 6769	Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	Apr. 28	3,915,084,181	Apr. 30	3,915,084,181	3,756,848,581	June 23	4,124,460,581	June 24	4,124,460,581	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400	Aug. 14	86-158
H.R. 7040	Independent offices	6,586,418,000	May 8	6,441,069,890	May 11	6,459,887,800	6,586,418,000	June 22	6,561,578,600	June 23	6,561,578,600	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800	Sept. 14	86-225
H.R. 7175	Agriculture	4,081,364,863	May 15	3,939,165,498	May 20	3,939,165,498	4,081,364,863	May 28	3,975,505,148	June 3	3,975,774,848	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190	July 8	86-80
H.R. 7176	General government	13,608,500	May 15	13,338,500	May 27	13,338,500	13,608,500	June 22	13,568,500	June 24	13,368,500	13,463,500	−145,000	July 8	86-79
H.R. 7343	State-Justice-Judiciary	682,387,600	May 21	649,896,700	May 27	651,896,700	682,387,600	June 22	650,674,700	June 23	650,924,700	648,941,200	−33,446,400	July 13	86-84
H.R. 7349	Commerce	732,191,000	May 25	674,687,300	May 28	675,297,300	732,191,000	June 16	715,328,500	June 18	715,328,500	712,672,900	−19,518,100	July 13	86-88
H.R. 7453	Legislative	105,460,095	May 28	100,279,350	June 1	100,279,350	133,648,180	June 16	128,797,380	June 18	128,797,380	128,797,380	−4,850,800	Aug. 21	86-176
H.R. 7454	Defense	39,248,200,000	May 28	38,848,339,000	June 3	38,848,339,000	39,248,200,000	July 7	39,594,339,000	July 14	39,594,339,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000	Aug. 18	86-166
H.R. 7509	Public Works	(1,185,406,259)	June 2	(1,185,406,259	June 9	(1,185,906,259)	(1,185,406,259)	July 8	(1,265,565,559)	July 9	(1,265,565,559)	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)	Vetoed	
H.R. 8283	Atomic Energy	2,718,715,000	July 17	2,660,529,000	July 21	2,660,529,000	2,718,715,000	July 30	2,711,829,000	Aug. 3	2,711,829,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000	Aug. 18	86-164
H.R. 8385	Mutual Security	4,436,277,000	July 24	3,209,782,000	July 29	3,191,782,000	4,824,484,137	Sept. 8	3,691,269,508	Sept. 14	3,692,262,137	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000	Sept. 28	86-383
H.R. 8575	Military Construction	1,563,200,000	Aug. 7	1,285,002,700	Aug. 10	1,285,002,700	1,563,200,000	Aug. 20	1,428,178,700	Aug. 21	1,428,178,700	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800	Sept. 16	86-275
H.R. 9105	Public Works	1,185,406,259	Sept. 4	1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,406,259		1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,309,093	−97,166	Veto overridden	86-254
	Total regular	70,323,723,208		68,049,996,922		68,053,424,922	70,740,118,520		69,900,426,335		69,902,940,664	69,235,752,364	−1,504,366,156		
	Total, all bills	74,077,609,151		71,162,088,261		71,320,671,761	74,859,008,445		73,856,652,497		73,883,029,577	72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093		

TABLE II. NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED OUTSIDE THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS (SO-CALLED BACKDOOR FINANCING)

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
H.R. 4452 S. 1094	Bretton Woods Agreement Act	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 25	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 19	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000		June 17	86-48
S. 57	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 27	(1,975,000,000)	May 21	(*)	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 3	(2,625,000,000)	Feb. 5	(2,525,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(−$350,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2539	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 25	(825,000,000)	Aug. 27	(825,000,000)	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 13	(825,000,000)	Aug. 18	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(−825,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2654	Housing Act of 1959	1,650,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	1,650,000,000	Sept. 8	925,000,000	Sept. 9	925,000,000	925,000,000	−725,000,000	Sept. 23	86-372
S. 1 H.R. 1011	Aid to airports	200,000,000	Mar. 2	297,000,000	Mar. 19	297,000,000	200,000,000	Feb. 5	565,000,000	Feb. 6	465,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	June 29	86-72
H.R. 2256	Veterans' Housing Loan Act		Jan. 29	300,000,000	Feb. 4	300,000,000		Feb. 3	300,000,000	June 16	100,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000	June 30	86-73
H.R. 3460	Tennessee Valley Authority bond issuance	750,000,000	Apr. 14	750,000,000	May 7	750,000,000	750,000,000	July 2	750,000,000	July 9	750,000,000	750,000,000		Aug. 6	86-137
	Total	7,150,000,000		6,822,000,000		6,822,000,000	7,150,000,000		7,090,000,000		6,790,000,000	6,451,000,000	−699,000,000		

*Authorized $1,975,000,000 to be appropriated.

NOTE.—Amounts shown represent total new obligational authority actually provided by each bill. Differences in amounts may include changes in scope of programs and differences in time periods covered by various versions of each bill.

Grand total, all bills, tables I and II	$81,227,609,151		$77,984,088,261		$78,142,671,761	$82,009,008,445		$80,946,652,497		$80,673,029,577	$79,428,598,352	−$2,580,410,093		

The Late Honorable David M. Hall

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the memory of the late Honorable DAVID MCKEE HALL whose recent untimely death deprived this House and our country of the services of a devoted and outstanding public servant. I felt a particularly close relationship to DAVID HALL because he and I came to Congress together as new Members at the beginning of the first session of the 86th Congress and were assigned together to the new Committee on Science and Astronautics. From that common bond I came to know him as a man of unusual attainments and great courage. In the work of our Committee he proved himself to be a keen student, an industrious and able worker, and the possessor of a sound analytic judgment which enabled him to cut to the heart of a matter and to emerge with a reasoned decision on any of the complex problems with which we were presented.

The fortitude he had shown throughout his life from the time he was stricken with the crippling ailment which eventually resulted in his passing from us showed clearly in his all too short career as a Member of this House. He was a man of indomitable courage and strong conviction. It took such a man to surmount his great physical handicap and to become the educated statesman and wonderful husband and father that he was. Those traits were the hallmark of his short tenure as the Representative of the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina. I had occasion to observe many times that even though DAVID HALL might stand alone in his convictions on a particular issue that fact did not deter him. Once having reached such a conviction on the basis of his moral and intellectual judgments, he was able to withstand the pressures exerted by other forces and to stand firm for what he believed to be the right. Although his voice might be the only one raised to voice a "nay" on some issue before us, that "nay" was clearly heard and carried with it the assurance that he had not been distracted from his duty as he saw it.

Withall, DAVE HALL was a warmly human and a lovable man. His keen sense of humor and his engaging personality endeared him to all of us who had the good fortune to work with him and to know him as a friend. His leavening presence on our committee will be sorely missed. His unique courage will not soon be equaled in our midst. His indomitable spirit will never find a replacement among us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that even more than we mourn DAVID HALL'S passing here, his lovely wife and daughters and his many friends at home in North Carolina will share the sweet sorrow of his memory. Mrs. Moeller and I extend our hearts and our prayers to them in the sure knowledge that the overpowering love of the Almighty Father of us all will bring them the solace they need and the courage to carry on in the unwavering pattern that he set for them.

The CED Report on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill, the forceful and erudite editor of the Atlanta Constitution, has observed that for the first time in the Nation's history, Federal aid to education has been endorsed by a national organization representing spokesmen of business and industry.

He referred, in a recent syndicated column, to the Committee for Economic Development, which has just published the results of its carefully documented study of educational needs entitled "We Can Have Better Schools." We would do well, Mr. Speaker, to study the recommendation of the CED.

Mr. McGill's comments follow:

For the first time in the Nation's history, we have a major endorsement of Federal aid to education by a national organization representing the top corporations of business and industry.

The CED (Committee for Economic Development) has published a carefully documented study of the Nation's educational needs, and recommendations, titled, "We Can Have Better Schools." The CED is composed of 180 men, most of them representing large corporations and universities.

Chief among their recommendations is Federal aid in low-income States and a drastic reform of the school district system. There are 45,000 local school districts, a majority of which are "much too small to provide good schools at all or to provid any kind of schools effectively." The report recommends reduction to 10,000 districts, none serving less than 2,000 pupils.

This report, which is historically significant in that corporate business formally reveals not merely its findings of the desperate educational plight of the Nation and the great waste of young talent in inadequate schools, but its grave concern. State boards especially should find it interesting.

The urgent recommendation that $600 million in Federal aid be spent in the low-income States certainly should interest both parents and educators.

Mississippi is at the bottom of all percentage findings in the low-income States. There are altogether 12 States which are well below national standards. Four are nonsouthern. The Deep South States of South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia are included.

The report serves to spotlight the problem of the States where the Court decision against discrimination is at issue. Georgia presently is nearest to a moment of truth in this category.

It is possible to have almost any kind of education. It is up to the people in political power.

In Virginia one county, Prince Edward County, has abolished its public schools and set up private classes in churches and private buildings. It is at best a sort of "half-loaf" schooling for its white pupils, a mere 1,500. It cannot expect to be fully accredited. Nor is there any claim that its graduates will be able to enter first-rate engineering or professional schools. It is properly described as a half-loaf and this is what the parents there have chosen rather than accept a pupil placement law. This is a legal choice. The effect on this generation of children and on the community itself will not be possible to evaluate for years to come. How long the community can bear the financial strain is also something for the future. But this presently is the sort of education they offer their children.

In other States small school districts seek to maintain high schools for handfuls of pupils. They offer, too, a half-loaf opportunity. A legislative committee in Georgia, for example, recently reported, after months of study, that entrance work at the State's technical institute and the university was already "beyond" a dismaying number of graduates of inferior high schools. This is a story which fits other States as well.

CED's research reaffirms this fact. Maine, for example, has a problem of small, rural high schools which are offering a "half-loaf" to their children. So do the two Dakotas. But the greatest need is in the South.

Under the CED plan for low-income States, Federal aid would be granted on a basis of the State's average income per student so as to prevent a State from collecting Federal aid by permitting its own effort to support schools from dropping below its ability to pay. (The full report is available at $2, and the summary at 50 cents, through CED, 711 Fifth Avenue, New York 22).

We can give our children half- or full-loaf opportunity.

Letter to the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith a letter I have today written to the editor of the New York Times, commenting on an editorial which appeared in that paper today.

The letter follows, and is, I believe, self-explanatory:

FEBRUARY 8, 1960.

The EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Relative to your editorial in this morning's Times, entitled "A Call for Greatness," I should like to make the following comments.

Nothing I say herein is intended to criticize Dr. Wriston, who has on other occasions rendered substantially worthwhile service to our country. Nevertheless, I cannot help but think what a great pity it is that after 8 years of President Eisenhower—with full access to all the intelligence data available—we now need a commission to determine our national goals.

If this truly be a call for greatness to a resolute people it does not speak well for what has happened during this administration.

Is it possible that we still do not know enough about discrimination in certain areas of our country so that we cannot cope with

the problem without the help of a new commission? Is it possible that after the many commissions already established and the volumes written on our failure in the educational field that this vital problem must be reexplored by another commission? Is it possible that the Committee of which Vice President NIXON is chairman is unable or unequipped to cope with the problem of the economic power of our Nation? It is a source of wonder to me what we have been doing these past 8 years during which time we have had more commissions than in any other period of our history. Is it possible at this stage of our development we still do not know what our goals are to accomplish a better and still greater America? Is it possible that your editorial indicates that we still do not have a sense of purpose and a sense of direction, or that we do not have enlightened and vigorous political leadership?

More importantly, if this Commission finds as it must that there is a great need in all the fields that you mention, is it possible to divorce the administration from its transcending marriage to the balanced budget? Frankly, I doubt that there is any need for this Commission at this time because if we begin from the inflexible premise that we must balance our books, we can never accomplish any of these goals, and certainly can never answer this call for greatness.

Sincerely yours,

A Review of the Downfall of the U.S. Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, Donald M. Johnson, of Jefferson City, Mo., mailed to me his statement reviewing the dollar values during the past 30 years. His statement is one of the most interesting and informative discussions on this subject I have ever read. For the benefit and information of all Members of Congress, I am having his words printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR DOUBLETALK

As we become more and more conditioned to the use of controlled currency as a coinage for the Nation, we hear less about the old gold standard. The idea of a firm footing for money seems too old fashioned when our real concern is with its daily useful buying power. The index figures, as set up in Washington, retain a fixed relationship to the gold standard and it seems that we are prone to indulge in doubletalk for expedient reasons. Perhaps it is because we do not see that relationship readily, or it may be that the facts come to us in small bits and need consolidating. For the moment, lets use a gold base line for comparisons. What has really happend to our money?

A CHRONOLOGICAL REVIEW

The period of 1927–29 might be called the setting of the stage for the depression. Benefit of hindsight permits us to realize that the availability of money is perhaps more important than any system of designating its value. Unsound fiscal manipulations, and their subsequent readjustments, affect availability. However, quick change in dollar value can be used to make room for more money. This brings relief without cure.

The period of 1929–39, devoted to experimental adjustment of the value of the dollar, established some fiscal policies for control of manipulation. These were hidden gains, lost in the dramatics of dollar devaluation by 40 percent, which was the tool for dissolving the depression, to most of us. The introduction of the 1939–40 index figure simply provided a convenient yardstick for new economic planning.

The period of 1939–49, devoted to the adherence to the 1940 index and the policies of which it was a part, resulted in a further devaluation of the dollar by another 40 percent. While this necessitated the establishment of the 1949–50 index figure, a realization was also developed that this was no cure.

The period of 1949–59 was, therefore, devoted to a more considered control of economics. This resulted in a reduction in the rate of depreciation to 18 percent for this like period. We thus postponed the need for a new index figure, while retaining the same economic plan.

A BASELINE PICTURE OF IT ALL

The 1929 dollar became a 60-cent dollar.

The 1939 dollar became a 36-cent dollar.

The 1949 dollar became a 29-cent dollar.

The 1959 dollar could now become the "little buck" of 1969 at a value of only 24 cents if we can hold to the 18 percent rate of depreciation. If the old system of 40 percent depreciation had continued, we would now have a 22-cent dollar which we could expect to be worth 14 cents in 1969.

What does this mean mean to the tax dollar, the pension dollar, or to the salary dollar? It means exactly what you would expect. It now takes just about $4 to do what $1 did in 1929. This is the basic fact that lies behind increased benefits under OASI, demands for increased pay patterns and the failure of faith in savings accounts.

HOW ABOUT YOU AND ME?

If you have been working for the past 30 years, and have been fortunate enough to have increased your salary by 400 percent, you can break even in terms of buying power. If you have been working for the past 20 years, you've probably started at a higher salary and need only a 300 percent increase to break even. Those of you who have worked for only the past 10 years are beginning to start to think about this problem.

These statements apply to salary only. If you are to cover the expanding tax picture as well, there is need to expand your pay gains even more. We expect more from Government services today and we get it. Government service employees have received some increases in pay, but not in proportion to the above percentages. Job for job, the chances are that he is well underpaid for what he does.

Unfortunately, fiscal manipulations have again entered the picture. This time the Government plays the role, in having to meet public interest rates. About all that can be said is that those in charge do not understand the role of money, and the part it should play in our economic system. You and I, we represent a large part of the cost of the things we buy, for the cost of our labor is a big piece of any price. Another large part of this price structure is the cost of financing the operations involved. Risk handling and percentage costs run far higher than the cost of raw materials.

This opens up thought on credit and deficit-spending. Can a retired person, on a fixed income of 10 years ago, indulge in these credit capers? Can you, on a fixed salary, spend more than you make? Obviously credit has its place, and it can be presumed that deficit-spending is a close cousin. However, it remains evident that a day of reckoning must come, for the Nation as well as the individual.

WHERE DO WE STAND?

The simple idea that we can continue to lop off 40 percent of the dollar at some indefinite periodic rate, simply because there is bound to be something left, has already reached the point of diminishing return. More than that, it has robbed us of recognition for a job well done and destroyed the rewards of a sincere sustained effort. What incentive is left for improving our abilities to do a better job? Look at us through the eyes of our younger people. They listen to us, true, but what do they see? One suspects that a pattern of life devoted to not quite breaking even has little appeal.

For many, the big debt has become the symbol of a fist full of money.

For many, credit buying is the way to spend and use, with a hope that a really cheap, or worthless, dollar will provide a way out.

For many, the manipulation of large and small credit deals takes more time than they spend working.

Can we honestly say that they are wrong?

Today we have an average salary of $5,137 which is supposed to do the work of $1,488 in 1929. Some are fortunate to have evolved an automatic escalator clause, which substitutes for basic value, and makes a form of coinage out of paper currency, for them. Others operate on a percentage basis which keeps them in step. Where do the rest of us stand?

The two graphs following these remarks, statistically prove that we might as well face the fact of our 29 cent dollar and realize what it is doing to us.

WHAT COMES NEXT?

The spree of throwing away our birthright is almost over. There is no answer in endorsing more and more minority sanctions, which achieve magnitude disruptive to the economy. The pernicious anemia of the earned dollar is in sharp contrast with the quick deal dollar.

Governmental sanction of minority organizational affiliation for favoritism is throwing off the restraint of arbitration. Governmental sanction of foreign industrial and economic competition is destroying even domestic markets. Yet the majority of our employees continue to be confronted with a depreciated dollar which destroys our hope of improving our status in life.

The remarks of Mr. John Winant clarify the obligation of Government without suggesting governmental substitutes:

"In positive terms, the security of a people is the sum of the arrangements set up by business, by government and by society, through which the things we cherish are safeguarded against hazards we, as individuals, can not control."

If we are to continue to believe in the essential integrity and importance of the individual, we will need leadership capable of recognizing our plight. Is it true that, "gregariousness is the refuge of the mediocre"? Is the competent individual to be entrapped by the mundane status of the mass action?

Far from pretending to have pat answers to these questions, I content myself with crystallization of the challenge. I am satisfied that the answer does not lie in rewriting the Bill of Rights, nor in further disposing of our American heritage.

A part of the answer lies in presenting adequate information to the public, not in dribs and drabs, but in solid articles. The Bureau of Labor has the information used in this review, and much more. Yet one is forced to glean it bit by bit from news clippings of unrelated dates. Since no composite evaluation can accompany such dispersal, one draws one's own conclusions, or ignores the matter. What were the national average salaries for the years past? How can one rationalize a "middle income hous-

ing project" having rents of $150 to $300 per month with the present average of $5,137 per year? Are the complete facts so bad that they must not be released?

Let us make a start toward facing the full facts.

Jobs for Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, of late there has been an increased interest aroused in the matter of jobs for older workers.

There are some of us who feel that the solution must be a combination of both social security advances as well as job placement programs.

It should be interesting to note the fine work being done in my home State of Pennsylvania by the Advisory Board on Problems of Older Workers.

This work is being carried out under the direction of William L. Batt, Jr., secretary of labor, and Harold W. Williams, executive director of the board.

They are working in direct contact with the office of Gov. David L. Lawrence.

I herewith submit the report of this board, dated February 1, 1960:

MORE JOBS FOUND FOR OLDER WORKERS IN 1959

A record number of job applicants who were 45 years of age or over were placed in employment through the Pennsylvania State Employment Service in 1959. A total of 54,467 older workers found jobs. The previous high was 52,782 in 1957. The statistics on older worker placements are for the 4 years beginning with 1956, when older worker legislation was first passed under the Leader administration. The two principal pieces of legislation passed by the general assembly were the Fair Employment Practices Act (which was passed late in 1955 and which makes discrimination in employment on account of age illegal) and the act establishing the Advisory Board on Problems of Older Workers, which went into effect in 1956. The figures follow:

Year	Total placements of applicants 45 and over	Percentage of total placements 45 and over
1959	54,467	20.6
1958	47,826	[1] 21.8
1957	52,782	20.0
1956	47,657	17.1

[1] The relatively higher percentage of placements in 1958 is probably due to an unusually large number of older worker placements made in Philadelphia in connection with an experimental pilot project.

The December 1959 index of older worker placements dropped to 46, down 6 points from 52 in November. However, the December index was the highest in 4 years. The comparisons follow:

Month:	*Index*
December 1959	46
December 1958	44
December 1957	43
December 1956	34

The average monthly index for 1959 was 50.5, compared to 58.3 in 1958, 48.8 in 1957, and 40.8 in 1956. It is interesting to note that the annual index for older worker placements in 1959 was 70, as compared to an average of 50.5 for the 12 months of 1959. Since the index compares the percentage of job applicants 45 years of age or over who were placed with the percentage of applicants under 45 years of age who were placed, the difference between the annual index of 70 and the average monthly index of 50.5 indicates that older workers do relatively better on an annual basis than they do on a monthly basis. This indication is supported by other information reporting that it takes longer to place older job applicants; thus, older applicants are in the files longer; and relatively more are placed in jobs in a 12-month period than in a 1-month period.

Older job applicants should take some encouragement from these figures. What they mean is that the picture is not quite as bad as the monthly figures indicate. They also mean that the longer the older job applicant keeps plugging at the business of finding a job, the better off he will be. Discouragement is one of the greatest enemies of the job seeker. It is important to keep looking. It may be more difficult for some older workers to find jobs; but it is often not impossible.

NO COMPLAINTS WHEN AGE LIMITS LIFTED, SAYS FEDERAL EXPERT

In recent testimony, Mr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director of the Bureau of Programs and Standards of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, indicated that many Federal personnel executives had originally been concerned at the removal of maximum age limits for employment in the Federal Government. These concerns proved groundless, even in hazardous or trainee-type jobs. Here is what Mr. Stahl says in a letter to the Advisory Board on Problems of Older Workers:

"What has been the impact of the provision of Federal law which prevents the imposition of an actual age limit for initial employment in the competitive civil service? There had been some concern particularly because we had age limits before, that we would need to continue to have maximum age limits imposed on jobs which were of an especially hazardous or arduous nature or for trainee-type jobs where you make a rather heavy investment in the individual with the expectation that he serve a full career.

"The interesting thing is, after 3 years of operation under no maximum age limits at all, that we have had no significant complaints from the agencies, no evidence of interference with their operations, by not being able to employ maximum age limits."

Public and private agencies alike which maintain that they must institute maximum age limits when hiring people because their jobs are unusually hazardous or arduous or because they only promote from within, should read Mr. Stahl's statement over several times. They are perpetrating a great injustice when they set a maximum age limit, and for no good reason at all.

Along these lines, Nation's Business for October 1959 reports that there is a marked shift away from hiring bias against men over age 40 or 45 in the executive manpower field. Top business is recognizing that a rigid policy based on chronological age alone often bars the most desirable person for the job.

FEBRUARY CALENDAR

February 1: Mrs. Marion E. Warner, regional director, will speak to the Richland Civic Club, Gibsonia, 1 p.m.

February 2: Harold W. Williams, executive director, will speak to the Soroptimist Club, Wilkes-Barre, Hotel Sterling, 6:30 p.m.

February 11: John H. Berkley, regional director, will speak to the Soroptimist Club, York, Yorktowne Hotel, 6:30 p.m.

February 18: Mrs. Warner will speak to the pensioners of local No. 1256, United Steelworkers of America, Duquesne, 2 p.m.

February 19: The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Older Workers will sponsor a group counseling session for older workers at the Bethlehem office, Bureau of Employment Security, 1 p.m.

February 23: Mr. Berkley will speak to the Soroptimist Club, Danville, Pine Barn Inn, 6:30 p.m.

February 24: The Berks County Council of Social Agencies will sponsor an employment panel for older workers at the Reading YMCA, 11 a.m.

February 26: The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Older Workers will sponsor an employment panel for older workers at the Bethlehem office, Bureau of Employment Security, 1 p.m.

February 29: Mrs. Warner will speak to the Retired Businessmen's Organization, Irene Kaufmann Settlement, Pittsburgh, 2 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS ANALYZED

It may be helpful for those who are concerned with problems of older workers to understand the various types of legislation which affect older workers. The simplest form of legislation of this type is antidiscrimination legislation—making it unlawful to discriminate in employment on account of age. Pennsylvania has such a law. So do Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Rhode Island. A bill has been introduced in the U.S. Senate (S. 1073) which would make employment discrimination on account of age a Federal offense.

Another type of legislative proposal deals with the creation of administrative agencies. Pennsylvania is one of the few States which has an advisory board on problems of older workers (some others have special divisions within the State employment service) and there are various State councils and commissions. A special Senate subcommittee (the McNamara Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging) is considering whether to recommend legislation establishing a Federal Bureau for Aging.

The appropriation of public funds to support direct services to older workers is another form of legislative action important to older workers. Most of this money is appropriated by the Congress and spent through the public employment services. However, at least two States, New York and California, have appropriated State funds to hire special employment counselors for jobless persons over 45 years of age. New York has had very good results with this program. The California experience is still too new for evaluation. A modest proposal for $40,000 a biennium for similar counselors in Pennsylvania was not reported out of committee in the State senate.

Some people have proposed that in addition to punishing employers who discriminate against older workers, we should reward those who hire older workers by giving them tax concessions. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate which would allow an employer to take a full deduction in his income tax for the extra cost in fringe benefits incurred in hiring older workers. Many people interested in promoting employment for older workers object to legislation which is based on the belief that it is inherently more costly to hire an older worker.

There is another broad field of legislation dealing with retirement. Here one finds proposals for special tax credits for retired persons, changes in the earnings limitation to qualify for social security payments, and changes in the retirement age. There have also been various proposals to make sure that private pension plans do not make it more

difficult for older workers to get jobs. Among these are Governor Lawrence's proposal to require all private pension plans to tie their benefits into the public social security system, thereby making all plans portable and preserving the worker's credits as he moves from job to job. Other proposals include making it mandatory that private pension plans give a vested interest to the employee that he can take with him when he leaves or is laid off; and the issuance of a Government bond that matures when an individual dies or reaches age 65.

There will be considerable discussion of legislation affecting older persons in 1960 as Pennsylvania prepares for the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. Those who are interested in problems of the older worker should consider what legislation, if any, is pertinent at this time.

LIFE EXPECTANCY ESTIMATES FOR 1958

Here are the life expectancy estimates for 1958, recently released by the National Office of Vital Statistics of the Public Health Service:

Age:	*Life expectancy*
Birth	69.5
1	70.4
10	61.8
20	52.2
30	42.8
40	33.5
50	24.9
60	17.3
70	11.2
80	6.3

New York Times, January 12: "Prof. Ronald Turnbridge, Britain's leading expert on old-age research, said in a report made public today (January 9) that all political leaders should be forcibly retired in their early fifties."

Increase in Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, one of the great names in land and water conservation circles in the United States is Bryce C. Browning. He has served as secretary and treasurer of the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District since its organization on June 3, 1933. He has been honored on numerous occasions by those who recognize that if we are to meet our obligations at home and abroad in the challenging days ahead, we must protect and preserve our natural resources from whence our wealth flows.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Browning which appears in the February edition of the Ohio Farm Bureau News. I commend to my colleagues the cogent remarks of this outstanding authority:

RISE IN POPULATION WILL INCREASE WATER PROBLEM

(By Bryce C. Browning)

All authorities seem agreed that water is the most critical resource problem confronting America. They also agree that economic solutions may be impossible except as prompt action is taken. While Ohio's total annual rainfall, together with Lake Erie and the Ohio River, seems to place her in an enviable water position, serious shortages already have developed. With increases in population and per capita water use, additional and more critical ones must result. It is believed that one of the greatest of these needs will be for irrigation.

POPULATION INCREASE

According to present trends, Ohio's population will double within the next 40 years. Present records indicate that water use increases at double the population rate. On the basis of present knowledge such needs cannot be met, at prices the public can afford to pay, except as prompt action is taken. It will require major improvements in the efficiency of water use, construction of great distribution systems, and, in particular, the complete utilization of our wasted rainfall.

The saying, "We never miss the water 'til the well goes dry," is an ancient one. Its significance is far greater today. In ancient times, when the water supply went dry, it was possible to move to new lands with new water resources. But we have no new lands and the competition for the remaining ones is increasing at a tremendous rate. Those which are necessary for the storage and transportation of essential water supplies are rapidly being taken for costly developments of various kinds. Except as prompt action is taken, their values will become excessively high.

WATER IS PROBLEM

Throughout our country progressive States have recognized this water problem and are already in process of spending literally billions of dollars to provide solutions. States which fail to promptly follow their example may soon find themselves at a tremendous economic disadvantage. Ohio is fortunate in having had farsighted legislatures. Through authority previously granted, the Ohio division of water has already made good progress in determining Ohio's future water needs and resources. At the recent session additional bills were passed which should go far in providing a solution. I have been asked to offer comments concerning two of them. Because of necessary space limits they must be quite brief.

The first of these bills, S.B. No. 237, establishes a seven-member State water commission. The State directors of health, natural resources, and public works are ex officio members, with the four additional ones to be appointed by the Governor. These four are to represent public water supply, commerce and industry, agriculture, and recreation. The bill's primary purpose is the coordination of water programs, the development of water supply, flood control and flood zoning programs for all areas of the State, and to obtain the most beneficial use of our water resources.

FIRST IN NATION

In the light of existing information it seems probable that Ohio's future prosperity may be largely dependent upon the Commission's success in attaining these ends. As interested citizens, it is the responsibility of each of us to encourage Governor DiSalle to use great care in selecting the members of this commission, to insist that they fully recognize their responsibilities and, with this accomplished, to unite in support of their proposals.

The second bill, H.B. No. 673, amends the Ohio Conservancy Act. Passed in 1914, the Conservancy Act was the first such legislation in the United States. Ohio's greatest flood had occurred just a year earlier and its purpose was to permit citizens to organize on a watershed basis for the solving of their water problems. While its basic objective was flood control, the act also made specific reference to water conservation, irrigation and reclamation. It was considered a model at the time and has since been copied by most States and certain other countries. But it has had only slight change during the past 45 years.

The purpose of H.B. 673 is to modernize the Conservancy Act so as to better serve modern needs. It provides a more practical means of financing planning programs and for their coordination at State level. A primary change is one which encourages formation of small watershed districts. As a result of the passage by Congress of Public Law 566, commonly known as the Small Watershed Act, there has been a steadily increasing interest in such programs. Public Law 566 offers a means whereby the residents of small watersheds may solve their flood control problems, with the Federal Government assuming a major share of the cost. Where conditions are favorable, and such need exists, it also offers an opportunity to solve water supply problems at substantial savings to the affected citizens. However, there must be an authorized public agency to sponsor such projects and to assume legal responsibility for them. Under existing Ohio law a conservancy district seems best qualified for such a purpose.

JUDGE WILL HANDLE

The Conservancy Act, as originally written, provided for the creation and administration of sub-districts within the boundaries of larger ones. However, it required action by the full court on all matters affecting them. As amended, the majority of such matters may be handled by the Judge of the county directly affected and at substantial savings in cost.

Another important amendment concerns the so-called Official Plan of a District. Under the provisions of the original act the board of directors of a Conservancy District must present a complete plan for the accomplishment of the district's purposes. Because of changing needs and conditions this is not always practical. As amended, partial plans may be presented and additional ones added as necessity requires.

MUST DO IT NOW

If economically practical solutions to our water problems are to be found action must not be delayed. The two laws referred to will provide improved methods. But results will still be dependent upon an aroused public interest. We cannot afford to wait.

Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans Post 1 Support Federal Aid to Education Legislation Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a group of World War II veterans, who were serving in the Army and Navy on the Island of Oahu, Hawaii, on the quiet but fateful Sunday morning of December 7, 1941, when the Japanese made a surprise air attack, have organized Post 1 of the Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans, Inc., in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

The avowed purpose of organizing the Pearl Harbor attack veterans post several years ago was so that these veterans of the opening day of World War II can preserve the memory of their buddies who died during the attack and to recall the horrible incidents that occurred as a result of the bombings at Honolulu,

Hickam Field, Schofield Barracks and Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, these Pearl Harbor veterans are also concerned about the United States winding up second best to Russia because of our education system. They so informed me in a letter today and I am happy to receive their views and to make them known to my colleagues in the House. I include this letter and resolution of the Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans with my remarks:

PEARL HARBOR ATTACK VETERANS,
February 6, 1960.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

REPRESENTATIVE BOLAND: The Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans at their 18th reunion at Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, December 6, 1959, passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans at their 18th reunion at Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, December 6, 1959, go on record as favoring a large increase in Federal aid to education including Federal grants for both school construction and teacher salary aid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this organization go on record as favoring passage of the amended Murray-Metcalf bill (H.R. 22) authorizing financing of education with appropriations to States of $25 annually for 4 years for each person aged 5 to 17."

We survivors of the worst military disaster ever inflicted on the United States are fearful of the consequences of our country winding up second best to Russia. The primary reason for our lagging behind Russia, we believe, is the poor support given to education by our Federal Government.

We urge you to support the $1,834 million public elementary bill containing funds for teachers' salaries and building construction passed by the U.S. Senate last Thursday night.

EDWARD F. BORUCKI,
Past Commander.

Mr. Speaker, the Pearl Harbor veteran who signed the letter, past Commander Edward F. Borucki, turned over the gavel of the post on Sunday, January 31, to the new commander, Leroy V. Lancaster.

Mr. Speaker, I further include in the Appendix with my remarks, a news story from the Springfield Daily News of February 1, concerning the new officers of the Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans, Post 1:

The men from this area who were at Pearl Harbor on the day of infamy, December 7, 1941, and who have formed Post 1, of the Pearl Harbor Attack Veterans, Inc., yesterday afternoon installed officers at the VFW home, Chicopee. The new commander is a former Navy aviation chief machinist mate with more than 23 years' service. He was stationed at Kaneohe Bay Naval Air Station on the island of Oahu, Hawaii, when the Japanese raided the base. He later participated in the Coral Sea and Guadalcanal battle and was awarded the Yangtze Patrol and Asiatic-Pacific Medals.

Retiring commander of the organization is Southampton School Committeeman Edward F. Borucki, a member of the Chicopee high school faculty and a former Navy chief petty officer.

Other officers seated were: Vice Commander, Tony J. Gregory, of West Springfield; adjutant, Joseph G. Gallant, Springfield; finance officer, Andrew F. Fitzhugh, Longmeadow; Charles Svensson, Springfield.

In addition, historian, Arthur H. Levesque, Springfield; sergeant at arms, Harry L. Chandler of Holyoke; executive committee members; Charles J. Lockhart of East Longmeadow, Victor Kamont, Jr., of South Hadley, and Mr. Borucki.

Frank E. Hayes of Northampton, William J. Lessard, Jr., of Roslindale, and Mr. Curylo are holdover executive committee members.

Six Catholic Bishops Plead for Dominicans in Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave, I am including a story from the New York Times for February 3, 1960, by Will Lissner telling of the protest made by the leading Catholic authorities in the Dominican Republic against the recent outrages of Dictator Trujillo against Dominican citizens:

The six Roman Catholic bishops of the Dominican Republic have intervened with Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, head of the country's regime, on behalf of the thousands of Dominican citizens imprisoned as revolutionary plotters.

This was disclosed in a joint pastoral letter the bishops had read last Sunday in all the Roman Catholic churches of the Republic. A copy of the letter was smuggled out of the country and brought to New York yesterday.

In their pastoral, the Bishops declared their solidarity with the many families bereaved by the arrests of their loved ones. They declared that Catholic Christianity must defend the rights of individuals, which, they said, came before the rights of any state.

Signers of the pastoral were Archbishop Ricardo, primate, who bears the historic title, Primate of the Americas; the Most Reverend Octavio A. Beras, coadjutor archbishop of Santo Domingo; and Bishops Francisco Panal of La Vega Real, Hugo E. Polanco of Santiago de los Caballeros, Juan Delix Pepen of La Altagarcia and Thomas E. Reilly of San Juan de la Maguana.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS DEFINED

An extensive section of the pastoral was devoted to asserting the rights of the individual derived from natural law, including the democratic rights of freedom of conscience, of the press, and of assembly. These rights do not exist in the Dominican Republic under the Trujillo regime.

To suppress these rights, the bishops warned, is a grave offense against God.

The pastoral says that before finishing the letter to the faithful, the bishops worked out a play for mutual understanding so that excesses might be avoided. They sent this, they said, to the highest authority in the land, meaning General Trujillo.

General Trujillo's reply was to suppress news of the issuance of the pastoral letter. The bishops said in the letter that they issued the pastoral so that the plan might be carried out as quickly as possible.

The outcome was not indicated, although the letter to General Trujillo was sent before last January 25, when the bishops dated the pastoral. That the bishops did not anticipate that their representation would be accepted at once was indicated in the pastoral's exhortation to the faithful to pray for the successful outcome of the representations.

The move indicated that the Roman Catholic Church was at the point of breaking with the Trujillo regime. Previously the church had kept aloof, since only in recent years had Generalissimo Trujillo returned to the practice of his faith.

FEW CLERGY RESPONDED

In 1958 the regime introduced the practice of making a public event of baptisms in church, with a member of the Trujillo family or of the Government acting as honorary sponsor of the baptized child.

Only a few clergy responded to the regime's overtures for religious support. As a whole the clergy, like most of the citizens, kept aloof from politics.

The pastoral served to confirm reports received by Dominican revolutionary organizations in New York of a serious uprising in the republic recently. As a result of the rising, thousands of Dominicans in business and the professions, including at least one priest and at least two seminarians, have been reported arrested.

The Government admitted making a small number of arrests, denied others, and said the cases against others had not made clear whether they were guilty of conspiracy. The pastoral letter, however, indicates that the fate of the thousands arrested is not known and that it is feared that many will die from torture.

Most Dominicans are at least nominally Roman Catholics. Church and state are separated, but the republic has a concordat with the Holy See guaranteeing freedom of worship. Several Protestant denominations maintain churches and missions and have thousands of members.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Statement by Gov. John Patterson, of Alabama, on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement by Gov. John Patterson, of Alabama, before the Rules and Administration Committee of the U.S. Senate, here in Washington, D.C., February 2, 1960.

I just wish all of the people in the Nation could know Gov. John Patterson, who is such a young man, but who has had so much experience and who is making such a fight to keep our way of life in our beloved Alabama and our Southland. Before the great people of Alabama elected John Patterson as Governor of the State, he was attorney general of the State. This great honor does not come to many men in this Nation, but he, John Patterson, is certainly doing his dead level best and he may make some mistakes, but it will be of the head, and not the heart. Personally, I have worked with him as hard as I could day and night, ever since the day the people of Alabama elected him Governor of our great State.

John Patterson is a human dynamo; he has a brilliant brain, an understanding heart and is doing everything in every way for the development of our State. We have had many great Governors, and I have worked with them all down through the years, but we have never had one that has given us more cooperation in the development of our great undeveloped State than John Patterson. He doesn't put it off for a lot of long conferences; he gives you a "yes" or "no" right now; and every one of the propositions I have put up to this great man have been accepted and we are working to carry them through. Right at the moment we are working on a tremendous plant that will manufacture all sorts of goods; and not only John Patterson, but his finance director, Charles Meriwether, his brother, Maurice Patterson, who is so much like John, Sam Engelhardt, State highway director, Bill Younger, director of conservation, and every one of them are working and cooperating with the entire Alabama delegation.

Later, after my friend, Gov. John Patterson, had made his speech before the Rules and Administration Committee in the Senate, my wife and I gave a luncheon in the Speaker's dining room on the House side. We had about 54 people, all that this room would hold; but they were such famous folks and such wonderful people, who had done so much good. We had Democrats and Republicans; and Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN both made wonderful talks, as well as each one of the Congressmen from every district in the State. We also had Dr. Wernher von Braun from the Redstone Arsenal and his Chief, Gen. Dan R. Ostrander; and I wish everybody could have been there to have heard some of the things, not only the Alabama delegation had to say about our State and our Nation and its development, but I wish you could have heard Dr. Von Braun and his Chief, General Ostrander; but best of all was the great talk that was made by our own Gov. John Patterson.

We didn't have the newspapermen there; there just wasn't room for them, but it's a pity we didn't, because I wish all of the people, especially in Alabama, could have heard the great talks that were made. And many other men made talks. The Honorable Homer Gruenther, Special Assistant at the White House, made a talk. Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON made a wonderful talk. He is a Republican from the State of Washington. He and his wife attended. Then we had Congressman THOMAS JOHNSON of Maryland, who is on my committee, and he, too, made a talk.

We had wonderful Mrs. Nathan Twining, and we had her make a little talk. General Twining was coming, but he had to go before a committee; but we have had him so many times in Alabama; and some day, if he should ever retire—and I hope he will stay here a long, long time—we hope to get him to retire in the First District of Alabama—the same as the great Gen. "Weary" Wilson of the Army Engineers is doing, who has helped us so much.

Well, it was a great day, and my only regret is that all of our people could not have enjoyed these wonderful, wonderful talks. Another thing, too, that will gladden the hearts of all of our people is that they have given us in our beloved State of Alabama $100 million to keep on working on the development of the great work we are doing at the Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., the home of JOHN SPARKMAN and Congressman BOB JONES.

Well, I wish we could have had Gen. Dan Callahan, who has charge of our beautiful Brookley at Mobile, Ala., where the Government has invested a billion dollars and where the payrolls and the purchases made for this great installation amount to over $105 million a year.

Well, we thrilled and thrilled with all of the great men and wonderful women that attended this luncheon that was given by Ocllo and me.

Last but not least, we had our own Senator and Mrs. Roland Cooper, of Camden, Ala. Senator Cooper made a great speech for the development of the Alabama River and all of our rivers, where we have more navigable miles of streams than any State in the Union; and today we are having a meeting at our regular congressional luncheon that we have every Thursday in the House Dining Room, to go over the development, especially of the Millers Ferry project, that Senator Roland Cooper talked so wonderfully about. I think, of course, that the Alabama River, as well as the Coosa-Alabama, as well as the Warrior-Tombigbee and all of these rivers, should have been developed a hundred years ago, and they will be, because it is right, and right is might, and we will win in the end.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GOV. JOHN PATTERSON OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE RULES AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 2, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, my name is John Patterson and I am the Governor of the State of Alabama. I am presently serving a 4-year term which began January 19, 1959. Prior to that date I served as attorney general of Alabama from January 18, 1955, to January 19, 1959. I wish to thank you for the opportunity that you have given me to testify before you on this occasion.

I wish to voice my strong opposition to bills S. 2535, S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2722, S. 2783 and S. 2814 now pending before your committee. These bills are far reaching in nature and seek to make radical changes in our basic laws. If these bills are enacted into law the implementation of such laws will lead to chaos and bitterness, and a further deterioration of the relations between the States and Federal Government. If these bills are enacted into law they could well lead to a breakdown of the election machinery in many States. I feel that I know the sentiment of the people of Alabama, and I know that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of my State are opposed to the passage of these bills. As Governor of the State, I feel it my duty to tell you the feeling of our people. The enactment of these bills will lead to grave consequences and these bills will not succeed in doing that which the authors of the bills intend.

S. 2535 seeks to establish an agency of Congress authorized to conduct elections and register voters in certain areas under certain conditions. This bill seeks to establish a Congressional Elections Commission for this purpose. Bills S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2783 and S. 2814 are similar and provide that where a person's application to register to vote has been denied and such person believes himself to be qualified under State law, and believes that he has been denied registration because of race, religion, color or national origin, he may file a petition with the President, requesting that a "Federal registrar" be appointed for the district in which such person lives.

The bills further provide that when the President receives not less than nine petitions within 1 year from persons in the

same registration district, he shall refer such petitions to the Civil Rights Commission for investigation. If the Civil Rights Commission determines that such persons are being denied the right to vote solely because of their race, religion, color or national origin, the Commission shall certify such information to the President.

The President then, under these bills, would appoint a "Federal Registrar" for the district involved and the registrar would accept registration applications from all persons in the district who claim that they are being denied the right to vote because of race, religion, color, or national origin. If the "Federal Registrar" determines that the applicants are qualified under the State law he shall certify the names to the State election officials, and such persons would have the right to vote in any election where Federal officials are being elected. The bills place a fine and penitentiary sentence on any State official who does not abide by the decisions made by the "Federal Registrar."

S. 2535 is similar to the aforementioned bills in that it attempts to do the same thing except it provides for a Registration of Voters Commission instead of "Federal Registrars."

S. 2722 requires State officials to preserve all registration and voting records of all elections for a period of 5 years after the making of the record.

I know that the members of the committee are familiar with these bills; however, I have attempted to summarize them briefly for the purpose of showing that we are dealing here with something new in the way of legislation, and to further show what a radical departure this procedure is from any registration procedure that any State has ever had before.

The Constitution of the United States does not give Congress power to prescribe the qualifications of electors in the States. The Constitution leaves the setting of the qualifications of voters to the States. In my opinion these aforementioned bills now under consideration are clearly unconstitutional. They are an attempt by the Federal Government to set the qualifications of electors in the States and to put Federal officials actually in charge of elections in the States. Such action is a usurption of the powers of the States by the Federal Government and is a clear violation of the soverign rights of every State in the Union.

The sponsors of these bills are inferring that our State officials are violating their oaths of office. I resent this inference. I can truthfully say of my own personal knowledge that the officials of my State are obeying the law, doing a good job, and living up to their oaths of office. This type of legislation is an insult to the officials of every State in the Union and obviously is politically inspired.

The right to vote is conferred and safeguarded by each State constitution. The laws of Alabama setting out the qualifications for electors are fair, just, reasonable, and impartial.

Adequate remedies exist to protect each and every individual in his right to register and vote. No one can come before this committee and truthfully tell you that the laws of my State protecting the right to vote are not adequate. If a person in Alabama files an application with the board of registrars of his county that he be placed on the list of qualified voters and the board of registrars denies his application, the applicant has the right of appeal, without giving security for costs, within 30 days after such denial, by filing a petition in the circuit court at law or court of like jurisdiction held for the county in which he seeks to register. The petitioner must allege that he is a citizen of the United States, over the age of 21 years, has the qualifications as to residence prescribed in section 178 of the constitution of Alabama and is entitled to register to vote under the provisions of the constitution. The issues are tried in the court in the same manner and under the same rules as other cases are tried, and by a jury if the petitioner demands it. The circuit solicitor defends the action for the State. If the petitioner wins his case in the lower court, the State has no appeal and the petitioner's name goes on the qualified voter list forthwith. If he loses his case in the lower court, he can appeal to the supreme court within 30 days from the date of the judgment. If the petitioner loses his appeal in the State supreme court, he can appeal to the United States Supreme Court. A judgment in favor of the petitioner under our law entitles him to be registered as of the date of filing his original application with the board of registrars. This procedure is similar in all States and it is a proceeding whereby a person's rights are tested by the judiciary, which is as it should be. I submit to you that this is a full and adequate remedy for each and every individual who claims that he has been denied the right to register as a voter because of race, religion, color or national origin, or for any other reasons which he might think unconstitutional.

I can truthfully say that I cannot recall a single instance where a Negro has filed an appeal under our State statutes claiming that he had been illegally denied the right to register. Furthermore, I can truthfully state and since January 18, 1955, when I took office as attorney general, not a single Negro has taken an appeal under our statutes providing for appeals where boards of registrars have turned down applications to register.

How can anyone come in here and truthfully say to you that our laws are inadequate when none of the complaining Negroes have taken advantage of our statutes. How can anyone say that the State of Alabama has denied citizens the right to vote when they have not even tried to use the remedies which the State gives them to protect their rights. The mode by which they may obtain justice is clearly marked out by the State law. It is so plain and simple that any citizen may readily avail himself of it. Yet the few complaining persons have not done so. Why?

I feel that the real reason why the agitators, who are constantly bringing up this issue, have not resorted to our courts for relief, if they are entitled to such relief, is that the Federal courts have consistently held that class actions will not lie in cases testing the qualifications of persons to vote. The courts have consistently held that each individual case and each individual's qualifications to vote must rest upon the facts in each individual case and that, of course, is as it should be. The proponents of this type of legislation under consideration by this committee are not content to seek individual redress through the courts. That's too slow for them. What they seek is a procedure which circumvents the courts and sets up an administrative procedure whereby Negroes can be herded together and marched in battalion formation to the polling places under the watchful eyes of Federal registrars and Federal marshals to register and vote whether or not they can read and write, and whether or not they are qualified otherwise under State laws. The proponents of this legislation are not interested in a judicial determination of an individual's rights, but only in mass registration before the next election. We have not had anything in the South similar to Federal registrars as outlined in these bills since Federal troops occupied the South during reconstruction days.

I submit to you that the statutory procedures for testing a person's right to vote under our State law are full, adequate, and reasonable. This is the proper and orderly way for a person to have determined his right to vote if he feels that it has been illegally denied. Certainly, this committee, and this Congress, should require these complaining people to at least try to seek relief under the existing laws, which heretofore they have not done, before this committee or this Congress should resort to such a radical procedure as sending Federal registrars into the South to usurp the powers of our State officials and to usurp the powers of our courts. Make these complainants go to the courts for their relief. They have not done so and I submit to you if you make them, their rights will be promptly and adequately determined.

S. 2314, S. 2783, S. 2719, and S. 2684 provide for investigations to be made by the Civil Rights Commission in cases where individuals claim they have been denied the right to vote because of race, religion, color, or national origin. I wish to voice my strong objections again to the actions of the Civil Rights Commission, and I urge you not to extend the authority of that body. The recent actions of the Civil Rights Commission damaged race relations in the South and further injured the already strained relations between the States and Federal Government. The Commission failed to do anything constructive, but, on the contrary, further widened the breach existing between the races. It harassed and intimidated our State and local officials. Its actions have made it difficult for us to find responsible citizens who are willing to serve as members of boards of registrars.

The Commission attempted to sit in judgment over the manner in which our officials conducted their offices. It interfered with the operation of our courts. The Commission attempted to arrogate unto itself powers which it did not, and could not constitutionally possess. It claimed to be "a roving grand jury" with the powers of a common law grand jury, a position legally untenable. The Commission attempted to go on "fishing expeditions" in the records of judicial officers. It subpenaed our State officials to hearings at distant places from their homes and put them on the witness stand under spotlights and before batteries of nationwide television cameras. No room or seats were provided for counsel of the public officials and the Commission would not allow attorneys for the officials to make objections. The State officials were in effect placed on trial by the Commission and publicly harassed and intimidated. The Commission attempted to go far beyond its factfinding powers, and hearings were conducted in a circus-like arena and no semblance of due process was accorded our State officials.

It is inconceivable that persons trained in the law would be a party to conducting such hearings as were conducted by the Civil Rights Commission. The Commission accused our public officials of violating the law, but refused to divulge the names of their accusers or to advise them of the nature of the charges against them. The Commission refused to permit the State officials' counsel to properly represent them and refused to allow them to cross-examine the witnesses who appeared against them. In fact, the actions of the Civil Rights Commission were so reprehensible that it was enjoined from conducting any further hearings by the Federal court in Shreveport, La., until the constitutionality of their procedures could be tested by higher courts. The Commission came into the South ostensibly to seek facts but in reality it was seeking publicity and notoriety.

I take issue with the report filed before Congress by the Civil Rights Commission. The information in that report is biased and prejudiced and is not based upon proper investigation. A large portion of the re-

port of the Civil Rights Commission is in the form of editorials by the Commission's staff writers. The actions of the Civil Rights Commission in Alabama created ill will and hostility between the people of my State and the Federal Government. The Commission accomplished nothing but its actions seriously injured race relations in the South. I ask you not to favorably consider any more legislation which would enlarge the powers of the Civil Rights Commission. Such action would not be in the best interest of our Nation.

No public official cares to serve in public office when he is subjected to harassment and intimidation by agents of the Civil Rights Commission, or any agency for that matter. No person likes to accept an appointment as a member of a board of registrars when he knows that he will be immediately visited by Federal investigators and run the risk of immediate suit in Federal courts seeking injunctive relief and damages. Recently President Eisenhower stated that he was having difficulty finding persons willing to accept appointment to fill the vacancy on the Civil Rights Commission, for, as he said, people do not like to be harassed.

The Attorney General of the United States and the Civil Rights Commission have apparently declared open war upon all members of State boards of registrars and they are making it difficult for us to find people who are willing to serve in that capacity. In most States the members of boards of registrars do not receive much pay and they agree to serve usually as a public service. They cannot afford lawyers to defend them, nor can they afford to attend court or hearings in distant places which take them away from their work and families. No member of a board of registrars likes to have a Federal agent peering over his shoulder, passing upon everything that he does and threatening to take him to court with every act. If the actions of the Federal Government in this regard continue and if "Federal registrars" are sent into the South along with the Civil Rights Commission investigators to carry out the provisions of the aforementioned bills, it could well lead to a breakdown of all our election machinery. It will certainly lead to bitterness and misunderstanding and hostility between the State and Federal officials. The people will suffer the consequences. I can tell you that if it would be practically impossible to get people to serve as election officials if they are dictated to, threatened, and harassed by "Federal registrars" and Federal agents. It is plain to see that the so-called Federal registrar plan will result in utter failure and bring confusion and chaos to our electoral system.

Due to the action of the Civil Rights Commission, we have been unable to get responsible people to accept positions on the boards of registrars in Macon and Dallas Counties, Ala. I have appointed numerous persons to fill these positions and they have declined, stating that they do not feel that they should have to subject themselves to public intimidation and harassment by Federal agents. The responsibility for the breakdown of our registration machinery in these counties rests squarely at the doorstep of the Federal Government. I feel confident that we will be able to find someone to serve on these boards soon, if we can have some assurance from the Federal Government that we will be able to carry out our duties within the framework of our laws without harassment and intimidation.

In conclusion, I want to again voice my strong opposition to all the aforementioned bills. They are clearly unconstitutional. They invade an area which has always been left exclusively to the States. The States have adequate remedies for all persons to quickly and promptly test their right to vote.

S. 2722 requiring the preservation of voting and registration records for a period of 5 years is absolutely unnecessary and an invasion of the rights of the States. Alabama law, which is similar to that in all States, provides that when an applicant is registered to vote by the board of registrars, his name is placed on the voters' list, and this list, along with his application, is filed with the probate judge of the county and becomes a permanent public record. Of course, after a person is registered, he should have no grounds for complaining. In cases where the application is denied by the board of registrars our laws provide that the board of registrars must keep on file the application form until the time expires for the applicant to appeal under our statutes. This procedure gives full and adequate protection to all citizens regardless of who they are, if they would just avail themselves of the remedies now available.

The sending of Federal registrars or a Registration of Voters Commission into the South, or into any State, would cause animosity and hostility among the people and would result in a breakdown of our election machinery. Such action would cause further widening of the breach between the races and would worsen Federal-State relations. The citizens of the States would look upon these Federal agents as "carpetbag registrars," and that is truly what they would be.

Any extension of the powers of the Civil Rights Commission would do nothing to help the situation and would cause a further deterioration in race and Federal-State relations. Federal registration of voters in addition to being unconstitutional and unwarranted, would not work, would lead to grave consequences, and I think would be analagous to the sending of Federal troops into Little Rock or the acts of Federal troops in marching Negroes to the polls during reconstruction days.

The views which I have expressed about the Civil Rights Commission are not mine alone but are shared by almost every citizen of my State. As further proof of the Commission's questionable conduct, one can refer to the actions in the Federal courts involving the Civil Rights Commission in Terrell County, Ga.; Montgomery, Ala.; and Shreveport, La., where the Federal courts ruled against the Civil Rights Commission in every case.

In recent days the Attorney General of the United States has expressed himself as favoring a plan whereby the Federal courts would appoint so-called referees to register voters. This proposal is just as shocking as the Federal registrars proposal and just as unconstitutional and unworkable. I am equally opposed to the plan of the Attorney General. The Federal courts have already expressed their opposition to being used as boards of registrars. See *Darby* v. *Daniels*, decided November 6, 1958, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi.

I would like to point out to the committee that the number of registered Negro voters in Alabama is steadily increasing. This is not due to action by the Civil Rights Commission or the Federal Government, but it is in spite of them. At present there are more than 70,000 registered Negro voters in Alabama. The number of registered Negro voters in Alabama has more than doubled since 1956. The number has increased more than 10 percent since the primary election of 1958. The Negro is making tremendous progress in Alabama. I ask you not to enact laws which would retard his progress. These aforementioned bills now pending before your committee would retard the Negroes' progress. Matters concerning race relations will never be solved by legislation, court decrees, injunctions, Federal troops and Federal registrars. It can only be solved through local people working together in a spirit of cooperation without outside interference and agitation.

We have on our books the necessary laws to protect every person's right to vote. They are State laws and State remedies and that is the way it should be. I ask you to leave it that way, and require these persons who complain that their rights have been violated to seek their redress in the proper and legal manner in the courts of our States. They have not done this in the past. They cannot tell you truthfully that our remedies are not full and adequate. So, before you resort to "carpetbag registrars" and Federal investigators, before you do harm to our people, before you do violence to our Federal system, before you resort to the tactics of grinding us under the heel of the Federal boot, and before you wreck our election machinery, make them at least try to test their rights in our State courts.

Address Broadcast by Hon. Alexander Wiley Over Station WIND, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is faced with complex challenges and divided opinions on how to meet the two major issues confronting us:

First, world peace; and, second, of promoting an ever stronger economy to provide better living for the people of this country.

In the face of conflicting viewpoints, both on the economic as well as the peace situation, the Congress has the particularly difficult task and grave responsibility of finding a correct course in these troubled times to provide for progress and promote security.

Recently I was privileged to comment over radio station WIND, Chicago, on the factors involved in these problems, as well as to humbly suggest some recommendations which I felt would make a contribution to providing better programs in these fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY OVER RADIO STATION WIND, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 31, 1960

Friends, today I would like to discuss with you two major challenges confronting our country: First, maintaining the peace; and, second, assuring progress in our domestic economy.

Although normally less closely related, world conditions now have actually created a real interdependence between these two challenges.

Why?

First, the strength of the economy may well determine our ability (1) to block the multipronged expansionist efforts by the

world conspiracy of communism, and (2) to promote peace.

INTERNATIONAL "CLIMATE" EFFECTS ON DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Conversely, the temperature of the cold war, now undergoing a temporary thaw, may well determine, to a substantial degree:

The cost of national security programs, estimated at $45.6 million in the 1961 budget;

The volume of manpower and resources required for national defense;

The amount of money available for consumer goods, homes, schools, business expansion, enjoyment of leisure time, and other domestic outlets for spending;

The burden on the American taxpayer and the outlook for national debt reduction and ultimate lessening of the taxload; and

The inflationary pressure, due, among other things, to high competition in the money market by Uncle Sam with private interests for funds to carry on defense and other programs.

ROLE OF UNCLE SAM IN ECONOMY

Briefly, this illustrates only a few of the ways in which peace and economic progress are closely intertwined. Now, what is the role of Uncle Sam in the economy?

In recent years the size of the Federal budget—and whether it will be balanced or unbalanced—has become more or less a symbol of stabilized or inflationary trends in monetary policy. The task of keeping outgo in line with income, however, is becoming increasingly difficult.

Why?

Harnessed by a vast volume of past obligations, the Federal budget has disproportionately little elbow room for adoption of new programs and meeting of new responsibilities required by our modern advancing times.

According to Budget Director Maurice H. Stans, for example, Uncle Sam has now accrued future obligations adding up to almost $750 billion. These include future c.o.d.'s for highways, housing, civil public works, shipbuilding subsidies, and others, amounting to about $98 billion; retirement benefits for military personnel and civil Government employees; costs of veterans' pensions or compensation programs; a public debt of $290 billion; $350 billion of future obligations for past services. If, however, no new programs are added in the next Congress, spending is expected to go up because of built-in increases in existing programs.

This gigantic mortgage—a portion of which comes due annually—will make it increasingly difficult to balance the budget in 1960, and in the years ahead.

Federal outlays, however, are not a complete loss to the taxpayer. According to estimates for fiscal year 1960, the money—for the most part—will flow back into the economy to purchase Government services, equipment, payrolls and other expenditures.

Nevertheless, the real wealth of the Nation—i.e., the major portion of the gross national product—still, as it should, depends upon private enterprise to produce the vast volume of goods and services required for our nearly 180 million people and to supply markets abroad.

WILL UNCLE SAM PAY BILLS AND REDUCE DEBT?

Now the question arises: Will the Nation be able to do as the President recommends—that is, pay its bills and reduce the national debt?

As you know, the spending budget for 1961 amounts to an estimated $79.8 billion. To meet expenditures, the Bureau of the Budget estimated on inflow of revenue of about $84 billion—resulting in a predicted surplus of about $4 billion.

However, there are serious questions—a great many "ifs"—involved in whether or not there will be a surplus. These include:

1. Can expenditures be held down to the essentials?

2. Will the inflow of revenues meet the expected $84 billion mark?

3. Will Congress increase taxes on highway and aviation fuels, and raise postal rates, as requested by the President?

4. Will it take the initiative in plugging tax loopholes, or conversely, take action that would open new ones.

5. In management of the public debt, too, the costs to Uncle Sam will be affected by whether or not Congress—as I believe it should—adjusts the interest ceiling on long-term U.S. bonds. The purpose would be to allow the Treasury to compete more favorably in the money market, thus getting longer-range loans at less cost rather than having to continue to raise money on a short-term basis at a higher interest rate.

For myself, I feel that Congress, which handles the purse strings, should attempt to put the Nation on a pay-as-you-go basis.

At this high tide in our economy—with production, employment, and income at record levels—we should, I believe, make every effort to put its economic house in order.

SIX-POINT PROGRAM FOR ECONOMY

In attempting to carry out an economically sound program, Uncle Sam, I believe, could well adhere to the six following steps:

1. Establish a priority system for approving programs supported by Federal funds—to assure outlays only for essential purposes;

2. Eliminate programs no longer necessary;

3. If a new spending appears to be essential, then attempt to find new ways of financing;

4. Reexamine our distribution of responsibility on the National, as well as State and local levels—to carry out a redistribution of such obligations, if this is possible;

5. Better correlate Government procurement—particularly in the military services—so that Federal agencies or the Armed Forces do not (a) compete with each other in the market and thus drive up prices; and (b) pay different costs for the same articles; and

6. Further streamline Government operations, eliminate unnecessary costs, waste, and duplication, and otherwise improve Government operations in order to lessen the burden on the American taxpayer. In other ways too, we must reduce costs, including putting into action additional meritorius recommendations by the Hoover Commission—which have already saved American taxpayers an estimated $10 billion.

NEEDED: ECONOMIC WATCHDOG ON MILITARY SPENDING

Particularly, we need to keep close tabs on spending for military purposes. Today, the outlays for national security programs amount to over one-half the Federal budget. In view of such high costs, the Defense Department has a particular responsibility to work toward careful stewardship of our citizens' investment in security. Among other things, this includes eliminating wasteful interservice rivalries that are costly, time consuming, in a critical era in which we do not have time to waste—and that are tremendously expensive.

Uncle Sam, too, must make a special effort toward unifying the procurement operations of the military services.

Currently, our Defense Establishment has about $150 billion invested in property, including real estate, buildings, weapons, and supplies. At the same time, the Department reportedly has about $26.7 billion in excess stocks.

In view of the fact that Uncle Sam recovers about only 2 percent of the cost on the $6-to-$10 billion worth of excess stocks disposed of annually, it is particularly important that efforts be made to keep stockpiling down to essentials.

RISE IN COSTS OF DEFENSE

Unfortunately, the international threat of communism promises greater, rather than less, defense costs for the future.

The changing patterns for defense itself—particularly for high-cost missiles, rockets, space vehicles with military potential, and expanding research—also will be costly. This is likely to result in higher—rather than lower—outlays for a missile-atomic-space defense.

In view of these factors, further efforts to unify the services to provide the Nation with a better coordinated, nonduplicating system are absolutely essential. This can be accomplished, I believe, for the overall good of our security program—without sacrificing the significant contribution which each of the respective services is now making.

The American citizen—I am confident—is willing to pay whatever costs are necessary to provide us with an adequate defense. However, the taxpayer must get his money's worth in defense.

The Defense Department must make an effort to spend its appropriations wisely. If this is not done, Congress will find it necessary to set up an "economic watchdog" to do the job.

BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION

Unfortunately, the spectre of inflation, also, still hovers over the economy—threatening to further reduce the purchasing power of our incomes as well as to devaluate savings, investment in bonds and insurance policies, and otherwise undermine the economy.

What can be done about it?

Uncle Sam, I believe, should lead the anti-inflation fight by adopting sound economic principles in determining the scope of Federal programs and designing spending policies. Management and labor—as well as the general public—must also discipline themselves to policies that will prevent—not support—inflationary pressures.

In a free society, government, I believe, can make its best contribution to economic growth by fostering conditions—as the President has pointed out—that encourage and reinforce the efforts of individuals and private groups to improve their circumstances, and promote progress.

This includes: preserving a free, competitive climate; maintaining a stable currency; attempting to minimize fluctuations in employment; developing human and natural resources; enhancing personal security of our people; providing for a sound national defense.

At the same time, States and local communities should reevaluate, and as possible, enlarge their roles in sharing the obligations for public interest and public service programs.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief look at some of the major factors affecting our domestic progress and security, as well as our ability to cope with problems on the international front.

Again, I stress: The Nation must maintain a sound, forward-moving economy—if we are to cope successfully, not only with our problems at home, but with the threat of international communism.

However, I am confident that—as has been traditionally true—our citizens stand ready and willing to dedicate the necessary resources and manpower to promote progress and insure our security.

At the same time, we in Congress recognize our responsibility to you—as citizens and taxpayers—as well as to the future of our country—to do all possible to: assure a strong defense; maintain a sound, forward-moving economy; and promote peace in the world—without which all efforts to improve the domestic life of our citizens would, in the event of a missile-nuclear war—be in vain.

Now, I want to express my gratitude for the opportunity to discuss these aspects of the challenges confronting us with you.

Thank you very much.

Col. Bryce H. Harlow Minuteman of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an address delivered by Col. Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, at the midwinter banquet of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States upon the designation of Colonel Harlow as "Minuteman of 1960" on Friday evening, February 5, 1960, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is acquainted with Colonel Harlow, but I take a great deal of pride in saying that I consider him to be a close personal friend.

Bryce came to the Congress as secretary to Congressman Disney, of Oklahoma, 20 years ago.

In World War II he became a member of General Persons' staff and was well known to Gen. George Marshall.

Wherever he went—in the Congress, in the Pentagon, or in the Army—his ability became the hallmark of his fame.

In January of 1947, Bryce became a member of the professional staff of the newly formed Armed Services Committee. It was as a member of the staff of the House Committee on Armed Services that I first came to know, respect, and develop a deep affection for Bryce Harlow; and my opinion of his ability, his brilliance, his incisiveness, and his outstanding congeniality is shared by the other members of the committee and the staff.

In December of 1950 Bryce became chief clerk of the Committee on Armed Services and he remained in that position until the fall of 1951 when he resigned from the committee to return to his father's publishing business in Oklahoma.

But the long arm of the Government reached out in 1953 when President Eisenhower was inaugurated and Bryce then became an assistant to General Persons at the White House. Again, he so demonstrated his outstanding ability in the service of his country that he has now risen to the important position of Deputy Assistant to the President.

Col. Bryce Harlow, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding men in Government today. I would even go so far as to say that he is one of the most outstanding men of the last two decades. Those of us who know and admire Bryce were proud to learn of the honor bestowed upon him by the Reserve Officers Association.

The address follows:

Colonel Richardson, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that in future years, as in the past, this fine award will go to individuals far more deserving. But I earnestly say this to you: Never will this Minuteman Award be appreciated more than it is tonight.

For I know it reflects the esteem of our finest citizens—those who sacrifice freely, in peacetime as well as in crisis, in order to help assure the safety of our Nation.

I realize that this award also stands for unwavering support of military preparedness. That the good citizen should prepare himself to come swiftly to his country's defense—that our Nation's sword and shield must be kept strong—are concepts that ROA has supported unfailingly, year after year.

So, Colonel Richardson, understanding the symbolism intended by this ceremony tonight, and remembering the distinction of your Minutemen of previous years, I feel at once humble, and deeply proud, to receive this honor. I sincerely hope to be worthy of the fine thoughts it is intended to convey.

I confess to having approached this speaking assignment with some personal misgiving. In this city, from now until November, anyone who dares to raise his voice will likely regret it. The quadrennial political orgy is hard upon us. Any utterance is fair game.

Also, I have troubled over our uniformed personnel. These are, for them, tense and worrisome days. In this season they must apprehensively cluster about committee launching pads, with their congressional ICBM's competitively raised. In all this world nothing is as nerve racking as the appropriations countdown.

Incidentally, I have noted over the years that to military budget officers ICBM means one of two things—either "I'm Clobbered by MAHON" or "Increases Can Be Manipulated."

In these delicate situations, I do have some reassurance. Here in Washington we resort on occasion to what we gamefully call bipartisanship, which, to the political cynic, means, "My party won't tell on yours, if yours won't tell on mine." Already we see its 1960 version shaping up, and I shall report this surreptitiously gathered information to you without juggling my intelligence data.

No doubt about it: In each party the warring wings show signs of closing the gap. We cannot yet be certain of their capabilities but we can divine their intentions.

So already we begin to see a Republican bipartisanship which supports our defense programs, and one can discern a growing Democratic bipartisanship, critical of it all.

I, for one, still cling up to the old time nonpartisan bipartisanship. And to prove it, I want to make this clear: as regards the kind of military protection our country should have, I will bank proudly and confidently on one of the great commanders in all history—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Now, my friends, most of us, I am sure, are already informed on the issues that mainly concern us today.

That for some time we have already lived, and that we must continue to live, in the immediate presence of deadly peril is known to us all. It is a period that calls for steady courage, unfaltering leadership, and strength of character. It calls for men who can face danger calmly, with the unruffled and steadfast spirit of our patriots of earlier years.

Our Nation has known danger many times before. In our acts, and in our talk, we must not shrink from it now.

Dangers we must face, yes, as have millions of Americans before us—but how fortunate we are in our generation, for we live in a dazzling transition. It is fascinating to live in a time when scientists and technologists contrive miracles so rapidly as to make the unbelievable commonplace. Daily we learn of marvels in instruments of war that are awesome in speed and power. But even as we are at once attracted and repelled by these terrible machines, we see exciting social and economic advances at home and throughout the world. And before us we see, within our reach, an era that can be resplendent beyond our dreams—if, and I must repeat if—if only man can have the wisdom to live with his fellow man, in good will and in peace.

We are fortunate, too, that ours is the most powerful and the richest nation on earth. But we realize how shrunken this planet has become, and how closely knit the human neighborhood. America is an oasis amid the hunger, poverty, and fear that afflict most of humanity. Most of us, I believe, realistically gage this situation and its opportunities, and its explosive potential as well. And so, together we cheer our President's assertion that America will always be willing to walk the extra mile with any nation, if in so doing we can bring one step nearer a brighter day for all mankind.

But as we so walk, we are aware that others in this world can be led to miscalculate our will and our might, and thus be tempted to attack us suddenly and violently. So it is that America must, and assuredly America will, remain powerful and poised. We shall be ever willing, of course, to negotiate, ever eager to forge a just peace, ever striving for trustworthy disarmament, but in the meantime we shall maintain a force that is plainly irresistible. Some across the seas may continue to belittle America's strength in their effort to dominate others, but they do not fool themselves. It is for us to see that this strength of our always warrants their full respect.

So fateful are the consequences of a miscalculation of the power of America—so swift and so deadly are modern weapons—so irretrievable a decision to resort to their use—that I believe each of us henceforth has the patriotic duty to speak responsibly and to speak prudently of the quality and character of our defenses. Henceforth Americans live in constant danger; we must speak and we must act accordingly.

No responsible person discounts the military strength of the Soviet Union and its undeniable potentialities. We have to recognize it, and grasp its magnitude, if we are fully to appreciate the urgency of our own defense efforts.

But respectful and wary as we are of Soviet power, we certainly do not need to apologize for our own. Our strength, for today and tomorrow, is truly enormous.

In view of our military and civilian leaders best situated to advise us knowledgeably and objectively, our defensive forces hold the power of annihilation over any aggressor on the face of the earth. We can measure their scope to some degree by the huge sums invested in them. To build and maintain our almost incalculable power, we have, since World War II, paid more than $450 billion—some $20,000 for each man, woman, and child in our country. Yes, burdensome it is, but this mighty force is our sentinel of peace. It has preserved our liberty. It has, in recent years, halted major aggression dead in its tracks.

I am not fearful that we have, or that we will, let down this guard, in fact or realtively. As to this, the American people have proved they are steady and firm. Responding to their will the Congress has time and time again since World War II rejected its prewar tradition of severely reducing appropriations for defense. In these past 14 years the amounts requested for defense have been collectively cut by less than 3 percent. Clearly, whatever is required for our Nation's strength will be given unhesitatingly by the American people.

Of course, some among us seem to see our country in a less favorable light. They see an American people sunk in complacency and sloth—our only adult interest self-indulgence, and our youth comparatively illiterate and morally degenerate. To these unhappy people, we seem doomed to wallow in increasing stupidity and fat until at last, we shall fall easy prey to the Spartan sons of atheistic communism.

Personally, I consider this despairing refrain to be a vote of no confidence in the people of America. It reminds me of the mournful fellow who sadly summed up life like this, "When you're born, you're soon to die."

Obviously our free society is far from perfect, and we should, and we do, struggle hard and constantly to improve it. But there is such a thing as becoming so obsessed with shortcomings as to lose all perspective.

I contend that any nation that will carry the domestic tax burdens which the American people have accepted uncomplainingly since World War II, at the same time buttressing about two-thirds of the entire world, can hardly be a nation of incompetents, ignoramuses, and indigents.

I would add that any nation that has generated and is maintaining an economic strength unmatched on earth is bound to be a nation hard at work, resourceful, and vigorous, and worthy of its finest traditions.

Such matters may seem only distantly related to our main interest tonight—the Nation's defense. But it is important that we remember what a nation's strength really is. It is far more than soldiers, missiles, or ships. Essential these are, but the force of every country consists of a combination of strengths—of social, economic, intellectual and spiritual energies and resources, as well as military power.

It is well that we also remember what our military strength is really for. Not simply survival justifies our defenses; they are to help defend our cherished liberty and ideals as well as our lives. There must be, therefore, a balance in all that we do. How unspeakably tragic it would be should we destroy our own freedom in an overzealous effort to defend it.

In saying this, I do not ignore the allegations being made by some that our defenses are too weak to meet present or future threats, or else are unbalanced, too rigid, or inefficiently organized. And, of course, one occasionally hears that the dollar, not defense, has become our reliance. This seems to imply that the various nonmilitary strengths I have mentioned, which in fact undergird our defenses, are something separate and distinct from the Nation's security. I cannot agree that the stability of our currency, the vigor of our economy, the spirit of our citizenry, and cost consciousness in the Pentagon are sworn enemies of our Nation's strength.

I know it to be a fact that most contentions of this kind are sincerely made by conscientious public servants who are devoted to our country's good. I know too, that our separate Armed Forces have separate and deeply held views respecting their own and their sister services' needs. But I recognize also that with an intensity that seems to vary a bit with the calendar, such allegations have ricocheted around Washington throughout a good part of the two decades I have been here. Curiously, however, despite the vigor with which such sentiments have been expressed over the years, only three times since World War II has a President's defense budget been increased by the Congress, and these three increases all together total only $1.7 billion. During the other 11 years, instead of the combined budget requests being raised, they were cut by more than $15 billion. In these matters, there seems on occasion to be an agonizing reappraisal between allegation and action.

Let me softly add, by the way, that it is intriguing how our defenses seem always frighteningly to shrivel around appropriation time each year, and it is appalling how they appear to disintegrate in the late spring of even-numbered years.

Of course, it is pointless to expect perfect safety from our defenses. It doesn't exist, and it never will. Anything less than complete mobilization requires us deliberately to accept calculated risks. This means that the size and character of our defense structure will always be arguable.

Nor is it reasonable for us to expect our military leaders always to see eye-to-eye on major security programs and policies, or to delight in every decision of the Secretary of Defense, the Commander in Chief, or the Congress. In fact, were our military leaders always to agree, I would then truly cry out, "God save the Republic." And were both ends of Constitution Avenue forever in accord on what our defenses should be, we would indeed have caused to fear the future.

One question, it seems to me, might help clarify some of this:

Where today is our leader, military or civilian, who would choose for the American people the Soviet strength complex of today or tomorrow in preference to our own?

I know of none.

It has been said: "Nations that refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

From two global wars and far-off Korea, we have at last, I believe, learned from history, and all the world is the safer for it. I would even say—with a weather eye cocked toward recent events at the Capitol—that there is still a bare possibility that the Congress this year won't cut the defense appropriation request. I risk that prediction, even though the post-World War II record denies it, because I am so deeply convinced of the alert readiness and determination of the American people.

And among our people that "alert readiness and determination" especially describes our Reserves, and I gladly say that their importance is valued more highly today than ever before. Only 7 years ago, in the Armed Forces Reserve Act, the Congress spelled out the authority so long needed, and the purposes so long desired, by all Reserves. Just 4 years ago came another epochal law making possible a surging growth in the manning of Reserve units. This current Congress, in its first session, helped still more by extending vital legislation about to expire.

And we have seen spectacular results.

By last July the Reserves had grown to almost 4.4 million, the Ready Reserve to 2.9 million, and the paid strength to well over a million.

But more important by far than these numbers has been the driving emphasis constantly placed upon Reserve readiness. More than 95 percent of the present Ready Reserve is now basically trained. This is truly a magnificent achievement. Many here tonight, in and out of government, deserve our thanks for having worked long and hard to bring this about.

The results in efficiency and military competence have been exhilarating for the Reserves and highly significant for our country. Today our civilian-soldiers are even assuming active operational assignments. The Air Guard, for example, provides fighter interceptor crews and aircraft on a runway alert status. The Naval Reserve adds to our active antisubmarine capability both in ships and aircraft. Seven missile battalions of the National Guard are in operational control of Nike sites.

The fact that this association has vigorously supported advances such as these, legislatively as well as in the executive branch, all of us know full well. For this I join many present in a hearty congratulations to this association. Not simply have you advanced the interests of Reserves; more importantly, you have held true to the greater purpose of helping to keep America's total defenses up to snuff.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, I repeat my conviction that all of us, civilians, Regulars and Reserves alike, will continue keeping our America adequately strong, while persisting in the building of a just peace. As we do so, I suggest that we might benefit by recalling on occasion a statement by a great leader of long ago.

Behind the chair of the Speaker of the House of Representatives are inscribed these words of Daniel Webster:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, provide for its great interests—and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

There, ladies and gentlemen, is our challenge in our time. It is for us eagerly and gladly to accept it.

There, too, is a rightful claim upon us by our children who, like us, want an America that is proud and strong, and like us, want to live their lives in freedom.

Report From Germany—Dr. Julius Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, more than the usual amount of interest may be attached to this firsthand report on West Germany in the light of the recent rash of anti-Semitic incidents. It was delivered as a sermon by Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanuel in New York City on the basis of his visit early in January to conduct several convocations for military personnel at the invitation of the Chief of Chaplains of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Mark's "Report From Germany," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM GERMANY

(By Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El)

Nestled in an enchanting valley in the Bavarian Alps lies the quaint and charming village of Berchtesgaden, a favorite German round-the-year resort area.

Great mountain peaks, completely covered with snow during the winter and lush with multicolored flowers and vegetation during the rest of the year, endow this locality with a picturesqueness that is exalting and a beauty that is breathtaking. As one views the unbelievable scenic splendors which greet him from every direction there surges up within his soul the inspiring accents of the psalmist: "I lift up mine eyes unto the mountains, from whence shall my help come? My help cometh from the Lord Who made heaven and earth." And also the other utterance that has rung down through the centuries: "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork."

But then, as one recalls the depths to which man's inhumanity toward his fellow man descended in this very place, the glorious beauty of which defies description, another quotation comes to mind—this one from a great English hymnologist and poet, Reginald Heber: "Though every prospect pleases—only man is vile."

For it was the Obersalzberg area of the Berchtesgaden district that the infamous Hitler chose for his official residence. Here, too, were located the homes of his trusted lieutenants—Goering, Goebbels, Bormann. It was in Hitler's home, called the Berghof, where the diabolical plots for mass murder were hatched. In September 1938, Chamberlain, Daladier, and Mussolini joined Hitler in discussion at the Berghof resulting in the shameful Munich Treaty which caused the English Prime Minister, umbrella and all, joyfully to hail "peace in our time." Nearby is the former Platterhof Hotel, which was reserved for Hitler's VIP's, and high above at the very top of the Obersalzberg, visible for miles around but inaccessible during the winter months, is his "Eagle's Nest," where he repaired from time to time to enjoy the scenery and to plan his unspeakable atrocities.

On April 25, 1945, Allied bombers partially destroyed the entire Obersalzberg area. The Berghof was only slightly damaged, but the SS guards, to prevent its falling into the hands of the oncoming Allied armies, blew it up and set it on fire. The Platterhof Hotel, which had been severly damaged, was restored by the American troops and renamed the General Walker Hotel. At the present time this beautiful hotel is used by our military personnel for recreation and religious retreats. I could not help but be conscious of the irony of my occupying a suite in this hotel which at one time had been reserved for Hitler's most important guests.

I confess to having experienced mixed feelings when I was invited by the Department of Defense, through the Chief of Chaplains of the Army and upon nomination of the Chaplaincy Commission of the National Jewish Welfare Board, to conduct two convocations and a chaplains' retreat in the General Walker Hotel in Berchtesgaden. I had visited Germany four times before the outbreak of World War II, but had made up my mind, as have a great many others, that I would never again set foot on soil that had absorbed the blood of millions of innocent human beings, Christians as well as Jews. My military training, however, reminded me that an invitation from a high official in the Armed Forces must be regarded almost as an order and should not be lightly considered. Besides, having had a similar experience in Japan and the Far East 4 years ago, I knew that I could render some slight service to the military personnel of the Jewish faith stationed far from home. The strange and eerie feelings, however, remained with me during the entire 2 weeks that I spent in Germany.

It was my privilege to conduct meetings or Torah convocations, as they are called, for nearly 600 soldiers and airmen, some of them accompanied by their wives and children, who were present during one or the other of the weekends of January 7–11 or January 14–18. The hotel accommodates only 300, however. Therefore, half of these 600 attended the first convocation and the other half the second. On January 12 and 13, I met with the 12 Jewish chaplains who were present. One of these 12, by the way, is an English chaplain attached to the British Army of the Rhine, and another a French chaplain who serves the French forces in Germany. The other 10 were young American rabbis, Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, who are serving their country in uniform with great distinction.

I suggested as the theme for the convocations "Judaism—Past, Present, Future." Each morning, from 9:30 to 12 noon, those present were divided into three workshops or discussion groups, each under the guidance of two chaplains. One of the workshops considered, "Judaism in Europe," another "Judaism in Israel" and the third "Judaism in America." The ladies had one of their own, "Judaism in the Home," which was conducted by two of the chaplains' wives. The afternoons were free for recreation and tours to points of interest and in the evenings the entire group gathered for plenary sessions when I was scheduled to deliver an address. Sabbath worship, at which I was invited to preach, was held on Friday evening and Saturday morning. And on the final evening, in addition to the address that I delivered, brief reports were made by the leaders of the workshops.

The 2 or 3 days between the convocations, I spent with the chaplains, leading discussions on homiletics, preaching and problems of the chaplaincy.

The concern which the Defense Department of the United States has for the spiritual well-being of our men in uniform is quite without parallel anywhere in the world. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish clergymen are invited each year to conduct convocations and religious retreats for the personnel of their own faith. I dare say that the upsurge of religious interest, under youthful guidance mind you, which is discernible among all religious denominations, has resulted to a large extent, so I believe, from the contacts which young men in uniform have made with chaplains and with civilian clergymen provided by the Defense Department. The thrill which I experienced when I witnessed the tremendous interest which our young men seem to have in spiritual matters is shared by all the others who have served as retreat masters. My pride in America is always heightened and strengthened when I think of the sincere desire of our Military Establishment to satisfy the spiritual needs of men of all faiths, when I think of the chaplains—Catholic, Protestant, Jewish—who are serving their God and country with unselfish dedication, and when I think of the American soldier who is learning to live in understanding and fellowship with his fellow American of another faith.

This pride in America becomes particularly meaningful to me when contrasted with the completely un-American and indecent eruption of swastikas painted on synagogues, churches and schools throughout the world. The contrast to me is frightening, just as frightening as is the contrast between a wealthy, greathearted, God-fearing America on the one hand and a period of unparalleled juvenile delinquency, crime and corruption in the high places on the other.

Since my return home I have frequently been asked whether I saw any evidences of anti-Semitism or Neonazism during my visit in Germany. My answer has always been in the negative, of course. I read the German newspapers and there saw only expressions of condemnation of these outrageous sign painters on the part of government officials and leaders of church, business and educational circles. I wonder, however, whether denunciation and censure and the punishment of the guilty when apprehended are really enough.

I came away from Germany with the feeling that the German people would simply like to forget the entire Nazi era with its anti-Semitism and other foul hatreds. They would like to sweep it all under a carpet and hope that somehow it will go away. In Wiesbaden I visited an attractive little park near the middle of the city. I was advised that the principal synagogue in Wiesbaden had stood there and was destroyed by the Nazis. Since there was another smaller synagogue in existence there and the tiny Jewish community residing in Wiesbaden no longer requires this large one, the city authorities suggested that a park to serve as a memorial with a sign indicating that a synagogue had once been located on this spot be established. The Jewish community officials agreed. The park has been constructed, but no sign has ever been erected. It is simply a park, and not a memorial.

I visited the Dachau extermination camp and was sickened by the gruesome sights of the crematoria, the gas chamber, the mass graves where the ashes of tens of thousands of Christians as well as Jews had been buried. I assure you, my friends, that as I walked through that place there wasn't the least desire for revenge in my heart. There was only pity—pity over man's bestiality and the silent prayer that it might never happen again. I was advised by the American officer in charge who was showing me around that the Germans would like to acquire the camp and raze it to the ground with bulldozers so that it will all be quickly forgotten. They want to forget.

We, too, in fact, the entire civilized world, would like to forget. But certain things must be remembered—they must be remembered as a warning that they shall never, never happen again.

The German passion to forget is evidenced in its education of the young. In many schools German history ends with 1870 or 1914. The Nazi period is simply glossed over, with a few paragraphs—at the most a page devoted to it. Hitler? Many a young German child will answer: "Oh, Hitler was the man who built the autobahnen or superhighways and he was the man who solved the unemployment problem—everybody had a job." Now this, of course, is poor history. It is worse psychology. The German child should be taught the truth, namely, that Hitler and his cohorts were beasts in human form, who not only murdered 6 million Jews and many more millions of Russians, Poles, Catholics, and others in cold blood, and who not only brought on the suffering of World War II, but was responsible for the disaster that came to their own country. Of all people, they, the Germans, should remember Hitler and vow that such a creature must never again be entrusted with the power to kill, destroy, and annihilate. That Germans should be horrified when they witness the movie "The Diary of Anne Frank" is only to be expected—who isn't horrified?—but to have many of them declare after witnessing it: "But I don't believe it. It didn't happen. It couldn't have happened in our civilized Germany." I say that is evidence of their need for proper education.

I believe that it is also a fact that our own educational system here in America requires perhaps a bit of revision. Our teachers might be encouraged to discuss with their children in the classroom nazism and the evils that it let loose upon the world. They might remind their pupils that the swastika, which has appeared recently and about which the children read in their newspapers and hear over their radio and see on television, is a symbol of hatred not only for the Jew but for all human beings who believe in God, in freedom, in decency. It is as much the enemy of Christianity as it is of Judaism. Because of its association with oppression and human suffering, its painting in public places thus is more than a childish prank. It is a reminder of everything that is mean and evil and diabolical in the world.

It will not, to be sure, be easy to introduce teachings which relate the truth about nazism in the German public schools, since it must be remembered that most teachers in those schools had themselves been asso-

ciated with the Nazi Party. Naturally, they would suffer great embarrassment—quite a number of them already have—when asked by their pupils: "And what were you doing when all this was going on?" And then there is resistance among the parents who, out of a sense of guilt or shame or what-not, would prefer that their children remain uninformed. But it will have to be done—the truth will have to be presented if nazism and anti-Semitism are to be uprooted and a truly democratic way of life is to develop in Germany.

There is another problem which should be resolved, namely, that of former Nazis occupying high positions in the present German Government. Chancellor Adenauer has castigated anti-Semitism with vigor and with forthrightness. And I believe that he is, without question, sincere in his protestations. At the same time, however, it is shocking to realize that his right-hand man, Hans Globke, wrote the official commentaries on the Nazi race laws, that Gerhard Schroeder, his Minister of Interior, who has charge of all the police, is a former storm trooper, that Theodore Oberlander, his Minister of Refugees, is a former SS captain detailed to the viciously anti-Semitic Vlanov army of pro-Nazi Ukranians, and that Fritz Schaeffer, his Minister of Justice, has authorized large pensions to ex-Nazis but has attacked the program of restitution for the victims of Nazism. It is possible, of course, that they have convinced Adenauer of their having been completely de-Nazified and of their loyalty to Germany's democratic government, but so long as they occupy their present positions of prominence and importance, they will continue to serve as symbols of Nazi frightfulness.

In modern Germany anti-Semitism is a crime. It is punishable by a stiff prison sentence and heavy fines. It is evident, however, that laws are not enough. There must be a change down deep in the souls of the people. And that change will not be affected by ignoring the facts through a conspiracy of silence.

I have been asked whether I believe that anti-Semitism in its most virulent form will return to Germany. My answer is that for the present, "No." The conditions which prevailed in the post-World War I period are not present today. The country is prosperous. The German currency is, as you know, the soundest in the world. There seems to be no leader on the horizon with the particular qualities of a Hitler, who combined in his personality genius, mind you, genius, and savagery.

On the other hand, if another depression comes—if there is unemployment and hunger in the land and if the currency loses its value as was the case after World War I, who can tell? Even the pitiful remnant of 30,000 Jews compared to more than 600,000 before Hitler came into power and most of them old, many of them sick, subsisting on charity, with not a single Jew occupying a position of prominence, even that fact will not deter a vicious anti-Semite from crying: "Die Juden sind Unser Unglueck." A prosperous Germany economically, but not too strong militarily, is the best hope for freedom and democracy in Central Europe. Germany must be placed in the position prophesized for Egypt by the prophet Ezekiel. Yes, let it be restored, but not as a mighty power—but as an ordinary power, perhaps as a weak power, so that never again will she be in the position to threaten the peace of the world.

I came away from Germany with one prayer in my heart, "God bless America." God bless America for her dedication to the advancement of individual liberty and for her devotion to the establishment of peace firmly founded upon justice in the world. And let America, too, bless God for the blessings, both material and spiritual, He has vouchsafed to her citizens. May we be worthy of this glorious heritage and dedicate ourselves anew in service to our God, to our country, and to humanity.

Amen.

The Constitutional Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include letters written to the editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch. Since it is the opinion of millions of Americans today that the real crisis facing the Nation is a constitutional crisis, I urge all Members of Congress to consider seriously the subject matter contained in these timely letters written in defense of one of the really great living Americans; an outstanding authority on constitutional law; a native of Virginia; a successful businessman of the western United States; a direct descendant of Attorney General Charles Lee in the Cabinets of Washington and Adams. I refer to the Honorable John Janney.

The letters are as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., *January 31, 1960.*

To the EDITOR,
The Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Richmond, Va.

It is difficult to decide whether "lawyer" Geo. E. Allen's attack on John Janney (VOP Jan. 23) is more notable for the ignorance it displays or its audacity.

The ignorance is apparent from the complete lack of understanding of Mr. Janney's proposal, which he declares is "following the Communist line." The name John Janney certainly needs no defense in Virginia from such attacks as Mr. Allen's but when a "lawyer" asserts misstatements of both law and fact with such boldness in the public press, he should be called to time.

Mr. Allen's assertion that Virginia legislation denying the Supreme Court its usurped power to legislate in Virginia is nullification displays either an inability or an unwillingness to state the question or constitutional law squarely. It is not a question of Virginia seeking to overturn the Constitution. It is a question of Virginia seeking to enforce the Constitution against the depredations of centralist usurpation. Mr. Janney's proposal that the State take measures to enforce the Constitution is not a new one. In 1821 Thomas Jefferson wrote in his letter to Archibald Thweat:

"The judiciary branch is the instrument which, working like gravity, without intermission, is to press us at last into one consolidated mass * * *. If Congress fails to shield the States from dangers so palpable and so imminent, the States must shield themselves."

This is precisely what Mr. Janney's proposal would do—use the State's orderly legislative powers to shield the State from the arrogations of the Federal usurpers. These legislative powers are placed explicitly and unreservedly by both the Virginia and Federal Constitutions in the hands of the General Assembly.

Mr. Allen's absurd statement that the only way in which the Supreme Court can be reversed, is by an amendment to the Constitution reveals less of his understanding of the law than it does of his politics. Jefferson gives the lie to this fatuous contention by his reference to the measures Congress can take to allay the pretensions of the Supreme Court. A further rebuttal of this contention is contained in the statement of Gen. Merritt Curtis, General Counsel of the Defenders of the American Constitution before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments:

"If the Supreme Court can, with complete impunity, disregard the clear mandate of article I, section 1, of the Constitution; if the Court can, with equal impunity, ignore the express language of article II, section 1, of the Constitution; if they can do the same with article III, section 2; if they can hold office, as at present, without being duly sworn as required by article VI of the Constitution; if they can ignore the express language of the VII, IX, and X amendments; and if they can do all this, who is to say to them 'nay' if they chance upon some new provision of the Constitution that may not be in accord with the philosophy of the current sociologists and the psychologists who have now been accepted by the Court as 'modern authority.' They may apply their newly instituted rule for testing constitutionality, that is to say, whether a law or practice, is, in the opinion of the judges, outmoded. If the Supreme Court can trample under foot the existing Constitution, what restraint will there be upon them to make short work of any new amendatory provisions?"

Pretending, as Mr. Allen does, that the General Assembly is powerless to protect Virginia from the indignities of Federal usurpers is a disservice to the constitutional liberties of freemen.

Sincerely,

T. DAVID HORTON.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Feb. 7, 1960]

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE—CURB ON HIGH COURT'S "LAWMAKING" URGED

It appears that Mr. George E. Allen (VOP, January 28) would have us sit idly by and permit the Supreme Court to become the American counterpart of the Russian Politburo.

First, Mr. Allen ignores the fact that when any agency of the Federal Government, including the Supreme Court, exceeds its authority, its acts are ultra vires and should be declared null and void. The Supreme Court attempted to exercise legislative powers. Its role is limited to judicial power. This is a limit fixed by the Constitution. When decisions of the members of the Court are null and void, they have acted in their individual capacity and not as a court. As a court they do not have the authority to enter a decision based on the exercise of legislative powers. The Court is not authorized to make law; being limited to judicial powers the Court is required to apply the law as fixed by lawmaking agencies.

The members of the Supreme Court refused to limit their acts to judicial power. When they refused to be limited by the intent of the parties to the contract they did not limit their acts to what the Court is authorized to do under the Constitution. So what we are dealing with is not an action of the Court but an unauthorized action by the members of the Court. If the decision was void and not an act of the Court, what is there to nullify?

Since the law is left in this state of confusion, what Mr. John Janney advocates is an act of the legislature clarifying the law. The law is still what it was before the mem-

bers of the Court attempted to change it, but it has been confused by their unauthorized acts and needs to be clarified by an act of the legislature.

Second. Mr. Allen confuses the Constitution with an invalid action of the members of the Supreme Court.

Third. Mr. Allen states that "it is the duty of the Court to say what the law is." He confuses this with the lack of authority of the Court to make law. It is true that "the Constitution of the United States is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature," but Mr. Allen confuses this fact with the fact that the legislature is a part of the Government that created the Court, fixed their power, and orders their selection and appointment, and it is superior to an unauthorized act of the members of the Supreme Court.

Fourth. Mr. Allen says, in effect, that the members of the Supreme Court are the final arbiters of their authority. This puts them in the role of a tyrannical dictator. It should be pointed out that when the Court acts within the authorized bounds of its authority, this State is bound by its acts. However, the framers of the Constitution reserved to this State the right to be the arbiter of whether it will be bound by an unauthorized act of the members of the Court.

Fifth, Mr. Allen urges amending the Constitution rather than exercise existing rights of the State to enforce the Constitution. If the members of the Court refuse to be bound by the Constitution, as it is, does Mr. Allen believe they would be bound by it if it should be amended? Why amend what is now a perfect document?

What Mr. Janney advocated was taking a legal position by the State, and the legislature is the only authorized body to take this position for the State.

LUCAS D. PHILLIPS,
Member, House of Delegates.

RICHMOND.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Feb. 9, 1960]

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE—JANNEY IDENTIFIED, HIS PROPOSAL PRAISED

I picked up a recent issue of your paper (January 28) which carried a letter signed by Mr. George E. Allen and which you titled, "New Court Proposal Assailed by Lawyer."

The letter had to do with the Warren court and its decisions as they affect Virginia. In effect, the writer was against a proposal made by Mr. John Janney. As I get it, Mr. Janney thinks that when the Supreme Court makes a decision which is outside, or beyond, its authority, it is no decision of the Court at all, just an opinion of nine old men who happen to be members of the Court. Mr. Allen says this isn't so.

Suppose the Court did make a legislative rather than a judicial decision, what does Mr. Allen propose to do about it? Simple. Mr. Allen would amend the Constitution.

What good would it do? The Constitution already says these people are to render judicial (and not legislative) opinions. That being so, what is to stop them from ignoring an amendment?

The answer, as Mr. Janney says, is to be found in the sovereign States. The States are the principals to the contract we call our Constitution, not the Supreme Court. That is but the agent. Let Lawyer Allen study his law on contracts.

I would suggest that Mr. Allen pay a visit to our capitol there in Richmond. Have him go to the hallowed hall that housed our delegates long before the new addition was built.

On its wall, just to the right of the speaker's rostrum, Mr. Allen will find a plaque. On it he will find an inscription which reads (as I remember) "In memory of John Janney, president, Virginia convention, 1861."

It was a descendant of this John Janney who makes the recent plea to Virginians. I will add—as today's John Janney is too modest to add—it was also a descendant of Charles Lee, first Attorney General of the United States and Revolutionary War hero.

That, Mr. Allen, is the John Janney who spoke so eloquently for the rights of the States, for the right of his beloved Virginia. And because he is, to the tips of his eloquent toes, a first-water Virginian he hid his family behind a modesty that only spells his greatness.

Indeed the Supreme Court has overstepped itself. And, God willing, our legislators will rise in wrath and tell it so, the Earl of Warren and his whole retinue.

As for me, I'm sick of them.

MARGARET WALD.

NORTH ARLINGTON.

Statement by Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 4, I requested the printing in the Appendix of the RECORD of a statement from the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic. The statement relates to a matter which I had in process with the Defense Department. Although the matter has been adjudicated, I still believe that the statement should be printed in the RECORD.

However, the statement is in excess of the allowable amount, under the rule. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding that fact, the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MOVERS COMMITTEE FOR EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC SUBMITTED BY RUSSELL E. GARRETT, AS CHAIRMAN, AND HERBERT BURSTEIN, AS COUNSEL

My name is Russell E. Garrett. I am an officer of the John F. Ivory Storage Co., Inc., of Detroit, Mich. I have spent most of my adult life in the moving industry. For a period of 4 years I held the office of president of the Movers Conference of America.

I am now the chairman of the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic. I appear here today on behalf of that organization to discuss your recent directive 4500.26. I reflect, therefore, not my personal views only but the sentiments of hundreds of movers throughout the United States.

At the outset, I want to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the time to make this statement. I shall try to be brief and I shall try to avoid repetition of facts previously submitted to the Department of Defense by the organization I represent and by hundreds of individual moving companies who are opposed to your directive 4500.26.

I trust that the object of this meeting is to engage in a friendly and fruitful exchange of ideas. To achieve this end, I shall try to synthesize the sentiments and the thinking of hundreds of representative movers located throughout the United States.

It seems to me that there are significant areas of agreement between the proponents and opponents of directive 4500.26. If we begin by defining these, we can then isolate the areas of disagreement and proceed to resolve or reconcile our differences.

We are all agreed, I am sure, that it is the responsibility of the moving industry and the military services to do everything possible to accomplish the satisfactory shipment and storage of household goods for military and civilian personnel when transportation is procured and arranged for by an agency of the Department of Defense.

We are all agreed, I am certain, that the best interests of the Government must be served at all times.

We are all agreed, I am certain, that the household goods industry must enjoy a reasonable profit in the performance of service for the Government.

We are all agreed that a sound and healthy household goods moving industry is important to the national economy and to the national defense.

We are all agreed that when a mover fails to provide satisfactory service and fails to protect the owner's goods or otherwise fails to meet his needs, that mover has failed to discharge his responsibility.

We are all agreed that if the Government does not receive a full measure of service for each tax dollar it spends, the purposes of the national program are frustrated.

We are all agreed that everything reasonable and appropriate must be done to eliminate abuses no matter what their source or nature.

I think we are all agreed that the Government must treat equitably with all persons who provide it with goods or services. Surely, no one in the Department of Defense favors a system of inequitable rotation. Indeed, equitable rotation is a practice normally followed in all other branches of Government transportation.

Finally, we are all agreed that the national transportation policy of the United States, which is designed to promote and preserve a sound transportation system, must be a guidepost for the moving industry and the Government alike. Policies which threaten to subvert the national transportation policy must be exposed and rejected.

The areas of agreement which I have marked out are, essentially, the goals to which we must direct our efforts. The route we travel to reach these goals becomes, therefore, a matter of the gravest concern and urgency. It is here that the overwhelming majority of responsible movers find themselves in sharp conflict with the Department of Defense.

Simply stated, we of the Movers Committee believe that Defense Directive 4500.26 is poorly conceived, will operate inequitably and, in the final analysis, will frustrate the overall purposes to which we are both dedicated.

The Department of Defense has electd to revise a policy of long standing—a policy which, in the main, has worked efficiently, fairly, equitably and effectively.

The rationale for the new defense directive, as stated by the Department of Defense in its public announcement of December 8, 1959, is to assure quality of service. Indeed, your Department stated:

"The most significant policy change is the emphasis placed on quality of service rendered by the carrier."

I say most respectfully that this statement is an unwarranted and unsupported confession of failure and ineptitude by the Department of Defense.

It assumes, without supporting evidence, that the policy of equitable rotation has failed. It assumes, without an iota of supporting evidence, that the new directive will succeed.

It assumes, contrary to your own findings, that the change in policy will work a miracle in building servicemen's morale.

We respectfully submit that all of these assumptions are wrong and neither semantics nor half-baked statistics will establish the validity of your assumptions.

We submit, further, that the new defense directive, camouflaged as a technique for improving quality of service will set in motion forces which once unleashed can never be recalled.

I do not know whether you gentlemen have read "On the Beach" or seen the recent movie. I am certain, however, that you are familiar with the theme of the story. You will recall that the entire world was obliterated as a consequence of an atomic war. In one small pocket of the world, Melbourne, a handful of persons survived and were awaiting inevitable death. A scientist who had been involved in the development of atomic power was queried as to the cause and the origin of the war. As I recall it, he stated that someone, acting on a false assumption, pressed a button and unleashed an atomic war. Once that had been done the forces of destruction could no longer be restrained.

I respectfully suggest that the Department of Defense has pressed a button and has set in motion a program so dangerous in concept and so catastrophic in its consequences, that unless reconsidered or revised, there will be no possibility of repairing the damage which it must inescapably work. Among other things, this action will initiate rate wars and destructive rate practices. You may properly inquire why we make these charges and how we can prove them. Permit me to set forth some basic and elementary facts in a categorical form:

1. There are now some 2,300 movers who hold ctdtificates issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These carriers have been found fit, willing and able, by an expert administrative agency, to provide household goods moving service. Surely your department does not propose to preempt the role and jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission is vitally concerned with a sound and stable regulated motor carrier industry, all to the end that the National Transportation Policy will be advanced. If you withdraw their sources of revenue, you threaten the survival of thousands of carriers.

The trend toward bigness in business has had an impact in our industry. The number of truly independent motor carriers consistently shrinks. More and more, the field is dominated by a handful of moving organizations. At this date there are four carrier organizations which collectively control more than 50 percent of all interstate moving business in the United States.

The Big Four have reached the position of dominance because of two primary factors:

(a) First, the unrestrained proliferation of agencies in every town, hamlet, village and city. These at times, have included such fine examples of movers as drug store owners, real estate agents, apartment house superintendents and the like.

(b) Second, expensive and extensive advertising and sales promotion campaigns. As a consequence, the four major carriers now enjoy well over 50 percent of the almost $300 million of annual military moving business.

3. All of the rest of the moving business in the United States, less than 50 percent, is divided among the remaining movers.

4. The Big Four have not been able to dominate all or a greater percentage of the military moving business because of the sound policy of equitable rotation. But they have never stopped trying. Let's examine some of the techniques they use and with which they apparently succeeded.

We all know that advertising experts have learned the art of semantics, the use of catch words, the skillful application of slogans, the trick of smear by innuendo. They have apparently succeeded in persuading a small segment of personnel in the Government that every mover outside the charmed circle of Four are fly-by-nights. This is a catchy phrase. Who, conceivably, would want his household goods possessions moved by a fly-by-night?

Implicit in your directive and in your emphasis on quality is the implication that quality service can only be provided by large organizations. The fact is that the contrary is true. Let's examine the so-called fly-by-nights who are opposed to your directive.

Included among the hundreds of movers represented by our committee are companies which have been established since 1886. Many of them have been carried on by several generations of the same family. These companies have made large investments in terminal facilities, storage warehouses, and motor-vehicle equipment. They employ thousands of drivers, helpers, and office personnel; they are a source of business to thousands of related enterprises. They contribute millions upon millions of dollars in taxes to the State and Federal Governments. Thirty-one other carriers exclusive of the Big Four, who are, in the main, represented by this committee, accounted for approximately $125 million of household goods transportation business in 1958; surely, these people are not fly-by-nights. The remaining 1,900 carriers are small but sound, stable, and respected businessmen. They are not and cannot be called fly-by-nights.

You know, as we do, that household goods transportation service is unique. The Interstate Commerce Commission has characterized it as call and demand service. One of its distinguishing features is its highly personal character. As a consequence, the small mover has traditionally provided the highest kind of personalized high-quality service. The small carrier gives his customers personal effort, interest, and attention which is not and cannot be duplicated by giant carriers acting through a multiplicity of agents.

Unless the Department of Defense has concluded that there is no room for the small carrier, then there is no justification for its present directive. The fact of the matter is that the independent mover has contributed a lifetime of personal effort and his personal fortune, the future of his family, and his personal security to his business. Is he the fly-by-night to which reference has been made? Of course not. If there are any fly-by-nights, they certainly include some agents of large carriers who masquerade under the symbols and trade marks of the system carrier and who secure business on the strength of fancy advertising representations and ingenious promotional devices.

It is not unrealistic to suggest that your new program will, in fact, encourage fly-by-nights because it will destroy sound, though small movers. Literally hundreds of small movers who have been in business as far back as 1912 depend upon a fair share of military business for the continuance of their business. Many of these companies were persuaded to make substantial investments in equipment and facilities and to incur heavy debts in reliance upon the system of equitable rotation. In some instances military business constitutes as much as 70 percent of the business handled by these companies. When one considers that the small business provides direct employment to thousands of workers and that literally millions of people depend upon them for their continued livelihood, the threat posed by this change in policy is so grave as to warrant your earnest reconsideration.

Is there anyone who believes that it is equitable for four large movers who constitute two-tenths of 1 percent of all the carriers and who now receive 50 percent of military business to be given all or a substantial part of the remaining 50 percent now shared by more than 99 percent of the industry? Nevertheless, this is the inevitable and inescapable result of your program.

Let me say now, that we are not only opposed to your new directive, but we are equally shocked by the course of events which led to the revision of your policy and the adoption of Defensive Directive 4500.26.

I think it would be helpful if we reviewed a little history so that we may have a proper perspective of the problem.

As you know, the rotation system for distributing shipments of household goods for members of the uniformed services was prescribed by section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act. This section made it possible for the Department of Defense to eliminate reliance upon the invitation-to-bid system. The Department of Defense then issued Directive 4500.13 dated March 15, 1955, which provided in substance and essence that shipments would be distributed, on an equitable basis, among those qualified carriers who accorded the lowest overall cost to the Government. The exact language reads, in part, as follows:

"DISTRIBUTION OF TRAFFIC

"(a) Subject to the conditions previously set forth, traffic will be equitably distributed among those qualified carriers affording the lowest overall cost to the Government. Each _____ officer will maintain a list of qualified carriers as well as records indicating the distribution of traffic. Records of traffic distribution will be maintained according to tonnage or total revenue, including all charges (except storage in transit) accruing in connection with the shipments, by destination State or oversea area."

This program won general industry acceptance and support. There is not an iota of evidence that it failed to meet the overall objectives of the law and the regulations. It had one other virtue which the new directive now seeks to eliminate, namely, publicity. Anyone could tell how much business was awarded to each carrier. American tax dollars were being spent and the public had the right to know who received those dollars and for what services. For some inexplicable and indefensible reason a program has been initiated to destroy this equitable arrangement. Some time ago, an insidious form of propaganda was generated. Rotation became the target for skillful articles and editorials. Unofficial publications such as the Military Times and the Department of Defense Register carried articles intended to convey the impression that the Department of Defense was dissatisfied with the rotation system and that legislative support was being sought to eliminate it. While it is true that these publications are unofficial, they carried an authoritative stamp and many people accepted them as reflecting official Department of Defense policy. We protested against these articles. On September 11, 1959, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense Le Boutellier informed us that he regretted that the articles had been misleading. We concur. The articles were misleading and seem to have been deliberately designed to mislead. And this was but part of a plan to create a climate of opinion favorable to the program now instituted by the Department of Defense.

What is particularly shocking is the manner in which the new directive was established. What was done is diametrically

different from the practice which had been observed in the past.

On August 28, 1958, there was a joint military-van industry meeting at St. Louis, Mo. Representatives of the Department of Defense affirmed that household goods would be distributed on an equitable tonnage or revenue basis. It was also announced that a new regulation to be known as chapter 217 of Military Traffic Management Agency Regulations was to be issued. Between January and April 1959, chapter 217 of Military Traffic Management Agency Regulations was submitted to Secretary of Defense McElroy. This embodied the results of a 1-year study and retained the principle of equitable distribution of household goods traffic. But chapter 217 was never put into effect.

On April 13, 1959, the military affairs committee of industry was present at a meeting in Washington, D.C., with representatives of the Department of Defense to discuss minor revisions in directives, then in effect. Even while this meeting was taking place, unknown to the rest of the industry, representatives of the big four, accompanied by Senator BRIDGES of New Hampshire, visited with Secretary of Defense McElroy at the Pentagon and submitted their proposals to eliminate the very directive which was under discussion. Shortly thereafter, in May 1959, the Department of Defense announced that it would review the effectiveness of its current policies and recommended changes, should any be found necessary.

On May 15, 1959, Aero Mayflower distributed a circular letter to all their agents which, by strange coincidence, virtually predicted the nature of Directive 4500.26. The big pitch was that military shippers would be permitted to select their movers. I have here an interesting advertisement emphasizing the same theme.

Then on June 4, 1959, Aero Mayflower distributed another letter to its agents. If the contents of this second letter are accurate it raises serious questions of propriety. In June 1959 the Department of Defense had indicated no intention to change the program of equitable distribution. The Mayflower letter of June 4 contains the following significant language:

"Since this decision has been made while Secretary McElroy has been out of the country with Secretary of State Christian Herter, and since this decision is not in accordance with the understanding we had at a meeting with the Secretary on April 13, this is also to advise you that no further action in this matter should be taken on your part until the return to this country of Secretary McElroy and us."

On August 23, not having been consulted, this committee communicated in writing with Senator BRIDGES requesting an equal opportunity to meet with him and Secretary McElroy. No acknowledgment or response to this written request was received from Senator BRIDGES, although the Senator was in Washington and the Congress was in session. Alarmed at the course of events, movers throughout the country communicated with the Department of Defense and with their Senators and Representatives. The Department of Defense consistently advised Congressmen that any contemplated policy change would be discussed with the industry prior to adoption. As late as October 1, 1959, this representation was made to various Congressmen.

On October 6, 1959, on 3 hours' advance notice, this committee and representatives of several other organizations were informed that they were to attend a meeting at the Department of Defense. There we were advised to submit a list of 12 to 25 representatives who would be invited to appear during the week of October 18, or shortly thereafter, at a meeting at which Secretary McElroy would announce his findings concerning rotation. Mr. Dunleavy, assistant to Secretary McElroy, requested that the representative list be submitted to the Department of Defense by October 14. A list was furnished by us, but no meeting was ever held. Instead, on December 8, 1959, without advance notice and without discussion, the Department of Defense issued its press release outlining the policy under DOD 4500.26 which was issued the same date.

There is one other fact I call to your attention. Going back to the proposal originally filed by the Big Four with the Department of Defense on April 13, 1959, we requested an opportunity to examine this proposal so that we could study it and prepare our reply. We were informed by DOD that this information would not be made available to us.

Oh yes, I am certain that the Department of Defense will contend that they discussed the new proposed changes with our group in August of 1959. Actually, this consisted only of an abbreviated discussion with subordinate officials of the Department.

The Department of Defense subsequently assured many Members of Congress their findings and recommendations would be discussed with the industry and its representatives prior to adoption. This was never done and I charge that there was never an intention to do so.

If we overlook these events and proceed to a review of the present directive I think that we must conclude that its effect, if not purpose and objective, is to enhance the position of the Big Four and to extend their dominance of our industry. I should like to discuss certain aspects of the new directive.

You point out in your public announcement that the policy change is intended to place emphasis on quality of service and suggest that in the past rotation was accomplished without regard to quality of service.

We contend that this is incorrect. Quality of service was always recognized and was a factor in the rotation of traffic among qualified carriers. The installations exercised the power of suspensions and did impose penalties. Indeed, even suspensions were equitably distributed. The big four and the smaller movers alike were penalized on occasions. This is made clear by the provisions of DOD 4500.13 and household goods service tenders. Indeed, the November 1959 findings of your group on page 5, states that 85 of 86 transportation officers rated moving service under the existing directive as satisfactory or better. It would seem to us that the dissent of one transportation officer out of 86 hardly justifies a revolutionary change in policy. We emphasize additionally that transportation officers did impose a quality of service requirement. Here, too, in your own findings on page 14, you pointed to the fact that carriers who failed to provide satisfactory service were removed from the qualified list in 262 instances by 61 installations, during fiscal year 1959. Suspension periods averaged 46 days. In 90 percent of the cases suspension was followed by improvement of service. We challenge the Department to point up a like record of achievement in any other field in which private business provides service to the Government.

Your report continues to say that under the new policies traffic will be distributed among qualified lowest cost originating carriers and that primary consideration will be given to quality of service. While lipservice is given to the concept of equal opportunity to compete for traffic, and you recognize the need for a sufficient number of carriers to assure adequate service in peak traffic periods, you overlook a certain basic fact. To begin with, your previous policy did assure quality of service and the results prove it. But I daresay that your present method, unlike the previous policy will not assure adequate facilities. You cannot expect carriers to make investments in equipment and facilities which must be amortized on an annual basis when their likely participation is limited to the scrapings which accumulate in the 3-month peak period. When the bulk of the business gravitates to the big four, you cannot expect other carriers to fill the gap when large volume of traffic causes them to impose embargoes.

At the Government table there must be an equitable distribution of the food. You cannot give us only the crumbs. You cannot assign the granary to the Big Four and leave us with only one loaf of bread. You may consider that it is equitable to slice that single loaf among some 2,000 carriers. It is true that each one will have a slice but it will be so thin that everyone will starve.

You then go on to point out that the transportation officer will continue to select the carrier but that the transportation officer will consider the owner's request for the use of a carrier and will honor the owner's veto if based on previous unsatisfactory performance. There is nothing new in this provision. This procedure is being followed under the existing directive. You confirm this in your November 1958 findings where you say that 23 percent of the 337 military personnel who commented on the subject reported that in 72 percent of the cases the requested carrier was utilized. Remember that military personnel, unlike the usual householder, does not have established relationships in the community with local businessmen. When you consider that 72 percent of the requests by owners were honored you must acknowledge that this is a convincing demonstration that the old poicy accomplished what the new policy; purports to do. Bear in mind, too, that under your own findings you reported that 54 percent of the 83 transportation officers opposed a change in policy which would make owner's selection of the carrier the dominant factor. The basis for their opposition was the lack of information on the part of the owner regarding carrier service and their recognition that carriers would actively and aggressively solicit business thereby divesting transportation officers of control over the program. What present urgency is there for a change when 86 out of 87 transportation officers expressed satisfaction with current moving services? Who can dispute the fact that a transportation officer experienced in this field is best equipped to control and handle the movement of household goods, within the framework of equitable rotation? If he is not, then the Department of Defense has made a confession of failure.

As for owner's choice, your regulation does not make it mandatory. But even if great weight is accorded to owner's choice, why and how is this incompatible with a fair and equitable system of rotation among carriers who have been certificated by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Remember too, that you must consider not only owner's choice but weigh the fact that you are spending money that belongs to all the people and that the expenditure of this money must be consistent with other major objectives. Weigh the fact that when you spend public funds, you must satisfy a public need. And the public needs a sound and stable transportation system. If all owners select one mover and all other movers were cut off, you would be deprived of service and the national transportation policy would be subverted by the destruction of thousands of carriers who depend upon and are entitled to a fair share of Government business.

You then propose to add a requirement that carriers have satisfactory terminal facilities near the shipping activity or point of origin in all instances and at destination where shipments may require storage. We

find nothing in the history of the previous policy which suggests that storage facilities have not been made available when required.

From time immemorial carriers have always been able to arrange with other members of the industry for the use of terminal facilities.

No directive should be issued which encourages changes in this time-honored procedure.

Finally, you criticize the old policy regarding suspensions on the ground that suspension procedures vary from installation to installation and you suggest that the new policy makes it mandatory that suspensions be invoked.

To begin with, suspensions have been imposed against carriers, irrespective of size, under the present directive. Surely, a uniform program can be established within the framework of DOD Directive 4500.13, with the cooperation of our industry which will take into account the factor of human error, the character of household goods transportation and generally accepted standards of performance. This objective can be achieved without the wholesale revision which you propose. As a matter of fact, a standard suspension guide was being promulgated during a meeting with your department at the time the proposal was made by the Big Four carriers. Surely, if a blemish requires a scalpel, you should not wield a machete.

We respectfully submit, as we said at the outset, that your program is poorly conceived and will have dire effects. We oppose the program for all of the reasons we have stated. We point out to you that by reason of size, aggregate wealth, the power of advertising and promotion, the Big Four will secure an even more disproportionate share of military business than they previously enjoyed. When you realize that the moving industry is dependent, on the average, to the extent of 50 percent on military business and that the margin of profit in this industry is extremely narrow, the withdrawal of a portion of the business now enjoyed by responsible and respectable carriers will spell bankruptcy for many of them. Most of these carriers have heavy debt commitments incurred in order to meet their obligations under your previous policy. You are abandoning them. You are throwing them to the wolves. You are depriving them of a fair opportunity to survive and to continue to serve the American public.

The foregoing statement was unanimously approved at a meeting January 10, 1960, by the following members of the policy committee of the Movers Committee for Equitable Distribution of Government Traffic: American Red Ball Transit Co., Airline Vans, Inc., Neptune Storage & Van Co., Ace Van & Storage Co., United Moving & Storage, W. Evers & Son Storage, Inc., Carroll the Mover, Burgess Movers, Shawmut Van Lines, Inc., Seaboard Van Lines, Atlas Van Lines, Inc., Trans-American Van Service, Community & Johnson Corp., Hood-Garrison Van Lines, Burnham Van Service, King Van Lines, Inc., Von Der Ahe Van Lines, Inc., Security Storage & Van Co., Inc., National Van Lines, Inc., Trans-Ocean Van Service, Weathers Bros. Transfer & Storage, Inc., Shamrock Van Lines, John F. Ivory Storage, Washburn Storage Co., Republic Van Lines, Dean Van Lines, Suddath Moving & Storage, Paxton Van Lines, Inc., Pryor Brown Transfer Co., Acme Moving & Storage Corp., M&WAA, Global Van Lines, Inc., Delcher Bros. Storage Co., Inc., U.S. Van Lines, Inc., Engel Brothers Moving & Storage Co., Ford Van Lines, Inc., Newlon's Transfer & Storage, Consolidated Freightways, Inc.

The Deterioration of the Railroads—Will the Bell Toll?

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during July and August of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, conducted hearings into the adequacy of transportation systems in support of the national defense effort in event of mobilization. At this time I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report of that subcommittee, dated October 10, 1959, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The widespread concern in Government and civilian life over the present status of our transportation systems is evidenced by the many statements relative there to which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the session just concluded. That there is need for concern is unquestioned.

The continued physical and economic good health of the transportation industry is of paramount importance. Unless we have adequate transportation in all modes to sustain both our military activities and our civilian economy, in event of an emergency, we will be like unto a living body with a ruptured aorta—our life blood slowly but surely running out. Indeed, the bell will be tolling for us.

Since I had the privilege of serving as ranking minority member of that subcommittee, I am acutely aware of the material presented there reflecting the situation that confronts us. I must say that I am profoundly disturbed at the picture that emerged during these hearings. It was distinctly sobering to learn that, despite our tremendous advances in all fields of industrial endeavor, we would assuredly experience vital shortages in transportation if confronted with other than a very limited military engagement. In the event of nuclear attack, "we would make do with what we have left."

Mr. Speaker, while we have concentrated on providing ourselves with the niceties of pleasant living, we have disregarded the hard core of our transportation existence—the railroads.

It is all to the good to be able to fly from New York to San Francisco between mealtimes, but this capability cannot supply the wheat and corn for our tables, the ore for our steel mills, or the coal for our industrial processes. Even the trucking industry, which has made such great and admirable strides in those fields formerly almost exclusively served by the railroads, will be at a distinct disadvantage in time of emergency because of its far greater dependence on fuel, manpower, and rubber.

The private automobile, which now accounts for approximately 90 percent of intercity passenger-miles in the United States, has become like a third leg to the people of this country because of the flight to suburbia. But what is to become of those workers when tires and gasoline are in short supply? How will they get to their jobs in the mills, the factories, the food-processing plants, and the offices? Without them, our military machine and the flow of our bread of life grind to a halt. The bell will have begun to toll.

No one will allege, least of all those directly concerned with the operation of the railroads, that each mode of transportation does not have a place in the scheme of things. In peacetime each can be counted upon to serve in that field where its special talents can fill a special need. But in time of emergency when vital materials for operation can be expected to be in short supply, we will necessarily have to look to that mode of transportation which can best do the overall job in the most economical and efficient manner.

Past experience has taught us that we have historically looked to the railroads to handle the increased load. During World War II, railroads shouldered the burden of war-swollen traffic, transporting over 90 percent of all military freight traffic and 97 percent of all organized military passenger movements. Our wartime experiences in the field of combat, both in World War II and in Korea, vividly pointed up the astonishing durability and recuperability of a rail line; its resistance to disabling damage or destruction, and its ability to make a quick comeback to volume operation.

Although we have been blessed by not having to cope with war or war-damage within the continental United States, in the memory of living man, the recent developments in weapons delivery capacity make this a not unreasonable likelihood.

It behooves us, therefore, to know just where we stand on this most vital question. What is the present physical and economic health of the railroads? Will the railroad industry be able to accomplish the mission it will be called upon to accomplish and, if not, why not? The following excerpts from the aforementioned report provide answers reflecting a situation which, if allowed to continue, must, assuredly, be viewed as a prelude to the tolling of the bell:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE ADEQUACY OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EFFORT IN EVENT OF MOBILIZATION, OCTOBER 10, 1959

Transportation is one of the tools required by civilized man to bring order out of chaos. It reaches into every phase and facet of our existence. Viewed from every standpoint, economic, political, and military, it is unquestionably the most important industry

in the world. You can no more operate a grocery store or a brewery than you can win a war without transportation. The more complex life becomes, the more indispensable are the things that make up our transportation systems.

The history of transportation is the history of adjustment to new situations that are constantly arising in a dynamic economy. Knowing its importance, one would expect that this great industry would be striding forward with giant steps to keep pace with all of the incredible achievements of our times. On the contrary, the picture that emerged from our hearings was one of a plethora of outdated and outmoded equipment, deferred maintenance, inadequate highways, depressed earnings, claims of unfair tax regulations, favored treatment of one mode over the other by subsidization, and the like, all of which reflected an unenviable state of suspended animation, detrimental to the economy and dangerous to the defense of the country.

Each mode of transportation had its complaints, both against competing modes and regulatory practices, and none presented the dynamic outlook and hope for the future that should prevail in this era of fantastic progress. The representatives of each of the modes of transportation devoted much time to indicating why theirs was the best, fastest, most economical in the use of fuel and manpower, and like reasons for indicating that each was the indispensable mode.

Despite the complete reliance of or economy and defense on all modes of transportation in varying degrees, no one deemed it necessary or desirable to concern himself with suggestions that might work to the benefit of all, economic and defensewise, through the cooperative actions of each mode, one with the other.

We do not wish to leave the impression that the fault is all with representatives of transportation. On the contrary, the Government bodies most concerned with the health and economic well-being of transportation showed all too little regard for this situation. They tended, rather, to view the present condition of transportation as adequate to perform the task it may be called upon to accomplish, with some possible soft spots. There was no indication of any new thinking in this field but rather an obvious dependence on past experiences for guidance.

All in all, it was a picture of obsolete equipment, 19th century economics and laws and antiquated thinking.

The railroad industry which at one time enjoyed a virtual monopoly in intercity commercial passenger transportation, has seen its position deteriorate in the past two decades from 67.8 percent in 1939 to about 31 percent in 1958 of the total for-hire transportation in this field.

As might be realized with a decline in the amount of passenger transportation there has been a similar decline in the means of such transportation; that is, pullmans, coaches and those items of railroad equipment necessary to a successful and efficient operation of long and short-haul passenger service.

Total ownership by class I railroads and the Pullman Co. of passenger carrying cars declined from 30,052 (seating capacity 2,163,744) in 1939 to 18,577 (seating capacity 1,226,082) in 1958. During this period there has been a similar decline in the appurtenances of passenger traffic, such as dining, lounge, club and baggage cars and the like. Despite increases in such items as cars per train, passengers per car and train, miles per active locomotive-day, passenger train speed, car-miles per train hour, and car- and passenger-miles per train hour, all of which would be expected to induce an increase in the use of this mode of travel, nevertheless the decline has been steady and continuous. In the field of commutation traffic, however, the number of passengers in 1958 was slightly more than in 1939.

No consideration of the capability of the railroads to transport passengers would be complete without a review of the condition of its equipment. Poor condition thereof would, admittedly, limit its capability.

According to data supplied to the committee, the average age of passengers cars, owned or leased by class I railroads and the Pullman Co. as of January 1, 1958, was 28½ years; more than 53 percent are over 30 years of age and only about 15 percent were purchased within the past 10 years.

With the retirement of passenger cars greatly exceeding installations of new equipment in ever increasing numbers and the total in need of repairs decreasing only slightly (from 9 percent of cars owned in 1939 to 8.1 percent in 1958), the ability of railroads to handle a substantial number of additional passengers is highly questionable.

As in the passenger field, the railroad industry portion of the total intercity ton-miles in the United States, has declined from 62.4 percent in 1939 to slightly over 45 percent in 1958. This loss has been accounted for by an increase in the percentage, of the total ton-miles, of the motor trucks and oil pipelines, which in the same period have almost doubled their aggregate percentage participation.

Despite this decline in railroad freight ton-mile haulage, the total number of freight cars of all class I railroads has not varied drastically in the past two decades. In fact, there has been a general upward trend, especially since 1950, in aggregate and average tonnage capacities. The retirement of old cars, the rebuilding and modernization of old cars, and installations of new ones, while it has varied from year to year due to changes in traffic and earnings, has not materially affected the total number of cars on hand. The percentage of cars in need of repairs, which as of December 31, 1958, was 7.1 percent, while higher than in any other year since the beginning of World War II, is considerably lower than the 12.8 percent which were in need of repair in 1939. The average of all freight cars is 18.9 years.

Due to the fact that shipments by rail of many commodities are seasonal, there exists during the year periods of surplus and shortages in cars. Here again, there has been a great variance from year to year but the amount of variance, in recent years, has been much less than existed at the start of World War II.

All of the above factors are considered vital to the existence of a transportation system in being which will be able to support the demands placed upon it.

From a system that was almost wholly operated by steampower, the railroads have, in the past two decades, converted almost 100 percent to diesel engines. From a total of 42,511 units of motive power in 1939, there has been a decline to 29,560 in 1958. However, the greater efficiency of this new type of power is reflected in the fact that the active freight locomotive average daily mileage increased from 104 miles per day in 1939 to 141.6 miles per day in 1958. In addition, the net ton-miles per train-hour, one measure of efficiency of railroad haulage, has increased slightly more than 100 percent since 1939.

According to statistics furnished the committee by the Pennsylvania Railroad, the past two decades has witnessed a decline in miles of road and miles of track as well as the number of train-miles operated per mile of track. This is accounted for by a program of road abandonment, undertaken by the railroads to ease their financial plight, which, in the period since World War II, has averaged about 600 miles of road abandoned per year.

Utilization of main-line track in recent normal years has averaged about 75 percent of the peak utilization in 1944 and on some rail lines is considerably less.

The hidden factor, as in the case of rolling stock, is that of deferred maintenance, a program which exists on the railroads because of their undesirable financial condition. If a program is initiated promptly to reduce this factor and to keep it current, road facilities will be adequate to handle an expanded amount of traffic.

Since World War II the railroads have increased the basic capacity of their line and terminals in a number of ways. They have increased the average weight of rails and the other elements which allow the carriage of heavier loads. They have installed additional miles of centralized traffic control and other systems which enable trains to move more frequently and with less interruption over a given line. They have built or modernized classification and terminal yards, permitting trains to be assembled and classified in greater volume and at faster rates. All of these basic improvements allow for heavier and longer trains which can run, if necessary, at more frequent intervals. The result has been a large increase in basic plant capacity over that of World War II or any previous period.

However, the railroad industry has not shared proportionately in the Nation's general economic growth and prosperity during the postwar years.

The railroad share of the total of public and private intercity ton-miles has declined steadily year by year, dropping from 67 percent in 1945 to 45 percent in 1958. Throughout the period, earnings have been uneven and relatively low.

Because of these low earnings, the railroads now are in a position quite different from that in which they found themselves in 1940. At that time, the railroad industry owned substantially more cars than they needed to cover prewar requirements. With that surplus and their unique ability to expand their capability without a proportionate increase in fuel, manpower, and equipment, the railroads were able to amass the record set by them in World War II. Today, the railroad industry does not have the reserve equipment necessary for such expansion despite new capital expenditures totaling more than $14 billion since the end of World War II.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No. 3

According to testimony received by the committee, the main reason for such shortages is financial. Many suggestions were offered for relief of this situation which should be given serious consideration. The main suggestions were as follows.

"(c) fully self-liquidating Federal equipment plan to lease rolling stock to the railroads; (d) change in law regarding agricultural commodities' exemption (either eliminate the law or make all carriers subject thereto); (e) change in depreciation allowance for rolling stock, equipment, and fixed facilities of the railroads; (f) establish provisions for a construction reserve; * * * (h) tax relief—Federal, State, and local."

Concerning these suggestions, the following recommendations are made:

"(c) This is in line with the provisions of H.R. 1365, introduced on January 7, 1959, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the recommendation of this committee that the Committee on Ways and Means give early consideration to H.R. 1365, acquaint itself with this report and the data developed in these hearings.

"(d), (e), (f) It is the recommendation of this committee that since these suggestions are within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the committee and the Interstate

Commerce Commission, within the scope of the latter's authority, should give serious consideration thereto in line with the declaration of the national transportation plan of providing "* * * for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation * * * to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail * * * adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. * * *

"(h) This suggestion has considerable merit and potential for immediate financial relief within the transportation industry. This is particularly true in the case of the railroads, for that segment of the industry, except for the pipelines, is alone in providing and maintaining its own rights-of-way. The railroads also provide their own terminals and other fixed facilities as do some other segments of the transportation industry."

In all, these fertile areas for taxation by governments, Federal, State, and local, are taxed to the extent that the levies placed thereon have become an oppressive burden operating to the detriment of the railroad industry in particular and to the economy in general.

In hearings by the ICC beginning in March 1956 relative to the railroad passenger deficit, the matter of such taxation, as it affected the whole of the railroad industry, was fully explored. On May 25, 1959, a report was released by the ICC which contained in addition to others, the following recommendations:

"(1) That Federal tax laws be amended to encourage local and State tax relief, at least to the extent of disregarding State- and local-provided pretax net income for Federal tax purposes.

"(2) That State and local governments take such steps as may be required to effect a greater degree of equity in respect to tax burden on railroad property in relation to taxpayers generally and consistent with the desire of their communities for retention of commuter and other passenger train service."

The committee is in agreement with these suggestions and recommends prompt action by those having responsibility therefor.

Recommendation No. 5

It is obvious from the testimony received in these hearings that the policies of the Federal and State Governments in providing roads, air terminals, waterways developments, and other means of assistance to transportation, have operated to the advantage of those forms of transportation, which advantages are not available to the railroads.

It is noted that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has, by reason of its jurisdiction, a continuing interest in the national transportation situation. The contents of this report and data set forth in these hearings are recommended to the consideration of the House committee.

Small Business Would Be Helped by Preventing Below-Cost Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is to be heartily congratulated on the introduction of his bill, H.R. 10235 about which he spoke yesterday. It is a privilege to be able to join in this cause by introducing a companion measure.

At the outset it should be made clear that this bill is in no way a fair trade bill, but is designed primarily to halt a practice known as loss-leader sales.

Annual Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, last December I mailed 100,000 annual legislative questionnaires to registered voters in the 30th Congressional District of California. My staff of volunteers in San Diego has just completed a careful compilation of the thousands of replies we have received to date. Returns are approaching the 20,000 mark, which means we have obtained opinions of a substantial cross section of registered voters.

As a means of adding interest to the legislative questionnaire, I added a presidential preference poll. The related standings of Vice President NIXON at the top and Gov. Pat Brown at the bottom of voter preferences in the Democrat column is most significant.

Under unanimous consent, I include the legislative questionnaire as a portion of my remarks:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Do you believe:

1. The Eisenhower-Nixon-Khrushchev meetings have started a thaw in the cold war? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

2. Our foreign aid (mutual security program) should be continued in its present form? Yes, 39 percent; no, 61 percent.

3. Foreign aid (mutual security program) should be increased? Yes, 17 percent; no, 83 percent.

4. Foreign aid (mutual security program) should be decreased? Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

5. The House of Representatives should continue the Un-American Activities Committee? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

Do you favor:

6. Continuing foreign economic and technical aid to friendly underdeveloped countries? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

7. The United States diplomatically recognizing Red China? Yes, 23 percent; no, 77 percent.

8. An income tax reduction at the risk of defense cuts? Yes, 18 percent; no, 82 percent.

9. Allowing parents to deduct from their income tax tuition paid on behalf of their children to institutions of higher learning? Yes, 59 percent; no, 41 percent.

10. Enactment of Federal legislation to tighten taxation of cooperatives? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

Do you believe:

11. The Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Act is just and fair to the rank and file? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

Are you a union member? Yes, 21 percent; no, 79 percent.

12. The $1 Federal minimum hourly wage should be raised? Yes, 52 percent; no, 48 percent.

13. More federally administered programs should be turned back to the States? Yes, 73 percent; no, 27 percent.

14. That agricultural price supports should be reduced? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

15. That agricultural price supports should be eliminated? Yes, 63 percent; no, 37 percent.

16. That postal rates should be increaesd again to allow the Post Office Department to operate in the black? Yes, 53 percent; no, 47 percent.

17. The limitation of $1,200 outside earnings a year for those receiving social security benefits should be raised? Yes, 78 percent; no, 32 percent.

Should we:

18. Give the President the right to veto or accept specific items in appropriation bills. (Now he has to accept all or nothing.) Yes, 87 percent; no, 17 percent.

19. Try to put a man in space before Russia, regardless of the cost? Yes, 19 percent; no, 81 percent.

20. Spend more money on defense? Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

Do you favor:

21. Federal aid to education rather than local taxation and administration. Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percent.

22. Emergency Federal aid to schools in areas hit by impact of defense activity. Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

23. A national fair trade law? Yes, 52 percent; no, 48 percent.

24. Medical care for social security beneficiaries, to be financed by increased social security taxes? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

25. GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans? Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

If the 1960 presidential election were held today, whom would you vote for?

[Percent]

	Republican	Democrat	Independent
Richard Nixon	89.5	31	55.5
Nelson Rockefeller	6.0	8	22.0
Hubert Humphrey	----------	5	1.0
Lyndon Johnson	1.0	7	1.0
John Kennedy	1.5	20	10.0
Adlai Stevenson	1.0	18	9.5
Stuart Symington	1.0	7	1.0
Pat Brown	----------	4	----------

Health Services Study Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Medical Society of the State of New York is one of the most important medical agencies in my State. It enjoys a membership of 25,000 physicians whom it keeps informed regularly by a monthly Newsletter. Its membership has been following the hearings on the problems of the aged with close attention. The society has voted approval and support for Senate Joint Resolution 43, which I have sponsored, providing for the establishment of a Health Services Study Commission. Under this bill, a commission would be established to study and

propose legislative and other solutions to deal with the health needs of our citizens, with particular emphasis on the needs of groups like the aged, unemployed, mentally diseased, and low-income families.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the society's Newsletter, dated January 15, which contains a report of the resolution adopted by the council of the society.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At its December 17 meeting the council voted approval and support of Senate Joint Resolution 43, introduced by Senator JACOB JAVITS, which would establish a Health Services Study Commission to determine the needs of citizens with special attention to certain groups, for example, the aged; and that the Senator be so informed. Voted also that a copy of the council's action be sent to the AMA.

Defender of the Shores—Arleigh Albert Burke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including an article published in the New York Times, Tuesday, February 9, 1960, entitled "Defender of the Shores," a tribute to the Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Arleigh Albert Burke. Admiral Burke is a man whose training, background, and devotion to the defense of our Nation calls for the most serious consideration to be given his counsel.

We look to men like Admiral Burke to conduct our defense in time of war, and in the interests of peace we should weigh carefully their recommendations. The views of Admiral Burke have been laid before us, and it will be helpful to our appreciation of his advice to recall his great record as set forth in the following article:

DEFENDER OF THE SHORES
(By Arleigh Albert Burke)

The Navy's needs and policies are being defended before Congress by a no-nonsense officer whose reputation for fast and decisive action has spread far outside service circles.

Admiral Arleigh Albert Burke once answered, when asked what the difference was between a good naval officer and a poor one: "About 10 seconds." The reply helps to show why he won the nickname in World War II of "31-Knot Burke." Word went through the Navy that whenever he was ordered into action with his squadron of destroyers, the confirmation came back: "Coming in at 31 knots"—a bit better than the rated top speed for most destroyers of the day.

His zest for action and his zeal for the Navy have marked his whole career. Captain Burke's name was stricken from the 1949 promotion list because he was suspected of having leaked information to the press in the bitter propaganda battle between the Navy and the Air Force. It was restored, as a result of general criticism; and there never has been evidence that he had gone beyond legitimate defense of the Navy position.

Captain Burke was made rear admiral, and in 1955 President Eisenhower reached over the heads of 91 officers senior to him to make him Chief of Naval Operations, a four-star admiral.

Since then he has zealously pressed for the Navy's needs. In testimony yesterday he told a Senate subcommittee that the Navy planned to seek funds for six more Polaris submarines.

He is a husky 5 feet 11 inches and 200 pounds. His eyes are still bright blue, though his sandy blond hair is greying. His manner is calm and his voice soft.

When the admiral is not working, he likes to relax with his pipe and read. But his reputation in Washington is for working nearly all the time, with a spell in his Pentagon office even on Sundays.

BORN IN COLORADO

Arleigh Burke was born on a farm near Boulder, Colo., on October 19, 1901, the eldest of six children. The family is not Irish, but a simplification of his Swedish grandfather's name, Bjorkegren, which Americans found a little hard to handle.

He entered the U.S. Naval Academy in the class of 1923. Contemporaries there have reported that Midshipman Burke was known as Billie (in tribute to the actress). They said he was noted for his capacity for vanilla ice cream and hotdogs. Even today, he is said to be unusually addicted to hotdogs as a lunch at his desk on busy days.

He was graduated number 70 in a class of 414, and the day after graduation married Roberta Gorsuch, whom he had courted for 4 years.

He received a master's degree in chemical engineering at the University of Michigan and when World War II started, he was on duty at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington. His urgent pleas for combat duty got him first a sharp reprimand from his chief and then command of a destroyer division.

Destroyers were his love, and in them he made a brilliant reputation. Apart from "31-Knot Burke," he was known as "king of the cans" (can being naval slang for a destroyer).

By the end of the war, he had won every decoration for valor that the Navy could give except the Medal of Honor.

SERVED WITH MITSCHER

As Commodore Burke, he ended the war on the staff of Adm. Marc A. Mitscher, commanding Carrier Division 3 and, in 1946, as Captain Burke he was one of those assigned to make an exhaustive, top-secret study of the potentials of modern war—what might be developed and how.

During the Korean war, he saw sea duty again as commander of a cruiser division and then played a prominent part in the cease-fire negotiations.

He was a rear admiral and commander of destroyers in the Atlantic when the President picked him for the Navy's No. 1 job. He was deluged with letters from both enlisted men and officers hailing the choice.

What's Fair in Campaign War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of February 1, by David Lawrence. With his usual discernment, Mr. Lawrence comments upon political ethics.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S FAIR IN CAMPAIGN WAR?—DEMOCRATS HIT FOR ATTACKING SPEECHES BY DEFENSE CHIEFS AT GOP DINNERS
(By David Lawrence)

Is the Democratic Party to continue to attack the Republican administration on the subject of defense policies, missiles, and outer space problems while urging that the Republican Party be deprived, in effect, of an opportunity to make authoritative replies?

This question is asked because of the nature of certain statements which have all the earmarks of having been prepared by the Democratic publicity experts, though issued in behalf of two Democratic Senators. One statement says that the appearance of top Defense Department civilian officials as speakers at a Republican fundraising dinner was "unethical and beneath the dignity of this administration." Another Senator is quoted as accusing the administration of a "callous disregard of even the most elementary proprieties," and his statement adds:

"In view of the 40-odd billions of defense contracts to be let to our big businessmen by the officials of the Department of Defense, it is not surprising that in one evening the Republican Party should be able to collect $7 million for the next campaign. * * * In due course * * * many more millions are to be expected. This is just the initial downpayment to get the ball rolling."

The implication is that only defense contractors attended the $100-a-plate dinners in 82 cities last week, which, of course, is not true, since a total of more than 100,000 people were there.

For several months now Democratic Senators and Representatives have been getting headlines by crying out that the United States is weak in defense and that there is a dangerous gap between this country's Armed Forces and the Soviet Union's. This issue now reached into the political campaign.

So the other night the Republicans decided to make reply. They lined up their top civilian officials from the Defense Department to speak at a coast-to-coast dinner over closed-circuit television. The persons in the audiences were for the most part the influential Republicans who are expected to debate with the opposition at the grassroots every issue of the coming campaign. No better opportunity for the Republican administration to tell its story to its own supporters could have been devised. Yet when the Republicans publicly endeavor to give authoritative information direct from the administration officials in the Defense Department, they are immediately accused of being unethical.

It may be questioned just what is ethical or unethical about dragging the defense problem into politics, and who, after all, started the partisan treatment of the defense problem? It might also be asked if any of the Democrats have received inspiration, financial or otherwise, from those defense contractors who either want bigger appropriations or are resentful because some of their contracts have been canceled. One thing is certain, the beneficiaries of defense work are by no means confined to one party.

It would be much better, of course, if the Defense Department were kept out of politics altogether, but such a rule should apply to both parties. It will be recalled that in the presidential campaign of 1948, the late James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense, was insistent that the Defense Department keep out of the campaign. While President Truman concurred at the time, the resentment produced

among Democratic Party leaders was such that it contributed to the effectiveness of the cabal that set out after the election to force Mr. Forrestal from his post.

It will be recalled also that, in one campaign in which the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was a candidate for Vice President, there was sent out over his signature a circular letter soliciting campaign funds from defense contractors who had benefited by projects in World War I, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

If the campaign records are researched, moreover, it will be found that contributions from individuals working for companies that have defense contracts are not out of proportion to those from individuals employed by companies in other lines of business.

If those groups benefiting from governmental funds or legislation are to be estopped from contributing to presidential campaigns, then the Democratic Party might be the greater loser. Many millions of dollars are collected by the Democrats from labor-union members and blocs which are putting pressure on Government for favorable legislation and appropriations.

Some of the most outspoken critics of the administration in Congress have received large sums in their election campaigns from such sources, and one has yet to hear any criticism from Republicans declaring it unethical for leading Democrats in Congress to be addfessing the conventions and local meetings of these organizations or pressure groups. Nor have former officials of the Defense Department, who held office under the Democratic administration, hesitated to make speeches at fundraising dinners where presumably there are those present who might benefit financially if a Democratic administration is elected next November.

Fair play would seem to require that defense contractors not be singled out as any more unethical if they attend dinners given by political parties than are other businessmen. To imply that the total sums received from everybody who bought a ticket to a fundraising dinner given by the Republicans is "an initial downpayment" from defense contractors and doesn't mean the same thing when contributed on the Democratic side is a bit of rationalization that doesn't sound like fairplay.

Layers of Fat in the Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I place herewith in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1960, entitled "Fat in the Defense Budget."

This editorial deals with important hearings held b ythe Joint Economic Committee on January 28, 29, and 30, 1960, on the subject of "Impact of Defense Procurement on the Economy." This is a most important subject for investigation by that committee when one considers the extent of the Department of Defense procurement expenditures.

According to a recent report of the Attorney General the armed services procurement actions from 1950 to 1959 totaled some 38 million separate transactions having a volume of $228.4 billion.

According to the same report expenditures for fiscal 1959 excluding certain important elements amounted to $22.873 billion.

We find also, Mr. Speaker, that—

First, the current rate of defense expenditures is $45.7 billion or 58 percent of the total Government expenditures—or about 10 percent of our gross national product.

Second, according to the Attorney General 86.4 percent of military procurement by volume was by negotiated contracts in fiscal 1959.

Third, the percentage of the riskless cost-reimbursement type contracts have increased by volume from 12.7 percent in 1951 during the Korean conflict to 40.9 percent in fiscal 1959.

Fourth, the 100 largest defense contractors received 61.2 percent of the contracts by dollar volume during fiscal 1951.

Fifth, the 100 largest received 73.8 percent of the business for fiscal 1959.

Sixth, the 10 largest received 37 percent of the business during fiscal 1959. They are General Dynamics Corp., Boeing Airplane Co., North American Aviation, Inc., General Electric Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Douglas Aircraft Co., United Aircraft Corp., Martin Co., Hughes Aircraft Co., American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Seventh, the Department of Defense supply systems contained $26.7 billion worth of surplus, excess, and long supply of personal property as of June 30, 1958. This is 76 percent more than our imports of merchandise of $15.2 billion for calendar 1959; 52 percent more than our total exports of merchandise for calendar year 1959 which was $17.6 billion.

Eighth, the estimated surplus disposal program for the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year will amount to approximately $10 billion or twice the average annual rate for the War Assets Administration during the period 1944–49.

Ninth, despite the O'Mahoney Act of 1952 and the McCormack-Curtis Act of 1958 which give the Secretary of Defense broad authority to integrate supply systems, the surface of the problem has merely been scratched to date.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious matter which many Members of the Congress, the Hoover Commission, and others have brought to the attention of the public for many years. As I stated in a letter to Secretary Wilson on October 24, 1955—the integration of common supply and service activities in the Department of Defense would yield sufficient funds to procure many things needed for the national welfare such as education, health, conservation, debt reductions, and even defense itself.

The editorial follows:

FAT IN THE DEFENSE BUDGET

Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress has made it clear that millions, or even billion, can be cut from the Nation's defense bill—without taking a dollar from funds earmarked for missiles or other military hardware. In fact, the money saved by elimination of budgetary fat might well be used to buy more military strength.

We refer to disclosures of continued wasteful duplication of services in the logistical field by the various Armed Forces. According to competent witnesses before the committee, the defense agencies have made little progress in eliminating duplication and overlapping of many supply and related services since the Hoover Commission called for centralization of procurement and supply activities. It has been estimated by members of the Hoover Commission that some $2 billion might be saved the taxpayers by centralization.

Controller General Joseph Campbell cited to the committee a number of glaring examples of blind buying and selling by military departments that, but for action by his office, would have cost the Government millions of dollars. "In one case," he said, "we found that during the same period one service had a long supply and excess of aircraft engines and accessory parts available for interservice use, while another service was placing orders for identical items." In another case the Army planned to buy helicopter parts from private industry, although the Air Force had more than $6 million worth of the same items left over from a reduced program.

One of the persuasive critics of military waste was Perry M. Shoemaker, railroad president and vice chairman of the Committee of Hoover Commission Task Force Members. He pointed out that although Congress has authorized the Defense Department to integrate supply functions, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, military officials seem reluctant to use the authority. Their only move so far, the committee was told, has been to set up a single-manager system for procurement of a few items used in common by the three services. Under this system one branch will purchase food or clothing or fuel or medical supplies for the other branches—but without information as to present stocks, usage rates, or other important details. Richard Newman, a staff member of the congressional committee, stressed that the particular service doing the buying cannot evaluate requests or take steps to redistribute excess stocks and reduce inventory investments.

Defense officials pointed to the single-manager system as proof of their concern over waste and their desire to cooperate in reducing overlapping of housekeeping activities. But Mr. Shoemaker and other witnesses declared that this was only a first step, a temporary expedient that is not a real substitute for a permanent centralization of purchasing and distribution functions in the Defense Department. And if, as the Hoover task force of outstanding businessmen and other specialists has asserted, billions of defense dollars are being wasted through uncoordinated procurement and supply management, it is time to put military buying on a businesslike basis and use the savings to build up our lagging weapons arsenal.

Amendment of National Defense Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. John C. Lynn, expressing the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation in regard to S. 2929, to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal

certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1960.
The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing the views of 1,602,117 member families in 49 States and Puerto Rico, is opposed to the passage of S. 2929 (KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts) which amends the National Defense Education Act by striking section 1001(f)(2), the provision requiring the disclaimer affidavit.

In considering this matter at our most recent annual meeting the voting delegates, representing the member State farm bureaus, developed the following policy:

"We favor the retention and enforcement of the requirements in the National Defense Education Act that recipients of Federal scholarships swear allegiance to the United States and file affidavits stating they do not belong to or support any organization intent on overthrowing the U.S. Government."

As you know, the American Farm Bureau opposed the passage of the National Defense Education Act on the grounds that it was unnecessary and that it would inject Federal control into our State and local educational programs. Farm Bureau favored the adoption of the Senate amendment that established the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit. We sincerely believe that this provision of the Defense Education Act is necessary and important since the stated purpose of this act is to strengthen our national defenses.

We are convinced that the support for the elimination of the disclaimer affidavit does not come from American college men and women, but comes instead from college administrators and professors. American men and women who are truly deserving of defense scholarships welcome the opportunity to not only take an oath of allegiance to support and defend the Constitution of the United States but also take pride in complying with the disclaimer affidavit requirement.

The contention that S. 2929, if adopted, would still require recipients to take the same oath requirement as Members of Congress, armed services, Government, etc., is true; however, it must be kept in mind that persons in military service, Government, etc., are required to answer, under oath, numerous questions relating to their personal views and associations with any and all subversive elements. If their answers indicate a friendliness toward subversive elements, there is little likelihood that such persons will be considered acceptable for service. We reject the contention of the proponents of S. 2929 that the standard oath requirement, with the elimination of the disclaimer affidavit, would be as effective in establishing loyalty to the U.S. Constitution as is the system used by the military and others sworn to protect the Constitution of the United States.

We see no reason why recipients of scholarships or payments under the National Defense Education Act should be exempt from the present disclaimer affidavit.

We believe that every loyal citizen should be ready and willing at any time to assert his loyalty to the United States and to answer freely and unreservedly any questions affecting such loyalty, and that only citizens who do so should be eligible to receive the benefits provided by the National Defense Education Act. We, therefore, recommend that S. 2929 be defeated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative Director.

Address by Hon. Paul J. Kilday at the Launching of the U.S.S. "John King"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable PAUL J. KILDAY, Member of Congress, 20th District of Texas, at the launching of the U.S.S. *John King* at Bath, Maine, on January 30, 1960. Mrs. Paul Kilday, the very charming and gracious wife of our distinguished colleague, christened this new guided-missile destroyer.

I know of no Member of Congress held in greater esteem by his colleagues than PAUL KILDAY. Because of his outstanding ability and unusual foresight, I believe every Member of Congress will benefit by reading this short address delivered by Mr. Kilday at the launching of the U.S.S. *John King*.

ADDRESS OF PAUL J. KILDAY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS 20TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, AT LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "JOHN KING"

Our Military Establishment is in a period of transition. The development and introduction into our Armed Forces of rockets, missiles and nuclear power creates a new war potential.

Transition from convential weapons to new weapons is not new in our Military Establishment. Inevitably, the new weapon is spectacular when compared to older concepts. They capture the imagination of the people. Our people have always been willing to translate the effect of such new weapons into wishful thinking. Each new weapon produces the hope that any future war will be most destructive of our enemy and practically bloodless for our own forces. Of course, such a day will never come.

In each transition the service carrying it on has faced the necessity of continued operation and maintenance of the conventional while developing and procuring the new. This is always most costly. It is, therefore, necessary to resist the clamor to do away with the conventional, even before the new weapon is on hand and operational.

The advent of nuclear weapons and their delivery by unmanned intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and intermediate range ballistic missiles (ICBM) differs from prior transitions in two respects. First, they are more spectacular than anything which the mind could previously conceive; and, second, they are fantastically expensive.

Some military men, in pointing out the necessity for and the devastating effect of these ballistic missiles in an all-out nuclear war, have, unfortunately, led the people to believe that all conventional weapons are obsolete. Sometimes I fear that, in their enthusiasm, they have convinced themselves that such is the case.

Such an atmosphere has made the maintenance of a force in being more difficult. Talk of 20-minute war has tended to obscure the more likely eventuality of a limited as distinguished from all-out nuclear war. Not a limited war which could ignore all of the progress which has been made in rockets, missiles and atomic weapons, but a war utilizing all of these developments—a war in which rockets, missiles, and atomic weapons of limited destructive force and of tactical application would be used.

Today a new destroyer will be launched and in due time will be commissioned and become a part of our naval fleets. Such a launching is always a significant occasion and one in which ancient traditions are observed. However, the real significance of this day lies in the fact that the *John King* is a guided missile destroyer. It utilizes conventional guns and torpedoes, but also combines the use of missiles with tremendous surface-to-air range and rockets effective against submarines.

The *John King* is, therefore, the realistic balance of the old and the new. It is the realistic application of the family of weapons. It is another strong link in the chain of defense against assault from the air or the very real submarine menace.

The *John King* is evidence of sound planning for present and future potential dangers. We launch her with every best wish for a fair breeze on all the seas she may sail. We shall feel more secure because she rides the waves with her guns, torpedoes, rockets, missiles, and sonar, ever ready. Through her life our prayers go with her that none of her weapons will ever be fired in anger. We are confident, too, that her existence renders that possibility more remote.

The Favorite Story of Representative Joe L. Evins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is mostly filled with serious matter. I must accept and I do accept my share of the responsibility for burdening the RECORD with serious subject matter, particularly since I spoke for about 3 hours yesterday on nuclear weapons policy. It has occurred to me that it might serve well to have printed in the RECORD an amusing anecdote reported by a great reporter, newspaperman, and gentleman, Elmer Hinton, whose home is in Portland, Tenn., in an article published in a recent issue of the Nashville Tennesseean. Perhaps a reading of this delightful article may lighten and brighten the day for those who here labor and for those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAVORITE STORY OF REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS

(By Elmer Hinton)

The favorite story of Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Smithville, is of an incident which he says brought him a newly-found humility.

The Fourth District Congressman had been in office a few years and was running for reelection. He figured he had a right good acquaintance with the voters of his district.

One day he was driving along the road when he picked up a hill farmer who wanted a ride into the county seat town.

Congressman EVINS told the old man he was a candidate for reelection to Congress.

"Aw, I know you," said the old farmer, flashing a toothless grin. "You air ALBERT GORE."

"No, I'm not ALBERT GORE," EVINS replied, "although we are neighbors and good friends."

"Uv course," the old farmer said. "I shoulda knowed all the time—you air Ross Bass."

Trying to be more direct, the Smithville lawmaker said:

"No, I'm Edgar Evins' son, of Smithville."

"Aw, now I know who you air," the hillman replied, "you air the feller what has them walkin' horses."

Again Congressman EVINS had to tell the old man he was mistaken, that he was thinking about his brother. With that explanation the grizzled farmer smiled with complete recognition.

"Well, bless my soul," he said, "I gotcha straight now. You air Judge Smartt's son-in-law."

Which he is.

The Future of the Mississippi Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Valley Association, meeting Monday in St. Louis, heard its president, Mr. Donald O'Toole, give an excellent and highly informative report on "The Future of the Mississippi Valley," and this speech contained a wealth of information which should be of great interest to every American interested in the economic growth of this country.

Mr. O'Toole, after pointing up in positive terms our tremendous future needs for water and for water development in this country, stressed that our rate of construction for our waterways has been lagging badly. For example, he points out that "During the period 1950–58, national income increased 51 percent, population increased 16.6 percent, costs of construction increased 66 percent, and Federal appropriations for waterways improvements decreased 9.6 percent."

Mr. Speaker, in view of this Nation's tremendous population growth and in the light of our tremendous future requirements in every field of water resources development, we cannot, as Mr. O'Toole points out, afford to restrain such expenditures within limits that are related to virtually no growth in population or international responsibilities.

On the contrary, one of our most urgent needs is the acceleration of our water resources development projects at the greatest possible speed. For example, acceleration of the Arkansas River Basin development program, which is now under construction by the Army Corps of Engineers, would do at least three important things.

It would lower construction costs to the Federal Government by millions of dollars.

It would give great economic impetus to the entire Arkansas River Basin area, unlocking its storehouses of natural resources and providing new markets.

It would enable the Nation as a whole to reap more quickly, and inexpensively, the economic benefits which would accrue by completion of this project.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe Mr. O'Toole's significant speech will be of tremendous interest to Americans everywhere interested in the development of our water resources, I should like to insert this report in the RECORD at this point.

THE FUTURE OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

The Mississippi Valley is the richest valley in the entire world. A great natural basin, it takes up most of central United States—all the land between the western slopes of the Allegheny Mountains and the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, except for the relatively small north central portion which drains into the Great Lakes.

Into this basin pour the rivulets, creeks, and streams which collect the surplus rain and snow falling on its vast land and mountain areas. Converging together into small rivers, then larger rivers, these waters finally form the great Ohio River, the rich Tennessee, the mighty Missouri, the long and wild Arkansas, and other great rivers—all finally converging into the Father of Waters—the Mississippi River.

The Mississippi Valley is the heart and core of the United States, the wealthiest Nation in the world. Here are found practically all of the resources that account for the wealth of our country.

Here are the oil wells of Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana; here are the coalfields of Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia; here are the vast corn and wheat fields of Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Iowa, and Illinois; here are the cattle and hog ranges and feeding lots of Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, and Illinois; here are such great industrial cities as Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis, where we unite the iron ore of northern Michigan, Canada, and South America with coal from the Mississippi Valley; here are the international seaports of Chicago and New Orleans, from whence the enormous production of this great valley moves out to the markets of the world.

The Mississippi Valley is the reason for the preeminence of the United States in world affairs, and its sole hope for maintaining that preeminence. Competition between nations today is not just warfare—it begins with economic competition, and final victory is determined by economic superiority. World War II proved that.

Wars today are wars between great nations, not small countries. They begin many years before the first shots are fired, and their preparations are long and deep indeed.

Those who are most concerned with a nation's defense must make certain that all of its products—agricultural, mineral, and manufactured—can be produced, assembled, and delivered better and faster than any other nation. Thus can victory be best assured—a victory which looks so certain to a hostile nation that no war ever breaks out. The first step in national defense is industrial and economic superiority.

Men produce and deliver goods according to the forces which drive them. We in the United States have the three greatest stimuli to achievement of maximum efficiency in production and delivery—democracy, private ownership of property, and the profit motive. Democracy enables each man to determine for himself what he can do best, and to unite himself with others in striking for his goals. Private ownership of property enables man to acquire his own tools and his own land to use as he knows best to achieve his goals. The profit motive challenges him to produce and deliver at lowest possible costs, so that he may fully enjoy the rich rewards of his personal efforts.

These stimuli—democracy, private ownership of property, and the profit motive—operating in this great and rich valley, should enable us to outproduce and underprice any other productive area in the world, as to those products which are indigenous to our land and resources. When the resources of this valley are properly utilized, and midwestern man is fully and completely harnessed to them, then production results which effects great prosperity, before, it has to be used for military defense. The successful defense of our country—of any country—begins with the development of a strong productive economy which meets its tests in world markets. The ability to outproduce and undersell other nations in a production economy as vast and complex as ours contains the entire ability to discourage other nations from tampering with us.

Nature has provided us with the rich natural resources of the Mississippi Valley. She has even blessed us with plenty of rainfall—30 inches per year—to give us the water to bring them into production. There remain just these things for Mississippi Valley men to do in using these natural bounties:

To unite, so that each man or body of men can join with his fellows, in achieving maximum development of natural resources, and minimum damage to one another.

To bring under control the things that Nature gives us raw and untamed; a wild and flooding river is as inexcusably useless as a strong mustang which has not been brought to bridle.

To conserve so that maximum continuous usage may be enjoyed; a great river that gets the same amount of water every year, but is permitted to range from raging floods to stinking dry beds, is as unforgivable to modern man as an electric generating plant that provides electric light by day and doesn't operate at night.

We have the capacities to unite and control these bounties of Nature, and unite we must. Not only does the whole Mississippi Valley depend on us—so also does our beloved Nation. Indeed, so does the whole world. For the efficiency with which we harness these resources into production and delivery determines the safety and prosperity of our Nation, and the peace and prosperity of the world, which will live better and more economically because we deliver our products into world markets at lower costs.

Water is the great catalyst that is vitally necessary to all of our production, assembly, manufacture, and delivery operations. Without water, nothing—literally nothing—can be produced. Whole nations lie barren and poverty stricken if they do not have water. Nations which have plenty of water, controlled so that it is available when and where needed—these nations can have the rich blessedness that we have in the Mississippi Valley.

Water must not only irrigate crops—it must also float valuable minerals to surfaces, and wash away useless scale. Water carries ships and barges which assemble raw materials for cooking, for melding, for fusing. Water cools the hot coils of industry, so that manufacturing operations can be carried on, and water catalyzes in the production of every kind of material you use—your suit, your fountain pen, your wristwatch, your car, all of these require billions of gallons of water in their manufacture; without water, 12 months per year, factories cannot operate. Water again carrying ships and barges enables delivery of finished products at lowest possible delivery costs. Water finally slakes the thirsts of the men who live everywhere, and carries away their wastes.

The network of the Mississippi River system is wonderfully suited to the performance of all of these tasks for its valley.

Steadily, year-by-year, rain and snow waters running into the Mississippi River system, flush down the great valley.

During the year, there are wide variances—sometimes nature floods us, sometimes she stops rain and snow for months. But she has constructed our streams and valleys so that they can be plugged, so that the basins of their valleys can be filled with water when it pours down, and then eked out through dams during the rainless months that follow.

Up to relatively recent years, such controls have not been needed. Our population and national security did not demand such intense use of our river waters.

But now the triple threats of an enormously growing population, a huge industrial economy with a ravenous appetite for water and a hostile enemy nation of great resources—these three threats call for careful planning and maximum utilization of our rivers. Just how are we measuring up to these responsibilities?

In the 55 years between 1900 and 1955, our daily use of water increased from 40 billion gallons to over 262 billion gallons, or over 6½ times; in the next 20 years it will again increase 191 billion gallons to 453 billion gallons, or 11.3 times what it was in 1900. Our supply of water—from nature—is just what it was in 1900.

Obviously we are going to have to adopt and enforce every possible means of conserving water. For nature isn't going to give us any more than she always has. We must catch it, save it, eke it out, and clean all pollution out of it so that it may be used over and over again as it descends downstream.

Facilities to do all these things can be installed at costs fully justified by the many and complex benefits they produce. A dam which holds up the descent of floodwaters not only protects the cities and farms in the valley below—it provides recreation, hydraulic power, a controlled and dependable stream on which towboats and barges move. A sewage disposal plant not only disposes of a homely problem—it also contributes to regulation of river levels; it enables recreational use of the river; it makes possible factories alongside of it. The river valley which was once barely populated because of the wrecking damage of a wild river becomes, when the river is dammed and controlled, a rich area marked by lush farms, busy industries and a healthy people.

But we have not been building these river facilities, much though they are obviously going to be needed. During the period 1950–58, national income increased 51 percent, population increased 16.6 percent, costs of construction increased 66 percent, and Federal appropriations for waterways improvements decreased 9.6 percent. If we apply the increase in cost of construction (66 percent) to the budget for 1950, we develop a requirement of $1.8 billion for waterways appropriations for 1960; the actual amount appropriated is about $1 billion.

Our appropriations for waterways improvements have been consistently lagging behind increases in population, national income and costs of construction. In spite of positive and undeniable estimates of enormous requirements by 1975 when our population will be 200 million people—over 21 percent greater than in 1955—Congress and the administration have consistently restrained expenditures on waterways within limits that are related to virtually no growth in population or international responsibilities.

It is just like owning a large industry and refusing to let management spend any money on research and development or on new plant and machinery. If you own stock in such a company, you had better sell out, because it's going to lose out—it's going to fail.

We cannot let this happen. We who have assumed responsibility for this Mississippi Valley must—for the good of our Nation—prevail upon our Government to spend the funds necessary to give the Mississippi Valley the plant and machinery it must have. If we are to have the waterway facilities we must have by 1975, there must be a minimum of $1.8 billion per year invested by the Government between now and then.

And we don't mean spent. We are talking about money invested by the Government in the tools and buildings of production, not spent for things having no enduring value. The salary paid the mailman last month for delivering your mail has no value in the future; the money invested in a dam will make it possible for goods to be produced and delivered cheaper for years to come. The funds we seek will lower total costs of production including taxes; failure to invest them will raise total costs of production including taxes.

With our rivers under proper development comes the need for knowing and understanding our markets. Here we who make up the Mississippi Valley are going to have to educate ourselves considerably beyond our predecessors.

For our production must go to far distant markets. We must hit those markets with the products they want and need, in the sizes, shapes and colors they want. We must get them to understand what we can do, and to place their orders with us.

We have, it seems, eight major markets for our production: The Central United States—largely our own Mississippi Valley; the east coast of the United States; the west coast of the United States; Canada; South American; Europe; Asia; Africa.

If we are to get the most out of these markets, we must begin to think about them, and set up continuous contacts with them. Just letting sales happen is not the American way. No business is any good unless you have to go out and get it.

Somehow, some way, we should effect the organization of a master chamber of commerce for the entire Mississippi Valley. Such an organization, representing all of the individual chambers of commerce which are now members of the Mississippi Valley Association, should undertake the promotion of all of their products, services, and resources.

It is a natural follow-up to the job of organizing the development of the valley's water resources. The basic objective in developing them is maximum production at lowest costs. When that is achieved, markets must be developed and retained.

Another organization should be formed to take over the task, or perhaps a new activity of the Mississippi Valley Association can do the job. If another organization is formed, then a lot of things are going to be done twice, and a lot of valuable material and resources will be developed and maintained at double costs. In any event, we should get on with the task, we who have sought to develop these production-making water resources. We should assure ourselves of our markets.

The future ahead of the Mississippi Valley is busy. It is a future of hard work, of long hours of thinking, planning, arguing, and selling. And it is a future of great prosperity.

Soviet Russia-Red China Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been much discussion, and it currently continues, on the subject of the "Two Chinas" policy. Recently, I have had the pleasure of reading two articles on this subject, written by Dr. Carsun Chang, and which were published in the Chinese World daily newspaper of San Francisco, on November 28 and November 29, 1959.

Mr. President, in order that Dr. Chang's views on this extremely important subject may be made available for reading by all Members of Congress, and others interested, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Chang's articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. CARSUN CHANG GIVES VIEW ON POSSIBLE "TWO CHINAS" POLICY

We have recently had five instances indicating that the United States has been considering a policy which recognizes two Chinas.

These instances are:

1. A court verdict stating that Formosa is not a nation.

2. President Eisenhower's use of the term, "the Republic of Formosa."

3. The State Department's explanation that "Republic of Formosa" really means the Republic of China which has its capital in Formosa.

4. The report that Mr. Eisenhower asked Premier Khrushchev if the Soviet policy toward Germany was not inconsistent with its policy toward China. If Germany is divided into two parts, why cannot China likewise be divided? In this talk between Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev there appeared to be a foreshadowing of a kind of Republic of Formosa.

5. The Conlon Report—which was published as a study for the U.S. Senate—proposing that Communist China be admitted into the U.N. by a series of steps; that it be given diplomatic recognition; that the Nationalist China Government of Taiwan be changed to the Republic of Formosa.

IMPLICATIONS

The two Chinas policy means then that Communist China will be admitted into the U.N., that it will be given diplomatic recognition by the United States, that it will trade with the United States, that it will have cultural exchanges with the United States.

This brings up a series of exceedingly complex and important considerations. If Communist China is admitted into the U.N., the Republic of China on Formosa must relinquish its seat in the Security Council. It is assumed that Formosa will keep her seat in the General Assembly. The consequence of this with all that it entails, is that the Republic of China will no longer be the Republic of China. Regardless of what name it may bear, it will be the Republic of Formosa.

THREE ASPECTS

I shall discuss three aspects of this policy: 1. Nationalist China. 2. Communist China. 3. The United States.

1. Nationalist China, whose Government is now restricted to Formosa, considers herself to be the legitimate Government of China. The millions of Chinese who came to Taiwan with the Nationalist Party expect that this Government will someday regain the mainland, and that they then will be able to return to their homes. The 15 million anti-Communist Chinese now residing in other parts of the world also hope for a unified, free China. They therefore give their support to the Nationalist Government, rather than to a divided China.

On the day that the two Chinas policy is proclaimed, the people of Formosa and the Chinese throughout the world will lose all hope of a unified, free China. The millions of Chinese now residing abroad will see no way out except in their complete support

of the Communist Government. The stability of the Government of Formosa itself will become a question. It is doubtful that Chiang Kai-shek will agree to continue as President of the Republic of Formosa. The so-called Republic of Formosa, in short, seems to be a phenomenon of uncertainty, except in one respect: it will cause trouble in that area and elsewhere.

2. Communist China has declared many times that Formosa belongs to her, despite the legalistic view of the United States that no treaty is valid which assigns Formosa to China. Communist China is adamant in its claiming of Formosa, and it will continue to be so.

WARSAW TALKS

The U.S. Government has been negotiating with the Communist Ambassador to Poland, for 2 years now, in an effort at finding a formula which would permit of China's renunciation of the use of force to attain a solution to this problem. Nobody seems to know whether or not such a formula can be developed. And, even if it can, it will be worth only as much as the paper on which it is inscribed. At her convenience Communist China will denounce it—and, eventually, renounce it. The desire to keep Formosa in the hands of the United States with the consent of Communist China is quite unrealistic.

3. From the U.S. point of view, Formosa is a link in the U.S. chain of military defenses. She hopes to keep it. If she thinks to keep it as a kind of protectorate, either as a Republic of Formosa or as an area under military rule, it can mean only colonization, and this will make her very unpopular among the nations of Asia. It will give Communist China more reason than ever before to accuse the United States of imperialism.

Some may then ask, "If this policy of two Chinas is impracticable, what do you propose in its place?" My answer is that the problem of China should be solved in accordance with the principles of justice and decency, and not for reasons of expediency. The United States should declare to the world that the Republic of China is an independent and sovereign country, and that mainland China was seized by a small minority of men trained by the U.S.S.R. against the will and contrary to the welfare of the Chinese people, with the purpose of furthering the cause of communistic enslavement of the world. It should be declared also that the American people do not wish to impose their form of government on China, and that they do not think that any kind of dictatorship is desired or supported by the Chinese.

DEMOCRACY

China should be democratic and under the rule of a multiparty system of government. This is the system that offers safeguards of liberty and progress which are not offered by the one-party system. The nature of each party should be subjected always to the scrutiny of the people. When a party is no longer worthy of popular respect and trust, it should be outlawed. The status of any group as a government party or opposition party should be decided by free elections.

China's foreign policy should embody friendliness toward all nations and permit of no destructive alliance with any nation against any other. China's economy should be developed in cooperation with all countries qualified and able to give such cooperation.

Multiparty politics, cooperative development of material and nonmaterial resources, cultural exchanges, friendliness toward all countries—these are forces which can produce incalculably good results for China, and in the long run for the world, if they are permitted to operate.

If the United States declares such an enlightened and practicable policy toward Free China, the people of Formosa and the millions of Chinese now residing abroad will give their support—and so will the millions in China who are mindful of the common welfare.

RED OPPOSITION

If the Communist government of China opposes such an enlightened and practicable policy, it shows beyond doubt that it still adheres to totalitarianism, shows beyond doubt that it will continue practicing the doctrine which will eventually lead to war.

Let me explain why such a policy toward Free China must be declared. The question of China is a vital one for all the nations of the world. It cannot be settled by a policy of two Chinas. It can be settled only by change of the form of government in China. The dictatorship must be terminated and a democratic government must be instituted.

(By Dr. Carsun Chang)

As long as the government of the mainland is a dictatorship there will be no human rights and the will of the people will not be heeded. The government will squeeze from the people every iota of toil, wealth and power possible. In the process of doing this they will attain a tremendous industrial and military development. This will then be used to threaten the nations of Asia or will actually be used against them, as has even now been done with the present military and industrial machine of the Communist China dictatorship. Already we have had the Korean war, the Tibetan oppression and the Indian border dispute.

According to the Conlon Report China will be admitted into the U.N. and given diplomatic recognition. Admission and recognition of a country should be based on its friendliness, its stability, its willingness to cooperate for the good of all nations.

Once admission and recognition have been given it is difficult to withdraw them without causing a potentially or actually dangerous situation. It is very advantageous to the world that a peaceful and friendly China be created. A China other than this may do worse things than the U.S.S.R. ever has done.

Mao Tze-tung's hatred for capitalism and for what he terms "imperialistic" nations is much more virulent than was Lenin's. One of the reasons for Mao's hatred and desire for revenge against the West—a hatred and revengefulness that are much stronger than those of the members of the Soviet Government—is the West's policy of exploitation of China. Mao's cruelty surpasses that of Stalin and Khrushchev. This is something which should not be overlooked.

MARXIST CAMP

Let us consider the relationship between Communist China and the U.S.S.R. Ideologically China is in the Marxist camp and is allied by treaty with the U.S.S.R. It appears that at present Communist China will, in general, follow Soviet Russia's foreign policy. I may say that in matters of common interest they will proceed in similar fashion. In other matters, China will not follow Russia.

Khrushchev now pursues the policy of cold war with the United States. It does not help Communist China's position in the Far East. It is because of this that Communist China criticized Khrushchev's plan as not being practicable to Asia. After Khrushchev's visit to Peking, no communique expressing agreement was issued, and the Chinese Communist Party did not return the courtesy of the visit by attending the U.S.S.R.'s 42d anniversary celebration. In the past, Mao and Chou usually did not miss an opportunity to go to Moscow. This time they did.

Mao and Chou have not yet decided as to what China's attitude shall be toward Khrushchev's peace and disarmament policy. This and the foregoing facts add up to one thing: Communist China may listen to Khrushchev, but it remains its own master.

Even if Formosa were given, through Khrushchev's intermediation, to Communist China, the latter will demand more and more. One of its next demands would be that all U.S. forces be withdrawn from the Far East.

In her speech of October 19 Mrs. Roosevelt said that the only thing which would assure world disarmament would be a U.N. seat for Communist China. "We can't disarm and leave Red China with weapons of destruction," she declared. "If she is not a member of the U.N. we will have no way to enforce an arms ban." Communist China does not at present qualify as a U.N. member because she has aggressive troops in other countries," Mrs. Roosevelt asserted, "but the day she pulls her troops out and says she will be peaceful, we can do nothing but accept her into the U.N."

I would ask Mrs. Roosevelt: If Communist China is ideologically, economically, politically and technically dependent on the U.S.S.R., yet does not follow Khrushchev's advice, but puts obstacles in his way, how can a "two Chinas policy"—which has only a seat in the U.N. to offer—cause Communist China to become reconciled to the United States and to desire to enter the U.N.?

It is quite clear to me that this policy of two Chinas cannot be an inducement for Communist China, and that it will produce a great many troubles in Formosa and among the millions of oversea Chinese. On the surface this policy has the appearance of being an adequate solution, but in reality it cannot be.

Though the existence of Communist China is a fact, not a supposition, adopting a policy of two Chinas will not bring the right results: a policy which will not be accepted by the Chinese Communists, but which will produce bad reactions among the millions of Chinese overseas and in Formosa. Nor would it do any good to the U.S. or to international relations.

As a substitute for the two Chinas policy I propose that China should be reconstructed in accordance with the plan mentioned above.

Such a plan the United States may openly and frankly discuss with the U.S.S.R.

EXPANSIONISM

The expansionist policy of Communist China has caused Khrushchev much anxiety, and made him speak conciliatory words on the China-India border question. Khrushchev will strive to bring Communist China into line.

World peace is considerably dependent on the internal and foreign policies of Communist China. Khrushchev knows this. He knows also that the U.S.S.R. might gain its objectives in peace, and that it might lose all in war. In view of these facts, the American offer can be put before him with the assurance that the best policy for attaining peace and disarmament is the policy which will make China democratic in government and friendly toward all nations.

At the time this offer is being discussed, the United States can say: "We are desirous of peace among all nations. We have no inclination to injure China in any way. But, if we are to act in the interest of all nations and for the freedom of mankind, we cannot leave Formosa unprotected. We expect those who are now in control of Formosa to develop that land in accordance with the principles of democracy, and we will help them to do so. We welcome the cooperation of the Chinese people in this. Our future relationship with Formose will depend on the successful outcome of our offer."

As long as Communist China and the U.S.S.R. do not agree to such a plan, they attest that the Communist Party of China will adhere to its policy of Marxian procedures, dictatorship, violent expansion in south Asia, and world revolution. Then, knowing that Communist China will continue to be a threat, not just to Korea, India, South Vietnam, Laos, and Malaya, but to the entire world, the democratic nations will know what to expect, and will be prepared to deal with the eventualities.

As for one member of the Communist Party in China, Mao Tse-tung, he already has clearly declared his overwhelming ambition in a poem wherein he looked down on the Emperor Shih-Wang, who united China and abolished her feudal system. He evinces superiority also toward the Emperor Wu-Tih, of the Han dynasty, who extended China's territory to central Asia. Mao's ambition will not be stayed or circumvented by a policy of two Chinas. Nor can such a policy transform Communist China into a gentle and cooperative participant in the U.N. or in a disarmament conference.

Can Farmers Survive the Long Run?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

CAN FARMERS SURVIVE THE LONG RUN?

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who spoke here Tuesday, thinks everyone in the Nation should be concerned about the farmer's bad economic situation.

"While other segments of the economy are prosperous, the farmer is caught in a price-cost squeeze," he declared.

This much is discernible fact and we know of no one who would dispute Mr. Shuman's thesis thus far. But when he adds "this condition has been brought about largely by Government price support programs which have encouraged excessive crop production and brought on price depressing surpluses," he has edged into debate.

Moreover, when Mr. Shuman gets down to specifics and suggests that the wheat surplus problem can be solved by the Farm Bureau's proposal "that wheat allotments be discontinued and price supports lowered so feed quality wheat will drop to $1.30 to $1.35 a bushel," he is laying himself wide open. This, of course, is a borrowed line from Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who tried the same thing with corn last year.

What happened? The price of corn went down all right, and with it the price of hogs, although the latter was at the lower arc of the so-called hog cycle, anyway, and prices doubtless would have dropped somewhat without regard to corn allotments and supports. This cost spiral continued, of course, and the immediate result has been tightening of that price-cost squeeze which Mr. Shuman correctly thinks so dangerous.

Beyond that, the removal of corn acreage allotments created the greatest corn surplus in history.

It is understood that Mr. Shuman and Mr. Benson offer a counterargument that in the long run things will work themselves out. Supply and demand ultimately will do it, they theorize. The question is: How long is the long run and how ultimate is ultimately?

When Mr. Benson took command, 7 long-run years ago, Democratic handling of this problem was said to be scandalous. Farm surpluses were terrific. They are far more tremendous today.

Another scandal was said to be the amount of money the Democrats were spending on agriculture programs. Mr. Benson has spent and is spending much, much more.

A Democratic idea for curtailing surpluses, the soil bank, was called reckless. Mr. Benson adopted it and administered it in such a manner that the rich got richer, the poor poorer and the surpluses grew with expenditures.

Under the Democrats, farmers were reasonably prosperous and received a larger share of the national income than they do today. The price-cost squeeze before Benson was a mild pressure compared with today's situation.

A valid question, then, is whether the farmers can survive the longrun experiments of Mr. Benson and the ultimate theories of the Farm Bureau Federation which, each year, has fewer farmers to federate.

Fifty Years of Welfare Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on February 15, the Community Welfare Council of Milwaukee, Wis., will celebrate its 50th anniversary.

The commemorative activities will include a pageant depicting the council's history of promoting constructive welfare program for this outstanding community.

In these times, when all too often individuals, organizations, and communities look to Uncle Sam to resolve their problems, the creative, voluntary, and humanitarian efforts by individuals and organizations at the community level to brighten the outlook of individuals and families, who otherwise are often forgotten, are most welcome and commendable.

Throughout the country, there are, of course, differing ideas on just what kind of welfare programs should be adopted to care for our people.

Despite these differing philosophies, however, we recognize that there is a real need and that it must be met.

Organized in the winter of 1909–10, the Milwaukee welfare group has undergone extensive changes during its 50-year lifetime.

Despite the problems involved in such an evolution, however, the council has grown tremendously. Today it has 154 members, 60 of which raise their operating funds through the annual Community Chest campaign.

Constructive in its work, the council today is considered a major planning body for dealing with problems of health, welfare, and recreation in the community.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article entitled "50 Years of Welfare Work To Be Noted," outlining the constructive work of the council.

It reflects real humanitarian efforts at the community level to brighten the outlook for the less fortunate among us, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF WELFARE WORK TO BE NOTED

The Community Welfare Council will start celebrating its 50th anniversary February 15 at the Schroeder Hotel.

A musical pageant depicting highlights in the council's history will be presented. About 500 community leaders and welfare workers are expected to attend the luncheon meeting. Other anniversary events will be held throughout 1960.

It was in the winter of 1909–10 that Milwaukeeans organized the Central Council of Philanthropies with 46 member organizations to coordinate welfare activities. The late James K. Ilsley, president of the Marshall & Ilsley Bank, became the first president. The plans were based on recommendations of a survey made by Francis H. McLean, a social scientist with the Russell Sage Foundation, New York. The first federated fund drive, combining the financial appeals of several agencies, was held in 1916 with William C. White as chairman.

CHARTER MEMBERS INVITED

These men and others prominent in the early history will figure in the pageant, "A Half Century of Community Service." The original music for the show was written by Mrs. Marianne Graham, 1504 North Prospect Avenue, and the lyrics and script by Calhoun Cartwright, public relations director for the welfare council. Mrs. Lorrayne Kuban, 7343 Milwaukee Avenue, a lyric soprano, will sing, accompaning herself on her Irish harp. Mrs. Kuban appears frequently in concerts and directs the Wauwatosa Methodist Church choir. The narrator will be George Comte, general manager of WTMJ and WTMJ-TV, the Milwaukee Journal stations.

Special invitations to the meeting have gone to charter members. These include the heads of 33 organizations still operating and five living individual charter members. The latter are Edward T. Fairchild, Madison, retired chief justice of the Wisconsin supreme court; Mrs. George Lines, 2245 North Lake Drive; Attorney Erich C. Stern, 3332 North Shepard Avenue; Miss Marion G. Ogden, 2237 North Lake Drive, and John H. Leenhouts, 4853 North Cumberland Boulevard.

TWELVE AGENCIES CLOSED

Twelve agencies have closed their doors in the half century. These include the University Settlement, Wisconsin Consumers' League, Wisconsin Aid Society for the Blind, Infants Fresh Air Pavilion, Milwaukee Society of Sanitary and Moral Education, Milwaukee Society for Care of the Sick, Federation of Civic Societies, Milwaukee Maternity Hospital, Sanitary and Benevolent Society, Mission Kindergarten, Provident Loan Association and Chamber of Commerce (a grain exchange).

TWO COMBINED IN 1949

Several name changes have attended the growth of the original Central Council of Philanthropies. It was known in the thirties as the Council of Social Agencies and the fundraising drive was a separate organization known as the Milwaukee County Community Fund.

In 1949, the two were combined into the Community Welfare Council of Milwaukee County. Last year, the name was changed

to the Greater Milwaukee Community Welfare Council.

The council today has 154 member agencies, 60 of which raise their operating funds through the annual Community Chest campaign. The council is the area's major planning body for problems of health, welfare, and recreation.

Secretary Mitchell Charts a Blueprint for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, members of the Paterson (N.J.) Rotary Club and their friends will long remember a remarkable address delivered at a special luncheon of the club last Thursday, at Paterson's Alexander Hamilton Hotel, by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. The Paterson Evening News, which carried the full content of the Secretary's address, also ran the following lead editorial, captioned "Secretary Mitchell Charts a Blueprint for America":

SECRETARY MITCHELL CHARTS A BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICA

What lies ahead for America in the 10 explosive years to come?

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, Jerseyman in President Eisenhower's Cabinet, laid it on the line for some 400 members of Paterson Rotary and their friends yesterday.

Tremendous opportunity, burgeoning population, expansive job opportunities and allied accruals.

But there must be teamwork among Americans, the Secretary told an intensively interested audience. Capital and labor, working together, should strive for the profits in their own ways, but always with an eye to the most important third party, the American public.

At every conference table, when a Mr. Blough, head of United States Steel, and a Mr. MacDonald, head of the Steelworkers Union, sit down together, there must be a third chair, the Secretary warned. This is the seat for the public, which gives them their powers and finding itself abused, can just as easily strip them of it.

There is no easy way to achievement, Mr. Mitchell warned Americans. Beating a path to Washington is not the answer, because there must be initiative on the home front lest in relying on the national capital, the great source of the country's strength be dried up.

The Federal Government must at the same time take a hand in the next 10 years in advancing the Nation's progress. There must be greater opportunity for education, for instance, to meet the impact of the millions of young folks who will seek higher education and who will be born of the tremendous birthrate of the early forties.

Millions will want to go to schools for higher education, he said, and opportunity must be provided for them. Other millions should be converted into skilled labor, efficient technicians and the like. For these, too, there must be ample training facilities if this country is to maintain the pace of competition with the world.

Secretary Mitchell could not have been aware of past discussions of a Passaic county vocational school when he spoke, and yet his pointed remarks on the subject of expanded opportunity for crafts training were thoroughly applicable locally.

There has been discussion for several years of such vocational facilities on a county basis, and indeed, in the light of Forward Paterson's executive council espousal of a regional mayors' organization, it would seem this would be an ideal subject for the municipal chief executives' later consideration.

Secretary Mitchell's exposition of the national scene was a scholarly presentation, given without forensics and without emotion but solid and portentous. It was an effective blueprint for the Nation.

Will capital and labor, will the public, pay heed? Time will tell, but the clock runs fast.

Incidentally, Paterson Rotary Club has been performing a fine public function in recent months in its presentation of leading figures on the local, State, and National scene at its weekly meetings.

As a result, the club has come to be a forum for information on a variety of subjects which have been both edifying and enlightening, and for this, its officers merit a public bow of appreciation.

President Albert M. Reilly and Program Chairman Dr. Earl M. Warren have been rendering a public service in this programing, in which Secretary Mitchell's appearance is but one facet of a brilliant constellation.

Resolutions of Certain Organizations in State of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions which have come to me.

One resolution is from the Sumner County Farmers Union of my State and relates to the restoration of the barter provision to Public Law 480.

The other resolution is from the Saline County Medical Society of Salina, Kans., relative to the Forand bill, H.R. 4700.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMNER COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Wellington, Kans., February 5, 1960.

Hon. Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Whereas we need to use every means we can to get food to less fortunate people, and the people wishing to pay in some way for the food, we believe it will be a great help to be able to trade our food for their products, in cases that do not disturb our industry and economy;

Whereas we believe that a program of exchange where possible, will build better relationships and good will as well as securing some materials which we do not have: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask you to do what you can to have the barter provision, again, be made a part of Public Law 480; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman BREEDING, Senators SCHOEPPEL and CARLSON.

The foregoing resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of members attending our Sumner County Farmers Union quarterly convention at Wellington, Kans., on February 1, 1960.

A. M. WEBER, *Vice President.*
Mrs. VELMA HOLLINGSWORTH,
Secretary.
WELLINGTON, SUMNER COUNTY, KANS.

SALINE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Salina, Kans.

RESOLUTION OF SALINE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

At a meeting of the Saline County Medical Society January 28, 1960, the society voted unanimously to oppose the Forand bill. The reasons for this opposition are as follows:

1. This bill is basically a step toward the socialization of medicine and with greater Government control with the subsequent loss of free individual enterprise, the practice of medicine with its now high standards would soon degenerate to an alarming degree.

2. There would be an increase in the social security taxes within the near future to as much as 10 percent.

3. That by recent survey, it was found that individuals over 65, by and large, are able to handle their medical bills adequately.

4. Because of voluntary commercial insurance plans can do a better job at less cost.

The medical society feels that this is part of a plan to expand the socialization of our economy by piecemeal absorption of individual responsibility.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for almost a century dedicated public spirited men have devoted themselves to the collecting of material relating to the great American patriots, North and South, who participated in the fratricidal conflict of the sixties which divided our country and yet, in some mystical manner, has become the one common experience which unites and makes us a greater and stronger Nation.

Foremost among these collectors have been the devotees of Lincolniana who, by assembling and by making available for future generations every outstanding book or pamphlet relating to the life and times of our 16th President, have made the great writings of Carl Sandburg, Allan Nevins, and Bruce Catton, among others, possible. One of the leading collectors of our generation is Carl Haverlin of New York and California, who for more than 35 years has devoted his leisure time and, indeed, many of his active business hours as president of Broadcast Music, Inc., to this worthwhile pursuit. Because of his labors of love, the task of many of our contemporary scholars has been made immeasurably easier. Many of the great books currently being read by students and scholars pay tribute to his collection and his counsel based on his lifetime of study of the American past. He has been most generous in making gifts of rare books and manuscripts to

many of our great libraries and museums.

He is more than a collector. He is also a scholar, and a few days ago it was my pleasure to hear him deliver an inspiring address before the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia. This remarkable talk deserves a wider audience. Its message should be directed to the American people and to the world. Because I know the Members of the House would like to hear this great tribute to a noble American who once served in this body, I now bring the address before it:

THE LAST BEST HOPE OF EARTH

(An address delivered before the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia in the Library of Congress by Carl Haverlin, honorary member, Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission)

This is the first time I have ever had the courage to say anything in public about Abraham Lincoln. The very real distress my acceptance of this invitation has caused me makes it likely that this will also be my farewell address about him.

If one merely restates or reshapes that which has already been well said about him by others, it were far better that the others should speak for themselves—or have that well read which has been well written about him. So many men of ability, some of whom are in this room—Roy Basler, Lloyd Dunlap, David C. Mearns, C. Percy Powell, Ralph Newman and your president, Fred Schwengel, to name but six—have said so much about Mr. Lincoln and said it so well that a man of conscience must hesitate between poaching on their preserves or venturing to shoot upon his own and thus risk bringing down lesser game or none at all.

Fully conscious of this though I was, the invitation came from one for whom I have such affection and respect that I was impelled to undertake that which I should not. So tonight I feel as though I had in a moment of regrettable audacity agreed to duplicate the feat of Blondin and cross Niagara on a tightrope bearing Mr. Lincoln on my back. Disturbed though I am for my own safety, I am more worried about the well being of my passenger. After all his agreement to participate in this trick was neither requested nor secured.

Here and now I find myself on the brink, and between me and the other bank stretches a tightrope some 20-odd minutes which I must cross. For Blondin's pole I have this script. With it I hope to avoid the gulf of unconscious plagiarism on the one side and the abyss of a complete loss of memory on the other.

Instead of the address that I will deliver tonight, I should have preferred to talk about collecting Lincolniana and to speak, with such modesty as a collector may summon up, about some rarities I have acquired recently, or to have told you that we might now fill in a few gaps in the great Lincoln Day by Day Books as a result of some meager gleanings of my own research.

However, I was impelled to choose a more sober subject tonight because some of the things that are troubling the world are diametrically opposed to the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln as I understand it.

He would have been outraged by the shocking outbreak of anti-Semitism and its attendant desecration of houses of worship and violations of the resting places of the dead; the continuing depressed status of millions of our fellow citizens who are Negroes in all of the 50 States and the raising of religious issues in politics. These outward indications of intolerance are the ingredients of a veritable hell brew that we must not let reach a point of critical mass. If we in the United States and all good men everywhere will only adopt the 52-word plan I shall propose tonight, these midnight terrors will vanish.

Too many, and I fear myself among them, presumed in the beginning that Hitler, that vicious little demon, and his dwarfish crew were but the outward indications of a mild case of German athlete's foot. Too late we found them to be leprous and infectious. The world still bears the scars of their dreadful affliction. Whether the current acts of antiracism that trouble me are the sporadic work of delinquents, juvenile or adult, or of a cunning centrally directed cell of vandals, is beside the point. We cannot afford to consider such outbreaks as only night-riding nits of know-nothingism that may be combed out at will from the beard of Uncle Sam. From past history we know they could be the forerunners of Armageddon.

We and our allies are involved in a titanic struggle. It is of such a dimension and complexity as to baffle career diplomats and to defy complete understanding by the layman. It is, in essence, a contest of ideas waged between communism and democracy, with the announced ultimate prize the entire human race.

It is inevitable that I am led back to Lincoln's house divided speech, as so many have been before me, and to wonder whether a world so divided can continue to live half slave and half free. It is the contention of the free world that the world will not fall, that it will not become entirely communistic and that freedom will prevail.

In this battle for sheer survival, the ideas of Abraham Lincoln and the power that has been generated by what he was, what he accomplished and what he stood for are, in my opinion, among the most potent weapons that the free world can wield. Since so many of the globe's inhabitants being fought for by these mighty forces are have-nots, the figure of Abraham Lincoln gains added strength because of his own insignificant beginnings, and his lifelong dedication to the dignity of man. Wherever one looks, whether at home or abroad, there are many examples of his imprint today, after all these years, upon men and women of all countries and in all walks of life.

In 1958 World Brotherhood conducted an international essay contest, "What World Brotherhood Means to Me." There were four winners—a young Mexican woman, a Burmese housewife, a captain in the Danish Army and a police corporal from Ghana. The young people were brought to the United States to receive their awards. In Washington, in February, they were taken to the Lincoln Memorial. The Ghanaian, 23-year-old Assibi Abudu of Accra, walked up the steps and, turning his back on the text of the Gettysburg Address, recited it from memory, flawlessly, and with evident emotion.

My own racial and national heritage is such that I believe, with Abraham Lincoln, that this Union of States which he fought to maintain and to restore, is indeed the last best hope of earth. Because of his race and his nationality, Mr. Abudu may very well look back across these many intervening years and think of Mr. Lincoln as the first great hope of Ghana. He will remember that the thrust of the message to the Congress of December 1862 was directed at emancipation for the Negro—graduated emancipation, it is true, and with a final deadline 37 years off in 1900—but freedom nevertheless. In all logic this young man from Ghana and his fellow countrymen may attribute the recent creation of their own new nation in considerable part to the extinction of slavery here. It is idle to speculate as to the details of world freedom had the Civil War ended differently or had someone other than Lincoln been President or had he not been a man of such adamantine conviction and utter patience. But none, I think, will deny that the course of freedom would have been retarded had its flame been snuffed out here and that today we would have a different and less favorable national image abroad. How long freedom would have been delayed and the exact difference in the face our Nation shows the world I must leave to those qualified in the nuance and complexities of historical extrapolation.

But, for myself, I am sure that in the balances of men's minds—whether they be men of Ghana and black, or men of India and brown, or men of China and, as they say, yellow, or whether pigmented like ourselves and thus in a world sense in the minority—the existence in our past of Abraham Lincoln and the body of people who supported him weighs in those balances more heavily in our national interest than we can realize.

It would be wrong of me to attempt further development of such a point beyond the obvious. Men like Gerald McMurtry, Paul Angle, Justin Turner, all Lincoln scholars of note, have made recent journeys abroad and can and will, I am sure, speak fore authoritatively in this regard. But so that you might not think that I have emptily conjured up this concept of Mr. Lincoln as a substantial bulwark of our national defense, I asked for some telegrams from the travelers:

George McMurtry: "The people of southeastern Asia know Abraham Lincoln because of his Gettysburg Address. The 'Government of, by, and for the people' is a ringing challenge to them today. Asia still looks to America as the last best hope of earth, and Lincoln is the most salable product any nation has to offer in the great world struggle to capture the minds of men."

Paul M. Angle: "The democratic government which Japan now enjoys is not deeply rooted in the nation's tradition. Many Japanese recognize the need to know more about democracy, and believe that they can best meet this need through the study of Lincoln's life. Thus his example is a significant force in the new Japan."

Justin G. Turner: "Foreign travel enables one to appreciate the world influence of Lincoln. To the illiterate and downtrodden masses of north Africa, Lincoln represents a hope for a better future. In Israel, where Lincoln's ideals are cherished, lectures will be presented by American scholars and historians. In England, reverence for Lincoln has been a factor in adding American history courses to the college curriculum. Lincoln continues to increase in world stature as a symbol of freedom to those peoples whose economic and educational standards must be improved if we are to enjoy peace and security. I should perhaps tell you that Mr. Abudu is now a student at Hampton Institute."

After I had written about him that which I have read to you tonight, I had some qualms in ascribing to him those thoughts and convictions. I will also admit to a certain uneasiness because of the impulses and assumptions I have attached to Mr. Lincoln tonight. I can only say that I have arrived at these after serious and careful deliberation and that on sober reflection they do not outrage any facts I know about him. I could not ask Mr. Lincoln if I had dealt fairly with him. But I could and did telephone to Mr. Abudu. I was pleased to learn that I had not strayed too far from his opinions about Lincoln. Further, I was delighted to have him tell me that although there was no formal instruction in Ghana about the specific contribution of Lincoln to their nationality, it was, as he phrased it,

nevertheless a more or less universal concept there.

If without academic direction this is true in Ghana, I think I take not too great a leap to assume that elsewhere in the world the good that Lincoln did lives on and that he thus serves us still.

He served us well on the 12th of February of last year when dignitaries from many nations went to Springfield, Ill., to attend the dinner given by the Illinois Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. I would like to read a telegram from Clyde Walton, Illinois State Historian:

"Twenty-one foreign countries including 10 ambassadors represented at February 12 Lincoln Sesquicentennial dinner at Springfield. Principal speaker Mayor Willy Brandt of West Berlin. Other speakers, Ambassadors Sir Harold Caccia, Great Britain; Herve Alphand, France; and Ernest Bonhomme, Haiti."

And by the way, representatives of 67 nations, including Iron Curtain countries, were on the floor of the House at the joint session of Congress February 11 when Mr. Sandburg delivered his notable address.

Although no Iron Curtain nation was represented at the Springfield dinner, when Mr. Khrushchev came to the United States, he paid his tribute to Abraham Lincoln, and further Soviet interest is apparent in the publication of Lincoln's speeches in Russian.

Most of us remember the dramatic confrontation of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Lincoln at the Lincoln Memorial that was suggested to the White House by Congressman SCHWENGEL and which was recorded by Life magazine in an unforgettable photograph. Who of us can evaluate, fully, the effect that long look of consideration had upon the mind of the chief of state of a great nation with a polarity the reverse of ours, with objectives antagonistic to ours and whose physical challenge to our continued existence absorbs more than half of our national budget and occupies not only our waking moments but those of the world at large?

He stared at the heroic statue without speaking for some time. He did not or would not hear the photographers who pleaded with him to turn around, according to eyewitness reports. Then he asked for translations of the graven utterances around him. It is unavoidable to presume that some of the personal greatness of Lincoln and his words and deeds were there and then added to the sum total of the image of this country that Khrushchev was building for himself.

Elsewhere our visitor saw examples of our enormous physical strength and our great economic well-being. At the memorial he saw majestic evidence of our recognition of the emotional and spiritual qualities of the man who gave freedom a new birth and who pleaded in the closing day of a great domestic war not only for a just and lasting peace among ourselves, but with all nations.

It would be as abhorent to me, as it would be to you, to suggest that Lincoln foresaw these troubled times in any mystic sense of prescience. But I will propose to you that had he, by any means, had such foresight he could not have conducted the affairs of his office more accurately, nor spoken more purposefully for our present good. Again and again he related, with brilliance, our domestic problems to the international scene. Time after time he directed our foreign relations, or exerted a restraining influence on others involved in them, in such a way as to earn our plaudits for his wisdom and foresight.

Consider the full closing paragraph of his message to the Congress in 1862. All too many remember it only for the literary excellence or emotional content of a few phrases:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it."

This audience needs no assurance that he did not invoke the world in the manner of the head of a household ashamedly warning that the neighbors would hear of the family quarrel. Rather, I think, as I assume you do, he said "world" for a far more noble purpose. He knew that in his household was a plague of a most virulent kind and that its germs were blowing abroad. He believed that if the plague could be contained, curbed, and eventually cured at home, then the plague of slavery, throughout the world, in all its manifestations—whether the bondage of men's bodies or their minds—would be replaced by freedom.

Certainly the rest of the paragraph needs no further gloss of mine to prove that he spoke not only for that day and to a narrow and insular purpose, but for all men, everywhere to hear, and for all time to come.

"We, even we here, hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly lose the last best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless."

I need do no more than remind you that Lincoln's concern with liberty and the world as a whole and of our place in it was of long standing. You may trace it through much of his life. In the fifth debate with Douglas at Galesburg, he quotes Henry Clay to the effect that "those who would repress all tendencies to liberty * * * must blot out the moral lights around us—they must penetrate the human soul and eradicate the light of reason and the love of liberty." In the Gettysburg Address he again casts his vision beyond the battlefield, past our continental limits to the farthest shores—it was the world, he thought, that would not remember. In considering his unwavering determination to accomplish his ends and the incredible patience and courage he displayed, I have sometimes thought that his awareness of the importance to mankind as a whole of what he was about might have been an unknown and secret emotional anchor to the windward.

While I do not mean to suggest that patriotism alone would not have sustained him, it is, I believe, admissible to think that the more universal view I ascribe to him was in some ways, at least, an added buttress to his adversities. That he did not delineate a definitive belief in the brotherhood and parliament of man is understandable when we consider the strong nationalistic currents that were flowing then. Indeed they still flow, and strongly. But in our generation most of us have been forced to accept the concept of one world as a concomitant to the one common fate that threatens its extinction. Most of us are really concerned now, and not wholly for selfish reasons, with the problems and the well being of men, women, and children everywhere. Some of our attitude, if not of the world as a whole, must be traced to Lincoln's general benevolence—for just as a man is, in great degree, the sum total of his progenitors, so a people is moulded by its past.

In these difficult times when, as Omar said, a hair perhaps divides the false and true and a split second may decide the fate of mankind, this all-pervading aura of Abraham Lincoln may hold, or may yet tip, the scales in our favor.

Many of us keep casting constant trial balances in regard to the Russians. We give them debit marks for the things they do that displease us or frighten us, but automatically add credit marks for the things about them that we look upon with favor. Instinctively I find myself trying to balance Mr. Khrushchev's barks and scowls and threats with memories of Russian music that I have heard and loved; I shudder at the cruelty of his slave labor and automatically try to redress with memories of the plays of Andryev or Chekhov. I think I know the truth about communism and I take it to be a real threat to all that I hold dear. The reason I think I know the truth about it is that I live in a free country and I have a mind as free as I myself wish it to be. Newspapers, radio, television, books, magazines, the reports of the Secretary of State and other Cabinet officers, the Presidential press conference, and the give and take of congressional debate make it possible for me to know the truth if I choose to read and listen and inform myself—and, from among the varying shades of opinion and emphasis available to a free man, to make up my mind for myself.

Russia is eager to export its composers, ballets and artists so that we will think better of them than their stern political visage alone would let us think. Believing, in turn, that they do not allow their people to know the full truth about us, we are equally eager that our composers and artists should go there to offset the unfavorable propaganda they give our system.

In this continuing and seemingly endless war being fought in the main so far, due to the mercy of providence, only in the minds of men and for the domination of the minds of men, it is my firm conviction that the living memory of Lincoln has played a powerful role.

I want to thank all those who, in the sesquicentennial year which will close on February 12, have labored so assiduously not only to memorialize Abraham Lincoln here, but to send his image abroad refreshed and revitalized by the attention his own people have given him. Only the completely chauvinistic would deny that if Lincoln were alive today, he would amplify his message of 1862 and term all nations in all continents as the last best hope of earth—if they but subscribed to one simple doctrine—perhaps the fairest ever penned—freedom and liberty for all.

In 1948 our American contribution toward world peace—the Marshall plan—electrified the world. In signing it on April 3 of that year, President Truman said, "This is the answer to the challenge facing the free world." In Washington on that very same day, General Eisenhower, in praising the Marshall plan before the Senate Armed Services Committee, said: "The United States cannot live as an island of democracy surrounded by a sea of dictatorship."

I suggest that in 1960 we announce a new American plan—the Lincoln plan. The plan itself, in the words of Mr. Lincoln, would be that all mankind and all nations should conduct themselves "with malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right," to "strive on to finish the work we are in; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

It is my suggestion to the Congress and to the people, yes, to use Carl Sandburg's immortal phrase, that although the money we vote and supply for the plans and projects of nations around the globe is highly meritorious and, needless to say, should be continued, the addition of the Lincoln plan would round out the circle. Any nation of wealth can finance the Aswan Dam, but only we can export in unlimited supply the great

good will, the commonsense, the dedication to his fellow man, the superb sense of justice, the quality of mercy and the universal understanding of Abraham Lincoln.

In a letter dated February 14, 1860, explaining a paragraph in the House divided speech which had been challenged, he wrote: "That is the whole paragraph; and it puzzles me to make my meaning plainer. Look over it carefully, and conclude I meant all I said and did not mean anything I did not say, and you will have my meaning."

Lincoln was assuring his correspondents, and those of us who will hear him, that he thought before he spoke or wrote. To him his words were weapons in his battles for the Union, before and after the outbreak of the war. He thought with the exquisite precision of a great advocate.

We, the people of the United States, and our leaders and the leaders of all nations on both sides of the curtain and all people in all countries must, to the best of our ability, think and speak with the precision of an advocate; because in Lincoln's own words again, "In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and in eternity. * * * The dogmas of the quiet past, are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise—with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." And if Lincoln were alive today, I am sure he would highly approve the addition of three more words—"and the world."

JANUARY 21, 1960.

Shipping Policy of U.S. Government Agencies and the Arab Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, Febraury 9, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Arab boycott of American flagships, which the U.S. Navy and MATS in effect are supporting by a provision in their contracts covering chartered oil tankers, is also being supported in similar fashion by the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with U.S. vessels carrying dry cargoes. These are U.S. Government sponsored cargoes of surplus foods under Public Law 480, on which the United States pays the ocean freight. In charter contracts for such shipments to Arab countries the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation prohibit the U.S. freighters from calling at Israeli ports and transshipping any part of its cargo. They require the vessel to state in order to qualify for such charters, that it "has not traded to Israeli ports."

The Navy's tactic acquiescence in the Arab boycott has been the subject of previous remarks by me on the Senate floor, and I shall continue to insist that any support by any branch of our Government of the illegal Arab boycott is inexcusable. The United States has always insisted on freedom of the seas and we, therefore, should not condone this kind of interference with American shipping. There can be no compromise with expediency in an action which violates our policy as well as the Charter of the United Nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report, based on documents provided by the American Jewish Congress, entitled "Two Other U.S. Units Aid Arab Boycott," by Edward A. Morrow, which was published in the New York Times, February 4.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO OTHER U.S. UNITS AID ARAB BOYCOTT—AGRICULTURE AGENCIES JOIN NAVY IN CURBING SHIPS TRADING WITH ISRAEL

(By Edward A. Morrow)

Three U.S. Government agencies are acting as policemen for an Arab boycott of American vessels trading with Israel, shipping industry spokesman said yesterday.

The Navy Department, which was recently criticized for tacitly supporting Arab policy through its tanker charter provisions, has been joined by the Agriculture Department and the Commodity Credit Corporation. These agencies are pursuing a similar policy affecting American dry-cargo vessels.

In chartering ships the Navy has for 2 years almost foreclosed bids by tanker owners whose ships have traded with Israel. This was done by stipulating that owners who may be refused accommodations at Arab ports as a result of the boycott will be responsible for any penalities resulting from delays caused by such refusals.

CONTRACTS ARE SPECIFIC

In the case of dry-cargo ships the U.S. position is more explicit. Charter contracts covering the transportation of Government-sponsored cargoes to the United Arab Republic state:

"Vessel is prohibited from calling at Israeli waters or ports. Transshipment is prohibited. Vessel has not traded to Israeli ports."

Ira Guilden, chairman of the committee of international affairs for the American Jewish Congress, said that most of the affected shipments were made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Sales of surplus commodities are made to friendly nations against payment in local currency.

This involves sales of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks authorized by the Agriculture Department.

Under a recent sales agreement with the United Arab Republic, for instance, one-half the proceeds in local currency will be available to Syria for investment and development, one quarter for United States investment there and the remainder subject to negotiation.

"In effect," one shipowner commented, "one can say the Arabs are looking a U.S. gift horse in the mouth by telling us how it should be wrapped and delivered."

Under the last half the Government-sponsored red cargoes must be carried in American-flag ships. A spokesman for the Commodity Credit Corporation reported yesterday that the freight charges for such shipping to the United Arab Republic amounted to $4,549,622.

The International Transport Workers Union reported yesterday that Finnish maritime workers had announced direct action against United Arab Republic ships because of the boycott's effects on some Finnish-flag vessels. The Finns said they would refuse to handle any ship flying the Arab Republic flag that docks in Finland.

INCE TOFT TO SAIL

CAIRO, February 3.—The owners of the freighter *Inge Toft*, which has been held at Port Said since May 21, have decided to discharge her cargo and sail, it was announced tonight. The United Arab Republic has seized the cargo.

The ship is owned by a Danish company but is under charter to the United Mediterranean Agencies of New York. The United Arab Republic contends that the latter is controlled by Zim, the Israeli shipping line.

The ship's agents in Port Said received a telegram today from the owners instructing them to unload.

The unloading of the cargo of cement, potash, beer, brass, and leather has already started and the ship is expected to sail tomorrow. Most of her cargo was loaded in Israel, and was destined for Japan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines.

The cargo was confiscated as a prize of war. According to authorities here, the proceeds will be turned over to Palestinian Arab refugees.

When United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold saw President Gamal Abdel Nasser January 21, the President told him the *Inge Toft* would not be allowed to sail unless she unloaded, that Cairo would continue to prevent Israeli ships and cargoes from passing through the Suez Canal. He said he considered this question part of the whole Palestine question, which must be settled before Israeli ships could use the canal.

ISRAEL AID COMMENTS

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, February 3.—An Israeli Foreign Ministry spokesman said the Danish owners of the *Inge Toft* had ordered the ship to discharge her cargo and sail because her condition had deteriorated as a result of the long anchorage.

The charterers have been paying an amount estimated at $1,000 a day for upkeep of the vessel.

A Greek ship, the *Astypalea*, remains in Port Said. She carried Israeli cement for east Africa, and her captain refuses to permit the Arab authorities to impound the cargo.

Some Recommendations for Long-Range Foreign Policy Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, citizens of five communities have united to engage in serious discussion of foreign policy.

Their organization—the Stamford (Conn.) Forum for World Affairs—includes among its participants some of the most distinguished citizens of this country, as well as outstanding authorities in the field of foreign policy.

Recently, the forum completed an educational project which included publication of a booklet entitled "Some Recommendations for Long-Range Foreign Policy Planning."

I regard these recommendations as so important that I would like to introduce them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress can become familiar with them.

Here are excerpts from the forum's booklet:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LONG-RANGE FOREIGN POLICY PLANNING

Convinced of the need to emphasize longer range considerations in planning the foreign policy of the United States, the Stamford Forum for World Affairs, aided particularly by the advisory committee, the resources committee and the board of directors and after consultations with outstanding experts in foreign policy, respectfully asks consideration of the following broad recommendations:

I. To insure more effective representation overseas, we recommend:

(A) That Congress appropriate sufficient money for the operation of all U.S. embassies so that career diplomats or others eminently qualified may fill all ambassadorial posts without need of private fortunes.

(B) That Congress appropriate on a long-term basis so that recently improved practices for inservice training among Foreign Service personnel may be further extended and a long-range program developed to attract and to hold outstanding young persons in a State Department career.

II. Recognizing that we may not have used economic assistance as effectively as we might have, either as a weapon in the cold war or as an instrument in building a peaceful world, we recommend:

(A) That economic assistance be planned, and financial appropriations be made where necessary, on a long-range basis.

(B) That long-term, low-interest loans be made more readily available, particularly for the benefit of underdeveloped countries.

(C) That for economic and technical assistance, more use be made of international organizations such as the U.N.-specialized agencies.

(D) That U.S. Government personnel administering economic assistance programs be, insofar as possible, career personnel with high standards of inservice training and specialized experience.

(E) That in both the planning and operation of economic assistance programs, full advantage be taken of eminently qualified technical consultants from universities, foundations, industry, and labor.

(F) That proper incentives be devised to stimulate increased participation of private groups, including business and foundations, in economic programs of value to the free world.

III. Recognizing that de facto recognition of foreign governments has been our policy during much of our Nation's history, although a de jure policy has sometimes been used to express disapproval of certain governments, we recommend:

That our recognition policy be realistic. It should be made clear to our citizens that recognition does not necessarily denote approval of a government but is based on the belief that important benefits will be derived by our Nation and our people.

IV. Besides bilateral recognition policy there are also important questions concerning membership in the United Nations. In this regard, we recommend:

That in view of recent developments such as the possibility of a worldwide atomic test monitoring system on the one hand and the Tibetan experience on the other, the advantages and disadvantages of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations be thoroughly explored to chart a course of action of maximum value to the continued survival of the free world.

V. To insure a more valid American image overseas and to offset propaganda directed against us as well as certain inaccurate impressions emanating from our own country, we recommend:

That the Department of State be encouraged to stimulate and coordinate public and private resources in the most effective program possible for informing our allies, those who oppose us and the neutral nations so as to bring a more real focus on our national life and on our objectives for the future in a world changing its ways with revolutionary rapidity.

VI. Secretary of State Herter on May 7, 1959, told the American people:

"Foreign policy is not an obscure art for a few specialists. It is of importance to all of us. Therefore, it must be of interest to all of us. Our foreign policy, to be successful, requires your continuing understanding and support."

To this end, we urge that newspapers, magazines, radio and television provide increased opportunity for citizen understanding by offering more information about world affairs. We also recommend that for increased citizen interest, understanding and support, the leaders in the Department of State be encouraged:

(A) To offer more frequent and better delineated statements of policy to the American people.

(B) To use the fullest candor limited only by minimum requirements of national security so that the American people are confident that they have a maximum of significant facts, be they favorable or unfavorable to the continued survival of the free world.

Arbitrary Residency Requirement for Relief Recipients

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the issues raised by proposed State laws requiring minimum periods of residence for relief payments transcend State boundaries because they touch on one of the aspects of our national policy of freedom of movement. In a nation like ours, the criterion for relief should be need. Statistics show that only 2 percent of the 500,000 recipients of public assistance in New York State have been residents for less than 1 year. Strict administration to guard against frauds and cheats is vital—and measures required to assure this are essential—but our concern for every really needy citizen has always made for the freedom of everyone of us. The Community Council of Greater New York has opposed legislation for any arbitrary 1-year rule, and its chairman, Carl M. Loeb, Jr., has waged a long fight against it. He has ably summed up the issues in a letter to the New York Times on January 27. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESIDENCE BILL OPPOSED—RESTRICTION ON GRANTS OF WELFARE ASSISTANCE CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York State Legislature will shortly be called upon to consider the Cooke-Volker bill which asks for 1-year State residence as a requirement for receiving State public welfare assistance. Such proposals have been put to the legislature before and have been defeated. The present bill well deserves the same fate.

The misguided thinking behind such proposals assumes three notions: migrants come here because they want to cash in on easy relief; migrant, whether from the South or from Puerto Rico, are a liability to the community; residency laws will keep them out.

How wrong can some of our upstate legislators and others be?

People come to New York not for public assistance, but for better jobs, better housing, to be with relatives, etc.—the very same reasons that brought in the forebears of our advocates of State residency.

New York has always benefited from the arrival of these newcomers. Labor officials say, for example, that the $5 billion garment industry would have left New York had it not been for the influx of Puerto Ricans. The hotel business, the restaurants, and many factories depend utterly on Puerto Rican and Negro workers. In short, our recent migrants are an asset, not a liability.

Trying to keep newcomers from a State through residence laws simply doesn't work. People seeking the opportunity for a new life are seldom deterred this way. To cite an example, California, with severe residence requirements, has a much higher inmigration than has New York State.

Finally, if the advocates of residency were frank, they might concede that it was prejudice against the newcomer which motivates their attempts and not economy at all. For there is evidence enough to show that putting welfare on a local basis rather than the traditional State basis would be far more costly to the public.

The Cooke-Volker bill should be defeated. Legislation which has the effect of making a target of Puerto Ricans and Negroes must not be countenanced in New York State.

CARL M. LOEB, Jr.,
Community Council of Greater New York.

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1960.*

The Impact of Our Foreign-Aid Giveaway Program on the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past 12 years the debate over the so-called foreign-aid program has received a lot of attention in the Congress. The debate at the outset of this program was rather one sided. Scarcely more than 60 Members of the House voted against it—when it was called the Marshall plan. Each year, however, the number of Members voting "no" has increased.

Perhaps no appropriation of tax dollars by the Congress has ever received as much favorable publicity from business interests, newspapers, radio, and TV commentators as has this measure. This, of course, has been called a bipartisan issue—the proponents of this spending always point out that only those who oppose it—are steeped in provincialism and are generally reactionary to the needs of the times.

Many of us who have always opposed this foreign-aid program are frequently

referred to as "uninformed and out of step with modern worldwide conditions." When some of us say we are opposed to it as being unconstitutional because it does not come within the so-called catch-all welfare clause of the Constitution we are quickly told the Constitution must be highly flexible in matters of this kind in order to keep pace with a fast-moving world.

Throughout the years, however, there have been groups and individuals with clear visions who have pointed out the road we travel and the dangers thereon, but their voices have generally not been able to stop these appropriations for foreign aid, but have only been able to cut the amount.

Recently it was called to my attention a most forthright statement in regard to foreign aid. I commend this address delivered by Mr. Walter Harnischfeger, of Milwaukee, Wis., chairman, Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, at Institute of U.S. Foreign Aid, Marquette University, Milwaukee, December 11–12, 1959:

THE IMPACT OF OUR FOREIGN AID GIVEAWAY PROGRAM ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Father O'Donnell, Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, permit me to offer my heartfelt congratulations to Marquette University for arranging this auspicious Foreign Aid Conference. As a native of Milwaukee and as board chairman of a 75-year-old manufacturing corporation whose products go to the far corners of the world from Milwaukee and subsidiary plants to play an important role in the progress and development of many foreign countries, I am gratified to share in our community's contribution to the study of this vital subject.

This is a most timely gathering. In less than 4 weeks the Congress will be engaged in its perennial controversy over foreign aid, a program which already has cost the American taxpayer more than $80 billion, not including American generosity, both Government and non-Government, in countless other forms for generations.

In January of this year, the White House requested another staggering foreign aid appropriation of $3.9 billion, an amount approximating its usual annual requests for the giveaway program since the Marshall plan was instituted as a temporary help-Europe device soon after World War II. The $3.9 billion was cut by an aroused Congress to $3.2 billion after the greatest fight in foreign aid history. Because of a country-wide taxpayer's revolt, the President avoided sending to Congress an additional $400 million request made by the Draper committee.

In January of 1960, Congress will assemble in a vastly different and improved atmosphere. There have been numerous developments during recent weeks which pfove conclusively that there has been a tremendous breakthrough in national thinking concerning the perpetuation of the giveaway program in its present form.

1. On September 28, both President Eisenhower and Secretary of the Treasury Anderson told the annual meeting of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Finance Corporation in Washington that other industrialized countries must help bear the foreign aid burden and must end their discrimination against imports of American goods.

2. A "Buy American" policy has been adopted in the administration of the Development Loan Fund.

3. The Director of the Budget, Maurice Stans, disclosed that Government spending was gaining a momentum threatening to wreck our economy, with our present public debt and future commitments now reaching the almost incredible total of about $750 billion—three-fourths of $1 trillion—apart from annual operating expenses.

The Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, of which I have the honor to be national chairman, is dedicated to a program of arousing the American people to the peril of continued foreign aid. As the only national organization devoted exclusively to opposing this program, we made numerous appearances before Senate and House committees earlier this year. Formed as recently as last March, our committee is conducting an action campaign for the end of the foreign aid program in 3 years.

Our committee speaks from a wealth of experience. Various of our members have devoted a lifetime to successful foreign trade and foreign business activities—men like Sterling Morton, of Morton Salt Co.; Gen. Robert E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck; Col. Willard Rockwell, of Rockwell Manufacturing Co.; former Ambassador James Kemper, of Kemper Insurance Co.; the late Henning Prentis, of Armstrong Cork; Howard Pew, of the Sun Oil Co.; former Ambassador Spruille Braden, and others. We have four distinguished West Pointers with the rank of general on our committee.

Those who would label such men as isolationists with extensive overseas trade interests and investments are merely resorting to name calling rather than giving honest answers to questions the foreign aid problem presents.

I, personally, have seen Europe on various occasions since before World War I. In fact, my business interests have taken me throughout the world. As one of the first civilians to visit Europe after World War II, under Army order to submit a report to the U.S. Senate, I personally saw the results of unsound fiscal policies resulting in inflation, government upheaval and misery.

I returned only last week from another extensive trip in various parts of Western Europe. I can add my voice to that of countless other businessmen, journalists and others to the fact that Western Europe not only has recovered but it is experiencing a tremendous boom in many places. Our committee urgently and insistently wants to know why American taxpayer money is continuing to flood Western Europe, to name only one area.

Upon formation last March, our committee recognized certain basic facts. We recognized that since 1932 when President Roosevelt called in the gold we have gradually been giving up our economic freedoms. Meanwhile both parties were far along with spending habits that started with so-called domestic depression relief projects and grew to enormous global and seemingly endless giveaway programs—all supported by the American taxpayer. No less a Government spokesman than General Draper was quoted as saying that Uncle Sam might have to continue the foreign aid program for 100 years.

At the outset, our committee outlined a set of fundamental principles that we felt were sound and to the interest of our country as conceived under our Constitution. As soon as we had developed our initial report, which was approved by every member of the committee, it was sent to all members of the executive department of our Government, to the Congress and thousands of citizens who are leaders in forming public opinion. We also organized a public relations program for press conferences and radio.

On the occasion of my appearance before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, the administration made public a 65-page report prepared by the department of government which are involved in foreign aid. It purported to be an answer in detail to our first report. Unfortunately, many of the facts referred to in the alleged answer were so worded as to become distorted.

We proceeded to rebut the administration's answer item by item in our second report. In the meantime, our research personnel developed information for the use of the various members of our committee who were regularly appearing before congressional committees. For the first time since the inception of foreign aid, a group of citizens, outwardly and steadfastly opposed our foreign aid policy before Congress. The total testimony given by members of our committee before congressional committees covered 7½ hours.

In addition to this activity, members of our committee conveyed our message in speeches from the Atlantic to the Pacific to the Gulf of Mexico. Leading newspapers, especially in Washington, D.C., have carried our ads.

Time will not permit me to refer in detail to the contents of our various reports which are available to you upon request. I am here to pass on to you in somewhat of a concentrated form the alarming facts that have prompted our committee at great personal sacrifice of its members to alert our fellow Americans to the serious consequences of our present foreign aid program.

Our studies have disclosed wasteful foreign spending on a global basis. In the course of this spending, under the guise of economic assitsance and military aid, there has been a serious impairment of our own economy and a weakening of the defense of America—the last bastion of the free world.

One of the most serious adverse effects of foreign aid is the flight of gold—the devaluation of the dollar.

Last year, we exported merchandise totaling $16,207 million. Half of what we ship abroad is giveaway or goes to pay for giveaway. But our exports were also needed to support the private foreign expenditures of American business, of travel abroad, and to pay for the $12,944 million of goods we imported. To balance accounts, therefore, foreigners took, according to the Department of Commerce studies, $3½ billion in gold and liquid dollar balances. It is estimated that the loss of gold in the year ahead will be at least $4 billion. Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in his recent speech before the National Foriegn Trade Council warned that no objective observer would argue that we can face with composure anything like a $4 billion adverse balance continuing for an indefinite period.

This process of drawing down dollars in gold or using them to accumulate investments in this country—bank balances and stock market securities—has gone on since the beginning of the Marshall plan. In the past 10 years, over $5 billion of the gold supply has been drawn down, or 20 percent of the total, and the gold reserves are today less than they were at the beginning of World War II.

Today, of our total gold stock of less than $20 billion, something like $18½ billion is subject to call by foreigners. Anyone who recalls the 1929 panic knows that it doesn't take much to tip the scales of public confidence and start a run on the bank. The point I would like to make is this. The U.S. dollar today supports the whole American economy, now running at twice the 1939 rate with less than the 1939 backing in gold. The U.S. dollar also supports half of the world's trade and provides half the backing of the free world's currencies. This is too heavy a burden to put on our diminishing stock of gold.

Foreign aid spending is a major contributor to growing inflation—another menace facing America today. Inflation initially brings a business boom. Everybody is elated, prices are going up and everybody is making profits—then suddenly collapse, stagnation, misery, hunger, breadlines, factories idle

while prices continue to rise. Unless this situation is brought under control, it is followed by political chaos and dictatorship. The only solution to the problem is a balanced budget and a sound fiscal policy. The beginning of a sound fiscal policy is to stop the wasteful, extravagant and useless spending of foreign aid.

To date, we have spent some $80 billion in foreign aid. The total foreign aid program which has been under consideration for the fiscal year 1960, amounts to the fantastic total of $17.5 billion.

Of course, not all of the $17.5 billion will be made available. Nevertheless, indications are that approximately $14.85 billon will be made available for foreign aid. The entire 4-year Marshall plan cost $13 billion and was enacted immediately after World War II at the time Europe was prostrate and in the great international crisis. It was to be a one-time program and was not to be perpetuated. Yet, today, over 20 percent of the personal income tax dollars of every American is hypothecated for foreign aid.

The dollars that are provided for foreign aid are so astronomical that an efficient administration of the program is impossible. It also results in setting up a planned economy in nearly every country in the world. It breeds state trading which in turn breaks down commerce, American private investments and free enterprise and it brings about international socialism, which is the first step to communism.

Many of the loans that are being set up are repayable in local soft currencies which compete with hard currency and break down American investments abroad. Many loan commitments have been made in foreign countries to build up basic industry without consideration to the importance of building secondary industries and developing distribution. It takes much experience and many years to develop an efficient distribution organization, even in highly developed countries.

It is unrealistic to build up artificially underdeveloped countries beyond the limitations of their internal resources and their ability to sustain them, and in turn subsidize them by American aid. American business possesses by far the largest know-how and experience to expand commerce and international trade on a self-liquidating basis with benefits to the American economy. Our committee has recommended greater incentives for such industry to accomplish these results.

We have literally taken billions of our resources to provide our foreign competitors with the latest type facilities to strengthen their competitive effort. This effort is further strengthened by low wage scales. In Europe, labor cost to these competitors is one-sixth of ours; it is one-tenth of ours in the Far East. At the same time, we are advocating free tariffs. The result is we are destroying one American industry after another, creating ghost towns and are subsidizing unemployment through unemployment insurance at the taxpayer's expense.

The huge foreign give-away program our country has indulged in on a most lavish basis since 1940 started with lend lease, war relief, international agencies. Foreign aid administration has been in a state of constant change and turmoil. The supervision has been poor and the records even today are often not available. The favorite method of preventing an investigation is for the administration to term the pertinent records as classified information.

An Army of 20,000 bureaucrats has been developed to administrate and maladministrate the civilian tied into the army procurement. The heads of this organization are given unlimited time to appear before congressional committees and even to utilize friends for propaganda purposes to justify the perpetuation of these efforts.

In addition to spending billions on NATO, we have spread our Armed Forces and maintain overseas troops and naval installations at 73 far-away bases throughout the world. One emergency follows another which in turn is used to frighten us into more spending.

The dollars spent abroad by the many spending agencies change hands many times. Many of them have enriched unscrupulous operators from here and abroad. However, they all ultimately return claims on the American economy and must be redeemed by the American taxpayer. Foreigners may exchange these dollars for American goods, land, residential and business buildings, stock shares and investments.

Part of foreign aid program involves the Development Loan Fund. I should like to make several observations on this lending device. First, 90 percent of the loans go to governments, instead of a private industry, and they serve to increase the tendencies to statism and socialism in those countries. Private enterprise is unable to compete with State enterprise which gets its capital at low rates of interest, which pays no taxes and which, in the case of these foreign loans, are under little obligation to repay. The result is that we encourage state capitalism and socialism and put a blanket over private enterprise.

Secondly, our effort is directed to building up integrated economics in the underdeveloped areas for which they are presently unprepared and which requires years of preparation.

Thirdly, in certain areas we have fostered a lush growth of industry in competition with American industry. Where wages are at a subsistence level and where costly fringe benefits are unknown, we have further reduced manufacturing costs by providing the most modern machinery and processes. The result is that foreign wares of every sort and description are now flowing into the American market at prices with which our industries cannot compete.

Our defense dollar represents 60 percent of our total budget and is closely tied into our foreign aid expenditures. Members of our committee who have had top assignments in military affairs and possess practical experience in global defense planning believe this entire defense program should be reevaluated.

Our committee believes that our Strategic Air Command, SAC, is the true keeper of the peace and the United States alone is providing the free world with the greatest known war deterrent—SAC—so long as SAC is superior to the Red strategic striking force, our deterrent is likely to remain effective, but SAC bombers are wearing out and our missile program lags.

The maintenance of overwhelming air-space-nuclear supremacy should be our No. 1 objective.

Our committee believes that considerable savings can be effected by bringing home a substantial number of our troops and reducing hardware handouts to allies who can be neutralized.

We believe that industries and all our intercontinental bombers, together with their essential personnel, should be provided with adequate bunker protection against sneak nuclear attack. We believe this is a better investment than our present foreign aid program of wastefully scattering funds throughout the world.

We believe that it is unrealistic to assume that it will be possible to coordinate military efforts of 40 to 60 allies on short notice in an atomic war.

We believe that reluctant allies are worse than no allies; that people who are unwilling or reluctant to meet the cost of their own military establishments are questionable allies. We have, in support of this view, the experience in Korea.

Our committee has made an extensive investigation of the total foreign aid and waste which has disclosed a tremendous amount of graft, corruption, maladministration and mismanagement. We have tabulated in detail many of these programs which have been brought to light at congressional investigations.

In Iran, a total of a quarter billion dollars was involved in the loose, slipshod administration of an unbusinesslike program. In Pakistan, a great deal of waste in equipment as well as over-indulgence of administrators was reported by the Government Accounting Office. In Laos, the Committee on Government Operations found a great conflict between the State Department and the Defense Department's decisions which brought about very substantial losses. In Vietnam, we set up a planned economy which was fantastic and entailed terrific expenditures without any relation to what this country could absorb. In Peru, the Country Director set up a sizable livestock operation for himself, utilizing foreign aid. Controller General Joseph Campbell, in testifying before the House Appropriations Committee, said that investigations by his auditors showed a pattern of loose, tax administration running throughout the entire foreign aid program. Korea, Thailand, and Burma are other areas of extreme wasteful spending.

Our committee is not unmindful of the fact that this huge unrealistic program was set up wtih the idea of fighting communism. Certainly, it is in order to analyze the results we have attained. In Europe, the Communistic element is strongest in the areas that have received the most financial foreign aid. Likewise in the Middle East, communism has made substantial progress in spite of the millions we have appropriated. According to the records, communism has expanded in Indonesia, Thailand, and in the Far East. In Latin America, certainly our lavish gifts have not stopped insurrection in Bolivia, Venezuela, Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, and the Argentine.

The Communist expansion is accomplished by infiltration and then seizing the Government in power. Our billions wastefully spent on a global basis have not stopped this type of procedure. Even administration leaders stress the fact that the Communist menace is now greater than ever even though we have spent $80 billion on foreign aid. Our best defense against communism is a healthy internal economy.

The Mutual Security Act of 1959 is one of the greatest pieces of "pork barrel" legislation ever conceived. It is most unrealistic to assume that 6 percent of the world population, even though we have many resources, can indefinitely support 94 percent of the world population by a giveaway program and if continued can only lead to chaos and international bankruptcy.

Proponents of global, continuing an ever-expanding foreign aid, expanding as new countries continue to be born around the world, would have the American people believe that the free world would suddenly collapse if foreign aid is killed. This is simply not so. There are abundant channels in existence designed especially to assist private overseas investment under our private enterprise system that can be adequate to any development situation arising.

The complete return to private enterprise in the financing of the needs of free world nations would restore to beneficiary nations the integrity, respectability, and responsibility lacking in government-to-government foreign-aid programs.

Our committee has not taken a negative approach to this involved problem. We have made a series of recommendations to systematically liquidate the giveaway programs and rationalize this program to put it on a busi-

ness and self-liquidating basis. We made the following recommendations to Congress:

1. That our traditional general private charity and governmental grants to relieve disaster be continued; that we encourage the expansion of our private missionary efforts.

2. That in countries which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, military assistance, for the time being, should be continued but on a realistic basis.

3. That for our own and the free-world survival, the United States built and maintain overwhelming air, space, nuclear supremacy over that of the Soviet Union. (This can be effected for less than is now being spent for defense and foreign aid merely by reducing appropriations for our military surface forces which are no longer decisive, and by terminating foreign aid.)

4. That foreign aid which directly or indirectly promotes governments that are hostile to our constitutional concepts of government be terminated immediately.

5. That we cease immediately using foreign aid to enable socialistic governments to finance government-owned industries that discourage private enterprise, support a basic principle of communism, and are a competitive threat to American industry.

6. That so long as governmental foreign aid is continued, the recipient should pay a part of the cost of the proposed project; that our aid should terminate when the conditions on which that request is based have been remedied; that private technical, scientific, and educational assistance be extended only to friendly peoples who seek our aid on a cash or loan basis. In any successful enterprise, experienced management is the principal ingredient. By virtue of the necessity to make a profit, business possesses many more men whose education has been directed toward results and economy, and developing self-liquidating projects. Every effort should be made to expand the experience of men employed by American business in its outposts, reinsure private bank credits, utilize engineers employed by American companies to develop programs without charge that are self-liquidating.

7. That greater encouragement be given to private capital as a substitute for Government-financed programs. Foreign gifts stimulate socialism and communism. American foreign investments build up the standard of living, increase production, produce profits and taxes, and are self-liquidating.

8. We endorse enactment of the Boggs bill as soon as the gold flight is under control.

9. That soft and local currency loans, which represent an unsound practice, be abandoned.

10. That counterpart funds, which are impossible to administer effectively and are a political fester in foreign countries, be liquidated by sale on the best terms obtainable and all counterpart accounts be closed.

11. That until foreign aid is terminated, the Congress take steps properly to exercise close supervision and control over the manner in which all foreign-aid funds are being spent; that aid during the tapering-off process be handled by the Export-Import Bank.

12. Our committee holds that the American people have the right to demand from the administration well-defined objectives for the foreign aid program so that they can be evaluated in the light of our huge national debt and deficit spending.

As a result of all of our efforts during the past year, we believe that our committee has been largely responsible for a reduction of $1,200 million in foreign aid requested by the administration. However, it must be taken into consideration that in the interim the World Bank has substantially increased its resources and also just recently appropriated $1 billion for soft money loans throughout the world.

During the last two decades, we have been gradually losing our freedom. Our Government is rapidly drifting from a capitalistic society to a socialistic government.

The one world philosophy plus our unsound fiscal policies will result in pulling our standard of living down to the standard of the underdeveloped countries.

Billions are voted by our Congress and are squandered on a global basis without adequate control and in areas where our people do not have the opportunity to observe the results. It is further questionable whether these appropriations are constitutional.

The forces involved in this international revolution are so great that no living individual can accurately appraise the results.

However, there is a simple axiom that we should follow to avoid disaster and that is keep the home bases strong and maintain a sound fiscal policy and maintain a sound dollar.

It is axiomatic when a family lives beyond its income it results in bankruptcy, when a business get into financial difficulty a receiver is appointed, when a government spends more than its income and mortgages the future of several generations, it results in inflation and a breakdown of its social structure.

I believe we all recognize that we are living in 1959 when the world has shrunk by reason of modern aviation. The facts remain we have grown and prospered over many years by adhering to a constitutional form of government which has produced a Nation of the highest standard of education, the greatest wealth per capita, the highest standard of living in the world, and a society of free men.

Under a constitution, our Government is supposed to be the servant of the people rather than the people being the servant of the Government.

There are many areas of government operation in which public scrutiny is necessary to eliminate waste and poor administration. The foreign aid program presents you with a real opportunity and challenge to bring about economy and efficiency in government. You can help to rationalize this huge program by alerting your friends and the Congress to the need for eliminating foreign aid.

I thank you.

Senator Bridges Offers Suggestions for Dealing With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] recently offered some suggestions for dealing with the problems caused by Fidel Castro in Cuba which have attracted favorable editorial comment and deserve careful consideration. In order to bring them more fully to the attention of the Senate and the country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the February 2 edition of the Laconia Evening Citizen, of Laconia, N.H.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES HAS GOOD PLAN TO BRING CUBA TO TERMS

Erwin L. Smith of the high school faculty, Laconia's top authority on Latin American affairs, due to his frequent trips for the purpose of on-the-spot study, showed clearly, in a letter to the editor published in the Laconia Evening Citizen last Saturday, that a U.S. policy of indifference has led to steadily worsening conditions south of the border. Several readers have commented favorably to us about the views expressed by Mr. Smith. He advised that it is time for a change in the thinking in this country, with suitable action in conjunction with other nations in the Americas.

Senator BRIDGES, addressing C. of C. members here yesterday at the excellent meeting arranged by Peter Karagianis' National Affairs Committee, also proposed a change in thinking in this country, and he favored immediate action in contrast to a possibly more deliberate approach suggested by Mr. Smith.

Senator BRIDGE'S proposal is to touch Cuba's pocket-book nerve. He spoke of tremendous revenue from lavish spending by American tourists. He would cut this off summarily, and there are more reasons than one for doing this. In a country infiltrated by Communists, where as Senator BRIDGES said, anti-American tirades are a daily occurrence, there is a real hazard to sightseers and persons from the United States bent on a good time.

Further, and with still greater effect Senator BRIDGES indicated, this country should stop buying Cuban sugar for which it now pays a 2-cent premium, the latter presumably in the interest of better relations. There are other countries on which we are on friendly terms which raise sugar, and they ought to have our business Senator BRIDGES declared. He mentioned the Philippines and Peru.

Communists are running the show in Cuba, as Mr. BRIDGES said, literally "in our backyard," in a country for whose freedom the United States went to war in 1898.

Congress is now in session, and we wish the text of Senator BRIDGES' address and the letter by Erwin Smith could be in the hands of all its Members for careful consideration. The thoughtful Smith letter reviews at length the circumstances which have resulted in a threat from the Communists at our very door. And Senator BRIDGES offers a method by which Cuba could be brought to good behavior. His plan ought not to be disregarded.

Woman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Plain Speaker of Hazleton, Pa., on Wednesday, January 27, 1960, announcing that Mrs. James A. Boyle was honored as the Woman of the Year for 1959 by the Soroptimist Club of Hazleton. I wish to

warmly congratulate Mrs. Boyle for this distinction.

MRS. JAMES BOYLE NAMED WOMAN OF YEAR

Mrs. James A. Boyle was honored as the Woman of the Year, 1959, at a dinner last evening at Gus Genetti's Town and Country Room, held by the Soroptimist Club of Hazleton.

The award is made by the Soroptimist Club to the woman who has been selected as most active during the preceding year.

Mrs. Boyle is past president of the Hazleton Business and Professional Women's Club; past district 8 secretary of the Pennsylvania Federation of Business and Professional Women; served on the original committee for the organization of the Hazleton Guidance Clinic; was the only active woman member on the committee for CAN-DO; is affiliated with the Visiting Nurses' Association and Child Care Center; has solicited for the Community Chest, Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other projects.

Religiously she is a member of the board of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine of St. Gabriel's Church, and is active in the auxiliaries of the Boy Scouts, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and the Knights of Columbus. She also is cochairman of the HHS 1937 class reunion.

Last evening more than 100 men and women from various civic and service organizations paid tribute to Mrs. Boyle, as Soroptimist President Marie D'Amico presented her with an engraved silver tray acclaiming her as the 1950 Woman of the Year.

KEY TO CITY

Mayor S. Thomas Capparell presented the key to the city to Mrs. Boyle, the first Hazleton woman to receive the honor. Mrs. Mary Ellen Schagan, chairman for the dinner, was toastmaster for the program.

Mrs. Boyle, in receiving the silver tray and the key, said that she was accepting in the name of the good all women of the community have done.

Mrs. Boyle's husband, James A. Boyle, was a special guest at the affair, and a surprise feature of the program was the presentation of piano selections by their children: James, Jr., 13 years old, and Mary Ellen, 10 years old; as well as the bouquet of red roses, presented by their third child, Tommy, 6 years old, to his mother.

Mary Ellen's selection was "Dark Eyes," and Jimmie played "Pillow Talk." They presented a duet of "Heart and Soul."

COSTELLO'S TRIBUTE

Attorney James P. Costello, Jr., main speaker for the function paid tribute to Mrs. Boyle and commended her for her many activities. He also complimented the Soroptimist Club of Hazleton, as well as the 15,000 members in 520 chapters of the club both here and abroad.

Miss Rose Marie Stevens, president of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Hazleton, which nominated Mrs. Boyle for the Woman of the Year, presented a gift to Mrs. Boyle from the club, and a letter from Miss Stevens relative to the selection of the Woman of the Year, was read.

Remarks of tribute were offered by Vincent Santapoli, Unico president; Mrs. Peter Forliano, AAUW president; Mrs. John R. Williamson, 1958 Woman of the Year; Ben Matteo, HHS class of 1937; and Miss Mary Jane Goldsworthy, president of Woman's Club.

Other organizations represented were Ladies of Unico, chamber of commerce, and child care center, and business and professional Women.

Mrs. Williamson, 1958 Woman of the Year, was introduced to the guests, as were Mrs. Boyle's husband and children, her parents, sister, brothers, and sisters-in-law.

Mrs. Schagan introduced the judges who made the selection of Woman of the Year, as Miss Dorothy Bayless, chairman; Mrs. Theodore R. Laputka, and Mrs. Julius Foldes.

Rev. Paul Purcell, of St. Gabriel's Church, gave the invocation and the benediction. Group singing of "America" and the Salute to the Flag opened the program. The Soroptimist pledge preceded the benediction.

Soroptimist colors of blue and gold were used in the programs and in the floral centerpiece.

Let's Take America Off the Hook on the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is the expressed intent of our agricultural program to limit or provide methods for the limitation of the total quantity of certain products and certain commodities. A better definition of featherbedding cannot be found elsewhere than in the legislative findings on the various crops now benefiting from this Government dole system.

It is the expressed intent of the law to encourage producers to underplant their allotments for more than a year, to allow the land to remain idle throughout the contract period—not less than 3 years—and not to harvest any crop from the acreage and not to graze any acreage. The U.S. Government agrees to make annual payments to the producers for fulfilling these "nots." Agriculture is the only business wherein idleness is not only encouraged, but is compensated for legally.

We city people are paying the price for this boondoggling featherbedding because our consumer prices are pegged to an artificial standard that has no rhyme or reason. To follow this subsidy to its logical conclusion, why should not city people be allowed to put their back yard lawns into the soil conservation program and receive annual payments for performing certain "nots"? And why should not cities receive soil bank payments for the acreage devoted to parks and playgrounds?

The farmers of our Nation, because of this subsidy program are in the public opinion doghouse, and sweeping the dirt under the rug or whitewashing the absolute failure of the program will not get them out of it. The public patience is exhausted and they will not tolerate a continuation of the present program indefinitely until it collapses of its own weight, and takes our country with it. Individual rights are being violated when one segment of our economy freeloads on another.

The farm subsidy system is the dole system, no matter by what fancy or justification it is promoted. It is nothing more than taking money from one group of taxpayers to purchase things it does not want or need, to cause these same taxpayers to pay more for food and agricultural commodities. The next thing farmers will want is the Government to drill each of them an oil well behind each barn to provide them with cradle to grave economy security.

The economic monstrosity of the agricultural support programs have now become sacred, solid, and perpetual. The programs have been in effect for 20 years with the result of staggering surpluses, and backbreaking costs to the taxpayers. Let us take America off the hook on the farm program.

The Foreign Trade Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today an address made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

I am certain this address will be not only very enlightening but informative to all Members of the House and to the people of the United States; more particularly, the working people who are being affected and will be affected by imports from abroad.

The address follows:

THE FOREIGN TRADE CRISIS

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, before the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, January 14, 1960, Washington, D.C.)

I have titled my talk to you today "The Foreign Trade Crisis." Perhaps it would have been more fitting to call it "The Crisis in Our Foreign Economic Policy."

Either of these titles will seem extreme to those who, viewing the scene with great calm or bravado, say that we have nothing to worry about.

It is certainly not my purpose to view with alarm for the sake of viewing with alarm Use of the term "crisis" does not mean that an immediate falling-in of the roof is expected. Rather, the term is used to throw light on the overriding fact that the elements of a world trade showdown loom in many directions, and also to fan up some recognition of the inescapable character of the hard-pressing competitive factors that are on the move internationally.

We become accustomed after many years of one-way thinking, such as has been the dominant course in the tariff and trade question, to believe that a permanent benevolent order has been established, unshakable, unassailable, and sublime. We become insensitive under this hypnotic state to movements and shifts that silently and slowly shape the maladjustments that make for a future earthquake.

To say then that we are in a foreign economic crisis is to say that heavy factors in the competitive world have so shifted and moved and changed that we today bestride the ominous calm of a threatening economic earthquake. This crisis is actually in the advanced stages of its longtime shapeup.

One of the signs of the underlying shifts that augur trouble is the cost differential between this country's producers and their

competitors abroad. It has been expressed in simplified terms by saying that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. More about this later.

Another sign consists of the technological leap made by other countries as a result of the installation of tens of billions of dollars' worth of modern equipment, shipped abroad by the United States under foreign aid and as commercial exports. The technical aptitudes of the people in many of the foreign countries is very high; and our long lead in production techniques and automation that previously served as an insulation against import competition is fast melting away. More later on this point, too.

A third sign of trouble lies in the lag of wages behind rising productivity in the more industrialized foreign countries. Labor unions in other countries have not achieved the bargaining power of American unions. Because of this the competitive advantage of low wages, such as prevail in most other countries compared with wages prevailing here, has become wider rather than narrower.

These three trouble spots are deepseated and have been long in the making. They will now be discussed in turn.

The higher prices that prevail in this country are not attributable to any single cause, such as high wages. Wages themselves would not be high had their rise not been accompanied by other strong contributing factors. Some of these factors were of legislative origin, principally in response to the great depression of the thirties. Rightly or wrongly the measures that were adopted were designed to increase employment, raise wages and farm prices, and in general to expand purchasing power. Among the elements of this design were obligatory collective bargaining, shorter work week, minimum wages, social security, crop curtailment, and price inflation as a means of lightening the burden of debts that were contracted during a period of higher prices.

Whether these steps would have succeeded in their design without the advent of rearmament and then the outbreak of World War II is beside the point. The fact that is important to us today is that they and the policies they represented did result in lifting the economy of this country onto a plateau, at least in combination with the vast demand created by war.

After the war the expected economic collapse did not materialize. Instead there was only a recession in 1949, and this was followed by the Korean outbreak. The latter event catapulted us back into the field of mammoth Federal budgets and ever higher levels of prosperity, drawn forward by rising wages, rising profits, rapidly expanding population and strong foreign demand for our materials, equipment and supplies. This latter demand was heavily financed by us and helped keep our national budget unbalanced and added to our debt and tax burden. The budget rose to a magnitude of $75 to $80 billion dollars, or about equal to the total national product in 1939.

The war and its aftermath left us a national debt of mountainous proportions, standing today at some $290 billion. The interest alone on this debt is higher than the total national budget in the thirties, or some $9 billion per year.

This great upward movement represents another of the great shifts that have been underway beneath the surface for 25 years.

In the past it was the inevitable answer of the academic economists to say in reply to charges of low-wage foreign competition, that our higher wages were offset by our greater productivity. If we paid our workers 10 times as much as the Japanese employers paid their workers, we still had nothing to worry about, they said. We were 10 times as productive per man-hour, or more. With respect to Europe, similar explanations were made.

It was under this aegis of this economic thought that our great mass production industries fell into line behind the great tariff-mutilation program launched 26 years ago by the eager economists who came tumbling out fresh from the universities, like a trail of ants, into Washington.

Assured by the erudite economists that they could outproduce the rest of the world to the end of time, these mass producers applauded the great trade program that was incidentally to pacify the world, in the belief that their future lay in expanded foreign markets while on the domestic front they would be immune to import competition. The words of the economists rang in the ears of these men in the forefront of American technology. After all, was it not true that our higher wages were offset by our higher productivity? Was it not stupid to be afraid of foreign competition merely because foreign wages were relatively so low? Only a low order of intelligence could possibly see any remote threat in such a situation: only McKinley-era type of horse-and-buggy thinkers could see any dangers in the premises. Or, better yet, Neanderthalers, or, if moderns, then sufferers from mental atrophy.

In the post-1950 world one of the great shifts already mentioned began to take shape slowly, like the earth movement alongside the St. Andreas fault in California, but just as ominous. With the shipment abroad of tens of billions of dollars in up-to-date machinery and equipment, foreign productivity began to rise much faster than ours. Much of this machinery was installed to replace machinery of a much lower order or even handicraft style of production. Where we gained a few percentage points in productivity when we replaced a less modern machine with a more modern one, installations of modern machinery in other countries might mean a doubling or tripling in productivity in the particular plant. In foreign competitive terms this meant a great deal.

Unfortunately for our competitive comfort, foreign wages have not kept pace with the rising productivity, as already noted. Reports have it that since 1954 foreign wages has risen more rapidly than the U.S. wages; but by 1954 we had come up a long way from the wages of 1945. Foreign wages were far behind us in getting started on their uptrend.

By 1958 our mass-production industries, supposedly immune to foreign pressure, began to feel the heat of the new competition. Steel, for one, began to pour in at a rate higher than our exports, which had begun a decline a year or two earlier. Automobiles, for another, saw a reversal of previous form. Small cars from abroad began to speck our highways and dot our streets; while the outflow of the proud American car took on the aspects of an ebb tide. Other countries were capturing our foreign markets. Typewriters felt the same reversal of flow, as did many other products. Suddenly, it seemed, we were living in a wholly new competitive world; and we were indeed.

Were the university-hatched professors wrong? Had they taken their cues too much from their textbooks which in turn were written by other university professors who in turn taught from books written by other university professors who also had never been out in the world?

Even today these professors are still blowing bubbles of doctrine that burst on the first impact with reality. They say, many of them, that we have not priced ourselves out of foreign markets. They say our industries have merely slid down into the wallows of laziness and no longer know how to sell; and that that is why they cannot compete as they did before. At the same time they applaud the oversea trek of industry after industry from this country seeking a foreign haven of lower costs, thus implicitly recognizing our increasingly untenable competitive position.

Under these various shifts that have been described lies the rubble of our shattered tariff structure. In its reduced circumstances it can no longer withstand much pressure or fend off the competitive onslaught.

Altogether the great changes and permutations of the past two decades have produced the elements of a cataclysm that may have the force to up-end the United States economically unless some reversing steps are taken soon.

The economists who predicted a collapse in the early years after 1945, and were left dangling as false prophets by events, for all to see, now seem inclined to the view that nothing will again upset our economy. Some of them, if not all, look with disdain on any disrupting effects that might be produced by our mounting import competition. When all indices point upward and optimism oozes from all pores, it seems like madness to suggest that all is not well.

Yet, the underlying elements of our foreign economic relations are in a state of serious maladjustment. In the immediate postwar era a number of important factors combined to underwrite a vastly expanding domestic economy. Bulging roundly among these factors were the heavy foreign demands of the war-torn countries for all sorts of materials, supplies, machinery, equipment, etc. The brisk foreign market was sustained by our own money, and was added to the pent-up war demand of the home market.

The final effect was the escalation of the American economy to the upper stories of the rising structure.

If we look about us today we will see that the elements that in the past have succeeded in containing our successive recessions have changed, so far as the foreign economic field is concerned. No longer can we ship the spillover of our domestic production abroad at will. The productive capacity of other countries has not only been rehabilitated. In the leading industrial nations production has expanded far beyond the prewar levels. They are not only supplying more of their home needs but of foreign markets as well, including that of the United States. It is no longer a simple matter of expanding our foreign aid as a means of sopping up our surplus production.

The Secretary of the Treasury, who is at the receiving end of the results of our past financial and economic operations, is in a position to appreciate what we face. Further foreign aid or better yet, increased foreign aid, would merely aggravate our problem. The point of saturation has been reached when, as now, further financing and further nonreimbursible outlays can be sustained only by offering higher interest rates; for these increase the Treasury's own future burden. In the earlier postwar years there was always some further recourse, some elasticity. Some new juggling could still produce postponement of the evil day. Today that elasticity is about used up.

The life has even drained out of our exports. It is not merely a matter of selling more energetically. We can sell until we froth at the mouth but we cannot sell our raw cotton in foreign markets when we are 8 cents above the world market. We can sell only by subsidizing to that amount; and that is what we are doing. It will avail us nothing to try to export wheat at the home level prices, which are some 65 cents per bushel above the world level. We can do so only by subsidizing. Yet when we subsidize, the Treasury picks up the check and that means a higher budget and a greater deficit.

It is well known that in the field of many industrial products we are priced as much above the world market as we are in cotton and wheat.

A few weeks ago the application of the buy American principle to the Development Loan Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury was sharply denounced by the liberal-trade prophets. They pointed out that if India, for example, was forced to buy its materials and equipment and supplies in the United States under the DLF, the loans made to her would fall 40 percent short of the distance they would go if she could spend them in other countries. In other words, our prices, according to that estimate, are 40 percent above world prices on equipment, materials, and supplies. This was an unwitting admission from the ramparts of free trade.

For that reason the general export front faces a somewhat dismal future. We will have to fall back more and more on special new advantages, while we see our accustomed advantages, in such things as automobiles, steel, electrical apparatus, typewriters, machine tools, farm implements, etc., fade away.

Under these circumstances it is even doubtful that the relaxation of import restrictions by other countries, such as Britain, France, Japan, and West Germany, will be of much avail. If we are as badly overpriced in world markets as our cotton and wheat prices attest and as the freer-trade zealots unwittingly allege when they deplore the Buy American requirement of the DLF, our exports will get but the slightest lift from these much-touted steps toward trade liberalization by Europe and Japan.

The point has been reached in the postwar world where we should take steps to recognize and counteract the cataclysmic shifts that have produced our foreign economic crisis. It should not so long have escaped our notice, as apparently it did, that the other leading trading nations while busily denouncing protectionism to the whole world during the postwar period, and particularly for our benefit and edification, nevertheless practiced protectionism in its most virulent form. They regulated imports not by reliance on mere custom duties but used real instrumentalities of control.

Believe it or not, lethal as protectionism is supposed to be to all healthy economic development, those countries by relying heavily upon it, convalesced, and with our help, recuperated and are now in a position to throw their protective crutches away. Of course, while continuing to pour the vials of venom on protectionism they will not cast the crutches beyond reach; for, as in the past, they will surely and quickly again pick them up, if, when, and as they need them; and they will hardly ask our permission.

Somewhere in this behavior lies a lesson for us. Are we bright enough to learn what it is?

Meantime we should not be deceived by the slanted official reports that say our exports have done an about face and that imports are lagging. Our exports of agricultural products depended in 1958–59 to the extent of 56.7 percent on subsidies and on sales for foreign currencies. Only 43.3 percent were sold for dollars in the course of private commerce. Since then we have increased our subsidy on raw cotton, and our exports have responded.

To suggest that this increase and a few others are the harbingers of a new dawn for our exports could come only from a species of paralysis in the face of unwelcome facts such as afflicts those who are incapable of meeting reality. Their recourse is wishful thinking and this will not meet the crisis.

The Future of Water Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Mississippi Valley Association meeting in St. Louis heard an outstanding speech on "The Future of Water Resources Development" by Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, U.S. Army.

General Wilson, with penetrating analysis and great ability, outlined not only some of the achievements but also some of the key problems to be overcome in carrying forward a water resource program of a scope adequate to meet our future needs.

His comments on some of these problems, and particularly in connection with proper regulation of flood plain development, should be of interest to State and local interests, as well as to anyone concerned with our great water needs of the future.

General Wilson stressed "the urgency that attends the necessity for moving forward both rapidly and soundly with water resources development." He pointed out one of the great truths of our generation when he said, "We can afford to waste no time, or money, in gearing up our navigation, flood control, water conservation and other water resources activities to meet what undoubtedly will be one of the greatest challenges ever to confront us in accommodating national growth."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this speech to every thinking American, and would like to insert the complete text of this speech in the RECORD at this point:

THE FUTURE OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

(By Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, U.S. Army, before the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 8, 1960)

It is a pleasure to address the Mississippi Valley Association and to associate with your membership gathered here today.

Yours is one of the country's oldest and most effective groups dedicated to the development of our water resources. During the past 40 years in which it has been active, it has provided much of the stimulation and support of basic legislation and specific project development which underlies the progress being made both within your own area and nationally.

The importance of the Greater Mississippi Valley to the United States and the intensity of the Corps of Engineers' interest in its advancement are reflected by the fact that more than one-half of our total water resources development effort is currently located there. Next year's budget, now before the Congress, contemplates a 15 percent increase in the Corps of Engineers' water resources construction program there. It comes to more than $420 million for advancing the work already underway and initiating construction on 10 new projects which ultimately will require more than $120 million to complete.

The improvements which the Corps of Engineers has made to our water resources in the Mississippi Valley and elsewhere are contributing greatly to the expanding national economy. Inland waterway traffic, exclusive of the Great Lakes, has grown at a spectacular rate from about 9 billion ton-miles in 1930 to nearly 115 billion ton-miles in 1957. Coastal shipping and Great Lakes commerce continue at the high levels prevailing for a number of years. Flood control projects in operation are preventing flood damages of some $600 million per year on the average, in addition to protecting human life. Electric power generation at multiple-purpose projects included in the Civil Works program, amounting to about 27 billion kilowatt-hours during fiscal year 1959, now comprises about 20 percent of all hydroelectric power produced in the Nation and about 4 percent of the total generation by all sources. Other benefits of the program such as the improvement of water supplies, abatement of pollution, enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, and the creation of new opportunities for recreation also are of major importance.

Despite the accomplishments to date, impressive as they are, much remains to be done before the civil works program adequately meets present-day needs, to say nothing of those of the future. We are a growing nation and one which is in the process of changing from an agricultural to a predominantly urban-industrial economy. This evoluation is accompanied by increasing needs for more and better transportation, protection from flooding, assured water supplies, and adequate electric power. Increasing urbanization, shorter workweeks, and our generally higher standard of living are accompanied by greater pressures for outdoor recreation and increased emphasis on the need to conserve and enhance our fish and wildlife resources.

The rapid growth of traffic on our 23,000 miles of improved inland waterways, coupled with a trend toward deeper drafts and larger tows, highlights the need for modernization and extension of many of these waterways. This is particularly true of the Mississippi Basin system which accounts for well over one-half of the present ton-mileage of inland waterway traffic. Our increasing reliance on foreign imports to feed our expanding industries, the trend to large deep-draft bulk carriers in ocean commerce, and the changing patterns of industrial development require continuing adjustment in seacoast harbors and channels.

Now underway to meet current needs are such works as the Calumet-Sag project to improve the interconnection between the Mississippi Basin navigation system and the Great Lakes, the replacement of outmoded locks and dams on the Ohio and Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, the extension of navigation up the Arkansas, deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to provide depths consistent with those provided by the new St. Lawrence Seaway, deepening of the Delaware River above Philadelphia, and the new Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet project. Contingent on appropriations we will start construction of the new Poe Lock on the St. Marys River and begin improvements of navigation some 14 miles up the Minnesota River next fiscal year.

Other works, such as a system of duplicate locks on the Illinois River, have been recommended to Congress to meet the needs of the relatively near future, and still others are under consideration in various investigations authorized by Congress, including the deepening of our Great Lakes harbors.

Flood control works completed or under construction include more than 200 reservoirs, over 8,600 miles of levees and floodwalls and almost 7,000 miles of channel improvements. Despite these facilities, the average annual damages occurring in areas not yet protected are now aggregating some $700 million. About one-third of the losses now being experienced will be prevented upon completion of projects now under construction or authorized for future construction. Probably another third can be prevented by new projects not yet authorized but which will prove to be economically justified in the foreseeable future. Thus there will always remain a sizable residual of flood damages that cannot be economically prevented, but we have a long way to go before we reach the point where only that uneconomic residual remains. And new developments add to the potential risk annually.

The project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi is further advanced than the flood control program for any other major section of the Nation, but as you well know the alluvial valley is still vulnerable to catastrophic damages in the event of extreme flood conditions which are within the realm of possibility. The flood control project for the alluvial valley is, in fact, now under review as a comprehensive whole to determine modifications that may be advisable under present conditions.

As the Nation continues to become more highly urbanized and industrialized, the assurance of an adequate water supply for domestic and industrial usage assumes ever-increasing importance. Not only are the population and industries growing, but per capita usage of water continues its upward trend, thus accelerating the problem of adequate supply. Estimates indicate that our present total demands for water will almost double by 1975. There is sufficient rainfall to meet this tremendous need, but to do it successfully there must be a substantial advance toward the ultimate goal of making beneficial use of all runoff. Until quite recently the Corps of Engineers was able to contribute to this growing need only to a limited extent by disposing of surplus storage capacity available in its reservoirs and, where practicable, by providing additional water supply storage to meet existing needs, with repayment by local interests in both cases. The Water Supply Act of 1958, however, will permit us to make greater contributions in this field by planning for future needs. Under that act beneficiaries of water supply storage may pay their share of project costs over a 50-year period, and payments for water that cannot be used immediately may be deferred until that use begins.

Earlier I mentioned increasing pressures for fish and wildlife enhancement and preservation and for recreation. In these fields, too, there is recent legislation and activity affecting our civil works program. The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 opens up a new field in the planning of water resource projects by authorizing, for the first time, consideration of modifications to a project for the specific purpose of improving and enhancing fish and wildlife resources as well as the previously authorized measures for the prevention of loss of, or damage to, such resources. In the field of recreation, the Outdoor Recreation Commission now is making a comprehensive study of future needs and policy recommendations. We know from experience at our completed projects, where relatively modest provisions for public use have been made at Federal expense, that the opportunities for recreation afforded by water resources projects are in high demand at the present time. The public made nearly 95 million visits to Corps of Engineers projects for recreational purposes in 1958 and we expect the 1959 figure to be higher when the computations are completed. We look for the study of the Outdoor Recreation Commission to be most helpful in establishing guidelines for planning our future activities in this field.

In the face of increasing needs of water resources development and the expanding scope of our civil works program to better meet those needs we must overcome increasing difficulties on several fronts. Little need be said about such obvious difficulties as those caused by the continuing increase in costs of land, materials, and labor, since those are difficulties common to the entire construction industry and, in fact, in some degree to all industry. Suffice it to say that as a result, the true worth of civil works appropriations of recent years, in terms of physical work that can be accomplished, is less than the worth of appropriations of some earlier years of smaller dollar amounts. Not only do these increasing costs reduce the volume of work that can be accomplished per dollar appropriated, but they prevent new projects and result in some previously authorized projects becoming uneconomic under present-day conditions.

A major contributing factor to the increasing cost of reservoir lands is costly investments in improvements placed within the reservoir areas before the projects can be initiated. A number of our authorized reservoir projects have been rendered uneconomic by this factor and the costs of many others have been increased inordinately. We have a policy of notifying State and local interests wherever areas needed for reservoirs can be definitely indentified, to encourage local authorities to take appropriate measures to discourage or prevent further expensive development within the areas involved. Organizations such as your association can be most helpful in accomplishing that objective.

Another pressing problem of recent years is to maintain properly our completed projects. As more projects are completed our responsibilities for operation and maintenance have grown. But funds available for this purpose have not kept pace with the needs, with the result that there has been a growing backlog of urgently needed work. We are extremely hopeful that new procedures worked out in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget will be supported by the necessary appropriations not only to prevent a further increase in deferred maintenance but to enable us to start reducing the existing backlog.

There are other problems to be overcome in carrying forward a water resources program of the scope adequate to meet our future needs. Some of these, such as the present trend toward higher interest rates with consequent elimination of marginally justifiable projects, and an increase in the rates of reimbursement by consumers of water and electricity, may be relatively transitory. Others—such as the requirement for greater local participation in such phases of the program as basic planning, recreational development, and cost sharing—are dependent on the Congress and the value the general public places on development of our water resources for the welfare of the Nation.

But there is one problem about which very little has been done and which inevitably will become increasingly severe. That is the unnecessary and undesirable development of flood plain areas. Basically, all flood damages result from man's encroachment on natural flood plains. Granted there is frequent justification for such occupancy with its inevitable alternatives of either suffering the recurring hazards and economic losses resulting from flooding or incurring the cost of providing effective flood protection. Too often, however, developments have taken place in hazardous areas with little thought of the consequences when equally suitable sites were readily available outside the danger zone. Unfortunately, this tendency continues and can only become increasingly severe with the growing population and urbanization of future years if reasonable measures of regulation are not put into effect. As a consequence, it would take larger and larger expenditures merely to hold average annual national flood losses at their present level without making any progress toward our goal of greatly reducing them.

We frequently hear the complaint that our flood-control program is ineffective because national flood losses continue to run extremely high despite the huge expenditure for flood prevention. This reflects the fact that the extent and value of property improvements being located in the flood plains are growing. Surprisingly this is true even in cities which show a decline in population.

We are greatly concerned over the needless drain on the national economy reflected by this problem whether through recurring flood losses or the necessity for building costly works to protect areas that might better be left undeveloped or developed in such manner as to require minimum protective measures. The States and communities affected also should recognize their vital stake in this problem, not only because of the local financial drain for flood fighting, evacuation, and rehabilitation of the affected people during times of flood and the possible deterioration in value with losses to tax rolls, but also the increased local share in eventually providing the needed protection.

Another aspect of this problem, and one which may eventually result in chagrin for many communities, results from allowing ill-conceived developments to usurp sites that might otherwise be in high demand in the future for the location of industries that need ready access to the riverfront for such purposes as industrial water supply or water transportation. With the increasing industrialization of future years there will be a corresponding need for new riverfront sites. Generally speaking, industrial facilities to be located in flood plains can and should be so planned as to require a minimum of flood protection. Well-planned developments of that type do not add to the flood problem to the degree, nor involve the threat to health and life, that occurs when such developments as residential property are allowed to occupy the flood plains.

Proper regulation of flood plain development is, of course, primarily a State and local responsibility. It is most gratifying to note the growing interest in this subject throughout the Nation and the promise of more effective action in the future. For our part, we wish to encourage action in this field in every practicable way and will therefore always be most pleased to assist local efforts by such means as furnishing any data available to us on the flood hazard and areas subject to inundation. We believe your association and similar organizations throughout the Nation, should attack this problem with the same effective vigor and enthusiasm that you have displayed for many years in fostering and encouraging development of the Nation's water resources.

On the whole, the future of water resource development in this Nation is a bright one. The growing public recognition of the needs in this field and the importance of continued progress in meeting those needs increase the prospects that the basic water requirements of our growing and thriving economy will be met.

However, in conclusion, I want to impress you with the urgency that attends the necessity for moving forward both rapidly and soundly with water resources development. Two factors must be kept prominently in mind. First is the extremely long lead time, which in some cases can be as much as 10

to 15 years, required for the long and difficult processes of conceiving, authorizing, funding, and building major water projects. And the other is the great rapidity with which the phenomenal increase in population and the attending expansion of water resources requirements is descending upon us. We can afford to waste no time, or money, in gearing up our navigation, flood control, water conservation, and other water resources activities to meet what undoubtedly will be one of the greatest challenges ever to confront us in accommodating national growth.

The Mississippi Valley Association can, and I am confident will, play an equally effective part in the task ahead of us as it has in the past. Certainly with your continued support, as individuals and as an organization, those of us who labor in the field of water resources development can do so with the assurance that our efforts will be much more rewarding. I wish you well in all of your present and future endeavors.

Advertising Versus Badvertising—A Few Quiet Reflections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as an advertising man I am concerned about current attacks on my profession. I feel constrained to say a few good words in defense of this much-maligned segment of the business world.

Admittedly, recent revelations of unsavory practices have cast a reflection on all advertising, but we must not let the exception prove the rule. It is the exception that is making the headlines these days. It is the misleading claim, the excessive counterclaim, the absurd distortion, or the downright rude or crude commercial that is under attack. All of these are true exceptions, the less than one-half of 1 percent that the Federal Trade Commission claims is unacceptable advertising.

It is to the credit of the advertising profession that a constant policy of self-policing has resulted in greatly improved advertising practices over the years. Undoubtedly, this public conscience has resulted in making advertising, like ivory soap, more than 99 and 44/100 percent pure.

A recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, the national business daily, expresses more eloquently what I am trying to say. I congratulate Mr. Robert M. Feemster, chairman of the executive committee, and Mr. T. E. Callis, advertising director of the Journal, for what can only be termed as a constructive contribution to a calm, effective solution to the current controversy.

I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial as a portion of my remarks:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 5, 1960]

ADVERTISING VERSUS BADVERTISING—A FEW QUIET REFLECTIONS

This is no attempt to minimize the seriousness of what advertising men presently are concerned about: the method by which public confidence can be restored and sustained.

But amidst all the many proposed remedies, here are a few central facts which ought not be overlooked:

The first of these is that as a profession, advertising performs many constructive benefits. This is acknowledged by nearly everyone. Nobody but a grossly misinformed alarmist, or an out-and-out demagog, would wish to cripple advertising or to destroy it.

The second central fact is this: The overwhelming bulk of all advertising is honest and reliable. (In 1959, the Chairman of the FTC publicly stressed that probably less than one-half of 1 percent of all advertising was bad from the standpoint of the public interest. Ergo, more than 99½ percent was blameless.) This results from the average adman's combination of acumen and ethics. He is both a good businessman and a good man. He knows it pays to be on the level * * * and, personally, he wouldn't wish to be otherwise anyway. Thus, financially and morally, advertising has strong built-in controls.

It takes much courage these days to describe somebody as being "a good man." The phraseology dates back to McGuffey's Reader. It's old fashioned. It's corny. And it certainly doesn't mesh with what many a novelist has said about advertising men, does it? Its only merit is that it happens to be true.

Here is another thing not widely known about admen: They are advertising's harshest critics. Like the best men in the medical and legal professions, advertising professionals devote much of their time to stern self-examination. Public and governmental reaction to recent exposés was mild compared with the reaction among admen themselves. It was a personal blow.

However, a psychoanalyst would explain it, the ad man is extremely self-conscious. He gives full support to the only trade journals we know of, which week after week raise the embarrassing issues of morality, ethics, and straight-shooting among their own readers. This compares favorably with other professions we hold in the highest esteem. Just as the Bar Association takes action against misguided lawyers * * * and just as the AMA unsmocks a doctor when necessary * * * in almost every issue, the professional advertising journals wallop the daylights out of ad men who step out of line.

And look at the professional advertising associations. They are positively relentless in their war against misrepresentation. The Advertising Federation of America maintains an unceasing insistence on truth in advertising. And through its clubs, the better business bureaus originally came into being. It was even at the suggestion of AFA that the FTC was born. AFA would have disbanded in explosive disunity long ago if its membership itself would not be equally insistent that AFA continue to be forthright. The American Association of Advertising Agencies actually invites its members to submit evidence of advertising not measuring up to AAAA's high standards. The Association of National Advertisers and the Advertising Association of the West are leaders among the many other organizations whose vigilance is directed first toward the public's best interests, knowing full well that these policies also will be best for business.

That these strictures are not 100 percent successful is to be deplored. More significant is that advertising never hesitates to launder its own linen * * * and in the full public view. (It should also be remembered that the most stringent recent criticism, right or wrong, of advertising organizations came not from public officeholders or consumers, but from highly regarded advertising leaders. They want the organizations to be even more aggressive.)

Many thinking admen believe the chief key to current problems is more of this self-consciousness and more self-policing.

Would it work?

Well, you might be surprised to learn how well it is working.

Major media (including the Wall Street Journal) reject millions and millions of dollars in advertising annually. The media believe this rejected advertising doesn't measure up to the standards of dependable information.

And even more of this undesirable advertising never reaches the media at all. Alert advertisers and their agencies kill it before it sees the light of day. No official hearings or investigations could possibly be tougher than the slug-it-out sessions from which most advertising copy finally emerges. "Can we prove that?" "Not 100 percent true." "Too wild." "Is this really fair?" "Believable?" "Let's tone it down" come floating through the transoms far, far more often than, "Think we can get away with this?"

Unbelievable? Only to those who enjoy thinking that admen are all villains, and not many people would be willing to admit to a prejudice of such enormous immaturity.

(Incidentally, an interesting aspect of the undesirable advertiser is that he is not truly an advertiser in the real sense. He is more likely to be the one-shot, hit-and-run promoter whose operations can't survive prolonged scrutiny. Less than 1 percent of the advertising rejected by the Wall Street Journal comes from well-known advertisers served by bona fide agencies. Years of experience have demonstrated that the prominent corporate name, and the well-established product brand, are not only valuable sales assets but also the public's best guarantee of dependable performance.)

This is not to say that even respectable advertisers and media are infallible. They sometimes repose trust in underserving individuals who populate the fringes of advertising. Overenthusiasm sometimes results in excessive claims. Competitive pressure is reflected in an occasional lapse of taste. But in the long run, the advertiser and his agency can give Caesar's wife useful lessons in decorum.

Witness the recent rash of proposed "remedies" for advertising's problem. You'll not find bland unanimity. Ad men—large and small—feel keenly on the subject. Notice, moreover, that no ad man is suggesting that the profession merely wait for the storm to blow over. Many another industry has had to face adverse public and political relations. But in the advertising profession, even the innocent are searching their souls and are doggedly asking: "How can we do it better?"

No, nobody wants to apply a broad brush dipped in soothing whitewash. There are things to be remedied in the world of advertising. But it is a civilized world. Its citizens are good citizens. They can be trusted.

Have We Lost Our Minds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial that appeared in the February 5, 1960, issue of the Winter Haven News-Chief, one of the leading daily newspapers in Florida. The editorial is

entitled, "Have We Lost Our Minds?" It is extremely pertinent because it questions the sanity of supporting the Cuban sugar industry while our Government is being harassed by Fidel Castro and while American investments in Cuba are being lost. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

HAVE WE LOST OUR MINDS?

The American people are going to contribute at least $150 million this year to Fidel Castro so that he can continue to insult us, breed a Communist group to harass us and cause us further to lose face in the world. Have we gone nuts? Aren't we bright enough to see that if we continue to go along with the sugar guarantee that we become the laughingstock of all nations?

We don't need to buy the sugar produced by Cuba. We can actually grow almost enough right here in Florida to take care of the needs of our country. However, we can get more from the Philippines, or from Puerto Rico—but we probably won't. We place a support under the Cuban price, which guarantees them double the world market price.

And on top of that Americans are scheduled to lose over a billion dollars in investments in Cuba. We can't help but wonder whose side some of the people in Washington are on? This thing is serious in Cuba. And every day we dally around trying to be the good fellow means that much more trouble later. We can expect trouble, for everything we do, is twisted around into a pack of lies by the "bearded one," supported by direct lies from Moscow. Maybe we have lost our minds.

Will Chiang Step Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Chiang Kai-shek has said that he will not be a candidate for reelection and the Constitution of the Republic of China would have to be changed to make his acceptance of a third term legal.

His second term expires May 20, 1960.

If Chiang is inclined to challenge the national assembly's authority to choose his successor he must act before May because the constitution says that the national assembly must be called into session 90 days prior to the expiration of the President's term, that is, by February 19, 1960.

John T. T. Ma has written a revealing article in the New Republic, February 8, 1960, entitled "Will Chiang Step Down?" Mr. Ma says that Chiang's personal choice would be his son Chiang Ching-kuo. It would not surprise me to learn that this man received his education in the Soviet Union and while there, prior to 1938, married a Russian and wrote public letters condoning his father and the Kuomintang, which letters he has never since denied.

Indeed, according to Mr. Ma, he has never publicly denied sympathy or affiliation with the Communists nor has he ever publicly taken back a single word of the criticism and censure he had previously directed at his father and the Kuomintang.

Another most likely successor, according to Mr. Ma and according to what I heard when I was in Taiwan last November, is Ch'en Ch'eng, now the Vice President of the Chinese Republic, vice chairman of the Kuomintang and head of the Executive Yuan. He is also widely identified with the very successful and reform movement in Taiwan. However, he is over 65 and is in extremely poor health. Mr. Ma believes that even if he were made president Chiang might still control matters so that the real source of power would be in his son's hands.

Recent correspondence from Taiwan confirms that the plan is to draft Chiang Kai-shek to serving another term.

Mr. Ma writes:

Even were Chiang strong willed enough to break the "opium" habit, that is, hunger for power, he will be pressured not to renounce the Presidency. Chiang is surrounded—captured is perhaps a more accurate word—by a host of relatives and personal followers, both on Formosa and abroad, whose only claim to the lucrative positions of power they hold is their personal relation to Chiang. This group is not only reactionary in its thinking, but is composed of men and women of at best mediocre talents whose sole interest is in position and the money it entails. They know full well that their very survival depends upon Chiang's continuation in office, that their services would be quickly dispensed with were either Chiang's son, or Ch'en Ch'eng to take his place. They are determined, therefore, to use every means at their disposal to have Chiang continue.

Chiang is a symbol of a defeated, discredited regime. It would be well for the United States if this symbol were to change so that Formosa would come to represent in Asia, not impotent aggression, but a successful land reform program.

Mr. Ma's article should be read by everyone who is interested in our policies in the Far East. He was editor and publisher of a Chungking newspaper until the Communist regime took over in 1949 and is now on the staff of the Foreign Service Institute in Washington.

Under unanimous consent previously granted, I include the text of his article:

WILL CHIANG STEP DOWN?

(By John T. T. Ma)

Within the next few weeks, time and circumstance will bring about within the Republic of China a singularly important development. The constitution of the Republic of China limits the president's tenure of office to two successive terms and President Chiang Kai-shek's second term expires May 20, 1960. Late in 1958 (December 23), President Chiang announced to the Mainland Recovery Planning Board his opposition to all proposals by the National Assembly for amending the constitution. The statement, made in Chiang's dual capacity as chief of state and chairman of the Kuomintang, came in the wake of Mao Tse-tung's announcement that he would not again be a candidate for Communist China's highest governmental position. Chiang's announcement has attracted widespread attention and has been interpreted as a firm pledge that he will voluntarily give up his position as head of the Chinese Republic in 1960. There is good reason to believe, however, that Chiang's course of action may not fulfill these expectations.

The question of Chiang's future, whether he will part with the office of president, cannot be analyzed realistically without considering the question of possible successors. There are, to be sure, several possibilities, but given the present state of politics on Formosa only two likely candidates: President Chiang's son, Chiang Ching-kuo, and the present vice president of the Chinese Republic, Ch'en Ch'eng.

Assuming that Chiang does intend to relinquish the presidency, it seems clear that his personal choice of a successor would be his son, who is already the controlling power in Formosan affairs, next to Chiang himself. And it is a public secret that in recent years President Chiang has had all important questions of policy referred first to his son, before being brought to himself. There is, thus, strong reason to believe that Chiang would personally place his son first on any list of possible successors to the presidency. Such a preference would fit in well with both Chinese tradition and the Chinese concept of family.

There are, however, strong factors working against such a choice by Chiang. Not only the native Formosans, but also the Chinese who have come to Formosa from the mainland since World War II would find the son unacceptable as Chiang's successor. This political opposition is considerably strengthened by similar sentiments within Chinese military circles. As for the Kuomintang itself, the prospect of the son's succession would be met with unmitigated hostility by the party's elder statesmen, those party members who have been Chiang's coworkers throughout the Kuomintang's history, not to mention the rank and file.

The widespread opposition to the prospect of the son's succession arises largely from uncertainty and suspicion regarding his intentions vis a vis the Chinese Communists. For more than a decade prior to 1938 the son received a typical and thorough education while living in the Communist motherland, the U.S.S.R. While there, he married a Russian and, of far greater significance, he wrote public letters condemning his father and the Kuomintang. Furthermore, since his return to China in 1938, the son has never publicly denied sympathy or affiliation with the Communists nor has he ever publicly taken back a single word of the criticism and censure he had previously directed at his father and the Kuomintang.

Ch'en Ch'eng, the other most likely successor to Chiang, is now vice president of the Chinese Republic, vice chairman of the Kuomintang, and head of the Executive Yuan. He has worked closely with Chiang for more than 30 years and has been entrusted with many top-level posts, both political and military. The place he occupies in Chiang's confidence and esteem was demonstrated in the winter of 1949 when he was appointed military and political commander of southwest China, in effect, the only part of the mainland then under Nationalist control. Perhaps even more significant, it was Ch'en Ch'eng who, during this same period, was assigned the task of preparing the way for Chiang's flight from the mainland to Formosa.

If Chiang's personal preference were to be the controlling factor in selecting a successor, there is little doubt the mantle would fall to the son. If other factors are taken into account, however, Ch'en Ch'eng's chances of succession are far greater. He commands the respect of the Kuomintang elder statesmen with whom he has had intimate relations for some four decades, and they

would undoubtedly support him as against the son. Similarly, if other political parties and independents, and especially the military circles, were faced with a choice between the two, they would also without hesitation favor Ch'en Ch'eng.

Should Chiang renounce the presidency, therefore, the relevant question would be how he could satisfy a personal desire to bequeath power to his son, and at the same time take into account the general and deep-seated hostility which the son's succession would arouse. It would be possible, although extremely unlikely, for Chiang to ignore everything other than his personal feelings and arrange directly for the son's succession. He would be more likely to seek his goal in a round-about manner. He could arrange to have Ch'en Ch'eng move up to the presidency and thus nominally become his successor while seeing to it that Ch'en Ch'eng himself arranged for the son's election to the vice presidency and his appointment to other high posts. Since Ch'en Ch'eng is over 65 and in extremely poor health, he would not be able actively to bear the load of the presidency and in all likelihood would soon be forced to retire from the political scene, opening the way for the son's assumption of the presidency. Even while Ch'en Ch'eng remained on the stage, Chiang could so arrange it that the real source of power would be in the son's hands; his appointment as head of the Executive Yuan, as Minister of Defense, and as chairman of the joint chiefs of staff would serve this purpose. In short, he would pursue a course which would pass the title of succession to Ch'en Ch'eng but the main substance of succession to his son.

Even in this event, it is highly unlikely that Chiang himself could be satisfied with merely memories of bygone authority. This would be in keeping with neither Chinese political tradition nor Chiang's personal history. In any country where political life is dominated, if not exclusively controlled by a single political party, power within the party carries with it ipso facto power within the government. Once before, Chiang gave up the Presidency for a short time—from January 1949 to March 1950—but managed to exercise a controlling voice in governmental affairs by retaining his position as chairman of the Kuomintang. If Chiang does relinquish the Presidency he would in all probability choose to follow this precedent again.

Obviously, more significant than the question of possible successors are Chiang's real plans regarding the Presidency: Was Chiang's announcement of December 23, 1958, really evidence of his intention to renounce the Presidency in 1960?

THE ARGUMENTS FOR RETIREMENT

It can be argued with considerable conviction that Chiang genuinely desires to step down from the Presidency. For one thing, such a step holds the promise of certain gains for the Nationalist reputation abroad. It could be pointed to as evidence of Free China's devotion to the rule of law and other bases of Western democracy, and could not but attract favorable comment from abroad, the United States in particular. The history of the constitution also offers reason to believe that Chiang never intended to serve more than two terms as President. When the present constitution was being drawn up in the spring of 1947, the draft agreed upon by the Kuomintang, the Young China Party and the Social Democrats contained a provision calling for a 4-year term for the President, with a limit of two terms. Interestingly enough at no time did Chiang disagree with the two-term limitation. He did, however, take issue with the suggested 4-year term, urging instead a 6-year term. His viewpoint prevailed and was responsible for the present constitutional provision limiting a President to two terms of 6 years each. It would seem, therefore, that 12 years ago at least Chiang was not planning more than two presidential terms for himself.

Another strong indication to the same effect came late in 1948, 6 months after Chiang had become President under the new constitution, at a time when all China was rapidly falling under Communist control and only shortly before Chiang's resignation from the Presidency. Just at this moment Chiang told a highly secret meeting of the Kuomintang that if Heaven would only allow him to live another 10 years he would destroy communism in China. Thus, at a time which by any standard must be considered one of the most critical in his career, Chiang was not thinking of continuing in office beyond the limit set down in the constitution.

Even if one assumes that Chiang did then and does now genuinely desire to abide by the two-term limitation on the presidency, all indications are that he will not be able to do so when the time comes. For one thing, voluntary relinquishment of personal power runs contrary to the Chinese political tradition. The exercise of political power in China can perhaps best be compared to the smoking of opium: it is not only satisfying, but also extremely hard to renounce. Even when there is an intellectual conviction that it should be renounced, more often than not the pleasure and strength of habit prove too great to resist. (In this connection, it might be interesting to note that for many Chinese the least comprehensible incidents in U.S. history are Washington's voluntary renunciation of the presidency after two terms, and his refusal to lend even an iota of support to suggestions that he head an American monarchist movement. The incidents are incomprehensible precisely because they are completely alien to Chinese political history and tradition.)

Even were Chiang strong willed enough to break the "opium" habit, he will be pressured not to renounce the presidency. Chiang is surrounded—captured is perhaps a more accurate word—by a host of relatives and personal followers, both on Formosa and abroad, whose only claim to the lucrative positions of power they hold is their personal relation to Chiang. This group is not only reactionary in its thinking, but is composed of men and women of at best mediocre talents whose sole interest is in position and the money it entails. They know full well that their very survival depends upon Chiang's continuation in office, that their services would be quickly dispensed with were either Chiang's son or Ch'en Ch'eng to take his place. They are determined, therefore, to use every means at their disposal to have Chiang continue.

HAVING IT BOTH WAYS

It seems certain that the habit of political power coupled with the pressure of this group will prove irresistible to Chiang, that he will, when the time comes, refuse to vacate the presidency. Such a decision would on the surface seem irreconcilable with Chiang's recent announcement disclaiming any intention to revise the constitution. But there is a way the two can be reconciled: under the constitution, the president is chosen by the National Assembly, a body of delegates elected to represent constituencies and special groups on the Chinese mainland. Not unnaturally, under the conditions ruling in China, there has been only one National Assembly elected to date, the one which chose Chiang as president in 1948. In 1954, at the end of Chiang's first term, the same National Assembly reconvened and reelected Chiang. The Assembly had no mandate to take such action; indeed, according to the constitution, delegates to the Assembly are to be elected every 6 years. It acted, however, arguing that since the election of a new Assembly, as required by the constitution, was impossible, the old Assembly would simply have to continue to function.

When Chiang's present term expires on May 20, such a precedent would seem ideally suited to his purposes. He can argue that since a new national assembly cannot be elected in the manner specified in the constitution, there is no constitutional means to choose a new president; and if a new president cannot be chosen, obviously the old president must continue to serve. Even if Chiang does not decide to deny openly the present national assembly's right to choose a president, there is a second variation on the same theme open to him: he can point out that less than one-half of the membership of the national assembly is on Formosa and claim, therefore, that the present assembly is not properly constituted to perform its functions. Whichever ground Chiang may pick to challenge the assembly's authority to choose his successor, Chiang must act before May because, under the terms of the constitution, the national assembly must be called into session 90 days prior to the expiration of the president's term, that is, by February 19, 1960.

The constitutional propriety of denying the national assembly's right to choose a new president would, of course, be open to serious question. The Chinese Government on Formosa, however, is not renowned for its adherence to the constitution. The ill-concealed control of the Chinese armed forces by a political party, the Kuomintang, has been in direct conflict with the letter of the constitution; and the Kuomintang's persistent use of government money for party purposes is, similarly, contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the constitution.

It would be difficult for the national assembly to denounce Chiang's reasoning, for almost identical logic has been used to justify its own continued existence. Indeed, the same argument has been used by two other organs of the Formosa government, the legislative and control yuans. In both cases members have continued to serve long beyond the terms set down in the constitution, arguing that old members must continue in office as long as conditions make it impossible to elect new members in accordance with the constitution.

Such logic and precedents will serve admirably to reconcile Chiang's announced intention to oppose any revision of the constitution with a decision that he cannot but continue as president.

There is no denying that Chiang's continuance in office under such tactics would only put off a problem which must eventually be faced, and there is no doubt that such toying with the constitution will seriously weaken it as a central symbol of the government to which many Chinese cling as an alternative to the Communist regime. Pitted against these arguments in the presently developing situation, however, are the weightier factors of political traditions and personal power.

Cleveland's Role in International Cultural Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland has truly pioneered in programs designed to build a better understanding of foreign nations and peoples through people-to-people diplomacy.

One of the outstanding examples of community participation in foreign affairs is provided by the Cleveland international program, which annually brings a group of foreign youth leaders and social workers to this country for 4 months of study, work, and participation in American family life. This unique project, which is made possible by the cooperative efforts of Cleveland citizens, the Department of State, and foreign governments whose youth participate in the program, has frequently been described as a model in the field of cultural diplomacy.

Now in its fifth year of operation, the Cleveland international program is the first of its kind to have the leadership of private American citizens. It is also the first and only program which reaches youth leaders in foreign countries as such a cooperative international enterprise. Directed by Mr. Henry Ollendorff, the program gives nearly 70 young people each year opportunity to acquire a better understanding of the United States and its citizens. Through the creation of lasting personal friendships, the program is enabled to make a greater contribution to permanent peace than nearly any other activity today.

In a recent address before the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc., Mr. Robert H. Thayer, special assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations, gave a most interesting account of the work presently carried on by the Cleveland international program and the Department of State. As these cultural activities are certain to be of wide interest, I include Mr. Thayer's address "Cleveland's Role in International Cultural Relations" at this point in the RECORD.

CLEVELAND'S ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

(Address by Hon. Robert H. Thayer, special assistant to the Secretary of State for the coordination of international educational and cultural relations, before the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, February 3, 1960)

The subject of my speech today is Cleveland's role in international cultural relations. I should think that you would feel it pretty presumptuous for anyone not a citizen of Cleveland to come here and talk about Cleveland's role in anything—a typical U.S. Government attitude I can hear some of you say—but let me reassure you right now I have not come to Cleveland to tell you what your role is or is not, or ought or ought not to be—I have come to tell you that we in the U.S. Government believe that what Cleveland is doing in the field of international cultural relations is one of the finest examples in the entire United States of this new exacting movement that has changed the imagination of the American people—a movement to build mutual understanding through the relation of people to people. The Cleveland international program is pioneering in a field that can make a greater contribution to lasting peace than any other activity today—and I have come here on behalf of the Department of State to thank all of you who are engaged in this work and to congratulate you, Mr. Mayor and the city of Cleveland on being such public spirited citizens.

The city of Cleveland has an outstanding reputation at the State Department for its work in the promotion of community participation in foreign affairs and in the Bureau of International Cultural Relations which I have the honor of heading. People like Katherine Bang, Henry Ollendorff, and Elizabeth Brown are considered regular members of our team. The Department of State is proud to be associated with the Cleveland international program as it prepares for a fifth year of operation. I want to hear about Cleveland's role as an example which I feel sure will be followed by every city in the United States. This international program of yours and its increasing success and rapid growth is proof positive that in this jet age today, international diplomacy is not the province of government alone, it is the responsibility of every single citizen. The old forms of diplomacy, the relations of government to government, are not alone adequate today to assure the kind of peace that is worth having—peace with justice and freedom and dignity for the individual. They must be reinforced by what I call cultural diplomacy—the relations of people to people. Cleveland's program represents a model in the field of cultural diplomacy.

Why are these relations between people and people, the people of distant lands and the American people so important today? One answer to this question was well expressed to me by a high official in the Government of the United Arab Republic in Cairo last April. He pointed out that war has been for centuries a common way of settling serious disputes. But today war is self-destructive and unthinkable. Disputes must be arrested before they become violent enough to lead to war, and there is no greater arresting force to violence than mutual understanding. No matter how much you may disagree with someone or even dislike someone, if you understand him or her, it becomes much easier to reach a modus vivendi. So mutual understanding and relations of people to people are the surest way to mold the cultural understanding which is essential as a force to maintain peace.

But there is another reason for the importance of mutual understanding between the American people and the people of other lands—the people of Africa and Asia are moving forward to take their places in the sun—they are forming new nations and in so doing are meeting the same difficult problems we faced as a new Nation less than 200 years ago. They are seeking as did we to develop their lands in peace. We have much to contribute to this development, particularly in helping them achieve peace with freedom and justice and dignity for the individual, but the peoples of these countries are not going to blindly follow our example unless first there can be established between us—mutual understanding.

What is mutual understanding? I can tell you what it is not: It is not trying to impose the American way of life on other peoples; it is not trying to make them into Americans; it is not ignoring or thinking queer their customs, their background, their way of thinking and of expressing themselves because they are not like ours. I think Mrs. Katherine Bang expressed the reasoning of mutual understanding as well as it can be expressed in a statement she made 2 years ago to the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Discussing the World Affairs Council's hospitality program for foreign visitors, she said: "We hope our visitor from abroad will like what he sees of our country, but we are not trying to indoctrinate or make him into an American. We want him to go back home with a sympathetic understanding of our ways and national ideals."

It is the Government's hope that this "sympathetic understanding" of which Mrs. Bang spoke will someday be mutual and widespread. Without it, no amount of traditional diplomacy, economic assistance, or military maneuver will suffice to eradicate the prejudice, ignorance, and fear that inhibit the natural desires of people to live in peace and cooperate for the benefit of mankind. The task of developing sympathetic understanding and building confidence is not something that can be legislated by Congress or negotiated by the Department of State. This is truly a process that starts in the hearts and minds of men. The development of understanding between peoples must begin at the grassroots or else international exchange programs are only an empty gesture.

This is certainly an era of revolution and massive change in all phases of human endeavor. While the Western nations cope with the complexities of political and economic interdependence, Africa and Asia are giving birth to new sovereign nations, the menace of international communism hovers over millions of people in the Soviet bloc. Events of the next 10 years will test this country's honored traditions far more than they have been tested during the past 180 years. At the same time, we will find it necessary to discard inadequate and obsolete methods to meet the unprecedented challenges of a world in ferment.

Make a quick survey of international affairs today, and I think you will agree that complacency and lack of imagination are two of our greatest potential dangers. The United States is in a position of dynamic world leadership. How successfully that leadership will be exercised depends upon a number of factors—our military alertness, our economic vitality, our ability to guide three-quarters of the earth's peoples into an industrial age. All of these factors combine to measure a nation's strength, or lack of it. But one more vital ingredient is needed to turn that prescription for strength into one for effective leadership—a solid dose of compassion for the values, aspirations, cultural achievements, and tribulations of the people of other lands who refuse, and rightfully so, to be mere statistics in a geography textbook.

Call it sympathetic understanding or mutual understanding or cultural diplomacy. They all mean the same thing—a conscious desire to go more than halfway to meet the other fellow on his home ground and listen to what he has to say and appreciate what his culture has to offer. I submit that this is one of the most difficult tasks for a people to accomplish in a world that is accustomed to the harshness of national isolation and economic degradation. It is a task that demands an effort far greater than the production of more steel or the building of bigger rockets. It is a job that can be done only if we divest ourselves of a conditioned antipathy toward people who look, act, and think differently than we. It is a goal toward which shortsightedness and feelings of superiority can effectively bar our path. It requires a quality that I am afraid we Americans are sometimes somewhat short of—perhaps because our struggles to build a great nation discouraged its growth—it is the quality of humility.

I do not feel the need to convince any of you here this afternoon of the importance of having the American people identify themselves with the strivings of their brothers in the family of man. I am sure that you would not be associated with the Cleveland international program if you thought otherwise. And I think you are all aware of the importance which your Government attachés to this aspect of international living today. Indeed, even the diehard traditionalists in Government are beginning to realize that world leadership without mutual understanding between peoples is no leader-

ship at all. The creation of the position that I hold is evidence of the interest of the Government in cultural relations.

Let me tell you about what the Government is doing in the field of international cultural relations. Much of this will be known already to you here today, active as you are in this field, but I am constantly amazed by the number of people who apparently do not appreciate all that the Government is doing.

The international educational exchange program, which most people know through such familiar terms as "Fulbright" and "Smith-Mundt" scholarships, has sponsored more than 70,000 exchanges of students, teachers, professors, leaders, and specialists between the United States and 100 countries of the world. The alumni of this program are the leaders and future leaders of the free world—the people who are in a position to disseminate the facts of international life to millions of their compatriots.

Under the President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations, American orchestras, theatrical troupes, jazz combos, dance groups, and athletic teams are assisted in traveling and appearing abroad. Attractions like the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, the San Francisco Ballet, the Benny Goodman Sextet, and the Westminster Singers have appeared on every continent to help dispel widespread misconception abroad that the American people are preoccupied with material objectives. Furthermore, we are conducting a survey in certain areas of the world of how we can broaden the base of our audiences and reach some of the people at the grassroots as well as the more sophisticated audiences in the big cities. We want very much to send some of our imaginative young nonprofessional talent abroad and give them a chance by spending a larger time at each place to make a greater impression on the local population through personal contact, lectures, and seminars.

During the past 2 years, we have been able to open the first of what we hope will be a growing number of channels of communication between the American and Soviet peoples. The epic making Cultural, Technical, and Educational Exchange Agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union of January 1958, has recently been extended for another 2 years, with arrangements for increased exchanges of students, professors, and experts in various fields.

We have also noticed with a great deal of satisfaction that our participation in the programs of the United Nations Educational Scientific, and Cultural Organization are bringing an awareness of other cultures to the many thousands of American citizens who cooperate with the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

Through the steadfast and able work of the U.S. Information Agency, millions of foreign citizens are able to buy inexpensive American books which are translated into their own languages; thousands of foreign educational institutions receive American text books and teaching materials; 200,000 foreign students in 55 countries receive instruction in the English language each year; and American reading rooms and libraries are open for business in a majority of the world's major cities.

Through the technical assistance programs of the International Cooperation Administration, about 8,000 foreign citizens come to the United States for technical training each year, and more than 3,500 American technicians go abroad to teach the skills other people need to grow more food, build better tools, and maintain their health. These people are engaged in cultural interchange as much as the students, teachers, and professors who take part in educational exchange programs.

The same situation exists for the foreign citizens who come to the United States and the American citizens who go abroad under the military assistance programs of the Department of Defense; or the fellowship programs of the National Academy of Science and the research programs of the National Institutes of Health. In all, 15 Government agencies conduct programs that involve the movement of persons, cultural materials, and ideas between the United States and other countries.

It was the recognition by the Department of State and the administration of the need to find a common focus for this vast proliferation of programs with an impact on our cultural relations that led to the creation of the position I now hold. I have not been assigned to coordinate the international cultural relations activities of the U.S. Government in order to create a new bureaucratic hierarchy. My primary job involves keeping other policymakers informed about trends and activities and underscoring common objectives in the area of foreign affairs and pointing out gaps that need filling and increasing overlaps in our cultural effort.

During my first 12 months in office, I feel we have made a great deal of headway in persuading many responsible officials to include in their planning a long-range view of what we are trying to achieve in the field of cultural relations. Representatives of different agencies are talking to each other more often these days about such common subjects of interest as the development of educational systems abroad; the teaching of English as a foreign language; and the orientation of exchange grantees to ease the changeover from one society to another.

Outside the Government, the work of private enterprise to foster international cultural exchange is far more extensive than the efforts of all Government agencies combined. Organizations like the Carnegie Corporation; the Rockefeller Foundation and the Institute of International Education were already highly experienced when the Department of State began its first educational exchange programs with Latin America in 1938. Missionary groups had already founded hundreds of American schools in Latin America, the Middle East and South Asia. Service clubs and professional groups, like Rotary and the American Association of University Women, had well established international fellowship programs.

Today, American universities have an annual population of approximately 50,000 foreign students and educators. On many college campuses, the job of foreign student adviser is a full-time faculty position.

According to the most recent available statistics, 184 American universities are conducting 382 international programs involving exchanges of students, faculty members and materials with educational institutions and Government agencies in 93 countries. Many of these programs are sponsored by the International Cooperation Administration in recognition of the university's role in economic development.

More and more American institutions of higher learning are including foreign travel in their curriculums. Right here in Ohio, Oberlin College is sending third-year music students to the Mozarteum in Salzburg for a full 10 months of instruction; and the Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, has an excellent course called "The Development of World Civilizations" which includes a summer of travel in an area of the world that has been thoroughly studied by the participating students for an entire year.

Several eastern schools have conducted junior year abroad programs in Western Europe for many years. This year, for the first time, three junior year progams are being conducted in Brazil, Peru, Costa Rica, and Chile by New York, Indiana, Kansas and Fordham Universities with the assistance of the Department of State.

In addition to our universities, many hundreds of philanthropic foundations, labor unions, service clubs, professional societies, religious groups, and civic organizations are conducting educational and cultural programs with foreign countries. These include the teenage exchanges of the 4–H Clubs, the American Field Service teenage program, the professional affiliations of the Inter-American Bar Association, and the educational programs of the League of Women Voters. Last week I spoke in Louisville to the National Convention of Ruritan, and I was told that 1,000 farm families had opened their homes to receive foreign visitors.

We haven't even begun to take stock of the work that is being done and the money that is being spent in the cause of mutual understanding by hundreds of thousands of individuals and perhaps thousands of organizations in the United States, although we are trying to make a survey, country by country, of all that is being done. In one small country there are 12 Government agencies and 93 private agencies with programs in the field of international educational and cultural relations.

How, for example, does one measure the contribution made by the 200 host families of the Cleveland International Program? Can you say that these families spend a total of $10,000 for extra groceries and recreation over a 6-week period and be done with it? Or take the family of Dr. and Mrs. Ernst W. Erickson, of Ypsilanti, Mich. Last year Doctor and Mrs. Erickson received Department of State grants to help set up a new library and teach high school subjects in Katmandu, Nepal. They took their three teenage children with them at their own expense and enrolled them in local schools. In typical American teenage fashion, these children had their Nepalese classmates coming to their home after school. They gave social dancing lessons which became so popular that the students were soon being accompanied by their parents and relatives. The Ericksons were finally forced to set up a Friday night dancing class to control the demand. How do we measure the contributions of this family? Certainly not in dollars and cents.

I think you will certainly agree after this recitation that cultural diplomacy is on its way—but let me emphasize something of very great importance. You in Cleveland are using the greatest care in the selection of those who come here from abroad and of the Americans who go overseas. You are taking foreign visitors into your homes and you are making certain that they are receiving the closest possible attention while they are in this country. Both of these factors are of vital importance. We must guard against the American propensity to do things on a mass basis. We must be certain that private organizations and institutions and particularly the Government in their enthusiasm for carrying on this vitally important activity of cultural diplomacy, do not forget that the visitors from abroad do not want a canned trip around the United States. They want to live in American homes and have time to themselves to find the flavor of American life in their own way. We must give more careful thought to our visitors as individuals, we must take care lest in our enthusiasm we unintentionally turn our visitors from other lands into an assembly line. I think that this type of partnership between private and public effort that exists today between the Cleveland International Program and the Department of State is one of the greatest safeguards against this danger.

And above all we must not forget the all important task of preparing the generations to come in our own country for the task of living in a world where their next door neigh-

bor is not from Cleveland but from Kabul or Cairo or Karachi. Our children and grandchildren must be taught at least one if not two languages other than their own and taught early enough in elementary and secondary schools so that they can speak fluently. They must learn to communicate rather than study the language as a language. They must be taught to understand the peoples of other countries—they must be ready to live their lives outside of their own environment. For this we must have more teachers of foreign languages and area specialists—are we doing enough to train these teachers and specialists. The United States of America is living in a world community—in this world community there is as much pioneering to be done as there was in the early days of the founding of this great land of ours. I am told that juvenile delinquency has increased because there is not a sufficient challenge to the youth of today to give them the physical and spiritual fulfillment that growing minds and bodies require. But I submit to you that the fault lies not in the environment of modern American life today—nor in the nature of young America—it lies in the lack of imagination in those responsible for the bringing up of our youth—in the lack of vision to see the great tasks that lie ahead—in the task of a sense of international responsibility to help guide the great masses of the peoples of the new nations of the world to a life of freedom and justice, and to help guard them from the force of evil in the shape of international communism.

You in the city of Cleveland have shown that you have that imagination, that vision, and that sense of responsibility. Don't keep it to yourself. The role of Cleveland in international cultural relations goes far beyond Cleveland. It can by example be used to enlist similar activity by every city and town not only of Ohio but of the other 49 States of the Union.

And finally may I emphasize that you private citizens are the ones who can succeed in establishing mutual understanding between the people of America and the people of the rest of the world. We in Government stand ready to help you and to serve in this effort but you are the people and cultural diplomacy is a people's program, and only through this program lies the certainty of lasting peace.

I speak for my children, and my grandchildren, and those who come after them when I say may God be with you and give your efforts continued success.

Resolution of United Regular Democratic Organization of Kings County, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution condemning religious and racial bigotry adopted by the United Regular Democratic Organization, 16th Assembly District, Kings County, N.Y. The resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the organization on February 4, 1960, on motion of Philip Ruffo, an ardent civic worker of our community:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL BIGOTRY

Whereas the widespread eruption of religious and racial bigotry recorded in recent press dispatches has not only shocked the whole civilized world, but calls insistently for a vigorous and public repudiation of this evil by all right-minded citizens; and

Whereas the defilement and desecration of synagogues and churches—whatever the stimulation and motivation that underlies this behavior—is a matter of grave import to all who have a deep-rooted belief in the inviolability and dignity of man; and

Whereas all citizens are, in this time of stress and crisis, called upon, whether Christians or Jews, and all those who love truth and justice, to protest privately and condemn publicly against further manifestations of bigotry in all its aspects and in whatever form it may be expressed; and

Whereas the people who comprise the membership of United Regular Democratic Organization, 16th Assembly District, Kings County, take pride in an historical tradition of tolerance and understanding, having a mutual and reciprocal respect for each other regardless of racial origin, ancestry and religious faith: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the United Regular Democratic Organization, 16th Assembly District, Kings County, hereby publicly declare their categorical condemnation against all forms and manifestations of religious and racial bigotry; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the unalterable sense of this body to express our collective detestation of any and every kind of hatred and bigotry, no matter what its source or against whom it may be registered; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of this organization pledges its unstinted and affirmative efforts to combat, by word and deed, the evil of racial and religious bigotry, and to this end each and all of us are resolved to pledge our mutual help and assistance.

Mr. Freedom Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of high privilege and great pride that I command to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States another editorial of recognition and tribute to an outstandingly great American, the senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Because it so clearly indicates the Senator's grasp of worthwhile human relations, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the American Jewish World, Jan. 29, 1960]

MR. FREEDOM FOREST

The strange and wonderful affinity between men and trees will find luminous expression Monday evening at the Minnesota Freedom Forest Dinner—at the Pick-Nicollet—honoring Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. It is a tribute this State's senior Senator fully and profoundly merits.

The event has two great aspects. One is the honor to Senator HUMPHREY; the other is the cause the tribute bespeaks and the certainty that the event will give dramatic impetus to the cause.

HUBERT HUMPHREY has brought the full force of his towering prestige, his buoyant personality, his sparkling mind, and his responsive heart to his warm and sincere friendship for the Jewish people of America, and for that unique human community, the people of Israel. Almost every significant movement in the Jewish life of this country can claim a specific and helpful act of friendship on the part of the Senator. If his personal friends among the Jews of this country could be counted, they might constitute a larger number than some national Jewish organizations can claim as constituencies. Senator HUMPHREY is, in sum (if anything as dynamic as the Senator can be summed up), the kind of significant and incandescent friend who symbolizes the quintessence of worthwhile human relationships.

It is almost gratuitous—and certainly in the nature of anticlimax—to add that the February 1 tribute to HUBERT HUMPHREY is apolitical. The identity of the guest speaker at that occasion, the senior Senator from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS (who happens to be a Republican), is an indication not that the event is nonpartisan or pan-political, or whatever innocuous label one may invoke to indicate neutrality, but that the dimensions of the man's humanity—the fervor, the zest, the joyousness with which he seeks the welfare of people—have earned him this deeply meaningful recognition and accolade.

As for the Jewish National Fund, and the gift of growing life and rootedness it has brought, first to Palestine and now to Israel, can anything at this date be said of its contribution that would not be dwarfed and hushed by the forests it has raised up in the Holy Land? We need only add the pragmatic note that the February 1 event is intended to help get a running start on the $50,000 fund the Minnesota JNF group is seeking for the Freedom Forest in Israel immortalizing Senator HUMPHREY. JNF's goal in this country—"Fifty States, Fifty Forests"—is a catchy and even dynamic expression of both its function and concept.

The forthcoming community tribute to the Minnesota Senator will, we are confident, be a distinguished and memorable occasion. We find that its very nearness evokes a pleasant, gay, festive mood. We have every reason to hope that the numbers who come to participate in the event and partake of its festivities will help make the Minnesota Freedom Forest in Israel a speedy reality.

Hon. David M. Hall

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 1, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I came to know DAVID HALL early in the 86th Congress through relatives of his in my own congressional district who are personal friends.

I admired him for his philosophy of government, and for his great personal courage. Had his cereer in the House of Representatives not been cut short, I am sure it would have been a brilliant one.

The world is, I believe, better for DAVID HALL's example. His State and congressional district are better because of his having lived there. I am sure that I am better because of having known him.

Eyeless in Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the devastating impact of Charles Van Doren's confession of guilt before the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee is still causing reverberations through the Nation.

This sordid affair transcends Van Doren's importance as an individual. It is more a reflection of the deterioration of our Nation's standard of values. When a university professor with a doctor of philosophy degree is not willing to make the basic distinction between right and wrong, it is a cause for widespread national concern.

During recent hearings concerned with the increased transmission of obscene literature through the mails, one of the conclusions reached was that "there is a lack of public conscience in America." This moral decay plays right into the hands of our Nation's sworn enemies. All the funds expended on national defense will be in vain unless the citizens of our country, who are willing to sacrifice their integrity for the sake of a "fast buck," begin to reform. There is no easy road to morality, but this is the road which the citizens of our country must find and follow.

The following absorbing article, written by Prof. Lawrence S. Hall, of the Bowdoin College English department, Brunswick, Maine, places Van Doren's confession in the proper perspective. Professor Hall's essay appeared in the December 10 edition of the Reporter magazine:

EYELESS IN WONDERLAND

(By Lawrence S. Hall)

One snowy December afternoon in 1955 a tall young man with a cultivated and ingratiating manner came into an office I was occupying at Columbia College. He tossed his green-cloth book satchel on the table, and without removing his coat sat down and looked at me with shining eyes.

"It's wonderful," he exclaimed with equal obscurity and charm, as though the mere feeling of wonder were in itself what was important and not the thing, whatever it may have been, that caused it. "It's wonderful."

Not being addicted to this sort of mesmerism, I said: "What's wonderful"?

"The mind of man. You know," he said, "it's wonderful what you can learn from people. I'm editing an anthology of famous love letters, and it's incredible how much I've learned. I tell my students what my father always does; they aren't in class to learn from me; we're all there to learn from each other. And I have as much to learn from them, if not more." Notable events have occurred which now lead me to speculate with alarm on what in fact it was that Charles Van Doren's students taught him and he taught them.

Today, in 1959, he tells us in his own words: "I have learned a lot in those 3 years, especially in the last 3 weeks. I've learned a lot about life."

In spite of the freshman-theme idiom, we grant that this is a considerable lesson, and we ask him what it is he has learned about life, and find him saying: "* * * the truth is the only thing with which a man can live."

Again we grant the premise and ask what truth he has learned, and hear him say, "I've learned a lot about myself."

Now we put it to him: What truth has he learned about himself? And this is what he says:

"I was involved, deeply involved, in a deception. The fact that I, too, was very much deceived cannot keep me from being the principal victim of that deception, because I was its principal symbol. * * * There may be a kind of justice in that. I don't know."

Well, here is obviously something he has not learned: He doesn't know whether what has happened to him is just or not. But, beyond this, when he describes himself as being "very much deceived" and the "victim" of a deception, by whom or what does he think he was deceived? From his own testimony, certainly not by Producer Albert Freedman, who told him he could not possibly go on the quiz program "Twenty-one" without collaborating in the deceit that had been so undeceitfully proposed in the privacy of Freedman's bedroom.

The only deception of which Van Doren is certainly the victim is his own self-deception. He has been made aware, with the great help of external pressures, of the more obvious phases of this self-deception. He knows, for example, that you do not do "a great service to the intellectual life, to teachers, and to education," of which he says he believes "nothing is more vital to our civilization," by performing mental stunts, even when they are honest; though it comes hard to imagine how, with his high intelligence, the best of education and training, and experience in the profession of the intellect, he could have avoided realizing this from the beginning.

But I myself do not see that he recognizes any of those acts of deception which have not been made forcibly obvious to him, because he is still practicing them.

While he was preparing his statement to the House subcommittee, he told a Time correspondent: "I've been getting just wonderful letters from wonderful people. I put the good letters in one pocket and the bad in another. When I looked I had 39 good letters in one pocket and there was only 1 bad one in the other pocket. I've been getting so much love from so many people that I just wish I could return it all. People are wonderful."

Here is material for another volume of love letters, of which the young man can this time be both editor and recipient. Of one of these letters Charles Van Doren says to a committee of Congress: "In the end, it was a small thing that tipped the scales. A letter came to me. * * * It was from a woman, a complete stranger, who had seen me on the Garroway show and who said she admired my work there. She told me that the only way I could ever live with myself, and make up for what I had done * * * was to admit it, clearly, openly, truly. Suddenly I knew she was right, and this way, which had seemed for so long the worst of all possible alternatives, suddenly became the only one * * * In the morning I telephoned my attorney and told him my decision."

This is an extraordinary piece of self-hypnosis. On October 14, 2 days prior to receiving the quoted letter, Mr. Van Doren was served with a subpena that he had by his own statement been forced to invite. At any stage of the 3 years preceding that moment he had been free to decide to tell the truth, but from this point on it became impossible for him to make a decision because he had left no real choice. To the very end he never did perform the ethical free act of making up his mind, and to the very end of his hearing he had not learned that vital fact about himself. At the very end he still speaks of "possible alternatives" as though circumstances, as inexorably as in a work of fiction, had not closed every one of them off. Van Doren did not decide to tell the truth; what he did was adapt himself to the finally inescapable necessity of telling it. The way he talks about finding, with the help of his correspondent who did not know he was no longer a free moral agent, was to blur the stark and damning distinction between these two actions.

"I spent the rest of the week (before the hearing)," he says, "trying hopelessly to seek a way out. There was no way, but even though my mind knew there was none, I could not face the prospect emotionally." Van Doren frankly did not have the emotional strength to face what he had done or what he was; and from the necessity, moral and practical, of facing this, he did at the zero hour find a way, as he inadvertently puts it, "out." By means of the little packet of letters in his pocket he was able to lay down a smokescreen of love and devotion which clouded the issue so that all distinctions could be miraged.

Any man must struggle for the image he needs of himself to make life supportable, regardless of what that image is, in the best way he can. If camouflage is indispensable to Van Doren, then in all humanity, I am willing it should do him as much grace as possible. I would do better than forgiveness, which as Shaw once pointed out has an element of condescension in it; I would forget him and let him rescue what felicity he is able to as a private man. But it is not as a private man that I am concerned with him, because he himself calls himself a symbol. And it is by this symbol, in all its pretentious deceptiveness, that I am repelled and alarmed.

There have been men throughout history who have regarded themselves as symbols; some of them have been good and some have not. But all are dangerous if they are not seen to be what they are. There is always megalomania in a man who regards himself as symbol, as Eliot's Archbishop Becket saw when he rejected the fourth and ultimate temptation of martyrdom. There is certainly megalomania in a man who says he could not act honestly without betraying the hope and faith of millions of people—as if the hope and faith of all these millions hung on him alone; who further says, "I felt that I carried the whole burden of the honor of my profession"—as if the burden of the honor of his profession were not being carried by thousands of the relatively obscure, conscientious men who were his colleagues, who were and still are discharging their responsibilities to the intellectual life undeceiving and undeceived, and whose honor could neither be upheld nor despoiled by any one man.

What Van Doren is asking us to believe here is that he sacrificed his personal need for honesty to his larger duty to all those people whose symbol he saw himself as being. So as not to fail in his larger duty, he martyred himself to the fatal obligation of deceiving them into believing he was the symbol he knew he was not. Van Doren told an interviewer for Newsweek: "Oedipus' reaction was to pluck out his eyes in order to see a strange paradox. Well, some explosion had taken place in me, too." When I read this I realized to my utter amaze-

ment that this young man sees himself as a hero in a Greek tragedy.

But in spite of his talk about his inner explosion, the record will show that from beginning to end Van Doren has learned nothing of himself, from himself or from others. He has indeed, though in a very different way from Oedipus, plucked his eyes out. There is a pitiful circular consistency in his behavior. His performance on "Twenty-One" and his performance before the House subcommittee with its nationwide gallery are of a piece. Let me quote him again:

"I hve deceived my friends, and I had millions of them. Whatever their feelings for me now, my affection for them is stronger today than ever before. I am making this statement because of them. I hope my being here will serve them well and lastingly." The symbol, alas, is still pathetically deceiving its believers, chief among whom is Van Doren himself.

Van Doren has taken his medicine only after, by a specious alchemy, he has converted it to an elixir—a love potion. He bowed out still representing himself as the loving martyred servant of these wonderful people who will be saved by his hapless example from being beguiled by worldly wickedness.

The shortest sane response to all this is, How noble can you get? Well, pretty noble, I'm afraid, if you set sail on the befogged sea of schmaltz in Van Doren's beautiful pea-green boat. And the alarming thing is that so many members of this culture are doing just that. We have the spectacle of four members of the House subcommittee commending this young man, and the chairman actually God-blessing him as if he had done something heroic, for a confession which he was driven into.

We have another spectacle of the students, who learned from him and from whom he learned, petitioning Columbia to restore to his intellectual duties a man they described as a conscientious and brilliant teacher.

But this is not a brilliant and conscientious teacher; this is a cruelly and pitiably confused young man who by exuding and receiving indiscriminate compassion, playing footsie with the public to the end, had made himself a rallying point, a national hero of the similarly confused. They do not help one another; they compound each other's difficulties. This is far more dangerous to a culture than crooked television with its rigged quizzes and its shows of murder and rape for which Van Doren thought he was atoning by being, he imagined, the only person to read 17th century poetry on a TV network program. Crookedness, murder, and rape are among those evils he had alluded to which appear to be clearly what they are. But so far neither he nor his sympathizers have learned to detect the other kind, which lurks, among other places, behind the easy safeguards of the sacred slogan.

The supreme fraud in this whole sordid and sick affair lies in concealing under piously reflexive formulas—poetry, kind heart, truth, gentle soul, contrition, fellow sinner, forgiveness, love—the most maudlin and promiscuous ethical whoredom the soap-opera public has yet witnessed. The time can come, if it has not already come, when wanton pity for human weakness will betray the equally pitiable but uninfatuated fidelity to its strength.

Nor is this kicking a man when he's down, because this young man is anything but down, a fact he realized well in advance of most when he said (Newsweek): "Will I have the guts to withstand this if they come up with new attractive possibilities? I don't know." He will have many chances to find out. Among other things, he has already been offered, in the movie "Wake Me When It's Over," the role of prosecutor in which, if he chooses, he can duplicate the histrionic subterfuge with which as unawakened defendant he delivered his lines before a committee of Congress and the Nation.

It has been a painful chore to come to grips with this case, which has in it many of the authentic Conradian tensions between judgment and sympathy. But in defense of what may seem to be and indeed may be harshness, I offer this paradox. If judgment without sympathy is monstrous, sympathy without judgment is also monstrous. Every sound judgment has behind it the injunction: Judge not, that ye be not judged. But this does not mean, as the misguided compassionate think, Don't judge at all, because you too are guilty. It means, Don't judge in a way that assumes you are not open to the same judgment. The first enjoins chaos, the second understanding. We have to judge where we are required to, though we may already ourselves have defaulted, or we perpetuate our defections in others from a sympathetic fear of denouncing our own.

What I have really indicted here, at the expense of Charles Van Doren, is an attitude, a cultural soft spot. In this connection I have indicted also Van Doren's commenders, his condoners, his publicizers—all those who are his creators and the creators of others like him.

I would say a final word about the man who, behind all the rest—the self-pity, self-delusion, self-devotion, and self-destruction—is the same as we all are, as all men have been and will be. Not the symbol, not the tragic hero publicly pronouncing "Troubles bring you closer together," "I found myself again," "Everything came too easy," "Maybe this is all a farce, too, part of the masquerade," "This is a phenomenal thing that has happened to me—I don't think it happens to most men." Not this man but the one whose genuine private torture shows now and then amid these tortuous and phony cliches.

The man I would finally speak about is the one you get only an insufficient faltering glimpse of now and then, as I did that wintry day 4 years ago when I forebore to tell him directly what I thought of his philosophy of education. It is the man who pitifully told the reporter for Newsweek: "I've been acting a role for 10 or 15 years, maybe all my life. It's a role of thinking that I've done far more than I've done, accomplished more than I've accomplished, produced more than I've produced. It has, in a way, something to do with my family, I suppose. I don't mean just my father, there are other people in my family. But I've been running."

What Happened to Ike's National Forest Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our great national forests are the concern of every citizen of the United States because they are a tremendous asset which is owned by the citizens of the United States and which produce immense revenues.

They can produce more revenue and more benefits if their managers, mainly the U.S. Forest Service, are given the amount of money they need to do the necessary jobs.

Last year Secretary Benson sent an ambitious 12-year program to Congress called "A Program for the National Forests." This year the budget falls far short of recognizing the needs which were apparently so clear last year.

Forest Amsden, executive editor of the World—Coos Bay, Oreg.—now a congressional fellow here on the Hill, tells the story in an article printed in his paper for January 28, 1960, and which is included here under a previous unanimous consent, as follows:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON—WHAT HAPPENED TO IKE'S NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAM?

(By Forest Amsden)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—About a year ago, Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson sent an ambitious 12-year program to Congress called a program for the national forests.

Under this plan, yearly stages of work and expense would be undertaken to bring the 180 million acres of national forest land up to adequate levels of development. The program covered all areas of the subject, from timber sales to recreation.

The program met the approval of most Congressmen and Senators. In fact, the approval was manifested in statements and money by legislators who had long urged that just this sort of planning be carried out.

In fact, Congress has been prodding the Forest Service for such a long-range plan ever since President Eisenhower suggested such a course in his very first state of the Union message.

Congress was so happy about it last year, in fact, that it raised the Forest Service's budget by $10.9 million to get the program underway. Benson had not asked for any money last year when the program was sent up to Congress. A start on the program, apparently, was to wait until this year's budget.

Well, this year's budget is now in Congress hands. And what, many are asking: What ever happened to the program for the national forests?

You couldn't tell, hardly, that the program had been remembered in the budget, for the expenditures to make it work—in the main—were not included.

Had the Agriculture Department forgotten its mighty fine long-range plans? Or did it perhaps run amuck in the far less development-minded Budget Bureau?

We'll probably not find out. But we do know that the appropriation which the President requested for the Forest Service for fiscal year 1961 is more than $20 million too low to achieve the minimum first-year goals of the program for the national forests, even after counting the almost $11 million which Congress appropriated last year, and which presumably is being spent this year if the administration has not impounded it.

The proposal is $5 million short of providing enough for access roads and trails.

It is $2.3 million short of asking enough for reforestation and stand improvement—perhaps the most serious deficiency of all.

It is $1.6 million too low in the field of developing recreation facilities.

It would be a mistake to think this isn't about what Congress expected. In fact, perhaps the budget comes closer to the program for the national forests than was expected.

Said a Senate Interior Committee aid: "The only reason Benson sent that program up last year was because a lot of Congressmen and Senators were riding him for it. After Eisenhower mentioned it in 1953, Benson hasn't been able to forget it.

"So last year he sent it up and walked right into the trap. It will be thrown in his face all year. And it should be. These were the things that have to be done in fiscal year 1961 to get our national forests in

shape. It will cost money, but not so much money as not doing it."

Added a Congressman: "Somewhere between planning and budgeting, the administration has forgotten to carry out its glorious intentions. I hope we can help it remember."

The problem is well understood by the Forest Service. Its personnel has for years known that deliberate, well thought out goals must be set and the time and money spent to achieve them. But the career people have been undercut, this is nothing new.

This administration's attitude in the matter is typical.

The gentlemen in policymaking jobs throughout the departments will recognize problems, most of them, but they are then required to beg that the country simply cannot afford to solve them.

Failure to solve the problems of the national forests—failure to fully develop this heritage—creates more problems easily understood by southwestern Oregonians.

Understanding of this particular problem is not so acute by most of the population of the country, however. This makes it relatively easy for the administration to bring pressures against solving the problems.

This has not been the case of the national forests alone. For years, the administration has been saying we can't afford to tackle our problems in all realms of activity, and has used the bright sounding, fooling cry of "economy" to head off anyone who wants to solve them.

When the United States again gets a Government ready to take a hard look at problems, the activity (and cost) necessary to attack them will be staggering.

Wilkes-Barre Businessman Acquires Controlling Interest in Dean Phipps Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Tuesday, February 2, 1960, which comments upon the acquisition by Mr. Oscar Weissman, president of the American Auto Stores, of the controlling interest in the Dean Phipps Stores, a retail chain with some 60 outlets in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey:

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY—OSCAR WEISSMAN ACQUIRES CHAIN

That our country and our community offer almost limitless opportunity to men of ability, initiative, and foresight was strikingly demonstrated when formal announcement was made that Oscar Weissman, president of the American Auto Stores with headquarters in Wilkes-Barre, had purchased a controlling stock interest in the Dean Phipps Stores, a retail chain with headquarters in Scranton, 60 outlets in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, two warehouses and a realty subsidiary.

Last year, Mr. Weissman took over the full responsibilities of ownership and management of American Auto when his father, Charles Weissman, founder of the company, formally retired and severed all connections to devote himself to other interests.

Although he is only 43 years of age, Oscar Weissman has had a variety of experience in the quarter century he has been identified with American Auto Stores and the wholesale division, American Auto Accessories, Inc. He launched his business career while attending Wyoming Seminary and continued it through 4 years of college at Lafayette and while he was doing post graduate work at Babson Institute in Boston, with time out for the Second World War and a tour of duty with the Office of Price Administration. Important milestones in his career were his advancement to the post of general manager in 1946 and to the presidency in 1954.

Mr. Weissman was not content just to follow in the footsteps of his colorful father, no small feat in itself; he pioneered on his own, nationally and locally, acquiring a reputation for civic and business enterprise that suggested he was on the way to bigger things.

Yesterday, the thoughts that were in back of the minds of business associates and other friends were confirmed with his acquisition of the Dean Phipps chain. As soon as it is possible to comply with the formalities, he will take over the active management, operating it independently of American Auto.

Like the late Fred Morgan Kirby and others who became nationally known figures in American business, Mr. Weissman has faith in the future of America and in the free enterprise system. So obviously he is set to grow with the country, picking up where his father left off. Who knows where his ambitions will lead, for Dean Phipps could be just a steppingstone to other conquests when he has consolidated his position? For an executive of Mr. Weissman's capacity, the outlook is promising indeed.

Mr. Weissman's business acumen is fortified by a becoming modesty, lofty idealism and his unfailing conisderation for others, be they members of his organization, store patrons or individuals with whom he comes in contact through his extracurricular activities.

His hometown, Wilkes-Barre, which is indebted to him for many services beyond the call of duty, will wish him well in the new venture.

Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that it is good now and then to laugh at one's self.

Recently I introducer in this House a bill to unify the armed services under a single civilian head. Understandably enough, my proposal has met some opposition in the services.

The current issue of Army Times, a publication which I read faithfully, has on its front page a bit of verse poking fun at my bill. The verse is so cleverly done that I believe it is worth quoting in the RECORD.

I still believe strongly in unification, Mr. Speaker, and I trust that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will set down my bill for a hearing in order that we may have a full discussion of this vital subject. However, I can relish some good-natured fun, hence I am happy to quote for the RECORD this verse from the Army Times of February 6:

UNIFICATION

(Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, a veteran of 33 years in the Army, has introduced a reorganization bill to create a single service with one uniform for all.)

Mr. KOWALSKI once was a soldier,
The uniform proudly he wore;
But now he's no longer a soldier
He don't like that suit any more.

Now he's a Member of Congress,
Where a man can wear what he likes;
No bugles at 4 in the morning,
No full field pack 20-mile hikes.

He wants a reorganization:
One uniform for all the troops;
The Army, the Navy, the Air Force
Would give way to functional groups.

Goodbye to marines, to tradition.
Goodbye to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
When you all wear the same kind of clothing
Personnel costs will be cut in half.

Well, we'd go for this drastic idea
To balance the budget for Ike,
But think of the possible savings
If civilians all dressed alike!

So we'll back Representative KOWALSKI's proposal
And work for it at every chance
When all women start wearing bikinis
And Congressmen all wear short pants.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of all the Members the timely article appearing in the International Teamster magazine for February 1960 concerning the 25th anniversary of rural electrification which had its beginning under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The article follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION CELEBRATES 25TH BIRTHDAY—96 PERCENT OF RURAL AREAS RECEIVING ELECTRICITY

President Franklin Roosevelt was in the third year of his New Deal. His brain-trusters, as all of his assistants were known, presented him the results of a survey of the number of electrified farms in rural America, revealing that only 10 percent of the farm homes had electricity. Thereupon FDR by Executive order established the Rural Electrification Administration with responsibility to electrify the farm homes in the Nation.

That was 25 years ago—1935 to be exact. Today, as REA celebrates its silver anniversary, 97 percent of all the farms in America enjoy the benefits of modern electric service. The farmers owe it all to their ingenuity and the Rural Electrification Administration, which has financed over 1,000 rural electric distribution systems. From these REA-financed co-ops have come the electric power to make America the greatest agricultural Nation the world has ever known.

Rural electrification has meant roughly $16 billion in jobs for teamsters and other members of organized labor. Today, as farmers are buying television sets, water heaters, refrigerators, electric motors and other electrical appliances, rural electrification represents additional millions of dollars in jobs for teamsters and others.

To the farmers of the Nation, rural electrification means much more than just jobs for their city brethren. It has changed their lives completely. For the farm women, life is now much more livable. The back-breaking drudgery that they once faced has been eased, and many of the working hours are now hours of leisure. For the farm men, years have been added to their life expectancy. They can now turn over to electric motors the tasks that they used to have to do with their muscle. A point of fact is that there are over 400 different tasks that electricity can perform on the farm that formerly the farmer did himself.

To city people, electricity on the farm means much more than we realize in terms of good health. For example, a farmer used to milk cows by hand. The milk went into an unsterilized bucket. It was then placed in a cellar or some other cool place until the dairy truck picked it up, and took it to the plant for pasteurization and bottling.

Today, the farmer uses electric milking machines, sterilized by electric hot water heaters. The milk is placed in electrically sterilized containers and immediately placed in an electrically refrigerated room. It never touches human hands that might contain any one of a variety of germs.

Electricity on the farm played a prominent role in winning World War II and the Korean war. It is also a major factor in our national security and defense today. If there is one area where America is unquestionably superior to Russia, it is agriculture, and much of the credit is due to the rural electrification program begun 25 years ago by President Roosevelt and subsequently supported by President Harry Truman and President Dwight Eisenhower.

Much of the success for the rural electrification program can be attributed to Roosevelt. He had the foresight and courage to devise a perfect partnership between the Government of the people and the people themselves.

Roosevelt created the REA by Executive order, but a year later, Congress realized the wisdom of the program and passed a law making it an agency of the Government.

Interestingly enough, the REA bill in Congress was authored by Democrat SAM RAYBURN of Texas, now Speaker of the House, and Republican Senator George Norris of Nebraska. This is typical of Republican and Democratic support that the rural electrification program has had over the quarter of a century of its existence. It is also strongly supported by Teamster officials and other segments of organized labor.

REA is empowered to make loans at 2 percent interest for a period of 25 years. The vast majority of REA borrowers have been groups of farmers who organized themselves into nonprofit co-ops. REA, itself, does not own or operate any electric facilities. Rather, it is a bank where money can be borrowed on liberal terms to perform an economic and social function for the Nation as a whole.

Co-ops are very similar to teamster locals. They are voluntary, democratic organizations. They are organized to perform a service for their members. They are not in business to make a profit. Both organizations are owned by the members they serve.

In 25 years, the REA has loaned over $4 billion to farmers' electric co-ops. Seventy-seven percent of this money has gone to construct electric distribution systems. This type of co-op purchases its power wholesale from either commercial profit power companies or from Federal public power projects like the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Twenty-two percent of the $4 billion has been loaned to farmers' electric co-ops to construct generation and transmission facilities. This type of co-op is called a G–T co-op, and its membership consists of several of the distribution co-ops, who have decided to join together and build their own supply of electricity.

These REA-financed co-ops have a record of repaying their loans to the Government that is nothing short of fantastic. REA Administrator David Hamil has published figures that show the electric co-ops have repaid over $1.1 billion on their loans. This includes $628 million repaid on principal, $375 million repaid in interest, and $146 million paid ahead of schedule. Only one REA borrower was delinquent in repaying its loan.

As REA celebrates its silver anniversary, it must look to its future. There are many power people and organizations that say it should be dissolved with "job well done" salute.

REA Administrator Hamil says: "The future of rural electrification can be summarized in three phrases: More people, increased consumption (of electricity), and heavier plant (facilities).

"These trends seem certain to continue for at least 20 more years:

"More nonfarm families will move into rural areas. Many will buy homes in new suburban housing developments. More retired people will buy country homes to escape the high living costs of the city. As highways are steadily improved, more commuters will seek a rural environment for their families. And in many areas, the resort boom will continue.

"More businesses and industries will start operation in rural areas, or move there from towns and cities.

"The number of farms will diminish and families that give up farming will be reclassified as nonfarm. Those farms that remain will use more electricity for farm chores.

"Nonfarm consumers, as well as farm, will heat more homes with electricity; year-round air conditioning may be as commonplace as refrigeration in 20 years.

"Rural power distributors will have to 'heavy up' existing lines and substations to keep abreast of demand.

"The first goal of the rural electrification program has been all but attained. * * * As REA borrowers approached their first objective, a second goal began to take shape," according to Hamil.

"To assure the availability of a constantly high quality of service to all rural consumers within a service area in whatever amounts they will use, at the lowest possible cost consistent with sound management of the cooperative."

The "Featherbedded" Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 28, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the dictionary definition of "featherbedding" is "pay for unnecessary or duplicating jobs, or limiting the amount of work to be done in a day as a means of stretching work."

The American people, from one end of our land to another, have been treated to the spectacle of gigantic advertising campaigns by industry, leveling this charge against the workers in major segments of our industrial machinery. As a result of this campaign, featherbedding is considered to be unethical, immoral, and indefensible.

A careful review of Federal legislation relating to agriculture leads one to the inevitable conclusion that the greatest area of featherbedding in our country today is concealed in our farm subsidy program, wherein farmers are being paid for work not performed. Agriculture is one business in America where idleness is not only encouraged but is made profitable through taxpayer-supported farm subsidy programs.

The present featherbedded farm program is a sick program because it tampers with economic laws under various guises which cannot be amended, and has failed miserably to accomplish its announced objective of a high per family real income for the farmer.

I agree that farming must be encouraged, but not in this giveaway manner. Farming, as defined by the typical pastoral scene of a ruggedly individualistic individual and his family tilling the soil on a small farm, is a misnomer or smokescreen to hide the real beneficiaries of this subsidy program—the gigantic agricultural corporations which are the real culprits draining the billions of dollars from the Public Treasury.

The small marginal farmer is being used and referred to as a man of the soil, and must be preserved at any cost.

To put the corporation farmers on an equal status with the rest of the segments of our society, we should throw them off the overburdened backs of the American taxpayers who have carried them long enough on the flimsy arguments to justify the current featherbedding, and provide them only with disaster protection such as given the workers in industry-unemployment insurance or welfare. It is just as much a disaster for a worker to lose his job as it is for a corporation farmer to fail to sell his crop at an adequate price.

There is a growing revolt among the average taxpayers who are treated to the spectacle of an example of one farmer receiving $40,000 of hard-earned tax dollars in one year for keeping land out of production to pay for work not performed—the definition of featherbedding accepted by all.

The American people are being taken by the farm program.

Expansion of Promotion of Private Commercial Exports Can Reduce Future Budget Outlays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that economy in Government operations is absolutely essen-

tial and I know that our Appropriations Committee has done an outstanding job in eliminating unnecessary expenditures. However, there are times when a very slight increase in appropriations can yield returns to the Nation of much greater magnitude. I am referring to the budget for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the Department of Commerce. The budget recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget would permit a modest expansion in the BFC's program to promote private commercial exports. An increase in exports at this time is absolutely essential if our country is to be successful in eliminating the deficit in our balance of payments—that is, increase our income from foreign transactions so that it will equal our outgo. A deficit in our balance of payments is every bit as serious as a deficit in our budget. As a matter of fact, if commercial exports are not increased so as to eliminate our deficit in our balance of payments, we can surely foresee that the consequences will be felt in our national budget. Timely attention to the promotion of private exports will result in elimination of many future demands for budget outlays for foreign spending. I believe that the Bureau of Foreign Commerce should have the resources which it believes, and the President believes, are necessary to provide trade promotional services to increase exports.

Maritime Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the Maritime Associates, New York City, on Monday evening, February 8, 1960. The text of my address follows:

I want to talk to you briefly today about the investigation of antitrust problems in the ocean shipping industry in which the House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is currently engaged. This investigation is both a continuation of a long-range investigative program and a response to immediate legislative problems. Let me explain.

In February 1956, I announced that the Antitrust Subcommittee would undertake a series of investigations of monopoly problems in industries subject to Federal regulation. Since that time the subcommittee has held extensive hearings and issued comprehensive reports on antitrust problems in the airlines, television broadcasting, oil pipelines transportation, and telephone communications industries. In each case, the object of the subcommittee was to ascertain whether the principles of free enterprise competition embodied in our antitrust laws were being carried out to the maximum extent consistent with the regulatory statute, the powers entrusted to the regulatory agency, and the responsibilities reposed in the Department of Justice. The present investigation of the carriage of ocean freight in the foreign commerce of the United States is part of this series.

Enactment by Congress in 1958 of so-called interim legislation which legitimized for 2 years the continued use in ocean shipping of dual rate systems served to stimulate the initiation of our ocean freight inquiry. In dual rate systems, as you know, so-called steamship conferences establish a rate differential for the carriage of cargo. Shippers who agree to use vessels of conference members exclusively pay the lower rate; all others pay the higher.

You will recall that the Supreme Court had held, on May 19, 1958, in *Federal Maritime Board* v. *Isbrandtsen Company*, 356 U.S. 481, that the dual rate system proposed in that case, whose purpose the Maritime Board had found to be that of stifling outside competition, was unlawful under the Shipping Act. Concerned lest this decision might have the effect of outlawing all dual rate systems, the shipping industry urged the adoption of validating legislation. In response, the interim enactment was passed in the closing days of the 85th Congress. It provides that all dual rate systems in use on the day of the Supreme Court decision, whether or not approved by the Maritime Board and whether or not discriminatory, or detrimental to the commerce of the United States or violative of the antitrust laws, shall be valid for 2 years. During the debates in the House on this legislation, I made clear that the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary would be interested in the proposed suspension of our antitrust laws and would undertake a thorough inquiry into the operation of dual rate shipping conferences in their impact on those laws.

In our ensuing investigation, the main focus of the subcommittee has been upon the interrelationship between the principles of fair and free competition inherent in the antitrust laws on the one hand, and the antitrust exemption of the Shipping Act of 1916 on the other. In this context, section 15 of the Shipping Act is one of the most important provisions of the statute. It exempts from the operations of the antitrust laws any agreement restraining competition entered into between or among persons subject to the act, provided such agreement has been filed with, and approved by, the Federal Maritime Board. In the absence of Board approval the antitrust laws are fully applicable.

Other important sections in the statutory scheme are sections 14, 16, and 17, which make unlawful certain unfair trade practices and certain discriminations by carriers between shippers, carriers, or ports. Section 20 of the act forbids the solicitation, giving, or receiving by any person subject to the act, or his agent or employee, of any information concerning the shipment of goods that might be detrimental to any shipper or carrier. These, in their relationship to the policies of the Sherman and Clayton Acts are the provisions of law with which we are most concerned and whose interpretation, enforcement, and shortcomings we are examining.

In preparation for public hearings the subcommittee staff examined the files of the Federal Maritime Board, 53 steamship conferences, and 9 American and 4 foreign steamship companies in an effort to study as many of the restrictive agreements and practices employed by the industry as time would permit. The most important—and by far the most voluminous—of the restrictive agreements filed with, and approved by, the Board under the antitrust exemption provision of section 15 are those providing for the formation of steamship conferences. These are associations of competitive steamship lines furnishing regular scheduled service on a given trade route. They are formed for the purpose of fixing uniform rates and establishing other uniform conditions of freight or passenger carriage that are binding upon all members. Conferences are of varying degrees of formality and size. Some conferences have as few as 2 members; others have as many as 55. Some have central offices and chairmen in this country while some have them abroad.

In general, the subcommittee is seeking to learn what standards the Board follows in approving conference agreements, what functions steamship conferences perform, what their procedures are, what their agreements provide, how those agreements are enforced, what action conferences take against independent operators, and what their economic impact might be upon other steamship operators, shippers, consignees, and the consuming public.

In addition, of course, the subcommittee is studying the conference's most favored tying device—the dual rate system. We are examining the provisions of existing dual rate contracts between the various conferences and their shipper customers, how these contracts are enforced, and what their economic impact is upon carriers, shippers, and consumers.

Of especial interest, too, are interconference agreements whereby antitrust exemption is granted to a conference that wishes to set rates jointly with another conference. For example, one conference of steamship lines operating from the east coast of the United States is permitted in effect, under such an agreement, to regulate the rates charged by a conference of lines operating from the west coast. Such power could easily affect the well-being of other industries and ports as well as the parties to the agreement themselves. Consequently, it is a power that must be closely supervised.

During October and November 1959, the subcommittee held 12 days of public hearings in New York, taking testimony from officials of the Federal Maritime Board and 19 representatives of 10 private corporations. Further hearings will be held next month.

The subcommittee's record to date discloses that the shipping lines frequently have conducted their operations without regard for the requirements of Federal law. There have been numerous examples of predatory actions against other shipping lines. The subcommittee's examination of the files of this industry has uncovered many instances where shippers have been victimized.

Efforts of the Federal Maritime Board to secure compliance with the requirements of Federal law is one of incredible failure. Neglect by Federal officials of their administrative responsibilities over a period that commenced before World War II is manifest in the subcommittee's record. The shipping industry's disregard for the requirements of the Shipping Act, coupled with the inadequacy of the Federal Maritime Board, undoubtedly has injured our foreign commerce, has caused American consumers to pay more for imported goods and has been detrimental to U.S. manufacturers and American exporters.

Among the problems revealed in course of the subcommittee's hearings are the following:

(1) Unfiled agreements: In studying the existing statutory provisions it is necessary, of course, to consider the conditions in the trade which gave rise to the Shipping Act and to weigh the purposes for which it was enacted. The 1916 act was an outgrowth of the extensive study of steamship agreements and affiliations made between 1912 and 1914 by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, Joshua W. Alexander, of Missouri. It was that committee's conclusion that steamship lines operating in the foreign commerce of the United States had made so many anticompetitive agreements among themselves that were detrimental to the commerce of

the United States that such agreements, if not outlawed completely, should be permitted to continue only under close governmental supervision and regulation.

The Alexander committee's report on this subject declares:

"While admitting their many advantages, the committee is not disposed to recognize steamship agreements and conferences, unless the same are brought under some form of effective Government supervision. To permit such agreements without Government supervision would mean giving the parties thereto unrestricted right of action.

"The committee believes that the disadvantages and abuses connected with steamship agreements and conferences as now conducted are inherent, and can only be eliminated by effective Government control; and it is such control that the committee recommends as the means of preserving to American exporters and importers the advantages enumerated, and of preventing the abuses complained of."

It is thus clear that the Alexander committee believed that conferences and other anticompetitive agreements among steamship lines should be permitted only under strict Government supervision, in order to insure the greatest amount of competition possible.

Our subcommittee's hearings to date reveal that the abuses detailed in the Alexander committee's report have continued unabated and unallayed. Many steamship lines and conferences have entered into numerous so-called gentlemen's agreements, restrictive arrangements and collusive practices without notifying the Board or obtaining its approval. Since these agreements often affect independent operators, shippers, and ports, and since without Board approval there can be no antitrust exemption, it may be that some of these agreements violate the antitrust laws, as well as the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act. It should be noted, too, that section 15 prescribes a civil penalty of $1,000 a day for each day of violation. Over 50 possible violations of the antitrust laws and over 100 possible violations of section 15 were demonstrated. Yet there has been no single instance of prosecution by either the Department of Justice or the Federal Maritime Board.

(2) Discriminatory practices: The hearings indicate that, notwithstanding the provisions of the Shipping Act, some lines discriminate in favor of valued shippers by making erroneous measurements or classifications of cargo, changing shipping schedules, reserving shipping space, reducing or eliminating passenger fares on freighter cruises, bestowing lavish entertainment, and similar practices. Over 140 instances of such rebates and discriminations, which may constitute violations of sections 14, 16, and 17 of the Shipping Act were disclosed at the hearings.

(3) Conference membership practices: Although it has long been the policy of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors to insist upon free and open membership in steamship conferences, the hearings reveal that this principle is not always followed. On occasion, applicants have been made to wait weeks or months for admission, during which period much revenue has been lost through inability to compete for carriage of goods shipped by contract signatories.

(4) Exchange of information: Among the many kinds of information exchanged among conferences and lines is data regarding shipments made via competitors, particularly on independent competitors. This practice could involve violations of section 20 of the Shipping Act which forbids soliciting, giving or receiving such information where it may be detrimental to any shipper or carrier. In one significant case before the Board, allegations were made by a party of violations of this section by one of the conference chairmen. However, the Board took no formal action on these allegations, and the inquiry was permitted to lapse even though the conference chairman refused to answer the Board's questions concerning these alleged violations on the ground of possible self-incrimination.

(5) Conference malpractices: According to documents and testimony received at the hearings, a considerable number of conference members engage in rate-cutting, rebating, use of unfiled rates, and other deviations from conference tariffs, rules, and regulations.

These and many other problems affecting the industry were aired before the subcommittee. When the hearings were recessed the subcommittee promptly referred all the revealed instances of possible violations of law to the Attorney General and to the Federal Maritime Board for appropriate action.

What has been the response of the Department of Justice and the Federal Maritime Commission to the revelations of our subcommittee's initial public hearings? For one thing, the Attorney General, on the basis of the subcommittee's hearings record to date, has embarked upon a grand jury investigation of steamship industry practices, impaneling juries in San Francisco and Washington. Preliminary litigation involving a challenge to the grand jury subpenas is even now pending.

Further, in January 1960, the Federal Maritime Board instituted a full scale investigation of abuses and law violations reflected in the public testimony so far received by the subcommittee. To this end, the Board has opened four rulemaking and seven investigatory dockets and has in addition issued three orders to show cause why certain agreements having Board approval should not be cancelled.

It would, of course, be premature to say how satisfactorily these enforcement steps of the Department of Justice and regulatory and investigative steps of the Maritime Board will have dealt with unlawful anticompetitive practices of the industry. When the Antitrust Subcommittee resumes its hearings toward the middle of March, the Department of Justice and the Federal Maritime Board will be asked to report on their activities. After the hearings have been completed, the subcommittee will submit its report and detailed recommendations. Our efforts will not stop there. We do not issue reports merely to file them. The agencies and enterprises which are the subject of subcommittee recommendations will be queried periodically concerning what they have done toward the solution of the problems involved. If their actions inadequately correct revealed abuses, remedial legislation will be considered. But in any event, the subcommittee will persistently follow up its investigative recommendations. This is a slow process, but, in my experience as chairman of an investigating committee, the continuing and patient attention to problems of enforcement is the only technique that brings results.

More on the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my position on the loyalty oath and the disclaimer provision in the National Defense Education Act is well known. I have introduced legislation to repeal this section of the act. I take this stand not because I object to oath per se, but because I think that it is unfair to single out these young people and imply that they are any less loyal and patriotic than any of the other people who receive Government subsidies and loans.

Not all of my constituents agree with my position, which is their God-given right. I respect their viewpoints and welcome the opportunity to make them known. Only in this free expression of viewpoints and opinions on all matters can we have true democracy.

One person who disagrees with my position is Attorney Howard E. Kopf of Davenport, Iowa. He has written me a letter with the hope that I will bring it to the attention of the Members in the House. I am glad to do this.

Under previous consent I include his letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

KOPF & CHRISTIANSEN LAW OFFICES,
Davenport, Iowa, February 4, 1960.

Re oath of allegiance.
Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I realize it is useless to expect you to face up on the proposition of a student asking for a free education at the taxpayers' expense, taking an oath of allegiance. I am ashamed of the weakness which will cause our Congress and even the President to oppose the oath. My only thought is that votes are needed. There could not be an honest moral ground.

The fact that revolts in foreign countries sooner or later involve students is reason enough for me to be opposed to giving taxpayers' money to any so-called citizens who refuse to take the oath for a free education. You say it is a loan. I'll agree when I see the loan paid and not turned into a subsidy by future acts of Congress. You already are on record as to asking financial help to individual families and income tax deductions for college education.

Do you object to repeating the confession of faith when you go to your church? Do you say it does no harm to the devout, but might help a sinner? The true Christian does not object and should not object. The hypocrite sounds off in the loudest voice and joyfully proceeds in his hypocrisy. Is that reason to abolish the confession?

Now you say, "Howard, I am sorry if you do not agree with my church. I do believe in my church and the confession of faith." I guess all you can do is find yourself a church which does not require a confession of faith. You would be right 100 percent.

I say the same thing about a college or a college president or a student who will refuse to approve the oath of allegiance in order to get free education at taxpayers' expense. If they are intelligent, red-blooded Americans, it should be a pleasure for them to support our Government. If they don't want to, let them get their education by whatever means pleases them.

When you attend this deal at Grinnell and get all the publicity, please look around. Are you actually happy in supporting any group of persons who will find some excuse to refuse to take the oath of allegiance or to object to it? I place all such persons in the classification of the ones who take advantage of the 5th amendment. If they are honest with themselves and God and our country, they will not be hurt.

You and I belong to a great many organizations. I belong to some that you should

belong to. I consider it a privilege as a red-blooded, honest, American citizen to take the oath of allegiance. I find no objection within these organizations to the oath of allegiance.

I ask that the next time you stand with hat in hand or hand over heart or at salute or at attention in the presence of your God and your fellowman, and while the national anthem is played or the oath of allegiance repeated, that you reflect for a moment. If I am in that room, I will be thinking also. Are you really doing right in assisting anyone who, for any reason, will refuse to take the oath of allegiance? Decide how you can justify your vote.

I wish it were possible for you to read this letter to Congress before the vote and put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD E. KOPF.

Address of New York State Winner in National "I Speak for Democracy" Contest, Harold Szenes of Schenectady, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest educational programs in our Nation is the annual Voice of Democracy contest which has been sponsored over the years by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This contest is valuable because it points up for the young people of our country the significance of our American ideals, which so many of us all too often take for granted, and to that extent it contributes greatly toward making better citizens of these young people, as well as all of us who have the benefit of hearing their presentations.

This year again the winners of this contest in the 50 States will assemble at the Statler Hotel on February 24 for the final awarding of national prizes, including the award of a $1,500 scholarship to the top winner.

One of these top State winners will, of course, be the winner from the Empire State of New York, Mr. Speaker, and it is my distinct honor and privilege to announce to this House that for the second straight year the New York State winner will be a constituent of mine from my home city of Schenectady, N.Y.

This year the winner is Harold Szenes, son of Rabbi and Mrs. Michael Szenes. Rabbi Szenes is the spiritual leader of the Congregation Gates of Heaven in my home city.

Harold Szenes' victory in the State with the largest population in the Nation is particularly outstanding because of the fact that he is not a native American, but came to this country originally as a refugee from both the Nazi and Communist brands of tyranny in Europe. The fact that this young man has so well understood and appreciated the principles which make for our democratic system of government that he has been selected as the top winner in the most populous State in the Union, is not only a great personal tribute but also a great tribute to his teachers and to his parents.

I know all of us in Schenectady are pulling hard for Harold to win the top national award, and in the meantime it is a privilege for me, under leave to extend my remarks, to make his thoughtful essay on this vital subject available to my colleagues and I commend it most highly to their thoughtful attention:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

How shall I speak for democracy? Shall I speak in terms of myself? I am one of the fortunate few who escaped to the United States of America from Hitler's Hungarian prison camps and the newer Russian tyranny. I could praise democracy for all it has done for me, but would it be right on my part to make my personal experience the test? Can a system be praised for what it does for one person? I need not search very long to discover that what democracy has given me, it has given to hundreds of thousands who in our time or another have found haven in democratic countries. I shall speak also for the millions to whom democracy has brought fewer benefits in a no less real way.

In a democracy every individual is important. Democracy chooses to educate the mass rather than a select few. Each individual, it feels, will have some contribution to make to society. On the other hand, certain other systems would rather think for the majority and educate the few who will be of immediate aid to the country. Democracy places the right to govern in the hand of the individual rather than in the hands of a select few. Each member of a democratic society has the right (even the duty) to select those individuals who will govern that society. Another of the cherished rights of citizens of democratic countries, and the strongest safeguard of democracy itself, is the right to be informed through a free press. The honesty of public officials, and the respect of the rights of the individual are protected not only by the law enforcement agencies and courts of justice but also by the vigilance of the people and the ever alert and curious press. Only the weightiest security reasons can keep information from the public in a democracy. Even the most hostile opinions appear in newspapers, magazines, on radio and television, pointing out the fact that democracy has nothing to hide. The opportunity for education, extended to every free man, has its material rewards, enriching the country as a whole and slowly but constantly raising the living standards of its citizens. Given the opportunity to try and to experiment, people will keep searching for ideas and ways by which to better themselves, and will thereby create new conveniences for all. It can hardly be considered an accident that countries which have followed the democratic way of life for a few generations have the highest living standards in the world. While material wealth is certainly not their only goal, the ambitious, imaginative, and creative individuals who produce it are the ones who are independent in their thinking, jealous of their freedom, and are willing to assume responsibility, thereby safeguarding the spiritual values of democracy, in which they believe.

This democracy for which I speak is not the sole possession of one country. It can be found developing in the newer African States, in Israel, and in many other countries throughout the world. Thus we have every reason to hope that the privileges we enjoy as citizens of democratic countries will spread to all countries of the world. We can hope that freedom of education, of economic advancement, and of the press will become cherished possessions of all. It may be that someday no person will be in need of haven from tyranny because the rights of individuals will be respected everywhere.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which was published in the New York Times on January 21, 1960.

This fifth of a series of articles I am inserting in the RECORD to focus attention of the Congress on the commuter problem is important in that it shows that there can be cooperation at the local level which, in my opinion, will be essential to the success of any program attempting to solve the commuter crisis. The article also indicates the need for Federal assistance to supplement local and State efforts.

Tomorrow I plan to introduce legislation to provide Federal assistance for improvement of commuter service which depends upon local cooperation as an integral factor in administration of the assistance.

The article follows:

PHILADELPHIA TO SUBSIDIZE RAILROADS TO HELP SERVICE

(By Clayton Knowles)

PHILADELPHIA, January 20.—The city, two railroads and railroad labor joined today in announcing a nonprofit corporation that is designed to increase fast rail transportation within the city, help the railroads stay in business and keep automobiles out of the center of the city.

The new agency, which will be known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corp., will operate at first under a city subsidy exceeding $2 million a year.

It will provide fast, frequent service from outlying points within the city to the center of the city at 30 cents a ride, a reduction from the normal fare. The Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads, acting as contract carriers for the new corporation, will be guaranteed fixed amounts. If the fares do not meet minimum guarantees a city subsidy will make up the difference.

The arrangement, the first of its kind in the Nation, contemplates Federal assistance for the railroads, possibly before the end of the year.

The hope is that legislation will be approved so that the Federal Government will match local contributions at least dollar for dollar, much in the way it now assists localities in urban renewal programs.

"The long-range success of this venture depends on Federal aid—and I think it will be forthcoming." Mayor Richardson Dilworth said.

Joining with the mayor in announcing the plan were Walter W. Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Joseph

A. Fisher, president of the Reading, and Anthony Matz of the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 railroad unions.

The mayor will name 11 directors of the nonprofit corporation, the railroads 2 and the unions 2. Incorporation papers will be filed tomorrow.

The operation of the plan at the outset will be confined to the Philadelphia city limits. But Mayor Dilworth and the rail officials expressed the belief that suburbs in Bucks, Montgomery and Delaware counties and possibly even across the Delaware River in New Jersey would ask to come into the operation.

Commuters living in these areas do not benefit from the present plan if they board the train in their hometowns. If they drive to the city limits, however, they can park, take the train and get the saving.

Under a highly successful test of the program begun in the fall of 1958 many commuters have taken advantage of the service. It is hoped they will bring pressure on their home communities to extend the plan beyond the city limits.

The test also showed that many persons living inside the city were willing to stop driving into the center of the city and use the train instead. Other people gave up the cheaper, but slower, public transportation system to use the train.

This has added to the railroads' revenues and enabled them to improve service.

The tests were called Operation Northwest and Operation Northeast.

Both operations were subsidized, the first at the rate of $320,000 a year and the second at $105,000. The city assistance just about covered the actual cost to the railroad of the extra service and reduced fares the city demanded.

Operation Northwest, serving the fashionable Chestnut Hill area, has increased rail travel by 20 percent. The number of riders to the more modest Fox Chase section under Operation Northeast rose 200 percent since last fall.

Both routes will be continued under the new arrangement and, in addition, the new corporation will take over two other routes this year. One will be to Torresdale near the Bucks County line on the Pennsylvania's New York division and the other to Manayunk and Shawmont on the Reading's Norristown line generally to the west.

If this can be achieved, 75 miles of railroad within the city limits will be included in the system.

Persons using these lines derive a further benefit in that they can get a transfer to the subway and bus facilities operated by the Philadelphia Transportation Co. for an additional 10 cents. The straight fare on these facilities is 20 cents.

Long-range objectives of the corporation will be the purchase of modern air-conditioned railroad cars, electrifying the Fox Chase line, building more auto-park-and-ride depots around the periphery of the city and merchandising transportation to attract new riders.

Lamar, Colo., an All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased that the city of Lamar, Colo., was selected as an All-America City, and will receive one of the annual awards presented under the joint sponsorship of the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

I want to congratulate Mayor Bowman, the members of the city council, the officers and members of the chamber of commerce, and all of the civic and community leaders in Lamar who made it possible for Lamar to receive this recognition, which is so richly deserved.

I am sure that Lamar will continue to grow and prosper, and I extend best wishes for the years ahead.

Economic Meaning of School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I read an article in the Washington Evening Star of February 8, 1960, by David Lawrence, entitled "Economic Meaning of School Aid—Inflationary Effect Seen if Congress Keeps Adding to Federal Obligations."

I commend the reading of this article to every Member of Congress as well as to every interested citizen. It is clearly indicated that with the great national debt of today the continuance of increased spending programs, further adding to the national debt, will cause inflation to spiral even more rapidly than it has in the past. Having recognized this condition for quite a number of years, I am opposing a great amount of legislation, while having very laudatory meaning, would only add further to the burdens of the American people and further reduce the purchase value of the dollar. I think it is time the American people made their feelings known and help prevent further inflation.

The article follows:

ECONOMIC MEANING OF SCHOOL AID—INFLATIONARY EFFECT SEEN IF CONGRESS KEEPS ADDING TO FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

The Democrats in the Senate are unwittingly doing a great deal to scare American business. They have set the stage for a spending orgy by Government which can gradually cut down the purchasing power of the dollar.

The vote in the Senate last week to provide nearly $2 billion in the next 2 years for school aid could start the Federal Government on an unprecedented course of subsidizing teachers' salaries. What has hitherto been a local obligation now could become a Federal liability every year. It starts with a few hundred millions for teachers' salaries, but, once a formula of this kind is embedded in Federal budgets, it means increasing sums every year thereafter.

Certainly schoolteachers should be better paid, and, if the States don't recognize this, they will lose teachers and fail to gain new ones. But once the Federal Government starts an aid program, the States will gradually transfer it to the majority responsibility. This could even lead to Federal control of the curriculum and teaching methods—as is the case in many a totalitarian government.

The States are not bankrupt. If they fail to appropriate enough, it is the local citizenry who should be making a fight for better schooling. The moment the Federal Government steps into anything, it becomes a custom that is never repealed.

What can all this mean to business? If dollars are to be cut down in value, unions will insist upon higher wages. Then prices start going up faster and faster. Also, interest rates have to be boosted to attract investors. It means a dislocation of the American economy.

Now, many of the 42 Democrats and 9 Republicans who voted for the $1.8 billion measure to aid the schools realize that in the House of Representatives this bill will be pared down, if not rejected altogether. Then there is a probability of a Presidential veto if the bill should get through the two Houses. It is, however, the possibility that this kind of spending will be approved by the White House if a Democratic administration comes into power a year hence which is causing apprehension in business circles.

It is significant that 10 Democratic Senators from the South and Senator LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, voted against the school bill along with 23 Republicans, but the coalition wasn't big enough to stop the measure.

Naturally, all the would-be presidential candidates on the Democratic side announced themselves as in favor of this inflationary bill. Vice President NIXON had a chance earlier to break a tie on a somewhat similar bill, and he cast his vote against it. He had been warned that this might hurt him politically, but he wisely disregarded such advice.

Skyrocketing expenditures of the Federal Government are a matter of growing concern. Just a few days ago, Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Federal Budget Bureau, gave some unpleasant facts to the public in a speech he made in Chicago. He pointed out that the U.S. Treasury is faced with a large amount of future obligations growing out of the tendency to start a system of continuous spending for projects—many of them taken over from the States. He said:

"Our present national debt of $290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. Here are some items it doesn't include: Our already accrued liability for military retirement is about $30 billion. Our unfunded present accrual for retirement benefits for civilian Govenment employees is almost $28 billion. On top of that, future pensions, compensation and other benefits voted to veterans will cost about $300 billion.

"Now, the $290 billion of current public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion of c.o.d.'s add to the almost incredible total of nearly $750 billion. That is the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future—on ourselves and our children—beyond the regular annual cost of defense, welfare, and commerce. Is it any wonder that your President pleads for a sense of proportion, for a limit on compulsive spending, for a passion for responsibility?"

What Mr. Stans means by his reference to commitments for the future is illustrated by the new school-aid bill. Once it starts, an annual obligation of the Federal Government is incurred. These are what is known as built-in expenditures, and Mr. Stans says:

"I see already built-in increases pushing expenditures up and up year after year. I see pressures continuing to mount for the Federal Government to spend more and more, to take over local governments' problems and to meet demands from pressure groups for more handouts on many fronts. If we yield to these temptations, we can soon have $90 or $100 billion budgets, higher taxes or more deficits, debasement of our money and weakening of our economy."

How many Members of Congress heeded that warning? The Democratic majority in the Senate evidently didn't, and neither did the few Republicans who apparently were

intimidated by political threats at the polls coming from pressure groups. Maybe some day an informed electorate will constitute itself as the biggest pressure group of all and vote for representatives who favor a sound economy.

Russian Textiles and Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to see where the United States is to import Russian automobiles. I was further amazed to see Americans are to build a huge textile plant in Russia. Of course this means someday, through our State Department, we will be importing Communist textiles from Russia. Khrushchev had all this in mind when he made his New York City trade speech last year. Khrushchev, with slave labor and world conquest in mind, can and will dump goods on the market much below cost. If permitted by our Government, this is the surest and quickest way to destroy the United States. The same threat to America is posed by Communist China and many other foreign countries operating with low wages and little fringe benefits. Mr. Speaker, here is the story from Southern Textile News:

NOW RUSSIAN TEXTILES?

The American textile industry, already feeling strongly the knife of low-wage foreign competition, probably is not welcoming the news that a $30 million textile plant soon will be built in Rusia by an American combine.

Some may argue that the Soviet Union never has been a large consumer of American textiles. Looking at it this way, it could be further argued that this large mill will not mean a loss of American markets.

But the Russians do business a little differently than most other countries. They have demonstrated before that they can use their productive facilities in political moves in the international markets. They are quite agreeable to deprive their own people of needed goods and use that production to swing political and trade deals in other countries.

While Americans have long been known as leaders in textile manufacturing, it has been very definitely demonstrated in Japan, Hong Kong and other Eastern nations that, given the same textile equipment found in American mills, they can become strong contenders in the world's textile markets.

The Russians, too, have demonstrated in many fields that they can equal or surpass other countries in scientific and engineering fields. It would be foolish to blindfold ourselves to the fact that they cannot produce textile goods of a fairly comparable quality at a lower price than American textiles.

This new turn of events merely again points up the pressing demand for protective legislation by the Congress of this country.

If this is not forthcoming, it will not be too long before we see Russian-made textile goods on the shelves of American stores, side by side with those of Japan and Hong Kong.

On Parliamentary Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the February 5, 1960, issue of the Sarasota Herald Tribune, an excellent editorial column on the importance of parliamentary law, which was written by Mr. Stan Windhorn. As Mr. Windhorn has stated, although it is a neglected and overlooked topic, parliamentary law has played and continues to play an important role in governing the lives we lead.

I hope our colleagues read his remarks and give thought to them.

The article "On Parliamentary Law" follows:

ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW
(By Stan Windhorn)

Here is one of those thoughts that never would have crossed the mind if it had not been brought to our attention by Mrs. Helene M. Morris.

It is the subject of parliamentary law. Although it is a neglected and overlooked topic it has had its role in governing the lives we lead and, more important, it has often prevented the potential tyranny under which we might live if it had not been devised as a substitute for bloodshed 1,000 years ago.

Mrs. Morris points out:

"It was 1,000 years ago—in the year 959—that King Edgar, the first ruler of a united England, developed a formula for settling disputes among his subjects. As a result, and in contrast to the previous 300 years of constant warfare, King Edgar's reign was largely peaceful.

"The outstanding means he used to promote this peace was to evolve elementary rules and regulations enabling individuals with conflicting interests to gather under one roof to discuss their grievances in a fair and orderly manner.

"This pattern of King Edgar's which protected the rights of even the least person, was rooted in old tribal customs. It was the forerunner of what we know today as parliamentary law.

"Putting such procedures into practice was no easy task for King Edgar. You can imagine the scene of the first meeting. Men accustomed to the terror and bloodshed of the battlefield were filled with misgivings. There was always the danger that the strong would push everyone else around and the weak would be shoved into the background.

"But King Edgar felt the plan had untold possibilities for good. After all, it was based upon a divine truth. The objective was to put into living practice Christ's principle: 'As you wish men to do to you, so also you do to them.'

"The new approach gained favor slowly but surely. Men began to see what could be done in every assembly to protect the rights of each human being.

"Nearly three centuries later these rules of order were adopted, strengthened and expanded by the English Parliament—hence the present name of parliamentary law. For the past 700 years parliamentary law has been used throughout the world. Tremendous advantages can be gained from its widespread application. Even if you have only a bowing acquaintance with parliamentary law you should be aware of the important and practical contributions you can make to the orderly running of human affairs."

In pointing to practical application of parliamentary law, Mrs. Morris cites these points:

"Even if you do not belong to an organization, you will find the spirit of justice and fairness encouraged by parliamentary law useful in the home, in your work and in every phase of life.

"Tens of thousands of organizations hold meetings every day. Whether religious, social, civic, educational, labor, business or fraternal, these groups involve your destiny and that of countless others. Many of these groups would increase their efficiency if all participants were familiar with parliamentary law. Its chief function would be to permit every person, without exception, to exert his influence for good.

"Without the regulations that parliamentary law provides, bedlam often results. A few individuals tend to dominate and the shy become disheartened. Wrangling impedes progress and many come to regard such gatherings as a hopeless waste of time and lose interest.

"Many persons with good ideas surrender leadership because they fail to learn the rudiments of parliamentary law.

"Many others with sound principles attend meetings out of a sense of moral obligation. But because of their lack of knowledge of how to participate their voices are never heard. With a little extra effort in learning the bare essentials of parliamentary law they could become an effective force in shaping policy.

"Those who are bent on favoritism, double dealing or disloyalty have a full knowledge of all the ins and outs of parliamentary law and the only way they can be thwarted is by all members sharing equal knowledge of such procedures."

In considering Mrs. Morris' contribution we recall the 1930's and early 1940's when hoodlum (and later Communist) elements set out to infiltrate and take over trade labor unions. In the local of the average union it would be safe to report that 99 percent of the membership bore no sympathy for either gangsters or Communists, so some people will consider it a manner for wonder how a small, hard core of gangsters or subversives could take over and dominate a sizable organization.

It was really very simple. In the case of hoodlum infiltration intimidation outside the meeting halls played a major role, but the Communists operated in a more subtle and surprisingly, legal, manner. They simply learned—as Mrs. Morris mentions—all of the ins and outs of parliamentary law.

They took over meetings and through use of parliamentary law they silenced a loyal majority by involving rules of parliamentary law upon members who had never bothered to learn the first fact about such procedures.

Had a loyal majority been familiar with parliamentary maneuvering such acts could have been avoided and we would not have lived to see the sorry sight of thousands of trade unionists—all loyal citizens—ruled and controlled by a handful of traitors. More than a decade has now been spent trying to eliminate influences which became strong simply because most people know nothing of parliamentary law.

As Mrs. Morris points out, the same thing has happened in less spectacular fashion in many clubs and organizations where a small minority has dominated, and finally discouraged, a majority made helpless through lack of knowledge of parliamentary law.

It is well to remember that rules and laws devised for the protection of the individual

can be quickly turned to a directly opposite use if the majority refuses to honor such laws by studying and learning their provisions.

Bates Strikes a Blow for Admen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Advertising Age, issue of February 11, 1960:

BATES STRIKES A BLOW FOR ADMEN

We do not admire everything Ted Bates & Co. does. We have been critical of a number of its campaigns, most recently that for Life cigarettes.

But we do admire Bates for taking pages in newspapers last week to question the action of the Federal Trade Commission in citing the Palmolive rapid shave cream ad and other advertisements. We believe that by doing so, Bates has struck a blow for sensible regulation, and done a public relations service for the advertising business.

In much the same way, Fairfax Cone, of Foote, Cone & Belding took public issue with the FTC in citing television advertising of Pepsodent, and Walter Weir, of Donahue & Coe also attacked the action of FTC in citing Palmolive and others, although none of his agency's clients is involved.

We believe all of these people deserve the thanks of the advertising business for speaking out, plainly and clearly, in cases in which they believe the FTC has overstepped the bounds of commonsense, and has unnecessarily brought advertising into disrepute through public charges.

Our own position about the necessity for cleaning up advertising is clear, and we do not in any way intend to defend advertising which is deceptive or misleading in any important particular.

But it does seem clear that in the most recent foursome of complaints to issue from the FTC, the bounds of reasonableness were exceeded, the FTC's own informal definitions of what constitutes deceptiveness were ignored, and a good deal of publicity was generated with the principal purpose of showing how alert and serious the FTC has suddenly become.

The shift from lack of diligence to sudden overzealousness on the part of regulatory agencies cannot be surprising to anyone who has been reading his newspapers or listening to radio or television newscasts in recent months. It is precisely because such overzealousness can be expected in a period like the present that it is important for people who believe they are attacked unfairly to speak out, publicly and forthrightly. Otherwise, it is too easy for the public to get the impression that every charge against every advertiser and every advertisement is sound and valid.

The advertiser's position ought to be a simple one: If an advertising campaign deserves censure, give it up, as quickly and as gracefully as you know how. But if you believe you are right, and the regulatory agency is wrong, fight vigorously and openly. If you don't, there is likely to be more and more encroachment on grounds which cannot be justified on the score of either law or reasonableness.

Southern Negroes Can't Vote Until Congress Enforces Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention a very revealing and analytical editorial published in the January 30 edition of the Philadelphia Tribune, one of the outstanding newspapers of this country. Its publisher, Mr. E. Washington Rhodes, author of the editorial, is one of the outstanding personalities of this generation. He has given many years of thought to the problems of America and to the problems of the Negro in America. His views therefore are of the greatest significance.

SOUTHERN NEGROES CAN'T VOTE UNTIL CONGRESS ENFORCES CONSTITUTION

"Representatives shall be appointed among the several States according to their respective numbers counting the whole number of persons in each State. * * * But when the right to vote at any election is denied to any male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridges, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State." Article XIV, section 2, the Constitution of the United States.

(NOTE.—Art. XIX, the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.)

Where are the great liberals in Congress who shouted in loud voices about their burning desire to assure American Negroes their full enjoyment of their privileges and responsibilities as American citizens? Are they blind? Have they not read the Constitution of the United States which they have sworn to obey?

Many of the brilliant minds in Congress and high executive officials are wrestling with the problem of how to guarantee Negroes the right to vote. They say that if we can get the South to permit Negroes to vote freely all the other injustices which they endure would pass away. They appear to believe that it is a most difficult task. It is complex because their thinking makes it so.

All the ills which Negroes suffer all over the United States can be directly traced to the denial of the ballot to them in the South. For if Negroes had full voting privileges in the South there would be no Senators and Representatives elected to Congress such as Senators JOHNSTON, of South Carolina; BYRD, of Virginia; and EASTLAND, of Mississippi; BARDEN, of North Carolina; SMITH, of Virginia; and DAVIS, of Georgia. These men and their associates come to Congress with the avowed purpose of maintaining white supremacy. All they had to do to get elected, since Negroes are barred from the polls, was to tell the voters that they were more determined than their opponents to keep Negroes in their place.

The record is full of facts which prove that officials of the State have barred Negroes from voting. All who read are aware of the constitutional provisions which declare that the basis for representation in such States shall be reduced in proportion which citizens are denied the right to vote.

Why, then, has nothing been done to reduce the number of Representatives from such States? The answer is clear. Members of Congress did not want to reduce the power in the South; they are not really anxious to give to Negroes their complete rights as Americans; they want to use the sufferings of Negroes as a political football.

It appears that those in Congress of both political parties should use their great powers to enforce the Constitution which they have taken a sacred oath to uphold and enforce. The racial bigots from the South control Congress because the so-called liberals permit them to do so. There are no other sections of the Constitution which are completely ignored by those in high places except those dealing with the basic human rights of Negroes. This inaction reflects upon the honor and integrity of every Member of Congress.

The test of their sincerity then rests upon their willingness to tackle head on the reduction of Representatives in Congress from States which bar Negroes from voting.

Fargo: All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Fargo, N. Dak., which I am proud to say is the city of my residence, are sharing in one of the finest honors that can come to any community dedicated to civic progress. Fargo was named last Thursday to the "all-America city" team in a nationwide competition sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine.

The basis for the selection, as quoted in the forthcoming issue of Look which carries the stories of the winning cities, is "energetic, purposeful, intelligent citizen effort in attaining specific civic improvements in the public interest."

Fargo faced some tough problems a few years back. Through concerted citizen effort and good leadership, these problems are being solved efficiently and with unusual speed. A sizable residential section was turning into a slum—it is now the site of a growing new civic center. Already completed is a fine city hall, replacing one outmoded and outgrown by a rapidly expanding population. A new city auditorium has been constructed. An urban renewal program is nearing completion and families who had lived in the depressed area are being successfully relocated. Other public buildings are going up and community projects, many supported by volunteer contributions and workers, are underway or in the planning stages.

To single out individuals who have contributed the most to Fargo's accomplishments would be impossible. I would like to compliment especially though, the Fargo City Commission, the City of Fargo Renewal Agency, the chamber of

commerce, the citizens city hall-auditorium committee, and the citizens for city planning organization.

Fargo, in short, is streamlining and modernizing itself. This is an expensive proposition and requires devoted participation from each citizen. The people have responded with spirit and determination to carry out a job that is never really finished.

Is it any wonder that Fargo made the team?

Boy Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this is Boy Scout Week and I was pleased no end when 10-year-old Cub Scout Freddie Vaughn, of Forest Heights, Md., pinned on me last week my 1960 Boy Scout pin and presented me with a copy of the "Golden Anniversary of Scouting," from my good friend, Mr. Elmer Condit, Scout executive, of Aheka Council, Boy Scouts of America, Passaic, N.J. Last Tuesday, the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News carried the following article on our Boy Scouts:

BOY SCOUTS
(By the Vagabond)

The Boy Scouts of America are making plans to observe the 50th anniversary of scouting this year. The various celebrations recognizing this half century of service to boys the world over will include dramatic and other characteristically Scout program activities. These will be on local, regional, and national levels.

Boy Scout Week in 1960 is February 7–13. In a special event to be held in Washington, D.C., that week a representative Scout or Explorer from each of our States and territories will make a special report to President Eisenhower in person. National leaders in many national groups will meet in a report to the Nation broadcast. On February 8 our Government will issue a 4-cent Boy Scouts of America golden jubilee commemorative stamp.

One of the character-building phases of scouting is the annual observance of Scout Week through attendance at a worship service in a church or synagogue. They attend in uniform and are recognized for their work in making their citizenship meaningful. It is rather significant their 50th anniversary theme is "For God and Country."

The golden jubilee celebration will be highlighted in the Nation's Capital at the time of the meeting of the National Council of Boy Scouts of America June 1–4, 1960. At this time recognition will be given to all the cooperating institutions which have done so much to make scouting available to so many boys across the country and the world during the past half century.

Perhaps the most dramatic event of all during the year's anniversary program will be the fifth national Boy Scout jamboree which will be held at Colorado Springs, Colo., July 22–28 of this year. It is estimated over 50,000 Scouts, Explorers, and adult leaders will be present at this huge encampment.

Scouting has provided boys with a big lift in their personal lives characterwise and with a great stimulation for the finest kind of American citizenship. In every walk of life one finds men of responsibility who have learned to "Be Prepared" by the Scout route.

I recall clearly when Admiral Byrd made his first long trip to Antarctica he took with him a Boy Scout. This Scout is today one of the world's greatest scientific authorities on Antarctica—Dr. Paul Siple. At the very heart of our national life and at the far frontiers are Scouts who are always prepared to be of service.

Internationally the movement has importance. On freedom's side are Scouts of all nations bringing encouragement and real assistance to the world's peacemakers.

And anyway—it is always good to "Be Prepared."

Public Service Time on Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following letter from Dr. W. James Westhafer, of Dayton, Ohio, a director of the Dayton Council on World Affairs, to Mr. James Cox, Jr., operator of Station WHIO–TV.

My reason for bringing this letter to your attention is to show what a great service can be rendered by a television station willing to offer free time to organizations having programs of educational value to present to the local community. You all know the purposes and aims of the Council on World Affairs. Its chief role is to produce an enlightened citizenry through its interest in and its study of international problems. Television is an excellent medium to use to get ideas across to the general public, but its cost could not possibly be borne by any single nonprofit organization. That we have a station in our city of Dayton donating 30 minutes of its valuable time each week to these educational programs deserves the gratitude of all who benefit from them and justifies our pride in the owner who makes them possible. May this serve as an example of a truly public spirited citizen and an inspiration to those with similar facilities to offer in other cities.

The letter follows:

Mr. JAMES COX, Jr.,
Station WHIO–TV,
Dayton, Ohio

DEAR MR. COX: At the monthly meeting of the board of directors of the Dayton Council on World Affairs it was noted that our educational television program, "It's Your World," for which you have provided one-half hour weekly on WHIO–TV, is entering its ninth year on the air.

The board took official cognizance of your fine spirit of public service and cooperation and asked me to write you an official letter of thanks.

We are also quite indebted to a member of your staff, Mr. Harry Butler, who for many years has voluntarily contributed time of his own to moderate this program.

There has been a good deal of comment in the news lately about the small amount of public service time contributed by TV stations. We don't know what stations in other cities have done nor what you have done overall, but we are so impressed by the extensive support of the Council on World Affairs program that we are taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to officials in Washington who we think should know about your generous actions in the past.

Sincerely,

DR. W. JAMES WESTHAFER.

The Mass of the Holy Ghost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Reverend Francis E. Lucey, S.J., regent of the Georgetown Law Center, at the Mass of the Holy Ghost—the red Mass—held at St. Matthew's Cathedral on Sunday, January 31, 1960. This historic mass is usually celebrated to mark the opening of the court year and goes back for centuries. In Washington, it traditionally marks the opening of the legislative session. The term "red Mass" comes from the color of the vestments worn by the celebrant of the mass. Father Lucey was recently honored on the occasion of his 50th anniversary in the Jesuit Order.

SERMON FOR RED MASS, SUNDAY, JANUARY 31, 1960, BY REV. FRANCIS E. LUCEY, S.J. REGENT, GEORGETOWN LAW CENTER

"Sovereignty over every man is in the hand of God who imparts His Majesty to the ruler." (Sirach X5.)

In a letter written to the New York Times, in the middle of this past December, Prof. John Herman Randall, Jr., Woodbridge professor of philosophy at Columbia University, suggested that it would be immensely helpful if some Catholic teacher would explain just what Catholic thinkers mean by the natural law of morality.

Professor Randall's request suggested to me a topic for today's talk, a subject inclusive of his idea but somewhat broader, namely: "The Catholic Natural Law Doctrine and Its Relation to Civil Law." It appeals to me as a subject quite appropriate for this occasion. This doctrine is not exclusively Catholic. There have been non-Catholics who have been its earnest advocates.

This question of natural law and its relation to civil law, though looming large in present day discussions, is not of recent origin. Back in the period of great Greek philosophers we find men proposing the question: Is civil law the product of custom, the will of the dominant, the wisdom of wise men or of a higher God-given law? A concept of natural law as the higher law has perdured down through the centuries, at times pushed into the background by new theories and explanations and at times the recipient of almost universal assent and approbation. The present-day Catholic concept of natural law received most of its revamped contents and a tremendous impetus from the writings of that brilliant philosopher and theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas. For centuries thereafter, though hotly con-

tested by many able philosophers, it continued to be the dominant doctrine.

After the French revolution, when there was danger of the natural law ideas of egalité et liberté spreading to other countries such as England and Germany, some able legal philosophers started a new attack on the natural law doctrine. They resurrected and strongly urged the old accusations that natural law was sterile and historically unrealistic. They contended that natural law, with its eye focused on the purposes of law, disregarded the real sources of law and strove for an ideal body of civil law that could be worked out by reason alone. Although these accusations were unfounded, the result of the attack was the birth of two important new schools of thought in jurisprudence. These two schools of legal philosophical thinking gained remarkable prestige during the latter part of the 19th century in Europe and America.

Savigny in Germany and Austin in England were the outstanding protagonists of the two schools. Savigny based his origin of civil law on a pantheistic concept of a volksgeist an unconscious spirit of the people unconsciously urging them into uniform ways of acting. By an unconscious process, customs arose which in time became mores and finally crystallized into civil laws. Each national group has its own volksgeist. Reason played no rule in the evolution of civil law. The obligation to obey laws flowed from fear of public opinion.

Austin in England devised quite a different theory. Adopting Hobbes' philosophy of man as antisocial by nature, and society as the result of a social contract embraced by force or fear of the same, he conceived civil law as the command of the sovereign. Civil law is the sum total of such commands or norms. Necessity to obey the law rests on the force or power of the sovereign. It involves a must not an ought. Civil law rests on no higher law, it stands on its own powerful feet. Laws do not have to be reasonable or just. Whatever is enacted is law, be it good or bad, just or unjust, reasonable or unreasonable. These two schools of jurisprudence, and especially the latter, dominated legal philosophy on the Continent and in the United States during the last half of the 19th century. In the first 40-odd years of this century in America, refinements of Austin's theory and new schools of thought gained vogue. The realist, with a system based on behaviorism or psychoanalysis, replaced norms or commands with what the courts will do in fact. Kalsen, retaining Austin's norms and force theory, evolved his stepladder theory of legal validity. Dean Pound, with allegiance to norms and ideals and some role for reason evolved his theory of harmonizing and balancing interests, needs, wants, and desires. Most of you are familiar, I am sure, with the battle that raged between Dean Pound and the realists during the thirties.

Just as the French Revolution gave birth to the historical and analytical schools, so World War II and its aftermath gave birth to a strong revival of natural law. Hitler's regime, and its atrocious and inhuman laws showed mankind the extremes to which positivism could lead. Positivistic legal philosophers in Germany and elsewhere started to reexamine and weigh their legal philosophy.

So today, legal philosophers are posing the question again: Does civil law impose a must or an ought? Does a subject have to obey unjust tyrannical laws? Do people have a right to rebel?

We here in America sometimes forget that our United States owes its existence to a rebellion against a constituted but tyrannical authority and its oppressive legislation. We at times forget that those who brought this great civil society into existence justified their rebellion on a higher law, natural law. God-given inalienable rights in the Declaration of Independence was not just a pious ejaculation. The Founding Fathers fought and suffered for the higher law. Many of their relatives and compatriots died for it.

When the war was over, the Founding Fathers wrote a Constitution. That Constitution was written with the thought of tyranny, dictatorship, and a higher law still fresh and vivid in their minds. No wise people would or should write into their fundamental law a provision for rebellion. They can, however, as did our Founding Fathers, eliminate as far as possible the need of recourse to the higher law. Our Founding Fathers made provisions for balancing the three branches of Government so as to practically eliminate the possibility of any one of them becoming a dictatorship or a tyranny. They added a Bill of Rights which was aimed at eliminating the possibility of a dictatorship of a majority and unjust laws. They wrote in provisions for freedom of speech, right of assembly, right to petition their Government potent and peaceful methods of providing for change without recourse to force. Our Constitution and its Bill of Rights became a revered document throughout the world because it protected the God-given inalienable rights and dignity of man.

The natural law of the Founding Fathers was, at least, in its basic tenets, what is now called the Catholic concept of natural law. The Catholic Church adopted natural law ethics because the doctrine responded to the test of reason and as such was in harmony with revelation. Unlike faith, it is not based on revelation, but reason alone. Some writers have termed it a theological doctrine, and, in the sense of resting ultimately and primarily on the existence of God, and man's relation to God, it is theological. There is no Catholic natural law without God in the picture. But it rests on God in a manner entirely different and distinct from faith. What we Catholics accept as a matter of faith rests upon the authority of God revealing. We accept revelation, not because we fully understand it, but because we accept God's say-so. In that sense, faith is authoritarian, that is, based on the revealed authority of God.

Catholic natural law ethics is only a part of an integrated philosophy adopted by Catholic philosophers and moralists. Natural law ethics is based on propositions taken from various parts of that philosophy. These propositions include the existence of God, the creator of all things, the existence of an eternal law of God governing all creation, a distinct part of that law governing man's free acts called natural law, the existence in man of a spiritual, rational soul separately created by God for each individual, the existence in man of a capacity to know some things with certainty, the capacity of man to exercise freedom of the will in some areas, and, finally, the fact that man is social by nature.

Because man has a rational spiritual soul given to him by God, he has a dignity in se, i.e., in himself. He has something he did not get from other men. He has a little bundle of basic duties and rights given to him by God which no man has a right to destroy. He does not exist by sufferance of a dominant individual, a dominant minority, or a dominant majority. He cannot be used as a chattel by others. Accordingly, there are limits as to restrictions other men impose on him. Relatively to others, the individual is as it were, sui juris.

Because of the natural law, man has duties to God, to his fellowman, and to himself. From these fundamental duties flow the natural rights necessary to carry out these duties. He has a duty and a right to use all his faculties and powers to perfect his nature and being. There are acts that perfect, and acts that are harmful to his nature. Those that are perfective of his nature we call morally good. Those that are bad for his nature we call morally bad. Man must use his intellectual faculty to discover and act, in accordance with what reason finds is good and to avoid what is discovered to be evil.

Catholic natural law philosophers hold that man is readily aware of the principle, "Do good and avoid evil," and quite easily recognizes fundamental principles that are easy inferences from the principle of "do good and avoid evil." These fundamental inferences correspond pretty much to the contents of the Ten Commandments. They are so intimately connected with the perfection of man's nature that they are said to be universal, perpetual, and inmutable. While man remains man, they will universally apply. Other principles of morality have to be worked out by reason with the aid of expanding experience and scientific investigation. The fundamental principles together with further implementing norms taken collectively constitute the contents of natural law ethics.

While natural law ethics holds that man has duties and hence some rights which are absolute in the sense that they have their origin in God, not other men, it does not hold that the exercise of these rights may not be restricted. Exercise of a right may be restricted because of its effect on others or on society. Reason dictates justice to others.

Studying the free acts that may be freely posited by man, natural law philosophers find that some are mala in se, i.e., bad under all circumstances, as for instance murder, and that others are neither good nor bad, looked at in the abstract. The latter get their goodness or badness from concrete circumstances of time, place, object, or intent. These latter are called indifferent acts. A good portion of individual behavior and a vast portion of civil law deals with these mutable indifferent acts.

But there is another source of mutability in the natural law doctrine. While the fundamental principles of the natural law are absolute, their application to concrete cases may be mutable. Some of this mutability flows from improved and expanding knowledge of how to apply the absolutes correctly. Experience and science are tremendous aids. What men considered murder not too long ago, may not be considered murder today. Discovery of irresistible impulses and urges and a fuller knowledge of psychotic conditions makes us aware that many acts formerly considered free acts are really not such. The principles have not changed but the application has.

In working out the norms of morality and the correct application of the same to particular concrete types of human acts, the role played by reason in the natural law doctrine is dominant even though reason draws on experience and science for factual information. Other nonnatural law philosophers have likewise emphasized the role of reason. But their rational conclusions may be far different from the catholic natural law philosopher's, because their premises are different.

In developing a body of ethical law or even civil law, the catholic natural law philosopher is always using reason against a particular framework of reference, namely: those established conclusions mentioned earlier, the spiritual nature of man's soul, its creation by God, its capacity to know, freedom of the will, the duty to act for the perfection of his being, all those elements which constitute the dignity, equality, and independence of the individual.

A legal philosopher who wishes to leave God and a spiritual soul out of the picture, may derive a philosophy of ethics and civil law quite contrary to that of the catholic natural law philosophy, no matter how much he emphasizes the role of reason and logic, or how much he desires some dignity for man.

Thus far I have devoted my talk to the basic framework of natural law and its application to man as an individual. As I mentioned before, one of the basic principles of the catholic natural law doctrine, is that man is social by nature. By that we mean, among other things, that man's very nature demands civil society, in short, that civil society flows from the natural law and through it ultimately from God. This position is in marked contrast with Hobbes' concept of man as antisocial by nature and Rousseau's concept of man as unsocial by nature. Since man is social by nature there is a God implanted necessity for civil authority and respect for the same.

In the Catholic concept, the citizen is morally bound to respect civil authority and to obey laws of lawful rulers unless by the intent of the lawmaker or the nature of the law itself, nor moral obligation is entailed.

While the Catholic concept stresses the moral ought in law, it does not however exclude the concept of force. Sanctions either penal or premial are a necessary adjunct to the moral ought. They serve as a buttress to the edifice of law and the moral structure of the edific. Sanctions are necessary because free human beings do not always do what they ought to do. Many factors influence the use of reason and human behavior. Emotions, intellectual limitations of cognition and understanding, weakness of the will and character, psychological and physical well being or its lack play a great part in determining man's behavior. Sanctions in such cases may exercise a subsidiary but powerful inducement to act or forebear from acting in accordance with the law. Laws do not exist to operate in a vacuum. They are made for man as he is with all his weaknesses and handicaps. A rational realistic concept of law demands sanctions.

The existence of civil society enables the individual to secure and develop his personality in a way he could not do as an isolated being. Civil authority accomplishes this objective by means of laws which effectively direct the actions of citizens toward the end of civil society, the attainment and preservation of order, peace, well being, and prosperity. Its eye is focused on the common good. The Catholic concept of the common good however includes the preservation of the natural law dignity of each and every individual. The common good is not an end in itself.

In selecting means required for order, peace, well being, and prosperity, civil authority has a right to limit and in some instances restrain, man's exercise of natural rights. It does this to protect like rights of others and the common good. Civil society may ration man's food, regulate his movement, his freedom of speech, his possession and use of property, his engagement in occupations or activities for which he may not have the requisite skill. It may outlaw ultra-hazardous occupations or hold the actor absolutely liable to unforeseeable plaintiffs, if the hazardous occupation is permitted. It may impose conditions for the validity of sales, contracts, deeds, wills, and many other transactions.

In addition, civil society may and should, enact laws necessary for the preservation of its own existence and for the progressive betterment of its own operation. In doing this however, it should not make itself an end in itself. The State is for man, not man for the State.

In view of the nature of this occasion I would like to indicate a couple of guides emanating from the natural law doctrine which Catholic lawmakers should bear in mind. First of all the civil law does not have to cover the whole field of morality with legislation. Under the natural law the chief concern of civil authority is with those things which are necessary for or helpful to the common good. Secondly in formulating into law the means which will attain the ends of civil society the lawmaker should exercise prudence. In fact, the chief function of the lawmaker consists in making prudential judgments, judgments as to the goodness or badness of proposed legislation and judgments as to the advisability or inadvisability, effectiveness or ineffectiveness of legislation as a means to the end of civil society, the attainment of order, peace and prosperity. In a country where the vast majority of the people have the same moral standards what would be prudent might not be prudent in a pluralistic country such as ours with a diversity of religious moral and social standards. Prevailing, predominant standards of the time and place must be given serious consideration in forming a prudential judgment as to what laws should be enacted or not enacted or what decisions should be rendered in cases and controversies.

While the vast portion of lawmaking presents little or no difficulty for the Catholic natural law lawmaker, there is one sphere in which it could inject a very serious problem. The Catholic natural law lawmaker may by nonaction permit evils for serious reasons of order and peace, but he cannot actively cooperate with the enactment of laws which order the doing of something which is intrinsically evil. Fortunately this type of proposed legislation is rare because most people accept the fundamental principles of the natural law.

Where problems of cooperation arise the Catholic lawmaker should carefully weigh the moral principles governing cooperation to discover what is permissible and what is not permissible.

The lawmaker under the natural law doctrine has been granted great authority by God. He holds in his power the life, liberty, property, and welfare of God's creatures. He is the recipient of great honor and majesty. "Sovereignty over every man is in the hand of God who imparts His majesty to the ruler." That majesty coming ultimately from God demands the respect of the governed. Without that respect, all law would fail.

While the right to rule carries with it honor and majesty, it also carries with it grave responsibilities for those who play a part in government, our executives, legislators, judiciary, and members of the legal profession, who by the nature of their profession participate in the administration of justice.

Looking over the history of our country, I believe we can be proud of our rulers and the role played by the legal profession. Critics may point their finger at instances of corrupt executives, corrupt judges, corrupting intrigue of powerful interests, political logrolling, and blackmailing minorities. But the overall picture, especially on the higher level of government, executive, judicial, and legislative, State and Federal, is a picture of dedicated men, conscious of their responsibility, striving to the best of their ability with the aid of reason, research, and experience to preserve our precious inheritance of the inalienable God-given rights of man within a framework of law directed toward the dignity and welfare of every individual. Looking toward the future I have only one anxiety.

The poet has said, "The night has a thousand eyes, the day but one, yet the light of the whole world dies with the setting sun." My only fear is that if we ever take God and His light out of the picture of law and legal justice, our people will wander in darkness and misery.

God has blessed our country and its rulers with a keen sense of justice and prudence and tolerance. May God continue to bless those who share His power and majesty.

Phil Regan: One-Man Mediation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article by the well-known columnist on labor affairs, Victor Riesel, which appears in the New York Mirror of February 9, 1960.

The article, entitled "Regan's Irish Tenor Soothed Steel Crisis," is about the role played by my old friend and former constituent from Brooklyn, Phil Regan, who turned out to be a one-man mediation service in helping to settle the recent steel strike. I am very pleased that this story about Phil Regan has now come out into the open so that he may get the credit due him for his service to the Nation.

The article by Victor Riesel reads as follows:

REGAN'S IRISH TENOR SOOTHED STEEL CRISIS
(By Victor Riesel)

When everybody was singing the blues over the steel strike there was one voice which kept them all cheery with Irish lullabies, including Torra-Loora-Loora.

This story—the story of Singer Phil Regan and the debt the country owes him has never been told.

Phil Regan, ex-Brooklyn cop, movie star, and now public relations spirit for National Distillers, is to Steel Union Chief Dave McDonald what Robert Montgomery is to Dwight Eisenhower. It was Regan who was at the Palm Springs Airport when the President arrived the other week. Regan drove to the home of his friend, George E. Allen, host to the President.

Meanwhile, back at Regan's Palm Springs home, McDonald was waiting. Regan returned with his coup. George Allen was on phone. The come-to-breakfast call came soon. The next morning, Saturday, January 30, Regan and Allen quietly listened to President Eisenhower talk to McDonald.

The President said, "You people in labor and the men in industry could keep things harmonious if you would fraternize more. Management wants that," McDonald replied, "It's also up to them—I'm ready and willing."

There was more, of course, in this man-to-man breakfast. Regan beamed. For him it was the windup of a long experiment in imaginative mediation and personal relations.

He had been in this steel thing, behind the scenes, for over a year—and not only as the voice of the union's "Man of Steel" radio program. Actually the trail leads backward from George Allen's Palm Beach home to Allen's tower suite in the Hotel New Yorker. Regan got to know Allen when the entertainer sang the "Star Spangled Banner" at Harry Truman's inauguration.

Late last year, Allen had Phil Regan and Dave McDonald in for breakfast at the New Yorker. Allen suggested that the Vice President would be just the man acceptable to both sides. It was then that McDonald flew to see NIXON at a Pittsburgh ball game. NIXON agreed to try to mediate.

Then there was much coming and going in and out of Regan's apartment in Park Avenue's Park Lane Hotel. It was there that

Regan first brought Edgar Kaiser and McDonald together. When the strike leader thought it was time to see the President of the United States, it was Regan who telephoned friend Tom Stevens, Ike's appointment secretary. The President said certainly. Regan set the half-hour talk with the President in a Waldorf suite.

Regan, McDonald, and the President talked about the Vice President's efforts. Mrs. Eisenhower said there would be more of them. Then, on November 5, the union people thought it time to brief the President again. Regan set it up—and McDonald slipped in a side door for a 45-minute secret talk.

Each time they talked, the President consulted DICK NIXON. Finally the Vice President called both sides to his home and laid it on the line. Then he flew to New York, got into a secret service car, and was just as blunt with the steel management's big 11. Then he flew to California. There Phil Regan, mellow voice and all, was the conduit. NIXON talked to Eisenhower, then to Regan. The singer telephoned Dave McDonald long distance. He relayed the messages to NIXON.

During this time Regan talked to steel industrialists and bankers—always good humored, always bringing all sides together. Practically a one-man mediation service—or it should be said a national service.

U.S. Diplomatic Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Iowans are very much aware of the position of the United States in world affairs, and are cognizant of the need for a good supply of well-trained diplomats, capable of conducting international negotiations with the highest degree of efficiency. The following resolution, adopted by the members of the Department of Public Safety Youth Commission of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, calling for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy, is a good recommendation for this proposal.

Whereas the security of the United States and the free world depends on proper and effective international negotiations; and

Whereas such negotiations must necessarily be conducted by individuals trained to a degree of excellence in the field of diplomacy so as to assure future peace and prosperity for these United States of America; and be it

Resolved, We, the members of the Department of Public Safety Youth Commission of the city of Cedar Rapids, in the State of Iowa, do vigorously encourage legislation providing for a U.S. Diplomatic Academy; and be it further

Resolved, That such an Academy would insure unerring, competent, and reliable representation of the United States and its foreign policy in the realm of international relations.

RICHARD A. BRANDT
(For the Chief Administrative Officer).
JOHN A. SIVER, *Chairman*.

Let Them Go on Earning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, more and more each day our people are urging Congress to eliminate the inequities contained in existing social security laws dealing with elderly citizens.

Only last week, one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Mansfield News Journal, published a penetrating editorial dealing with legislation which I introduced last year designed to remove the limitation on earnings of persons participating in the social security program. Under previous leave, I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THEM GO ON EARNING

Last year, Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING introduced a bill (H.R. 4212) in the House which would have raised the limit of $1,200 now placed on earnings of people receiving social security.

As you know, if a social security beneficiary makes more than $1,200 a year his benefits are cut accordingly. If social security truly represents a return of what the citizen has paid into the program, then this limit is unfair.

In this session of Congress, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG has taken over LEVERING'S idea. He wants the earnings limit raised to $3,000.

Actually, is there a necessity for any limit at all?

Social security is, at least in theory, like a gigantic insurance plan. Thus, it can be argued with conviction that a person who pays his premiums (i.e., social security charges) should get his promised payments whether he be pauper or millionaire.

A vast amount of confusion, cheating, record keeping and checking could be eliminated if every social security "policyholder" automatically began collecting at the age of 65.

Those who argue that it's unfair for an individual with a good income to collect social security overlook the great equalizer—income tax.

It can be accepted as a certainty that oldsters, given a free hand by the lifting of an earnings limitation, would produce a substantial return in income tax.

The major objection to the proposal is that oldsters would take jobs needed by younger people, and would add to the problem of overproduction.

That is a subject in itself, but a brief answer is that our Nation and the world do not have overproduction but rather underconsumption stemming from flaws in the system of distribution of goods. If the necessary adjustments can be made in distribution, there will be jobs for all and the oldsters will be needed in the productive system.

Any program which forces idleness on those who desire to work—and, in effect, that is the result of the earnings limitation set by social security—is putting an artificial barrier in the path of the Nation's progress, which is tied inextricably to production.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have received some inquiries from my district concerning a matter that seems to have become controversial and yet I can find no reason for the controversy to exist. It appears that there has been a widespread mass of misinformation given to the general public on the qualifications of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to be the chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education.

After a thorough and exhaustive search and after making inquiries, I find there is no such thing as standards for qualification as chairman of any committee of the House or Senate. The only thing that a man has to do to be chairman of any committee of this House is to live long enough and be elected more times than any other member of the committee. This is the time-honored system employed in the naming of chairmen and regardless of what may be said about a person—good, bad, or indifferent—there is no instance on record of any Member being denied the chairmanship when he met these very simple and somewhat ridiculous standards. So, the question of qualification for the position is one that cannot be argued by any person, whether he wants to help or wants to hurt Representative POWELL. I believe, however, at this time as a fellow member of the Committee on Education and Labor, that I must in all fairness state that insofar as Congressman POWELL'S position on that committee on the various pieces of legislation that have come before us, he has always given his support for legislation that would do the greatest good for the greatest number of our citizens.

It is noteworthy to chronicle here that during the hectic and ofttimes bitter debate and through the mountainous piles of newspaper clippings, editorials, letters, petitions, and telegrams that were sent in while the argument raged on the proposal of the labor legislation originally introduced by Senator KENNEDY and finally passed under the cosponsorship of Representatives LANDRUM and GRIFFIN, Representative POWELL never deviated from what he believed to be the proper and honorable course to follow. He fought shoulder to shoulder with those on the committee who felt that this was an attack upon the legitimate and honest labor unions, their officers, and their members and as an eyewitness to his activities, I can say that he was a stalwart in the fight for the rights of the little peoples. Further than this, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of which he is chairman and received the most courteous and considerate treat-

ment when I appeared in behalf of the bill to create a Coal Research Commission.

In passing, it is noteworthy to note that Congressman POWELL reported this bill to the full committee and that it has been passed by the House and although it was vetoed by the President, Congressman POWELL has again reported the bill out of his committee and it is now awaiting action by the House of Representatives. I am particularly astounded at the bitterness of the attack on Mr. POWELL by certain writers. It appears that while condemning Mr. POWELL for his publicly known position of fighting for equality of rights for all citizens, these same writers show a tendency to bigotry and prejudices that are the main reasons for Mr. POWELL's forthright fight for equal and inalienable rights for all Americans. It is interesting to note that Mr. POWELL has been awarded much recognition for his outstanding services in various fields of endeavor and I would like to record for the RECORD the following awards that have been tendered to him:

In 1953: Citation of honor for outstanding service in the advancement of civil liberties and human rights. The Bronx division of the American Jewish Congress.

In 1955: House Resolution 236. Resolution submitted by Mr. DINGELL. For statesmanship, patriotism, and forthright courage displayed at the recent Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung.

In 1955: House Resolution 239. Resolution submitted by Mr. KEOGH. For statesmanship, patriotism, and forthright courage displayed at the recent Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung.

In 1956: For loyalty to the cause of civil rights in the Congress of the United States. Maryland State conference, NAACP.

In 1956: Outstanding man of the year—Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

In 1956: The Rheingold award for meritorious services in the cause of unity and progress. I.B.P.O.E. of W. department of economics and Liebmann Breweries, Brooklyn, N.Y.

I know nothing about Congressman POWELL's home district, and know very little about his all-time record in Congress, but I do speak from personal knowledge of his performance as a Member of the Committee on Education and Labor which, in the final analysis, appears to be the bone of contention, I would not hesitate to give my full degree of support and to the best of my knowledge I know of no member of the committee who has expressed any opposition whatsoever.

Men Over 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following letter to the editor which appeared in the Journal Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., January 27, 1960.

MEN OVER 50

To the EDITOR:

I would like to get help in my effort to reduce the age limit for social security from 65 to 60.

I am at the age of 62 and have been unemployed for 3 years. Just this morning I called on the phone the personnel manager of the Chrysler plant in Newark and was told the usual thing, namely that the age limit is 50. Now I ask you sincerely, what are men in the age bracket from 50 to 65 going to do?

I have received some favorable replies from the following: Senators WILLIAMS, FREAR, Congressmen MCDOWELL and BRADEMAS, of Indiana, but they and they alone cannot do a job like this by themselves. That is why I was hoping that your paper would give this matter just a little thought, because while this affects me, I am thinking of the thousands over these United States who are in the same predicament.

In a recent issue of Life magazine there was a picture of the wedding gown of the bride to the Shah of Iran—price $46,000. So we had better send some more money under the terms of foreign aid to help pay for the gown.

HENRY O. SWENSON.

Committee of One Million: Lobby of a Million Ghosts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our China policies are bound to change in the very near future. The prevention of war and the establishment of a disarmament program make these changes inevitably imperative.

What about the so-called Committee of One Million against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations? Back in 1953 and 1954 they collected 1,037,000 signatures but no attempt has been made since then to find out what the signers believe now.

It took a lot of doing for the organization to get the signatures spontaneously in the first place, and 1,037,000 was a pretty poor showing compared to the 11 million American signatures which were claimed for the Stockholm peace appeal which was subsequently denounced by the State Department as Russian-inspired fakery.

The secretary of the Committee of One Million, Marvin Liebman, wrote me an indignant letter last fall after I identified the committee with the China lobby in a speech I made in San Francisco. However, he told John O'Kearney, who wrote the informative article, "Lobby of a Million Ghosts"—The Nation, January 23, 1960—that "if there is a China lobby, we are it."

Under a previous consent I am including the text of Mr. O'Kearney's keen and informative article.

LOBBY OF A MILLION GHOSTS
(By John O'Kearney)

Using a bloated title for themselves, and working with a budget of about $70,000 a year, a handful of zealous men exert a more determining influence upon U.S. policy towards the People's Republic of China than all sanity, unorganized, has thus far been able to counteract. "If there is a China lobby, we are it," says Marvin Liebman, secretary of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The handful of men who control this lobby base their claim to express what they call the "grassroots sentiments of all America" towards the Communists of China on 1,037,000 signatures to a petition which for almost 6 years has lain unriffled in the darkness of a New York warehouse; but though there are not more than 6,000 persons out of the 1,037,000 who ever contribute a dime, and not more than 25,000 names on the committee's mailing list, the weighty name of it will be slung about again in this election year in an effort to silence every politician who may dare to suggest that recognition of China, and trade with her, are essential to peace.

One of the major voices of this lobby, which has its headquarters at 343 Lexington Avenue, New York City, is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana. "Americans who favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations," said Mansfield, "base part of their argument on the false premise that opposition to such admission comes from a minority and lunatic conservative fringe of American politics." He then cited the 1,037,000 signatures, and asserted that millions more have endorsed this petition through the action of national organizations.

But what do they say at committee headquarters about the possibility of there being just such a lunatic fringe? The genial Liebman observes that in 1953 and 1954, with Korea fresh in the public mind, "anyone would have signed the petition." Since then, he admits, no one knows in what fashion the collective mind of 1,037,000 persons may have changed. "It would cost about 10 cents a head to get in touch with them all, and the committee simply cannot afford that."

Nevertheless, on the authority of all those names, the committee is working to get both the Democrat and Republican national conventions to adopt a joint plank against any move for recognition of China or resumption of trade with her. A propaganda kit is in preparation to be sent out to every person who runs for Federal office. The committee plans to poll all candidates. Conferences at the universities will be arranged to give the 1960 anti-Peiping campaign the respectability of what Liebman calls a "high degree of literacy." And since politicians and literate people who are well known and also conservative are never ignored by newspaper editors, the issue of China will again appear to have had a fair verdict among us.

Let us now consider who they are that rig the jury. A few are old China hands, but among the rest it is difficult to find any common motive beyond that of a fervent belief, as Liebman puts it, that they are acting as patriots whose only concern is what is best for their country. This is true, surely, of Liebman himself, if we may take it that his motives are as pure as his admitted ignorance of the evils of the Kuomintang rule over China is absolute.

The honorary chairman of the Committee of 1 Million is Warren R. Austin, member of the Loyal Legion of the Sons of the American Revolution, member of the China Society of America, and our first ambassador to the United Nations. After him come the six more or less active brains of the Steering Committee, the executive exploiters of the authority of a petition long years in a warehouse. At the head of the list is Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois, one-time pro-

fessor of economics. (Most politically aware people ask: What's he doing there?) With him are Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey; former Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey; Congressman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Congressman Walter H. Judd, of Minnesota, and Joseph C. Grew, Ambassador to Japan from 1931 to 1941. JUDD was a medical missionary to China from 1925 to 1938, a man who knew Shanghai in the Kuomintang days when every dawn revealed more than a hundred human bodies to be carted off out of the filth of the gutters.

The treasurer is Frederick C. McKee of the National Casket Co., an avocational joiner of causes. He was chairman and national director of the Committee for Boycott Against Japan from 1938 to 1939; national chairman of the Citizens for Victory, 1942–43; national treasurer of the League of Nations Association, 1942–44; and a member of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, 1949–52. McKee's assistant is Bettis Alston Garside, missionary to China, 1922–26, bearer of the Order of the Auspicious Star (Chiang regime), executive vice president and secretary of United Services to China, Inc., New York.

The committee got its start in October 1953, with a statement signed by 212 politicians, businessmen, scientists and religious leaders, intended for the ears of President Eisenhower. It was a protest against the growing pressure from Britain for recognition of China and relaxation of the American-enunciated trade embargo. It was ultimately to be given to the President on his way to the Bermuda Conference "to arm you in speaking to the British"; but it appears that Time magazine was the first to call it to his attention. "Congressional signers," said Liebman, "got mail pro and con, and before we knew it there was a spontaneous movement." How spontaneous it was may be better determined, perhaps, by Liebman's admission that the signatures came in pretty slowly because most of them were gathered through channels dug locally out of the membership of the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks also helped, along with the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Catholic War Veterans.

The Stockholm Peace Appeal had earlier claimed to have gotten 11 million American signatures, so it was decided that the committee must get at least a million. On July 9, 1954, the committee sent a telegram to the President announcing that it had rounded up its one million. In the end, the Stockholm petitions were denounced by the State Department as Russian-inspired fakery; but President Eisenhower took the 1,037,000 names presented by the committee as supporting evidence that 95 percent of the American people wished to keep the People's Republic of China beyond the pale. As a document, the full petition had less literary interest than an old telephone book, so it was never read. It was put in a warehouse and the committee closed up shop.

In the autumn of 195, an American assembly of Protestant religious leaders was held and there was more agitation for recognition of Red China, so it was decided to set up an informal group from within the membership of the Committee of One Million and get it going as a lobby in opposition to the agitators. Those who had led the previous petition movement became the lobby. The signers of the original petition were not solicited for support. "It would," said Liebman, "have been too expensive." However, in 1958, the committee polled 50,000 Protestant clergymen, and of those who responded, 93 percent were on our side. The support of these clergymen was taken as a mandate for continued exploitation of the 1,037,000 signatures.

Today, the authority of the original number has become dogma: On the basis of the original petition, the committee claims to have among its charter members one-fourth of the U.S. Senate, one-fourth of the House of Representatives, and nine Governors. The list is impressive, but it is a question how many would be there today if Judd, Smith, Douglas, Grew, and Edison were to turn around to look. Newspaper editors still accept the committee at face value, as ready to believe in the existence of an army here as those who were deceived by the 'round and 'round parade of the troops of Henri Christophe. Nevertheless, the committee's executives find it harder and harder to make news as time goes by. To keep itself in the public eye on a shoestring budget, the committee takes page advertisements in the international edition of the New York Times and reprints them for mail distribution, buying the aura of the newspaper's reputation for $450 on international page, instead of the $5,000 it would have to pay for a page in the domestic edition. The committee's friends in Congress provide further reprint material, flying the flag of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: for example, the speech of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, "Should the United States Change Its China Policy?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, delivered June 8, 1959, reprinted (not at Government expense) and distributed as committee propaganda. This Byrd speech could have been prompted by Chiang Kai-shek. "Continued support of the Nationalist Republic of China serves to best advance the interests of the United States and the free countries in Asia," BYRD said.

After the resumption of activity in 1954 by the small informal group which still calls itself the Committee of One Million, "we found ourselves," said Liebman, "with new responsibilities we had not figured on. We were the only responsible organization dedicated to anti-Communist activity, and suddenly we were getting letters from all over the world, particularly from the Far East regions."

Liebman has since been out there to meet the committee's friends. Chiang, a hard man to see, gave him 2 hours of his time and posed for a smiling, side-by-side photograph. In Bangkok, 2 years ago, Liebman was told by a cabinet-level spokesman: If the United States were to recognize Red China, within a week we would have to do so also. Presumably Liebman did his fervent best to reassure his friends in Thailand. Telling of his tour around the area, he said: We felt it was important to convince them that the United States is not changing its policy.

Out of their new-found sense of responsibility the committee's leading members set up the American-Asian Educational Exchange, with Edison as chairman and Liebman as executive vice chairman. Judd and McKee are vice chairmen, along with Bishop Herbert Welch. This organization, which Liebman says will try to fill the gap left by the United States Information Service and other outfits that try to educate Asians, began its work with the publication of Communism at Work in China, by Stanley K. Hornbeck, who from 1928 to 1937 was Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs of the State Department. He was Special Assistant Secretary of State in 1944, at the moment when President Roosevelt was upbraiding Chiang (United States Relations with China, the Department of State, pp. 66–68, 1949) for his persistent refusal to cooperate with General Stilwell in prosecuting the war against Japan, and for letting his anti-Communist obsession bring China to the brink of catastrophe. But Hornbeck still champions Chiang.

The transcendent arrogance of this China lobby was bared by Liebman last November 4 in a press statement attack on Conlon Associates, Ltd., of San Francisco, for having urged the admission of China to the United Nations. The Conlon group had been hired by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to study the China problem and came out for recognition and trade. Said Liebman:

To the best of my knowledge, Colon Associates conducted no serious investigation of either the sentiment of the American people or their leaders. We doubt very seriously whether Conlon Associates consulted with either the people or the governments of Korea, Free China, Hong Kong, et cetera.

More Debate by Insertion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in this the greatest of all deliberative bodies we should, it seems to me, debate the vital issues face to face on the floor of the House. Our distinguished colleague, war hero, and former chairman of the National Republican Committee, Mr. B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, however, apparently prefers to debate by insertion.

This means the gentleman turns in his side of the argument to the clerks, just as I turned this in. It means he does not have to undergo cross-examination by a colleague who may disagree with him. It means he does not have to defend his words.

It was this kind of debate he insisted on carrying on with me during the 85th Congress in spite of my efforts to persuade him to debate the issues personally on the floor of the House.

Now, in the Appendix of the RECORD for February 8, 1960, pages A1002–A1003, the gentleman reverts to this regrettable practice of debate by RECORD insert. Not only is this unworthy of the issues and the traditions of this great House, in my opinion, but the practice makes it very difficult for the readers of the RECORD to follow the arguments.

I repeat my most respectful request to my distinguished colleague: Desist from debate by insert and agree to carry your differences with me or other colleagues to the floor of the House. I would be delighted to discuss personally our policies with respect to Cuba or China with my esteemed colleague from east Tennessee on the floor of the House at his early convenience.

It is my hope, but hardly my expectation, that the gentleman will see fit to alter his policies and to give me an affirmative answer to this request.

Meanwhile, since the gentleman saw fit to include in the Appendix a slanted article from Time magazine—November 30, 1959—about my trip to the Far East last November, I shall include, following these remarks and by previously granted unanimous request, the text of two press releases issued by my office with respect to the Time article, copies of which releases were sent at the time to Mr. REECE.

The releases are as follows:

NOVEMBER 25, 1959.

Charging distortions and inaccuracies in Time magazine's November 30 article about his recent Far Eastern trip, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, in a letter to the editor of Time challenged them to produce an editor to debate China policy with him publicly.

"Let the objective press, radio, and television give the public an opportunity to judge as to the merits of the arguments and the good faith of the participants," PORTER said. He said he had informal assurances from one national television network that it would be pleased to program the debate.

According to PORTER's letter to the editor of Time, the question is: "Will Time, the weekly newsmagazine, produce from its editors a champion to dispute publicly and in person the proposition that effective opposition to the Red Chinese requires disengagement from our warm embrace with the defeated, discredited Chinese Nationalists?"

PORTER said he knew that Chiang Kai-shek was "the most cherished of Time's sacred cows but even so the extent of Time's personal attack, distortions and inaccuracies surprised me." He referred to an article on page 16 of the magazine.

The Congressman sent two letters to Time, one for possible publication and one personally to Henry Luce, editor in chief. PORTER cited the distortions and inaccuracies in detail. The text of the letters follows:

NOVEMBER 24, 1959.

The EDITOR,
Time magazine.

DEAR SIR: My China policy recommendations do not, as you correctly report (Nov. 30), meet with the approval of either the Red Chinese or the Nationalist Chinese. I have been expressing them publicly since 1954 and I believe an increasingly large number of Americans hold the same opinions.

My views coincide with the recommendations made earlier this month to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Conlon Associates, Ltd., at the conclusion of a study requested by that committee. Of course, I knew that Chiang Kai-shek was the most cherished of Time's sacred cows but even so the extent of your personal attack, distortions and inaccuracies surprised me.

For example, you report that a "glacial silence" followed my opening remark at my Taiwan dinner meeting with Chinese Nationalist leaders and then you say that I returned to Tokyo the next day as though that were the reason. This is untrue and misleading. As I intended, my remark relaxed the atmosphere and we had a cordial discussion. I returned to Tokyo the next day to fulfill a predetermined schedule of work for my committee.

It seems to me a shame, both politically and journalistically, that Time will drag an important issue to such a low level to promote an editor's opinion. Ambassador MacArthur backed out of his challenge to debate China policy with me. Will Time, the weekly newsmagazine, produce from its editors a champion to dispute publicly and in person the proposition that effective opposition to the Red Chinese requires disengagement from our warm embrace with the defeated, discredited Chinese Nationalists?

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 25, 1959.

Mr. HENRY R. LUCE,
Editor in Chief,
Time Magazine.

DEAR MR. LUCE: We agree about the importance of promoting world law. We disagree about China policies and I am writing to you now to protest against the distortions and inaccuracies of an article about me on page 16 of your November 30 issue.

I spoke at some length this morning with Mr. Furth, your executive assistant. He very patiently heard me out on the matters set forth below and told me that he would investigate them and bring them to your personal attention upon your return.

Of course I knew the time-line about Nationalist China. I didn't expect sympathetic treatment of my activities on my recent trip but I did expect better journalism. Let me now be specific. I hope you'll turn to the article and have it in mind as you read these comments.

1. The references to tuxes and birds are well within the range of fair comment. Congressmen, however, have always been concerned about our foreign policies and today, far from becoming less active, they are more and more participating in the formation of foreign policy. No real complaint here.

2. As for the "embarrassment and consternation" created by my flight, I found none except among the Chinese Nationalists, not among Americans, both in and out of government, and certainly not among Japanese. The unpalatable fact is that the Red Chinese are in firm control of the mainland and that the Chinese Nationalists, even in the unlikely event of a revolution, have no chance of regaining control. They have the intention but not the ability. We have the ability but not the intention. Point: Good reporting would have made it clear who was embarrassed and who displayed consternation.

3. "He next turned his attention to seething Cuba." Apparently your writers don't read your Latin American edition, much less the New York Times. In the interim I was active with respect to Venezuela, Colombia, and Latin American policies generally, including opposition to Batista. I went to Europe to a meeting of the World Parliament Association at the urging of Grenville Clark. Point: I didn't "next" turn to Cuba.

4. "I've urged him from the first to shave his beard." Of course I urged him to do that and settle down to the hard job of administering his country. I also urged him to hold elections, ban Communists from government and labor union positions, use civil courts, reform land reform, and so on. Any slight check of my activities here would show I had tried harder than any other 10 Congressmen to assist him along democratic paths. Point: The writer wanted me to look ridiculous so he selected that quotation.

5. "Looked around for new worlds to explore." My views on China haven't changed for a long time and I first expressed them publicly when I ran for Congress in 1954. I mentioned them on the floor in 1958 and I made many speeches embodying them earlier this year. Point: I'd been exploring this area for a long time.

6. "But prudently trimmed his travel plans." I had travel orders and a C-54 which could have taken me to Hong Kong from where I might have been admitted to China, just as Senator Malone went into Bulgaria. I didn't go because I had the question before the Supreme Court and I don't believe in defying duly constituted authority however much I may disagree with its rulings. Point: I didn't "trim" my plans.

7. That quotation about sending Chiang to an old soldiers' home is one I've used many times. I told one of your reporters that if you used it you ought to use it all, that is, including "for his protection and ours." Point: You didn't.

8. "Understandably hesitant about going to Formosa." The implication here is that I was afraid. The fact is that Chiang's Ambassador Yeh had warmly urged me to visit Taiwan and his First Secretary in Washington had repeated the invitation after Chiang had formally protested my "old soldiers' home" statement. I didn't want any sticky incident—that is, the sort of thing that a true whooping Congressman would seek. No "discreet inquiry" was made. A telegram went from MacArthur to our embassy in Taipei. The answer was affirmative, strongly so. Point: I made sure I was welcome, not just permitted to come, and I let the State Department have a chance to veto the whole trip.

9. "Chiang too preoccupied." I didn't ask to see him, although I indicated in a polite, low-pressure manner to Foreign Minister Huang that I would be glad to see him, even delay my departure a few hours, if he cared to see me. Point: Chiang didn't snub me nor I him.

10. "A glacial silence descended on the party, and PORTER returned to Tokyo next day." Untrue and misleading. There was a warm response to my intentionally flippant remark and we had a cordial discussion all evening. I returned to Tokyo because I had a heavy schedule of visits beginning the next day. Your people in Tokyo and Washington know better. Your editor had to make this out of whole cloth. Don't take my word. Talk to the Air Force man who accompanied me, Joe Hochreiter. Ask the chargé, Mr. Yager. Point: No factual basis for saying there was a "glacial silence," nor for the implication about my return to Tokyo the next day.

11. "Row" with MacArthur. It might have been relevant to mention what we argued about, namely, his putting off the record an interview I had had with a leading Diet member after the interview and with no previous notice. Point: Maybe I had a right to argue with the Ambassador.

12. MacArthur's denial of the China debate challenge is put down uncritically, whereas I know Alex Campbell understood very well that wire stories on two successive days, emanating from Embassy sources, affirmed the challenge. It wasn't until the third day that the Ambassador issued this denial. Point: The undisputed facts discredit MacArthur's denial.

13. "Excess of adrenalin." This was the reason suggested by MacArthur for our differences at a 40-minute meeting, very cordial, which I had with him on the day I left Japan. This quotation is out of context and garbled. Point: MacArthur's diagnosis, not mine.

14. "Strong nonrecognition in the two places most concerned." I would say the United States was the place most concerned. Point: I did not adopt my views to make either the Red Chinese or the Nationalists happy.

"U.S. goodwill abroad" might be increased if we disengaged ourselves from a defeated, discredited army. The issue is communication and recognition is only a part of that. It is not a question of softness or in any way diminishing our strength. Red China is the nation most likely to commit the rash act that could lead to war. We need her participation in any acceptable agreement with respect to the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. Communication will not insure against rash acts or that Red China will go along with international inspection stations, but it will help.

I cannot see how your editors could write such a story on the basis of the available facts. Crusading journalism is one thing. This article is something else.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Publisher Henry R. Luce has admitted his Time magazine was imprecise and could have looked further in its November 30 article

about Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER's recent Far Eastern trip. PORTER made public today the publisher's December 5 letter commenting on Time's article.

"Time was imprecise," wrote Luce to PORTER with respect to Time's report of the reaction PORTER's opening remark received when he met with Chinese Nationalist leaders in Taiwan in November.

"Time was 180° inaccurate," PORTER wrote Luce in reply. "My remark was not received by a 'glacial silence' as stated in Time but with relaxation and courteous good humor," PORTER said.

In reply to PORTER's objection that Time misrepresented his concern for Cuba, Luce wrote, "I shall concede that Time could have looked further into your total attitude toward Castro." He added that PORTER had been reported "in rationalization of Castro's acts" and that it was not "clear to us" that PORTER was Castro's "severe critic."

"Mr. Luce should read his Time magazine," PORTER said. "It quoted me months ago as seeing an 'ominous trend' in Cuba. It is easily ascertained that I have constructively criticized Castro more than any other Member of Congress."

In his letter to PORTER, Luce wrote that he thought the story was "sound journalism" and was "just and essentially accurate."

"In spite of Mr. Luce's admissions and in the face of other distortions he does not admit, he writes me that Time will say in its December 21 issue that it 'stands by its story,'" PORTER said.

(The texts of the letter from Luce and PORTER's reply are attached.)

DECEMBER 5, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: On my return from Hawaii a few days ago, I received your personal letter, and a written report from the editors who studied it in my absence. And I have given due attention to both documents.

As you correctly point out, you and I agree on the importance of promoting world law. We disagree, however, not only on policies toward China, but also on what constitutes sound journalism.

I shall be explicit. Was Time's report of your trip to the Orient "sympathetic"? No; and not merely because of our policy disagreement. It was unsympathetic because the reports from our correspondents in the Far East portrayed the incidents of your visit as unfortunate for our national posture there.

Addressing myself to your 12-point letter, I shall skip some points that I consider too tenuous to warrant debate. There remain others worth talking about.

For example, your No. 4, the bit about Castro's beard. I shall concede that Time could have looked farther into your total attitude toward Castro. However, you have been reported in rationalization of Castro's acts, and it is not clear to us that you are, as you imply in your letter, his severe critic.

Your No. 8, "understandably hesitant about going to Formosa." Time did not imply that you were "afraid," any more than you imply it in your explanation: "I didn't want any sticky incident."

Your No. 10, "A glacial silence descended on the party." Time was imprecise. Evidently your remark about shooting was not followed by silence. However, a recheck to our correspondents in Hong Kong and Taiwan confirms that the Chinese guests at the party considered your remarks "provocative"; that they maintained their tempers and good manners with conscious effort.

Your No. 12, the Ambassador said in a press conference: "I have been in the foreign service 25 years and I think I am too experienced to propose that I debate with a Member of Congress on any matter." That sounds convincing to me.

In sum: While I can see why you consider Time's report tough, I consider it just and essentially accurate. Your shorter letter intended for publication will be published in the December 21 issue. Time will say that it stands by its story.

So, it is clear that we have more on which to disagree than we had before. I shall be happy one day to resume discussion with you on, for example, world law.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY R. LUCE.

DECEMBER 7, 1959.

DEAR MR. LUCE: Many thanks for your prompt and careful consideration of my letter of November 25 protesting the distortions and inaccuracies in Time's recent article about my Far Eastern trip. I am glad to know you intend to publish my other letter in your December 21 issue.

You say that Time will say following my letter that it stands by its story which you regard as sound journalism even though—

1. I didn't "next" turn my attention to seething Cuba.

2. Time, as you admit, could have looked further into my total attitude toward Castro. This wouldn't be difficult. I inserted many speeches, etc., into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Your Washington correspondent, Jerry Hannifin, is fully informed in this respect. I still say it's "dirty pool," not sound journalism, to use, all by itself, the quote you did.

3. China was not a "new world" for me to explore politically.

4. I didn't ask to see Chiang so his being "too preoccupied" was irrelevant.

5. Time was, as you admit, "imprecise" in reporting the response to my remark at the Taiwan dinner party. "Inaccurate" 180 degres is more precise. I note you do not comment on the misleading implication in "* * * and PORTER returned to Tokyo the next day."

6. Both UPI and AP carried news stories, coming directly from the embassy, affirming MacArthur's challenge to debate China policy with me. I don't ask you to believe me. All I say is ask Gene Kramer of AP or Arnold Dibble (UPI) or your own Alex Campbell. Moreover, in the same conference where he said the words you quote in your letter he remarked that he had offered to debate the propriety of his refusing a transcript to me. I'm enclosing a thermofax of these news stories so you can see for yourself.

I certainly cannot agree that Time's report is "just and essentially accurate," although I did anticpate that Time would stick by its story nevertheless.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Dedication of the National Memorial Building of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a longtime dream of nearly 2 million members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary was fulfilled on February 8, 1960, when President Eisenhower dedicated the magnificent white marble National Memorial Building here in Washington, D.C.

Inside the handsome five-story structure a perpetual light burns in honor of those soldiers, sailors, marines, and airment who paid the supreme sacrifice. As an office building and a memorial, it represents a tribute to both the living and the dead, a symbol of the purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to honor the dead by helping the living.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I should like to include the preamble to the constitution and objects of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION AND OBJECTS OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

We, officers and enlisted men, and honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States of America, who have served in foreign wars of the United States of America, do unite to establish a permanent organization, which shall be known as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

This, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, was organized by the amalgamation of the Army of the Philippines, American Veterans of Foreign Service, and the Army of the Philippines, Cuba and Puerto Rico, on September 14 to 17, 1914, at Pittsburgh, Pa.

The objects of this association are fraternal, patriotic, historical, and educational; to preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory and history of our dead, and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America, and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies, whomsoever.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars who live in the Third District of Indiana are particularly proud that Mr. Samuel E. Leman, of Bremen, serves on the VFW National Council of Administration and that Judge E. Spencer Walton, of Mishawaka, a former VFW department commander and past chairman of the VFW National Legislative Committee, now serves as vice chairman of that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following brief history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

HISTORY OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was created by the merger in 1914 of three national societies of oversea veterans that were founded shortly following the close of the Spanish-American War in 1899.

These societies were composed of small groups of veterans who yearned to perpetuate that spirit of comradeship that is known only to those who have shared dangers and hardships in the actual zones of warfare.

The American Veterans of Foreign Service was chartered by the State of Ohio on October 11, 1899. After a brief period of activity the founding chapter in Columbus became dormant but was later revived.

The Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines was organized in Denver, Colo., December 1, 1899, but it has functioned continuously since its origin.

Shortly thereafter, still another society, also known as the American Veterans of Foreign Service, was formed at Altoona, Pa.

These various organizations merged their identities in 1914, at a convention in Pittsburgh, Pa., to become the single nationwide association that has been known since then as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

From the very beginning, the new organization took its place on the American scene as a major national veteran society, operating on a nonpartisan, nonsectarian, nonprofit basis. The close of World War I witnessed a great membership increase. As more and more oversea veterans joined its ranks, the VFW grew in prominence in national affairs—not only as a veteran fraternity but as a patriotic and service organization as well.

CAMPAIGN MEDAL SERVICE

A unique eligibility qualification distinguishes the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States from all other veteran organizations, past and present. Membership in the VFW is restricted to "any male officer or enlisted man, or any honorably discharged male officer or enlisted man, who is a citizen of the United States of America, and who has served in the military or naval service of the United States of America in any foreign war, insurrection or expedition, which service shall be recognized by the authorization of the issuance of a campaign medal by the military or naval service of the United States of America."

This campaign medal service requirement explains why veterans of the Spanish-American War, who founded the societies in 1899 that later gave birth to the VFW, have enjoyed a common bond in this organization with the overseas veterans of subsequent wars, campaigns, and expeditions—including World War I, World War II and the fighting in Korea.

Thus it is today that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States continues to exemplify that "evergreen" characteristic that inspired its founders in 1899, when they ordained that campaign medal service should always be the basic membership qualification. More than 60 years ago these men planned that the VFW should continue to exist so long as American citizens are required to serve on "foreign soil or in hostile waters" in defense of the American flag.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

The basic aims of this organization—for more than 60 years—have been definitely expressed in a nationwide program of activities with a fourfold purpose: (1) To insure the national security through maximum military strength; (2) to speed the rehabilitation of the Nation's disabled and needy veterans; (3) to assist the widows and orphans, and the dependents of disabled and needy veterans; (4) to promote Americanism through education in patriotism and constructive service to the communities in which we live.

This program is reviewed and strengthened annually on the basis of resolutions discussed and adopted at VFW national conventions.

VFW NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE

It is the proud boast of the VFW that every major veterans welfare law now on the statute books was either initiated or supported by this organization. These laws provided compensation for those suffering from service-connected disabilities; pensions for aging veterans with limited incomes; hospitalization and domiciliary care for needy veterans whose physical welfare requires proper hospital treatment; employment preference in civil service; housing and business loans; education and training, etc.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative service in Washington works for the benefit of all war veterans—and to implement policies endorsed by each VFW national convention.

The legislative director prepares measures for introduction in the Congress. He represents the organization at congressional hearings and keeps VFW members advised on current issues most important to all ex-servicemen.

Outstanding among VFW legislative accomplishments are the major roles of this organization played in the creation of compensation, pension, hospital, and bonus benefits for World War I veterans, and their widows and orphans; passage of the GI bill of rights, and subsequent measures for both World War II veterans and Korean veterans, and pensions for their widows and orphans also.

The VFW national legislative service also works constantly for the enactment of laws and policies that will strengthen the national security and international relations designed to preserve peace for America in the future.

SERVICE AND WELFARE

The VFW maintains the central office of its national rehabilitation service in Washington, D.C. This nationwide program serves all disabled veterans of all wars, members and non-members alike, in matters of Government compensation and pension claims, hospitalization, civil service employment preference, etc.

The VFW National Rehabilitation Service office in Washington, D.C., functions as a coordinating agency between the various agencies of the Federal Government and service officers of local and State VFW units. This office is staffed with claim experts and medical advisers qualified by study and experience to prosecute the claims of individual veterans seeking the benefits to which they may be entitled under the law, when such claims have been denied on lower levels within the Veterans' Administration.

YOUTH WELFARE

The VFW youth welfare program embraces countless activities, all dedicated to the purpose of teaching the youth of America the obligations of good citizenship. VFW local units throughout the country sponsor Boy and Girl Scout troops, musical units, rifle-clubs, teenage baseball and softball teams, marble shooting contests, bowling leagues, summer camps for underprivileged children. They cooperate with schools and churches, and—in every possible way—constantly strive to teach respect and reverence for America's patriotic traditions.

VFW NATIONAL HOME

At Eaton Rapids, Mich., the VFW maintains one of America's most unusual child welfare projects. It is the VFW National Home, founded in 1925 as a home for the orphans of deceased and/or totally disabled oversea veterans. Functioning under the "family unit" plan, the home campus includes more than 30 family-size dwellings, each housing a typical family group of children under the care of a trained housemother.

The site is a 640-acre farm, equipped with adequate farm and dairy buildings, swimming pool, athletic fields, nursery, memorial chapel and guest lodge, hospital, community center and auditorium, playgrounds, orchard with farm land, and fields where crops of grain and garden produce are raised.

Education, food, clothing, constructive play, physical welfare—all the essentials to well-rounded American youth—are supplied free of cost for the boys and girls who live at the home, plus financial assistance if they desire to obtain special training or college degrees after they earn their high school diplomas.

Today, more than 60 years since its roots took hold in 1899, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States fills an important place as a great service organization—one that is still composed of oversea veterans exclusively and dedicated to the ideal which seeks to "honor the dead by helping the living."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Family Farm Income Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARL HOGAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the beginning and foundation of free enterprise in this country, and indeed of the whole concept of democratic representative government in America, was the family farm system of agriculture. Family farming has continued throughout our history to be one of the major bulwarks of democratic government and our American way of life. The basic ideals of freedom, liberty, and self-reliance that characterize the warp and woof of our social values and our competitive free enterprise system had their roots in the American family farm system. Many observers feel that if the trends of the past 7 years continue, the family farm will disappear, a victim of industrial-controlled vertical integration, factory farming or some other form of rationalized or collectivized agricultural production.

Yesterday, the Congress received a farm message from the executive branch. This message was in two parts: Part 1 was a reiteration of the recommendations made by Secretary Benson, which experience has proven to be wrong, and which repeated hearings before our Committee on Agriculture have shown to be completely devoid of any constructive solution of the major aspects of the farm income problem. The proposals which were yesterday reiterated have already been found in practice to have adverse results and the reports prepared for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the Department of Agriculture in Senate Document No. 77 say these would be the results of future application of such policies: continued increase in farm production; continued piling up of surpluses in Government ownership; continued fall in farmers' income, and a continued increase in the middleman's share of the consumers' food dollar.

The second part of the farm message from the executive branch was more reasonable. The second part of the message indicated a willingness on the part of the Executive to work with Congress to bring about an acceptable solution to these problems. The message said that the timeworn recommendations were preferred, but that alternative courses would be considered and not turned down out of hand.

In the spirit of this second and more reasonable part of the farm message, I am today, in company with a large number of colleagues, on and off the Committee on Agriculture, proposing for consideration, an alternative course, that will in our opinion raise not lower farm income, reduce not increase the Government cost of the farm program, and reduce not increase the quantity of farm commodities in Commodity Credit Corporation inventories.

The bill we are introducing today meets the President halfway on his proposed alternative course. It provides means whereby farmers can make realistic choices commodity by commodity whether they wish to adopt the no-controls-low-supports approach favored by the executive branch or whether they wish somewhat more nearly adequate income stabilization levels and are willing to accept the self-discipline required to balance supply with demand at such stabilization levels.

Title I of the bill, "Balancing Supply With Demand at a Fair Price" gives producers of each different commodity a choice, first whether they wish to solve the problems of their commodity by means of nationwide marketing orders similar to the orders in successful use now for many commodities, or alternatively they want to make use of some other type of commodity market stabilization procedure for their commodity.

Part I, "Nationwide Marketing Orders," amends, as did the bill I introduced last spring, the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 in several ways to increase the commodity coverage of the act and to improve its authorizations in other ways. Eligibility to make use of marketing orders would be extended to the producers of all commodities and thus they would take this load completely off the Government and carry out the complete program for their commodity on a self-help basis through an administrative board elected by producers to operate the order. This part of the bill would authorize national, as well as regional, marketing orders.

Part II of the bill, "National Commodity Stabilization Program" provides for the orderly termination of all of the price support and acreage allotment legislation now on the books, except for tobacco, sugar beets, sugarcane, and wool. In the place of existing programs, the Secretary of Agriculture would be directed to work with producer-elected committees of producers of the different commodities to develop workable programs at considerably less cost to the Government than existing programs.

Section 151 of the bill directs the Secretary to initiate the use of a fair-price concept based upon the definition in the Agricultural Adustment Act of 1938.

Section 152 requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a farm commodity program development committee for each commodity of importance where the supply exceeds the demand at a fair price, if the commodity is not already serviced by a nationwide marketing order under part I of the bill. This committee would be made up only of producers of the particular commodity and would be elected by secret ballot by the producers of that commodity.

The bill requires that the committee be set up in a manner that will give appropriate regional representation to all production areas of the commodity, with one commodity committee member from each production area of equal size in terms of production and sales of the commodity.

Section 153 provides that each such commodity committee shall, with such help as the Secretary shall provide, develop a workable income and supply stabilization program for that commodity in accordance with the standards specified in the following sections of the bill. When the committee has developed a program for the commodity involved, they are required to recommend it for adoption to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Whenever one of the commodity committees recommend such a program to the Secretary he is authorized and directed to study it carefully to determine if the recommended program is consistent with the standards and yardsticks set up in the bill and if it is a feasible application of such standards and yardsticks. If he determines that these requirements are met, the Secretary shall then submit the proposed program to a referendum of the producers of the commodity. All commercial producers of the commodity with annual sales above $500 would be eligible to vote in the referendum.

If two-thirds of the producers voting in the referendum do not favor the proposed program, the existing program under existing law stays in effect.

However, if two-thirds of the producers who vote favor the proposed new program, it shall be placed into operation by the Secretary, except that if it calls for expenditures from the Federal Treasury of more than $20 million per year, the program must be submitted, through the President, to Congress for review. The proposed program would be submitted to the Vice President, who would refer it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who would refer it to the Committee on Agriculture.

If either such committee rejected the proposed program by resolution within 90 days, it would not be placed into effect.

Sections 155 and 156 established the standards or yardsticks by which the producer commodity committees, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Agriculture Committees of Congress must be guided in the development and approval of proposed programs.

The standards or yardsticks are:

First. Each such program must provide for a means to balance market supply with demand at a fair price, while bringing about a reduction of at least 10 percent of the Government inventory of the commodity each year. The needs of each commodity for special domestic welfare food utilization programs and special exports would be included, as well as regular commercial dollar demand requirements;

Second. Establish means for adjusting such quotas or goals among States, counties, and individual farms;

Third. Utilize as necessary a diversified kit of income stabilization tools in workable combinations to meet the fair price objective. However, no method of income stabilization could be used that would result in the acquisition or storage by Government of any agricultural commodities. Each such program must be designed to operate at an annual net cost to the Government of not more than 5 percent of the gross sales of the commodity. This would place a very strict limit upon Government costs, much lower than has been expended on many commodities in each of the past 7 years. Moreover, any payments or benefits under the act would be limited to not more than $5,000 to any one farm family in any one year.

Section 157 of the bill requires that groups of closely related commodities, such as feed grains, be combined into a single program and considered as an individual commodity.

The Commodity Credit Corporation resale price would be set at the equivalent of the fair price rather than at 5 percent above the support price as provided in existing law.

All provisions of the bill, if enacted, would terminate on December 31, 1965.

Title II of the bill would institute a new welfare type food distribution program, aimed specifically at the high protein foods such as meat, milk, and eggs. The Secretary would be directed to take from stocks of Comodity Credit Corporation or to buy on the open market $500 million per year of such foods for distribution to schools, public institutions, and needy people. For each approximately $2 value of such high protein foods so distributed, the Secretary would be authorized to sell $1 in value of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed grains.

Title III of the bill, and again, this is substantially the same proposal which I submitted to the Congress last May 18, would carry out the recommendation in the farm message of the executive branch to take out of surplus commercial production up to 60 million acres of farmland and devote it to soil building practices. The provisions of this title would allow the discredited Soil Bank Act to remain expired, as it did on December 31, 1959, and would not bring it to life or extend it.

Instead, the bill that is being introduced today would expand and implement the soil conservation program established under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1937. The new program would be a part of, and an expansion of, the time proven ACP program approved and utilized by almost every farmer in the land over the past 23 years.

Under the program proposed in the bill, each participating farmer would contribute, without rental payments, not less than 10 percent of his tillable acres to a "producers' contributed acreage" of the national soil building base.

In addition to the producers contributed acreage, each producer could place an additional acreage up to not more than 30 percent of his tillable land into the soil building base and receive payments in kind equal to two-thirds of the annual production as rental.

This proposal would meet the major recommendations in the farm message but would avoid some of the major defects that have shown up in the soil bank program. With producers making a partial contribution to the program in acres the cost should be greatly reduced; by not allowing any farmer to put more than a total of 40 percent of his land into the soil building base, the adverse situations developing from the so-called whole farm approach would be avoided.

Title IV of the bill outlines the legislative findings that orderly nationwide market stabilization and supply control measures are required to maintain orderly conditions of interstate commerce in agricultural commodities.

Marguerite Brooks Memorial Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the efforts of the La Puente Players, a little theater organization in the 25th District of California, to the attention of my colleagues.

The proclamation below was signed last week by Mayor S. Chester McIntosh, of La Puente. All of the proceeds of the presentation by the players will be donated to the City of Hope cancer research hospital which is also in the 25th District.

Marguerite Brooks was one of the most beloved newspaperwomen our area has known and over the years became fast friends with a number of the Nation's leaders. Cancer was the cause of her untimely death last year.

The proclamation reads as follows:

Be it resolved: The week of February 7 through 13, 1960, shall be known to these parts as Marguerite Brooks Memorial Week.

Whereas Marguerite Brooks, cherished, respected, outstanding citizen of this city, active in community affairs, was called by the High Tribunal, the victim of cancer; and

Whereas Marguerite Brooks' final wishes included that funeral contributions be sent instead to the City of Hope, from which institution she had received comfort; and

Whereas the memory of Marguerite Brooks, charter member of La Puente Players, is being honored by that organization with onstage prseentations of "Blythe Spirit," February 11, 12, and 13, 1960, in a Marguerite Brooks Memorial, with proceeds to the City of Hope; and

Whereas the city of La Puente, cognizant of her outstanding abilities and continued contributions to the welfare of this community and local area, and desirous of publicly recognizing such exemplary citizenry, and abetting to the compliance of her final wishes does, therefore, proudly endorse La Puente Players' tribute, the Marguerite Brooks Memorial, and proclaim in these parts the week of February 7, through 13, 1960, as Marguerite Brooks Memorial Week.

In testimony thereof, I have caused my signature to be hereunto affixed. Done in the city of La Puente, Calif., on this 3d day of February in the year of our Lord 1960.

By the mayor:

S. CHESTER MCINTOSH.

Farm Outlook 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most impressive article by Mr. D. W. Brooks, who is the general manager of the Cotton Producers Association. This timely article was called to my attention by Mr. George W. Morrow, an outstanding industrialist and civic leader in the lovely town of Graceville, Fla. The serious situation of the farmers generally appears to have escaped the attention of altogether too many of the Nation's leaders who are more concerned with the sociological and industrial problems of the Nation's population centers. Unless there is an improvement in the status of agriculture, we may see farming as an industry killed except for the big corporation farmers in this country.

The article follows:

FARM OUTLOOK 1960
(By D. W. Brooks)

At the beginning of any new year all of us like to start with lots of enthusiasm and hope, believing that this is the way to accomplish most. However, sooner or later we have to look at the bare facts as they are. When we take a look at the bare facts of agriculture, they make a sorry picture.

All of our figures on this are generally based on average prices from 1947 through 1949. This was a 3-year period between the Second World War and the Korean war and was the most stable period we have had in a long while. A careful study of the facts based on this period will show that agriculture has been taking a gradual beating in both directions. No. 1, our prices have been going down; and No. 2, our costs have been going up. Consequently, what is left for the farmer has been getting less and less.

As an example, since the 1947–49 period the average price of agricultural commodities has gone down approximately 18 percent at the wholesale level. The average price of nonfarm commodities at the wholesale level has gone up 28 percent. Even after agriculture has furnished the consumers of this country, farm commodities at 13 percent lower prices, the other parts of the economy of this country, namely labor and industry, have not only eaten up the 13 percent but have increased

their cost 28 percent or a difference of 41 percent. Consequently, even with the farmer taking a licking year after year the cost of living has been going up not only against consumers but against farmers themselves.

We hear lots about industrial revolutions and industrial efficiency, the efficiency of labor, and so forth, in this country, but when you put the bare facts down and look at them, by far the most efficient operation in this country in recent years has been agriculture. Except for agriculture the cost of consumer goods in this country would be much higher and the scale of living of the people of this country would be very low as compared to what it is today.

The sad part is that the industry that has made the most progress in lowering its costs and reducing its prices to the consumers of this country is the industry that is now the most maligned, most misunderstood, and most condemned of any industry in this country. It is bad enough to have to take the licking that agriculture has taken for the benefit of the consumers of this country. When you have to take the licking, and then the cussing on top of the licking, it becomes unbearable.

If you will study other industries in this country you will find that when they bring about tremendous increases in efficiency and lower their cost they can generally continue to hold their price level and the industry itself gets all or at least a good part of the benefit in the improvement of efficiency and lowering of cost. This has not been true at all in agriculture. The more efficient we become, the more we lower our cost, the worse shape we get in, because our prices go down faster than we can increase our efficiencies.

As one illustration of this situation, I have recently made a study of the price of broilers. In 1953, only 6 years ago, our average price was running from 27 to 29 cents per pound. Even as late as 1955 we received as high as 30½ cents a pound for broilers. During the past several months our price has been holding around 13½ to 14 cents per pound, or less than one-half of the price during the same period of time 6 years ago.

If any other industry in this country had been able to cut its prices in half, in the last 6-year period, it would be hailed as the business wonder of the entire world. But all that has happened to the broiler industry is that as fast as it has improved its efficiency the price has gone down and the farmers are obtaining far less money today for their labor than they obtained 6 years ago.

During this same period the wages of labor in most industries have gone up at least 25 to 50 percent, and the price of nonfarm commodities has gone up approximately 25 percent. If some manufacturing industry, such as the automobile industry, had been able to reduce the price of its commodity one-half in the last 6 years through lower labor costs and increasing its efficiency, it would be the marvel of the civilized world. Instead of paying $3,000 for an automobile, we would be paying $1,500 or less for the some automobile today. If this had happened all the way through the industry, we would now have the highest scale of living the world has ever dreamed about, much less actually had.

With this as a background, let's look at what is ahead for farmers in 1960. The prediction now is that the income will go down 5 to 10 percent more. The prediction last year was that we would go down 5 to 10 percent, but it is going to work out 15 percent down for 1959. The price trend is continuing downward and the cost of things farmers have to buy is continuing upward. We are fast becoming an island of poverty in a sea of prosperity. Everybody seems to be getting rich except the farmers. Yet when you read the public press of this country about what the Government is paying out for farmers, they have thoroughly convinced the consumers of this country that farmers are driving Cadillacs, they have so much money they can't spend it, and they got all this money from the taxpayers. All of this indicates to me that we must do an entirely new job of thinking about farm programs and stopping this cost-price squeeze which is making peasants out of agriculture and kings out of other groups in this Nation. Nineteen hundred and sixty will probably be the most prosperous year this country has ever known for everyone except farmers. We are going down that same lonesome road that we have gone down for many years now. To me this indicates that we are going to have to change some roads, and we are going to have to use some of the techniques that have been used by labor and industry to carry them on the high road while we were going down the low road.

The predictions now are that the net agricultural income in 1960 will be back to the 1940 level. Industry and labor have moved forward 50 to 100 percent during this 20-year period. Agriculture is back where we started 20 years ago. If farmers were making the same per hour wage as that given recently to steelworkers, milk would have to sell for $1 a quart and eggs $2 a dozen.

Such a situation is a terrible reflection on the ability of people in agriculture. It indicates definitely that something is basically wrong and we had better start entirely on a new road.

I wish that I could write an optimistic report telling you how good things were going to be in agriculture, but as far as I can see, no changes have been made which would indicate that we have any better chance to stop this cost-price squeeze in 1960 than we have had in the past. Surely there are enough brains in agriculture now for us to rethink and re-do our whole philosophy of agriculture in this country, so that we, too, can join in and participate in this wave of prosperity that is engulfing our country. I am going to be writing articles from month to month as we move along suggesting possibilities of some changes in the direction in which we might go in at least getting some of the rewards which we deserve from the greatest production job and the greatest revolution that has ever taken place on this earth.

Outstanding Alabama Editor Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Lions Club in Piedmont, Ala., recently honored one of Alabama's outstanding newspaper publishers, the Honorable Austin Johnson.

"Mayor" Johnson is one of my dearest friends and neighbors down in Piedmont, and the newspaper which he puts out is widely respected, read, and quoted.

I regretted very much that business has prevented my being in Piedmont to honor my good friend, and I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in another outstanding newspaper in the same county, the Anniston Star.

The editorial follows:

CONGRATS, MR. JOHNSON

The entire populace of Calhoun County and members of the Alabama Newspaper Publishers Association in general will join most heartily in the tribute that was paid Austin Johnson, editor of the Piedmont Journal, last night in observance of his 20 years of perfect attendance at the Lions Club in that city.

Mr. Johnson is one of Alabama's most useful citizens. His weekly paper is one of the best in the State, his editorials being ably written and widely quoted. He has always been progressive in his point of view and never hesitates to take a stand on anything that he conceives to be for the betterment of the State.

It was fitting that the honor paid to Mr. Johnson by his fellow citizens and others from outside Piedmont was in recognition of his 20 years of uninterrupted attendance at the meetings of the Piedmont civic club, of which he was one of the founders and a past president.

And let it be said in passing that the Lions Club is one of the best of all the luncheon clubs that have sprung up in this country in the last 50 years or so. Their affiliation has become international, and their service for the sick and handicapped around the world has won them plaudits everywhere.

But Mr. Johnson does not confine his activities to his paper and the Lions exclusively. He has served on the city council of Piedmont more than once and was one of its most outstanding mayors a few years ago. Indeed, he is always in the forefront of anything that is for the betterment of his hometown.

It is with genuine pleasure, therefore, that the Anniston Star joins with the Lions and the people of Calhoun County in general in congratulating Mr. Johnson on the recognition he has received for his many benefactions to his city, county, the State and the country in general. May his pen be ever damp.

Piedmont itself has been showing many evidences of growth and prosperity in recent years, the fine new hospital there being one of the more recent accessions. And the people of the community are to be congratulated as a whole on the recognition they give to the outstanding service of their good citizens.

"In God We Trust"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on February 3, 1960, to represent the people of Durant, Okla., in the presentation of a plaque to the main post office building in Washington, D.C. This bronze plaque bears the national motto, "In God We Trust," and the official seal of the United States of America. This gesture was stimulated by a desire for public expression of the religious reverence and respect of the American people.

Attending the official dedication ceremony, in addition to representatives of the various departments and organizations involved, were ministers of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. Their remarks on this occasion indicate the fundamental beliefs on which our country is founded, as well as the cooperative spirit symbolized by this National Brotherhood Month. Under unanimous

consent heretofore granted, I include the invocation delivered by Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives; comments of the Very Reverend Monsignor Leo J. Ccady, director of Catholic charities in Washington; and the benediction of Rabbi E. William Seaman, Washington Hebrew Congregation; be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

INVOCATION BY REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D.

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we rejoice that Thou hast also been the God of all their succeeding generations.

We humbly acknowledge that in our day and generation we are facing tasks and responsibilities which challenge and demand the consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

Help up to feel that America's great hour has come when we must revive our trust in Thee and in the spiritual foundations of our beloved country.

Grant that all the barriers of doubt and misgiving which separate us from Thee may be supplanted and submerged by a renewed trust in Thee.

Create within us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy. May we hold our own wishes in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will. On Thee may we depend for light to know, for wisdom to choose, and for strength to perform.

Give us a greater faith in the glorious prediction that they who trust in Thee and wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

COMMENTS BY THE VERY REVEREND MONSIGNOR LEO J. COADY

We in Washington are grateful to the people of Durant, Okla., for the interest they have taken in promoting this project of erecting plaques signifying the Nation's trust in God in various public buildings in cities throughout the land. To me, it seems significant that here in Washington we have such a ceremony and such a plaque erected in a city which is the foundation of our Government, where all our ideals, all of our political philosophies have their roots, and all our aspirations find their highest embodiment in what we do here in this seat of government.

It was a small thing perhaps but it is symbolic of a tradition and symbolic of the fundamental convictions that we share. Throughout the years they will have meaning for all of those who pass by in this post office. It is a reminder that the people who began this Government, the great men on whose philosophy our country is based, whose names are still held in reverence, were also men of aspirations and high ideals.

They were men who were, in a sense, joiners in that they joined spiritual ideals and political action. To me it is most significant that here in the city that bears the name of the Father of our Country, the first President, a man who himself was deeply religious, we today here are erecting a plaque signifying our Nation's trust in God. It seems a continuation of one of the things Washington said in the last address that he made as President to the Congress of the United States: "I consider it an indispensable duty as part of my last official action as President to entrust to the protection of Almighty God our dearest country." I think that these sentiments are being reiterated here today.

We in Washington and throughout the country are grateful to you, Congressman ALBERT, the people of your district, and the city of Durant for the interest you have taken in reinforcing our ideals by bringing to mind more forcibly and tangibly in this plaque the aspirations for which we all strive.

BENEDICTION BY RABBI E. WILLIAM SEAMAN

Lord our God, let Thy blessing, we pray Thee, rest upon our country and our people, guarding them from calamity and injury. Enlighten with Thy wisdom and sustain with Thy power those whom the people have set in authority, all who are entrusted with our safety and the guardianship of our rights and our liberties. May peace and goodwill obtain among all the inhabitants of our land. May religion spread its blessings among us and exalt our Nation in righteousness. Praised be Thou, O Lord, in whom we forever put our trust. Amen.

The Library Services Act—Vital to the Nation's Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who believe deeply in democracy place great faith in the power of education to strengthen man's ability to govern himself, and indeed, to provide the basis for the future defense, security, and progress of our Nation.

But education should not cease abruptly with the ceremonious awarding of diplomas and degrees. It is a dynamic, continuing process which keeps freemen forever free.

An essential ingredient of this process is books—books which are readily available to all our citizens, regardless of the ability to pay. Such an indispensable, democratic service is provided by our free public libraries across the Nation.

In 1956 Congress took a significant step toward expanding free public library services where they were needed most—in our rural areas—by enacting the Library Services Act. Federal grants totaling $19,050,000 over the past 4 years have been invested in this program. The States have provided matching funds and imaginative leadership in extending library services into rural areas where books simply were not available to the people.

My State of West Virginia has moved dramatically ahead under this program of Federal-State partnership. Per capita expenditures jumped from 26 cents in 1956 to 45 cents in 1959. And the number of West Virginians with library services has increased from 50 to 56.5 percent.

In 23 counties in West Virginia, with a total population of 243,757, library services have been strengthened. Three bookmobiles are serving new regional libraries operating in eight counties, including two counties—Jackson and Roane—in the Fourth Congressional District which I proudly represent. More than 184,000 books, including basic reference collections, have been purchased for libraries throughout the State.

These significant beginnings in breaking West Virginia's book barrier have been made with only $277,921 in Federal funds and $174,246 in State contributions.

Thousands of West Virginians, however, still do not have reasonable access to public libraries. In my congressional district alone, the citizens of two counties have no library services whatever. More than half of the people in 4 other counties among the 10 in my district are without library facilities. A similar story of library neglect exists throughout West Virginia.

As my able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has pointed out, the absence of adequate library services is a national disgrace which reaches into practically every area of our country.

Outstanding progress has been made in the past 3 years under the Library Services Act, which began a new era of Federal-State partnership in making books available to all the people.

My bill, H.R. 9574, would extend this act for another 5 years. I would like to urge my colleagues to vote for this extension of the Library Services Act, which is making a dramatic contribution to democracy's growth. As Thomas Jefferson once remarked: "A nation that expects to be ignorant and free expects that which never was and never will be."

Moral Climate Held Chiefly at Fault in Scandals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article from the New York Times of Sunday, January 31, 1960, under the heading of "Advertising: New Villain Is Tagged in TV."

The article is by Robert Alden and has some very interesting and timely references concerning the deported Lincoln Steffens and a very active, patriotic and outstanding American, Philip Cortney, of New York.

It is as follows:

ADVERTISING: NEW VILLAIN IS TAGGED IN TV—MORAL CLIMATE HELD CHIEFLY AT FAULT IN SCANDALS

(By Robert Alden)

Late in 1907, in a speech before some 100 prominent Los Angeles businessmen, attorneys, clergymen, and their wives, Lincoln Steffens, the journalist and an authority in his day on municipal corruption, was asked to give not a superficial view of corruption, but to get right to the basic roots of the evil.

Mr. Steffens turned to the Bible and spoke of the original corruption that had taken place in the Garden of Eden:

"You want to fix the fault at the very start of things," Mr. Steffens said, " Maybe we can. Most people, you know, say Adam was to blame. But Adam, you remember, said that it was Eve, the woman—she did it. And Eve said no, no, it wasn't she; it was the serpent.

"Right now you blame that serpent, Satan," Mr. Steffens paused, almost as if he had finished. Then he went on: "Now I come and I am trying to show you that it was, it is, the apple."

INVITATION TO CORRUPTION

After a long and searching study of corruption across the United States, Mr. Steffens had concluded that any way of life that held up riches, power, and acclaim as prizes for success and conditioned people from the cradle to the view that these were the goals worth seeking no matter what the cost, not only invited, but insured corruption.

At the present time, advertising, as honorable profession as any and a profession more creative than most, stands accused in the public mind of being guilty of a deep wrongdoing.

To draw a parallel from Mr. Steffens' Biblical story, it is as if Charles Van Doren and his like were Adam, the television industry was Eve and the corrupter, at whom the finger of real guilt pointed, was the serpent, the advertising profession.

The moral climate of the time, the actual villain that fostered this tragic disillusionment of the American public, goes virtually undetected. Advertising becomes the whipping boy to salve people's consciences.

The United States is today a rich country, the richest country in history. Its way of life is the most comfortable. It has more leisure, more food, more mobility, more good things to enjoy than any of the people were able to enjoy at the crests of other great civilizations.

This great goal was achieved by good fortune and, more important, by more than 300 years of hard work.

It was not achieved by long weekends and the notion that it is possible to get something for nothing. It was achieved in spite of a small group who felt that it was all right to do things that were illicit—as long as it was possible to get away with it.

To judge by reports of the Government's Central Intelligence Agency, the United States today is becoming soft and flabby compared with another power that already has sent one rocket around the moon and shot another 8,000 miles onto a speck of a target in the Pacific.

WARNINGS IN PAST

The past warns us that great civilizations have been tumbled from their crests before—the Roman Empire, the Kingdom of Khmers, and the Court of Louis XIV.

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corp. of America, said in a speech recently, that we ran the danger of confusing democracy with mediocrity, and that we might grow softer, more pleasure-loving, content to squander our increasing leisure on the trivial, if not on the harmful.

Later, on January 7 of this year, in a statement before the Federal Communications Commission, Philip Cortney, president of Coty, Inc., warned that "the degrading of our taste, the corruption of our morals, the juvenile delinquency to which many of the television programs make such an outstanding contribution, are too high a price to pay for so-called free television."

Mr. Cortney was not particularly advocating pay television. He was advocating that television be taken completely out of the control of advertisers, that legislation be passed that "would specifically make it illegal and punishable by law for any advertiser to exercise control over programs."

That was Mr. Cortney's drastic remedy for a situation in which the bill for television, the single greatest influence on the Nation, is picked up by advertisers, "whose main criterion for presenting a program," according to Mr. Cortney, "is what is supposed to be most popular."

The duty of television in these critical times for the United States, Mr. Cortney said, is not to pander to the low tastes, already debased by a steady diet of cheap entertainment, but to raise those tastes for the good of the public and the good of the country at a critical time.

Is a remedy as drastic as Mr. Cortney's necessary—a remedy that would specifically make it illegal for any advertiser to exerecise control over any program?

Does tampering by advertisers automatically spell venality? In other media—newspapers, for example—such tampering does indicate corruption.

And the chances are that if the notion that advertisers are degrading public taste becomes widespread, then the connotation of venality in television programs produced by advertisers will surely follow.

ADVERTISERS' TASK

The responsibility thus becomes the adtisers' to show that they are not only capable, but willing, to exercise the kind of influence on television programing that the television product, which they work on in cooperation with the networks, will be as good a job as the networks could do if the networks did the job alone.

In proper perspective and with proper values, this task would not be a difficult one for the advertisers. However, in the present moral climate, where the most popular shows—no matter by what method their popularity is achieved—are the most sought after, the task becomes almost impossible.

The World of Coos Bay (Oreg.) Wins Freedom Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story and editorial appearing in the February 5, 1960, edition of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, a fighting and capable newspaper in my district.

The World and particularly its news editor Jack Pease, brought to the attention of its readers the fact that segregation is not necessarily a problem one reads about—it can take place in your own backyard, as it did in the Coos Bay area. The work of the newspaper and its staff has, I feel, made Coos Bay a better place in which to live.

Segregation is a national problem and it is high time we accepted this fact. Past time, indeed, that we put teeth into Federal civil rights legislation.

The editorial and news story follow:

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Feb. 5, 1960]

WORLD GETS FREEDOM AWARD

A college, a newspaper, and a community worker have been selected to receive the annual Freedom Award for 1959 of the Portland Chapter, American Veterans Committee, Chapter Chairman John Holley announced today.

Reed College, the World of Coos Bay, and Mrs. Helen Catlin were chosen for their contributions toward achieving a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world.

The World, a daily newspaper of Coos Bay and the surrounding area, gave considerable space in its issue of December 7, 1959, to the plight of a Negro serviceman's family which was forced to leave the community because of abuse and inability to secure a home. "The stand of the World for human decency," said the AVC selection committee, "was a community service which might easily have been slighted."

MRS. CATLIN

Mrs. Helen Catlin was named because of her many years of volunteer services in a great many organizations and for a variety of causes. During the 1959 legislative session she worked successfully for a school of social work for Oregon, long needed if Portland and other parts of the State are to be provided with a supply of trained social workers.

Among her many volunteer jobs she has been an active organizer and worker in the United Fund in the neighborhood division, has been a member of the advisory committee to the board of control on the State training schools, and was a prime mover in the volunteer service bureau which gave help to many community organizations and individuals.

At present Mrs. Catlin is employed as director of volunteer services by the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon.

FREEDOM AWARD

To Reed College goes a Freedom Award for the refusal of the college to use available Federal moneys for a student loan fund because of the requirement that each student must sign a negative loyalty oath.

Although a few other colleges in the East had taken a similar stand. Reed was the first college in the West to turn down such funds on the grounds that such an oath unfairly discriminated against college students alone.

"Although the financial assistance would have been of substantial value to Reed College," says John Holley, chairman of the AVC chapter, "this oath would have been in violation of traditional American positive affirmations of loyalty and implies that college students are less trustworthy than other groups receiving Federal assistance. We just don't possess that lack of confidence in young Americans," he added.

The American Veterans Committee was formed at the end of World War II by a group of liberal-minded veterans headed by Charles Bolte.

The group, according to Edgar A. Taylor, Jr., chairman of the Portland chapter's freedom awards committee, dedicated its efforts more toward civil rights and social progress of veterans and all citizens than toward the customary veteran group goals of pensions and cash remuneration.

Pease will be a guest of the Portland chapter at a luncheon in the Downtown YMCA next Thursday, when he will receive the award.

Principal speaker at the award luncheon will be Dr. Ford Lewis, associate minister of the First Unitarian Church of Portland.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Feb. 5, 1960]

HONORS FOR THE WORLD

Like the maker of better mousetraps, or the compounder of finer cheeses, the writer of newspaper stories mainly looks forward to the completion of his product with the satisfaction any good craftsman knows. He hopes someone will get some good from it.

He finds his satisfaction in the knowledge of a good job well done, for a good purpose.

But occasionally, the merit of his work is so great that fellow men rise up and remark that this is indeed a better mousetrap, a better cheese, or a better newspaper story.

And once in a great while, the quality of the product is so outstanding that special rewards are attached to the completion and presentation of the product.

Paths are worn to the door of the mousetrap maker, exhibition awards are given for

the finer cheese, and groups of persons who have special interests attach special merit to certain newspaper achievements.

The World has been so honored today by the American Veterans Committee, a national group dedicated to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world.

The World accepts the honor and transfers it to where the honor rightly belongs, to World News Editor Jack Pease, who spent many weeks sifting every detail of a story he wrote in December concerning the expulsion of a Negro family from the bay area.

The World is proud of Jack Pease for his achievement in winning the newspaper's monthly award for the best story, and this honor from the American Veterans Committee.

However, we like to think that the greatest honor that can come to Mr. Pease is the creation of a proposed community committee in the bay area to see that such incidents do not happen here again.

This, we feel, would be a true monument to his endeavors to educate the public to a better, more creative way of living with tolerance and helpfulness toward all. This is the goal which he was seeking when he wrote the prize-winning story.

Governor Faubus on Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an address by the Honorable Orval E. Faubus, Governor of Arkansas.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. ORVAL E. FAUBUS, ARKANSAS SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 20, 1960

You are familiar with what has been done in Arkansas during my administration. The improvement and expansion of education has been and is a prime objective of my tenure as Governor. Moreover, your State government has assumed leadership in a reassessment program which is, at least, moderately successful. This reassessment program will furnish a firm base for local support of education and other county services. The reassessment program is, perhaps, the most important single governmental improvement which has taken place in Arkansas during our lifetime. The program is receiving national attention.

The 1957 general assembly passed a tax program designed to improve many of the fundamental services, including education. This program, enacted by a progressive legislature, resulted in a 30-percent increase in the salaries of classroom teachers. In addition, some increases have been supplied, or will be forthcoming, as a result of the reassessment program. Though our salaries are still far from what we consider adequate, they have substantially improved in recent years, and we have reason to be proud of what has been accomplished.

I hesitate to quote a former resident of Arkansas, but Mr. Harry Ashmore, in his book, "The Negro and the Schools," published in 1954, stated that "Arkansas ranks ninth among the 48 States in effort to support public education in proportion to our ability to pay." Assuming that the statistics reported by Mr. Ashmore were correct (and since his statement contains only statistics, I am inclined to accept them), we may be sure that Arkansas ranks at or near the top of the 50 States in support of education, in proportion to the ability of the people to pay. This is the real yardstick of the interest of citizens in their schools. Yet, funds available for education are insufficient to meet what we consider adequate requirements.

Let us review, briefly, some of the changes that have taken place during the past quarter of a century in our Nation. Twenty-five years ago when local school authorities took a look at sources of revenue with which to operate their schools, they discovered that 75 percent of all tax revenue was in the local treasury, with probably 15 percent in the State treasury, and about 10 percent in the Federal Treasury. You are probably well aware, as am I, that these percentages have almost exactly reversed themselves. These figures do not hold exactly in all of the States, but on a national basis they are substantially correct. Approximately 75 percent of all taxes collected go to Washington. Moreover, only about 4 percent of the cost of education is returned to the States. As a practical matter, therefore, school boards are required to depend upon two pumps: One in the local tax well, and one in the State tax well, and the combined yield of the two wells amounts to only 25 percent of the tax dollars of this Nation. You must secure 96 cents out of every dollar to operate your schools from 25 percent of the tax revenue of our country. I submit that this is unrealistic, and despite the fact that various political angles are involved, a solution to the problem should be found. The Federal Government has preempted many of the tax sources of the Nation, leaving little for the States to tax.

The local tax well and the State tax well have both just about run dry, not from overpumping by local and State agencies, but by transfer of the revenue to the Federal well. Instead of Federal aid to education, it would be better for the Federal Government to release some of the revenue back to the local and State level, where the local and State tax pumps could obtain the needed revenue for public education.

I cannot refrain from saying at this point that this solution to this overall problem must be discovered and implemented in keeping with the finest traditions of America. These traditions include local control of public schools. I am unalterably opposed to any Federal aid scheme which, through a required State plan or any other subtle way, attempts to control directly or directly the policies, curriculum, operating procedures, employment practices, or any other phase of the operation of the public schools of our State and Nation. Because we have no sound national policy dealing with education, we have a sort of crazy quilt Federal arrangement, so far as Federal participation is concerned. It is unfortunate, I think, that there are no signs pointing to an improvement in the present situation. Our present programs have been evolved piecemeal as a result of pressures from groups and individuals. I am not saying that these programs are bad, but the fact is that the Federal Government has not faced up to the problem of establishing a sound policy, either by the legislative branch, or the executive branch, in the field of public education. As a matter of fact, instead of principle, governing Federal policy action has preceded and tended to set policy. Many arms of the Federal Government are now dealing directly with educational matters. This may or may not be good in each instance, but, nevertheless, it definitely proves that we have no national policy worthy of the name.

The U.S. Supreme Court has seen fit to invade the legislative field by assuming authority which our Founding Fathers never dreamed it would have. Action by what it considers political expediency, even by the Supreme Court, cannot be justified.

Other less-serious examples of Federal invasion of States rights in the field of education could be listed. Categorical legislation supplemented by legal interpretations of Federal counsel, curriculum making by special legislation, and the gradual support of special aspects of education have all resulted in a degree of Federal control in specialized areas. We are not debating the desirability of any of these programs, but these examples are given to support my statement that a national policy in the field of education is sadly lacking.

Among the fundamental questions involved in Federal support for education are: (1) Shall the States control the policies, curriculum, and all operating phases of their own schools, in keeping with the Constitution adopted by our Founding Fathers? and (2) Should Federal assistance be general, broad, Federal support for all phases of education, instead of categorical aid which is the present pattern of Federal support of education?

My position with reference to the first fundamental question is well known. I shall not retreat from this position. If we must submit to the Federal Government in order to secure general Federal support, I would be the first to say that Congress should not pass such legislation. I am opposed to controls, however subtle and innocent they may appear. Some existing controls are not so subtle in nature.

Several programs which have received and are receiving Federal support, which are categorical in nature, are excellent. The school lunch program, which is essentially a welfare service, is a good example. The rehabilitation program for the disabled, which began as an educational program, but is largely now in the category of health and welfare services, is another example. Vocational education has done much for our Nation and our State. All of these programs, as well as the new National Defense Education Act, are categorical in nature. It is interesting to note, I believe, that these programs all have Federal controls, some of which are minor, but they, nevertheless, exist. For example, State plans must be submitted by the States and must receive Federal approval. The requirements of these State plans are contained in outline which are written by Federal authorities as a result of interpretations written by Federal lawyers. It is hardly necessary to pursue further a description of categorical aid and how it works in the States.

The States, due to limited tax sources and the heavy cost of education, have and probably will continue to accept categorical aid. A hungry man would be most likely to accept two pieces of bread, even though he would very much desire to have a full meal. Inadequate financial support is the fundamental reason States and local communities accept Federal assistance, regardless of how meager such funds are in comparison to the total cost of education. But this does not mean that a firm, sound, and sensible Federal policy should not be established. It is my considered judgment that the lack of such a policy is the fundamental reason for much of the misunderstanding in the field of education, as regards Federal-State relationships in fiscal affairs.

In light of all facts involved is broad purpose, general Federal aid to education at the elementary and secondary level desirable?

I do not believe this question can be answered at the moment by simply a yes or no.

If the Federal Government, through the ledership of either the executive or legislative branch, could present to the Congress, a comprehensive proposal which would establish a broad, sensible Federal policy in the field of public education, many arguments

in the affirmative are readily available. The development of such a Federal policy would be a difficult and tedious task, but the importance of education makes it highly desirable that sound leadership in this area be exercised.

In the event a sound Federal policy with reference to education is not developed, it is my considered judgment that the extension of Federal aid would be dangerous. The control of the minds and hearts of the young people of this Nation by the Federal Government, through the control of the curriculum of the schools, would eventually result in the people's losing most of their rights which we all cherish.

It is significant, I think, that all dictators project youth orgainzations having as their purpose indoctrination to the point that submission by future generations to dictatorship will be assured. I do not mean to imply that this would necessarily be true with the extension of Federal aid to education, but I am most emphatic in my belief and conviction that the people should take no chances on interpretations of acts of Congress by Federal lawyers who have as a primary purpose the extension of the powers of the Federal Government. It is almost trite to add that those who are always promoting the authority and power of the Federal Government at the expense of the States have little or no regard for the rights of the States.

The school boards of this State have not only the right, but also the duty to defend the rights of the people to manage their own school affairs. I pointed out yesterday to the general assembly that no school district in Arkansas has been forced to integrate its public schools over the objections of the local authorities.

School boards as a whole have done an excellent job in administering affairs of their districts. You are to be commended for the job you are doing, and you may be assured of the continued support of education by my administration.

I am sure that all of you have noted from the press the reports of the increase of revenue. If the trend continues, as it has up to the present time, we will probably have on hand some surplus funds by the end of the next fiscal year.

An appropriation was made at the last regular session of the legislature which was more or less a faint hope at the time, with not much expectation of its becoming a reality, of $600,000 for construction at the State hospital, and $400,000 for continued construction of facilities at the Children's Colony at Conway. Already we have been able to determine that these funds will be available, and both the State hospital and the Children's Colony have been given the go-ahead for the construction projects which were authorized.

This means that beginning with the fiscal year of 1961-62, we will be collecting funds over and above our present allocation of $93 million. I feel that most of this increase will be justifiably allocated to public education—perhaps as much as 60 percent to the public schools, or anywhere from 60 to 75 percent for the public schools and higher education. This means that as a result of the program enacted by the 1957 session of the general assembly, public schools will continue to benefit, and that further increases in the salaries of public-school teachers can be anticipated from this revenue.

Now, there is something that I don't want to see happen between the public schools and other State agencies. I remember once, when teaching school in a rural community in the midst of the depression, that a pie supper was announced, to be held at the schoolhouse. The proceeds were to be used to buy curtains for the little one-room school, in order that school plays and social programs might be held, and to buy candy, oranges, etc., for the children of the district at Christmas time. In a rural community such as that in those times, no one was left out from the Christmas tree program. A check was made of all the children in the community, and the people who sponsored the program saw to it that each and every child had a package under the Christmas tree. Sometimes this package of candy, oranges, and nuts was the only thing some of the children of the poor families received at Christmas.

As the rural schoolteacher, I served as clerk at the pie supper. I wrote down the name of the purchaser, the price, and the sale price of the pie. Before the pie supper began, the question came up as to what would be done if the pie supper did not bring in enough funds to purchase both the curtains for the school and the candy for the Christmas program. They got into a big argument about the matter. Some people got angry and left. Some of the women took their pies and went home, and one lady made us give her the money for which her pie had been sold. The dispute created bitterness that lasted for weeks, perhaps months.

When the program was all over, there were sufficient funds for both purposes. The dispute was entirely unnecessary, and need never have occurred.

Now, I don't want the public schools to get into a dispute with other State agencies over the division of these funds until the time the funds become available. There is no need for a fight over something which we may not yet have. By the time the next legislature meets in regular session, there may be enough funds to divide equitably between the public schools, the colleges, and other State agencies, and have enough to benefit all. That will be much better than fighting over the funds before they ever become available, or before the division is made.

In conclusion, I sometimes think of the great differences in our public schools of today and even a short 25 or 30 years ago. As a boy, I attended a one-room school. It was so large that it had to have three windows on each side. The only equipment other than the seats was a pot-bellied stove in the center, which we boys fed with wood, a water bucket and dipper, which all of us used, a rather poor-quality blackboard with chalk and erasers. The only thing in that room to be used in training boys and girls was the teacher's hickory switch, which he kept over the blackboard. At that time, there was not even a well nearby to supply the water. We carried it a distance of almost half a mile to the school from the spring. High school training was unavailable to the great majority of boys and girls then, just as it was unavailable to me.

Now we have modern buildings with central heating. I have often thought of how wonderful it is to come into a building and be just as comfortable in the far corner as you would in the center, where it appeared the stove ought to be, or at one end of the building where there might be a fireplace. Instead of walking through the cold in the winter, or the summer heat, along rough roads, crossing swollen streams on foot logs, children are now transported in buses on vastly improved country roads, or hard-surfaced highways. High school training is available to all boys and girls anywhere in the State of Arkansas. Almost all schools have ample facilities for a modern athletic program. In those old days, there were no athletic facilities at all.

With all of this great improvement, I still sometimes wonder—Will the time come when we look back on the days of the one-room school as the best era in American education? In those days the academic facilities may not have been so adequate and expansive as today. Athletic programs were limited, or nil. Yet, there was something we learned from those one-room schools which does not appear to be quite so well promulgated today. That was a basic integrity, honesty, fair dealing, civic-minded attitude. Most of the boys and girls from those one-room schools became good citizens, although they may not have been the best educated.

There is a great increase in juvenile delinquency and crime in this modern age. Are our more modern schools failing in this purpose of moral training in which the old one-room school system did such a magnificent job? Remember that a boy or girl with a bad attitude who acquires a good education merely becomes a more clever shyster or crook. I say that it is not enough to make our students masters of English, good mathematicians, scientists, engineers, or public speakers. There must also be inculcated into them a genuine understanding of the basic principles of democracy, and a Christian attitude, which will make them good citizens, or else we fail in our purpose of education.

Unless we do this, it won't make any difference how much money is made available. It won't make any difference how fine the buildings, how luxurious the facilities, how high the teachers' salaries, how high the degree of academic skill. Our civilization will fail, and if this occurs, we will, of course, look back upon the time of the one-room school as the golden era of American education.

This need not be so, and I hope it is not so. But we must assume our responsibilities in this respect, because fine buildings and high salaries are not all it takes to provide for good education and good citizenship, which are necessary to preserve our great American way of life.

High Cost of Motor Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Theodore R. van Dellen's column, "How To Keep Well," recently dealt with the terrible toll of highway traffic accidents.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this column:

HOW TO KEEP WELL

(By Dr. Theodore R. van Dellen)

THE HIGH COST OF MOTOR ACCIDENTS

The familiar picture of the soldier boy saying goodby to his teary eyed parents should be applied to those who climb into a car every day and wave as they leave for work, the grocery, a Saturday night date, a Sunday drive, or a weekend trip. These individuals stand a greater chance of getting hurt than does the soldier.

Motor vehicles have been booby trapping us for years. The number of people injured on the highways in a single year is greater than the sum of the nonfatally American wounded in the eight principal wars during the 184 years of U.S. history.

Furthermore, the slaughter is not lessening. Automobiles killed more people during the first 6 months of 1959 than they did during the same period in 1958. The death rate, as measured per 100 million miles of travel, may have fallen if we consider the greater number of cars on the road and the increase in drivers. But statistics are of no consolation to the widows, orphans, and parents of the victims.

Each year approximately 4½ million persons are being injured in vehicle accidents. Fatalities usually make the headlines but I

have yet to read a newspaper that carried a week-by-week account of what happened to the injured.

Many are disabled for life despite the best medical care. They spend months or years in hospitals. Others are plagued with complications thereafter. A head injury, for example, may be followed by headache, dizzy spells, or unusual disturbances. Ugly scars may affect the personality. Paralysis, loss of limbs, or blindness means permanent disability.

These injuries are getting to be more costly insurancewise and in every other way. The insurance companies pay enormous bills but who actually pays them? These firms are not philanthropic or benevolent organizations with unlimited funds; their income stems from premiums. Who pays the premiums? You and I—and the more accidents, the higher the premium.

The Buffalo Post Office Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the high-handed procedure that a member of the President's Cabinet is following in attempting to railroad through this Congress his request for funds in the 1961 budget. I refer to the Post Office Department's request for $80 million for post office modernization in fiscal 1961.

Here is a little background: About 3 years ago the Post Office Department decided to proceed promptly with plans for a new working post office at Buffalo, N.Y. There were two false starts, but finally the Department acquired an acceptable site near Central Terminal.

The next step is to obtain architectural and engineering plans. Despite repeated inquiries, the Department gives little satisfaction as to the schedule for this Buffalo project.

Now, we are learning why the Department has been so indefinite. Indeed, Buffalo stands to suffer a great disappointment in a few days—the revelation that there will be no funds in the 1961 budget for equipping the proposed Buffalo post office. And if there is no money to equip it, it is logical to expect that the construction schedule will be delayed accordingly.

Two weeks ago, I publicly stated that the Postmaster General was playing politics with the Buffalo Post Office project. Now the proof is out.

In submitting his budget to the House Appropriations Committee, the Postmaster General has juggled the positions of projects in each section of the country in the hope of insuring that not one penny will be cut from his request for equipment and modernization funds.

Whereas recently Buffalo was ranked fifth in priority, now the Postmaster has placed Buffalo second from the bottom of the list—17th among 19 projects.

By juggling the positions and knowing that one of the Congressmen from our area is a member of the powerful Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations, the Postmaster General has placed Buffalo in the lowest priority category to accomplish his deal. This maneuvering on his part has led me to the opinion that Mr. Summerfield is blackmailing the committee.

No one has done more than Congressman PILLION in getting the ball rolling for the eventual construction of a new post office in our city. Since coming to Washington, I have cooperated and done everything possible to be of assistance. It is my true feeling that this should be a nonpartisan project for it will benefit all the people in Buffalo and the surrounding area.

One of our principal postal facilities in Buffalo is being rented at a high rental cost. The landlord will not renovate or repair the building. If the health inspectors made a thorough inspection, they would find it should be condemned. The amount spent here for rent could be saved and used for new equipment.

In a letter to me, dated as late as December 21, 1959, the Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Rollin D. Barnard, wrote as follows:

> We appreciate your expressions concerning the need for improved facilities in that city [Buffalo]. The Department has been aware of this need for some time.

In several letters to the Postmaster General, I pointed out to him the dilapidated condition of the present facilities and the outmoded and antiquated equipment. I repeat that if Benjamin Franklin could return and take a walk through our post office, he would see some of his very own inventions.

Congressman PILLION, who is highly regarded among his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, has been outspoken in his efforts to obtain economy in government, and I am sure the Postmaster General is well aware of this fact. With this in mind, the Postmaster General is playing the game of cat and mouse, and is saying, in effect, if you want to see a post office constructed in Buffalo, then do not cut any of our appropriation request for post office equipment and modernization.

I wish to state now that if funds are not included in the Department's appropriation bill for our post office, as appears inevitable, I will ask the cooperation of the committee for an amendment to the bill which would earmark at least $3 million for equipping the new post office in Buffalo.

Honesty Still Best Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 4, 1960:

HONESTY STILL BEST POLICY

A letter published by the Oklahoma City Better Business Bureau has something to say about the public indignation that followed the revelations of rigged television quiz shows—with accompanying demands for more investiagtions of advertising, more crackdowns and, more Government regulation.

"The whole shameful mess is a dramatic illustration of the inevitable result when business fails to regulate itself," says the letter. The point is that if business fails to police itself, somebody else, probably Government, will do the policing.

The bureau's publication adds that the situation amounts to "a challenge to every field of business to clean house * * * to the retailer who uses ficticious comparative prices—to the stock salesman who misrepresents, either by what he says or by the information he withholds—to the automobile dealer who lies about the condition of the used cars he is selling—to the TV serviceman who charges for unnecessary parts and service—to the * * *. We could run the whole gamut of business. Every business and professional field needs continuous self-scrutiny, so that bad practices can be eliminated before they cause public scandal."

If free, private enterprise is to live, it must have ethics that meet the public concept of what is right, decent, and honest. If it fails to establish and maintain such ethics, it will be asking for punitive treatment.

We Have Civil Rights Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Nashville Banner, a great southern newspaper, an editorial relative to our distinguished colleague, Representative J. CARLTON LOSER. Representative LOSER is an outstanding lawyer and is held in high esteem by everyone who knows him. The outstanding ability he possesses will be a great asset to the Committee on the Judiciary in this body.

This editorial is very timely and I commend it to those who are interested in this matter. The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Feb. 5, 1960]

WE HAVE CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

U.S. Representative J. CARLTON LOSER is on firm ground when he objects to the so-called civil rights proposals and the measure which would establish Federal voting registrars, basing his reasoning on the fact that these fields are amply covered by the U.S. Constitution.

For instance, that document states it is unlawful to hold a person in involuntary servitude; rights of citizenship cannot be abridged and voting privileges cannot be denied any person regardless of race or color.

These civil rights are embodied in articles 13, 14, and 15 and, as Mr. LOSER points out, they adequately cover the situation, there being no reason—other than for vote-getting purposes—to attempt to further shore up the Constitution.

It also is questionable if Congress has the right to give the Federal Government more power in these fields by merely passing laws.

It has been suggested that if the field is expanded it would take a constitutional amendment, a somewhat more difficult process since it requires passage by a two-thirds majority of both Houses and subsequent ratification by three-fourths of the States.

If, as charged, some States have been abridging the civil rights of certain citiezns, the Federal Government has been remiss in not seeking relief for them. The Attorney General of the United States has enough basic law to act if action is called for.

Mr. LOSER, a former district attorney general of Davidson County, has reiterated a cogent point.

The Customs Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Journal of Commerce on December 3, 1959, calling attention to our Customs Service.

The Customs Service is one that plays an important part in the economy of our country. It is the agency that collects the import duties on foreign articles that enter our commerce, and the efficiency and competence of this Service is of prime importance to the importing and shipping industries.

Customs has been doing a highly creditable job all over the country, and a greatly increased workload has been handled under adverse conditions. However, there is undoubtedly room for improvement and the article entitled "Streamlining Customs" that appeared in the Journal of Commerce and Commercial on December 3, 1959, is well worth reviewing.

The Journal of Commerce and Commercial is an authoritive trade newspaper that reflects the thinking of those in the importing, exporting, shipping, and related industries. The suggestion in this editorial that an impartial management group survey the idea of decentralizing Customs appears to have considerable merit. It is said that substantial savings can be realized by this streamlining, and if appropriation dollars can be saved in this manner, the possibility should be explored to its fullest extent.

The article follows:

STREAMLINING CUSTOMS

Customs in this country is big business. Just because it has no profit incentive does not mean that it can be run without proper respect for sound business principles. Its operations must be conducted with greatest possible efficiency and at the lowest possible cost.

We wonder whether this is true in the current way the affairs of the Customs Bureau are being run or whether the Bureau is missing some obvious and valuable chances of reducing the costs of its operations and, at the same time, improve its services to boot. There is now a wide duplication of jobs which could be eliminated.

At least one of the high officials of the organization believes that the Bureau of Customs could do a whole lot better—increase its efficiency, serve the public better, and greatly reduce the cost of its operation.

He is Robert W. Dill, the collector of the port of New York, who believes that all these desirable results can be attained by moving the Bureau of Customs from Washington to New York and combining it with the collector's office in New York into one central agency.

Ever since Mr. Dill came up with his proposal to shift the Bureau of Customs to New York, he has been getting the cold shoulder from most of his colleagues in Washington.

That is understandable. Why embark on new experiments when everything runs smoothly? Why exchange the pleasant Washington atmosphere with life in boisterous New York?

New York collects roughly 40 percent of the customs revenue, has roughly 40 percent of the customs employees, has nearly all overseas passenger traffic by sea and the greatest number of overseas passengers by air. Thus, New York would seem to be the logical place where the Bureau of Customs should be located.

There are other reasons for this as well: The majority of leading importers and exporters are located, or at least fully represented, in New York. The headquarters of the principal steamship lines and airlines are located here. The trade associations which have regular dealings with customs operate from New York. The Customs Court and the Customs Bar Association are in New York, not Washington.

Yet customs and Washington have gotten so used to each other, that it would take more than logic to blast them asunder. Washington may let customs go, but will customs give up Washington?

They nearly parted company during the war when Washington became too crowded with Government offices and bureaus; and construction could not keep up with the demand for space.

Had the separation gone through then, chances are that Customs never would have returned to the Nation's Capital. Now it will take a miracle or a major blast to accomplish such a divorce. At any rate, it will take a hard and tough uphill battle to make New York acceptable to the Bureau's top hierarchy.

This means that, for the foreseeable future, Customs will keep on operating as it always has: slow, cumbersome, in pretty much of a what's-the-hurry philosophy. Actually, under the present system Washington has New York do a lot of the work that should be done at the policy level. Washington frequently queries New York for advice. And New York, on the other hand, has to settle many of its local problems with a detour via Washington. When problems arise in other ports, they go to Washington first and from there to New York. Decisions that should take a few days at worst, drag out for weeks and often months. New York's position in this respect, by the way, is so unique that other ports could hardly object to such a move as regional dominance.

The present split agency setup also costs a good deal of time and money in travel from New York to Washington and vice versa. These expenses are a big item in the Bureau's budget. They also increase the costs of doing business with the Government—unnecessarily.

Those opposed to a removal of the Bureau of Customs to New York feel that this would complicate the liaison with other Washington bureaus and would be unfair to Members of Congress who jealously guard their ready access to the Bureau.

Actually, such contact work could be maintained by a small group of high-ranking Customs officials to be left behind in Washington in case of a move to New York and such a setup probably would function better than the present one.

It would take the suspicion of undue influence, improper use of lobbying, logrolling or what have you out of the Customs setup. Thus this argument, if brought up at all, would favor the move rather than weigh against it.

At the very least, the idea merits an independent survey—preferably by a management group having no identification with either side.

Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this is Boy Scout Week. It also marks the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America. It is therefore fitting that we Americans join in paying tribute to Boy Scouts everywhere, and to the men and women who have so selflessly dedicated themselves toward the advancement and betterment of America's youth by serving as scoutmasters, den mothers, unit leaders, and committee members.

The Boy Scout organization has come a long way since its inception 50 years ago when it was incorporated February 8, 1910, under the laws of the District of Columbia. To mark the immediate recognition of the importance of this bold concept, that same year President Taft accepted the office of honorary president, and Theodore Roosevelt honorary vice president. During the following year the membership grew to 61,495 Scouts and Scouters.

The Scouts can well look back in pride on its work in behalf of our country during times of stress. In 1917 the Scouts rendered nationwide first aid service in the influenza epidemic. Exceptional service was rendered by the Boy Scouts in 1927 in the Mississippi and Vermont flood disasters and the St. Louis tornado. In 1934, during the worst depression the world has ever known, in response to the request of President Roosevelt in a radio address, Boy Scouts performed a national good turn, collecting clothing, household furnishings, foodstuffs, and supplies for the distressed and needy.

In 1941 the Government requested Boy Scout service in such ways as distribution of defense bonds and stamp posters; collection of aluminum, wastepaper collection, defense housing surveys; victory gardens; distribution of air-raid posters; cooperation with the Red Cross; and by joint agreement with the Office of Civilian Defense, Scouts served as messengers, assisted emergency medical units, and acted as fire watchers.

The following year the Scouts continued in their war service. At the request of the Government, the Boy Scouts collected 30 million pounds of rubber salvage in a 2-week whirlwind drive. The Scouts' service continued throughout the remainder of the war.

Since that time the Boy Scouts' usual cooperation with public authorities in flood, earthquake, hurricane, and other disaster relief has been widely reported and acclaimed.

Among other noteworthy Boy Scout efforts was their get-out-the-vote campaign in 1952. That year the Scouts distributed more than 1 million posters and 30 million Liberty Bell doorknob posters. It is interesting to observe that there was a recordbreaking 60 million turnout of votes that November.

As evidence of the widespread acceptance of the Boy Scout organization as an integral part of our community is the fact that over 70,000 of America's greatest institutions actively support it. Churches, civic, and veterans groups, management and labor, and educational and fraternal organizations contribute to the spiritual and cultural growth of the organization.

Equally attesting to the influence and the high esteem in which the Boy Scouts are held is their tremendous growth during the past half century. In 1920 for instance, only 10 years after its conception, the Boy Scouts already had a membership of 478,528. By 1958 there was a total of 4,950,885 active adult leaders and Boy Scout members.

The goals and achievements of the Boy Scouts are unquestionably of invaluable worth to the future welfare of America. Of utmost importance to all of us is the Boy Scouts' goal aimed at furthering international friendships. Certainly, international cooperation is uppermost in all our minds in our relations with other countries. It is therefore gratifying to know that these youngsters, at ages from eight through their teens, are actively working toward this goal.

The Boy Scouts' overall basic principles, their motto "For God and My Country," are indeed commendable. May their ranks continue to grow and may they continue in their succesful development of America's future leaders.

Interest Rate Ceiling on Long-Term Bonds Should Not Be Raised; the 4¼-Percent Rate, Which Has Prevailed for 42 Years, Should Not Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a copy of a letter that was written to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, by Mr. Arthur Temple, a prominent lumberman in Texas, which contains good arguments why the 4¼-percent rate should be retained.

It is as follows:

DEAR MR. MILLS: I have a copy of a letter from Cotton Northup to you urging the removal of the ceiling on interest rates on Treasury obligations of more than 5 years' maturity. I take issue with his recommendation and question the logic involved.

The housing market, in my opinion, will be adversely affected by removing the ceiling on this competitor for long-term investment funds. If the magic 5's attracted funds normally invested in long-term mortgages and bonds, it seems reasonable to assume that an even greater shift from the mortgage market to long-term Governments would take place since both investments draw their support from the same sources.

In addition, I am not convinced that an increase in bond rate will do more than start another round of bidding for available funds. Most people seem to overlook the fact that interest rates cannot increase the total quantity of money available for investment and that a temporary adjustment by one of the markets can only attract additional money at the expense of another segment of the economy. Each breakthrough invariably sets off another round of rate increases as inadequate funds flow from one investment to another.

I am concerned about the effect of present high interest rates on the growth of our economy at this time. I am also worried about the tremendous increase in the cost of servicing our public debt at every level.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR TEMPLE.

From Whence the Tools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of February 3, 1960:

FROM WHENCE THE TOOLS?

National Review recently dealt editorially with a proposed revision of the Federal tax laws which, among many things, would eliminate the capital gains provision and treat profit from the sale of securities or other holdings as ordinary income for tax purposes.

The magazine said: "The worst feature of the proposed change would be its almost certain impact on the capital market. With the possibility of capital gains eliminated, why would any man bother to risk his money on a growth opportunity? And who could hope to stay even in an inflationary period?

"In Britain there is no capital gains tax. In Germany, corporations are allowed tax exemption on profits that are plowed back into investment. Result: a constant expansion of taxable incomes. But in America, we apparently elect Congressmen to spend their time figuring ways to knock the investor out. Will it ever occur to Congress that the best way to increase the U.S. tax take would be to encourage investment profitable tax-paying businesses whose expansion would put more and more potential taxpayers to work?"

It costs around $15,000, on the average, to provide the tools needed to create just one job in American industry. The work force increases by millions every year. Where will jobs come from if investors are driven away by tax laws which say, in effect, "You will absorb all losses, while we will take the lion's share of any profits?"

An Iowa Post Office Employee Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the Burlington (Iowa) Hawk-Eye Gazette of January 28. This letter, written by D. L. Hand, vice president of the Burlington branch of the National Postal Transport Association, refers to the continued and increasing use of airplanes to transport first-class mail on which airmail postage has not been affixed. Mr. Hand points out several basic fallacies in the Department's plan to increase the airlift of first-class mail, a program which has already resulted in the movement of 94 million ton-miles of first-class mail by air since the airlift began in 1953 on an experimental basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9488, which would require that the Post Office Department cease the airlifting of first-class mail. Use of airmail facilities should be restricted to those letters and parcels for which postage has been paid at airmail rates. The continuing use of airplanes to transport first-class mail is unfair to those who pay the premium for airmail. It is unfair to the railroads who have provided and equipped railroad cars for the use of the Post Office Department. It is unfair to the taxpayers who will, until such time as there is no postal deficit, pay the extra costs involved in transporting mail by air.

The letter referred to follows:

All up. All up. These words have, at one time or another, had a very disturbing effect on members of our Armed Forces. These words now have been borrowed by the Post Office Department and will, if present plans materialize, have the same disturbing effect on our civilian population.

The Post Office Department has decreed all up for all mail by July 1, 1960. Your mail will be transported by plane to 62 key points in the country where it will be worked and then sent out by trucks to its destination. There will be no en route distribution.

CHANGE OF PATTERN

This will mean a switch from the use of privately financed facilities for the transportation to the use of publicly financed facilities, airfields and highways, a fact that will increase your already staggering tax-load.

An all-up plan for the transportation of the mails can only lead to the construction of more airfields and the expansion of present fields in order to handle the increased number of flights necessary in carrying out this operation. These new and expanded fields would be financed with tax dollars.

From the key points in the Nation trucks will branch out in all directions over the Nation's highways. The Post Office Department plan to flood our already overcrowded and dangerous highways with more trucks can hardly be called consistent with sound safety and economic practices.

AIRFIELDS CLOSED

These factors together with the fact that the Department is, by its own admission

(assuming this plan will work)—if the planned methods of transportation are available—comes at a time when the Nation's airfields in 40 of the 50 States have been closed to all traffic for a week.

It would not be economically feasible for the railroads to have standby equipment and personnel ready to take over when air transportation failed. The result, in the case of weather such as we had the week of January 10 through 16 would be delayed service to the postal patron.

By the Department's own figures an overwhelming percentage of the Nation's mail travels only short distances from starting point to destination. This would mean that a large percentage of the users of the mail service will be paying for air service even though their mail cannot possibly enjoy that service. We should be allowed to retain the right to choose the type of service we individually wish to pay for.

THREE-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LOSS

To Burlington this plan will mean the loss of nearly $300,000 annually in wages of displaced postal personnel alone and the loss in wages to Burlington in wages of mail handlers at depots and railroad employees will swell this figure even more.

We here in Burlington would not be consistent in our policies of spending money for industrial sites and paying salaries of men to do research and advertising to attract industry to our city, for the avowed purpose of giving wage earning jobs to our citizens, and then sit idly by and watch several hundred thousands of dollars in wages, leave our city.

Inflationary Threat of Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as our Republican colleagues fan out over the Nation during the next few days to expound the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, I hope they will give some attention to the warning against inflationary spending as sounded by our favorite columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star for February 8.

Touching on the subject of Federal aid to education, which I covered in a recent extension of remarks, Mr. Lawrence has this to say:

The vote in the Senate last week to provide nearly $2 billion in the next 2 years for school aid could start the Federal Government on an unprecedented course of subsidizing teachers' salaries. What has hitherto been a local obligation could become a Federal liability every year. It starts with a few hundred millions for teachers' salaries, but, once a formula of this kind is imbedded in Federal budgets, it means increasing sums every year thereafter.

Neither Mr. Lawrence nor I are speaking in opposition to an expanded educational program. We believe that the United States provides and should continue to provide the best educational facilities in the world. But we believe that these services should be provided by direct taxation at the local and State levels. We do not believe, however, that we should go through the phoney maneuver of taxing the people for Federal aid, or what is worse add the cost to the national debt, and then eventually collect taxes locally to pay the bill, resulting in a substantial discount in the amount of money actually returned in grants in aid. Addressing himself indirectly to that proposition Mr. Lawrence says this:

The States are not bankrupt. If they fail to appropriate enough, it is the local citizenry who should be making a fight for better schooling. The moment the Federal Government steps into anything it becomes a custom that is never repealed.

And to that I might add that there is nothing so permanent as a temporary Federal aid program or the taxes to finance it, as witness the durability of the so-called wartime excise levies.

Quoting Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget, Mr. Lawrence goes on to point out:

I see already built-in increases pushing expenditures up and up year after year. I see pressures continuing to mount for the Federal Government to spend more and more, to take over local governments' problems and to meet demands from pressure groups for more handouts on many fronts. If we yield to these temptations, we can soon have $90 billion or $100 billion budgets, higher taxes or more deficits, debasement of our money, and weakening of our economy.

And in final summation Mr. Lawrence made this challenging observation:

Maybe some day an informed electorate will constitute itself as the biggest pressure group of all and vote for representatives who favor a sound economy.

Mexico Is U.S.S.R. Spy Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Taylor is one of Scripps-Howard's topflight staff writers. His fine journalistic abilities have won him the Lee-Evans Round Table Award three times and the 1956 award of the American Political Science Association for outstanding coverage of State and local politics. Just last month he was chosen for the Ernie Pyle Award. He is completing an extensive trip through the Caribbean, Central and South America, and at present is in Mexico.

A recent column of Mr. Taylor's entitled, "Mexico Is U.S.S.R. Spy Window," is quite revealing in the light of current Communist espionage activities and should be read by every Member of Congress. Last year the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its report entitled, "Soviet Espionage," stated, among other things, that Soviet embassies and consuls were used as spy nests for the Communist apparatus. Mr. Taylor's findings in Mexico City further document this report. His well-written report follows:

MEXICO IS U.S.S.R. SPY WINDOW
(By Harry Taylor)

MEXICO CITY.—From its Embassy here, Russia is mounting a massive offensive against the United States.

Mingling among the tourists, dozens of Soviet-enlisted agents are shuttling regularly between this city and U.S. defense centers in on-the-job training as the first stage of a spy career.

Men whose profession is to combat communism here, Mexicans and officials of other nationalities, agree that one of Moscow's most potent secret weapons is the modest mansion which houses the Soviet Embassy with its 125 employees whose actions are above Mexican law, diplomatically immune.

Here is how the Soviet espionage network operates:

Through Mexican and other Latin-American leftist groups, Soviet diplomats learn of a man who may be prone to accepting money in exchange for a few simple chores on behalf of Moscow.

He may be a Mexican migratory worker who has access to U.S. travel during the annual fruitpicking season. Sometimes he is actually an American, brooding here over some grievance at Uncle Sam, a man perhaps subject to blackmail or bribe.

Discreetly making contact, the Russian will ask a prospective spy to take a trip to an approachable U.S. point and bring back a description of something easily viewed—such as U.S. Navy ships at San Diego.

The object isn't to gain new information. It's to test—and train—the apprentice. But the recruit is thanked profusely for his important information, paid well (a beginner's fee is around $75 plus expenses), and assigned another routine chore.

These early assignments are seldom complicated or dangerous.

But gradually the tempo of assignments is stepped up. Spies, once they have proved themselves, are asked to make a special target of U.S. airbases, particularly SAC fields.

The key moment comes when a recruit is asked to contact a friend and bring him into the apparatus, too. When an agent has become a recruiter as well as a reporter, submitted reports in writing and accepted cash for them, he's regarded as hooked by Moscow.

The Russian Embassy is the second largest in the capital. Only the United States has more personnel. All 125 Russian diplomats here speak Spanish. The only non-Russians employed at the Embassy are 10 Spanish refugee Communists. Not a single Mexican is permitted so much as to polish the doorknob.

From here the agents go not only to the United States, but also to Cuba and other Latin targets. Sometimes they are detected and there was one instance when a couple of Soviet attachés were expelled.

Stop Pollution of San Francisco Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, my seven California colleagues in the House of Representatives who also represent districts around San Francisco Bay, together with Senators THOMAS KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE, have joined with me

in support of legislation to end pollution of the bay by the discharge of raw sewage from Treasure Island Naval Station.

While communities and industries of the San Francisco Bay area have spent nearly $150 million during the past 10 years for water pollution control facilities, the Navy's Treasure Island base continues to contaminate the bay in violation of restrictions set by the Regional Water Pollution Control Board.

In a recent public statement we said:

The Regional Control Board reports that a recent engineering survey indicated that sewage outfall from Treasure Island is directly responsible for befouled bay waters and strong, nauseating sewage odors.

It is clear that the Federal Government will not be doing more than its share by spending $701,000 for these facilities.

The Treasure Island sewage treatment plant necessary to end this distressing situation has now been authorized. It is our hope that appropriations will also be voted this year, with the support of the Department of the Navy.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of February 1, 1960, which indicates to what extent this problem is in the public eye in the San Francisco area.

The editorial also points out that a second source of serious bay pollution is the Army's Benicia Arsenal at the city of Benicia located on Carquinez Straits at the northern end of San Francisco Bay. This problem which would cost only $320,000 to solve is a matter of equal concern. Here again the Federal Government is in violation of local restrictions and has a clear responsibility to provide adequate sewage treatment facilities.

STOP BAY POLLUTION BY ARMY AND NAVY

The Army and the Navy, which expend considerable money and energy in the promotion of good public relations, are plainly slipping backward hereabouts through their continuing and substantial contributions to the pollution of San Francisco Bay waters.

The Navy continues to pour 850,000 gallons of raw sewage into the bay every 24 hours from its Treasure Island installations, and the Army pours another 400,000 gallons a day into Carquinez Strait from its arsenal at Benicia.

Thus they violate the California State water pollution law. Thus they flout long-standing orders that Federal agencies comply with such laws. Thus they stultify a Federal antipollution program on which the Government has spent $163 million in the last 4 years—$2.6 million of it in the nine bay counties.

The Benicia case is worth examination. Responsible officers at the arsenal have employed commendable energy toward abating the nuisance. Three times they have asked Washington for the $320,000 that would do the job, and three times the proceeds have been nil.

This sum would connect the arsenal sewage system with pipes that the city of Benicia has carried up the property line for the express purpose of providing the services of its new sewage reduction plant. This plant, built to capacity far beyond the city's needs in order to meet the arsenal's needs, cost $1,148,000. Of this, $250,000 was a Federal grant for the specific purpose of reducing pollution of the very waters into which the arsenal's sewers discharge.

Senators KUCHEL and ENGLE and eight bay area Congressmen have set out to end this offensive and ridiculous situation. They have announced that they will ask an appropriation of $701,000 in the 1961 Federal budget to construct a sewage-treatment plant on Treasure Island. By all means they should ask another $320,000 for the Benicia arsenal hookup.

Communities and industrial plants of the bay area have already spent some $150 million, and will spend many million more, toward ending the contamination of bay waters. The Federal Government, spending millions to control water pollution wherever it occurs, can hardly refuse this relatively small expenditure to clean up this unsavory mess of its own making.

Resolution of the Democratic State Committee, Harrisburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, adopted by the Pennsylvania Democratic State committee on January 25, 1960, may be of interest to Members of Congress, and particularly to Democratic Members:

"Whereas we are proud of the efforts of the 86th Congress and of the Democratic majorities in both its Houses, and particularly of the Democratic Members of both Houses from Pennsylvania; and

"Whereas we are disheartened by the refusal of the national administration to conform to the principles and programs enumerated by Democratic Congressmen and Senators representing a compelling majority of Americans; and

"Whereas we have noted with deep dismay the unwillingness of the national administration to propose or to effect solutions to our many pressing national problems, such as those involving our depressed areas, our urban blight, our farm surpluses, space exploration, and our military preparedness; and

"Whereas we have noted with increasing trepidation the rising dominance of the Communist image and the inability of the national administration to counteract this impression with any actions of substance; and

"Whereas we are deeply concerned with the determination of the national administration to resolve the Nation's problems by use of propaganda techniques rather than through straightforward, understandable programs of action; and

"Whereas we have witnessed the obstinate refusal of the national administration to serve all the people of this great Nation and a determination to sacrifice the welfare and well-being of the many to the will and desires of the few: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Democratic State committee in regular meeting assembled in Harrisburg, this 25th day of January 1960, do hereby:

"1. Commend the Democratic leadership in Congress and especially each Democratic legislator from Pennsylvania for their outstanding efforts in the legislative branch of the National Government, and pledge them our continued support and assistance;

"2. Express our hopes and determination that the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation in Congress will be substantially increased in 1960, and to this end we pledge our unceasing efforts; and

"3. Express our hope and confidence that the voters of Pennsylvania will join the voters of the United States in electing a Democratic President in 1960 and in returning the administrative branch of the National Government to Democratic leadership, and to this end we pledge our untiring efforts; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Democratic Members of the Congress of the United States."

I hereby certify that the aforementioned resolution was unanimously adopted by the Democratic State committee at its meeting in Harrisburg, Pa., Monday, January 25, 1960.

GENEVIEVE BLOTT,
Secretary.

Russian and American Education—Like and Unlike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members to the following excerpts from an article from the Educational Record for July 1959:

RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN EDUCATION—LIKE AND UNLIKE

(By Robert J. Havighurst)

There are basic similarities and fundamental differences between Russian and American education. To know what these are and why they exist is important for American educators.

The principal likenesses of the Russian and American educational systems are two: first, both have recruited and trained the manpower necessary for industrial development; second, both have aimed to make economic opportunity available to the children of all the people, regardless of their socioeconomic status.

Beyond this, the two systems diverge because they operate in different societies, with different values, and in different stages of economic and industrial development.

PRODUCTION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

The United States of America has become the world's greatest industrial power within the last 50 years. The Soviet Union has moved swiftly into second place through an immense effort at industrialization since 1930. Consequently, both nations have produced engineers and scientists and technicians at a prodigious rate.[1]

In making comparisons of scientific manpower, it is useful to combine the numbers of engineers and physicists, chemists, biologists, and mathematicians, because a good many Russian engineers do work which is done by people who are called scientists in the United States. Russian higher institutions graduated about 65,000 people in this

[1] The numerical data for this article are drawn from: Alexander G. Korol, "Soviet Education for Science and Technology" (Cambridge, Mass.: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1957); U.S.S.R. (Russian information magazine), No. 11, 1958; U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Circulars, 1957 and 1958 (Washington: Government Printing Office); "Engineering School Enrollments," Journal of Engineering Education, XLVII (March 1957), 619-36; Frank Lorimer, Population of the Soviet Union (Geneva: League of Nations, 1946).

category in 1954, and 90,000 in 1958, while the United States graduated 48,000 and 63,000 respectively. Thus, by this kind of comparison, Russia is currently outproducing the United States in engineers and scientists.

But let us take account of the numbers of young people from whom these scientists were chosen and thereby introduce the concept of effort. The effort of a nation in producing engineers, or any other types of persons, should be defined in relation to the number of young people who are in the basic manpower pool. Thus, if one country has only one-tenth as many young people as another country, it will be equal in effort to the larger country if it produces one-tenth as many scientists.

In effort, the United States is superior to the Soviet Union in the production of scientists and engineers. According to the Russian census reports, the Soviet Union had 210 million inhabitants in 1958, when the United States had about 175 million. Furthermore, Russia has currently almost twice as many young people of university age as the United States, due to differences in the age structure of the population in the two countries. The Soviet Union has had about 4 million 22-year-olds a year for several years to draw upon, while the United States has had a few more than 2 million a year (table 1).

The United States has been producing more engineers and scientists per thousand 22-year-olds than the Soviet Union. In 1958, the United States produced 29 per 1,000 as compared with 22 per 1,000 in the Soviet Union, while in the 1946–50 period, the United States produced 26 per 1,000 as compared with 11 per 1,000 in the Soviet Union.

At the same time, the United States has been outproducing the Soviet Union in other fields of training, both in terms of effort and in terms of gross numbers. In the Soviet Union in 1958, 200,000 young people earned the equivalent of our bachelor's and first professional degrees; in the United States in the same year, 350,000 people were awarded such degrees. Measured in terms of effort, the United States spent three times the effort of the Soviet Union in producing university graduates in 1958.

It appears that Russia is now catching up with her need for engineers and scientists and will not produce them in much greater numbers in the near future. Evidence for this inference is the fact that the resident enrollment in higher institutions has stabilized since 1955. The Soviet universities may even have some difficulty in maintaining the present output, because the Russians will be short of young people during the next decade (table 1), due to the low rate of births during the war years.

The United States has seen a shortage of college-trained people during recent years, due to a combination of three factors—a great postwar economic boom, which has increased the need for college-trained technical experts and executives in business and industry; the low birth rates of the depression years of the 1930's, which give us an abnormally low supply of young adults in the 1950's; and the great upswing in the birth rate since 1946, which has crowded the schools and created an enormous demand for college-trained teachers.

TABLE 1.—*Effort going into production of secondary school and university graduates, United States and Russia* [1]

Year	Number of 22-year-olds (in thousands)		Number of secondary school [2] graduates per 1,000 18-year-olds		Number of university graduates per 1,000 22-year-olds		Number of graduating engineers and scientists per 1,000 22-year-olds	
	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.
1928–30 (average)	2,000	2,900			58	12	11	4
1940	2,400	3,200	500	125	77	32	13	11
1946–50 (average)	2,400	4,000	520	110	118	33	26	11
1954	2,150	3,800	620	260	135	46	22	17
1958	2,200	4,100	650	420	155	49	29	22
Projected:								
1960	2,300	4,400						
1965	2,900	3,700						
1970	3,600	4,200						
1975	3,900	4,800						

[1] The data for Russia on which table 1 is based are not completely reliable. Population data are inadequate, because there are no official census data on the population by yearly ages. Educational enrollment and graduation data are also somewhat uncertain. One source of difficulty is the fact that a relatively large proportion of students and graduates are older than school or college age and have studied in evening classes or by correspondence, rather than in full-time courses. The actual numbers given by Soviet publications have been reduced to take some account of these categories of students. Since we are concerned here with the education of young people of secondary school and university age, the numbers of older students should not be considered in computing the proportions of young people in various categories. Probably the numbers given in the table for the Russian data are correct within 10 percent.

[2] Figures for U.S.S.R. include secondary school and technicum graduates.

Thus, at present, even though our effort is greater than that of the Soviet Union, and even though we have record enrollments in the colleges, we are short of engineers, scientists, teachers, and nurses; and we will continue to suffer from those shortages until after 1960. Then the upward trend of the birth rate, which commenced in 1942, will begin to increase the numbers in the manpower reservoir from which the university graduates are drawn. By 1966 we will have 3 million new 22-year-olds, 40 percent more than we have now, and by 1975 we shall approach the number of 4 million 22-year-olds. Indeed, some people fear that we shall have an oversupply of university graduates by 1975; but our economy may have expanded by that time to need far greater numbers than it uses now.

While there certainly is a shortage of college-trained people today, particularly in the teaching field, there is some evidence that the shortage of engineers is a thing of the past. The economic recession of 1957, combined with cutbacks in defense spending, actually threw some engineers temporarily out of work. Meanwhile, enrollments in engineering colleges, which reached their postwar low point in 1951, have increased to the point where the 1958 enrollment was 80 percent above the 1951 level. A further increase of some 60 percent above the present level is anticipated by engineering educators during the next 10 years.

It appears, also, that the recent shortage of scientists and mathematicians may soon be overcome, in spite of the need for large numbers of secondary schoolteachers in these fields. Colleges report increasing proportions of students majoring in these fields. Despite the claims made by some people that American youth think of scientists as queer people and do not want to be like them, some recent studies show that the ablest high school students are choosing overwhelmingly to go into science and engineering. Thus, the annual report of the National Merit Scholarship Corp. for 1957–58 shows that 77 percent of the 5,916 boys who won scholarships or were semifinalists have indicated science or engineering as their college field of specialization, and 46 percent of the 2,693 girls have done so. Furthermore, 39 percent of the boys and 33 percent of the girls chose pure science or mathematics. Of the freshman class entering the University of Chicago in 1958, 38 percent say they will specialize in physical sciences, and 14 percent in biological sciences.

Thus the United States and the Soviet Union are each recruiting and training enough scientists and engineers for current and immediate future needs.

SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ALL

Russia and the United States have in common the aim of secondary education for all. Though neither nation has reached this goal, both are far ahead of other countries in this respect. Table 1 shows that 65 percent of youth graduate from the American secondary schools, while 42 percent graduate from Russian general secondary or technical secondary schools.

The reasons the two countries share for this goal are two: first, both countries need a large supply of fairly well educated people to man the economy of an industrial society; second, both countries wish to maintain as great an opportunity as possible for upward socioeconomic mobility of children of lower-status parents, and conceive the secondary school as an avenue of economic opportunity. Consequently it is important that the secondary school lead the student fairly easily into higher education. Most American secondary schools lead directly into a higher institution. The Russian 10-year school of general education leads to higher institutions, and so does the technical secondary school, or technicum.

The technicum is generally a 4-year technical high school, commencing with the eighth grade of the general school system. In addition to training people for technical and commercial jobs, it also leads, in principle, at least, to higher institutions, since 5 percent of the places in higher institutions are reserved for graduates of technicums. In table 1 the graduates of resident courses in technicums are added to the graduates of the general secondary school to get the total number of Russian secondary school graduates.

Just at this time, however, when the Soviet Union seemed to be reaching toward the American model of a broad system of secondary education for all, leading either to work or to a higher education, there has been a massive change of Soviet policy. Commencing at the eighth or ninth grade (students of age 15 or 16) the Soviet schools are now proliferating a variety of experimental programs in which study is combined with productive work and work gradually takes precedence over study for most students.

The causes behind this movement appear to be two—a factual cause and an ideological one. The factual cause is that the production of university candidates had become excessive in relation to the economic need for people with a higher education. Within the last 2 or 3 years there have been many more applicants for entrance to higher institutions than places for them, and a considerable group failed to gain admission the first year out of secondary school have waited around until the next year, hoping to get in at that time. But the secondary school is now graduating about three times as many students as can get into a higher institution, and obviously something had to be done to direct many secondary school graduates into jobs. This meant that the general secondary school must be redefined so that it should be more than a university-preparatory in-

stitution, which it has been in the past in the Soviet Union.

The ideological cause of the change in secondary school policy goes back to the writings of Marx and Engels who advocated a polytechnic education which "familiarizes one with the basic principles of all productive processes and at the same time gives the child or adolescent the skill of using the simplest tools employed in every branch of production." Polytechnic education for all up to age 17 was in 1919 proclaimed by the Communist Party as the objective and method of the Soviet school. But this slogan lost most of its meaning during the period after about 1933, when the drive began to produce large numbers of people with rigorous scientific and technical training. The school program was filled with academic subjects and the homework assignments became heavy. It was about 20 years before the campaign for polytechnic education was resumed. Then, in 1952, the 19th Party Congress passed a resolution "proposing to undertake the realization of polytechnic instruction throughout the secondary schools." In 1953 the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Moscow published a book entitled "Polytechnic Instructions in Schools of General Education" in which the stress was on the interdependence of theory and application, and it was argued that polytechnic instruction must include vocational training. In 1954, I. A. Kairov, the RSFSR Minister of Public Education, said:

"The school is now faced with the responsible task of uniquely reeducating the pupils' psychology. Up to the present time the school only prepared them for the institutions of higher education. Now, when a considerable portion of those finishing school will go directly into life, our task is to nurture young people right from the beginning in the habits of work, in the love of work, and in respect for laboring people."[2]

At the same time, in the last 2 or 3 years, there has risen an increasing objection to the pace of schoolwork in the latter half of the school of general education whose enrollment is made up of students from about age 11 to 17. On May 10, 1956, a group of leading Soviet medical authorities published a long letter in the Literaturnaya Gazeta (literary gazette) charging Soviet educational authorities with endangering the health of schoolchildren by overloading them with lessons and homework. They said, "Chronic overexhaustion, frequent headaches, weakened memory and vision, proneness to infectious diseases with various complications, result in a general weakening of the child's organism." They wrote of the "unbelievable overburdening" of schoolchildren. Children of 11 to 13 years of age work an average of 8 to 10 hours a day (including homework); children of 14 to 17 work 10 to 12 hours. The majority of the upper forms of secondary schools not only have no time left for reading, sport, theater, or amusement, but so little time is left even for sleep that an industrious pupil becomes irreparably exhausted mentally.

The following September, the Russian Minister of Education ordered the abolition of end-of-year examinations in all grades but the 7th and 10th, where the examinations are necessary for promotion to other schools. This lessens the nervous strain and the burden of work toward the end of the school year, though it does not decrease the daily amount of work which has to be accomplished during most of the school year.

Thus the stage was set for a revolution in the Soviet secondary school which has come into action only during the 1958–59 school year. The essence of this revolution is the combination of productive work with academic instruction for almost all Russian youth from about the ages of 15 to 20.

[2] Komsomol'skaya provda, Aug. 11, 1954.

Experimental changes have been taking place gradually during the past 4 years and were not announced as official policy until 1958. It was with these changes in the background that Khrushchev made his famous call for a complete reorganization of education in the age period from 15 to 20. Speaking at the 13th session of the Komsomol (Young Communist League) in April 1958, and speaking again in September 1958, Khrushchev proposed that henceforth education should be divided into two phases: from 7 to 15 years old and from 15 years old up. The new elementary eighth year school should be the school of general education for all. The program of this school "should be revised so as to liquidate the overloading of the pupils and to take into consideration their moral, vocational, physical, and esthetic development." In grades 5 through 8 (ages 11 to 15) pupils should participate in caring for public property, work in school shops and school gardens, on collective and state farms. "As the pupils advance in school their socially useful work should take on a broader and broader character until, upon graduation, they are prepared to take their places in the world of work."[3]

Following the 8 year school of general education there is to be a period of about 4 or 5 years in which nearly all youth do productive work and at the same time are encouraged to continue their studies on a part-time, evening school or correspondence basis so as to get ready for admission to a university or higher institution if they so desire.

[3] For an abridged text of these two speeches, see George Z. F. Bereday and Richard V. Rapacz, "Khrushchev's Proposals for Soviet Education," Teachers College Record, LX (December 1958), 133–149.

"However, the general education secondary schools, being oriented to the preparation of their graduates for institutions of higher learning, failed to pay attention to labor education and to Lenin's ideas on polytechnic education. There occurred a definite rift between the schools and life which became painfully apparent during the postwar years when the graduates of secondary schools began to enter into industrial and agricultural productions. Graduates of these schools demonstrated a lack of preparation for real work. Many of them thought that graduation from a secondary school should relieve them of the necessity of doing direct labor as workers or farmers."

Kairov went on to propose that after finishing the new general 8-year school, the following procedure should be followed:

"First of all, the young persons going from the 8-year school into production would receive vocational training, the importance of which would grow constantly. Then he would continue his studies for 4 years without having to leave his job. In order to allow better working conditions for the pupils, it is proposed that they operate on a shortened work day or work week. These new schools could be operated both on an evening and extension basis."

The present technicum courses would be so organized that pupils would spend one-half to two-thirds of their time in productive work.

If these proposals are followed fully, it will mean the end of the present academic and university-preparatory secondary school in the Soviet Union. All youth will enter productive work at about age 16, and those who also carry on evening or correspondence study will eventually be permitted to apply for admission to higher institutions while continuing their jobs. But it seems unlikely that the present 8th, 9th, and 10th grades of academic secondary school will disappear overnight. Kairov himself said that:

"We already have special schools for children who are gifted in music, art, and choreography. It would also be desirable to establish special schools for those children displaying outstanding talent in mathematics and the other branches of scientific knowledge. Each of these special schools should operate on the basis of its unique situation, but all of them should effect a close connection between study and socially useful labor on the part of the pupil."

This may leave the door open to the continuation of the present academic high school on a highly selective basis, with study taking priority over productive work. But such schools, if they are continued, will apparently be restricted to small numbers of students. Most entrants to higher education will be expected to have 3 or 4 years of experience in productive work.

The new policy will also apply directly to the students in the higher institutions. It is proposed that most university students shall commence their higher education on a part-time basis while doing productive work. V. Elyutin, Minister of Higher Education in the U.S.S.R., writing in Pravda, September 17, 1958, on the subject "Higher Education Must Be Brought to the Level of Contemporary Needs," said:

"In our country, which is building a Communist society, it is indispensable for all members of the society to participate in socially useful work. Not even the young people who are studying can be excused from this obligation."

He proposes that students coming to the higher institutions without previous work experience should take jobs and study in evening classes or by correspondence for the first 2 or 3 years of their course. Possibly those young people who have had work experience while in secondary school will be permitted to study full time.

Only the most capable and industrious student should continue beyond the second

Russian and American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the following comments were made by Robert J. Havighurst on Russian and American education:

or third year of the higher institution. It is suggested that after the second or third year in the higher institution students might study full time, having by that time served their apprenticeship in socially useful labor.

Elyutin adds:

"In filling each uinversity's student quota, the general rule should be retained that, if possible, those young people who have had experience in practical work should have precedence. However, the rigid application of such a rule must not be assumed, particularly in determining admission to the universities of students in such fields as mathematics, physics, mechanics, chemistry, and some others."

Thus it appears that the education of the late adolescent in Russia is about to take a completely new form. This writer's interpretation of the situation is as follows. The Russian academic secondary school was expanded with enormous speed after the war to the point where it was no longer limited to serving the traditional European function of preparing students for higher education. By 1957 the academic secondary school was graduating three times as many young people as were needed to fill the quotas for entrance to higher institutions. Further, as Khrushchev pointed out, some 60 percent of the university students were children of officials and intellectuals. This is about the same as the situation in American universities. For a society which aims to give maximum opportunity to the children of its farmers and industrial workers, this is an alarming situation. Consequently it seemed desirable to the Russian leaders to put all youth, no matter what their fathers' occupations are, through the experience of productive work in factory or field, hoping thereby to inculcate attitudes favorable toward labor, as well as to give the children of workers a better chance for higher education.

The effect of this new policy, if fully carried out, will be that practically all Soviet youth will work in factories, offices, or on farms for several years after age 15. Most of them will thus find the vocation in which they will continue all their lives. But all will be encouraged to study part time, and thus those with the most energy, ambition, and ability will get further technical training and go to work as technicians, or will eventually enter a university or higher institution and qualify for a higher level position. The quotas for special secondary schools and higher institutions can be adjusted to meet the needs of the society for various kinds of trained people, and there will be no unruly excess of students competing for white-collar positions and getting into trouble and developing antisocial attitudes because the society does not offer them the positions which they believe they deserve. This is what the Russian leaders hope will come from the new policy of adolescent education.

COMPARISONS OF THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND U.S.S.R.

To this point, we have been discussing quantity rather than quality in the output of the educational system. But there are some critics of American education who contend that the Russians have a better educational system and that they produce better scientists and engineers than the United States. The question whether the younger Russian scientists and engineers are better than their American counterparts can hardly be answered on the basis of our present knowledge, except by giving opinions. However, it is possible to make some factual comparisons between Russian educational practice in science and mathematics and American education in these subjects. This has been done quite carefully by two recent writers, Nicholas DeWitt[1] and Alexander G. Korol.[2] Both of these men point out that the Russian student at the end of the 10-year secondary school has spent more time studying physics and chemistry than the American student at the end of high school, and about the same amount of time in mathematics as the American student who takes 4 years of high school mathematics. All Russian secondary school students take these courses, and only a minority of American secondary school students. Russian youth finish secondary school about a year younger than American youth, and consequently the Russian student is presumably somewhat ahead of his American counterpart at the age of 17 or 18. Opinions differ concerning the wisdom of studying science and mathematics so intensively at the secondary school age, and the Russian practice during the past 2 or 3 years has been to reduce the intensity of study.

Korol's book contains a careful analysis of the examinations in science and mathematics which secondary school students take at the close of the secondary school, comparing the Soviet questions with those asked by the College Entrance Examination Board of American secondary school students who have taken the maximum of mathematics and science offered in their schools. Comparisons are difficult, since it is not known what level of answer is required for success in the Soviet examinations, and the Soviet questions are drawn from a pool which are known to the students beforehand. However, the Educational Testing Service came to the tentative conclusion that the Soviet mathematics examination was pitched at about the same level as the college board advanced mathematics test, a level achieved in the United States by about 10 percent of 12th-grade students. With respect to the physics examinations, the Soviet examination seems to be pitched at about the same level as that of the college board advanced placement test, which level is reached by only a small fraction of American 12th-grade students.[3]

In comparing the quality of Russian undergraduate college education in science and mathematics with that of the United States, both DeWitt and Korol conclude that they are of approximately equal quality. Korol says:

"Both in science nad, to a lesser extent, in engineering, under a set of circumstances which combines all or the majority of the possible favorable factors, the quality of training provided within the Soviet system can be and is in its technical content comparable to the very best that is included in the undergraduate education of a comparable professional man in the United States and other nontotalitarian societies."[4]

Wtih respect to engineering, Korol says:

"Discounting the vocationally oriented store of precarious knowledge a Soviet engineering graduate possesses after his 5 years of training, we conclude that in terms of basic engineering preparation he does not achieve appreciably if at all a higher level of competency in his 5 years of training than his American counterpart does after a 4-year course."[5]

It should be noted that the Soviet engineering schools in a 5-year course give instruction in basic engineering subjects and also train for a specific job, whereas the American engineering schools generally leave specific training for a specific job to the experience the American gets on his job.

IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES

American and Soviet education are more alike in structure and social function than they are like education in the Western European countries. However, American and Soviet education are different because of several factors.

General culture versus polytechnic education: The current reform of education for the late adolescent in Russia illustrates the consistent Soviet emphases upon education for work and upon educational value of socially useful work. This contrasts with the consistent American emphasis upon liberal education or general culture. Thus while the Russians plan to close the period of general education for youths at about age 16, after which the main stress is upon vocational training, the Americans organize education for the period from ages 16 to 20 around the concept of general education, and tend to fend off vocational choice and vocational training as long as possible. One reason for the relatively larger enrollment of youth in higher education in the United States than in Russia is that the Americans believe it appropriate for a boy who will go into business or industrial management to start with a college degree based on a general liberal education.

The European academic tradition: The Russian secondary school of the postwar period has been very similar to the established European secondary school, with a rigorous academic curriculum designed to prepare students for higher education. One characteristic of this type of school is its bookishness, its separation from the everyday life of the society, and its appeal to children of the professional and Government official classes. This tradition is antagonistic to the concept of polytechnic education and is involved in the present crisis in Russian secondary education.

The American secondary school is much farther from the European tradition and is much more accessible to children from homes of manual workers. The American boy tends to get the equivalent of a polytechnic education through nonschool experiences with machines and tools and through summer and part-time work. Thus the American student, growing up in a capitalistic society, gets work experience and training in the use of tools which are denied the European secondary school student, and for which the Russian educators strive through their program of educational reform.

Russian "puritanism" versus American "hedonism": Since the early 1930's, there has been a continuous and strenuous campaign to extend education to all Soviet youth and over a longer period. It has been understood that progress toward industrialization and higher living standards depended on more and better education. The Russians have seen themselves meeting one emergency after another with austerity, self-denial and hard work as their only choice: it has been a matter of life or death to train engineers and scientists rapidly and in sufficient numbers to man the expanding economy. Not until the very latest years has there been an adequate supply of secondary school graduates.

In contrast, during the 1930's America had an oversupply of young people in relation to the needs of the labor force, and the most effective solution of the problem of oversupply was to keep young people in school longer. There was no need to hurry their education. During World War II there was a need for youth in the armed services and in the labor force, and this resulted in some pressures to push youth through school and college faster. There were experiments in acceleration of

---

[1] DeWitt, "Soviet Professional Manpower" (Washington: National Science Foundation, 1955).

[2] Korol, op. cit.

[3] Ibid., pp. 85–98 and apps. D and E.

[4] Ibid., pp. 356–57.

[5] Ibid, p. 357.

student progress through college. These were continued after 1945 because by this time the postwar economic boom was creating a demand for young people on the labor market, and the low birth rates of the 1930's were producing small annual contingents of new adults. By the early 1950's there was something of a feeling of emergency about the education of youth. Plans for accelerating the progress of young people through school and college had become fairly popular.

Still, there has not been as much feeling of an emergency need for young people in America as in Russia, and the emergency attitude in the United States has had to contend with a kind of hedonistic view of childhood and adolescence which regards these periods of life as good in themselves, worthy to be enjoyed. The Russians have been willing to sacrifice the pleasures of youth to the satisfactions of adulthood, if not to the needs of the state. The Americans are more likely to feel that there should be pleasure in life at all ages, and thus to encourage young people to combine play with work during school and college years. Thus the recent alarmist statements by some critics of American education to the effect that the schools and colleges are too soft on youth have received an ambivalent response from parents and from youth themselves in the United States.

Women's roles: One of the most striking differences between Russia and the United States (and also Western Europe) is the much greater place of women in the Russian labor force at the professional level. Three-quarters of Russian physicians and one-quarter of Russian engineers are women. In 1955, 55 percent of graduates of higher institutions in Russia, were women, compared with about 40 percent in the United States.

Looking ahead for the next 10 years, it seems likely that Soviet and American education will continue to be both alike and different, for reasons both of ideology and of socioeconomic realities. There will be a contrast in the supply of young people which will cause deep differences. The United States will have percentages of young people in their twenties increasing more rapidly than percentages of other age brackets, due to the great upsurge of the birth rate which followed World War II and has not abated. On the other hand, the Soviet Union will have a lean period during the 1960's due to the deficit of births in the disastrous war years. Not until after 1970 will Russia have as many 22-year-olds as she will have in 1960.

Election Year Politics Offers a Threat to a Sound and Sensible Approach to 1960 Legislative Activities of the 86th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, few sessions of Congress in recent history have opened in an atmosphere of louder political overtones than prevails in this election year of 1960. Unfortunate it is, too, because the demand for commonsense in the conduct of the Nation's business has never been greater in the past half century.

I believe it is the keen desire of every citizen to see this Congress rise above partisan politics in dealing with the basic functions of government where it concerns our fiscal stability, national defense, and foreign policy. All are, however, to no small degree related in a world of unrest and changing philosophies which marks the social, economic, and political scene both at home and abroad.

Programs designed purely and simply to vote baiting will undoubtedly be dangled before this Congress and accordingly before the American public with neither a hand on the fiscal throttle nor the safety brake of our Treasury mechanism. Potshot criticism of nearly every program from national defense to education and welfare must be expected with so many eyes on the November elections. An intelligent voting public must and can, I am sure, determine where this criticism ends as constructive and begins as political campaigning. This is the one hope of keeping the 1960 legislative program on Capitol Hill in the proper perspective.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

From 1947 until 1952, the United States fell sadly behind Rusia in research and development of missiles. As a matter of fact, from 1945 through 1952 we obligated a total of $3.6 million for research, development, and procurement of both intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles. Is there any wonder, then, that we now lag behind the Soviet Union in this field by an estimated 2½ to 3 years? Notwithstanding this lag, which is being closed as rapidly as dollars and the human brain permit, our overall defense and striking ability is, according to experts and not some politicians, superior to that of the Soviet Union. Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and Chief of Staff General Twining, have both testified to this appraisal before the Armed Services Committee. Gates pointed out that our seapower is clearly superior to that of the U.S.S.R. with advance nuclear powered surface ships and nuclear powered carriers and cruisers scheduled to join the fleet next year.

With respect to ground forces, the Soviet Union outnumbers the United States, but a comparison of the ground forces of the Sino-Soviet bloc with those of the free world allies including the United States is more favorable. General Twining pointed out that if the United States downgrades itself by its own hands, it may mislead the Soviets into plunging the world into war.

General Power, Strategic Air Command Chief, testified that the Soviets know well that SAC could "clobber" them right now but he warned that by 1962 Russia may have sufficient supermissiles to destroy our nuclear bases within 30 minutes. The conclusion can only be that we must remain militarily strong and keep our striking power of such strength that it will serve as a deterrent to war until the day comes when leaders of all nations can agree on mutual disarmament as the only means of insuring the very survival of humanity. A world in which freemen can live without the shadow of nuclear destruction and devastation offers, of course, the only hope for this and future generations.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The 86th Congress reconvened while the world remains in turmoil, restlessness, and discontent.

Just 90 miles off of the coast of Florida, Cuba is apparently falling into the hands of Communist infiltrators. While in other Latin American countries crises seem to be sprouting. Subversion creeps through Central and South America and as close as the Panama Canal Zone. China, at least for our generation seems to be in the throes of the human slavery of communism and descension punctuates the social, political, and economic lives of Algeria, Kenya, and Ghana. Unfortunately, there is no type of guarantee one nation can offer to another toward its solution of these problems. And, even so, as one writer puts it, "International conferences seeking humane objectives proceed with external piety and inward distrust."

ON THE DOMESTIC HORIZON

Recovery from the cost of two wars in less than two decades has left its mark upon the fiscal complexion of this Nation despite its great economic and productive strength.

As we seek to assist in solving the problems of our less fortunate neighbors abroad, we find ourselves saddled with a national debt which exceeds $290 billion and upon which we must divert $9 billion annually to the payment of interest. We must not ignore the need for not only a determined prevention of any further deficit spending but the further need to reduce the present incumbrance of the Treasury. This will take the courage of self discipline and fiscal responsibility above political expediency. During the great depression of the thirties the flood gates of the National Treasury were thrown open. There have been only weak efforts to close them—such weak efforts that even under the present burden of heavy taxes, we have yielded to the pressures of spending beyond our means as a nation.

Some segments of the American public, acquainted with the weakness of statesmanship and the deep desire for reelection of legislators, time their new demands to campaign years. Those receiving Government subsidies generally pick an election year to get Congress to increase these subsidies—and those trying to get their foot in the door use the same psychology for their purpose.

As Congress deals objectively with many legislative problems this year, we must remember that any new or increased benefits which must be paid for from the Federal Treasury can come but from one source—the pocket of the taxpayer. Until someone discovers a pump from which these dollars flow, other than the means provided by taxes, we must exercise prudence in dealing with the many demands that will exceed in cost the funds available for Uncle Sam to furnish them.

First in Peace, First in War: U.S.S. "George Washington"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, as the year 1959 drew to a close, an event which was little noticed among the hectic preparations for the celebration of the New Year took place in Groton, Conn. I do not feel it is an exaggeration to say that in terms of our national defense it was one of the most significant developments of the 1950's.

I refer to the commissioning ceremonies of the U.S.S. *George Washington*, this country's first ballistic-missile-launching submarine, held at the shipyards of the Electric Boat Division of the General Dynamics Corp., in Groton on December 30, 1959. Electric Boat, the world's pioneer builder of submarines, was the logical choice to design and build this epoch-making addition to our defense arsenal.

As a tribute to the 11,000 men and women who comprise the superb design and construction team at Electric Boat, as well as to the officers and men of the *George Washington*, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the February 1960 issue of Navy magazine, entitled "First in Peace, First in War: U.S.S. *George Washington*":

FIRST IN PEACE, FIRST IN WAR: U.S.S. "GEORGE WASHINGTON"

One day next year a missile shaped much like a champagne bottle will pop out of the ocean and soar down the Atlantic missile range to a target more than 1,200 miles away.

With the launching of this missile, one of the deadliest weapons systems ever conceived will become a reality—a nuclear-powered submarine that fires Polaris intermediate range ballistic missiles from below the surface.

The first such submarine joined the fleet in commissioning ceremonies at General Dynamics Corp.'s Electric Boat Division at Groton, Conn., on December 30.

Named *George Washington*, the 380-foot, 5,400-ton ship has 16 tubes for launching Polaris missiles. "The *Washington*, with nuclear warhead missiles, can cause more devastation than all the bombs dropped during World War II," said her commanding officer, a tough, crew-cut U.S. Navy commander, James Butler Osborn, 41, who looks like a football player, talks like a marine drill sergeant and displays the mind of a well-educated engineer.

Commander Osborn declared that the sub "combines the nuclear power of *Nautilus*, the reliability of *Skate*, the agility of *Skipjack*, the massiveness of *Triton*, and, in addition, possesses the world's most advanced self-contained and mobile weapons system."

The decision to unleash the submarine's power will never be Osborn's but the act itself will be.

How does it feel to be cast in such a role?

"I've never given it any thought," Osborn says, jutting a remarkably square jaw just a bit. "If we ever have to hit, we'll hit. And there won't be a second's hesitation," he adds.

Osborn usually discourses through an almost inevitable cigar. This, along with a black turtleneck sweater he wears frequently, makes him look like Hollywood's conception of what a submarine commander should look like.

The *Washington*, he declares, is a "deterrent force whose purpose is to let an enemy know we can hit him as hard as he can hit us. And when you reach the point where the winner is hurt as badly as the loser there's no point in fighting."

Commissioned an ensign 12 days before Pearl Harbor, Osborn took a short leave to marry Miss June Hanna, of Crystal City, Mo., and then went off to war, serving on surface ships and submarines.

His specialty: gas turbines and jet propulsion engines, the propelling forces of missiles.

"Don't forget the crew," he says frequently and emphatically. "The officers and men are the guys who'll make the ship. I'll do my part and more, but you don't have a fine ship because the captain would like it to be that way. It's the result of hard work by everybody on board."

Some of the hard work he speaks of is behind Osborn and his crew. Most of it is ahead. In fact there will be two crews comprised of 10 officers and 90 men each so that the sub may constantly remain deployed at sea except when one crew relieves the other. One crew will be known as the "Blue" and one as the "Gold."

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, special assistant to the President for science and technology, who gave the principal commissioning address, stressed the new capability represented by the *George Washington*.

The new fleet ballistic missile submarines will "provide our Nation with a unique strength—the strength of a secure deterrent—of a force that can, with inevitable assurance, decisively punish an aggressor," he said.

He pointed out that the *George Washington's* detection and destruction will be well nigh impossible and yet her targets for retaliation will be continually within reach.

Very much to the point also were the remarks of Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, U.S. Navy, commander of the Eastern Sea Frontier, who accepted the ship for commissioning from Carleton Shugg, president, Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics.

Said Admiral Combs: "We are opening the door on a new era in national power for peace. We live in an age when every fixed address on land can be marked for certain destruction. There are no fixed addresses at sea and there are no addresses at all beneath the surface of the sea.

"The oceans cover 70 percent of the surface of the earth, and the fleet ballistic missile submarine, running quiet and deep, will have the choice of an infinite number of launching points."

Others who participated in the ceremony were Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, Director, Special Projects, Bureau of Ordnance; Rear Adm. Frederick B. Warder, U.S. Navy, commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet, and Capt. Arthur C. Smith, U.S. Navy, Navy supervisor of shipbuilding at Groton.

Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Research and Engineering of the Defense Department, and other high-ranking civilian and naval officials attended.

The *George Washington* was built in the record time, for nuclear submarines, of 2 years. She is ahead of the missiles she is to carry.

The Polaris missile, with Lockheed Aircraft Corp., as the principal contractor, is still in the process of development and testing. The first full-range of 1,200-mile missile will probably not be fired until next summer, but the operational Polaris is expected to be ready next fall.

The *George Washington's* reactor cost about $12 million of the total of $100 million spent on the submarine. The ballistic missile submarines cost about twice as much as prior nuclear-powered submarines. This is partly because of the maze of computers and electronic systems required to fix precisely the ship's position and the equipment needed to process missile-firing data constantly and to launch the missiles.

A shipload of 16 Polaris missiles is expected to cost initially about $20 million in addition to the $100 million cost of the submarines.

So far nine fleet ballistic missile submarines are under construction, of which four have been launched. Funds have been provided for long-leadtime items for three more, and next year's budget is expected to provide money for at least three additional submarines. The Navy wants a total of about 45.

Will We Match Russia's Dedication to Schools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Utah Educational Review, "What Can We Learn From Russian Schools," was written by three of my former colleagues who recently returned from an extensive tour of the Russian school system. It is both impressive and challenging. Certainly there is much that we can learn from the Russian schools, and it is high time that we were learning all we can from every source.

The big question in my mind is, "Does the dedication on the part of American teachers, pupils, administrators, parents, government officials, and citizens equal that of the Russians?" The psychologist, Flemming, said, "Show me a boy's IQ and I will tell you what he is capable of doing, but show me what he wants to do and I will tell you what he will do." The will to do is the greatest factor in learning as well as in the building of better schools. Do we have it?

The editorial follows:

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM RUSSIAN SCHOOLS?

Were you impressed by the Russian schools? We were asked this question by a news reporter as we entered the Idlewild Airport in New York on our return from a month-long study of the schools of the Soviet Union. The same question has been asked repeatedly by friends since.

It is difficult to give a simple answer. Our reaction to the Russian schools runs the gamut from revolt to approval of different aspects of the program.

We were revolted at the communistic indoctrination. We were surfeited by the propaganda fed to children by the use of every technique known to the art. We were repelled by the use of negative motivation of children, the extreme formality of the class instruction, the poor school buildings, the great pressures put on the children to force them to conform to one pattern of behavior and to master the single curriculum.

THINGS THAT IMPRESSED US

On the other hand we were impressed by the dedication of teachers, pupils, admin-

istrators, parents, government officials, and citizens to the cause of education. We were impressed by the physical education program which includes a medical doctor on the school faculty and two complete examinations a year for each pupil. We marveled at the well-equipped astronomy laboratories and some of the other scientific equipment.

Among other things that impressed us were: The variety of evening school and correspondence school opportunities for adults to enable them to pick up and continue their education; the respected status of teachers; the numerous opportunities for further education for teachers without loss of salary; the coordinated educational research program for the Academy of Pedagogical Science; the friendliness of teachers; the retirement program for teachers; cultural opportunities provided through teachers' clubs; the opportunities for pupils to further their education in areas of their special interests through extracurricular programs; the use of community resources; and the high ratio of professional staff to children.

PURPOSES OF SOVIET SCHOOLS

The general purposes which guide the school systems of America and the Soviet Union are miles apart. The chief purposes of the schools in the land of the hammer and sickle are to indoctrinate the pupils with the Marxist-Leninist philosophy and to prepare them for life in the Communist society. All other purposes are secondary to these overriding objectives. Even the present national preoccupation with science is motivated by a fierce desire to prove that communism is superior to other forms of government.

The spirit of the Soviet school was defined for us by Mr. Anton Chernikov, the Minister of Education in the Russian Republic in Moscow in the following words:

"The chief aim of the Soviet schools is to prepare the pupils for life, to perform a useful social work, to attain a higher level of universal and polytechnical education, to train well-educated people, thoroughly acquainted with the fundamentals of science, to bring up the Soviet youth in a spirit of full attachment to the principles of the Socialist society, in the spirit of the Communist ideal."

All forms and techniques of propaganda are used in the schools to instill into pupils the spirit of the ideal, from blatant banners in school auditoriums to subtle paintings in libraries and directors' offices. A pupil can't go through a normal school day without being bombarded with slogans, symbols and quotations from Lenin's writings which have become the scriptures for the new Soviet substitute for religion.

One school in Moscow displayed a huge red and gold portrait of Lenin in the auditorium. Large gold letters on a bright red background spelled out this slogan: "The party and Lenin are twins and brothers."

A school in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, posted this slogan: "Remember, love, study Lenin, our teacher, our leader."

School hallways are favorite spots for displaying quotations of Communist beliefs and portraits of national heroes are standard equipment. Each school has one room set aside for the use of the youth organizations. Red flags, busts of political leaders, oaths of loyalty to the regime and rules of behavior grace the walls.

One can't even attend a sports event in the huge Leningrad stadium without being confronted with a picture of Lenin about the size of our American scoreboards. Underneath the picture are the words "Peace to the World."

In the beautiful University of Moscow there is a large colored panel in one of the main hallways which has this message:

"In capitalist countries only the richer person, the person with capital, benefits from the growth of production.

"The person without capital will continue to eke out a meager subsistence even when production grows.

"The rich possess the goods things in life, but there is no way out of poverty in the poor homes. And thousands of laboring people do not even have work there."

Were we impressed with the Russian schools? Yes—with some phases of their operation. Yes—with the enthusiasm and faith with which the people support education. But from the purposes, the single curriculum and formal methods of Soviet schools we have nothing to learn.

No nation's future rests more heavily on the civic competence of its individual citizens than America's.

Our task is to look critically at our own schools. Are they strong enough to enable us to achieve fully our own national ideals? Certainly, no nation on earth has a greater stake in good schools than America where our national decisions are comprised of a sum total of our individual decisions.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, and for other purposes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, when the House first considered this legislation to augment the national program to control and fight water pollution, I discussed why I believed it was good and necessary. I also outlined a specific instance in which it would aid the towns of New Britain, Berlin, Cromwell, and Middletown to support a project needed to control pollution on the Mattabesett River. Where population is growing as fast as in urban New England, these measures cross not only town lines but county lines.

I note that Connecticut would qualify for $1,114,965 in the coming year under this bill, compared to $619,425 authorized under the present law and only $247,770 recommended in the 1961 budget. Few domestic programs are as important as the fight to conserve our natural resources and protect the water supply on which human life and the economy depend. I would hope that this measure soon becomes law.

A year ago in Connecticut, a survey showed that no new treatment plans were put into effect that did not involve a Federal contribution. Preservation of our water resources and cleaning up our streams to provide adequate water for industrial expansion, the growth of the economy and the needs of an increasing population for a better supply to cope with a rising standard of living insist upon action now in this regard.

Cancer: Enemy on the Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to speak before the Cancer League of Philadelphia last Thursday evening, February 4, 1960, in the Phillip Scherr Auditorium of the Albert Einstein Medical Center, northern division. The Cancer League is doing a tremendous job in fighting cancer in the city of Philadelphia. The work which it has done in supplying Philadelphia hospitals with equipment for the detection and treatment of cancer has been a significant contribution in the fight against this enemy. My remarks before the league were as follows:

CANCER: ENEMY ON THE RUN

"Progress in Fight on Cancer Is Reported by Institute Here," "Researcher Suggests Anticancer Tactics," "Significant Changes in Cells Detected in Cancer Patients." Nearly every day reports like these, appearing in newspapers, magazines, and medical journals, revitalize our efforts in the fight against cancer. We sense we are on the brink of a wonderful discovery, and that with a little time, a little more money, and a little more hard work, we will achieve success.

I feel this challenge deeply, as I know you do, and it is for this reason that I am delighted to be here today. I believe that the annual campaign fund rally of the Cancer League of Philadelphia, is a major event on the cancer calendar. It is this type of community effort which makes the hope of finding a cure for cancer a real one.

I need not tell you that the vital statistics on this disease are grim. Each year in the United States, cancer takes the lives of about a quarter of a million persons. Since 1900 it has overtaken tuberculosis, pneumonia, diarrhea and enteritis, nephritis, and accidents to become, since 1938, second leading cause of death in this country. One can point to the cost of hospital care for cancer patients which runs to approximately $300 million a year, or to the loss in goods and services due to this disease, which has been estimated conservatively at $12 billion each year. But these figures are meaningless symbols in comparison to the personal tragedy experienced by families for whom cancer is not a number but a desperate reality.

The monster is powerful, but fortunately his adversaries grow in strength each year. The blossoming of the research effort against this disease has been one of the medical wonders of this decade. You are all aware, I am sure, of the very exciting projects being carried on at the National Cancer Institute, the oldest of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. I know of no better example of the difficult, determined, sometimes discouraging medical research being carried on today. You may be interested in some of the work currently being carried on in their laboratories or being supported through their research grant funds.

One striking example of the growth in the Federal effort against cancer is the increase in the annual appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. The figure has climbed from $18,900,000 in fiscal 1950, to $21,737,000 in fiscal 1955, to a staggering $91,257,000 in fiscal 1960. These sums are an indication of the importance attached by Congress to research against cancer. The

House Committee on Appropriations in its report on labor, health, education, and welfare appropriations stated in 1958, and repeated again last year:

"Considering the rate at which medical science has advanced over the past 10 years, it is plausible to believe that in the decade ahead simple, accurate tests for cancer, such as a blood test, may make the early detection of cancer simple and be usable as a routine tool of the physician and public health worker."

The National Cancer Institute is an active outfit. Approximately 600 scientists, technicians, and laboratory assistants have about 325 research projects underway at all times. Scientists work in the laboratory with experimental animals and these studies are coordinated with the studies of human cancer in the 14-story clinical center. Studies in biochemistry, chemical pharmacology, endocrinology, pathology, environmental cancer, radiation therapy, clinical cancer, and biostatistics are being carried on simultaneously—all with one aim: to vanquish this disease enemy.

Perhaps you will be as interested as I was to learn that more than twice as much money is spent on grants to scientists in non-Federal institutions, with no direction, supervision, or interference on the part of the Institute, as is spent on National Cancer Institute research. Surely this is in keeping with our belief in the importance of the intellectual freedom of the scientist. It is also an incentive for institutions throughout the country to expand their research activities, and to look into hidden corners previously neglected by research sleuths.

One of the most impressive crash programs being carried out at the Institute is the cancer chemotherapy program. This research and development program is a cooperative enterprise of national scope. It is jointly sponsored by the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund for Cancer Research, the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration. The program involves three phases: The initial testing of chemicals, hormonal substances, and other materials on mice with cancer; the testing of materials which appear to have promise on larger animals to determine those safe for human use; and finally the conduct of extensive clinical studies with patients in cooperating hospitals. No final answers have been arrived at. But lives have been prolonged, the course of the disease has been checked, and pain has been alleviated with certain chemical agents. Supporters believe that this may be the road to the development of drugs effective against many different types of cancer.

In addition to the program I have mentioned, the Institute makes grants for professional training, cooperates with voluntary groups in cancer education programs, carries on field projects, makes grants to State agencies for their programs, and even lends radium to qualified persons and institutions for radium therapy.

The rationale for all this activity is summed up in the words of the Surgeon General Burney, who stated: "We do not know from what corner of the research firmament will come the next burst of light that will guide us closer to our goal—the conquest of cancer. But we can be sure that light will come and the goal will be reached.

You must be proud to know that you participate in this giant effort. We are all aware that the work of a scientist in his laboratory must be financed, that his discoveries must be communicated to the public, that the public must be kept aware of the precautions against cancer. Voluntary groups like yours have performed an invaluable task in cooperating with the Federal Government in the support of research and in waging effective public education campaigns. As we seem to approach the goal, the need for this kind of activity becomes more urgent.

Recently two public figures have brought home to all of us the immediacy of the danger. I speak of Senator NEUBERGER and Dr. Tom Dooley who have both recently undergone bouts with cancer. Both of these men have been operated on for cancer. Both are determined to see that the effort to conquer this and other dread diseases is increased. Both men have led useful public lives, and their incapacitation even for a time, was a severe public loss.

Senator NEUBERGER's illness has convinced him that our Nation must build a crash program to beat cancer—perhaps something like the Manhattan project of 1940. He believes, as do most of us, that we can increase our efforts still further. We still spend more on cigarettes, liquor, radio and television repairs, and even chewing gum, than we do on cancer.

Senator NEUBERGER's description of his reactions to his disease are moving indeed. He states: "I can tell you that the cancer victim is frequently the loneliest person in the world. He feels that nothing can help him. Friends, family, doctors, associates, all seem without power to check the malignant growth that perils his life. He wishes, desperately and profoundly, for some miraculous cure which will ring a reprieve."

He continues with words which can serve as a campaign cry for all of us: "As a cancer patient, I want to help others who have suffered or who may suffer this disease. I want to encourage them and their families as I was encouraged and supported by cancer progress. I want more: I want to see us lick this disease the way we've licked the infectious diseases. I sincerely believe the world would be more electrified by a breakthrough in cancer than it was by a rocket landing on the moon. As a U.S. Senator, I'm more convinced than ever that we should economize in any other sphere of government than funds for the research program of the National Cancer Institute, because economy at the expense of human life is the worst extravagance of all."

Dr. Dooley has recently returned, as you know, deep from the jungles of Indochina to be operated on for cancer. He returned from his work in Medico, a nonprofit nonsectarian, organization founded by him to gather money, equipment and personnel for hospitals in Asia, Africa, and South America. Tom Dooley has been described as a "splendid American" who can combat the recent talk about the "ugly American." Before entering the operating room he sent a message to many leaders in Congress which included the following remarks: "I am being operated on tomorrow for cancer. As soon as I recover, I intend to go back to Laos to continue this fight against communism with the tools of health."

These two cancer victims have made an impassioned case for more cancer research. Dr. Howard Rusk, the medical editor of the New York Times, takes up their plea: "When will the scientific breakthrough come to solve the riddle of cancer? No one knows. What we know, however, is that the more scientists who are at work on the problem in laboratories all over the world, the greater are the odds for solution and the quicker that solution will come."

These words stir our souls and reinforce our desires to do something about this enemy. I have little to add to their plea. May I close with a word of congratulation for the fine work you have done in the past and with a hope that this campaign will be better than ever before. Your efforts will one day be rewarded in the conquest of cancer.

Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the 34th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense here in Washington was very fruitful. The following article from the Washington Evening Star mentions the highlights of this great meeting:

CULTURAL EXCHANGES WITH RUSSIA HIT

A warning that the Communist Party apparatus in this country was greatly strengthened by the recent visit of Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev was voiced yesterday by the 34th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense which also denounced the cultural exchange program with Russia.

Delegates from 16 national organizations participating in a 3-day meeting here adopted a number of resolutions yesterday and had others pending as they prepared to wind up their annual session this morning.

In opposing the cultural exchange program, the women said there is sworn testimony that delegations from Russia are accompanied by special agents who have posed as ice skaters, clergymen, educators, and scientists for the purpose of conducting espionage operations in the United States.

In the resolution on communism, delegates urged Americans to become informed on Communist aggression, which is psychological, political, and economic as well as military.

LOYALTY AFFIDAVITS

The conference also called for retention of the loyalty affidavit required of students receiving loans under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. "We believe it is unfair to the taxpayers to ask them to underwrite the education of individuals who hesitate to sign the loyalty affidavit," the woman stated.

They also asked that such Government loans be made only to citizens of the United States.

In other resolutions, the conference called on Congress to proclaim the constitutional sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone and urged that the United States announce its claim to sovereignty over territory in Antarctica explored by the United States and its citizens.

The women opposed all efforts aimed at expanding the powers of the present World Court and especially urged retention and enforcement of the Connally reservation.

SUPPORT STUDY

The conference supported a proposal to create a nonpartisan commission to investigate the entire subject of food and beverage contamination and, in a separate resolution, rejected as unconstitutional fluoridation of the community water supply.

Mrs. William D. Leetch, of Washington, was chairman of resolutions for the group which held its meetings at the Mayflower Hotel. Mrs. Frederick Griswold, Jr., of Montclair, N.J., honorary national president of the Patriotic Women of America, was the presiding officer.

Representatives EDGAR W. HEISTAND, of California, and WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, were among yesterday's speakers. Robert Morris, former counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, director of the institute of international studies at Bradley University, also spoke.

A mass meeting last night was preceded by a concert given by the U.S. Air Force Headquarters Command Band under the direction of Capt. Harold L. Copenhaver.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, there were two significant aspects to the President's special farm message which the Congress received yesterday:

First. For the first time in several years the President indicated a willingness to compromise on this issue with Congress.

Second. Apparently Secretary Benson's domination of farm policy in the administration has been ended, if only temporarily.

These two factors present this House with an opportunity to pass urgently needed wheat legislation.

The present situation is serious. Producers realize this. They are not happy with a program that piles up a tremendous surplus in warehouses at a cost of almost a billion dollars a year.

Consumers are certainly fed up. They are demanding a change.

As long as the President followed Mr. Benson, there was no hope for achieving any constructive wheat legislation. Mr. Benson has made it crystal clear on many occasions that the only wheat legislation he will approve would bring about ruinously low prices for producers.

In his message, the President outlined guidelines and said he would sign any wheat legislation which fell within the framework of this broad policy.

For several weeks representatives of a number of farm organizations have been working on new wheat legislation. The only task remaining is to translate the program into legislative language.

The National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Grange, and the National Farmers Union are among the great farm organizations which have worked together in coming up with a plan which, I am firmly convinced, meets the criteria spelled out by the President.

This new program is supported by the National Farmers Organization, Missouri Farmers Association, National Corn Growers Association, American Soybean Association, the Grain Sorghums Producers Association, and several State wheat producing groups.

While I am not in any position to present the proposed wheat marketing program in detail at this time, I can say it will materially reduce the wheat surplus and the cost of the program.

It would stabilize the price of wheat near the parity level by requiring the Secretary to set an annual marketing quota to meet total domestic and export requirements, then subtracting 150 million bushels before breaking down the quota to an individual farm basis.

This provision would force the grain trade to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation for 150 million bushels of wheat each year. Inasmuch as CCC would be barred from selling wheat below parity, this would result in a price to the farmer at or near full parity.

No wheat could be sold for milling or other primary uses without a certificate based on individual marketing quotas expressed in bushels rather than acres. To be eligible, a producer would have to retire at least 20 percent of his wheat base acreage to noncommercial use.

I wish to emphasize that this proposal has the enthusiastic support of a large majority of wheat producers. They see this proposal as an opportunity to achieve postive results and make a start on clearing up what has developed into a serious situation.

I plan to introduce this bill as soon as a draft is completed. I will request the House Committee on Agriculture to hold hearings in the immediate future.

We need action on wheat legislation. This is an economic, not a political problem.

But we have to make sure that the wheat producers' income is maintained. It would be better to retain the present system, imperfect as it is, than to give in to pressures and pass legislation that would bankrupt wheat producers.

We also have to remember that a prosperous agriculture is the key to a sound economic situation for many businessmen in the farm areas. The merchants along Main Street of our small towns depend upon the farmer. When the farmer is hard pressed, the sales of merchants suffer and the entire economy suffers.

This new proposal would maintain the income of the farmer and farm areas. It would reduce the surplus of wheat and it would materially reduce the cost of the program to the taxpayers.

Inasmuch as it meets the requirements set forth by the President, I cannot see any reason why we cannot pass an acceptable bill at this session.

I am going to dedicate my efforts to this end in the coming weeks.

Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in complimenting the Committee on the fine job they have done in this field, but I did want to call attention to one matter which I think is regrettable. In the budget for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce I understand that the request for the 94 new positions has been reduced. I would like to call to the attention of the Committee that since 1947 the appropriation for this Bureau has been reduced from 438 to 200 positions; and that today, because of the marked decline of U.S. exports, this Bureau should be given some consideration, and I hope that at some future time the Committee will consider some additional services, at a time and during a period when I believe those services are needed most.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is the anniversary of the birth of a great Polish patriot whose contribution to the freedom of our United States should never be forgotten. General Kosciuszko designed the fortifications at West Point, as visitors to the partly restored Fort Putnam on Mount Independence at the Academy well recall, and played a vital role in the winning of our independence.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a true product of his age: a gifted, energetic, and of course, ambitious youth, born in the mid-18th century with a mission to fight for the cause of human freedom. This son of an impoverished family in Poland showed remarkable abilities even in early youth, and he was aided in his desire to obtain the best military education Poland could offer him. But he wanted to go beyond that; he wished to carry on his studies in the art and science of war in the celebrated Mezieres Military School in France. With the aid of a scholarship he entered Mezieres and graduated as a specialist in artillery and engineering. He had finished his courses there and was staying in Paris when he heard of the American Revolution in 1776. There and then he made up his mind to go to America, and here to put his learning to practice in the service of a good cause. On borrowed money he sailed for the New World and in the fall of 1776 he was in Philadelphia.

Immediately upon arrival he applied for service, was of course admitted, and, on the strength of his preparation, was entrusted with drawing up plans for fortifying the Delaware River. The successful completion of this assignment earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. Thenceforth his rise was rapid and his accomplishments were great. He was soon placed in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently he took part in the battle of Charleston, and was among the first of the Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British. In Octo-

ber of 1783, in recognition of his outstanding services, Congress made him a brigadier general.

This brave son of Poland, having served the cause of our freedom with distinction, wanted to serve the cause of his beloved Poland. He returned to his native land, and there, after fighting the forces of oppression and tyranny for more than 20 years, he had to seek refuge abroad and then die in exile in 1817 at the age of 71. In commemorating the 214th anniversary of his birth we pay our tribute to this gallant son of Poland for his service in the cause of our freedom.

Is There a Public Conscience in America Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, to view the newsstands at the local drugstore or to attend a movie at one of the so-called art theaters is an education in itself. Unfortunately, it is an education which I feel that most of us, adult as well as juvenile, can very well do without.

Some citizens of questionable repute are willing to exploit others just to make fast dollars for themselves. Many of our young people are prime targets for this type of sordid operation. Their impressionable minds are affected, much in the same manner that narcotics might affect their bodies.

Unfortunately, the dissemination of this type of material appears to be spreading rather than diminishing. Can we allow this trend to continue without taking strong remedial action? I, for one, do not think so. As a member of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, it is my feeling that the Post Office Department must be provided with further tools, urgently needed to combat distribution of obscene, filthy printed, and pictured material.

The Catholic Church, through its Legion of Decency, continues to provide a standard for material which is fit for us all. Perhaps through the development of realistic standards by local groups in each community, it will be possible to restrict the profitable operation of all dealers in smut, thus putting them out of business. At any rate, the whole problem requires immediate action, on the local, State, and Federal levels. We cannot countenance further delay.

I wish to include the remarks of Dr. Adrian H. Scolten, of Portland, Maine, a man who recognizes the enormity of this problem. His comments originally appeared in the editorial column of the January 7 edition of the Norway-South Paris Advertiser-Democrat:

THOUGHTS FOR THE NEW YEAR

As the new year begins we need to take the time to examine ourselves. What are we thinking about? What is the substance of the thought wave that goes on and on in ofr minds when action is stilled and life in general is quiescent. It varies, of course, but whatever it is, it influences our lives for we know from our elementary psychology books that every thought tends to become an act unless inhibited or counteracted by a stronger thought. It is our thinking that in reality makes us what we are.

Let us consider for a minute the influences that are playing upon the thinking of our young people, the murder, intrigue, and false teachings that are the daily diet given on television shows. One cannot see a program of this kind without being affected by it. Its insidious influences permeate the subconscious mind and come to the surface of the conscious mind when one least expects them.

We have often heard the committers of crime say "something came over me—I didn't know what I was doing." Anyone who says "It doesn't do me any harm to see this movie, or read this book—I just forget it" doesn't know what he is talking about.

From the standpoint of the psychiatrist or any doctor who works with young people, he is doing far more harm to his mind than he would hurt his body by eating contaminated food. This subtle invasion of the subconscious mind is responsible for many of the teenage problems which have caused distress and tragedy in so many families.

The television program is being watched by millions every day and every night. The time spent in character building constructive influences; the time spent in church or under good teachers or even good parents, is short compared with the time that the doubtful or downright harmful television program is playing upon the impressionable minds of the grownup boy or girl.

Then there is the movie. We have had a rash of them lately, filmed in foreign countries, the theater managers tell me—and put on here—uncensored. I am told that they are uncensored, and they certainly should be censored. No censor could possibly leave this product for the public—the names tell the story—"Fire Under the Skin" made up entirely of naked people, with no thought, word or deed left to the imagination—"The Naked City," "Unmarried Mothers," etc. I am told that the owners of the chain choose the pictures and the local manager has to take what is sent to him.

He explained that he thoroughly disapproved of the pictures, but it was his way of making a living—in words to that effect.

If a drug house does damage with the medicines he prescribes, or a restaurant serves food that makes people sick physically, he cannot get away with it; the law steps in. Damage to the minds and morals of the youth of our country is far more serious than damage to their physical bodies.

Of course, we all know of the pernicious reading matter that is being given to everybody, young and old—sold over the counter in the corner drugstore, sold for 25 cents a copy in the 10-cent stores and handed out in our lending libraries.

The law states that if the seller knows what he is selling to a young person is obscene, he can be prosecuted—but how about the dime stores and the lending libraries? They know what they are handing out, and they certainly must know that they get into the hands of the young. Is money so much more important to them than minds or morals?

We will not take the time to mention the illicit trade or pornography that is flooding the country. Some effort is being made to combat that, we know, though not enough. It is the combined effect of the veritable food of vicious influences that are being let loose to pray upon our immature youth. It will take the combined influence of all thinking people and certainly all Christian people to check it.

The Catholic Church has made a valiant and praiseworthy effort through its Legion of Decency. It continually realizes that every effort must be made to keep teenagers in the right path or they will choose the wrong one.

Hapy New Year.—Adrian H. Scolten, M.D., Portland.

Annual Recognition Dinner, Blair-Bedford Council, Boy Scouts of America, Altoona Pa., February 4, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 at the Juniata Pavilion, Altoona, Pa., the Blair-Bedford Council, Boy Scouts of America, staged its annual recognition dinner with some 300 leaders of Scouting present for the occasion. Numerous awards were given for outstanding leadership in the field of Scouting.

It was my privilege to deliver the principal address which follows:

SPEECH BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, BLAIR-BEDFORD COUNCIL OF BOY SCOUTS, JUNIATA PAVILION, ALTOONA, PA., ON FEBRUARY 4, 1960

It is a pleasure to participate in the program of this annual Scout recognition dinner for the Blair-Bedford Council, Boy Scouts of America.

It is fitting and proper that the fine leadership and the time and effort donated by Scout leaders should be publicly acclaimed.

It is common knowledge that the history of Scouting had its beginning in England.

Its first impression on Americans was during the year 1909 when a courteous unidentified boy offered his hand to guide William D. Boyce, Chicago publisher, to his destination through London's fog.

The lad had thus performed his "good turn" for the day and refused a tip from the grateful American.

He was a British Boy Scout.

So impressed was publisher Boyce by this kindly deed that he acquired all available information on the British Boy Scouts Association and returned to the United States with a firm conviction that America needed a similar youth program.

On February 8, 1910, the Boy Scouts of America were officially incorporated in Washington, D.C., and today "Scouting" is a familiar word in American homes throughout the length and breadth of our land.

From its humble beginning in 1910, the Scout alumni in the United States now exceed 30 million.

During Boy Scout Week this year—February 7 to February 13—more than 5 million boys and leaders of the Boy Scouts of America will begin the observance of the 50th anniversary of Scouting in the United States.

In addition to the observance of the 50th anniversary, the year 1960 marks the triumphant conclusion of the 4-year program of the Boy Scouts of America, "Onward for God and my country."

Like each of the successive special programs of the Boy Scouts in the past, this program has had a close relationship to the continuing ideals and constant effort of Scouting, expressed in the motto, "Be Prepared."

In this special program, the emphasis has been on the spiritual aspect of scouting—on the strengthening of religious faith—and the increasing of religious activities in each individual Scout and in each troop sponsored by a religious organization.

By this program, which owes its success to cubmasters, scoutmasters, post advisers, and den mothers, the Boy Scout has been inspired to be prepared to do his duty to God, as revealed to him through his own religion.

Ministers, priests, and rabbis have in this program been aided in the spiritual direction and teaching of the youth of their congregations, by the support this program has given to their endeavors.

Scout troops have been inspired to new ambition and vigor by chaplains and other religious leaders cooperating with the Scout officials in this program.

It has been brought home to the boys—emphatically and in many ways throughout these 4 years—that service to God is the chief purpose in life of every man—and the ultimate aim of every worthwhile activity.

The joining of "God and my country" in one slogan reflects the religious development in the United States—demonstrated by many factors—that have been particularly strong during the past decade.

Our people have become more strongly religious, as is plain from statistics of church membership, church attendance, and church giving.

The result is that as they have become more strongly religious, they have become more sure that our country itself must be dedicated to the service of God, subjected to his will, and placed under his protection.

It is significant that during this past decade the Congress has established a prayer room, where Members may retire for private prayer and mediation.

In addition, legislative action has been taken to add the phrase "under God" to the pledge of allegiance, to establish "In God we trust" as our official national motto, and to place those four words on all our future issues of currency.

The relation of religious belief to ethics and particularly to political morality has been frequently and earnestly discussed in Congress and in the newspapers and magazines.

This concern of our people generally, with the relation between God and our country is suitably reflected in the Boy Scout program, "Onward for God and my country."

Patriotism and the preparation of our youth for the service of the country have been given prime emphasis by scouting from the beginning.

You leaders in the Scout movement know that scouting—in this country as elsewhere in the world—has successfully resisted powerful efforts to make it a military or semimilitary activity.

However, no one would deny that whatever tends to increase in the youth of our country, the love of country and the value of physical and mental fitness, tends to make of our youth a formidable defense force in war, as well as a stabilizing force in peace.

The love of our country, under God, is the greatest quality any activity could aim to develop in our young people, and the 4-year program emphasizing this ideal is a splendid service to the country by the Boy Scouts of America.

As we swing into this fourth and final year of the great nationwide program, "Onward for God and Country," let us all continue to work together, scouts and adults alike, to make the year a memorable one in the history of scouting, and in the lives of every one of us.

We must work to realize this ideal in our own lives, as well as to develop it in the lives of the boys in whose interest we are serving.

Each of us, as well as each of them, must be: "Prepared in body; prepared in skill; prepared in spirit; prepared in will; prepared as a member of a team."

This is a suitable occasion for reviewing the past achievements of scouting in America, rejoicing over successes, resolving to repair shortcomings, and determining to drive forward with renewed vigor toward our goals.

Much is being said currently of the prevalence of juvenile delinquency.

Though scouting is not generally a remedial measure directed at reclaiming the delinquent—who often expresses his scorn of the ideals of scouting—I should like to emphasize on this occasion that scouting is much more and better than a cure for delinquency.

It is a preventive of delinquency in the individual boy and in the group of boys, and it is a valuable aid for a neighborhood and for neighborhood organizations in combating the conditions that foster delinquency.

New York's chief magistrate, John M. Murtagh, a man in a position to know the facts about juvenile delinquency and a man whose nature and experience alike would prevent his indulging in easy optimism or polite compliments on such a subject, has publicly expressed his opinion that an increase in Boy Scouts means a decrease in delinquency:

"I can't think of better insurance against boys appearing in youth court than scouting," said Mr. Murtagh.

He continued: "Boys who have really healthy homes never will be delinquent, and I believe scouting brings boys closer to their families and communities as well as providing leadership training."

Mayor Wagner enthusiastically seconded this opinion and added that he believed if the 500,000 boys of New York City who are eligible for membership were absorbed into the scout movement, New York City would make great strides toward overcoming juvenile delinquency.

But through the primary purpose of scouting is to take good, healthy, well-intentioned boys and help them mold themselves into strong, able, virtuous men, scouting can be and has been used with spectacular success in the rehabilitation of crime-ridden areas and the restoration to good conduct of rebellious and stubborn boys.

The Boy Scout movement in Washington, D.C., for example, is now engaged in the second of two major efforts to establish scouting in an area of maximum delinquency.

Back around 1954, Rudy Carson—known as "trouble shooter" for the National Capital area council—directed concentrated Boy Scout efforts toward organizing the boys in the second precinct, then considered the "wickedest precinct" in the city.

The project resulted in the formation of 50 scout troops and cub packs in the area, and recruited 1,000 boys.

Since the establishment of these troops and packs and the organization of scout activities, conditions in the second precinct have improved, and the crime rate has been considerably reduced.

As always, scout leaders undertook this project in cooperation with police and other municipal authorities and welfare agencies, and no claim is made that scouting alone accomplished these happy results.

But scout leaders are convinced that the success of the scout program in the area is at once a cause and an evidence of a major contribution to the improvement of the neighborhood conditions.

These are emergeny measures, and certainly constitute working under difficulties.

The ideal situation is more like what we have here in Blair and Bedford Counties where many adults—such as you—have already been through the discipline, learned the skills, and absorbed the ideals of scouting.

Here—instead of an enormous effort to achieve a barely measurable result—you have seized the opportunity and by a sincere effort have achieved enormous good.

What is needed for continued success is a comunity devoted to the Scout ideals—a community in which the children grow up in scouting and in which boys too old to be Boy Scouts join the Explorer Scouts.

There is also the compelling need that those who have gained this experience and earned this prestige continue to use their knowledge and their influence, gained through scouting, for the benefit of younger boys.

This can be done effectively by giving all possible time and effort to the assistance of cub packs and Scout troops in their neighborhoods.

In return, the community as a whole has its obligation to scouting.

We need public and frequent recognition of the glories, as well as of the fun, of scouting.

While the individual scout needs no thanks or recognition for his good deeds—nevertheless, the cub pack or the Scout troop should be given public praise and recognition for its ideals, as well as for each specific contribution it may make to the well-being of the neighborhood.

In this way we shall both encourage the Scouts to live up to the high ideals their organization has placed before them, and by such good examples encourage other boys to take part in their activities and adopt their ideals.

With the aid of such incentives, we shall build scouting and in so doing lead our people onward for God and my country.

I would like to mention another aspect of scouting and that is: The high caliber of you men and women who have dedicated your lives to the Scouting movement for it is through your skills; your deep understanding of a boy's needs; and your inspired leadership that boys are attracted to Scouting.

You volunteers, who now number well over 500,000, are well trained in courses arranged by the national council. However, it is not simply technical ability, it is your patience and your willingness to give so generously of your time and energy that makes invaluable leaders in the Boy Scout movement. Then, too, by the example you set in your personal lives you create enthusiasm for the ideals of Scouting in the young man.

We are fortunate here in the Bedford and Blair council in having men who recognize the vital importance of instilling in our youngsters the ideal of (a) honesty, (b) patriotism, (c) service, and (d) Godliness.

To you leaders I offer my gratitude for the wonderful work you are doing with the youth of our community. I salute you and the Boy Scouts of America on the celebration of the golden jubilee of scouting and extend best wishes for continued success.

The strength of America depends on the strength of the rising generation, and in this connection the Boy Scouts of America are in the forefront of organizations devoted to preparing our youth to meet the challenge of tomorrow with stout hearts and sound principles.

The Range of Soviet Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD some very pertinent and well-nigh prophetic observations made by Prof. John Cobb Cooper on the range of Soviet airpower in his book, "The Right To Fly," which was published back in 1947. Professor Cooper is one of the world's leading authorities on air law.

He points out that the range of Soviet bombers results directly from the size and geographical location of the U.S.S.R. I especially call to the attention of my colleagues the following observations by Professor Cooper:

Added together these air-penetration sectors, with aircraft having a range of 5,000 miles, would include all of Europe, all of Asia including Japan and the Netherlands East Indies, all of North America (except southern Mexico, the Caribbean area, and Central America), all of Africa south to Johannesburg. In other words, such aircraft will reach from the Soviet to all the important land surfaces of the world except Central America, South America, Australia, and a small part of South Africa. Only a small percentage of the world's population is in the area free of Soviet airpower—and this assumes aircraft with a range of only 5,000 miles. If the range is doubled, all of South America, Australia, and New Zealand, is included. From the Soviet Union, aircraft with a range of 10,000 miles can cover the entire land surface of the earth except the South Polar regions—and no one lives there.

The Federal Reserve: A Public System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the March 1959 issue of Economic Trends and Outlook, a publication of the AFL–CIO Economic Policy Committee:

THE FEDERAL RESERVE: A PUBLIC SYSTEM

Last month, the AFL–CIO Executive Council's monetary policy statement recommended that the Federal Reserve become "in fact, a public system, representative of American life."

The Federal Reserve, whose control of U.S. money policy affects everyone, is supposed to be a public service institution, not an exclusive club. An official publication of the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors states, "How is the Federal Reserve System related to production, employment, and the standard of living? The answer is that the Federal Reserve, through its influence on credit and money, affects indirectly every phase of American enterprise and every person in the United States." [1]

Elsewhere the booklet includes this description: "The Federal Reserve System is a service institution to the Nation. The more than 250 directors of the 12 Reserve banks and their 24 branches * * * as well as the Board of Governors * * * are all serving as trustees of the Nation's money." [2]

The AFL–CIO has asked that the selection of these trustees reflect their public responsibility by including representation of the largest economic sectors of this Nation.

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Under present law, guidance of the Federal Reserve System rests with the Board of Governors composed of seven members appointed by the President. "In selecting the members of the Board," states the law, "the President shall have due regard to a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial and commercial interests and geographical divisions of the country." [3]

There is no requirement to avoid dominance of this seven-man Board by a banker-oriented, big-business-oriented group. Nor is there a specific requirement that the President have even a due regard for including representatives of the Nation's largest economic sectors—consumers, labor, and small business.

Yet, this seven-man Board has predominant control of national monetary policy. Its decisions influence economic growth by expanding or contracting credit and money. The Board regulates the operations of each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and selects three of the nine members on each of their boards of directors. Such regulation includes approving the discount rates the Federal Reserve banks may charge their member banks—and thus influences the interest rates charged borrowers throughout America. If discount rates are high, interest rates of borrowers for homes and cars and small-business loans will almost automatically increase.

The Board of Governors also influences the management and cost of th public debt through its automatic membership on the Federal Open Market Committee, a group which makes decisions about Federal Reserve's buying and selling of Government securities.

Board credit policies and its dominant effect on Treasury Department financing can influence production and employment and affect the whole course of the economy. The Board represents the Federal Reserve System to the Congress and Government departments.

Today much of the original act has been amended. But the selection of the Board of Governors, whose powers have been changed over the years, retains the flavor of 1913, when the labor, consumer, and small-business interests in the economy lacked sufficient voice and recognition, when the standard of living of the average American did not include the kind of life considered important for the whole economy in 1959, when a banking act was enacted mostly to provide a flexible currency and alleviate recurring intermittent money panics.

The AFL–CIO contends that the selection of this Board has been such that the Nation's economic growth lies in the hands of a narrow group—dominated by investment and big business interests. Even if they were the most enlightened and public spirited citizens in America, they are human beings, affected by the minority interests of their background and training. It is the AFL–CIO's belief that whether the decisions this group makes are right or wrong, the power vested in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should rest with an agency more representative of the public and include labor, consumer, and small business interests.

DIRECTORS OF RESERVE BANKS

The AFL–CIO has also asked for a change in the provisions for the Boards of Directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. Some basic provisions for the composition of these Boards have not been changed since 1913.

"The directors are responsible for the conduct of the affairs of the Reserve Bank in the public interest, subject to the supervision of the Board of Governors." [4] But to what extent is the public represented? A look at the composition of the Board of Directors of one of the most important Reserve banks, the New York Bank shows that the current law, despite changes over the years, does not in fact avoid domination by an interest group of bankers and big businessmen.

Yet the Board of Governors believes that each Reserve bank "* * * gives effective representation to the views and interest of its particular region, and at the same time helps to administer nationwide banking and credit policies." [4] The AFL–CIO requests amendments that would make this true, by extending representation to consumer, labor and small business interests.

OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

The seven-man Board of Governors and five representatives (bank officers) elected by boards of directors of the Federal Reserve banks make up the Federal Open Market Committee—perhaps the most powerful economic arm of Government.

This Government Committee in effect influences the price of Government securities and their future interest rates. It does this by deciding whether, when and how many U.S. Treasury securities the Federal Reserve System will sell or buy in the open market. Decisions by this small Committee, therefore, affect interest rates, the cost of the public debt, the whole bond market and the financial condition of the U.S. Government.

There is no assurance and little possibility that the Open Market Committee will be dominated by anyone except bankers or big businessmen under present law. Yet these 12 men's decisions affect the money standing of the U.S. Government and its citizens. Public interest requirements for such a group need no elaboration. The Open Market Committee should be made more representative of major economic sectors or be abolished.

Decisions by any agency, however representative, will never be beyond criticism in a democratic society. To assume that AFL–CIO proposals to make the Reserve System more representative of American life is an arrogant demand or that the present System is too exclusive and independent to be questioned is to deny our Nation's democratic structure.

FEDERAL RESERVE POLICIES BEFORE AND AFTER RECESSION

In January 1957, this publication called for "a new look at monetary policy," and criticized Federal Reserve policies:

1. Tight money (higher discount rates which cause higher interest rates) was hampering economic growth by creating further imbalance between investment and consumption. The Board was following a fallacious theory that demand inflation (too much money chasing too few goods) was causing price rises. Tight money, we said, could not halt price rises, but could hurt the economy.

2. The pattern of discount rates chasing U.S. Treasury bill rates created inflation and confusion in the short-term securities market. Instead of a Federal Reserve effort to keep the interest rate on Treasry short-term bills low, so that the discount rate would be low, it followed the backward pattern of letting Treasury rates go where they would by "not interfering too much" and then raising discount rates to meet the new heights of Treasury rates.

3. Through a hands off policy, the Federal Open Market Committee did not support the price of Treasury long-term bonds. As a result, Government long-term bonds were offered in the open market on a free and

[1] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, "The Federal Reserve System, Purposes and Functions," Washington, D.C., 1954, p. 2.

[2] Ibid., p. 198.

[3] The Federal Reserve Act, sec. 10 (U.S.C. title 12, sec. 241).

[4] "The Federal Reserve System," p. 75.

competitive basis. Since buyers knew there would be no Reserve support for such long-term bonds, they held off buying on the supposition that interest might go up and speculated on prices of the bonds. The result: Treasury attempts to move the Federal debt into long-term issues and out of the bank structure were not successful.

Policies unchanged

Two years and a recession later, several Board representatives have shown signs of an initial recognition that these policies have not been successful or appropriate. Nonetheless, almost the same course of action has been followed.

On February 6, 1959, Chairman William McChesney Martin told the Joint Economic Committee, "Despite the rapid recovery in production and sales, unemployment remains disquietingly high. * * * The present availability of capital and manpower resources represents a potential for near-term growth of the economy without inflation."

This seemed to imply some recognition that another hike in the discount rate would harm an economy whose attempt to recover from the recession had not been fast enough to alleviate unemployment.

A month later, on March 4, Governor Szymczak told the Washington Society of Investment Analysts that "* * * reduction in unemployment has lagged behind gains in output" and suggested that unemployment was deterring the Board from raising the discount rate again. (During the recession, the Board had three discount rate cuts, reaching a low of 1¾ percent in the summer of 1959. Before the recovery got underway, however, the Board approved higher rates in late summer and fall up to 2½ percent.)

Higher discount rate

But on March 5, the day after Szymczak's statement, banks in the important money areas of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia upped the discount rate to 3 percent—only one-half percent below its prerecession high in the summer of 1957.

Why? Possible reasons lay in Governor Martin's fear of inflationary timber. Obviously, even the recession had not convinced him that tight money hurt the economy more than it affected price rises.

But even more important were money-market problems. In short-term securities, for the previous 7 months, U.S. Treasury bills had been yielding interest rates higher than discount rates. The game of discount rates catching up to Treasury bill interest rates was still to be pursued. The Board still did not recognize that higher discount rates were no solution. They would just make all interest rates higher and thus cause Treasury short-term offerings to bear higher interest rates in order to be attractive to buyers.

In long-term securities, Governor Szymczak had given the clue in his March 4 speech: "Since mid-1958, the U.S. Treasury has found it increasingly difficult to encourage investors to acquire and hold U.S. Government securities, particularly issues of longer maturity. This fact was highlighted by the recent February Treasury refunding in which more than one-fifth of the publicly held maturing securities were turned in for cash, notwithstanding the fact that interest rates on the new issues offered in exchange were generally accepted as realistic."

In other words, the February Treasury refinancing had flopped. Investors hesitated to buy intermediate or long-term Government bonds, because they thought by holding off they might later get a more attractive interest rate on the bonds.

The investors were probably right. When asked about this refinancing failure in a press conference, President Eisenhower spoke of free enterprise and said, if necessary, the Treasury would have to ask Congress once again to raise the legal limit on interest rates charged on Government bonds. Recognition that the Federal debt is not like a corporation's debt has still not reached the big-business administration. Confusion and inflation in the money market continue.

On March 9, faced with the repeated confusion and failure in money markets, the Treasury and the Reserve Board announced a study of the Government securities market. "In this study, we hope we can learn more about what makes the market work," said a Federal Reserve official. This is an admirable, but curious aim for a group of men whose disinterested knowledge of our money system is, in the eyes of the financial press, so great that the AFL–CIO should never have had the arrogance to question them.

Tris Coffin on Nuclear Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, intelligent and conscientious Tris Coffin reports on our present status with respect to nuclear weapons testing. It is a chilling, fateful story, told by a first-rate reporter. The text of his broadcast last night is included here under a previous consent:

Men are digging a curious kind of catacombs deep in the pebbled plateau of Frenchman's Flats. The sound of blasting echoes across the bleak and harsh landscape of Nevada. The setting, as one fascinated visitor remarked, is "like a scene from hell."

The landscape is a long, sloping desert of blackened pebbles. The scraggling creosote bush grows in extraordinary geometric patterns and defies the barrenness. This plant with its tiny and waxen leaves sucks what moisture is hidden among the stones. The sky is a gray, for this is the rainy season. The temperature is mild, but a sudden drop chills the bones at sunset. The catacombs are being scooped out on the upper edge of the slope, 2,000 feet down in the rock.

The purpose of these strange underground canals and chambers is as chilling to the marrow as the sudden fall of night.

For here, men are patiently, innocently preparing to resume a race of death. The Atomic Energy Commission and Defense Department are determined to test new nuclear weapons here within 2 months. And then the Russians will test theirs, and the race will be on again, and where it will end God only knows. One observer, watching this digging, said, "They're going to blow us all up. Don't they know that?"

A sharp, intense glimpse of the struggle that has been going on inside the administration and Congress for almost 4 years over bomb testing was given late one afternoon last week.

Crowded into a tiny hearing room in an ancient corner of the Capitol were scientists, Senators, an Assistant Secretary of State, reporters and spectators. There was hardly room to breathe, and people stood all along the wall while the afternoon changed to dusk, and then to night.

The shop talk of the reporters, fitted in with the testimony at the hearing, was a fascinating story. It begins actually in 1956 when Adlai Stevenson asked that nuclear tests be stopped. His reason, he said, was humanitarian. Every fresh explosion showered death, crippling disease, and disfigurement from atomic fallout. But the public was unconcerned, even resented bringing this cruel issue into the open.

But 2 years later, in August 1958, President Eisenhower proposed such a ban, and announced we would halt tests for a year. In October, the three nuclear powers met in Geneva to work out the details of a test ban.

Why did we propose a ban on nuclear testing in 1958? The answer came out at this hearing of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY asked, "Why did we choose to end nuclear testing, instead of missile testing? Was it because we were ahead in the production and sophistication of nuclear warheads and behind in the missile race?"

Yes, this was it in large part. Another factor was world opinion. We could score a propaganda victory. But, equally as important, the United States was far ahead of Russia in nuclear warheads, and would like to freeze that gap.

But within the last several months, even weeks there has been a subtle change within the administration. It shows at times a fever of wanting to test again. The President has shown his irritation with the slow progress of the talks in Geneva. He has threatened to test again.

The real reason can be seen only dimly and through a veil of secrecy. Dr. Edward Teller, the inventor of the hydrogen bomb, a man of unusual eloquence, has been talking behind closed doors, and urging new tests. He hints at a revolution in nuclear techniques, one that can miraculously close the missile gap. And what solace it would be to the administration to have that wiped out and silence the cries of the critics.

Our missiles today lack both long-range thrust and dependability. We cannot seem to get them off the ground in long, sustained, successful flights. Much of the weight of the missile is in the warhead. This weight requires a tremendous thrust.

Now, Dr. Teller is talking of the possibility, still a theory, of miniaturizing the hydrogen bomb, that is a bigger boom in a much smaller size. This would mean the size of the warhead could be cut down drastically, and so would the size of the rockets. The thrust power could be reduced to a point where we could handle it with present equipment. And the guidance problem would be easier.

So deep down below Frenchman's Flats, they would play with nuclear explosions—not in the tremendous power needed for an ICBM. A small explosion, say 1 kiloton, could be produced. Data would be gathered and magnified for the more powerful bomb.

A sign that the administration is thinking of weapons, and little else in resuming tests came at the hearing. Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, has been looking for a way to break the United States-Russian deadlock over underground test inspection. He proposed that the nuclear powers join in underground tests and gather data on detection. None of the administration spokesmen at the hearing were really interested.

There was also an inference, nothing more, that the Russians may be conducting hidden underground tests now.

Senator CHURCH asked, "Can we assume that the Russians have not done any underground testing?"

Senator ALBERT GORE, a member of the Joint Atomic Committee, said quickly in his bland Tennessee drawl, "That is not my understanding."

Senator GORE undoubtedly meant well by raising his point. But this is a tantalizing mystery that should not be kept from the world. If the Russians have broken their pledge, let this be charged openly. No, all we hear are inferences. A Senator says, "That is not my understanding." Well, what is his understanding? What are the facts?

The hearing in the small, stuffy room poked into two major objections the United States raised this year on the reliability of a test ban.

There was talk of being able to muffle an underground explosion by a burst deep underground. An Air Force research laboratory said a 70-kiloton explosion could be so muffled. Seventy kilotons is more than 3 times bigger than the Hiroshima bomb which killed 78,150 human beings.

Senator HUMPHREY asked what kind of a hole would be needed. They said you would have to dig down a half mile and clear an area equivalent of two city blocks in salt. It would take 3 to 4 years to dig such a hole and cost around $25 million. Such a huge engineering task could not be undertaken secretly.

Next, we said that our hardtack tests in Nevada in the autumn of 1958 proved that existing systems for detecting underground blasts—separating the earthquakes from the man-made explosions—were inadequate and unreliable. Therefore we demanded more, many more inspections on the sites of suspicious earth movements. The Russians said this was absurd. Everyone became upset. The talks broke down, and we are now building the tunnels in Frenchman's Flats.

At the hearing, the scientists said the techniques of detection were really in a state of flux, and no one knows the answers. The Atomic Energy Commission produces data to show how very, very difficult it is to detect underground shots. Yet the Coast and Geodetic Survey reports new techniques that can increase detection tenfold. And, it is also revealed, that a technique of burying detection instruments underground might well be substituted for inspection teams on the ground. This possibly could meet the Soviet objections. This we did not push at the Geneva talks.

Where do we stand today? A high official of the Atomic Energy Commission has said privately we must begin tests within 2 months. Nineteen Congressmen have introduced a resolution to stop the tests. The Secretary of State is worried over world reaction if we reopen the nuclear race. The President has not made up his mind.

This is Tris Coffin in Washington.

The Mood of British Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the British election last October, the distinguished Washington journalist, Mr. George W. Oakes, drew upon his extensive background of experience in Britain to describe the current mood of British politics. His article, "Why Yesterday's Empire Today Turns Inward," appeared in the October 1959 issue of the magazine, Freedom and Union. What he had to say still has meaning for American policy and public understanding. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article as follows:

WHY YESTERDAY'S EMPIRE TODAY TURNS INWARD

(By George W. Oakes)

Whichever party wins the British election October 8, one can safely predict what foreign policy its government will follow. It will aim at reaching a summit conference and modus vivendi with Moscow, seek by soft words and actions to nip in the bud any danger of atomic war, and try to secure as stable a world situation as possible for the coming years.

This last aim is spurred not only by the fear of war's destructiveness, but by the country's need of time in which to: (a) modernize its economic plant, develop those specialized exports in the electronic, engineering, aviation, automotive, and other industries which do successfully compete in world trade and thus contribute vitally to economic stability; (b) continue to satisfy the domestic demand for consumer goods and raise the standard of living; and (c) thus give the people time to digest the economic changes since the war and absorb them into the social fabric.

LONG-TERM FACTORS AFFECTING FOREIGN POLICY AND ELECTION

Although dread of atomic war has had the most immediate and publicized impact on British policy, other more deepseated factors are involved in the election. To a considerable extent, the current British attitude toward foreign policy has been conditioned by important long-term internal psychological and sociological factors.

The tremendous decline in the British power position especially since World War II is a fundamental fact which Americans, as well as the British themselves, have found extremely difficult to accept and understand. Basically, this has occurred as a result of their losses in two World Wars and the gradual disintegration of what had been a far-flung empire. Yet the fast-moving developments depleting the strength of America's other major allies, plus the subconscious and inherited impression of a powerful Britain as our major partner in the world, have tended to obscure the fact that particularly in the last 15 years Britain has been undergoing a series of economic and financial crises. Too often Americans have failed to appreciate the extent to which these factors, having a vital impact on the internal life of the United Kingdom, has been reflected in her foreign policy.

The results of the huge loss in capital assets during World War II, the need for the U.S. loan and Marshall plan, the devaluation of 1949, the accompanying postwar years of shortages, and rationing all focused public attention in Britain on its domestic problems. In addition, the Labor government of 1945 put forward a program of the welfare state which all governments since—whether Labor or Conservative—have felt it essential to maintain and even extend. This program involved a vast process of internal economic and social change.

Therefore, domestic affairs have, by force of necessity, dominated the interest of Government and the public. Today British economic and financial problems, though at the moment in relatively an improved condition, still face an uncertain future. Full convertibility of the pound is far from realization, and this state of affairs seems likely to continue for somé time to come.

Yet, despite concern over the uncertainties at home and consequently of Britain's ability to speak with authority abroad, the impression prevails that those who determine policy in Britain are constantly straining to keep the country in a prominent role in foreign affairs. They are doing their utmost to maintain the historic reputation of Britain as a great power.

Several factors are responsible for this attitude. First of all, Britain is still run by a ruling class. Although the establishment—as it often called—has absorbed especially since the war outstandingly able men who have risen from the lower middle and working class, its traditional sense of values remains. Those who have come up in the social system have in many cases accepted the general point of view of the upper-class groups who have set the tone for British foreign policy for centuries.

MACMILLAN REPRESENTS TRADITION

This governing class includes top civil servants and foreign office officials, industrial and business leaders, leading figures in the universities and professions, outstanding journalists, et al. Many of these are of an age group brought up during the period before and just after World War I when Britain's place in the world was only beginning to change from its 19th century hegemony. Their thinking is rooted in their educational background—the days of the height of Britain's empire, and power in Europe and throughout the world.

Prime Minister Macmillan represents this tradition perhaps to a greater extent than most of Britain's present political leaders. His generation—those who served in World War I—cannot lightly shed the reputation of Britain's power with which they were indoctrinated in their youth. These products of the "public" schools—Eton, Winchester, Harrow, and the others—reflect an attitude that doesn't change easily. This powerful impact of the private schools (as Americans would call them)—with their stress on inherent British values—is largely responsible for handing down a similar point of view to many younger influential opinion-formers in Britain—the sons of the World War I generation.

To a considerable extent, this urge to try to keep Britain in a leading world position also has a psychological explanation. National pride is a most important characteristic among British people of all classes and particularly those who occupy the upper rungs in molding opinion and forming national policy. These groups, reared in the doctrine of British world power, have found it extremely frustrating to live through a period when their confidence in Britain's stature was being repeatedly challenged by the facts of the post-World War II period.

BRITAIN'S PSYCHOLOGICAL HANGOVER

This sense of injured pride, this sudden realization that conditions which supported Britain's former status had basically altered, has produced an extreme national sensitivity. It has shown up frequently in the postwar years, notably at the time of the Suez adventure. All elements of the population were infuriated that President Nasser could dare insult their country, which had dominated the Mediterranean for generations. "Let's give him a bloody nose," echoed on all sides. Any issue that touches the emotional nerve of national reputation evokes an immediate outcry. "What's the matter with us that we are so sensitive to criticism" is a frequent comment among the more sophisticated. As Britain is a highly integrated national unit, such a feeling runs throughout the entire body politic.

This sensitivity, coupled with confidence born of Britain's success in overcoming continental threats to its independence and existence since the days of William the Conqueror, leads many in the ruling groups to boast of their diplomatic know-how. How often have visitors heard the remark, either directly or by implication, "if you fellows would just leave these negotiations to us, we'll find a way out. We've had generations of experience in dealing with these people—Russians, Chinese, Germans, Arabs, etc. You are newcomers in these matters." There exists a strong urge to show what they can do—partly to compensate for injury to their national pride.

This psychological hangover of Britain's former world position is evident in the rising degree of public interest in the past. Of course, the British people have always been unusually conscious of their history. Yet today one senses a stronger tie toward any reminders of the days when London was the

center of world affairs. At a time when the average citizen is being taxed almost to the limit "from the cradle to the grave" people cheerfully support those visual evidences of Britain's historic glory. One senses that the old customs and ceremonies—the famous military pageant of "trooping of the color," the colorful changing of the guard, the pageantry performed at the opening of Parliament or at the installation of the Knights of the Garter at Windsor—have in some ways gained a greater meaning for the public as a reminder of the historic and glorious past. Though these public displays certainly have a tourist value for foreigners, it is clear from observing the crowds that they primarily appeal to the British themselves.

A similar pride in the past has stimulated thousands of Britons of all classes to visit the many country houses, castles, and estates that, because of the rising cost of maintenance, are now open to the public on a paid admission fee.

This sense of looking backward to some extent compensates for the realization that Britain cannot in fact any longer play the part in world affairs that it did even a generation ago. Despite the efforts of the ruling groups to maintain a front, to foster the impression that Britain still is one of the big three, they, as well as all elements of the population, recognize the facts of the present state of world affairs. They know that power has been polarized to a great extent between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and that Britain cannot take an equal place with these two colossi. Yet the British, conscious of their position only a generation ago, as well as the fact that the Commonwealth and colonial areas still give them the most extensive worldwide interests, cannot see themselves on a level with France.

SHIFT FROM FOREIGN AND CIVIL SERVICE TO BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

The shift in the status of the British oversea possessions from an empire centering in London to a Commonwealth of increasingly independent countries, has had its repercussions on life in the United Kingdom. No longer are there the careers available in the civil and military services abroad as in the days of a large army and navy, and the Indian Civil Service. As these opportunities have shrunk the type of young man who 25 years ago contemplated a lifetime of service in the empire now directs his attention toward a career at home. Even in Africa, one of Britain's last important colonial areas, the rising forces of nationalism will soon eliminate this field for public service work. In fact, increasingly difficult conditions may force many emigrants to return to the United Kingdom.

The urge to reinforce their economic security shows up in the career preferences of university graduates. Since the war there has been a marked shift from public service—the foreign and civil service—to business and industry. Today the outstandingly able graduates of not only Oxford and Cambridge but the provincial universities are being attracted through lucrative salaries by leading corporations.

Oxford undergraduates do not have the interest or enthusiasm for foreign affairs or politics characteristic of them before the war. At that time students vigorously expressed differing views on controversial issues such as the Spanish Civil War. There was a feeling that the troubles of the world could be corrected through political action. Now they are disillusioned and find an outlet for their aspirations in religion, music, art, or drama. The spirit of revolt has almost disappeared and in its place exists an acceptance of things as they are. There still is support for projects fostering international goodwill but the stress is on cultural rather than political means. This state of mind fits into the national desire for a period of tranquility, a search for a way to reduce the continuing threat to existence implicit in a state of constant international tension.

Chatting with Englishmen in a leading London club, whose members are drawn primarily from the academic world, the professions and business, one feels a strong sense of the pervasiveness of domestic problems. After-luncheon conversation seldom centers on foreign affairs.

The appetite for the material advantages of modern industrial society has been so whetted that it must be continually and increasingly satisfied. This is a major goal toward which the average voter—particularly in the lower middle and working class—insists that Government policy be directed. Foreign policy must take this basic, popular demand into account and follow a line that will permit its maximum possible fulfillment. One major reason why the most daring foreign adventure in British postwar policy—the Suez operation—had such widespread support was that the average citizen believed that the hard-won material gains he had achieved since the war were in serious jeopardy through Nasser's threat to Britain's Mideast oil supply. In such a crisis, vigorous action seemed the only solution.

The demand for higher living standards is reflected in popular pressure on the political parties that a larger share of the national budget be spent on housing, health, education, atomic power for industrial use, roads, etc. For some years opinion polls have shown that the public has picked defense expenditures as the area where budget cuts should be made, and so the proportion of funds devoted to defense has been reduced.

Between 1953 and 1958 the gross national product rose £5 billion but defense spending increased only £14 million. On the other hand the national health program received £170 million more in the budget during the same period.

Political leaders in both major parties fully realize that they must be responsive to this powerful public demand to maintain the gains in the standard of living for the mass of the people. Since Britain's economy is so dependent on trade, they recognize that in foreign policy this requires that every effort be made to achieve the maximum possible stability in international relations.

BRITAIN AVERSE TO ANY RISKY POLICY

Public pressure for relaxation of tension is likely to increase if the Labor Party should come to power. There is a strong element of pacifism in the party stemming from its Christian Socialist doctrine. Labor, moreover, would be more responsive to the public's desire for a greater diversion of the national product toward consumption goods.

Britain cannot lightly risk any policy that would tend to provoke international ferment. In terms of Soviet relations, the result is that a modus vivendi must be worked out. All groups in Britain are convinved there is no other practical solution. On the basis of their bitter experience during the last war, they appreciate, to a degree that the American civilian population cannot realize, what war means as it affects the life of the ordinary family. Now with the potential destruction that nuclear war could bring at a moment's notice, their vulnerability to devastation is deeply understood.

The British realize that any such power requires the backing of the United States. Two years ago Aneurin Bevan, in stating that he would not favor the closing of American airbases, explained he took this position because the British need the power of the United States in order to be in a strong negotiating position with the Soviet Union.

British policy has to concentrate on doing its utmost to persuade American opinion that its interests will be equally well served by following the British line. For this reason alone, more attention has been paid in recent years toward seeing to it that influential Britons in industry, the professions, academic and cultural life, and so forth travel more extensively than ever in the United States and exchange views with their opposite numbers in this country. Britain's cultural heritage—as well as current achievements—are important elements in strengthening Britain's status abroad, particularly in the minds of those who shape opinion.

Conversely, the British appreciate that if the Anglo-American relationship is to survive the hazards of Soviet attempts to divide the two, greater understanding of the United States must be encouraged in the United Kingdom. Therefore influential circles have been fostering expanded study of American history, for example, in the schools and universities.

Running counter to these efforts are several deeply held convictions which find an outlet in widely shared anti-American views, more often suppressed than expressed. Many also resent Britain's dependence on the United States.

Perhaps the thing which most infuriates Britons in their relationship with the United States is that it is in position either intentionally or through miscalculaton to plunge them as our ally into nuclear war without their knowledge and before they have had a chance to make their views felt. This fear is so great that Soviet provocations are often disregarded.

Americans must never forget the fact that Britain is determined to avoid any provocation action that might lead to war. As Alfred Duff Cooper, who resigned from the Cabinet during the Munich crisis, wrote in "Old Men Forget": "It is a curious fact that the British, who fight with the most glorious courage and toughest tenacity, have such a horror of war that they will never support a policy which entails the slightest risk of it. Nor have they yet learned that reluctance to take risks is not the way to acquire security."

But when they do see clearly the handwriting on the wall, then, as the whole world witnessed so impressively in 1940 and throughout the last war, they will fight to the end.

The difficulty in the present situation vis-a-vis Russian power is that the Soviet attack is not so far a headon military challenge against which the British would react in keeping with their obligations but an indirect one which encourages the public in the view that in some way an accommodation can be reached.

Birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 12, we observe the anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, an outstanding hero whose belief of liberty and justice for all mankind carried him to two continents to fight for these rights. He played an important part in creating our right to stand in these Chambers and express the will of the people of our great country in deciding our own fate and future.

Our country is made up of people of every conceivable nationality who have united for one purpose—life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness. We, of Polish descent, are proud of Kosciusko for he played an important part in our war of independence. He borrowed money to come to America to offer his services to the struggling Colonies. As a student of engineering and artillery, his choice of battlefields and erection of fortifications contributed greatly to the brilliant victory of our forces at Saratoga. He was among the first of the Continentals to enter Charleston after its evacuation by the British. His success as a leader of men earned him the rank of brigadier general in 1783.

Having served our country brilliantly in gaining our independence, he was not content to relax and enjoy the fruits of victory. This burning desire for freedom of all men carried him back to his native Poland to carry on the fight for freedom there. For more than 20 years he continued his valiant but unsuccessful efforts for the independence of Poland. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

His name will live forever and will remain a symbol for the oppressed people of Poland today. It is fitting that today, Americans of all rank and creed solemnly observe the anniversary of his birth and do homage to his memory.

TVA: The Unlearned Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, no other Government agency has been the target of so much invective as has the Tennessee Valley Authority. The interests who continue to publish their self-serving propaganda not only refuse to recognize TVA's substantial accomplishments but resort to representations which have inadequate relation to fact.

In spite of the living testimonial of the TVA system in terms of industrial growth, flood control, national defense, and agricultural development; unreasoned accusations continue to be made. Unfortunately, these accusations, in addition to being inaccurate, are retarding the development of our country's natural resources.

If the United States is to continue to pace Soviet efforts in the field of power development, action must be taken to harness to its ultimate, our Nation's power potential. The Passamaquoddy tidal project on the Maine-Canadian border is only one of the many projects throughout our Nation that must be undertaken without further delay. The development of Quoddy-Rankin Rapids would bring to New England the same benefits that have accrued to the Southeastern States through the development of TVA.

I would like to include an article entitled "TVA: The Unlearned Lesson," which appeared in the August 1, 1959, edition of the Nation. Mr. Lloyd Armour, in his objective study of TVA, clearly outlines its many positive contributions to our Nation's progress. All Americans should know of the results achieved through this creation of American initiative, and demand further similar investment in our Nation's natural resources.

The article follows:

TVA: THE UNLEARNED LESSON
(By Lloyd Armour)

Twenty-six years separate the historic legislation creating the Tennessee Valley Authority from the latest important TVA measure; a new method of financing the continuing work of the agency. In that time, a new generation has grown up without knowing what it was like in the days before TVA. And an older generation has had time to forget.

This is a fitting time, then for a new look at the reality of a dream, at an experiment that has become a $2 billion going concern. How does it justify its costs to its owners, the people of the United States? What has it done for the people of the Tennessee Valley? Is it "creeping socialism," as some have claimed, or is it "democracy on the march," as others describe it? Does the valley use the agency as a lure to uproot industry elsewhere? Does TVA steal pennies from the pockets of taxpayers elsewhere to subsidize cheap power? Does it build steam plants as an excuse for continuing its work, now that the task of developing a river is all but complete?

These are some of the questions raised by a continuing barrage of criticism, against TVA. For the answers, it is necessary first to go back, briefly, beyond the TVA era to some farsighted statesmen such as Theodore Roosevelt. Gifford Pinchot and Senator George Norris. These were men who pondered long about ways of conserving and developing the Nation's resources. From their thinking, and that of others, emerged the concept of total development of river valleys. In the depression years, a small band of men in Congress began a long fight for such an experiment in the Tennessee Valley.

From almost any standpoint, the choice was an excellent one. The South as a whole was underdeveloped, and it was labeled by some as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem; and in the South, no region presented a greater problem than did that valley washed by the deceptively passive Tennessee River. For each spring, this sleeping tiger awoke and became a roaring, rampaging flood. Residents fled in terror to the high ground as the water swept away crops, homes, and land. Millions upon millions of tons of topsoil vanished in hours. Businesses were wiped out, and with them sources of taxation.

The region depended upon a one-crop economy. "Balance" in agriculture was a phrase of the professors. There was little industry and much poverty. Malaria, tuberculosis and malnutrition left their marks upon the people and the burial places.

But the sickness that sapped the region most was one for which no doctor could prescribe. It was the sickness of fear. There was fear of the river, fear of the land that produced less and less. There was fear of the future. And in the beginning there was fear of TVA.

But the building of dams meant jobs and a flow of money. As the mighty dams took shape, hope rose. There was a new look about the land. Ears began to listen to what the experts of the fledgling TVA had to say. Eyes began to see help, as in mosquito control. There were specialists looking at the land, testing it and finding the need for fertilizers of a particular type. Since the type wasn't being produced, TVA began to make it.

Quickly, the valley learned something about the TVA: It would help, but there had to be cooperation. Soon the valley farmers, guided by their extension services and county agents, began to apply lime and phosphates to jaded land in the first of many, many thousands of farm-test demonstrations. They began to learn about soil needs, about contour plowing, about the importance of trees as windbreaks and erosion curbs. In a few seasons, the barren, soil-scalped hillsides were green, the valleys below them lush.

As research and production details were worked out and TVA-born fertilizers developed fully, the agency turned over its data and its processes to private industry—free of charge. In addition, industry got another gift—a readymade market. Since research, introduction and promotion of any new fertilizer is costly, the industry moved slowly. But here TVA was doing the whole job with its research, demonstration plots, fertilizer schools and educational programs for the farmer.

Today, the farmer in Wyoming or New York, as well as in Tennessee, benefits by the TVA fertilizer program (which is paid for by appropriations from Congress). Minnesota farmers saved almost $750,000 from 1949 to 1954 by using TVA-developed and promoted "4–16–16" and "5–20–20" fertilizers.

It may be noted here that a chemical paradox—the fact that nitrogen is both a lifegiving plant food and an ingredient of powerful explosives—makes it possible to turn the TVA fertilizer development center from peacetime to wartime use in a day.

As TVA was helping to promote a new and more productive farm economy, it was also having an effect on commerce and navigation. The series of high dams which canalize the Tennessee created a long, deep waterway over which freight traffic moved in increasing tonnage. Tows hauled automobiles from the industrial north to the Alabama plains, saving more than $10 a car. Ferroalloys moved from Muscle Shoals, Ala., to Pittsburgh $5 a ton cheaper.

What does this mean to shippers? On 12.1 million tons of traffic in 1958, they saved more than $24 million. Deducting the annual cost of the waterway—$4.2 million—there was a net transportation benefit of $19.8 million. This is a 14.5 percent return on the $136 million net investment in a navigation system which contributes to interregional commerce and strentghens the whole Nation.

It is axiomatic that navigation development and industrial growth go hand in hand. Since 1933, private industry has invested nearly a billion dollars in more than 130 terminals and plants along the river. All in all, more than 3,000 new industries have come to the TVA region.

This growth has prompted many critics of the agency to raise cries of "industry piracy" on the part of the valley. But the vast majority of new plants represent branches and subsidiary operations of industry which still have their headquarters elsewhere. In a recent survey by TVA, it was found that during a 19-year period only 25 plants pulled up roots elsewhere and relocated in the TVA area. During this time, nine much larger plants left the region. The 25 incoming plants represented 3,800 jobs; the 9 outgoing, 2,000; net gain for the valley, 1,800 jobs.

The truth is that while industrialization in the valley has been rapid, it has lagged behind the Nation as a whole, and the cry of industrial piracy is absurd.

Originally, cheap electric power was considered among the less important objectives of TVA. It was viewed merely as a byproduct of river control that would allow for increased rural electrification and encourage a moderate expansion of industry. But with

the coming of World War II, the picture changed. A secret installation known as Oak Ridge needed power in enormous quantities. Opportunities for increasing hydropower were limited; new dams might justify their costs in power terms, but not, at the time, in other ways. Besides, a hugh dam is not an overnight project. In 1940, TVA turned to a much quicker method of adding to generating capacity: the steam plant. First to be built was the Watts Bar plant, with a capacity of 240,000 kilowatts.

After World War II, and with the beginning of the Korean conflict, it became increasingly clear that more sources of quick power were needed. Not only were farms, homes, and factories demanding more current, but entirely new energy-devouring installations were entering the area: atomic-energy plants, the Arnold Engineering Development Center, and the Redstone Arsenal, where the Army was building missiles.

By fiscal 1958, the atomic-energy plants and other Federal defense agencies in the area were using 51 percent of all TVA power—more than 29 billion kilowatt-hours. This is more power than was sold last year in any of the States outside the valley except four.

So TVA became a defense weapon. But it had an extra meaning for taxpayers in that it provided very large savings on the Government's electric bill. Perhaps this will show how much:

From 1959 to 1958, TVA delivered 129.8 billion kilowatt-hours of power to Oak Ridge and Paducah, Ky., atomic facilities. This cost the Government $590 million. If there had been a one-mill per kilowatt-hour increase in this cost, the bill would have been $130 million more—about the cost of the U.S. share of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Now compare the average cost of producing and marketing electric power by TVA with that of privately owned utilities. Last year, the operating cost for TVA was 5.21 mills per kilowatt-hour; the corresponding cost of privately owned utilities was about 10.09 mills. At that rate, the Government's $590 million electric bill would have been almost doubled.

But, say the private utilities, TVA doesn't pay taxes. It's a subsidized operation. True, TVA doesn't pay taxes in name, but it makes payments to State and local governments in lieu of taxes. In 1958, these payments (from TVA and is distributors) totaled $13,751,000. Excluding Federal agencies, about 6.3 percent of the electric bill of all TVA consumers was paid to State and local governments. Corresponding taxes of private utilities in neighboring areas ranged from 5.1 percent to 11.8 percent.

In addition, the law requires TVA to repay to the Treasury, from its power revenues, the entire investment in each power facility within 40 years. To date, payments of $250 million put the agency well ahead of schedule. The payments exceed the entire Federal investment in the first 13 dams TVA built.

There are other money savings involved. Millions of electricity users in other parts of the Nation are paying lower electric bills because of TVA's rate policies—the so-called yardstick of power. Electric rates, according to Federal Power Commission data, are lowest in the TVA and Bonneville areas, and grow progressively higher as the distance from these public-power facilities increases. Before TVA, rates in a semicircle through parts of Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Michigan, and New York were $10.08 for each 250 kilowatt-hours. In 1958, rates for the same area averaged $7.10.

The power companies nearest the Tennessee Valley have made the greatest reductions in retail rates. Nevertheless, their earnings have increased at a rate substantially greater than the average of all the large utilities in the Nation. From 1937 to 1957, according to published Federal Power Commission figures earnings available to the common stockholders of the larger privately owned utilities multiplied 3¼ times; similar earnings of companies bordering the TVA increased 8 times.

So much for power. To many people, a more important objective of TVA is flood control. The valley is now protected by 10 major multiple-purpose dams providing 6 million acre-feet of storage for flood waters.

Were there no TVA dams, a flood stage of 57.9 feet in the Tennessee River today would cause $100 million in damage to lowlying Chatanooga. The total estimated annual average value of flood regulation by the reservoir system is $11 million. Over 26 years, this annual sum more than equals the annual cost and total investment combined of the system's flood control facilities.

TVA's extensive experience in mapping, advising and aiding in engineering studies of flood control is being put to work in many sections of the country. One of the agency's special interests now is the tributary watershed program—away from the rivers, back among the creeks and branches where flooding is also destructive, though less so than on the rivers. This program seeks to establish ways by which, under State leadership, communities can organize themselves, study their problems and apply solutions through their own agencies and their own resources.

Critics charge that the citizens of the valley are the helpless victims of an autocratic project. How well have these helpless victims done with the help of the TVA? In 1933, only 3.4 percent of the total Federal income tax collections came from the seven States of the TVA region. By 1958, the percentage had more than doubled. From 1933–56, total collections amounted to $21,900 million. If we assume a rate of gain based on the 1933 percentage, TVA has meant an extra $10 billion in Federal tax revenues—almost five times the entire cost of the project.

At the same time, the valley has become a vast market for goods produced outside. From 1934 to 1958, TVA alone purchased $1.1 billion worth of outside goods. Users of TVA power spent $1.8 billion for electrical appliances. Still another billion has been spent on automobiles, boats, motors, and other products.

These figures should not lead anyone to envision the valley as more prosperous than any other section of the Nation. It is far from that. It lags the national averages in almost all economic measurements. Twenty-five years ago the per capita income was only 45 percent of the national average; despite a sizable gain, it is only 63 percent today.

There is a great deal yet unaccomplished. The balance between agriculture and industry is short on the industry side. Too great a portion of the region's youth leaves each year because there are not enough jobs. Farms are too small and too many. An estimated 2.7 million acres need to be reforested.

The demand for electricity is growing at a rate of 800,000 kilowatts a year. People are just naturally using more power—the air conditioner, for example, is a big sales item where it once was a rarity. Business expansion, new industry, demand more—and the valley must have these if it is to continue to progress.

So TVA must have new funds merely to keep abreast of demand. That is why its supporters have fought for a self-financing measure (a method, incidentally, first suggested by the Eisenhower administration). TVA will be lucky if the $750 million made available by the latest TVA legislation can adequately provide for needed facilities in the valley. The pattern of progress has been set, and there can be no slackening off without harm to the region.

The great irony of TVA is that its value is given more recognition abroad than in the United States. It is the one great American project that draws a steady stream of potentates, students, engineers, and politicians from every corner of the globe. It is the one great idea we have exported with success. Eight foreign countries now have big projects based on TVA—countries ranging from India to tiny Lebanon.

Efforts have been made to establish TVA-type authorities in the valleys of other American rivers: the Missouri, Rio Grande, Colorado. A new Columbia Valley Authority bill—the Neuberger bill—is before Congress. None of these efforts has thus far succeeded.

The TVA was an experiment at a time of national economic distress when the public was receptive to daring innovations. The electric utility interests, natural enemies of such an enterprise, were themselves in trouble. These interests, reviving, have since fought the spread of the TVA idea with a rising fear. While keeping TVA under carping attack, they have sown widely and nurtured well a confusion that restrains the people of other sections from emulating a valley program that is, nevertheless, the outstanding example of a people's ability to make the most of a natural environment.

February 12: Birthday of Lincoln and Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to join in paying tribute on February 12 to two outstanding figures in American history. There is an interesting significance in the fact that on this particular day we honor one of America's greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, on the 151st anniversary of his birthday, and, at the same time, honor Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, hero of the American Revolution, on the 214th anniversary of his birthday.

The significance lies in the fact that even though each of these heroes lived in an entirely different era, they had the same unyielding respect for the dignity of man and the value of human freedom.

Every American knows the inspiring history of Abraham Lincoln and how he virtually gave his life in the great struggle for equality of man. His brave decision to end slavery in America has been a symbol to people who respect freedom throughout the world.

It is perhaps ironic that the glorious contributions of General Kosciuszko to American history have, unfortunately, been obscured by time and have not found as great a recognition in this country as they should. General Kosciuszko was born February 12, 1746, at Siechnowicze, Poland. He was a brilliant son of a prominent but impoverished family. After briefly attending college, young Kosciuszko entered the Polish Corps of Cadets and completed his military training with the rank of captain. The King of Poland, impressed with Kosciuszko's natural ability for engineering, sent him to France to pursue further studies.

Kosciuszko returned to Poland 7 years later, in 1774.

He demonstrated his deep dedication to freedom when, realizing that there was little opportunity for his engineering talents in his native land after the first partition of Poland, this young soldier decided to come to America, determined to help our Nation in its struggle for independence. He arrived in this country in 1776 at his own expense and volunteered his services to General Washington. On October 18, 1776, he was commissioned by an act of Congress as an engineer in the Continental Service with the rank of colonel.

Kosciuszko's unique engineering ability gained recognition in 1777, when he joined the northern army and participated in the campaign against Burgoyne. Perhaps his greatest contribution was in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign, but France's recognition of her independence.

In the course of the running battle for American independence, Kosciuszko was selected to build the fortifications at West Point. We can all take pride in the fact that it was his suggestion that the Nation build a national military school at the spot which he first helped develop as West Point.

Perhaps one aspect of Kosciuszko's deep dedication and respect for human dignity which places his own beliefs in close parallel with those of President Lincoln, is demonstrated by his concern for the American Negro. Kosciuszko first recognized the plight of the American Negro when, at the request of General Gates, General Washington transferred the Polish hero to the South. Kosciuszko was stationed in Virginia and, while awaiting further orders, he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with Negro slavery. It was this experience, coupled with Kosciuszko's deep resentment against every form of human suffering, that developed in him a profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

By 1784 Kosciuszko had written a brilliant record of bravery in the American Revolution, when a wave of patriotic ardor swept over Poland after the second partition of that nation in 1792. Convinced that his efforts in America were no longer needed, the Polish hero of the American Revolution returned to his native land. Upon his arrival in Poland, General Kosciuszko immediately proceeded to Krakow, where he summoned the people to arms and proclaimed new decrees in favor of the Polish peasants. He attacked the Russians at Raclawice. Infuriated, Catherine of Russia sent a large army to fight Kosciuszko and his poorly equipped army in the south of Poland. The battle can best be described as devastating. The two forces met, and after suffering heavy wounds himself, Kosciuszko was taken prisoner. With him fell the independence of Poland. Kosciuszko was taken to Peterburg as a prisoner, and only after Catherine's death, her successor, Paul I, liberated the Polish hero.

In December 1796, Kosciuszko returned to America, arriving in Philadelphia. His great contribution to American independence had not been forgotten, and he was warmly received by Thomas Jefferson. By this time, grants of American land and American money awarded to Kosciuszko by a grateful Congress were very considerable, and these he turned over to Jefferson, with the stipulation that the gifts be used to establish a Negro school and to buy and free Negro slaves.

Thus, in 1826, the legacy went to found the Negro school at Newark, the first educational institution for Negroes in the United States and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

Kosciuszko returned to Europe in 1798 and began negotiating with the French Government for her help in restoration of Polish independence. In 1806, Napoleon summoned Kosciuszko to assume leadership of the Poles, who were in revolt. Kosciuszko had little faith in the promises of the emperor, and believing the offer to be a trap, he remained in Paris.

Kosciuszko died on October 15, 1817, in Switzerland, and to the very end his courage and determination for a free Poland served as a symbol to his countrymen.

From the tribute which we pay to these two great heroes on February 12, modern Americans can learn a great lesson. As we engage in the great debate over civil rights in America today, it is wise to reflect what great sacrifices have been made by our forefathers to restore men—all men—to their proper place of dignity and freedom. We should also learn that there can be no lasting peace so long as people are subjugated, whether it is in the United States, or in Poland, or any other corner of the world.

Both Lincoln and Kosciuszko have carved for us a great challenge; but it is we, as Americans, who today must dedicate ourselves to the fulfillment of those principles for which both these inspiring heroes fought and died.

Our recognition of respect, equality, and dignity for all Americans by passage of appropriate legislation can indeed be an inspiration to people throughout the world that the principles of Lincoln and Kosciuszko have not been forgotten. Perhaps through our forthright action in the field of civil rights in this country, we can look with greater confidence for the restoration of total freedom from Communist oppression in Poland and the other captive nations throughout the world.

Additional Federal Judges for Eastern District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has long been known among members of the bar in our area, that additional Federal judges were needed for the eastern district of New York, and in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Hearings were held recently before the House Judiciary Committee on legislation for the creation of these new judgeships, and I fully support this legislation.

A fellow member of the Brooklyn Bar Association, Robert A. Morse, chairman of its committee on Federal legislation, presented the bar association's views to the Judiciary Committee. I am sure what he had to say to the committee will be of interest to my colleagues in the House. I concur with his logic before the Judiciary Committee and join with him in urging the passage of the necessary legislation.

His statement was as follows:

I should like to extend my appreciation, and that of the Brooklyn Bar Association, for this opportunity to set forth our views in support of the bill which provides for two new Federal judges in the eastern district of New York, and two new judges in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Unfortunately, your communication did not reach me until February 1, 1960. Consequently, there has not been sufficient time to collect all the data which might be desired for presentation on February 3, 1960, before your committee. However, this matter is so important that I have been designated by the president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, Lynn G. Goodnough, to present our views to your committee concerning the essential elements underlining the problem concerning the Federal court in Brooklyn. We would appreciate the privilege to submit such additional data as we may see fit within the near future.

I am addressing this report not only in my capacity as chairman of the committee on Federal legislation, but as one who served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the eastern district of New York for approximately 2½ years, and as one who served as law clerk to the Honorable Walter Bruchhausen, presently the chief judge of the court. It is with this experience in mind that I desire to present to this committee the compelling reasons for passage of H.R. 6159.

The eastern district of New York comprises the counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau, Suffolk, and Richmond, the last of which is known as Staten Island. In 1930 the population of this area was 4,288,984. At that time the district had five judges and a sixth judge was added in 1936. Today, some 25 years later, the population has grown to 6,764,000, a growth of approximately 2,476,000. During that time the jurisdiction of the Federal court was immeasurably increased by changes in the national labor law. In addition, the waiver by the Government of its sovereign immunity brought forth a great number of tort actions against the Government. During this time litigation concerning such subjects as taxation, immigration, maritime causes and criminal actions was greatly increased.

The population explosion was accompanied by a litigation explosion the nature of which has been such that the court has been, for all purposes, severely hampered.

During the entire 25 years, when our system of society was undergoing vast changes calling for extensive litigation, the judge power of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York has remained in status quo. The eastern district of New York has undergone a phenomenal growth of those factors which bring about litigation. An example of this is the fact that although a high proportion of incoming sea passenger traffic goes through the Southern District

of New York an extremely high percentage of the freight discharged by cargo ships passes through Brooklyn, which is Kings County. This fact, coupled with the tremendous increase of new dock facilities in Brooklyn, has brought about a tremendous increase of litigation arising out of injuries to longshoremen and harbor workers, which injuries are covered by Federal law. The growth of industry in Nassau and Queens, as well as within other counties in the eastern district, has brought forth extensive Federal litigation. Much of this litigation requires trials of an extensive nature all of which increase the workload of the court. As pointed out by Judge Bruchhausen in his letter dated February 2, 1960, a copy of which is appended hereto, one of the judges in the eastern district recently presided in a criminal trial which consumed 7 weeks of trial time and a number of other long cases await trial. Judge Bruchhausen emphasizes the fact that he has been unable to obtain help from judges in other districts since they, themselves, have problems within their own jurisdictions.

A quotation from Judge Bruchhausen's letter adequately points up the problem. He says: "While the adoption of modern procedures has been helpful, they are of minor value and not a substitute for judge power."

Although statistics are of great value it is only by practicing within the eastern district that one may be fully impressed with the great injustices that result from inadequate judge power. All too often I have witnessed, with saddened heart, the tragic capitulation of plaintiffs who have been forced to accept inadequate settlements because of the inability of plaintiffs to receive an early trial. On the other hand I have also seen, during so-called crash calendar programs, defendants pay on cases which have absolutely no merit when faced with settlement conferences before the court. It would be a tragic affair if the Federal court, long the barrier and bulwark of individual freedom and liberty, were to become an insurance adjustment house as has occurred in so many of our State courts.

With respect to the so-called crash program wherein visiting judges assist with calendar clearance within the eastern district, as referred to on page 1 of Judge Bruchhausen's letter, it might be readily seen that no sooner have the judges departed for their respective jurisdictions when the backlog of new cases brings the court right back to where it was before. Artificial crash programs which strain the court, overload the office of the U.S. attorney in order to bring about an improvement in the numerical statistics of the court, are not a substitute for a just result which grows either out of a fair trial, or as a result of a settlement against a background where either the plaintiff or defendant could get a trial within such a time so as to render any settlement a sensible one.

With respect to the time element between the filing of the note of issue and the actual date of trial, litigants are required to wait approximately 2½ years before trial. As the result of the recent temporary crash programs, this has been reduced to 2 years. However, the backlog is once again increasing at a rate even faster than prior to the calendar clearance by 16 visiting judges.

With respect to the addition of two circuit judges for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, it is well known that the court of appeals for New York, Connecticut, and Vermont is a court of tremendous responsibility covering types of litigation both unusual and difficult. The addition of two new circuit judges will do much to assist that court in rendering earlier decisions and prevent its distinguished members from becoming overworked. In addition, it is patently apparent that the nature of the appellate matters which reach the court of appeals require extended and mature consideration. These judges, above all, should have sufficient time, and a reasonable workload, to continue their distinguished service.

As stated herein earlier, the Brooklyn Bar Association desires to have the privilege of submitting whatever additional material it deems pertinent within the near future. On behalf of the bar assocation I heartily recommend and, indeed, plead for the passage of H.R. 6159 in order that the citizens of the eastern district of New York shall have the adequate protection of the Federal court as guaranteed by the Constitution.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS,
New York, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

ROBERT A. MORSE, Esq.,
Attorney at Law,
Brooklyn Bar Association,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You called me this morning to inform me that you are to be in Washington tomorrow, representing the Brooklyn Bar Association, to present, on behalf of your association, the well-known position of the bar here that the Federal courts in this area are grossly undermanned, a fact we judges know only too well.

Needless to say, we of the judiciary are appreciative of the awareness that the members of the bar have with respect to our courts, and particularly appreciative of the action taken by your bar association.

An opportunity is to be given us of the judiciary to make presentation of our needs in our accustomed way by personal appearances of designated judges. However, we are very grateful that a bar association, particularly one as well known and as keenly observant as your Brooklyn Bar Association, is, on its own initiative, also presenting a statement.

Thank you very much for informing me of your trip.

Believe me, with greatest respect,

Sincerely yours,

STERRY R. WATERMAN,
Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

U.S. COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

ROBERT A. MORSE, Esq.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am informed that in your capacity as chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the Brooklyn Bar Association, you have requested information, supporting the need for two additional judges in this court.

Inasmuch as I appeared before the House Judiciary Committee, headed by Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, some 3 years ago, I thought it appropriate that I write him directly. I enclose a copy of the letter, which you may use as you see fit.

Sincerely,

WALTER BRUCHTAUSEN,
Chief Judge.

U.S. COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Judiciary Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In recent weeks representatives of bar associations and other organizations have requested details of the caseload of this court and related information, principally for use in connection with the so-called omnibus judges bill, now under consideration by your Committee on the Judiciary. Annexed is a schedule of some of the statistics. While I do not underestimate their importance, I believe you should have before you all of the relevant facts.

I am conscious that the Congress expects the judges of this court to exert every effort to reduce the caseload. Early last year we embarked upon a carefully planned pre-trial and trial program, headed by Chief Judge William F. Smith, of New Jersey, with the assistance of 16 other visiting judges, each of whom participated, 3 weeks more or less, supplementing the services of the regular judges of this court. As a temporary solution of our problem, the undertaking was successful in that we disposed of some 1,600 cases. During the period about 1,100 new cases were filed with the result that we cut the backlog by about 500 cases. However, the prospect of further reducing the caseload and the time for bringing a case for trial is dim for several reasons. The number of cases filed in 1959 materially increased over the number filed in 1958. Another factor, not adequately reflected in the statistics is the protracted cases, both civil and criminal. One of our judges recently presided in a criminal action which consumed 7 weeks of trial. A number of other long cases await trial. During the past few months I have contacted judges in other districts, and requested them to help us out. Because of similar problems in their jurisdictions, I have met with no success.

While the adoption of modern procedures has been helpful, they are of minor value and not a substitute for judge power. The addition of a calendar commissioner to our supporting personnel has enabled us to so constitute our trial parts of the court as to avoid wastage of court time.

Yesterday Judge Byers retired from active service. While he plans to take some cases, there is an indication that he will not contribute the same amount of time as in the past. This situation aggrevates our problem. Within the past few years, several of the judges of this court retired. The time elapsed in replacing them has been an additional impediment in the dispatch of the business of the court.

The enlargement of the jurisdiction of Federal district courts has and will undoubtedly increase the court's business. For example, it is estimated that the recent amendments to the National Labor Relations Act will double the number of cases in that field.

As you know, there has been no increase in the number of judges in this court in 25 years.

I respectfully plead for approval of the bill, adding two judges to this court.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

WALTER BRUCHAUSEN,
Chief Judge.

Schedule of statistics of pending civil actions—Docket and trial calendar comparison: Dec. 31, 1958, Dec. 31, 1959

	Dec. 31, 1958	Dec. 31, 1959
Causes on dockets, including those noticed for trial	2,319	1,816
Causes, noticed for trial	1,027	284
Causes filed, during year	1,141	1,269

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
U.S. ATTORNEY,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,
Brooklyn, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

Re need for additional judges in the eastern district of New York.

ROBERT A. MORSE, Esq.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You have asked my opinion as to the need of this office for additional judges in this court. There is no question in my opinion but that this court needs at least two additional judges. There has been a steady increase in the volume of Government work in this district over the past 7 years. The court has been able to do its work only by bringing in visiting judges.

The bringing into this district of 17 different judges who sat here for a total of 100

judge-weeks last year in the so-called crash program was perhaps the most dramatic proof of the need for judges in this district, and proof of what can be accomplished if an adequate number of judges is available.

But even these judges, although they disposed of 914 civil cases, were not able to handle the long cases. The cases that looked as if they would take a long time for trial were largely deferred on the trial calendar so that a volume of dispositions could be achieved. The result is that there is now pending on the civil calendars of this court a disproportionately large number of cases which will take 2 weeks or more to try.

The Government has on the civil side approximately 60 cases where notes of issue and a statement of readiness has been filed. The Government is now ready for trial in all these cases. The lack of a judge available to try these cases, however, indicates that it will be well over a year before they can all be disposed of. As you know, the small number of judges available allows for only one judge each month to sit in nonjury and admiralty cases. This judge divides his term between admiralty and civil nonjury. The result is that any long case ties him up completely, and at best we can expect a judge available 1 week per month to try our civil nonjury cases.

Similarly, on the criminal side this office has been deferring the long criminal cases in order to dispose of the volume of current smaller cases which otherwise would have been held up, but even on the criminal side this office has been making use of additional judges over and above the one who is regularly assigned to the criminal part. During the months of October and November, Judge Rayfiel was tied up during the entire period with the trial of a single criminal case, *United States* v. *Gillilan, et al.* And during January 1960, Judge Abruzzo was tied up for almost a whole month with the trial of *United States* v. *Freeman*, an important narcotics case, with the result that the smaller cases have had to wait.

We have an additional nine criminal cases pending where we anticipate that the trial will take anywhere from 2 to 8 weeks, and these cases by and large are our most important cases from the point of view of the enforcement of the criminal law. The long cases have to be tried at some time, and during the calendar year 1959 while we had 41 trials as against 56 in the previous year, those 41 took longer to try than the entire 56 in the previous year, thus in the year 1959 we had 211 criminal trial days against 200 for more cases in the previous year.

I have requested the chief judge of the district court to assign additional judges for the trial of criminal cases during the spring of 1960, and to asign a judge to sit and try criminal cases during the summer in order that we may bring our docket of over 100 pending criminal cases more current. The number of criminal prosecutions started increased (over 10 percent) in 1955 to 466 as against 416 in 1958.

I enclose a copy of the annual report of this office for the fiscal year 1959 showing the volume increase in the work of the office.

Sincerely yours,

CORNELIUS W. WICKERSHAM,
U.S. Attorney.

Cases commenced in eastern district of New York

Fiscal year ending June 30	Civil, United States	Criminal	Total, United States	Private civil	Bankruptcy	Total, non-United States	Total cases
1952	490	252	742	677	731	1,408	2,150
1953	510	250	760	741	698	1,439	2,199
1954	496	371	867	684	819	1,503	2,370
1955	+655	427	1,082	729	805	1,534	2,616
1956	494	509	1,003	601	825	1,516	2,519
1957	519	500	1,019	788	822	1,610	2,629
1958	502	421	923	737	886	1,623	2,546
1959	653	425	1,078	601	832	1,433	2,511

Median interval from filing to disposition of civil cases in which trial held: 1952, 25.4 months; 1956, 41 months; 1958, 49.9 months.

Source: All statistics are taken from the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S Courts.

CONCLUSION

The most important development of the current year in judicial administration has been the crash program to dispose of civil cases in this district. Under the very able leadership of Judge William Smith, who headed a team that provided five additional judges to handle civil cases in this district during the months of May and June, and part of the month of April, great strides were taken in bringing the civil calendar in this district up to date. Although the number of additional trials was not great, the ability of the court to provide a prompt trial induced many parties to settle on the basis of their realistic and reasonable value, and in some cases even to dismiss suits. As it turned out, we could have used even more judges, as the number of cases in which the Government was ready for trial exceeded those which could be tried even with the five additional judges.

As the Government is a party to more than half of the cases on the civil nonjury calendar, it is vitally interested in the condition of the court calendar, and cooperated with the visiting judges and with the judges of this court in all attempts to bring the calendar into the current position.

Another innovation was the institution of a central jury pool with a jury and calendar clerk, and the handling of the civil calendar by a single judge. Though these innovations made possible a better handling of the civil calendar at a substantial saving to the Government in jury fees, there seems some question as to whether funds to continue it are available.

The institution of a calendar clerk who will keep in touch with the attorneys so that they may be advised in advance as to when they can expect their cases will be called for trial, is a necessary part of any modern court system, particularly in New York City. A large proportion of the cases, both civil and criminal, are handled by a few lawyers who have a busy practice in the many courts scattered throughout the metropolitan area. Such attorneys must schedule their time, and cannot afford to wait substantial periods of time in readiness to be called. A calendar clerk, with authority to advance cases which are actually ready for trial over cases ahead of them on the calendar which are not ready, can keep the calendar moving, and can make sure that there is a case actually ready for trial at all times. This also has been demonstrated in the recent crash program. These improvements should be continued.

During the past year, the number of criminal cases pending more than 2 years has been sharply reduced. The number of actual trials and the utilization of court days for criminal cases has increased to a new high for recent years. Despite this improvement in the court's criminal docket, there are pending more cases than can be tried by the regular criminal judge during the coming year. Additional judges from outside the district to try the pending criminal cases and those which can be expected to arise during the coming year, are a necessity. If such outside judges are not available, it will be necessary for the court to reassign some of the existing judges of the court from civil cases to the handling of criminal cases, which will have an unfortunate effect on the civil calendar, which at so much effort and expense has been brought up to a more current position by the crash program.

It would be erroneous to conclude this report without a word about the excellent work done by the assistant U.S. attorneys and the secretarial and clerical staff of this office, who deserve the praise of the Department for the fine results achieved by this office. Unfortunately for the Department, in the last half of the fiscal year, many experienced assistants resigned. If the work of the office continues to increase, and particularly if other experienced assistants resign, it will be necessary to increase the staff of the office.

Even with improved calendar procedure and handling of the docket, the existing number of six judges cannot be expected to handle the volume of cases that flow into this district. If any demonstration was needed of the need for additional judges in this district to dispose of the large and growing amount of litigation that exists in this community, the crash program and the effective work that the additional judges did provides it. Few realize that if the eastern district of New York were a separate State, it would be the eighth largest in the country. With but one judge to a million inhabitants, this district has far less Federal judges than other comparable districts. The Judicial Conference has recommended two more judges. This is the minimum needed.

Respectfully submitted.

CORNELIUS W. WICKERSHAM, Jr.,
U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of New York.

Fuera Trujillo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Dictator Trujillo has put himself into the position of being helped on his inevitable way out—and there are many and powerful people and groups willing to lend a hand. Moral indignation has been aroused by his latest atrocities and has been expressed recently by priests in his own country and now by the O.A.S. at the instigation of Venezuela, only recently emerged herself from the bloody dictatorship of Perez Jimenez.

Under a previous consent, I include herewith an editorial from the New York times of today, which truly concludes:

It seems safe to say that the hemispheric organization has driven Generalissimo Trujillo a few more steps toward the abyss in which all dictatorships end.

The editorial follows:

GENERAL TRUJILLO ON TRIAL

The Dominican Republic has been tried by its peers and condemned. In effect, this is

what happened on Monday when the Council of the Organization of American States met and yesterday when the 11-nation General Committee discussed the Dominican situation.

The initiative came from Venezuela, which had suffered 10 years of brutal and corrupt dictatorship under Pérez Jiménez and knows what tyranny means. The case presented by Venezuelan Ambassador Falcón-Briceño, which included a reading of the remarkable pastoral letter of the Roman Catholic bishops, was effective. In reality, not much of what is happening is known in detail, but what is known is damning.

The church leaders spoke of "a grave offense against God" and they prayed that none of the members of Generalissimo Trujillo's family "shall ever experience, during his lifetime, the sufferings that today afflict the hearts of so many Dominican fathers of families, of so many children, so many mothers, and so many spouses." Ambassador Falcón-Briceño accused the Dominican Government of "patent and flagrant violations of human rights," and on this all the hemispheric countries were agreed.

The O.A.S. is without powers to take sanctions in cases like this, but one should not underestimate the force of a moral condemnation. An investigation by the O.A.S. Peace Commission, which Secretary Herter suggested as a possibility, could produce results because the Dominican "benefactor" is sensitive to criticism. It seems safe to say that the hemispheric organization has driven Generalissimo Trujillo a few more steps toward the abyss in which all dictatorships end.

Kosciuszko: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, every year we pay tribute to the life and works of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the Polish nobleman and American revolutionary hero. It is fitting that we do so, for were it not for the services of men with such distinguished qualities in leadership as Kosciuszko, we would have been hard pressed in our war for independence.

The career of Kosciuszko can be instructive for Americans today. The ideas that motivated this great leader were twofold: Love of freedom and an appreciation for the role of power in winning and maintaining freedom once it has been won. In Kosciuszko one finds a classic example of the excellent combination of idealism and realism that assures the greatest political effectiveness.

Kosciuszko proclaimed his devotion to the abstract principle of liberty and democracy. He was inspired by the theories of Locke and Rousseau, theories that provided the ideological basis for the American and French revolutions. To this extent Kosciuszko was among the greatest of idealists.

But Kosciuszko's devotion to democracy was not a passive one, not at all an attitude of detached emotionalism. Kosciuszko wedded his idealism to reality. He had the inner compulsion to translate theory into practical action. This explains his enormous contribution to the American revolutionary effort.

Yet there is another aspect of Kosciuszko's activism and realism. It was his ability to see the unequivocally clear and unambiguous relationship between the need for power and strength if freedom is to be won and maintained. In brief, Kosciuszko would argue that a patriot may have an abstract notion of liberty, but to achieve this liberty he must fight, and to maintain his liberty, he must be strong.

We Americans could well apply Kosciuszko's concepts in our conduct of foreign relations today. It is well for a nation to proclaim to the world the virtues of democracy. It is also a heartwarming experience to feel the inner emotional upsurge that comes with an outward appeal to the highest idealistic instincts of man. But it would be disastrous were we as a people to fail to support our idealism with a hard calculated apraisal of the role of power and strength in international politics. We as a people must be strong. We must maintain our strength and power, today more than ever before as we face the Soviet challenge. We dare not commit ourselves to a life of luxury and repose, for here lay the seeds of national decline.

As we pay tribute to Kosciuszko, let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the principles of idealism which he proclaimed, but let us also rededicate ourselves to the realistic principle of strength and power and national resolve as Kosciuszko had done in his fight for American liberty and the freedom of his native Poland.

Clemson Tigers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is proud of Clemson College.

Clemson is in a beautiful setting at the foothills of the Blue Ridge, on the old estate of John C. Calhoun and his son-in-law, Thomas G. Clemson. It is my honor to represent Clemson in this Congress.

The story of football at Clemson is a fabulous one. It is a "rags to riches" story without parallel among the major grid powers of America. It is a story of drama, suspense, and success. It is a saga of champions. Its Horatio Alger aspects would inspire the youth of the United States. The General Assembly of South Carolina adopted the following concurrent resolution which is a tribute to Coach Frank Howard, his staff, and the fantastic Clemson Tigers—three times Atlantic Coast Conference champions in 4 years:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE APPRECIATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO CLEMSON COLLEGE FOR ITS DEFEAT OF TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY IN THE BLUEBONNET BOWL IN HOUSTON, TEX., ON DECEMBER 19, 1959, AND FOR ITS OUTSTANDING FOOTBALL RECORD OF PAST YEARS

Whereas the people of South Carolina learned of the defeat of trichampion Texas Christian University by the one-sided score of 23 to 7 in the Bluebonnet Bowl at Houston, Tex., on December 19, 1959, with great joy, as the Clemson team was considered by sportswriters as the underdog; and

Whereas the Clemson football team became Atlantic Coast Conference champions for the second consecutive year and for the third time in the past 4 years; and

Whereas this victory gave the Clemson team nine wins and two losses for the season which was the best record made by the team since 1950, when a record of nine victories and one tie was recorded; and

Whereas the game in Houston was witnessed by 55,000 spectators and several million viewers on television as the game was carried on a national network and listened to by other millions as the game was broadcast over radio by a private concern; and

Whereas the Clemson team has appeared in a total of seven bowl games, six of which have been in the past 12 years, and in all of which Clemson has been rated as the underdog, with the astounding record of having triumphed in four of the seven games; and

Whereas the victory over Texas Christian University was the 115th victory for veteran Coach Frank Howard, who has guided the Clemson team on such a victorious course of 20 years as head coach and in addition has served 9 years as line coach; and

Whereas six of the players on the 1959 Clemson team were selected on at least one all-conference team, and five made the all-State selection, and one member gained the great distinction of being named to several all-American teams; and

Whereas the glamour of the 1959 Clemson team has attracted many spectators and wherein the Tigers played before 4 sellout crowds during the season, with an average of 32,925 persons per game; and

Whereas one player led the Atlantic Coast Conference in scoring 70 points and was 10th in the Nation; 1 player was 1st in the conference and 7th in the Nation on kickoff returns; and the entire Clemson team was 26th in the Nation on total offense, 6th in the Nation on scoring, 11th on total defense, 6th on rushing defense, and 8th in the entire Nation on kickoff returns, and was ranked by both the AP and UPI 11th among all major teams in the country; and

Whereas the fine football teams of Clemson College by participating in 7 past season bowl games have brought much favorable publicity to the institution and to the great State of South Carolina; and

Whereas this outstanding record in a large measure resulted from scholarship aid through the Clemson athletic program through IPTAY whose thousands of members over a period of 26 years have provided educational opportunities for more than 900 student athletes; and

Whereas the Clemson athletic department has consistently enjoyed most cordial relationships with the press, radio, and television, and whose members have given generously of both time and space in recognizing these accomplishments; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that it is very fitting on behalf of all the people of South Carolina to express deep appreciation to the president of Clemson College, and particularly to Coach Frank Howard and his staff and to the entire team on its display of skill and good sportsmanship in establish-

ing this outstanding record of which the people are justly proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the general assembly on behalf of the people of South Carolina hereby expresses its deep appreciation to the president of Clemson College, to Coach Frank Howard and his staff, and to the entire team for the defeat of trichampion Texas Christian University in the Bluebonnet Bowl in Houston, Tex., on December 19, 1959, and for its outstanding record on the gridiron during the year 1959 and past years.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent that a statement he has prepared relative to the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

During this week the Boy Scouts of America are celebrating their 50th anniversary. It has been 50 years this week since the Boy Scouts of America were chartered by Congress. In that period several million young boys have received the spiritual and outdoor training of this splendid organization, to the benefit of themselves and the Nation. Today there are Boy Scouts in practically every country of the free world, who are dedicated to the principles of tolerance, good will, and friendliness.

The Scouts themselves are proud of their organization; of its happy, wholesome program of activities; and its contributions to the making of a finer America.

I was reminded of this when Eagle Scout Tom Richards of Tayhouse Troop 19 in Rochester, N.Y., visited me in my Senate office recently. He had been chosen as the Boy Scout representative from New York State to participate in a special ceremony at the White House. Eagle Scout Richards is a fine boy indeed, and representative of the millions of self-reliant young boys who have learned courtesy and the principles of good citizenship from those dedicated men who serve so selflessly as scoutmasters.

The Boy Scouts have lived up to their objective: "Onward for God and Country." In doing so, they have gained the gratitude of the Nation, and I tender the heartiest of congratulations to Boy Scouts everywhere on this significant anniversary.

America's Critical Challenge Evaluated by Hon. Carl Vinson, National Defense's Foremost Exponent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last night to attend, along with yourself and other Members of Congress, the annual dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, here in Washington.

These assemblies of veterans are always most pleasing and inspiring. But, this 1960 dinner was the most outstanding of any that I have attended because of the alert to the critical challenge to our physical survival which was sounded. Certainly, no group of American citizens is any more conscious of this urgent and emergent challenge than the veterans of the several armed conflicts in which America has been involved.

It was entirely appropriate and timely, therefore, that our able and distinguished colleague, Hon. CARL VINSON should be the principal speaker. There is no citizen of this Nation, in my opinion, who has had the close relationship with our defense problems, over these many years of our military emergencies, as has this great chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee. The people of America know him and continue to have implicit confidence in his ability, his integrity, his knowledge and his judgment regarding the overwhelming problems of adequate defense for this Nation not only in the emergencies of the past, but as well as in the greatest of all emergencies, this one of the present and the near future.

Therefore, his statement of last night commands the attention of all thinking men and women of America; and, in fact, of the entire free world. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that any objective analysis of the principal points which he made as to our military deficiencies will support, in detail, the conclusion that we are, and will continue to be, unless we snap ourselves out of our current complacency, in a most vulnerable position of defense.

It is unfortunate that this running argument concerning our defense posture comes during a political year. It is also, unfortunate and even partakes of the vicious that those of us, who criticize constructively what we consider to be the deficiencies in our Military Establishment, are being labeled as partisan politicians, by those with whom we are in disagreement. Certainly, if we did not try to alert our people, to the inadequacies as we understand them to exist, we would be derelict in our responsibilities, and, in a sense, even un-American.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include in these remarks a letter of constructive criticism recently sent by me to Secretary of the Army Brucker, which speaks for itself:

JANUARY 30, 1960.

Hon. WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary, Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a citizen, as the father of an officer in the Regular Army, and as a Member of Congress with official responsibilities, I am deeply disturbed because of what seems to me to be a dangerous downgrading of the Army, both through insufficient funding for modernized combat equipment, as well as through inadequate funding for the manpower which our worldwide commitments require, even for limited wars.

The recently published book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," written by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor (Retired) persuades me, further, that the Army has been, and is being, critically crippled in its effectiveness to do the job upon which it may be, and probably will be, called upon to do.

Your public statements which indicate a posture of the Army's readiness to meet any challenge, requiring quick response do not reassure me. For example, in December, in an issue of the Christian Science Monitor, you were quoted to the effect that the STRAC units of the Army are equipped, trained, and ready to go, presumably to any spot in the world, when, as and if called upon. Yet, there is no information available to me which points toward immediate availability of air transport for the necessary lift to get there. Then again if such a demand should be made for emergent action by STRAC units during the May-August training period for Reserve and National Guard units, when STRAC personnel and equipment are committed to such training programs, dangerous delay in getting to the area of action, even if the airlift were available and ready to go, could result in failure of the mission.

It has, also, been called to my attention that vehicles for mobility are sadly lacking. Certainly, motor vehicles which have had over 100,000 miles of usage and which, because of budgetary limitations, are being patched up at a repair cost of $200 or more per vehicle, do not suggest combat readiness. No businessman would conduct his own business on this penny-wise, pound-foolish basis.

General Taylor calls for a modernized, relatively small, but well-protected balanced retaliatory force as his concept of a U.S. Army ready for limited wars or incidents in any area of the world.

In this connection, is there any present indication that the Army is to get, in the reasonably near future, the volume of procurement in planes, tanks, guns, rifles, and other combat equipment on a modernized basis which is so obviously and urgently required to do the kind of a combat job, envisioned by General Taylor and other dedicated, experienced, and able Army officers?

Certainly, the $137 millions of dollars of the $300 million appropriated for modernization of the Army in the 1960 budget, which I enthusiastically supported, and which is now, according to my understanding, impounded by the Bureau of the Budget does nothing for the reassurance of those of us who question the present combat readiness of an Army, composed of enlisted men and officers who personally and collectively are ready to go, but who are, in too many instances, inadequately equipped to do the combat job which will be expected of them.

I know that you will agree with me that any overstress of budgetary requirements at the expense of modernized arms and equipment to carry out the missions of the Army in this nuclear age, is ill-advised, to say the least, in the kind of a world in which we live today. You, apparently, do not agree that budgetary limitations have been overstressed and have become the prevailing guideline of our defense expenditures at the

expense of effective readiness so far as the Army is concerned.

If you can find the time to advise me if I am unfair in this evaluation of the present combat posture of the Army, I shall appreciate and value your contribution most highly. It will be especially encouraging for me to learn that these impounded appropriated funds will become available in the near future for a greater volume of modernized weapons and equipment for the Army.

Thanking you for your courtesies of the past and any pertinent information in order that I may reassure my constituents, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a military expert, but I respect the judgment of those with whom I have discussed this issue of our military preparedness. It is my firm conviction that we are not prepared for any eventuality and that we are even losing ground because of our complacency and our obsession that dollars are more important than the threat to our physical survival.

I respect, as does every American citizen, the President of the United States, who is the commander in chief of our military forces. He has had a lifetime of military service and a most distinguished career. But, I do not agree with him that all is well and that we can leave these terribly hard decisions to his judgment, alone, regardless of our evaluation of conditions as we may individually, or collectively as a majority of the Congress, see them. Others in this great country of ours feel, similarly, as witness this comment of Chalmers M. Roberts, a respected and competent news analyst and columnist, in a recent issue of the Washington Post:

A BLEAK FORECAST OF STORMS AHEAD

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In the midst of the agony of France and the confusion of Cuba it is dangerous to take one's eyes off the main show. The East-West summit conference opens 16 weeks from Monday in Paris, assuming that De Gaulle will survive his great moment of testing.

Already there are signs, new signs, of the troubles ahead.

Whether or not Nikita Khrushchev intends to alter the game of peaceful coexistence he has been playing these past months is impossible to say. Whether or not he does will be important not only to international relations but also to the presidential campaign here at home.

The candidates on both sides are nervous, naturally enough, lest some Khrushchev move put one or another of them in a bad light for having been too receptive or too hostile to the Soviet peace offensive.

What has recently been occurring—in Washington, in Geneva, in Berlin, and in Moscow—at a mimimum demonstrate that Khrushchev is preparing for some hard bargaining. This much, of course, is not unexpected. No one in his right mind on the Western side could expect anything else.

In Washington the Russians have refused to settle the lend-lease account without deriving some form of dollar credits at the same time. In Geneva they have argued long and bargained hard on the nuclear test ban. In Berlin—in Communist East Berlin, that is—the Communist puppets of East Germany have begun a new pressure campaign against West Germany. In Moscow Khrushchev has been talking tougher publicly and rattling his missiles privately to American Ambassador Thompson.

But Khrushchev still talks of the "Spirit of Camp David." His recent speech to the Supreme Soviet condemned American efforts to negotiate from strength, as President Eisenhower put it Wednesday night, while making it clear he, Khrushchev, intends to do just that at the summit.

Berlin remains the focus of the East-West problem. The great question is whether Khrushchev will agree at the summit and later when he talks with the President this June in Moscow to let the present situation continue, whatever the formula, or whether he will force a change.

In the 14 months since Khrushchev first raised the Berlin issue nothing has altered the basic facts: West Berlin is still a thinly defended free world island in the Communist sea. Khrushchev has postponed his threat to sign a separate peace treaty with his East German puppets but the threat remains and he constantly repeats it.

Against this backdrop of troubles ahead the Eisenhower administration is living out its final months in a defensive fashion. Under attack both politically and nonpolitically for its military preparedness posture, the administration has bogged down in a semantic argument over what is a missile gap or a deterrent gap. All the Cabinet members save Secretary of State Herter are sent to the political rostrums to defend the record in one way or another.

At the State Department there is no sign of new thinking or of imaginative measures to cope with the coming diplomatic negotiations. The Berlin argument will begin where it left off at last summer's Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers.

The Coolidge report on disarmament has disappointed many inside the administration. Some effort is being made, it appears, to pump some new short-term ideas into the arms control field beyond the limited and mostly long-term proposals by Coolidge and his staff. But even here there is as yet no indication of any success.

On every hand one hears the remark that the next President will face the flock of chickens come home to roost, in both military and diplomatic terms. Some of the candidates themselves are saying this out loud; the others all seem to acknowledge it implicitly.

A gloss is being applied by the President's trips, the recent one to three continents, the next one to South America, the following one to the Soviet Union and Japan. All indeed have a value. But they cannot cover up the underlying situation to which only the word "deteriorating" can be applied.

We can, Mr. Speaker, meet the challege of these times. But we cannot, and will not, do the job which so obviously must be done unless and until we evaluate basic military and economic needs in terms of those needs rather than in restrictive dollar terms which inhibit us on the basis that we cannot afford to take the steps necessary to meet these needs. Our approach necessarily must be that we cannot afford this continuing failure of ours to meet the challenging needs of this, the last half of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, leaders in the Soviet Kremlin are moving relentlessly, step by step, toward their objective. We must not think for one minute that their pressures will not increase. This is already clearly evidenced. We must act, and act fast, to meet these pressures.

The words of dedicated responsibility of CARL VINSON, whom Veterans of Foreign Wars have honored with the VFW Citizenship Gold Medal award and citation, have been of the utmost significance to the future survival of America.

We must heed them, Mr. Speaker, and act upon them now.

Tribute to Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we celebrate not only the birth of one of our greatest Presidents but also the birthday of another hero, who, like Lincoln, dedicated his life to the principles of human dignity and freedom.

This man was Tadeusz Kosciuszko, hero of the American Revolution. He was one of a host of foreigners who helped our Founding Fathers in their fight for independence. Our country owes a great debt of gratitude to these gallant fighters, who zealously devoted themselves to the cause of liberty.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was born into a poor family in Siechnowicze, Poland. He was a gifted and brilliant person, who succeeded in obtaining not only the best military education which Poland could then offer, but also obtained his degree from the famous Mezzieres military school in France, where he specialized in artillery and engineering.

Then in 1776, on hearing of the War of Independence, Kosciuszko borrowed money for passage and sailed for America. He offered his services to Washington and was subsequently commissioned a colonel in the Continental Army. His engineering abilities were recognized and one of his first tasks was to draw up the plans for the fortifications to be built on the Delaware River. He subsequently participated in many battles, and established a brilliant record for bravery, ability and courage. In recognition of his outstanding services Congress made him a brigadier general in 1783.

Having completed a brilliant contribution to the cause of liberty here in America, Kosciuszko then turned to the needs of his native land, which was in the throes of an incipient rebellion against the Russian occupation. General Kosciuszko immediately proceeded to Krakow, there to take up once again the battle for liberty. His attack on the Russians brought devastating reprisal, and the fight for Polish independence was lost as Kosciuszko's army was defeated. The general was sent to Russia as a prisoner.

Upon his release, in 1796, Kosciuszko returned to America. His great contribution had not been forgotten, and he was given numerous awards and gifts by a grateful Congress. An interesting sidelight to Kosciuszko's career is that he asked that these gifts be used to alleviate the lot of the Negro. Subsequently, in 1826, his legacy was used to set up a Negro school in Newark—the first school for Negroes in the United States.

We owe a great debt to General Kosciuszko not only for his valiant contribution to the War of Independence, but for his lifelong dedication to the cause of dignity and freedom. Freedom-loving peoples everywhere take inspiration from his example. His sacrifice moves all of us to rededicate our own lives to the end that one day people everywhere will be free, and no man required to suffer oppression or slavery.

Address by Deputy Secretary of Defense James H. Douglas at "Dinner With Ike" Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. James H. Douglas, Deputy Secretary of Defense, at the "dinner with Ike" banquet in Wichita, Kans., on January 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DINNER WITH IKE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES H. DOUGLAS, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, WICHITA, KANS., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1960

I am greatly honored to join such a distinguished group of fellow Republicans for the "dinner with Ike." We are proud to salute our President and express anew our gratitude for his leadership in peace, as in the past we saluted his victorious leadership of our forces in war. And I know you must be proud to claim him as a Kansan.

I am happy to be in Wichita. Having served the Air Force for more than 10 years, including my service during the war, I take special pride in your aircraft industry and also in McConnell Air Force Base. My last visit here was to witness the roll-out of the first Boeing B–52 built in Wichita. Since that day the production of these advanced long-range bombers has contributed greatly to our military power, and they will play an important part in our strategic forces for years to come. Cessna and Beech are also important defense producers.

Kansas is strongly represented in the Congress by Senator SCHOEPPEL, Senator CARLSON, and your own Congressmen, ED REES, WINT SMITH, and BILL AVERY. They have given strong support to the President, and you may well be proud of them. In the Defense Department those of us who work with the Appropriations Committee miss Errett Scrivner as a senior member of that committee, but we're glad to have him in the Pentagon.

We live in a difficult and dangerous time—a time of revolutionary change. We cross oceans or continents in a few hours. Nuclear power is available to serve man or destroy him. With rocket vehicles we have begun the exploration of space.

Communism governs in Russia, Siberia, China, and parts of Eastern Europe. While the tide appears checked, communism still seeks and confidently expects to dominate the world. This it can never do so long as the free world remains united and resolute.

We Americans continue to enjoy the personal freedoms that our forefathers won. As a Nation we are prosperous beyond past experience. And when I say this I am well aware of serious agricultural and economic problems such as some of you have here at present. Western Europe has recovered, and our Far Eastern allies are growing stronger.

In fact the entire free world is far stronger today than most of us had genuine reason to expect 10 years ago, or even 5 years ago. When President Eisenhower was nominated in 1952, he stated our aim a determination "to build a sure foundation for prosperity for all here at home, and for a just and sure peace in the world." In building for sound prosperity, the President's faith in the dynamic power of a free economy has strengthened the faith of the rest of us. He eliminated many restrictive controls, and he fought, as he fights today, to maintain an honest dollar to avoid increasing the mortgage on the prospects of future generations. Today the prospect of a balanced budget for the current year, and of possible debt reduction of $4 billion in 1961 is good assurance for sound prosperity. One doesn't advocate a balanced budget only because it will be popular. A balanced budget involves more taxes than are comfortable, and less spending than some would like. But in fighting for a balanced budget, the President fights to protect the purchasing power of our earnings, and to avoid further increase in the cost of living. And, finally, our savings which stand for our capacity to renew and increase the national productive plant. We must remember spending and debt can be as real a threat to our liberties as being unprepared to meet aggression.

As to building for a just and sure peace, we have built and maintained military strength that is an effective power for peace. We have provided effective military and economic aid to our friends among the free world nations to the point that today their ground forces of some 5 million men, air forces of nearly 30,000 aircraft, and naval forces of 2,500 combat ships offer a major deterrent to any aggression against them, as well as us.

We have strongly supported the United Nations and the strengthening of international law to solve the disputes that are sources of tension and can produce conflict. The President has patiently encouraged negotiations looking to a reduction of armaments, but only with adequate safeguards. He has promoted a people-to-people program to break down the barriers of distance and custom and language, and to bring better international communication and understanding. He has undertaken a new diplomacy of travel and meetings with the chiefs of state, which was initiated by Vice President NIXON'S trip to South America and to the Soviet Union. President Eisenhower visited England, France, and Germany, and received Mr. Khrushchev in our national capital. More recently he visited 11 capitals in Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and North Africa. When he left on this great mission he stated our basic aim as "peace and friendship in freedom." And he said:

"* * * I hope to make this truth clear—that, on all this earth, not anywhere does our Nation seek territory, selfish gain, or unfair advantage for itself. I hope all can understand that, beyond her shores at home, America aspires only to promote human happiness, just achieved. * * *

"Actually, as our founding document proclaims, the core of our Nation is belief in a Creator who has endowed all men with inalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In that belief is our country's true hallmark. * * *

"So believing, we look on our Nation's great wealth as more than a hard-earned resource to be used only for our own material gain. We believe that it should also serve the common good, abroad as well as at home."

This was the meaning of the message he delivered to kings, premiers, presidents, and to millions of common people.

A few days ago I saw a color newsreel of the President's trip. I wish every American could see it, as it communicates much better than words an understanding of our President's effort, vitality, and confidence in this new crusade, and an appreciation of the tremendous welcome he received everywhere. This new diplomacy has not settled international problems, but it has surely strengthened the bonds of friendship in the free world. It has given millions of people confidence in the purposes of the American people. It has created a better atmosphere for exploring at the conference table every avenue, looking to a settlement of problems that threaten peace.

We are pleased that Mr. Khrushchev gives assurance of peaceful intentions, but the peace he favors is very different from our aim of peace and friendship in freedom.

We are pleased at his announcement of a reduction in Armed Forces, but he told his listeners that there would be no reduction in military power. Make no mistake that until agreements with adequate safeguards are reached, military power continues as our best assurance of peace, and in the event of war, our only assurance of survival.

Communism seeks to control the minds of men. It operates in every sphere of human effort—economic, political, psychological, and military. And the challenge of its competition leaves no room for complacency. We cannot afford to rely on our past accomplishments or our lead over the Soviets in material comforts and enjoyments—30 million homes, 50 million automobiles, and 50 million television sets. These are important—they testify to an enormous and versatile productivity—but they do not of themselves assure the victory of freedom, or even the survival of our American way.

Let us renew our dedication to the principles that have made our country great. We must understand that our material prosperity is basically the product of individual freedom and a free market; that individual freedom can be retained only under a government of law as opposed to one of men, and we must make clear to the world that our primary concern is freedom and dignity for the individual—for every man and woman. In the meantime, while the struggle continues, we must stay militarily strong.

Our strategy is one of deterrence. Today the combat readiness of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, together with the forces of our allies, should make clear that aggression against us or any ally cannot profit the aggressor. This deterrent power must stay strong.

To deter attack against us we must have long-range striking power that can survive surprise attack and perform its mission of retaliation. We look first to the manned bombers of the Strategic Air Command for this power, but long-range missiles are entering our inventory and emphasis has begun to shift from manned systems to missiles.

To prevent and contain local wars, we look particularly to our carrier task forces, to our Marines and Army forces already deployed, or to be moved by air; and to our tactical air forces. We have long since stopped thinking in terms of our national defense alone; we think rather in terms of the total defense capabilities of the free world. And so our strategy of deterrence places special importance on the integrity of our alliances and our continued strengthened of the forces of our allies.

The introduction of ballistic missiles has had an extraordinary impact on our strategy and all our planning. Today our long-range striking power and that of the Soviet Union

still depends on manned bomber aircraft. In our long-range bombers we are far stronger than the Soviet Union, but there is the ballistic missile to consider.

Our Strategic Air Command has received its first operational Atlas missiles at Vandenberg. We believe that the Soviet Union also has a small number of operational intercontinental ballistic missiles. I have read published statements to the effect that the Russians have many intercontinental ballistic missiles today. Our best information, and no subject is more intensely studied day after day, is that this is not so.

During the next 3 years, however, our present estimates are that the Soviets will produce more long-range missiles than the number of Atlas and Titans we plan to produce in that period. On the basis of all present indications, however, the advantage they might attain in numbers of ICBM's would fall far short of providing rational support for a decision to attack. This conclusion results from most careful study. It relies on our overall retaliatory power—manned bombers with air-to-surface missiles, on missile submarines, on other forces besides long-range missiles, on a high state of readiness, improved warning, and on vigilance in reacting to changes in the Soviet posture. It is basic to our defense policy.

In short, because of the versatility and strength of our overall retaliatory capability, the numerical advantage that the Soviet Union may attain in long-range missiles, which is likely to be greatest in 1962—will not produce a gap in our deterrent power.

Concern naturally exists as to the Soviet's more powerful rocket propulsion systems. This gives the Soviets an advantage, which will not soon be overcome, in space exploration, and in putting up large satellites. We need not be surprised if the Soviets carry out new spectacular projects ahead of us. We believe that the large size of the Russian rocket is explained by the fact that it was planned and undertaken before they had achieved a nuclear explosion, and when it appeared that military missiles would have to carry very large warheads. Our Atlas program was undertaken, and the missile designed, after the solution of the thermonuclear problem was assured and we could count on much lighter warheads. As to size Atlas and Titan meet our military requirements.

A strong factor in determining the number of missiles in our Atlas and Titan programs has been our confidence in the development of land-based and submarine-based solid-propellent missiles, which are smaller, easier to handle, and offer more advantage as to concealment and mobility. Atlas and Titan have an advantage in range and payload, but we look to solid propellents to provide our second generation of military missiles.

The Saturn rocket vehicle, with several times the thrust of Atlas, is now being developed by the National Space Agency for the exploration, scientific investigation, and peaceful uses of space. These activities are the responsibility of NASA. Saturn will be available for military use when needed. The Defense Department is not interested in space flight and exploration as ends in themselves, but it will use space when the defense mission can be better performed in space. I expect effective cooperation between NASA and the Defense Department—such cooperation as we have had and have today on such projects as the X–15, which made its fourth successful flight last week, and Dynasoar. These are advanced manned vehicles which will give us knowledge of the problems of flight from speeds of a mile a second to 3 miles a second.

The Defense Department is proud of the accomplishments in our missile programs. Atlas and our intermediate-range missiles, Thor and Jupiter, are effective weapons of extraordinary accuracy. The development of Atlas into a satisfactory production missile was accomplished in 5 years, much less time than was estimated to be necessary by the scientific group that first asserted its feasibility in 1954. The 5-year development period was certainly shorter than that required for the Soviet ICBM.

Thor missiles deployed to England last year created the first force of ballistic missiles among our allies, and Jupiter missiles are scheduled for Italy.

The first production for the solid-propellent Minuteman has been authorized. Two Polaris submarines with their complement of ballistic missiles should be in operation by the end of this year. Seven more are under construction and procurement of another 6 are in a planning stage for a total of 15. Progress in this system is good.

In his budget message to the Congress earlier this month the President stated:

"Strategy and tactics of the U.S. military forces are now undergoing one of the greatest transitions in history. The change of emphasis from conventional-type to missile-type warfare must be made with care, mindful that the one type of warfare cannot be safely neglected in favor of the other. Our military forces must be capable of contending successfully with any contingency which may be forced upon us, from limited emergencies to all-out nuclear general war."

The budget and the defense programs upon which it is based are aimed to provide such forces.

I wish I could discuss with you the effort in planning. In research, in training, in production and supply, that gives us ready forces today, and assures us of a defense posture of strength for tomorrow. And I wish you could see and know more of the people who are the heart of our armed services. But here in Wichita you have a good sample of service personnel and know first hand of their character and competence.

Several years ago we had serious difficulty in retaining our military personnel—in attracting them to military careers. We are doing the job much better today, but you can all help in making military careers more rewarding—and so strengthen our national defense. I suggest you can give our service people something beyond better pay, and housing, and the things that good service management can provide. You can give them—in the communities in which they serve—the satisfaction of knowing that they have the respect and gratitude of their fellow citizens—and that they are recognized as the shield of our national life, behind which we can all work for a lasting peace in freedom.

Grain Storage in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a copy of a speech made by the very able executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, at the annual meeting of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association at Des Moines, Iowa, recently.

Mr. Hendrickson deals in a very factual way, with a very difficult facet of our farm problem—that of Government grain storage costs. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the speech will make 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $216. I ask unanimous consent, however, that notwithstanding the cost it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN STORAGE IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks by Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, Washington, D.C., before the annual meeting of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, January 27, 1960)

On January 12 and 14, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, conducted public hearings on grain storage costs. One professor and three elevator managers out of some 11,000 in the Nation testified.

Congress has clearly the right to investigate. Its investigations are often useful. This is especially so when they employ systematic presentation, display an earnest endeavor to present the whole picture fairly, and a sincere effort to give bias a holiday.

In this effort to supply perspective on the complex grain storage problem we are not concerned with the examination, or even the existence, of political motivations.

CCC STOCKS

At the present time, and for some years past, the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and has owned large quantities of grains, fibers, and other farm commodities acquired under price supports. The inventory figure changes every day.

The Government also owns many other things—for example, a strategic stockpile of metals, rubber, duck feathers, and other items of approximately the same magnitude of value. This occasions limited interest. It is not dealt with here. Few have shown the slightest interest in the cost of transporting and storing its contents. So far as we know, this information is not classified, but we may be in error.

The CCC stocks of grain consist mainly of wheat and corn. If war came tomorrow, they would rise in price and any surplus vanish in short order. These commodities are basic to the national food supply of cereals and livestock and livestock products.

These and other grains are perishable organisms. In years of study under powerful microscopes at the Peoria, Ill., regional laboratory of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, only one sterile kernel of wheat was found, none of corn, oats, barley, rye, or grain sorghum. Each kernel has a small host of microorganisms and each undergoes constant, subtle change, sometimes slow, sometimes rapid, which justifies the classification "perishable." Some warehousemen learn this the hard way.

A LONGSTANDING ISSUE

An issue of public policy has centered about grains for 30 years, which is not settled or in prospect of early settlement. It was a red-hot issue when I came to Washington in 1932; it is still an unsettled, lively issue. Other things change, but this issue goes on and on and on.

The level of price supports for these grains continues currently to be the central issue—the subject of periodic political debate, especially in election years. It is a matter of great importance to many farmers and their families. It is a matter, too, of importance to the public interested in a secure food supply. It is of importance to taxpayers as a matter of cost.

The two extreme views are: no supports versus support prices at a substantial level. There are many compromise proposals in between.

Another facet of the same controversy centers on whether the most desirable method to equate supply (for some years now in excess of market requirements) with demand is through unlimited production and free pricing or through production control and price supports. Again, there are numerous compromise variants.

Currently the forces at odds in this long-standing controversy are so arrayed that neither side can have its way fully. The result has become a chronic state of stalemate.

But while this stalemate continues, production goes on by farmers, featuring the dynamics of new technology, hard work, and the application of American farm genius. This is reflected in steadily increasing per capita farm productivity, the envy of the world. While most nations wrestle with food shortages, our problem is how to deal with abundance.

Despite markets expanded by domestic consumption reflecting a high level of employment and growing payrolls and exports assisted by Public Law 480 and other steps, grain continues to outrun effective market demand in this country even though there have been substantial reductions in support prices in recent years.

The result is that additional millions of bushels of these living organisms we call grain are each year set aside to be stored against the day they may be needed for some peace or war purpose not clearly specified at this time. No clean-cut rationale which might be regarded as a national stockpile policy exists in law.

It is not the function of those who assume responsibilities for storing and preserving such grain for the account of the Government to formulate a farm policy either for Congress or the executive branch. Proximity to grain at the marketplace or in a mill or warehouse does not confer the requisite wisdom. The fountainhead for such wisdom is doubtless hard to find.

But two things are self-evident:

1. Those who, in good faith and at great financial risk, contract to store grains for the Government now find themselves in the crossfire of the controversy between the contending camps over farm policy.

2. The terms and conditions of the contract to store for CCC and the rates paid do not constitute the farm problem. The solution of that problem calls for deeper digging.

The annual cost of storing these commodities is substantial and growing. Even one-half or one-third of the cost figure currently used is substantial. Protecting these grains from loss and deterioration is part of the current national policy as laid down by Congress, and they are being well protected, and for performing this service all agree there must be just compensation.

SOME BACKGROUND DATA

On May 15, 1918, according to the USDA Yearbook of 1921, grain storage capacity in the United States was 1,432,053,000 bushels. The estimated capacity then of country elevators was 1,034,351,000 bushels; of terminal elevators, 248,122,000 bushels; and of mills, 149,580,000 bushels.

The storage rate effective then under published tariffs, used as the basis of payment by the U.S. Grain Corporation, in the Kansas City area was one-thirtieth of a cent per day with 10 days' free time. This meant that if wheat was stored for a full year of 365 days, the charge was 11.83 cents per bushel. This was exclusive of handling charges.

Passing on to 1928–31, when the Farmers National Grain Corporation came into being as an institution created by the U.S. Government, storage capacity had changed only slightly from 1918. The rate in effect for the same area had advanced to one-twenty-fifth of a cent per day. With 10 days' free time, this meant a charge—if storage was for a full year of 365 days—of 14.72 cents per bushel.

In the 1930's, two severe droughts in the grain-producing areas created hardship, and there was widespread support for the idea of creating and maintaining an "ever-normal" granary. This was a period of severe depression in the grain warehousing industry, with much empty, unused space.

Under the present Uniform Grain Storage Agreement, in effect since 1956, Kansas City is in area III for wheat. The rate is forty-six-one thousandths per bushel per day, which figures—if the wheat is stored for a full year—at 16.79 cents.

The published public tariff for storage of grain there by others than the Government is one-twentieth of a cent per day, or 18.25 cents for 365 days.

Taking the rates of those three periods into account—1918, 1928–31, and 1956–59—if other things had advanced in price no more, we should not hear so much talk of inflation.

STORAGE BY COOPERATIVES

The first grain storage facility built by farmers as a cooperative, joint venture was constructed more than a century ago at Madison, Wis. Since that time, grain producers have repeatedly joined together in self-help grain marketing efforts known as cooperatives.

Grain and other farm producers have been encouraged to enter into self-help organizations by every Secretary of Agriculture since the Department was founded. Every Congress and every administration for many decades has endorsed and encouraged this form of enlightened private enterprise. Most States have passed laws to facilitate the organization of farm cooperatives, recognizing their unique character as incorporated partnerships of producers engaged in collective bargaining.

These cooperatives have these characteristics in common: (1) One vote per member. (2) A contract between the member and the cooperative, under which it agrees to remit any earnings above necessary expenses to the member in proportion to the business he does with or through the cooperative. (3) Policies and programs are determined by majority vote of the members who select the board of directors which, in turn, employs management.

These cooperatives have an important place in the marketing or grains and oilseeds. There are more than 2,700 local grain associations, small, medium, and large. These in turn have organized some 28 regional or federated marketing associations to supply marketing services at all of the terminal markets. Twenty-two of them have joined in the creation of an export corporation which is successful and growing in selling these commodities for use in other lands.

These cooperatives at all levels were organized in response to need—often acute need—for fair practices, for better service and adequate facilities, to assist in realizing the highest possible financial return for producers, and to give tone, vitality, and spirit to the competitive principle in price-making at the marketplace. They are private enterprise 100 percent. They have greatly contributed to efficient marketing by appreciably narrowing the margin or toll borne by producers and consumers in the marketing process, and are generally regarded by students of grain marketing to have made a constructive contribution. Their margins above expenses, known as savings distributed to producer patrons, have increased financial returns to farmers by many millions of dollars annually.

These cooperatives are reported by Daniel H. McVey, Chief of the Grain Branch, Farmer Cooperative Service, U.S.D.A., to own approximately 33 percent of the licensed grain storage in the United States of more than 4 billion bushels. About 80 percent of this capacity is at the country or primary marketing level; about 20 percent is at terminal or subterminal points.

These have expanded storage substantially in the last 14 years in response to the requests of the Government and of producers. The latter, more than 1,350,000 farmers owning and controlling their own self-help institutions, have repeatedly asked for safe, efficient storage space where their grain might be conditioned and stored so as to qualify for price supports. These farmers, usually by unanimous vote, have ordered expansion and chosen to supply the basic capital to finance or have authorized large borrowings. Then they have seen the facility filled with grain left there by CCC pursuant to its rights under the CCC contract, and have been forced to build more. Obviously, they are entitled to a return on this investment commensurate with the high risks involved when they assume the hazards and responsibilities of warehousemen, with account to be taken of the temporary or emergency character of the building enterprise.

Many have contracted heavy indebtedness, and substantial amounts of this remain outstanding at current high interest rates. Many of these structures face a future of uncertain need. Grain merchandising requirements for facilities under normal conditions will require only 25 percent of current storage space.

Other elements of the grain marketing and warehouse industry have equally, if not even more, aggressively, expanded facilities. In general, most operators, cooperative and otherwise, are fully agreed that the industry is very seriously overexpanded, with minor exceptions at a few locations. The day may well come when many giant grain warehouses will be known as white elephants of the prairie.

Most who are realistic sense that congressional farm policy may change in important respects at any time. That policy is often unpredictable. In general, they realize that a rational stockpiling policy, geared to meet any known contingency of war or peace, would counsel a degree of contraction and surely no expansion in the inventory at hand. Doubtless it would be unwise to return to the small average carryover preceding World War II, but there is no proven need for the present level of supply.

The function of warehousemen is not to reason why, but to condition grain, to store it, to ship it, and to transfer the grains and oilseeds as ordered by CCC. They have learned to have a high regard for the capacity of the USDA personnel administering the inventory management programs, and most contracting warehouses are credited by the leadership of this and preceding administrations with rendering good services promptly and honestly.

THE CURRENT CONTRACT

The terms and conditions of the uniform grain storage agreement in current use were established in 1956. Some of its essential features have been in effect for two decades.

Under this contract most grain and oilseeds are stored commingled—a method that contributes to economy in the use of facilities. If all grain should be stored identity-preserved, the number of bins required would be endless and much space wasted.

As grain is received by a warehouse under contract with CCC, the methods employed for identifying it vary as to whether it is a country or a terminal facility. The chief difference is that at terminal facilities, official grades and weights are available. After grain has been graded, pursuant to Federal grades, as to grade, class, and various grading factors, and its weight determined by licensed weighmasters, warehouse receipts are issued, much as deposit slips are issued by banks, on forms specified by CCC. The ownership of grain by CCC in public warehouses is in the form of these receipts, redeemable at any time. Possession of such

warehouse receipts supplies CCC with the right to call for the loading out of grain of the same grade, class, often with supplement quality certificates as in the case of wheat protein content. Grain put in store may be ordered loaded out in a week, a month—at any time—with only routine notice. Thus, the per diem storage rate is the significant one. Computing rates in terms of a year is like multiplying a single day's hotel room rate by 365 in the face of the fact that few hotels have every bed filled every night.

The warehouseman is fully bonded. The risk of deterioration in quality, shrinkage, and other substantial risks are assumed by the warehouseman, and he must be financially responsible. The liability of warehouses currently outstanding runs into billions of dollars because that is the value of the grain represented by the paper—warehouse receipts—CCC owns. No revenue for storage is finally earned and not subject to offset for losses until loaded out and the warehouse receipt canceled.

CCC'S OWN STORAGE

At present, CCC owns storage bin space of 985 million bushels, up from 543 million in December 1952. As of February 27, 1959, there was commercial storage space approved by CCC for its use of 3,546 million bushels. This figure has since passed 4 billion bushels, may soon reach 4.5 billion bushels.

In the case of its bins, CCC owns the grain outright and is heir to all the attendant risks. It buys and operates equipment and employs many people at the tasks of checking and doublechecking the condition of its inventory. No one really knows with absolute finality what it costs CCC to do this job for itself. But almost anyone with any business experience knows that no one can compete with the Government in any field with the expectation of winning, for the simple fact is the Government has more resources and need not rely upon normal profit and loss measurements.

Why wouldn't it be a good idea for CCC to store its entire inventory in bins, thus saving warehousemen from worry and risk?

The same question might be asked about other things the Government buys, such as planes, trucks, pencils, and caps for sailors.

The charter of the CCC enacted by Congress states that whenever practicable CCC shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce. This has been properly interpreted to mean that Congress did not intend to transfer the function of grain storage to public ownership.

Under the Hoover administration, there was formed by the Government the Farmers National Grain Corporation, which owned and operated storage. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt, this organization was abolished and ownership of storage was placed in liquidation, and the commercial storage industry was employed to store and handle grain for the account of CCC. Some bins were purchased and used, but most were liquidated during World War II. Some became houses for war workers.

The matter of whether the Government should purchase bins was an issue in the 1948 presidential campaign. The result of that campaign was interpreted as a mandate to expand CCC bin ownership, if needed. However, during the administration of Charles F. Brannan as Secretary of Agriculture, inducements were offered to encourage expansion of commercial storage. These included some increases in storage and handling rates and offers of guaranteed occupancy. During the Korean war, accelerated depreciation of up to 40 percent was authorized on application to the Defense Transportation Coordinator. Such accelerated depreciation granted grain warehousemen was minor in volume compared with that granted many other business segments.

Actually, the need for an extremely large volume of commercial storage plus CCC bin storage was interrupted by the Korean war, which greatly reduced carryover stocks of grains. Worried deficit countries built up their stocks by purchases here. The grain-surplus carryovers on July 1, 1952, and even July 1, 1953, were not burdensome.

There were no allotments in effect, for example, for wheat planted in 1952 or 1953; and for the crop harvested in 1954 Congress, on the recommendation of the current administration in 1953, placed the national wheat allotment at 62 million acres, instead of the fixed statutory minimum of 55 million. The chief pileup of inventory has occurred since.

THE EVOLUTION OF HANDLING RATES

Earlier we have referred to storage rates during World War I and subsequently. The handling rates, the charges for unloading grain at a warehouse, and, on call, for loading it out into a boxcar, truck, barge, or other vessel, have remained unchanged since 1949. It is generally believed that the in-and-out handling charges for terminal elevators are not only profitless, but are actually carried on at a loss. New data supports this conclusion.

For all grains except flaxseed, which is 2 cents a bushel, the "in" charge for grain received by rail or water, usually referred to as the terminal rate, is 1½ cents a bushel. The loading-out charge is three-fourths of a cent a bushel, or 2¼ cents in all.

Table 24 of the USDA storage and handling cost summary, released on January 22, shows the average direct cost of in-and-out handling, excluding such an important factor as return on capital, to be 3.5 cents. This would indicate an average loss of 1¼ cents per bushel. Considering the great volume handled by more than 600 terminal warehouses, this indicates a substantial loss overall which must be absorbed from revenue from storage.

The average cost to country houses for in-and-out handling was reported to be 4.7 cents. This also means that for many this operation was at a loss before taking any return on capital into account.

It happens that there is variation in wheat country handling charges by areas. They are highest in the South and East, where volume is smaller and unit costs are presumably higher. For corn they are uniform nationally—3¾ cents in and three-fourths of a cent out, or a total of 4½ cents. This is somewhat below the national average cost of 4.7 cents reported in the USDA survey on January 22.

THE STORAGE RATES

The USDA storage cost survey, released January 22, shows, first, that there is a substantial range in costs. This is to be expected for a number of reasons. First, construction costs, including labor and materials, vary greatly from area to area. Secondly, many warehouse operators have long since built as much high-cost-per-bushel conventional elevator space as they feel is justified for grain merchandising needs in their markets for the next three decades.

This is because such facilities, with modern equipment, are capable of handling fast a large volume of grain daily, and storage is only incidental to their normal merchandising operations. Such houses are capable of conditioning and standardizing grains to meet market needs, and market needs are expanding at a far slower rate than storage needs.

There has come, therefore, increasingly into the picture to meet CCC's emergency—and perhaps very temporary—need less expensive but far less maneuverable facilities. Some of this is vertical storage, safe enough for a prudent warehouseman to operate if he uses it only for seasoned grain of good and proven storage deportment. Some of it is in the form of tanks that resemble balloons awaiting the signal to go aloft. Some consist of adaptation of other structures.

These types of emergency storage will have little or no place in the normal marketing process now or in the future. They are creatures destined to pass into other or no uses when the present inventory problem is dealt with resolutely by an attack on the problem instead of the symptoms.

The responsibility of the warehouseman storing grain for CCC account in these temporaries is virtually the same as in conventional storage. If he loads out grain below the specification shown on his warehouse receipt, he is assessed the difference between the market value of the grade of grain he took for deposit and what he loaded out. His shipments are subject to rejection by CCC if they fail to meet specific standards. He must absorb the costs of shrinkage. He must be prepared to buy free grain to replace grain as may be needed to offset quality and quantity losses.

One warehouseman, experimenting with new forms of low-cost storage, experienced a loss variously estimated at $15 million to $18 million. There have been other and substantial losses. By and large, warehousemen have been prudent, careful, and responsible. They have been credited repeatedly by this and prior administrations with protecting and preserving well and responsibly the values in grain entrusted to their care by CCC.

The fact that there is a substantial range in costs shown in the survey, that the average cost is below estimated revenue, was to be expected. It is far less significant than seems true at first glance. It is a large country and costs vary, management capacity varies, the extent of the surplus owned by CCC is not distributed with equal impact in all areas, and harvests vary.

The survey period, the most recent full fiscal year, was a year of large CCC inventory relative to available space. Thus, the warehouses surveyed showed average occupancy of 78.6 percent, 77.3 in the country and 83 for terminals. This was large, extraordinary, unusual, and abnormal by any standard except a few recent years. It is like comparing the occupancy of hotels at Chicago during a year when the World's Fair is there with ordinary years.

A warehouse that is 80 percent filled with revenue-producing grain in storage is one thing. A 50-percent occupancy figure is another. The costs will remain nearly constant. But in one case the revenue yields a profit; in the other it may well be below the break-even point. The break-even point will vary but usually takes effect well above 50-percent occupancy.

THE CCC STORAGE COST SURVEY

CCC on January 22 released the preliminary results of its grain storage cost survey. It covered 331 country and 101 terminal warehouses. It showed that direct operating costs, not including handling charges, shrinkage, return on capital invested, and other costs involved, to range from an average of 5 to 21 cents a bushel figured on an annual basis.

In his comment, Secretary Benson said:

"Average direct operating cost, excluding other expense items previously mentioned, was shown by the survey to be 10.1 cents a bushel for country warehouses, on an annual basis. For terminal warehouses, it was 8.6 cents a bushel. The overall average, for both types, was 9.5 cents a bushel direct operating cost to the warehouse for a year.

"Only half the space the commercial industry has available for storing grain for others falls within the groups of houses where the storage costs are at or below the averages. A check of the cost per bushel

groups (see second table at end) shows that the direct storage costs go up to about 13.5 cents a bushel for the groups that would have to be included to cover around 85 percent of the total commercial space which is available. In recent years, the Government, farmers, and others have needed a very high percentage of all space."

FARM STORAGE

CCC also employs programs under which farmers are encouraged to store grain owned by CCC under reseal programs. Farmers receive the same rates for storage as commercial warehouses in the area.

Many farmers so store, but many of them, after difficulty in maintaining the quality of stocks and incurring grade discounts on loadout, have chosen to discontinue this service.

CHANGES IN TERMS OF AGREEMENT

A report entitled "Storage Operations of CCC," being a report of hearings on March 24, 1959, by the Jones Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations of the House Committee on Agriculture, was published in 1959.

Starting on page 27, the changes in the terms of the contract since 1940 are outlined. The summary of rate changes begins on page 31.

Subsequently, this useful report compares various State rates with those posted by CCC. In general, this study shows that CCC rates are either the same or lower than tariffs charged other depositors of grain under published tariffs.

The changes in terms over the years indicate a strong increase in the assignment of financial responsibility to warehousemen.

When more responsibility is thus assigned, risks and costs are obviously increased. These changes would have justified substantial rate increases for the average warehouse except for one average offsetting factor—a high average rate of occupancy. Thus, CCC has had the benefit in its rates of large volume use.

The time will come, of course, when CCC inventories will be sharply reduced from current levels. No one known to me is capable of prophecy as to the timing or extent of such reduction. Accordingly, we do not know when average occupancy of the greatly expanded commercial storage space will fall below the average break-even point. It could be soon.

This points to a problem which will then arise. If and when there are only 1 to 2 billion bushels of grain and oilseeds to store for CCC and normal market needs, with more than 4 billion bushels of space available, a period of unbridled competition will begin which will bankrupt many warehousemen. It is not a pleasant prospect. It hovers as a specter in the shadows of every cupola crowning the grain warehouses of the land.

Let's Lift the Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier, February 3, 1960. Specifically the editorial points out why the ceiling on earning for persons eligible to receive social security should be lifted. I agree that this should be done.

The editorial follows:

LET'S LIFT THE CEILING

Men and women past 65 years can't get full benefits under social security as of now unless they earn no more than $1,200 a year. In other words, it is possible and legal to draw a social security check 12 months out of a year if other income doesn't exceed $1,200 for that time. That limitation doesn't apply to persons past 72 years.

Yet, it has been determined by persons adept at figuring out things that a worker can, at the maximum rate of pay over the specified period that builds his social security benefit base, contribute close to $6,000 in the course of a working life of 40 years. Then an additional $6,000 is added to that in accumulated interest. This belongs to the worker as a savings fund, a pension, and should be payable without any strings attached.

The railroader, the carpenter, the person in most any trade or professional walk of life builds up a pension or retirement fund that he or she draws after a given age, usually 65, without any compunctions and without any ifs and ands.

Legislation in this respect is pending in the Congress now, that is proposals that the Government remove restrictions from one's earnings and at the same time permit them to draw their saved-up pension. Social security isn't a dole. It's your hard-earned money and mine, money the Government borrowed, or rather dogmatically converted to some other fund while it was not being drawn on—in the early days of social security. It is even alleged the Government used some of this social security money for loans to foreign nations.

It is fair and just that social security fund contributors be permitted to draw it back to their own use as they see fit, not as the Government wishes to dole it, based on what extra money one makes.

Volatile Reverend Powell Is Capping Secular Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post, Sunday, February 7, 1960:

VOLATILE REVEREND POWELL IS CAPPING SECULAR CAREER

(When Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, Democrat, North Carolina, the other day announced his decision to retire from Congress at the end of his present term, congressional Democrats faced a real dilemma. An ultraconservative southerner, BARDEN is chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee. In line to succeed him is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, New York, a politically controversial Negro. For days, many southerners sought a way to bypass POWELL, but found themselves stymied by an institution dearer to the South than their opposition to POWELL—the congressional seniority system. A breach of the seniority system would threaten their own traditional route to committee chairmanships. Denying him the post on grounds of blacksliding from the Democratic Party in 1956 would lay them open to the same reprisal if they—or their States—clung to their habit of occasional defection. Many Democratic liberals were opposed to POWELL for reasons other than race. Boxed in by their own liberalism, they were unwilling to take a stand against him. Thus POWELL, in all probability, will become chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee when BARDEN steps down. Speaker RAYBURN has told him as much. Herewith is a study of the prospective chairman.)

(By Edward T. Folliard)

NEW YORK.—The tumultuous political career of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., a Negro whose light skin and aquiline features lead many to mistake him for a white man, began in the pulpit of a Harlem church.

For 19 years now, he has carried on in the two roles of clergyman and politican, and has prospered in both.

His church is jammed when he preaches at 10 a.m. and at noon on Sundays. Next year, if things go right for him, he will reach a new peak in his political career, taking over the chairmanship of the important Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

In the pulpit or on the political stump, POWELL has but one issue—Negro rights. When he first ran for a House seat in 1944, he said: "I will represent the Negro people first. I will represent after that all the other American people."

HERO OR LOUDMOUTH?

To his flock of 10,000 in the Abyssinian Baptist Church in Harlem, said to be the largest Negro congregation in the world, he is a hero, a glittering knight of the cloth engaged in a brave crusade for equality for America's 16 million Negroes.

Not all Negroes admire him, however. Earl Brown, a Negro member of New York's City Council, a writer for Life magazine and POWELL's primary opponent in 1958, has called POWELL an irresponsible loudmouth, a wild man of racist tendencies, and a do-nothing Member of Congress with the worst attendance record on Capitol Hill.

POWELL has a ready epithet for any Negro who criticizes him. He is likely to call the critic an Uncle Tom, meaning a hat-in-hand type of Negro who is obsequious toward the white man.

After being backed by the Democratic organization in New York (Tammany) for seven terms in the House, POWELL bolted his party in 1956 to support President Eisenhower for a second term. He said that the President had made "the greatest contribution to civil rights in the history of the United States"—words which he has pretty well eaten since then by accusing the Chief Executive of "seeming indifference" to civil rights problems.

In the spring of 1958, as the country was preparing for the midterm congressional elections, Carmine DeSapio and other Tammany leaders voted to read Representative POWELL out of the Democratic Party. They explained that there was only one reason for their action—POWELL's desertion of the party and his support of the Republican national ticket in 1956.

POWELL, however, insisted that this was not the true reason.

"I am being purged," he said, "because obviously I am a Negro, and a Negro should stay on the plantation."

A newsman pointed out that Tammany leader DeSapio had said he was being dumped solely because he ran out on his party to back General Eisenhower.

"DeSapio is a liar," POWELL snapped.

The Harlem preacher-politician said that DeSapio was "a Mississippi boss," and added:

"The Negroes left Mississippi to get away from white bosses, but they found them here in Harlem."

Tammany's leaders looked around for another Negro to oppose POWELL in the Democratic primary election of 1958 in the 16th (Harlem) Congressional District. A white candidate would have little chance in what has been called "the largest Negro ghetto in the world."

They finally tapped Harvard-educated Earl Brown, the city councilman, who had led a fight to end Jim Crowism in New York housing. Brown faced almost certain defeat, but he was determined to make a fight of it.

"In all his years in Congress," said Brown, "POWELL has accomplished nothing."

He said that POWELL'S attendance record was the worst in Congress.

"He has been absent half the time," Brown continued. "When the civil rights bill was passed last year (1957), POWELL didn't fight for it or vote for it. He was in Europe on a free trip at your expense."

POWELL outdid Brown in diatribes and in creating headlines. He referred to Tammany Leader DeSapio as "Massa Carmine." And he called both Brown and Hulan Jack, Negro president of Manhattan Borough, "Uncle Toms."

He said that Brown was "a handpicked Uncle Tom selected by the Tammany plantation bosses to work against his own people."

NAACP PROVOKED

At an outdoor meeting in Harlem, sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to celebrate the fourth anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision outlawing segregation in public schools, POWELL warned DeSapio and Jack that they had better avoid "walking up and down the streets of Harlem."

"We won't do what the Communists did to the NIXONS in South America," he added, "but we will make it mighty uncomfortable."

This was too much for the NAACP, which issued a statement saying:

"We deplore and dissociate ourselves from the banner of extreme racialism raised by Mr. POWELL in his May 17 address. If Negro citizens are to win permanent victory in the long run, we must be consistent. We cannot condone racism in others while using it ourselves."

Later on, POWELL explained that his remarks were simply "bantering."

Jack, a Catholic convert, said that POWELL was preaching racial and religious hatred and warned that this could only lead to disaster.

Something happened in the spring of 1958 that might have hurt an ordinary politician but hurt POWELL not at all. A Federal grand jury in New York indicted him on charges of filing a fraudulent income tax return for his wife, jazz pianist Hazel Scott, in 1951 and tax evasion in a joint return for 1952.

POWELL cried out that was being persecuted and likened the grand jury to a posse bent on some kind of lynching.

His admirers in Harlem, and especially the devoted members of his Abyssinian Baptist Church, agreed that this was so. The indictment had no more effect on POWELL'S popularity than had his 1945 divorce from his first wife, Isabel Washington Powell, after 12 years of marriage and his marriage that same year to Miss Scott.

The outcome of the Democratic primary election was, as expected, a lopsided victory for POWELL over Tammany's candidate, Brown. The vote: POWELL, 14,387; Brown, 4,925.

These figures take on a special interest when one considers the clergyman-politician's congregation of 10,000. This is the hard core of his political strength, a fact that is acknowledged by the Abyssinian Baptist Church itself. In a press release dated July 30, 1950, the church said:

"A special committee of church members has also been set up independent of the church to mobilize the church's vast membership financially and in terms of volunteer work to help Reverend POWELL in his current campaign for reelection to Congress."

The Abyssinian Baptist Church was started in 1808 with 12 members. It grew out of protests over discrimination practiced against Negroes in the First Baptist Church of New York. It was customary in those days for the balcony in some churches to be set aside for Negroes and the balcony came to be called the "slave loft."

The church was just 100 years old when it was taken over by the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, father of the present pastor. The elder Powell came from a poor family of 17 children. He had great energy and ambition, however, and worked as a waiter to pay his way through Yale University.

It was the Reverend Powell, Sr., who moved the Abyssinian Baptist Church to its present site in Harlem and began building up the congregation. At the same time, he did well on the side as a real estate operator.

When the whites started leaving Harlem after the Negroes came flooding in, he began buying up white homes at bargain prices. The value of the houses he bought ultimately rose and provided a firm base for the Powell family fortune.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., likes to boast about his background and tell of his grandfather, a branded slave.

"My folks were field Negroes for countless generations," he has said. "That's why I belong to the masses."

The fact is, he was pampered as a child and has never known want. Born in New Haven, Conn., November 29, 1908, he was 6 months old when his father moved to New York to take over the Abyssinian Baptist Church.

He got his bachelor of arts degree at Colgate University, where he passed as a white student until his father arrived on the campus to deliver a lecture. He won his master's degree at Columbia University and his doctor of divinity degree at Shaw University, a small Baptist-affiliated school at Raleigh, N.C. He also studied abroad.

Young POWELL entered the ministry on the night of Good Friday, 1929. He became an assistant pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church in 1931 and pastor in 1937.

He was relief director for Harlem in the early days of the depression. Later he joined with others in persuading store owners in Harlem to hire Negroes and in helping get Negroes jobs as bus drivers.

In 1941 he was elected to New York's City Council, the first Negro ever to be so honored. Then in 1944 he was elected to the House of Representatives, the first Negro in the East to be sent to Capitol Hill.

He is now the undisputed political champ of Harlem. His adoring followers almost certainly would reelect him to the House even if he should have the bad fortune to be convicted and imprisoned for income tax evasion.

"Adam is unbeatable," one of his admirers told the New York Post. "Why, he has 10,000 parishioners—and every one is a campaign worker before election time. Who can build a better machine?"

After his defeat of Brown in the 1958 Democratic primary, POWELL announced that he had ended his feud with Tammany Boss DeSapio and would work for the election of the Democratic State ticket, which meant that he would try to help Gov. Averell Harriman defeat his Republican opponent, Nelson A. Rockefeller.

This infuriated the Republican leaders of Harlem, who had given him the Republican nomination. Harold C. Burton, one of the GOP leaders, said: "This is a masterpiece in doublecrossing and doubletalking."

POWELL wasn't able to save Harriman from the Rockefeller blitz, but of course he won an eighth term for himself in the House.

It is because of this long seniority that he is now in line for the chairmanship of the Education and Labor Committee if Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, Democrat, of North Carolina, the present chairman makes good on his promise to retire at the end of the 86th Congress.

Representative POWELL is something of a Beau Brummel out of the pulpit, a man who enjoys good food and drink and likes to drive imported racing cars.

In the pulpit, he wears a Roman-type collar, a dark suit and, over this, flowing black robes. His parishioners refer to him as "Dr. Powell."

At last Sunday's 10 a.m. service in the Abyssinian Baptist church, he delayed his sermon until the congregation and the 50-voice choir had sung Let the Lower Lights Be Burning and Be Not Afraid, and until the two assistant pastors had preached. The church was packed to the walls.

The Reverend Oberia D. Dempsey asked for a blessing on the congregation and also a blessing on others—even "those who would destroy us." He then read from the Sermon on the Mount. Not a word about politics came from him.

The Reverend David N. Licorish, the other assistant, prayed that Congress would vote for racial equality and then mentioned Pastor POWELL'S 16-year battle for equality.

Taking over the pulpit himself, the Reverend Dr. POWELL prayed in a low voice. Then he moved onto a more worldly level.

He spoke in praise of President de Gaulle, of France, noting that in the Algerian crisis the Frenchman stood out boldly in a time of mediocrity. Gradually he eased into the affairs of another man—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. That was his theme almost to the end.

He hammered away on two points: "It pays to take a stand" and "You don't have to compromise." He said he had been warned that, by some of his tactics, he was committing political suicide. He said he also had been warned that his congregation might drift away from him.

This evoked subdued merriment in the congregation, in which Representative POWELL joined. He said that some explained away the packed church Sunday after Sunday by saying that people came "out of curiosity." That might be so, he acknowledged; but it wasn't curiosity, he said, that piled up all that money on the collection plates every Sabbath. Then he announced that the collections had more than doubled.

It ended with Pastor POWELL extending an invitation to newcomers to move forward and enroll in his flock.

Representative POWELL is scheduled to go on trial on the income tax charges March 7, after many delays. He was indicted May 8, 1958, after charges had been made—and denied—that certain administration officials tried to protect him after he agreed to support President Eisenhower in 1956.

Two POWELL secretaries, Acy Lennon and Hattie Freeman Dodson, were convicted on income tax charges in 1956 and served prison terms.

If convicted under the three counts of the indictment, POWELL could draw prison sentences up to 5 years and fines up to $10,000 on each count. He has retained one of the best known criminal lawyers in the country, Edward Bennett Williams of Washington, who has served as counsel for the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (Republican, Wisconsin), Teamster President Jimmy Hoffa and Frank Costello, notorious underworld figure.

POWELL seems unable to maintain good relations with the White House, whether the

occupant be a Democrat or a Republican. Former President Truman barred him from the mansion after he referred to Mrs. Truman as "the last lady of the land"—this in connection with Mrs. Truman's attendance at a tea given by the Daughters of the American Revolution, who had denied use of their Constitution Hall to Hazel Scott, the second Mrs. Powell.

Just what President Eisenhower has against POWELL is something he is keeping to himself. But clearly he has turned on the Harlem Democrat in spite of the support he got from him in 1956. On September 18, 1957, while he was in Newport, R.I., on vacation, the President wired POWELL to say that he would meet later with him and other Negro leaders.

The Chief Executive did meet with four Negro leaders in June 1958, but POWELL was not among them. He had been indicted just a month before that.

Memorial for Four Chaplains Proposed for Mount Charleston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, interested citizens in southern Nevada are at this moment attempting to raise funds to construct a memorial for the four chaplains who perished in the sinking of the transport U.S.S. *Dorchester*.

I am sure that Members of this Congress will be interested in learning of the progress of this project, and in reading of the efforts of Rev. John F. D. Carruthers, of Pasadena, who is assisting citizens of Las Vegas in preparing for the construction of this worthy memorial.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article describing these preliminary events printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Dec. 27, 1959]

MEMORIAL TO FOUR CHAPLAINS PROPOSED FOR MOUNT CHARLESTON

(By Colin McKinlay)

The longstanding dream of a retired Navy chaplain to erect a memorial cathedral to the four Navy chaplains who perished in the sinking of the transport U.S.S. *Dorchester* may become a shrine on Mount Charleston.

Seventy-one-year-old Rev. John F. D. Carruthers of Pasadena, a member of the faculty of Claremont Men's College in Pomona, says he will return soon after the holidays to look over a prospective site on Cathedral rock on Mount Charleston.

Reverend Carruthers has been staying at the Hacienda Hotel where owner Warren Bayley has promised assistance in obtaining land if he decides that it is the fitting location for the cathedral.

A veteran of both world wars, Reverend Carruthers is now director of research and aeronautical history at the college. His longstanding dream has been to erect, at a cost of several million dollars, a permanent house of worship for all faiths to attend on pilgrimages, "to unite the world into religious unity."

"I think the people of the United States would like to pay tribute to the four chaplains," he said.

He said that the general outline of the architectural structures are already made, but their completion hinges on the selection of the site.

Although there would be no religious services at the cathedral, there would be four wings for prayer to symbolize each of the Navy chaplains who went down together with their ship. Two were protestant, one Jewish rabbi and the other was a Catholic priest. They had their arms around each other in prayer when the end came after an attack by the Japanese.

Reverend Carruthers said that the memorial would preserve this spirit of the chaplain corps and Christ's words, "Greater love hath no man than he lay down his life for his friends."

Each wing of the building would be consecrated by one of the faiths representing one of the four chaplains, he said. He said the proposed name is the "World Cathedral of the Four Chaplains."

When the national American Legion commander visits this area, Reverend Carruthers said he plans to enlist his aid in the project.

The four chaplains have also been memorialized on a commemorative U.S. postage stamp.

Wisconsin Man Brings the Hoe to Backward Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the free world is engaged in an ideological and economic battle to prove the superiority of its systems over communism.

As we know, the battle—overt and covert—extends to a great many fronts.

Over the years, our Nation has dedicated a tremendous volume of its resources and manpower to providing a military deterrent to Communist expansion.

Economically, too, we have made a unique effort in history to shore up the economies of other nations to enable them to withstand the pressures of the international conspiracy.

Too little heard of, but perhaps one of our major exports to areas of the world searching for an ideology and a way of life to enable them to progress and live better in our age, is the dedicated American serving abroad in nonmilitary fields. A great many of these individuals are giving their time, energies, and talents, to bring a little of America into the hinterlands of the globe.

Today, I refer to one specific individual, Mr. Robert D. Judy—a native of Peshtigo, Wis., and formerly a county 4–H agent and assistant agricultural extension agent of Superior, Wis.

Mr. Judy, with 15 American technical experts is bringing new ideas in farming to the tribesmen of Somalia on the African Continent, under the International Cooperation Administration program of assistance for less-developed nations—more commonly known as the point 4 program.

Unfortunately, the agricultural methods in Somalia are still primitive. Under the ICA program, Mr. Judy and his associates are carrying on a heroic effort to bring some modernization to the agricultural techniques in that country to enable them to improve their economy.

Along with bringing technical assistance in agriculture, Mr. Judy and his associates are setting splendid examples of friendly Americans willing to get dirt on their hands, and dedicate time and energies to help these people improve their standards of living.

Recently, the Minneapolis Star carried a detailed article by Robert Hewett, entitled "Wisconsin Man Brings the Hoe to Backward Somalia."

The article outlines the splendid way in which Mr. Judy and the ICA program are bringing better living, and greater respect for the United States, to the natives of that country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN MAN BRINGS THE HOE TO BACKWARD SOMALIS

(By Robert Hewett)

MOGADISCIO, SOMALIA.—A young county agent from Superior, Wis., is bringing new ideas in farming to Somali tribesmen.

One newfangled American implement causing quite a stir here is an ordinary long-handled garden hoe.

An even more daring innovation for tradition bound Somalis getting their first look at an American dirt farmer is the plow.

For centuries Somali tribesmen who settled down to farming (most are still camel-raising nomads) have literally scraped along with two simple tools: A crude hatchet to hack away scrub bushes and a mattock-like hoe with an 18-inch handle used to scratch up the soil to plant corn, peanuts, and sesame seeds.

The American trying to show Somalis how to get better crops without inefficient, back-breaking toil is Robert D. Judy, 35, who was county 4–H Club agent and assistant agricultural extension agent at Superior before coming here last December.

Judy is one of 16 American technical experts brought to Somalia under the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) program to help underdeveloped nations, commonly known as the point 4 program.

The onetime farm boy, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clinton Judy of Peshtigo, Wis., was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1953.

Point 4 men like Judy, who gets out and works with ordinary people, frequently do a more effective job at representing the United States abroad than do many conventional diplomats.

Somalia is a strange and interesting country, but not exactly the most comfortable spot for a foreigner to live and work. Slightly larger than Minnesota and Wisconsin combined, it is hot and arid, stretching along the east African shore of the Indian ocean not far north of the Equator.

Italy took over the barren region as a colony in 1889 during the European power scramble for Africa. During the 1920s and 1930's, Italian Somaliland had the reputation of being the spot to which Benito Mus-

solini banished political enemies he hated most.

Next year, Somalia's estimated 1,250,000 people, largely illiterate tribal nomads, get their independence under United Nations auspices.

Italian colonizers paid no attention to native agriculture other than to recruit, sometimes by force, workers for the Italian-owner banana plantations which still provide the bulk of Somalia's meager exports.

And that explains in part why the long-handled hoe, a simple plow—or a friendly American farmer who gets dirt on his hands—is something of a sensation in Somalia.

Judy, a brawny bachelor who looks younger than 35, lives in a little stone house presided over by a smiling Somali cook who already has learned to prepare Wisconsin-style fried chicken via the sign language.

The house is at Merca, a banana shipping port about 70 miles south of Mogadiscio. Judy was the first American in the area. But a few weeks ago another point 4 water resources technician and his wife were assigned to Merca.

We drove over bumpy dirt roads (they are impassable when it rains) to the nearby village of Coriole, a cluster of circular huts whose thatched roofs look like inverted ice cream cones. There we met some of the big, black-skinned Somalis with whom Judy has been making friends in recent months despite the language barrier.

Judy took the standard 2-month State Department cram course in Italian before coming to Somalia and each day adds a few Somali words to his vocabulary. Italian is the language of those Somalis who deal with foreigners. The Somali language is little-known by non-Somalis mainly because it has no written characters and dialects vary widely.

Organization of a point 4 program has been slow in Somalia where, in many respects, farming practices are more primitive than in the Arab states and India. Judy has spent much time so far in the necessary job of making friends with the more progressive Somali farmers, who usually till only about 2½ acres per man.

Judy's most receptive customer has been one who might be termed a capitalist by Somali standards. He is Mahmud Omar, a tall, dignified Somali who owns about 35 acres, hires some of his neighbors on a share-crop basis and is regarded as the smartest man in the village.

Mahmud Omar is a good example of the universal fact that some farmers simply are more enterprising than others. He readily saw the advantages of the long-handled hoe, for example, even though some of his neighbors preferred the old way of bending almost double to till the ground.

Like all Somalis he is probably suspicious of this strange foreigner in a land where foreigners usually have meant trouble (but he is too polite to say so).

This fall part of his land will be tilled with a new 8-inch steel plow and some will be planted with hybrid seed corn brought from America.

Experience in other countries has shown that once farmers see better results with their own eyes, they also try the new idea.

Although Mahmud Omar has never heard of America's farm price-support program, it seems the idea is not confined to the Midwest. He pointed to a hole in the ground, carefully lined with corn husks, where he is burying part of this season's corn.

"The corn price in Mogadiscio is not very good right now," Mahmud explained in a mixture of Italian and Somali. "I'm going to hold this for a better price. What we Somalis really need is for the Government to fix a good price and buy all our corn."

Judy's main job on his 2-year assignment in Somalia is to help train 41 Somali youths as the nucleus for an agricultural extension service patterned somewhat on the American model to give advice on new techniques to farmers.

"But, in a country like this, first things come first," he added as he pulled a garden hoe and shovel from the back of his jeep station wagon. "It's going to be a very slow process."

This fall, about 40 inexpensive, lightweight steel plows are going to be distributed to the Somali extension agents to show their farmers what can be done about getting a better crop.

"The average corn yield this year on plots cultivated with hoes is about 12 to 14 bushels an acre," Judy said. "We used a demonstration plow, and deeper cultivation alone resulted in an increase of 80 percent in the crop. When Somali farmers learn this they are going to find that plowing is an economic proposition—but first we have to teach them to use oxen and camels to pull the plows."

Use of light tractors is something for the future as far as the average farmer is concerned. Some of the big Italian plantation owners rent tractors (all prewar models) for plowing to a few of the more prosperous Somalis but they are unknown in most farming areas.

Another big problem in Somalia, as in most underdeveloped countries, is establishment of cooperatives to provide credit for seed and equipment purchases as well as marketing. Some co-ops were tried in the last few years but failed because of poor supervision.

Credit to ordinary farmers is now provided mainly by Arab lenders who get as much as 300 percent interest—payable in crops—during each growing season.

Defying Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the most pressing of domestic problems after stemming the tide of inflation is the vexing problem of our mountainous farm surpluses. Yesterday, for example, there were three editorials in the Washington papers on the subject, and I should like to have them reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

The first, entitled "Defying Commonsense," appeared in the Washington Daily News; the second, entitled "Action on Farm Surplus Needed," by David Lawrence; and the third, entitled "Much More Than Vexing," an editorial appearing in yesterday's Evening Star.

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 10, 1960]

DEFYING COMMONSENSE

Surplus crops are the farm problem. The price-support program built this overabundance. It continues as a strong financial incentive to produce more and more. This, says President Eisenhower, is a situation which "defies commonsense." That's stating it mildly.

In his special message to Congress yesterday, the President indicated his general preferences on reform, but expressed a willingness to go along with anything within reason which Congress may suggest. Solemn regard for the Nation's welfare should prompt a comparable cooperative spirit among the lawmakers.

The wheat surplus properly was emphasized in the message. Wheat provides only 6 percent of the farm income. Yet the Government has $3.5 billion tied up in wheat—30 percent of the total currently invested in farm price support operations. And, if the present system is continued, that will only be the downpayment.

Basically, President Eisenhower would start solving the problem by gradual withdrawal of subsidy incentives to overproduce. He would free the farmer of arbitrary controls by eliminating both acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat. Price supports would be continued but would be a percentage of recent average market prices, rather than a higher figure based on parity.

The effect of this system, long urged by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, would be to stop the marginal production of wheat at a guaranteed profit. At the same time, it would insure the efficient producer against disaster.

As further aids to retreat from overproduction, the President would:

Gradually expand the conservative reserve program up to 50 million acres. This would more than double the amount of land now withheld from production by this program. In his budget message, the President asked for 9 million additional acres in fiscal 1961, bringing the total to 37 million acres. Expanding population will require the use of this land years hence. Meanwhile its cultivation swamps the market.

He would be willing to consider payments in kind for reduction of surplus crop acreage. This is an interesting idea, advanced by farm groups. A wheat farmer, for instance, would stop growing wheat, temporarily, and draw the amount of his usual crop from Government shortage. Properly managed, this scheme could reduce Government cash outlays, reduce surplus supplies and cut storage costs.

The President's recent trip strengthened his belief in the food for peace program which uses surplus crops to feed hungry people abroad. He wants greater emphasis on research to find new uses for farm products, also more attention to the rural development program, finding new sources of income in depressed agricultural areas.

In none of this is there any quick cure for deep ills accumulating from generations of politically inspired tinkering with the fundametnal laws of supply and demand. Reform will take a long time and objective consideration is admittedly difficult in a Presidential election year. But, somewhere short of disaster for American agriculture, a start must be made. The President's suggestions are constructive to that end.

ACTION ON FARM SURPLUS NEEDED—DANGER TO NATION OF COSTLY PROBLEM CALLED SPUR TO SOLUTION BY CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

President Eisenhower has put up to Congress the task of closing perhaps the biggest gap. He says:

"The Government sustains a net cost of more than $1,000 a minute—$1.5 million every day—the year around, to stabilize wheat prices and income."

The President reveals that Federal funds tied up in wheat approximate $3.5 billion, and makes this further point:

"Although this means that well over 30 percent of the total funds invested in inventories and loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation goes for wheat, this crop provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from sales of farm products.

It wouldn't be so disturbing if the financial support given the farm program was getting somewhere. But it isn't. Produc-

tion, instead of being curtailed, is being stimulated. Here's how Mr. Eisenhower, in his latest message to Congress, explains what's happening:

"Day by day this program further distorts wheat markets and supplies. Its only future is ever higher cost. Inexorably it generates ever larger surpluses which must be expensively stored. Ultimately, if our Government does not act quickly and constructively, the danger is very real that this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation, and thousands of our farming people will be hurt."

What can be done about it? This is a political year. The so-called farm vote is supposed to be drawing away from the Republicans largely because the administration has refused to go in for higher and higher subsidies. So the President has put the dilemma squarely before Congress. He has, in effect, challenged the politicians in both parties. He says:

"Whatever the legislative approach, whether toward greater freedom or more regimentation, it must be sensible and economically sound and not a political poultice. And it must be enacted promptly. I will approve any constructive solution that the Congress wishes to develop."

The President then discusses several basic principles and various alternative plans, and promises to approve any one of them or a combination of constructive proposals. He doesn't abandon the idea of farm subsidies and, indeed, urges expansion of the present conservation reserve program up to 60 million acres. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make payments in kind for reduction of acreage devoted to crops in surplus and for retirement of such acreage from cultivation. The main condition imposed is that measures must be provided to keep total production below total consumption while this program is in operation. He says that, lacking such safeguards, a payment-in-kind procedure "would overload the free market and thereby depress prices."

Mr. Eisenhower has not heretofore offered such a flexibility of approach. He declares that, if Congress wishes to propose a plan of its own as an alternative, he will approve it so long as the plan is constructive. He insists that "the important thing for farmers, and for all other Americans, is for us to act sensibly and to act swiftly."

This means that Congress will be on the spot. It cannot dodge the issue. It will have to offer a legislative plan to remedy the present situation. This will tempt some influential members of Congress to write the kind of bill that will bring a presidential veto. But it is unlikely that such a measure would command a two-thirds vote to override a veto. For Congress is very much divided on the farm question.

The Republicans will make good use of the President's latest message to Congress. They will point out that he has placed directly upon Congress the major responsibility for originating farm legislation. If no suitable legislation is offered, the Democrats—since they are in control of both Houses of Congress—will have to accept the blame. At least, that's the theory. Conversely, if the Democrats come up with a measure that the President can sign, it helps the Republicans to take the issue to a large extent out of the 1960 presidential campaign.

Apart from politics, the next administration, irrespective of whether it is Democratic or Republican, will have to come to grips with the same agricultural problem. Hence, a start might as well be made now as a year hence to close the gap between the low net income of many farmers and the excessive production of certain farm products which, the President says pointedly, has been "largely due to economic distortions induced by years of Federal interference."

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 10, 1960]

MUCH MORE THAN VEXING

President Eisenhower erred on the side of understatement when he said that the farm situation is our "most vexing domestic problem." It is much more than that. It is a problem which has assumed nightmarish proportions, and which is threatening our agricultural economy.

Even so, it does not necessarily follow that anything will be done this year to ease the problem. The effect of Mr. Eisenhower's latest message is to toss a very "hot potato" to the Democratic Congress. As the President put it, "the American people have every right to expect the Congress to move promptly to solve situations of this kind." In this election year, however, it is most unlikely that the Congress will move promptly. For one thing, the problem is not susceptible of any quick solution. For another, the Democrats this year may very well prefer a farm issue to a solution of the farm problem.

Still, as one looks at the mounting agricultural surpluses, especially wheat, the day of reckoning obviously cannot be postponed indefinitely. The wheat program alone is costing the Government—and this means Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer—$1½ million every day of the year. Furthermore, the mounting surpluses, under the existing program, are defeating the avowed purpose of the program itself—to aid the farmers. The President, we think, was fully justified in saying that it "defies commonsense to continue to encourage, at the cost of many millions of tax dollars, the building of ever-larger excess supplies of products that, as they accumulate, depress farm prices and endanger the future of our farmers."

Undoubtedly, as Mr. Eisenhower says, this defies commonsense. But commonsense is bound to have rough sledding in any year in which the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, one-third of the Senate, and all of the House seats are at stake. At best, we doubt that anything that is politically courageous and constructive will be done about the farm problem before 1961.

Proposed Lifting of 4¼-Percent Interest Rate Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. John Schoonover, chairman of the board of the Idaho First National Bank, which sheds a great deal of light on the controversy over the President's request that Congress lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on the interest rate for long-term Treasury obligations. I know John Schoonover well, and I have the utmost confidence in the soundness of his views. He qualifies as an expert on matters of fiscal policy.

Mr. Schoonover is opposed to lifting the ceiling. He says that it seems to him appropriate that, when long-term money is sought, bonds should be put out in a market that wants long-term investments. Since there is not now that kind of a market, he feels that 4 years and 9 months are a long enough term for borrowing at the present high rates. He suggests that the Treasury should at least make some attempt to manage its affairs so as to borrow money as cheaply as possible, just as a private concern would do.

Mr. President, I have never known of a private business that intentionally took on long-term obligations at a time of record-high interest rates. During such a period, private business naturally endeavors to do its financing on a short-term basis, so that it will not be burdened by the high interest for a 20- or 30-year period. If this makes sense for private business, it seems to me it should also make sense for the Government.

I ask that the Schoonover letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDAHO FIRST NATIONAL BANK,
Boise, Idaho, January 20, 1960.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: You have undoubtedly heard a great deal about the administration's desire to have Congress remove the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Treasury obligations with a maturity of 5 years or longer. I should like to have you know my views, which you may be surprised to learn are in opposition to such a move.

I think the interest rate limitation is a good one from almost every standpoint, and the arguments that the Treasury uses seem to be a bit weak. Whether a borrower is the Government or some private enterprise, it seems to me to be appropriate that when long-term money is sought, bonds should be put out in a market that wants long-term investments.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the present time, in order to counter inflation, is pursuing—through its open market operations—a restrictive monetary policy. That is, whenever money seems to be easing a bit, they sell Treasury bills into the market, withdrawing Federal Reserve currency from general reserves in order to make payment of the bills which are purchased.

A couple of years ago they were doing the opposite in order to give a boost to the economy when a recession seemed to be under way. That would have been a good time for the Treasury to have borrowed long-term money. In fact, in May of 1958 a long-term bond of the Treasury, bearing 3½ percent and due February 15, 1990, was selling at 106. That same bond today is selling at around 85 per 100.

Some existing Government bonds presently outstanding are selling on a basis of over 6 percent yield to the investor, when consideration is given to the capital gains feature; and as a consequence I doubt whether any material amount of long-term Governments could be sold by the Treasury even if they were permitted to pay 5 percent or thereabouts.

They have the privilege now of paying whatever rate they need to pay for money under 5 years, and it would seem that 4 years and 9 months would be long enough period for borrowing at the present high rates. It seems that the Treasury should at least make some attempt to manage its affairs and borrow money as cheaply as possible, just as a private concern would do.

There is a limitation on the rates of interest which can be paid by many counties, cities, and municipalities generally, and I think these limitations are good. They serve to cause various municipalities to hesitate about borrowing when rates are abnormally high. That same psychology ought to apply

in connection with borrowings of the U.S. Government.

You do not need to feel that being opposed to the removal of the ceiling is entirely a political argument, because many folks who are students of finance and who are conservative in nature feel that the present limitations should be maintained.

With best wishes, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. SCHOONOVER,
Chairman.

Tax Ruling for Small Business Investment Companies: An Aid to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a press release, issued by the Small Business Administration, carried news of import to small business in this country.

It stated that the Treasury Department has approved a proposed rule that properly licensed small business investment companies "will not be subject to the 27½ percent tax on accumulated earnings up to $100,000 and 38½ percent above $100,000 if they engage in providing funds to small businesses and meet all other provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958."

In other words, this will encourage expansion of the investment company program, the advantage of which will accrue to small business enterprise. For this ruling will mean that an investment company—in order to take advantage of this tax ruling—must actively engage in the business of providing funds to small business concerns, either through the purchase of convertible debenture bonds or through the disbursement of long-term loans.

Mr. Speaker, with the thought in mind that perhaps this information is not, as yet, widely known in the small-business community and because I think it merits the widest possible distribution and leadership, I wish to insert at this point the full text of the SBA release of February 10, 1960:

The Small Business Administration hailed as salutary today the Treasury Department approval of a proposed rule that small business investment companies licensed by the agency will not be subject to the 27½ percent tax on accumulated earnings up to $100,000 and 38½ percent above $100,000 if they engage in providing funds to small businesses and meet all other provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Approval of the exception to the tax imposition was published January 28 in the Federal Register, following earlier publication last September 2, 1959, of the proposed rule.

Duncan H. Read, SBA Deputy Administrator for its Investment Division, said the Treasury's approval of the proposed rule would have "a salutary effect" on the expansion of the investment company program.

The rule adopted by the Treasury Department said that a small business investment company would still be considered a "mere holding or investment company" within the meaning of section 533(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, but the "presumption of existence of the purpose to avoid income tax" resulting from its being a "mere holding or investment company" will be considered overcome if the SBIC:

1. Complies with all the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and the regulations thereunder; and

2. Actively engages in the business of providing funds to small business concerns through the purchase of convertible debenture bonds of such concerns or through the disbursement of long-term loans to such concerns under sections 304 and 305 of the Small Business Investment Act.

Violation of or failure to comply with the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act or failure to invest its funds actively in small business concerns would reintroduce the "presumption" by the Treasury of "the purpose to avoid income tax" and result in imposition of the accumulated earnings levy.

Small business investment companies are already exempt from the personal holding company surtax of 75 percent on undistributed earnings up to $2,000 and 85 percent above $2,000.

In addition, SBIC's and their individual stockholders are allowed an ordinary loss deduction, rather than a capital loss in the event of loss in the sale of convertible debentures of small businesses or of the stock of small business obtained by conversion, or in the event of worthlessness of either the debentures or the stock.

SBIC's are given also a 100-percent deduction on dividends they may get from the stock in small business which they may hold.

Internal Revenue Bureau regulations covering provisions of the above-mentioned statutory allowances were published in the Federal Register simultaneously with the accumulated earnings announcement.

Recommendations Concerning the Soil Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am happy to report that two of the major farm organizations of North Dakota, the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union, have in one county of my State, Richland County, gotten together and have made some very good recommendations concerning the soil bank program.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted at a joint meeting of the boards of directors of the Richland County Farm Bureau and the Richland County Farmers Union held in Wahpeton, N. Dak., January 27, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a joint meeting of the Boards of Directors of the Richland County Farm Bureau and the Richland County Farmers Union held in Wahpeton on January 27, 1960—the following resolution was formulated, and, on motion by Herb Goerger, Farm Bureau chairman, and seconded by Darrel Miller, Farmers Union chairman, was unanimously passed.

Be it resolved, That Congress appropriate funds sufficient to put the following program into operation to accommodate all applicants who can qualify:

1. That rental payments should be made in accordance with the past 10-year production average for each individual farm and not on a bid basis. The payments should reflect a wider differential between high- and low-productive land.

2. That the soil bank be open to farm operators only and payments divided between owner and tenant on the same basis as the crop-share terms.

3. That a maximum and minimum percentage of a farm unit be allowed in a soil-bank contract of from 10 to 40 percent with a $5,000 limitation per operator.

4. That a 3- to 5-year contract be allowed, and, if continued, no acreage could be banked a second time under one long-term contract until the whole farm had been covered by such a contract rotation.

5. That all weeds and pests be more strictly controlled on soil-bank land.

MARVIN J. HUCKLE,
Farmers Union Acting Secretary.

University of Florida Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the great Florida Medical Center which is located on the campus of the University of Florida in Gainesville, Fla., which is in my congressional district. I am very pleased to note that this great medical center is not only known throughout Florida, but has already achieved a national reputation. As evidence of this fact, I am pleased to enclose an article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, February 7, 1960:

FLORIDA MEDICAL CENTER—TWO NEW UNITS IN GAINESVILLE COMPLEX PUT IT IN VANGUARD OF U.S. SERVICES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

A few years ago on the northern edge of the great Florida Citrus Belt, which starts a few miles south of the University of Florida in Gainesville, a young farmer fell from a ladder while working in his groves. Although the fall was not from a great height, he landed on some of his agricultural equipment in such a way that his back was broken and he was paralyzed.

Fortunately, through the Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the young man was sent to a rehabilitation center outside the State for treatment and returned later to become a successful insurance man, working from his wheelchair.

Today it is no longer necessary for severely disabled Floridians to be sent out of the State for rehabilitation. Their needs can now be met through the new rehabilitation services of the teaching hospital and clinics of the J. Hillis Miller Health Center, at the University of Florida. Five hundred persons from 12 States attended the formal ceremonies held here this weekend to announce

the new rehabilitation services and the new college of health-related services.

ONE OF BEST IN UNITED STATES

These two new units are the latest in one of the most modern and best planned university health centers in the Nation. The center is named for the late president of the university.

Already in operation are the colleges of medicine, nursing, pharmacy and health-related services and a teaching hospital and clinics. Ground-breaking ceremonies for a new $1,680,000 pharmacy-research building were held last November.

Florida's new health center did not just happen. Aided by grants from the State, Federal Government, and the commonwealth fund, the university brought experts and consultants in all aspects of health education, research and services to the campus in the 8-year planning period.

MEDICINE SCHOOL THE FIRST

As a result, the health center is unique in many ways. Major among these is its educational philosophy, which is based on the concept that members of the health team who are trained together in the same environment will be better prepared to work together.

Professional isolationism is broken down because students in the colleges of medicine, nursing, pharmacy and health-related services utilize the same educational and clinical facilities.

The first units to be activated in the health center were the colleges of medicine and nursing, which admitted their first students in the fall of 1956. First dividends on this investment will come this June with the graduation of 40 new physicians and 25 new nurses.

The second major development came with the opening of the magnificent 400-bed teaching hospital and clinic in the fall of 1958.

Many of our older hospitals, obsolete architecturally and disorganized functionally, are reminiscent of the clutter of a country general store. In sharp contrast, this hospital has the efficiency of a modern department store. However, it has more of the atmosphere of a home than an institution. This feeling is carried out in the most minute detail, from the noninstitutional furniture to the soft pastel colors.

A particularly remarkable feature of the center is an ambulant wing, which functions as a hotel. Here are housed the patients receiving diagnostic and therapeutic services who do not need such costly items as nursing and bedside food services.

Patients live in comfortable surroundings at a cheaper cost, eat in the cafeteria and may even have a family member with them. They are free to come and go as they wish within the limits dictated by their physical condition.

For these patients recreational group therapy as well as visiting with other patients and staff are excellent antidotes for anxiety. This ambulant unit has proved to be especially valuable for psychiatric patients.

THERAPISTS TRAINED

The new College of Health-Related Services currently includes a graduate program in rehabilitation counseling, which has been conducted by the university since 1956, and three new undergraduate programs in medical technology, physical therapy, and occupational therapy. The latter are particularly important new resources for Florida and all the Southeast.

Prior to their establishment there were no programs for training physical therapists in Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, and no training programs for occupational therapists in these States plus North Carolina. This has resulted in fewer physical therapists and occupational therapists for the population in the Southeast than in any other section of the country.

Tribute to Women's Role in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, as our country expands and progresses, the role of women becomes increasingly important in the economy, as well as in all other phases of our way of life.

Today, there are about 23 million women in the labor force of the Nation. By 1970, it is expected there will be about 30 million—accounting for one out of every three workers in our labor battalions.

Once confined to the home, women today—because of farreaching changes in our social and economic systems, as well as new educational and vocational opportunities—are participating more actively in practically all aspects of American life. These include office work, manufacturing, professions, arts, agriculture, and many other fields. In this rapidly advancing technological age, the sciences, too, are offering new opportunities of careers for women.

However, the American woman still splendidly performs her fundamental role as wife, mother, and homemaker, as well as constructively contributes to community, civic, religious, and other programs.

Today, I would like particularly to pay tribute to the outstanding accomplishments of Mrs. Julia B. Dolan of Milwaukee, Wis.

Over the years, she has been a wife, homemaker, and, as well, a lawyer and a leader in providing legal aid to the indigent.

The State Bar of Wisconsin Committee on Legal Aid recently sponsored a testimonial breakfast in recognition of her splendid contributions in the legal field, particularly in connection with her work with the Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee—a community chest supported agency, which, since 1914, has furnished free legal counsel to persons who cannot afford to pay counsel fees.

Symbolical of the splendid contributions which a member of the once so-called—but erroneously, I believe—weaker sex is making in the professional, as well as a great many other fields, I ask unanimous consent to have an article on her work from the Milwaukee Journal, by Ellen Gibson, reviewing her contributions to this field, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HER LEGAL AID TO INDIGENT IS BASIS FOR A TESTIMONIAL

(By Ellen Gibson)

Julia B. Dolan hopes that one of her granddaughters will take up what Mrs. Dolan regards as a wonderful profession for women—the law.

There is some encouragement for her fond dream in the fact that Louise, the oldest of three granddaughters, is at 4 parroting bits of "Nana's" mealtime conversations about the Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee.

Since 1914, this community chest-supported agency has furnished free legal counsel to persons who cannot pay an attorney's fees. For the last 20 years, the society's direction has been in the small but capable hands of Mrs. Dolan.

The State Bar of Wisconsin Committee on Legal Aid is sponsoring a testimonial breakfast in tribute to her devoted duty at 8:30 a.m., February 19, at the Schroeder Hotel. Invitations are going out from Walter Graunke, Wausau, committee chairman, to some 450 lawyers, judges, and other friends. Judge F. Ryan Duffy of the Federal circuit court of appeals in Chicago will speak.

FAMILY TO BE PRESENT

In the audience will be Mrs. Dolan's husband, John J., an attorney who is now a vice president of the Milwaukee Gas Light Co., and their three sons, John, 30, of Hartland, an advertising man; Thomas, 27, now teaching the history of philosophy at Edgewood Academy, Madison, while working on a doctorate at the University of Wisconsin, and Philip, 25, in the marketing division of a manufacturing firm.

The Dolans decided ruefully several years ago that their boys must have heard too much law talk to favor it as a profession for themselves.

Mrs. Dolan completed work on her law degree after her marriage to a fellow Marquette University law student. For 12 years she was in part-time private practice. She specialized in probate and domestic relations, fields which she believes are particularly suited to women attorneys.

LOGICAL CHOICE FOR POST

One of her major problems was asking clients for money when they had so many other troubles. So in 1939 when the strictly nonprofit legal aid society needed a new director, she was a logical choice. She had already become widely known in civic and welfare circles.

They tell the story that she asked a low salary so that she would not feel guilty if she stayed home when one of the boys had measles.

Mrs. Dolan is not the usual mental image of the woman lawyer. She is just 5 feet tall in high heels and enjoys pretty clothes and jewelry. She has short black hair and hazel eyes and an air of friendly efficiency. The big old-fashioned Dolan home at 2522 East Newberry Boulevard is the scene of many festive parties and family gatherings.

WOMAN'S TOUCH APPARENT

Her office is on the sixth floor of the YWCA, 610 North Jackson Street, has its complement of legal texts and workaday tools but the walls are a soft gray blue and there are textured drapes at the windows, abstract hangings over a davenport, a vine in a brass planter, and handsome barometer and clock that were Christmas gifts from her husband, and pictures of the four grandchildren set in novel paperweights.

There she was interviewed last week.

Legal aid, she pointed out, provides the community with a unique service.

"In our free enterprise United States," she said, "there is no setup in the law for representing indigent people in most court actions. Only in felony cases does the

court appoint an attorney for an indigent defendant. In any person's life, there may be a time when he needs the protection of the law. It can be a catastrophe if he does not have legal representation."

BASIC TO MOVEMENT

It is basic to the legal aid movement that "equality before the law is the cornerstone of the American concept of democracy" and that "poverty must not be allowed to stand in the way of equal justice for any citizen."

Many Milwaukee clients of the Legal Aid Society have been frightened by eviction notices or are involved in landlord-tenant disputes. Others are in marital difficulty. Wives may need help to obtain support orders. Small claims cases are frequent, and often can be settled with a letter.

Mrs. Dolan supervises a staff which includes another full-time attorney, a part-time attorney handling courtwork and two office secretaries. She has developed a program of training 20 Marquette University law students each semester. With the Milwaukee Bar Association, she organized a bar reference panel, to which clients who can pay but don't know an attorney may be directed. With the help of the Junior Bar Association, the society organized a voluntary defender program to give free counsel in the district court.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

The newest of her ventures is a volunteer program for the Lawyer's Wives of Milwaukee. About 35 of them are now appearing at the office for regular half days. They answer telephones, register clients, file papers, and soothe waiting children in a playroom which they fixed up in a corner of an office.

Mrs. Dolan has been an active member of such groups as the Zonta Club, Business and Professional Women's Club, Women's Court and Civic Conference and Community Welfare Council. She helped found the Milwaukee County Women Lawyers' Association. For 3 years, she served on the executive board of the National Legal Aid Association. The Quota Club in 1955 named her the Milwaukee "Career Woman of the Year."

CASELOAD SOARS

In her 20 years with the society, Mrs. Dolan has seen the caseload climb from 2,000 a year to 5,500 and the budget grow from an annual $5,500 to $31,634.

A tireless "salesman" for legal aid service, Mrs. Dolan looks upon each new extension of program as an opportunity to enlist more public support. That is the way she is trying to regard the testimonial breakfast ahead. She returned from a recent Caribbean vacation to find the plans afoot. She protested.

"It's already in the hopper," her good friends and admirers told her, "and there is nothing you can do about it."

Tadeusz Kosciuszko—1746–1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Poland has been a great reservoir of soldiers of freedom. And whenever her brave and courageous sons have found it impossible to serve the cause of their unhappy and unfortunate kinsmen, they have had no difficulty in findings fields of activity where they have rendered immense services for the cause of human freedom. Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who served in our War of Independence from 1776 to the end of that war, was one of those gallant fighters whose deeds on battlefields and his ingenious methods of devising our defenses and fortifications, have endeared him to all Americans.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a rare character in his days. He showed remarkable aptitude as a student of the military art and was offered the best military education in his native Poland. But for this energetic, ambitious, and idealistic youth of fighting spirit, that was not sufficient. He went to France and there at the famous Mezieres Military School specialized in artillery and engineering. Thus he was thoroughly prepared for the tasks he undertook while in the service of the Continental Army. For his distinguished services Congress made him a brigadier general in 1783, and with that proud rank he returned to Poland hoping to serve his country's cause. Unfortunately that was not to be; after more than 20 years' struggle, he died in exile in Switzerland at the age of 71. Today in paying homage to his blessed memory we once more acknowledge our gratitude to this brave and patriotic son of Poland.

Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, this week over 5 million members of the Boy Scouts of America will celebrate their 50th anniversary. The Boy Scouts were first incorporated in the District of Columbia on February 8, 1910. On this occasion I wish to pay tribute to this organization and its members for the outstanding contribution they have made to our country and people.

The Scout, through his training and adherence to the Scout oath and law, represents the qualities of our American youth. Scouting has played a major role in the activities of our country in every kind of emergency. During both World Wars, they responded to the call of duty with the obedience of a well trained soldier. In World War I they raised nearly one half billion dollars in Liberty Loans and distributed over 30 million pieces of Government literature. During World War II, in the year 1942 alone, the Scouts collected 250 million pounds of wastepaper, over 73 million pounds of rubber, over 293 pounds of scrap metal and nearly 10 million pounds of tin cans. There are so many accomplishments the Scouts made during these two wars it is impossible to list them all in these brief remarks.

Disasters during peacetime found the Scouts responding to the urgent pleas of help. In 1925 they rendered service in the Illinois tornado, California earthquake, and the fire at Shreveport, La.; 1927 found the Scouts assisting in the Mississippi floods, St. Louis tornado, and the New England floods. They collected 1,812,284 items of clothing, foodstuff, household furnishings, and supplies for the needy and distressed in the year 1934.

Today, reviewing the past 50 years of the Scout movement, I hope the next 50 years will be as fruitful and rewarding. The Scouts in their devotion to God and country, will continue to lead our youth in the building of spiritual values, high moral character, and strong bodies. In these days of danger of communistic oppression and atheistic ideology, we should heed the words of our late President Roosevelt in a speech to the Boy Scouts on February 8, 1941:

> The Boy Scouts of today are approaching manhood at a grave hour in the world's history. Recent events have threatened the security of freemen everywhere, and the democratic way of life is being challenged in many parts of the world. The United States must be strong if our free way of life is to be maintained, and for our national policy we, as a nation, have adopted the motto of the Boy Scout organization—"Be Prepared."

During these days of uncertainty, I feel that we as a nation should heed these words and again use the motto "Be Prepared."

Birthday Anniversary of Two Great Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 12, is the anniversary of the birth of two great men who have played important roles in the history of our Nation—Abraham Lincoln and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko. Although they lived in different periods, they shared the same respect for man's dignity and they both loved liberty.

Every school boy and girl in America learns about the great champion of freedom, Abraham Lincoln, and how he has inspired men of good will everywhere.

General Kosciusko is the hero of two continents. He fought for freedom in our American Revolution and then returned to Poland where he led a revolt to bring freedom to his own people. He was the first foreign patriot who did not hesitate to cross the ocean to fight for the principles in which he firmly believed. He was a great military leader and his engineering genius contributed a great deal to the American cause.

Kosciusko dedicated his life to the universal struggle for freedom, and his courage, bravery, and sacrifice should be an inspiration to us all. This struggle continues, never ceasing, and while Poland is oppressed today under communism the love of liberty has not diminished. As long as the spirit of Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the

Polish people, their outlook for the sacred cause is bright.

We all join together in paying tribute to the memory of these two great men.

Necessary Business Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials entitled "Necessary Business Expenses" which appeared in the New Orleans States-Item in the issue of Wednesday, February 3, 1960; and "Petition for Fair Play" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, February 1, 1960:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Feb. 3, 1960]

NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES

Timely and fair is a bill by Representative HALE BOGGS asking classification as legitimate expenses those sums spent by industry to speak its mind on Federal legislation.

Until now, the Internal Revenue Service has held that bills run up by a business or anyone else in attempting to influence legislation through the medium of free expression of opinion are not proper expenses.

And the advertiser who has bought space or time to set forth his views on a measure before Congress has had to pay taxes on the money so spent.

Representative BOGGS, however, proposes in House Resolution 7123 that all such expenses be deductible.

As things now stand, he believes, a penalty is being placed on the utilization of freedom of speech in communicating opinion to the Nation's citizens and lawmakers.

He is on sound ground when he says that any business which feels a particular measure is deleterious to its interest must be allowed to say so without being penalized income taxwise.

Such expressions of opinion should be interpreted as legitimate, deductible expenses.

If the cost of being heard in the interest of self-preservation isn't a necessary business expense, then what is?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 1, 1960]

PETITION FOR FAIR PLAY

If you look at Representative HALE BOGGS' bill one way, we suppose it could be called a proposal to help Washington lobbyists. Why, one might be inclined to ask, should the law be changed to permit an individual who wants Uncle Sam to ease up on his taxes, or pass a measure that will help his business, to deduct the costs of his attempts to influence legislation from his income?

The argument sounds reasonable enough. But if you'll take the trouble to look at the other side of the proposal of the Louisiana Congressman, his bill takes on a far different appearance.

The problem lies, first of all, in the inequities of the tax laws that result in a privilege to some and a penalty to others. In this case, the constitutional right of petition granted all the people is affected.

Here's how it works: A great many tax-exempt organizations and a lot of pressure groups are permitted—and rightly so—to engage in lobbying efforts to influence legislation without losing their tax-exempt status. And Government agencies, which of course pay no taxes, are among the biggest lobbyists in the Nation's Capital.

But, says Representative BOGGS, present Internal Revenue Service regulations prevent like deductions by individual people. "Even the expenses of a businessman's appearance at a public hearing before a congressional committee considering legislation affecting his business may be disallowed."

Mr. BOGGS' petition for fair play is based on the pretty sound idea that the right of any and all citizens to petition for good laws, or to oppose bad laws, as they see those laws, should not be diluted by punitive taxation.

Hence his bill to allow expenses legally incurred in attempts to influence legislation to be as tax deductible as expenses of foundations, tax-exempt lobbies, and Government agencies.

And when you get right down to it, the way the regulation works now it means that if a bill is before Congress and John Smith wants to have his say in opposition to some pretty powerful tax-exempt interests, John Smith has to pay taxes on what he says.

Mr. Powell Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MR. POWELL SUPPORTED—QUALIFICATIONS FOR HEADING HOUSE COMMITTEE REVIEWED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

One must always agree—on the basis of its unmatched stature—that the New York Times is a most responsible pillar of journalism. At the same time one must also recognize the fallibility even of the Times.

It appears to me that in support of the opposition to Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL'S appointment as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor the Times is employing a specious argument. This argument stands on a three-legged stool: He is a racist; he has a poor record as a legislator; and his absenteeism.

In the first place, what is a racist? Is he a citizen fighting to extend democracy to his own race, or one who would deny those rights? A "racist" is one who believes in racial superiority and not racial equality. If the Times' reasoning on this point should be carried to a logical conclusion, no southerner and few northerners could qualify as a committee chairman.

WILL OF MAJORITY

In our democracy the real test for the chairman of a congressional committee is whether or not he is willing to allow the will of the majority to rule. In his very first press conference on this subject, Congressman POWELL made it clear that, as chairman, he would bring all legislation to a committee vote. Congressman POWELL said that Congressman PHIL LANDRUM of Georgia and CARL ELLIOTT of Alabama would be retained as subcommittee chairmen.

The argument that Mr. POWELL should not be appointed because he is a "poor legislator," is both irrelevant and misleading. In the 16 years in Congress Mr. POWELL has done exactly as his constituents in Harlem have wanted him to do: continue to introduce all forms of civil rights legislation whether the Congress passed it or not. It would be far more accurate to say of Mr. POWELL that a good legislator has been operating in a poor Congress.

Thirdly, the charge of "absenteeism" against Congressman POWELL is an old canard which really does him a grave injustice. The workload carried by Mr. POWELL, despite many serious illnesses, would stagger the most hearty individual. For 30 years he has been minister of the Abyssinian Baptist Church. In Congress he is the Representative for practically the whole of the Negro population of the United States. His daily mail easily outnumbers that of any other Congressman, by at least 3 to 1. He reads, and answers, every single letter.

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING

Congressman POWELL is in his second term as chairman of the 17-man House subcommittee on mines and mining. He has attended every meeting and has brought along such fine knowledge and ability to this highly technical committee as to win public commendation from the full committee chairman and those members who serve under him.

I submit that the Times would have been wise to examine the members of Mr. POWELL'S present committee before reaching such a hasty and premature conclusion; the same would be true of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who by public pronouncement has supported Mr. POWELL'S appointment.

In the light of the foregoing evaluation one can only hope that the Times will give further editorial consideration to Mr. POWELL'S appointment. For if for any reason, including Mr. BARDEN'S decision under pressure to run again, Congressman POWELL is denied the chairmanship, the whole world will look upon democracy as a bitter palliative for its oppressive sickness.

JOHN YOUNG III.

A Letter From Bishop Sherman L. Greene to the Editor of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 1, 1960.

The EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

SIR: As a southerner, familiar with the great need for fairer regional representation on committee chairmanships in the Congress, I am somewhat dismayed at the editorial position of the New York Times as it voices opposition to Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL as possible head of the important House Committee on Education and Labor.

In direct rebuttal to your reference to Mr. POWELL'S record as "miserable," I respectfully call your attention to the splendid record our "champion of civil rights" has been making during his tenure as subchairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining. It is a matter of record that Mr. POWELL has been publicly applauded by his colleagues in the 86th Congress for his industry, attention to work and "attendance at all of the meetings." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, 1959.)

Your reference to Mr. POWELL as a racist was most ingracious, in fact it was inept. If the gentleman from New York has been

forced to emphasize his resentment over the denial of basic citizenship rights to Negroes, it should be to his credit that he has thus made himself a Congressman at Large, the voice of the Negro people themselves.

When contrasted with the segregationist, fascist, and most un-American character of some of Mr. POWELL's colleagues in this same Congress, he stands out in bold belief as a patriot. There is nothing racist about POWELL's demands for Negro equality. Either he simply echos the determination of Negroes for full freedom now.

The New York Times must continue to criticize editorially and your right to do so is the very essence of democracy. Seizing this moment to attract the system of seniority however, is almost certain to be misunderstood, for POWELL is a hero from Bandung to Birmingham. Then too, is it not the judgment of the voters of Mr. POWELL's district that keeps him in the Congress? Let us help, not hinder those who work for a better America.

Bishop SHERMAN L. GREENE,
Senior Bishop and Chairman of the General Board of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Retirement of Prominent Bank Executive of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story that was featured in the Plain Speaker of Hazleton on Tuesday, January 19, 1960, announcing the retirement of Mr. Alvan Markle, Jr., as vice president of the Northeastern Pennsylvania National Bank & Trust Co. of Hazleton. Mr. Markle has had a most outstanding career in the business life of the city of Hazleton, and is a member of a distinguished family which pioneered the development of that city, the second largest in my district. Though Mr. Markle has retired from an active role in banking, I am certain he will continue to make impressive contributions to the progress of his native city which will redound to the benefit of the entire community which I have the privilege and honor of representing.

ALVAN MARKLE, JR., TO RETIRE FROM BANK POST—FORMER HEAD OF MARKLE BANK TO CONTINUE SERVICE WITH CAN-DO

Alvan Markle, Jr., one of the region's most prominent bank executives and member of a family which pioneered the development of the Hazleton area, retired as vice president of the Northeastern Pennsylvania National Bank & Trust Co. of this city.

He will continue to serve as a member of the board of directors and will maintain offices in the bank at 8 West Broad Street.

He will also continue to serve as a director, executive committee member and chairman of the finance committee of CAN-DO.

Markle has served as an officer of the banking institution—one of the oldest in the city—since 1916, when he became a vice president of the Markle Banking & Trust Co. He was elected president in 1929.

In 1958, when the Markle Bank merged with the First National Bank of Scranton and the Wilkes-Barre Deposit & Savings Bank to become Northeastern National, Markle became a vice president and director of the new bank.

WILL CONTINUE CAN-DO ROLE

The retiring bank official told the Plain Speaker that he hopes to continue to serve on the CAN-DO board "as long as they want me."

Markle, born in Hazleton on July 28, 1889, is the son of Alvan Markle and Mary Dryfoos Markle. He received his early schooling in the Hazleton public schools, Fay School at Southborough, Mass., and the Hill School, Pottstown.

Later he entered Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, graduating in 1913 with the degree of bachelor of philosophy. While at school and college he was active in athletics and at Yale was a member of the senior student council.

After graduating from college, he entered the services of Guaranty Trust Co., New York City, where he remained a year and a half; this experience, together with another year's apprenticeship at the Markle Bank, gave him a fundamental knowledge in banking and trust work as he assumed the vice presidency of the Markle Bank in 1916.

EXTENSIVE COAL INTERESTS

The production of anthracite coal interested Markle as it did his father and grandfather before him. He became a director of Jeddo-Highland Coal Co., Hazle Brook Coal Co., Markle Corp., Fuel Service Co., General Coal Co., Rockhill Coal Co., Raven Run Coal Co., Madeira Coal Sales Co., Jeddo Supply Co., and Jeddo Tunnel Co.

He was also interested in transportation and manufacturing and became a director in Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton Railroad Co., Lehigh Traction Co., Hazleton Auto-Bus Co., North Branch Bus Co., Hazleton Manufacturing Co., and Artcraft Hosiery Co., later Sanson Hosiery Mills, Inc.

A director of the Altamount Hotel Co., he was instrumental in starting Pennmar Shares, Inc., an investment holding company, in 1930, and became its first president as well as director.

Turning his attention to the development of new industries in recent years, he was elected a director of Greater Hazleton Community-Area New Development Organization, Inc. (CAN-DO), and has served as its first and only finance committee chairman.

HEADED LIBERTY BOND DRIVE

When World War I started, Markle was local chairman of the first Liberty loan drive, but left that job to others when he went to Fort Niagara on August 25, 1917, to enlist in the Officers Reserve Training Corps.

He received a commission as second lieutenant in the U.S. Signal Corps on September 12, 1917.

Later the aviation section of the U.S. Army was formed and he was promoted June 15, 1918, to first lieutenant in the air service. At the time of the armistice he had been recommended for a captaincy.

During World War II and up until 1949, he served as war bond chairman in lower Luzerne County.

On January 20, 1917, he married Gladys Jones, daughter of Thomas D. Jones, coal operator. Four children were born to them: Maj. Alvan Markle, Lt. Thomas Vaughn Markle, Dr. George Bushar Markle IV, and Marian Markle Pool.

Mrs. Markle died May 20, 1945, and on February 21, 1948, he married Ruth Thomas Gillett at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City. Ruth T. Gillett Markle died August 10, 1952. On February 21, 1955, he married Rebecca Miller Conderman, of Bryn Mawr.

CLUB MEMBERSHIPS

Markle is a member of the following clubs: Union Club, Yale Club, St. Anthony Club, and Pennsylvania Society, all of New York City; the Racquet Club, Midday Club, and Gulph Mills Golf Club of Philadelphia; and the Fishers Island Country Club and Porcupine Club of Nassau.

In Hazleton, he is a member of the Craftsman's Club, American Legion Post No. 76, and is a past president of the Valley Country Club.

He has been a member of the board of trustees of the Hill School, Pottstown, since 1934, and was president of the board during the years 1951 and 1952. He is a 32-degree Mason.

Residing at Sugarloaf, he finds his recreation in golf, tennis, books, photography, and landscape painting. In past years he devoted much of his time to community chest work and chamber of commerce activities.

Real Life in Fiction Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of "The Benefactor," by Maria Flores, which appears in the Saturday Review of February 13, 1960. "The Benefactor" is in real life Dominican Republic dictator Trujillo. The Spanish professor, Dr. Tomas Alfaro, was in real life famed Basque Scholar Dr. Jesus de Galindez. The young American pilot, Johnny Daly, was in real life a former resident of the congressional district I represent, a young man named Gerry Murphy. Author Flores has written in fictionalized form a real-life story which ought not to have happened but did.

BOOK IN THE NEWS

Maria Flores is the pseudonym of an Anglo-Argentinian who emigrated to this country in the forties and later wrote "The Woman With the Whip," a study of Eva Perón. In her new novel, "The Benefactor" (Doubleday, $3.95), she tells another tale of Latin American dictatorship. A Spanish professor named Dr. Tomás Alfaro finishes one of his evening lectures at Columbia University, waves goodbye to several students who have dropped him off at the Columbus Circle subway stop, and is never seen again—except by his captors. He is shanghaied onto a waiting airplane, strapped to a stretcher, and passed off as an invalid to the naive young American pilot who flies him to an unnamed island in the Caribbean ruled by "The Benefactor."

Readers may find that the plot of this fast-paced, exciting novel has a familiar ring. It was just a little more than 3 years ago that a Spanish professor named Dr. Jesús de Galíndez finished one of his evening lectures at Columbia University, waved goodby to several students who had dropped him off at the Columbus Circle subway stop, and was never seen again—except by his captors. Based on later evidence reported in the press, it was widely believed that Dr. Galíndez was shanghaied onto a waiting airplane, strapped to a stretcher, and passed off as an invalid to Gerald Lester Murphy, the young American pilot who flew him to the Dominican

Republic, a misnamed Caribbean dictatorship ruled by Rafael Leonidas Trujillo de Molina. After the flight, young Murphy became quite affluent, but his luxury living was brief, and the price of his idyll in the sun was high. On December 3, 1956, he was murdered in the Dominican Republic.

In Miss Flores's novel a young American pilot named Johnny Daly is murdered on the unnamed Caribbean island of The Benefactor, and it is largely through his experiences after flying Dr. Alfaro in from New York that the story is told. Daly was merely doing a job, and he felt that the political intrigues of these foreign-speaking folks was their own business. Dr. Alfaro, the captive whom Johnny flew to his death, was killed because he had constantly attacked and exposed the tactics and dictatorial rule of The Benefactor (just as Dr. Galindez had devoted his speaking and writing to outspoken criticism of the Dominican dictator). Johnny Daly was killed because he knew too much—or perhaps, in a larger sense, because he understood too little. He knew too much about the kidnapping of the invalid he flew to the island of The Benefactor, but he understood too little about The Benefactor's ruthless power.

This story of intrigue and tragedy is told by Miss Flores through the eyes of a hired killer, of Dr. Alfaro himself, of the young American pilot who is doomed and doesn't know it, and, finally, of the island girl who is hired to gain Johnny Daly's intimate confidence and disobeys orders by falling in love with him. Behind the private loves and losses of all these people—and, indeed, of all the inhabitants of the sun-baked, fear-stiffled island—looms the figure of The Benefactor, who, like fate itself, is cruel, ruthless, unsparing, and unseen.

In a sense, The Benefactor is the major character in this novel, and yet it is appropriate that the author never lets us hear his voice or see his face. His presence pervades the action, like the presence of death, and weighs more heavily throughout each page as the characters move in the paths that are charted by the whim of his vengeance.

Unlike many novels that bear resemblance to certain factual situations, "The Benefactor is a tightly written, well-wrought narrative that is absorbing for its own sake. The shadows of the real-life tragedy that it suggests merely adds a nightmare dimension to its already harrowing quality.

—DAN WAKEFIELD.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, 1746–1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, great men dedicated to great causes sometimes find themselves hopelessly frenzied and sadly frustrated. Often circumstances and the course of events interpose insuperable difficulties, and thus prevent such men from serving the cause to which they are dedicated. The life of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, of Poland, illustrates this point quite clearly.

This brave son of Poland was dedicated to the cause of his unfortunate kinsmen. By the time he grew up and was ready to serve that cause, he learned that, because of political conditions, his services were of no avail to his beloved country. Fortunately for our great Republic, he devoted himself to serving an equally good cause in fighting for our independence. What was Poland's loss, turned out to be America's gain, and tomorrow, February 12, on the 214th anniversary of his birth we honor the memory of this great soldier of freedom for the signal, invaluable services he rendered to this country as a courageous soldier and as a resourceful planner of our defenses in our War of Independence.

Inflation and Irredeemable Currency Go Hand in Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. J. Stuhlmiller:

INFLATION AND IRREDEEMABLE CURRENCY GO HAND IN HAND

(By H. J. Stuhlmiller)

Regarding the tangibles—the things that we make and can see or touch—much progress has been made.

But regarding the intangibles—morals, politics, government, and monetary economics in particular—our progress has lagged; at times it has been retrogressive. The reason is our neglect of history and our failure to profit by lessons of the past.

Consequently civilization has advanced and declined. Nations rose, then fell from power. Because their rulers debased their currencies, many governments have fallen.

Since the time that paper money and bank checks came into general use, currency is debased by causing it first to become irredeemable. Commonly that is known as going off the gold standard. Causing currency to become irredeemable means that government ceases to respect its obligation to redeem its paper money promises with coins of the metal it has designated as standard. Governments have rarely taken this step unless forced to do so by reason of near insolvency—usually the aftermath of wars.

Without one single exception, history shows that while currency is not redeemable, all money loses value, evidenced by a price level that sooner or later starts to rise; slowly at first, then gaining momentum in its later stages. Only while currencies remain irredeemable is it necessary to fight inflation. That our U.S. dollar is irredeemable is the direct and underlying reason that our Nation is having its continual fight with inflation.

ITS START

It was started in 1933. Our Nation was emerging from the depression. Even in 1932 there were signs of recovery. But prices seemed too sluggish; in his impatience to drive them up, our President decided to inflate. So we were taken off the gold standard. Then, by means of inflating the money supply—deficit spending—until prices had reached some desirable level, inflation was to stop and we were promised "a dollar that will not change in debt-paying and purchasing power within the next generation."

True to history, inflation was not stopped for the reason that a redeemable currency has not been restored.

THE INFLATION OF 1862–75

Much may be learned by reviewing that period of the preceding century when Americans had to fight inflation. The costs of carrying on the War of the Rebellion were so great that both the Northern and Southern States had to resort to the issuance of irredeemable currency to pay their bills.

According to the records, "Those who advocated their issue (the irredeemable greenbacks) justified themselves on the ground of necessity. No one who spoke in favor of the measure favored it upon principle, or hesitated to express his apprehensions that evil consequences might result from it. But the Government was in peril, the emergency was pressing, necessity seemed to sanction a departure from sound principles of finance, if not from the letter of the Constitution, and an irredeemable currency became the lawful money of the country."

True to history, prices went up and up.

During this Civil War inflation, in his letter to the national banks, December 20, 1863, Comptroller of the Currency Hugh McCulloch stated: "Although the loyal States appear superficially to be in a prosperous condition, such is not the fact * * * while cities are crowded and the country is to the same extent depleted, the Nation, whatever may be the external indications, is not prospering."

And in his report dated November 25, 1864, he commented: "Governments should not be bankers. None has existed which could be safely trusted with the privilege of permanently issuing its own notes as money. * * * When money is plenty, and fortunes are being rapidly acquired the country is always in a feverish and unhealthy state. This is especially true at the present time. The enormous expenditures of the Government and the great advances in prices since the commencement of the war have made many persons suddenly rich, and upon fortunes suddenly acquired have followed reckless expenditures, extravagance, waste. Speculation is taking the place of sober and persevering industry and thousands are deluded with the notion that the wealth of the Nation is being increased by the increase of its indebtedness."

Mr. McCulloch later became Secretary of the Treasury (1865–69), and in his annual report of 1868, he stated, in effect, "Why should not an irredeemable Government currency be regarded as evidence of bad management of the national finances, if not of national bankruptcy? The U.S. notes, although declared by law to be lawful money, are nevertheless a dishonored and disreputable currency. The people are compelled to take as money what is not money."

In 1869 President Grant stated, "The national honor must be protected by paying every dollar of Government indebtedness in gold unless otherwise stipulated in the contract." Fighting inflation during those turbulent years was the problem then as it is with us today.

A reconstruction boom followed the termination of the Civil War. Railroads were expanding tremendously and millions of bonds and other railroad securities were sold to the banks and to the public.

Rising prices, inevitable while a currency is irredeemable, brought overtrading, speculation, and easy riches for some. This speculative boom terminated in the panic of 1873 when the railroads began to default on their bond interest.

Storms of protest came whenever the issue arose of restoring a redeemable currency. Finally a number of Congressmen determined that the people should be relieved of the ills of an irredeemable currency. Under the courageous leadership of Senator John Sherman whose slogan was "The Way To Resume Is To Resume" and with the support of President U. S. Grant, the battle was finally won. The act of January 14, 1875, for resumption of specie payments was

passed, to become effective as of January 2, 1879, when the banks were again to pay gold coins to those who preferred gold to the paper greenbacks.

Thus ended our Nation's great inflation of the 19th century and inflation never again was to rear its ugly head until 1933.

Following resumption was recorded one of the most rapid growth periods in U.S. history, according to studies made by the National Bureau of Economic Research. During that 25-year period production almost tripled while prices slowly declined. So it was under a redeemable currency that our Nation again went forward to attain world leadership.

WHERE WE STAND TODAY

In spite of declining prices of farm products the cost of living creeps up and up and is at an all-time high. The dollar that was to retain its purchasing power has now sunk to the lowest point in history.

Investment in U.S. savings bonds is now regarded less attractive and the volume of bonds being cashed exceeds new bonds being issued.

Our total money supply—currency outstanding plus bank deposits—has been inflated to the extent that it has now reached $262 billion. Compare this with the 1940 total of $84 billion.

The statement so frequently made that the Federal Government has at its disposal only those funds that are raised by revenues and taxation is false. So long as our U.S. paper money is not redeemable our Government can always pay its own citizens with paper. Thus it can continue to create additional paper money and new bank deposits against which it can draw its checks. Since 1940 alone, our Federal Government has created more than $100 billion of new, unearned bank deposit money that it has spent. This is in addition to the money spent which our Government obtained from tax revenues and borrowing from the people. As this new money is added to the money already in circulation, prices go up and the purchasing power of all money goes down.

Our Nation has lost more than $3¼ billion of our gold to foreign interests since January 1, 1958. This reduces our gold stock to $19.582 billion, according to the most recent report. This is less than the amount we held 20 years ago.

That our money supply has more than tripled since 1940 deludes people with the notion that our Nation's wealth is likewise increased, when in fact, this indicates the distance we have traveled down the road of monetary inflation.

Payments made to the public by the Federal Government alone for the past fiscal year exceeded $94 billion. In 1940, the total money supply in existence in the United States was only $84 billion.

HISTORY OF OTHER NATIONS

The history of other nations throughout the world is full of similar examples. Irredeemable currency and inflation go hand in hand. Without exception, on every occasion where governments have been overthrown and the people ruined by inflation, that government was using an irredeemable currency—off the gold standard.

Our Nation did not lead the world down this inflationary road. The other nations led us. England stood out longer than any of the other European nations but finally succumbed in 1931. Then we followed 2 years later.

WARNINGS

By means of newspaper articles and printed pamphlets the public is being warned of the dangers of inflation, urging us to write letters to our Congressmen demanding that they practice economy and avoid deficits. Our Congressmen have been receiving thousands of such letters.

Then we have the so-called "built-in stabilizers" administered by officials chosen for their outstanding ability. And inflation moves merrily along.

It is true that our U.S. Treasury is required to redeem in gold its paper dollars which are held by foreign governments and their citizens. This accounts, at least in part, for the higher interest rates and tighter money now prevailing in the United States of America. By means of converting into gold the proceeds of their U.S. and other securities sold on the American markets, foreigners can protect themselves from dollar devaluation, and so, to a limited extent they can discipline our Federal Government. This right that U.S. citizens formerly held was taken from them when our dollar became irredeemable.

Three major organizations of reputable economists are urging our Congressmen to restore a redeemable currency—the gold standard. Aside from them, it is probable that few of the letters received by Congressmen advocate this vital measure. This writer has talked with a number of younger college graduates who did not know that we were off the gold standard. All of this indicates a sad neglect of the study of history.

It is time for the American people, and their political leaders as well, to wake up. The lessons of history are clear if we are only willing to study and to comprehend.

Slavs Here Before the "Mayflower"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, American-Slovak journalist and editor, of Passaic, N.J., which appeared in the December 1959 issue of the Dobry Pastier—Good Shepherd—official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America:

SLAVS HERE BEFORE THE "MAYFLOWER"

(By John C. Sciranka)

On December 19 it will be 80 years that the first group of Slovaks arrived in Passaic, N.J., brought here from the famous Castle Garden, then the immigration depot by Mr. Waterhouse. The first seven arrivals were from three different Slovak counties. Andrew Pastor, Jan Socha, Jan Kostosin, and George Slivka came from the Saris County; Jan Pochlod and Jan Salasovic from Zemplin, and Edward Geiger from Spis County. Six months later Stephen Cherepy and Frank Drombly arrived from Saris.

I have already reviewed their history on previous occasions. However, they were not the first Slovaks or Slavs in America, for the first Slav immigrants came to America from Poland before the *Mayflower*. Also the famous Dalmatians, who are Croats, accompanied Christopher Columbus on his voyage to the New World.

It is most significant that a year before the *Mayflower* dropped anchor off the New England coast, carrying English immigrants who were to establish a Puritan theocracy in the northern wilderness, Polish and Slovak immigrants were fighting for democratic rights in the young Virginia colony.

Arriving in 1607 to aid Capt. John Smith in building Jamestown, Va., the first permanent English settlement in the New World, the Poles were employed by British capital to manufacture glass beads for trading with the Indians and as workers in other crafts.

But in 1619 when the House of Burgesses met in Jamestown, for the first time the Poles and their Slav brothers, despite their vital contributions to the maintenance of the colony, were denied the rights to vote. Rebellion against this injustice quickly took organized form and the peace of the small settlement was threatened by a stoppage of work unless equal rights for all were restored. They won their demands and the court book of the Virginia Co. of London, attests. Under the date of July 31, 1619, the record book of the English financial backers of the Jamestown colony declared:

"Upon some dispute of the Polonians resident in Virginia it was now agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitants there whatsoever. And because of their skill in making pitch and tar and soap ashes shall not die with them, it is agreed that some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge therein—for the benefit of the country thereafter."

Fifty years after the Jamestown experiment, Peter Stuyvesant, Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York, held out allurements to groups of Slavs. Augustine Herman, first Czech (Bohemian) in America was on his board of advisers. He later established Bohemian Manor in Maryland and made a map of the State. In 1659 groups of Poles arrived and settled near Fort Orange, now New York, where their skill as tillers of soil soon became evident.

During the same period of the Dutch occupation, Dr. Alexander Kuriusz, a Pole whose name has become known to history as Curtius, is credited with having established the first school of secondary education in America, which subsequently became an academy at which pioneers of more than one racial strain received their early education.

In the volumes of "Passaic and Its Environs" by the late Passaic historian, William W. Scott, Rev. Henry Loskiel, a Moravian missionary, was baptizing Indians in 1676 in the vicinity of Passaic. Moravians are closely alined with the Slovaks from the time of the Great Moravian Empire, which had Slovak rulers like Pribina, Rastislav, Mojmir, Svätopluk, etc. Polish nobleman Zaborskie, who was an early settler in New Amsterdam, later moved to New Jersey where he acquired large tracts of land in Bergen County, along Passaic River. The family is known as Zabriskie. Poles settled in Delaware as early as 1650, according to old records. And Pennsylvania archives show them to have taken root with its founder, William Penn. And of course, the Slovaks were always close neighbors of the Poles.

On this the 80th anniversary of the arrival of the first Slovak group to Passaic, we pay tribute to the early pioneers and hope that the present and future generations will carry on the good work in their footsteps for greater America and freedom of Slovakia.

New Jersey's Inventory of Historic Sites and Buildings Heralds a National Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are reminded by the distinguished historian and author, Eleanore Nolan Shuman, that although the his-

tory of New Jersey is significant and closely intertwined with the history of our country there has long existed a feeling among informed and responsible citizens that some of the New Jersey story is still unknown and some of its important historic sites and structures have been overlooked.

This explains, at least in part, the disappearance of a number of New Jersey's historic structures and sites in recent years. This tragedy is part of a larger movement and, according to a recent estimate by the Reader's Digest, one-fourth of the historical buildings in existence in this country in 1941 have been destroyed. Many of these buildings have been destroyed to make way for federally assisted highways and housing projects.

In a recent editorial, the Trentonian, a leading New Jersey newspaper, declared:

> To many people who are appreciative of New Jersey's deeply rooted historical associations, progress is an enemy ever on the prowl. * * * The airplane, the superhighway, and the housing development all must be served, but it isn't always necessary to serve them by sacrificing those things which are or should be sacred to Americans.

Many kinds of criteria are considered by local, State, and Federal officials in reaching their decisions as to where the new federally assisted projects should be located but criteria as to the national, regional, or local historical and architectural significance of the buildings and sites which may be in their path are almost never taken into account.

It is my considered opinion that Federal officials must shoulder a large share of the blame for this disregard of the precious and irreplaceable heritage which is being uprooted and destroyed by such careless spending of Federal moneys. I have said before and I will say again, that never before have powerful Federal officials shown so little interest in, or knowledge of, the importance of the great heritage which is ours in the buildings and sites which constitute an irreplaceable link with our past.

The urgency of this situation requires the enactment by the Congress at an early date of several bills which have been introduced in this Congress by Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and JOSEPH S. CLARK and in the House by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and myself. Several of our colleagues have joined with us in sponsoring this legislation and we have been receiving rapidly growing support from many citizens and organizations throughout the country who are deeply disturbed over the disappearance of so much of our visible history.

It is not, however, solely and entirely a matter of unresponsive and misguided Federal officials. State and local officials can do a very great deal to remedy the situation, as can private citizens through organizations devoted to the preservation of the visible remains of our past.

Local business groups can also perform a vital role in the matter of historic preservation. Among the most heartening examples of local business interest in historic preservation that I know of is that shown by the Greater Trenton Council in the preservation and restoration of downtown Trenton, N.J., and the support of local Philadelphia businessmen for the extremely successful movement to restore downtown Philadelphia and create there the great Independence National Historical Park.

In Trenton, N.J., too, the Greater Trenton Chamber of Commerce is planning a national campaign to call on American students to take part in a nationwide essay contest on "Why I Would Like To Visit Historic Trenton." To the winner will go an all-expense-paid trip to Trenton, N.J., for two for a gala week of sightseeing, entertainment, and prizes.

Certainly one of the most heartening and significant steps in many years in New Jersey was taken recently when Commissioner Salvatore A. Bontempo, of the department of conservation and economic development, launched a study of New Jersey's historic sites and buildings. Every New Jersey site and building of historic importance will now be inventoried in a county-by-county survey in preparation for the 1964 celebration of New Jersey's 300th birthday. Some 2,000 to 3,000 cultural and historic sites will be listed and described by the survey. Already officials in a number of other States have shown deep interest in this survey.

Coordinating the survey, which is expected to be completed by September 1960, is Dr. William H. Cole, professor emeritus of Rutgers University. Another distinguished New Jerseyan who will participate in the survey is Dr. Herbert B. Butcher, president of the Trenton Historical Society, who will head the nine-member Mercer County inventory committee. Other members of the committee from Mercer County are the Reverend F. Elwood Perkins, Trenton district superintendent, Methodist Church; Howard L. Hughes, former Trenton Library head; Samuel Mountford, architect; Mrs. Eleanor Nolan Shuman, Robert B. Immordino, Halbert E. Phillips, Walter W. Ziegler, and Lewis B. Traver, members of the Trenton Historical Society.

Dr. Richard P. McCormick, professor of history at Rutgers University, is chairman of the evaluation committee. Other members are Mrs. Kathryn Greywacz, director of the New Jersey State Museum; Dr. Roger H. McDonough, New Jersey State librarian; Robert N. Lunny, New Jersey Historical Society director; John Cunningham, author; Alfred Bussell, State architect; and Mrs. Olga C. Atkins, New Jersey State supervisor of historic sites.

New Jersey's commissioner of conservation and economic development, Salvatore A. Bontempo, is to be congratulated for his foresight and good judgment in launching this important study, and, indeed, for his great good fortune in securing the services of such an outstanding group of citizens to undertake this, an arduous and exacting task. New Jersey's initiative and example in launching a statewide historic survey heralds a national trend.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to point out that Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers University, New Jersey's State university, at the annual meeting last fall of the Constitutional Convention Association of New Jersey, urged the establishment of an educational and cultural commission to advise New Jersey in its quest for significant educational and cultural goals. If New Jersey's commissioner of conservation and economic development can establish such a high-level body to survey the State's historical resources, New Jersey's commissioner of education, Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger, undoubtedly has the authority to create an agency along the lines suggested by Dr. Mason W. Gross. It is a certainty that New Jersey's civic and cultural and business leaders would support such a further step which would make it possible for New Jersey to rival New York State in cultural pursuits. These pursuits have brought New York immense prestige and great wealth, I might add.

I include as part of my remarks articles from the Trentonian, and the Trenton Times-Advertiser, two of New Jersey's greatest newspapers, as well as my bill, H.R. 6680, to assist in the task of historic preservation at the Federal, State, county, and municipal levels of government.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Trentonian, Jan. 25, 1960]

SEARCH FOR HISTORIC SITES IS UNDERWAY

(By Eleanore Nolan Shuman)

Although the history of New Jersey is fascinating and closely connected with that of our Nation, there has long been a feeling among responsible citizens that perhaps some of its story is still unknown and perhaps many of its historic sites and structures have been overlooked. Some people have asked, "Have we preserved the right historical and cultural sites? Are we doing right by the ones we own? Are there other sites more important than the ones we already have?"

The need for answers to these questions led Salvatore A. Bontempo, commissioner of the department of conservation and economic development, to direct the historic sites division of his department to investigate. As a basis, it was decided to use the volume of reliable information, "Historic American Building Survey." Here is listed in great detail 1,301 New Jersey buildings of historical and cultural value. The information was collected between 1937 and 1939 by the survey group in cooperation with the National Park Service, the American Institute of Architects and the Library of Congress.

In order to supplement the list of buildings with a list of sites, the historic sites division found it necessary to form a State citizens advisory committee. Headed by Dr. Richard P. McCormick, Rutgers University history professor and university historian, the committee is composed of such people as Mrs. Olga Atkins, supervisor of historic sites; Mrs. Kathryn Greywacz, director of the State museum; Dr. Roger H. McDonough, State librarian; Robert N. Lunny, director of the New Jersey Historical Society; Alfred Bussell, architect of the State bureau of construction; John Cunningham of the Newark News and author of books on New Jersey; Dr. William H. Cole, retired head of the Rutgers Bureau of Research, and this writer.

The challenging job of discovering and cataloging the additional New Jersey historical information which now faces Dr. Cole is a new kind of research, but one that appeals to his interest of long standing in antiques and things historical. One of his recent

achievements was the preservation of centuries-old Mettler's Woods, near East Millstone.

In turning his organizational and administrative talents to this statewide survey, he said, "The committee and I believe that only a small percentage of the State's historical and cultural assets has been discovered and listed in previous surveys. All efforts will be directed to supervision and coordination of research groups who have undertaken to aid in the survey and inventory. Groups set up in the State's 21 counties have been charged with using all the resources at their command in listing important places."

On January 16, Dr. Cole conducted a regional briefing meeting for the representatives of the central counties of the State at the old barracks. The Mercer County delegation was headed by Dr. Herbert B. Butcher, president of the Trenton Historical Society, and included Howard L. Hughes, Robert B. Immordino, Halbert S. Phillips, Lewis B. Traver, Rev. F. Elwood Perkins, Samuel Montford, Walter W. Zeigler and myself. Instructions were given for the field survey of Mercer County (with the exception of Princeton, which will be done independently.)

Upon the completion of the surveys by counties, the plans call for an evaluation and check by Dr. McCormick's committee. A copy of the final preliminary list of the State's historic and cultural places will be deposited in the State archives.

Steps will then be taken to convince the legislature to provide funds to continue and preserve the selected sites. Sites or structures of statewide significance will be determined and plans made for their preservation or perhaps historical or other civic groups will undertake to maintain some of them.

If the State committee deems some of the sites to be of national significance, they will be referred to the National Parks Service, the American Institute of Architects or other interested groups for possible operation or preservation.

"The program," Dr. Cole explained, "has many cultural and social aspects. It will also be of aid in planning. When we find these places of historical or cultural significance, we can attempt to save them. Each committee is well qualified, but it must have all possible cooperation if the survey is to be complete and satisfactory. The members will, I am sure, welcome suggestions from State residents as to any sites which may have special significance in the history and development of our State and Nation."

[From the Trenton Sunday Times-Advertiser, Jan. 17, 1960]

INVENTORY OF HISTORIC SITES IN NEW JERSEY TO BE MADE

Every New Jersey site of historic importance will be inventoried in a county-by-county survey in preparation for the 1964 celebration of the State's 300th birthday.

Some 2,000 to 3,000 cultural and historic sites will be listed and described in the undertaking sponsored by the historic sites division, State conservation and economic development department.

Six hundred sites will be recommended for preservation by a six-member New Jersey Committee for Historic Sites Evaluation.

Coordinating the survey, which should be completed by next September, is Dr. William H. Cole, Rutgers professor emeritus.

Dr. Herbert B. Butcher of 15 Whittier Avenue, president of the Trenton Historical Society, will head the nine-member Mercer County Inventory Committee. Other Mercer members: The Reverend F. Elwood Perkins, Trenton district superintendent, Methodist Church; Howard L. Hughes, former Trenton Library head; Samuel Mountford, architect; Mrs. Eleanor N. Shuman, writer on local history; and Robert B. Immardino, Halbert E. Phillips, Walter W. Ziegler, and Lewis B. Traver, members of the local historical society.

Dr. Richard P. McCormick, Rutgers history professor, is chairman of the evaluation committee. Other members are Mrs. Kathryn Greywacz, State museum director; Dr. Roger H. McDonough, State librarian; Robert N. Lunny, New Jersey Historical Society director; John Cunningham, author; Alfred Busselle, State architect; and Mrs. Olga C. Atkins, State supervisor of historic sites.

"This survey will enable us to put our historic house in order," said Dr. McCormick yesterday during a meeting of the central Jersey committee at the Old Barracks. Forty-two persons attended.

Sites will be categorized by period (from prehistoric to 1900), style (Jacobean, Georgian, Dutch, etc.), physical condition, and notable features.

Earlier meetings organized north Jersey and south Jersey county committees.

[From the Trenton (N.J) Trentonian, Jan. 25, 1960]

PROGRESS WITH SENSE

To many people who are appreciative of New Jersey's deeply rooted historical associations, progress is an enemy ever on the prowl. At times, beauty and tradition must give way to progress, as was the case when it became necessary to build a reservoir at Round Valley in Hunterdon County.

More recently, a beauteous portion of Morris County was threatened by progress in the form of an airport for jet airplanes. Fortunately, the uprising against this intrusion seems to have won out.

And even more recently, it was discovered that Green Sergeant's covered bridge in Hunterdon County, the last remaining covered bridge in New Jersey, finally had given way to the weight of the years and traffic and was no longer fit for service. The obvious answer in a progress-minded age was to raze it and make way for a modern structure. Lovers of history and sentiment seemed to have prevailed, however, and it appears that the bridge will remain intact, although it will be moved to a different location.

The airplane, the superhighway, and the housing development all must be served, but it isn't always necessary to serve them by sacrificing those things which are or should be sacred to Americans.

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Trentonian, Dec. 25, 1959]

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PLANNING VISIT-HISTORIC-TRENTON CONTEST

Can you imagine high school students throughout the country suddenly doing research on Trenton?

The publicity committee of the Greater Trenton Chamber of Commerce thinks that's exactly what's going to happen in the next month or so.

The committee is going to call on America's student to take part in a national essay contest on "Why I Would Like to Visit Historic Trenton."

To the winner will go an all expense paid trip here for two for a gala week of sightseeing, entertainment and prizes.

William J. Garry, chairman of the project, hopes to have the visit coincide with next year's Easter vacation period.

In explaining the committee's objectives, Garry, a WBUD executive, declared, "Today's students are tomorrow's businessmen and tourists. The more out-of-town people know about Trenton the more likely they are to locate here, do business here, or visit here."

He went on to say that the contest ties in perfectly with the committee's goal of promoting Trenton regionally and nationally. "Within the next few months we should have thousands of students—and their parents—talking about Trenton," he declared.

First step is to establish the contest rules. Conferences with local English teachers will determine the maximum length of the essay as well as techniques for incorporating the contest into the curriculum. This phase will be handled by Miss Katharine M. Weber of WTTM.

H.R. 6680

A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461), is amended to read as follows:

"That it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, objects, and antiquities of national, regional, or local significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 462) is amended by redesignating paragraph (k) as paragraph (m) and by adding after paragraph (j) the following new paragraphs:

"(k) Carry out (insofar as practicable and appropriate) the same duties and functions with respect to historic areas (including sections of cities) as those which are specified in the preceding paragraphs of this section with respect to historic sites, buildings, and objects.

"(l) Protect and preserve, in the manner provided in section 8 and through the performance of such other functions of the type described in this section as the Secretary may deem appropriate, historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local significance."

"(m) As used in this section the term 'objects', and 'antiquities' include objects and antiquities of art."

SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Secretary receives a petition from any State or political subdivision thereof, or from the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Wildlife Federation, the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Association for State and Local History, the Natural Resources Council, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Parks Association, the American Institute of Planners, the American Automobile Association, the Society of Architectural Historians, the American Planning and Civic Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Garden Club of America, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Urban Land Institute, the American Federation of Arts, the National Academy of Design, the National Council on Arts and Government, the National Art Education Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the College Art Association of America, the Artists Equity Association, the American Association of Museums, the Joint Committee on the National Capital, the National Capital Arts Council, or any other organization recognized by the Secretary for purposes of this section as being concerned with historic preservation, alleging that a Federal project or program or a State or local project or program financed in whole or in part with Federal funds will seriously damage or destroy a historical site, area (including a sec-

tion of a city), building, or object of national, regional, or local significance, or upon his own motion, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation, which shall include (but not be limited to) holding public hearings or affording the opportunity for such hearings, for the purpose of determining whether or not such site, area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that a site, area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance, he shall forthwith determine whether or not the proposed project or program will seriously damage or destroy it.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary determines under this section that a site, area, building, or object of national, regional, or local historical significance will be seriously damaged or destroyed by a Federal project or program (actual or proposed) or by a State or local project or program which is or will be financed in whole or in part with Federal funds, he shall submit such determination to the head of the Federal department, agency, or instrumentality under the jurisdiction of which the project or program is to be carried out; and after the receipt of such determination the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality shall not commence or further proceed with such project or program, or expend or approve the expenditure of any Federal funds (or further Federal funds) for such project or program, unless and until such project or program has been modified and the plans, specifications, and contracts thereunder amended so as to provide to the satisfaction of the Secretary for the preservation of the historic site, area, building, or object involved. Such modification or amendment may be made notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the right of a department, agency, or instrumentality to modify a project or program or amend plans, specifications, or contracts, but shall otherwise be subject to all the provisions of the law under which the project or program is being or will be carried out."

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the organizations named in subsection (a) of section 8 (as added by this Act) of the Act of August 21, 1935, and other organizations recognized by the Secretary as being concerned with historic preservation, shall make a continuing study of the tax advantages, technical and financial assistance, and other incentives which could be provided (by legislation and otherwise) to promote and encourage the restoration and preservation of sites, areas, buildings, objects, and antiquities (including objects and antiquities of art), in the United States of national, regional, or local historical significance by the Federal Government, and by States, political subdivisions, private organizations, and individuals, giving appropriate consideration to the methods which have been used to encourage such restoration and preservation in other countries and in areas of the United States where intensive programs for historic preservation have been successfully carried out.

Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we commemorate not only the 151st anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, but we also mark the 214th anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko, the great Polish statesman, military engineer, patriot of two continents.

I should like to indicate in what ways these two leaders have much in common, but before making such a comparison, let me speak briefly of the life of Kosciusko.

His birthright was Polish. The natural splendors of the New World were unseen by his young eyes and the democratic culture of the American Colonies was alien to his noble background. Yet from halfway around the world he came to share his own vision of liberty and justice with the Founding Fathers of our country. A true son of Poland, he gave of himself, wholly and freely, to the cause of the American Revolution, distinguishing himself both in combat and in the erection of military fortifications. A grateful Congress bestowed upon him the rank of brigadier general, and the appreciative people of his adopted land offered him honors and citizenship. But the success of the American Revolution had intensified his fervent desire to see his own homeland free and he returned to Poland.

In his native country he was to know few successes in his mission to see Poland throw off foreign domination. Once, for but a moment, he sat at the head of a free Poland and instituted the guarantees of constitutional government for which he had worked with such dedication. Although Poland's freedom was then to be shortlived, Kosciusko had ignited the spark of liberty in the hearts of his fellow countrymen. Never again, though their nation was to be conquered by forces from the East and the West, was that flame to be snuffed out.

SPIRIT OF KOSCIUSKO ALIVE TODAY IN POLAND

Mr. Speaker, the spirit of Kosciusko is alive today in Poland. It is as enduring as the spirit of Washington and Lincoln which is so much a part of the American people that it can never be separated from us. This common spirit, in Poland and in America, will live forever and it will, in time, triumph over all tyranny.

It is natural that most Americans think of February 12 primarily as the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. Yet there are more similarities than their date of birth between Kosciusko and Lincoln. Both were men of peace, yet compelled to employ the tools of war. Both dedicated most of their lives to the unity of their respective nations, yet their example has had great impact among peoples all over the world. Both were vigorous participants in the events of their own day, yet they will have an enduring influence upon the histories of their respective countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the anniversary of the birth of Lincoln and Kosciusko, the citizens of Poland and the United States, now so sorely tried by despotism, should rededicate themselves to their heritage of freedom. This spirit of freedom, so integrally a part of the traditions of both Poland and America, is a bond between our peoples that can never be broken.

The Right Reverend Edward J. Higgins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 21 issue of the Long Island Star-Journal on the Right Reverend Edward J. Higgins, of Astoria, Long Island, N.Y., who was the founder of the Catholic War Veterans 25 years ago.

Monsignor Higgins has served his church, his country and his community with distinction and dedication for many many years, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to add my sincere congratulations to him and to the members of the Catholic War Veterans on their silver jubilee.

The article follows:

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LATER—CWV FOUNDER'S WORDS ECHOED

It is fitting tribute that the words spoken more than two decades ago by the Right Reverend Edward J. Higgins, of Astoria, are being echoed this week during the 4-day convention of the Catholic War Veterans at Immaculate Conception Church.

For one thing, Monsignor Higgins founded the organization. For another, the convention, which celebrates the 25th anniversary of the Catholic War Veterans, is being held in his home parish.

Warning against the spread of totalitarianism, Monsignor Higgins said 21 years back that "It is better to have biscuits than bullets." But he cautioned that when the time came to fight for liberties the people of his church "would not be afraid to die."

Similar words and warnings are being repeated in the auditorium of the Astoria parish where the veterans are convened for the annual—and this year, special—occasion.

Founded by Monsignor Higgins in 1935, the Catholic War Veterans was formed "to bring together a body of veterans to help fight the spread of communism in the United States."

A chaplain in the Army during World War I, he served at Camp Upton and at the General Hospital in Dansville. After viewing the important roles played by other veterans groups, he received permission from Archbishop Molloy to found the Catholic War Veterans in May of 1935 and just 1 month later visited Rome to obtain an apostolic blessing for the new organization from Pope Pius XI.

Astoria Post No. 1 was formed and became the forerunner of some 2,000 units throughout the Nation including 33 in Queens which Monsignor Higgins developed. Some 70,000 veterans are members.

Through the years, Monsignor Higgins has worked in a dual capacity with the Catholic War Veterans and as pastor of Immaculate Conception. He organized a rebuilding program in the Astoria parish and in 1951 a new $1,500,000 towered church topped by a 10-foot-high lighted cross was erected.

It was dedicated as a national shrine for the Catholic War Veterans.

One of the first honors given to the Catholic War Veterans founder was the medal of St. Sebastian, patron saint of the veteran's organization, in 1936. St. Sebastian was a captain in the Imperial Bodyguard of the Roman Army who was ordered put to death when he embraced Christianity. Though

his body was riddled with arrows, he was healed by St. Irene, but later clubbed to death by Roman soldiers.

A stained-glass window in the Catholic War Veterans Memorial Chapel at Immaculate Conception was erected to Sebastian, known as the Saint of Soldiers.

Pastor of Immaculate Conception since 1933, Monsignor Higgins was ordained in 1914 after studying in St. John's Seminary. He had graduated from St. John's College 4 years earlier and to this day he keeps several pictures of his football days there in his room at the church rectory at 21–47 29th Street.

He was a curate at several Brooklyn parishes, assistant pastor at Our Lady of Sorrows in Corona, and pastor of St. Peter's Church in Brooklyn before coming to Immaculate Conception.

Born in the old sixth ward of Brooklyn on July 7, 1890, he is known to his boyhood friends as Edward Joseph.

Affirmative Action Always Best

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in these critical times, it is imperative that the United States—the acknowledged leader of the free world—stand firm in its agreements and treaties with other nations and insist that other nations have the same respect for us.

We are all very much aware that it is one of the techniques of the principal opponent of our system to use every means at his disposal to test the mettle of the U.S. conviction wherever and whenever he can. It is victory for him to see this great Nation take a step backward from policy when pressure is applied. For such an action can be exploited as at least an implied admission that the policy was wrong in the first place. But, more importantly, it can be exploited as evidence that this country is willing to pursue a course of conciliation and appeasement—a course which history has revealed most dramatically to be sacrificial of national integrity and fatal to prestige.

I like to think of international relations in terms of human relations. Fundamentally, the same things move nations in their relations with each other as move human beings in the conduct of their lives. The basis for effective human relations is respect. If any of us is willing to live without the respect of our contemporaries, his effectiveness is nil. And if any nation, however powerful, makes a habit of retreating from policy under duress, its position in international affairs is precarious, mainly because it cannot maintain the respect of its fellow nations.

Now, this is not to say that I am opposed to change. The United States should continually reevaluate its agreements and treaties in the light of changing times; and through the Executive and the Congress agree to change in policy necessary for the continuance of just and honorable international relations and for the best interest of the Nation.

I am saying that there is and should be change; but our treaty policies should not be altered solely as the result of Executive interpretation.

A strong case in point is before us today. Our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], has placed before this body a resolution directly concerned with pressures on the United States to adjust its traditional treaty posture with regard to the Republic of Panama and the Panama Canal Zone.

It would be repetitious for me to go into the background of this issue; you have heard it many times. But the hard fact is that the United States is under pressure to abandon previous policy with regard to the treaties with Panama and allow the display of certain symbols of Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone, where the United States is sovereign.

Now, where does this pressure originate?

The United States now has pending before it the formal request of the Panamanian Government that our policy in this regard be changed. This, I call proper; and I do not quarrel with it.

But, we cannot ignore the fact that forces nor interested in the nationalistic aims of Panama have seized the issue to exploit it and attempt to publicly place the United States in a position of reacting under duress. This tactic, I do quarrel with.

There have been indications that the President and the Secretary of State are giving serious consideration to yielding to the pressures without regard to the constitutional treaty making and amending process.

Let me make one thing perfectly clear; I am not arguing the merits of the validity of the properly presented demands of the Panamanian Government. I am taking issue with the idea that we should change policy in Panama by interpretation, rather than by the affirmative course of exploring the full implications of the problem and instituting any action needed within the framework of the Constitution.

That is why I support the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN]—which, I might add, was given thorough and exhaustive study by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which Mr. SELDEN and I are members, Mr. SELDEN being chairman of the subcommittee.

All Mr. SELDEN's resolution says is that we, the Members of this Congress, believe that any change in policy regarding Panama should be promulgated affirmatively—by treaty or amendment—and not by interpretation, which would leave some doubt as to whether we are reacting to pressure or to the existence of just reason.

The people of the United States and the people of Panama have been friends for many years, and we all want that friendship to endure. We also appreciate their strong nationalism. But, we cannot allow these considerations to move us to depart from long-established policy without full regard for all the implications of such a departure, and without submitting the issue to constitutional process.

The respect we have earned is too valuable to be jeopardized by doing otherwise. I hope all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, will join in support of this resolution, which merely is a way of saying, "Let us do things right."

Pollution Remains Critical Problem in Many Areas of State and Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent of October 3, 1959:

HIGH FISH KILL—POLLUTION REMAINS CRITICAL PROBLEM IN MANY AREAS OF STATE AND NATION

(By Ben Lewis)

WAUSAU.—A putrifying smell arose from the drainage ditch and hung heavy in the air. It was paradise to an army of flies. But it was sickening to man.

A thick scum, deposited by a flow of milky liquid, lined the ditch bottom. Quack grass and small plants along the sides turned brownish black, as if burned to death by the water's toxicity.

The ditch ended a quarter mile down the road where its contents drained into a small stream. On one side of the road the creek was clean, clear, harmless. On the other it was contaminated and dangerous.

DEATH TO FISH

It had been transformed into a carrier of death to fishes. And when toxicity runs its course, deposits become fertilizer, causing dense growths of aquatic vegetation and algae.

This is pollution—a problem not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States.

Hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin fish die annually because of it. Productive waters become sterile. Rivers are choked with vegetation and sludge.

Corrective measures have and are being taken. But progress is too slow. Too many people ignore the law. Cheese factories, papermills, cesspools continue to drain wastes into public waters.

When is it going to stop?

Let's go back to our little tributary stream. What's contaminating it? And why is such a small brook, far from major waters, so important?

TOXIC MIXTURE

Source of pollution, in this case, is a cheese factory. After milk is brought in, containers are washed. And the combination of milk and water is then drained into the ditch.

This mixture is toxic enough. But even worse is whey drained from a tank and channeled into the ditch.

Although these wastes are odoriferous and deposit a scumlike substance those aren't the main causes for alarm. It's the dropping of the water's oxygen content to a dangerously low point that is of chief concern.

Tiny tributary streams in themselves are not too important. If they contain any fish they are minnows. But each empties into a

large body of water. And many are chief contributors to flowages.

Enough damage is caused during warm months of the year. But the problem becomes critical when flowages ice over.

NEED OXYGEN

Fish require oxygen. Polluted streams supply little of that. So a flowage fed by these creeks is destined to a severe winter fish kill.

Such has been the case with the Big Eau Pleine flowage in Marathon County. At one time this was a most productive body of water. It could be again if pollution would stop.

Are industrialists taking steps to avoid pollution? Many are * * * and at great expense and effort to themselves. They realize the importance of clean water.

Too many others, however, knowingly and willingly continue practices which result in pollution. They may be apprehended from time to time, but the usual fine of $25 doesn't make much of an impression.

Stronger action must be taken if we are to stop the polluting of our waters.

The Elkhart Truth and the La Porte Herald-Argus Oppose Eisenhower's Plan To Raise Gas Tax Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, among the several newspapers published in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, the Third of Indiana, there are two which consistently produce some of the most intelligent editorials that I believe are to be found in the United States. These newspapers are the La Porte Herald-Argus and the Elkhart Truth.

Two good examples of the thoughtful editorials to be found in these newspapers are the following on the subject of President Eisenhower's proposal this year for another increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

I strongly favor building more highways but, along with many other citizens of Indiana, I want to see more evidence than the administrations of former Gov. George Craig and our present Governor, Harold Handley, have given that Hoosier taxpayers are actually getting adequate highways for their gas tax money.

The editorials follow:

[From the La Porte Herald-Argus, Feb. 1, 1960]

GAS TAX PROPOSAL

If there is anything certain in politics, the probability that Congress will not grant President Eisenhower's request for a half cent increase in the present Federal gasoline tax is a safe assumption. Congress is in no mood to raise any tax so far reaching in effect and already at a height, now 4 cents a gallon, which helps spur the current, steady movement of purchase of small cars in this country.

With the Federal gasoline tax at 4 cents and with State gasoline tax averages a bit more than 6 cents, the consumer is paying about 10 cents fuel tax now. He also pays registration fees, driver license fees, excise taxes on cars, tires, and parts. And in many States, as in Indiana, he pays a personal property tax on his vehicle.

To frame the issue another way, John Q. Driver in paying approximately 10 cents a gallon in Federal and State taxes is just about equaling in taxes the selling price of regular grade gasoline at refineries in the midcontinent and the gulf coast.

Granted the Nation is now enveloped in a fierce struggle against a transportation octopus which clogs our arteries of travel, imperils our lives and adds immeasurably to society's complexity of problems and that to win a measure of triumph in the struggle calls for vast and continuing expenditures, still the issue is very real whether the pressures of gasoline taxes are not approaching the point where they tend to price gasoline out of the market.

As one reaction, the consumer is turning to small cars which consume less fuel as one way of beating the already high tax. Fuel economy has become a major factor in today's car buying. This year, the automobile industry figures, sales of small cars, both domestic and foreign, will be between 25 and 30 percent of the total sales.

Highway construction and the financing of our whole complicated vehicular transportation system to make it safer and more convenient demand constantly more money but excessive taxation on fuel, hitting heavily the little fellow, the rank and file of car owners in the Nation, threatens now to become increasingly ineffective as a fund-raising method.

There are no present signs the total income from gasoline taxes is to decline, as there is the growing number of vehicles and drivers to consider, but the present scale of gasoline taxes, State and Federal, probably represents a maximum precariously close to excessive. Before long it might begin to defeat its own purpose. Congress apparently senses, and rightly, that no increase is desired by the people.

[From the Elkhart Truth, Jan. 30, 1960]

FEDERAL GAS HIKE? WHY?

President Eisenhower has asked for an increase in the Federal gas tax from 4 to 4.5 cents per gallon.

Congress should look that one over skeptically.

The new Federal road construction program should proceed reasonably fast. But we have an idea the program could be speeded up by finding ways to save on tax funds now being appropriated.

For instance:

Congressmen on the subcommittee that has been investigating this interstate highway program have begun to make "clucking sounds" about what's been found.

These findings won't be made public until hearings open in mid-February.

But from the tone of the clucks, investigators have been finding plenty to worry about.

Representative WALTER S. BARING, Democrat, of Nevada, says the Department of Justice has informed him that highway violations have, to its knowledge, occurred in Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, and Texas.

Criminal prosecutions are pending in these States which involve allegations of fraud and conspiracy.

It has been pointed out that witnesses took the fifth amendment more than 200 times in Senate hearings on land-grabbing on only a few projects in one State.

BARING has complained about "elaborate geometric interchange designs and expensive superstructure planning."

Naturally Democrats in Congress will stress criticism of this kind in an attempt to make political capital.

But the present woes of our highway program can't be blamed all on the GOP administration in Washington by any means.

One big problem has been chaos resulting from the Federal Highway Act passed by Congress in 1958, which suspended provision for pay-as-you-go financing and which raised authorizations for highway aid far beyond the revenue capacity of the highway trust fund.

Crash programs which ignore the basic need to give the motorist taxpayer his money's worth are hardly the answer.

It may be that the research project on highway paving materials, now nearing completion in Illinois, will point the way to greater efficiency and saving.

Should the proposed gas tax boost be added to the average State gas tax, it would bring to 33 cents the combined taxes paid out of every dollar spent for gasoline.

The motorist is soaked heavily now.

Let's not soak him again if we can possibly avoid it.

Realism and Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Canada defers recognition of and full relationships with Red China only because of the constant pressure exerted by our State Department.

The Globe and Mail, of Toronto, which perhaps ranks as Canada's most influential newspaper, carries great weight with the Diefenbaker government. This Globe and Mail editorial indicated that it will not be long before Canada abandons the unrealistic China policy to which she now reluctantly pretends to adhere because of our insistent demand.

Under a previous consent, I include the editorial which appeared in the Globe and Mail on Monday, February 8, 1960:

REALISM AND RECOGNITION

The Canadian Government has been given further evidence that a great many Canadians are uneasy about this country's relationship—or rather, lack of relationship—with China. At the annual meeting last week of the National Progressive Conservative Student Federation, there was an intensive debate on the subject, in which External Affairs Minister Green and his Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, were grilled for more than an hour.

The heart of the discussion was whether Canada should or should not grant diplomatic recognition to China; a resolution calling for such recognition was defeated after Mr. Green said—as he has said on previous occasions—that if Ottawa established diplomatic relations with Peiping, it would be dealing "a grevious blow to countries which are standing up to the Communists in Asia." On the other side of the argument, one student delegate denounced the Nationalist regime on Formosa as of a sort that would make us blush.

This, at the moment, is the essential point—more essential than establishing diplomatic relations with Peking. On the mainland there is a real Chinese Government which Canada refuses to recognize; on Formosa there is a so-called Chinese Government—a Chinese Government without a China—which Canada does recognize, or, at any rate, whose legitimacy Canada accepts in the United Nations and elsewhere.

If we are ever to have dealings with Peking, as sooner or later we must, we will first have to end our dealings with Taipei. This we must do, not because the Formosa regime of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is corrupt or oppressive—Canada recognizes quite a number of corrupt and oppressive regimes—but because it in nowise represents China.

Let us suppose that a minute proportion of the Canadian population had established themselves on one of our offshore islands. Let us suppose that they called themselves Canada, and denied the legitimacy of the Canadian Government in Ottawa—in fact, boasted of their intention to overthrow it. Let us further suppose that the Peking Government recognized this island as Canada, these squatters on it as the authentic Canadian Government. Would we not, as a first condition of improved relations between Ottawa and Peking, require Peking to stop insulting us in this manner, to give up this ridiculous make-believe?

It is just such a make-believe that Canada is maintaining in regard to Formosa today. And not only does it preclude any improvement of relationships between this country and China; it also sullies Canada's relationship with other nations, among them Canada's allies in Europe. These nations assume (are they not precisely correct?) that Canada goes along with the Formosa foolishness in order to placate the United States, which is the chief protector and benefactor of Generalissimo Chiang. These nations are thus given room for doubt as to the independence of Canada's foreign policy. They could be reassured; Canada's position with them and with the world would be strengthened if on this issue she parted company with the United States.

The realities of China, of living and dealing with China, will have to be faced at some future point. Even Washington is beginning to admit this; last month State Secretary Herter took the first small step when he said that in any East-West disarmament agreement Chinese participation was "inevitable."

But before Washington or Ottawa or London can be realistic about China they must stop being unrealistic about Formosa. They must disencumber themselves, fully and finally, of this "Nationalist China" which represents no nation on earth, of this "free China" whose 10 million unwilling subjects enjoy no more freedom than the 670 million people who live in the real China under the real Chinese Government.

Your Old Passport May Have New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, Department of State, is a remarkable girl and she is doing a terrific job in her assignment.

Susan Powers, contributing writer for the Washington Evening Star, in last night's issue of this Capital paper, described the revolution accomplished by Miss Knight in the Passport Office which has inspired encomiums from Congressmen and passport patrons throughout the land. The article by Miss Powers follows:

YOUR OLD PASSPORT MAY HAVE NEW LOOK
(By Susan Powers)

Foreign immigration officers may be in for a surprise before many more tourist seasons roll around, thanks to a Washington woman.

She is Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State, and it's her job to provide proper identification for protection of U.S. citizens traveling abroad.

To this end she is currently spearheading a campaign that will result in a new look, plus greater efficiency in the international identification document.

In her first interview on the subject of changes, Miss Knight had this to say: With 733,000 passports issued last year—20,000 of them alone to commercial travelers—something must be done about the passport.

The something that she proposes starts with replacing the old green cloth cover, and the change continues right on through the document's size, descriptive data, and visa pages.

The primary change is the cover because the first impression with documents, as often with people, is the most lasting.

"An American citizen abroad is a representative of the United States. Presenting a soiled passport is like presenting a soiled business card," she says.

The present cloth cover is inefficient; it frays with wear and tends to separate from its backing in hot, humid weather, she adds.

PLASTIC COVERS

The new cover probably will be made of plastic, and tests are now being conducted to determine that material's durability and appearance after temperature changes and excessive use. Another consideration in the final choice of cover material will be its flexibility. To avoid replacement cost, the new pasport must be capable of use in the machines now operating.

As for passport size, Miss Knight would reduce the present measurement of 3¾ by 6⅛ inches to a more compact 3½ by 5½ inches. Again, this would be more practical.

More women travel than men, and a smaller passport will fit more easily into a woman's purse, she feels. It will help the men, too, says Miss Knight, especially in preventing loss. (It's true, 57 percent of the passports lost last year were lost by men.) The present size passport is designed to fit into a man's inner coat pocket. When he takes off his coat, he often says an unwitting goodby to his passport.

The interior of the document would be renovated, too, if Miss Knight's recommendations go through. She would place the picture and descriptive data pages side by side, insuring an easier means of rapid identification.

With a total of 5 years' validity to the present passport, Miss Knight also feels the need of a special issue of the document, upping the current 20 pages to a possible count of 50. This, also, would be for the benefit of those commercial travelers who at present carry awkward, and easy to lose, extension pages attached to their passports.

There's a chance that the old "greenback" green color may be changed, too. Blue, maroon, and grey, as well as green, all look good in the proposed plastic coverings. Perhaps, suggests Miss Knight with a twinkle in her eyes, a public opinion poll among American women could determine the most popular color—or maybe the final choice could be a fluorescent shade, to aid the traveler in finding that mislaid document he had "just a minute ago."

HER RECORD

If all the proposed changes—shape, size, cover, color, and format—sound a bit ambitious for a one-woman project, take a look at what the Passport Director has already done in her less than 5 years on the job.

Annual output of passports has increased in number over 200,000 since 1955, yet they are now being produced more rapidly, at the rate of 10 per minute. This is due in large part to the change from a vertical to horizontal position of the descriptive data page.

It used to take several weeks for processing. Current time from reception of application to issuance of passport is 3 days.

Nonsmiling black and white pictures have been replaced by a more natural picture, in color, contributing to more pleasant travel and more accurate identification. All these changes have been brought about under the direction of Miss Knight.

Having accomplished this much, Miss Knight is set to complete her renovation of the U.S. passport. And, she candidly admits, the biggest obstacles in her way are men.

"Men buck change. They shy away from it—it makes them feel insecure."

"My difficulty," she says, "is in proving to the male officials concerned that my recommendations will be a practical improvement on an official document; they're not just a woman's whim to make the passport more glamorous."

It may take a while for these changes to receive the official stamp of approval, Miss Knight admits. "Perhaps I won't have an answer to all the problems concerned this year. But," she adds, quickly and firmly, "there will be an answer."

From her past record, you can bet your vaccination certificate against 42 pesetas that there will be, too.

If Lincoln Were Here Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Roy M. Harrop, of Omaha, Nebr., wrote the following article. It is very timely and appropriate.

Mr. Harrop is national chairman, National Commercial Travelers Economic Security Foundation, Inc.

The article follows:

IF LINCOLN WERE HERE NOW

On February 12 Americans will celebrate the 151st birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, and one of America's greatest statesmen, constitutional lawyer and champion of solvency of the United States of America. In the crisis of 1863 Honest Abe saved this Republic when the Nation, after 3 years of the War Between the States, public credit was on the verge of ruin and a bleeding, bankrupt nation was restored to solvency when he authorized Congress to issue full legal tender currency, good for all debts public and private, free from interest and taxation.

We are again at the crossroads of destiny with a debt burden in the colossal volume approximately a thousand billion dollars, which includes the national debt, State municipal and private debts. Our national debt, caused by deficit spending, has now reached $290 billion, all of which is borrowed credit, and foisted upon us by international bankers under the privately owned Federal Reserve bank system which must be paid through taxation by the people of the United States.

We cannot forget the millions of men of all nations who laid down their lives in World War I, II, and the Korean war, who,

not realizing they were the pawns of the scheme of international bankers to gain control of the world through the control of money and credit monopoly which produced a debt-credit slavery system, under a one-world government scheme (the United Nations) did not realize they might spend the remainder of their lives in a foreign prison, and some are still serving a sentence in Chinese Communist prisons.

If Lincoln were here today, his conception of a world court would be far removed from an alien supergovernment. He would recognize no international flag, nor the consent to reduction of the U.S. Government as a mendicant to peaceful coexistence with international communism. He would never submit to a program of surrendered rights and policies (but would hold fast to the Constitution of the United States) who by summit agreements would transfer the right to declare war from the Congress to the United Nations, or the submission of the Monroe Doctrine, or our immigration policy, foreign giveaways, our control of the Panama Canal and our foreign possessions, or any other question vital to our rights, liberties and the pursuit of happiness, to an alien court in contravention of our destiny under our Constitution.

Lincoln once said: "I appeal to you to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you, is the question, Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?"

Our problems today are equally grave and perplexing. Having reached the forks of the road, which way shall we Americans go? Standing between civilization and chaos, destiny is hidden here; there is no halfway ground. We must choose between the Communist scheme of peaceful coexistence under the United Nations world government, which would make slaves of the U.S. citizens, or adhere to our U.S. Constitution that we may survive and live, and as Abraham Lincoln said that "government of the people, for the people and by the people may not perish from the earth."

Ninety Miles to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I salute Mr. Ken Woodman, the alert and well-informed editor of the Mansfield News Journal of Mansfield, Ohio, for his editorial of February 7, 1960, entitled "Ninety Miles to Communism" which I believe reflects clearly the concern of many people in my congressional district with reference to our Government's policy of extreme patience toward the Castro regime in Cuba.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include for the consideration of my colleagues, particularly those serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, this hard hitting, no holds barred editorial which I believe typifies the thinking of every red blooded American who revolts at anything resembling appeasement:

NINETY MILES TO COMMUNISM

Ninety miles from the mainland of the United States a dictatorship has been established by murder, false propaganda, and public thievery. Holding positions of power are men known to have close connections with the Communist Party and Soviet Russia.

The people of the United States are being required to financially support this dictatorship by paying 2 cents extra on each pound of sugar they buy.

Speaking so all the world can hear, the President of the United States says this Nation will invoke no economic sanctions and take no military steps to disturb the Castro dictatorship of Cuba.

This is also saying, in effect, that the American people will continue to be taxed at their grocery stores for the financial support of the Castro regime.

Apparently it is morally all right for the Communists to infiltrate Cuba.

Apparently it is morally all right for the Communists to have a stooge at the head of the Cuban military which has supplanted the courts and conducts drumhead trials for Cuban citizens who can expect on justice under law, but only the merciless whim of a dictator.

Apparently it is all right for the Communist-infiltrated government to seize farms and businesses without payment to the owners on the pretext of benefiting the people, when the move is clearly one to try to keep the dictatorship solvent.

But apparently it is morally wrong for the United States to make any move whatsoever to prevent the establishment of a pro-Communist dictatorship on its doorstep.

Apparently it is morally wrong for the United States to act to protect the property of its citizens on an island closer than Hawaii or Alaska.

Apparently it is morally wrong to stop looting the pockets of American housewives on grounds that it might upset an outspoken foe of the United States who harangues for hours against us.

This is not only nonsense, it is dangerous.

Our State Department has noted with great satisfaction that since the President announced the U.S. will continue to finance the Cuban dictatorship through our sugar price and quota system. Castro's attacks on the United States have ameliorated.

Isn't that marvelous.

Castro isn't going to bark quite so loud at the hand that feeds him. All he is going to do is turn his country over lock, stock, and barrel to the sworn enemies of the American way of life.

We prate of liberty and justice and the good life for all the downtrodden nations of the world, yet almost within sight of our seacoast we let an unshaven fanatic and his Communist henchmen abolish all justice, trample on personal liberty, and establish a political system designed to provide a good life only for the Communist hierarchy.

To the world our prattle must sound meaningless indeed.

They see us as a great nation so cowed by our own doctrine of noninterference that we actually support a dictatorship which crushes the very ideals we say we stand for.

It seems that nonintervention is only for us.

The Communist may intervene in Cuba. We may not.

And this is true only because we make it true. The United States is stronger than the Communists. They could not intervene in Cuba if we did not permit it.

Have our notions of morality, our concepts of justice become so twisted that we must, by inaction and financial blood donating, foster the very evils we seek to combat?

Have we, crying justice, become the unjust?

Have we, babbling morality, become the immoral?

We had better find out before we reap the whirlwinds of the whole world's disrespect.

Establishment of a Federal Commission Urged To Implement Public Law 86-90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to etxend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Spas T. Raikin, secretary general, American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., with headquarters in New York City, with which he forwards a copy of a resolution adopted at the annual convention of his organization held in New York City on December 20, 1959:

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE
ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 2, 1960.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It is my privilege to bring to your attention the resolution of the annual convention of our association, held in New York on December 20, 1959, and to request your support for our views by joining with other U.S. Senators and Congressmen and work for the implementation of our demand that a Federal commission be constituted to carry out to the fullest the intent of Public Law 86-90.

We will appreciate it if you could advise us of your actions on this matter.

Most respectfully yours,

SPAS T. RAIKIN,
Secretary General.

Whereas the United States is engaged in a struggle for survival with the forces of Russian Communist imperialism—an unorthodox war which has been provoked by and is now fully supported by the Russian Government;

Whereas the unorothodox war provoked by the Russian Government is directed at all the free nations of the world, with the United States as the primary target of this war;

Whereas this unorothodox Russian warfare has resulted in the violent overthrow of many free and independent governments and the Russian occupation of these formerly independent nations, among which are: Albania, Bulgaria, Cossackia, Byelorussia, Croatia, Armenia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechia, Slovakia, Poland, Turkestan, Serbia, Idel-Ural, Ukraine, East Germany, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Rumania;

Whereas the Russian nation alone among all the nations of the U.S.S.R. has failed to know by firsthand experience the blessings of freedom and individual liberty in the result of which most of the Russian people became an easy prey to the Communist regime;

Whereas the peoples of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., who comprise the large majority of peoples of the U.S.S.R., are overwhelmingly opposed to communism and Russian imperialism and desiring the restoration of their national independence thus constitute a powerful force against any efforts of Moscow to win their war against the United States and other free nations;

Whereas the overwhelming majority of the people of the Russian captive nations outside the U.S.S.R. have made common cause with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

and all seek the overthrow of the modern-day Russian Empire;

Whereas the Department of State has failed to recognize or to support the aspirations of the peoples of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. while at the same time weakening our support to the other captive nations, and by this failure has weakened the chances for a just peace in a time of increasing prospects for war;

Whereas the leadership and the Members of the 86th Congress have given public recognition to the aspirations and the yearnings of all the peoples of the captive non-Russian nations of the modern-day Russian Empire for liberty, freedom and national independence through the passage of Public Law 86-90, signed by the President of the United States, by which Captive Nations Week resolution is to be nationally observed each year;

Whereas this enlightened action by Congress is a potentially powerful weapon for peace and merits the unceasing support by the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 2d session of the 86th Congress be urged to maintain the initiative for a just and lasting peace by taking steps to make certain that the intent of Public Law 86-90 is fully exploited during 1960 and for each succeeding year until peace is won; and be it further

Resolved, That the 86th Congress be urged to create a Federal commission with the necessary authority to implement to the fullest the intent of Public Law 86-90.

Inadequate Protection from Radiation Will Create Workmen's Compensation Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech by Mr. Leo Goodman, atomic energy advisor of the United Automobile Workers, delivered to the Conference of Southern Association of Workmen's Compensation Administrators in Lexington, Ky., on August 21, 1959.

This revealing speech calls attention to British action as well as concern over workmen compensation problems raised by the new radioactive age.

The text of Mr. Goodman's remarks follows:

INADEQUATE PROTECTION FROM RADIATION WILL CREATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CRISIS

(Statement of Leo Goodman, atomic energy adviser, UAW, to Conference of Southern Association of Workmen's Compensation Administrators, Lexington, Ky., August 21, 1959.)

The South is fortunately blessed with the resources which changed nuclear science from a theoretical and laboratory activity into a decisive military weapon, and more recently a tool of great potential benefit to mankind. I am sure that Oak Ridge is the name known throughout the world. In the past the association of that name was solely with the mushroom cloud produced by the explosion of the atom bomb. Today Oak Ridge is even more well known as the source of thousands of radioactive isotopes which are used throughout the world. I think a brief review of the atomic energy industry is in order if we are to comprehend the full scope of the problem which we face.

THE SIZE OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY

There are two major divisions of what is increasingly known as the atomic energy industry. First, the largest is the Federal Government's activities under the Atomic Energy Commission and the various branches of the Department of Defense. Since the establishment of the Manhattan Engineering District with its initial allocation of $6,000 in 1941, there has been appropriated a total of over $22 billion to be expended under the atomic energy program. Of this amount over $7.5 billion represents investment in plant and equipment. The number of employees direct and indirect, approximates 150,000. In the private sector, according to testimony presented to the Congress this year, 14 firms represent 85 percent of all activity, and some 5,000 organizations are currently engaged in the use of nuclear science either through the establishment of a laboratory or facility, or through the use of radioactive isotopes produced in a Government-owned installation. I estimate that there are over 1 million employees in the 5,000 industrial plants, mills, and institutions which are using radioactive isotopes in industrial processes today.

I would like to approach the problems we face with certain basic assumptions. These are not my own assumptions but rather those which I have garnered from others who have spoken on this same topic of workmen's compensation laws in relation to radiation injuries.

Assumption No. 1 is, "We should proceed on the hypothesis that a harmless dose of radiation does not exist."

A second assumption which I believe will have universal acceptance is that, "It is fair to say that the sources of radiation will increase many fold during the next 10 years and that nuclear powerplants will increase in number, size and capacity of output."

Many outstanding organizations such as the National Academy of Sciences, and the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, have reported extensively on the influence of ionizing radiation on human beings. These reports make clear that serious health problems are being created if undue radiation exposure occurs. Every organization which has studied this problem, of course, recommends that the highest social standards in plants extracting and producing fissionable materials, producing atomic energy and using its products should be taken both in the interests of the workers employed and for the public at large. Some who would prefer to maintain the status quo, that is the status quo prior to the establishment of Oak Ridge, will tell you that there is no serious problem, that we have always lived with radiation, and that the dial on your wristwatch, or your television set, or the shoe x-ray machine, will produce as serious a problem as the development of the atomic energy industry. Those who believe these stories will face a sad awakening in the future. Possibly one way to illustrate the difference in the radiation problem today from that of the past would be to analyze the amount of radiation realized from the reactor accident which occurred in Canada in November of 1952. The amount of radioactivity released in that one accident exceeded by 1,200 times the amount of radiation released by all radium which had been refined in the world up to that date.

Another reactor accident at Windscale, England, produced more radiation than the bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan.

Not all radiation accidents have happened in other countries. Some of you may be familiar with the Kellogg case which occurred in Houston, Tex. If you are not familiar with it, there is some detail regarding this story in an article in Look magazine for September 3, 1957. But even more significant is the accident which occurred in Darby, Conn. Some detail of this accident can be found in an article printed in American Weekly for February 24, 1957. In that case an electrician took a capsule of cobalt 60, which was hanging in the midst of a construction job, put it in his pocket, and subsequently in the glove compartment of his automobile, and then traveled around the community for 3½ days before the geiger counter at the plant gate revealed the location of the missing capsule of cobalt 60. The workers who accompanied him on his daily ride to and from the job are suing in the Federal courts, but the more serious aspect of this case is the exposure of possibly hundreds who were in the vicinity of the man carrying an uncovered capsule of cobalt 60, or his automobile which is known to have been on the parking lot of the grocery store near his home.

Now the problem we face here today is—what do we do about the injury which occurs through the widespread use of this new science. We of organized labor would oppose any effort to abandon the use of this new science. But we do not believe that the chance victim of exposure should be required to pay the costs which result from the negligence or inevitable acident which produce radiation exposure both to the worker on his job and any person exposed by chance.

Cases are now in the courts all over the United States, whether it be Houston, Tex.; Hartford, Conn.; or New York City. The only case which I am aware of which has been processed through the Supreme Court in the Anglo Saxon world is *Thoonen v. Commonwealth of Australia*. This case has been through the supreme court of that country, and an award of £40,000 ($112,000) has been sustained. That case was surprisingly similar to the case in Darby, Conn., where an electrical worker picked up a capsule of cobalt 60 and put it in his pants pocket. He sued for criminal negligence. Most of the testimony in the trial court was medical evidence relating to the character of the injury. It may be that when the court cases here in the United States reach final decision, that serious attention will be given to finding a solution to the problem.

I recommend that you check into the action taken by Parliament in London these past few weeks. There Parliament, after extensive debate, adopted the nuclear installations (Licensing and Insurance Act, 1959). In behalf of the Crown the act was described on the floor of the House of Lords where it was introduced by Minister of the Crown, Paymaster-General Maudling, who said:

"I come next to the question of liability. I take, first, the licensees, namely, the nationalized industries or the private enterprises which own the installations. There will be placed on them an absolute liability toward everyone, including their employees, who may in any way be hurt or damaged by the emission of radioactive substances from their installations, and this absolute liability will replace or subsume their common law liability, which is now limited to cases of negligence. The only qualification of this absolute liability is the natural qualification where contributory negligence can be established. If so, that can be pleaded in mitigation of damage.

"The absolute liability will apply to everything that happens on the site of the nuclear installation and anything that emerges from it whether by reason of the operation of the reactor or the discharge of waste, and it will also apply to any hurt or damage caused in the course of the transport of irradiated fuel elements.

"We therefore feel that the bill, as drafted, will place upon the people concerned an absolute liability for hurt or damage in all cases where, conceivably, hurt or damage can be caused by radioactive substances.

"The other extension which the bill provides is in the period of claim, which is extended to 30 years in the case of both damage to an individual and damage to property. That contrasts with the periods of 3 and 6 years respectively which, as I mentioned earlier, are the rule under existing law. The reason for this extension is the fact that hurt or damage caused by radiation can take a very long time indeed to become apparent. I think that it is now agreed by all concerned that the limitations in this case should be very much longer than the normal rule. * * *

"So the second stage of the bill—after the first stage, which provided for the licensing and the safety regulations—is to provide that, should anyone be hurt or damaged despite the safety precautions he or she shall be absolutely entitled to compensation. * * *

"The liability of the owners of the installations is absolute to their employees just as it is to the general public. Therefore, the employees could not possibly be more clearly and completely covered. * * *

"As I said at the beginning, the existing law is either inadequate or uncertain to cover the whole of this problem. Therefore, we have tried to provide, first, for maximum safety in construction, operation, and maintenance of these installations; secondly, to clarify the laws as to liability and impose an absolute liability in respect of all the people who enter or operate reactors; and thirdly, to insure that people who are hurt or damaged can be confident that they will receive the compensation to which they will be entitled."

This provides absolute liability for 30 years and the presumption is that anyone within the affected area of an accident shall have been affected and, therefore, come within the protective terms of the act. This act does not meet all of the problems which this new science imposes, but it goes a long way toward protecting the individual from the serious harm which can come to him because society at large has determined to use this new science. I do not know the mechanism which we will adopt in this country. Extensive hearings have been held before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the Federal Congress. No significant bill has been introduced as a result thereof. Though hundreds of suggestions were made there was little area of agreement and practically no consensus of opinion. As a result, no action was taken, nor is any likely until this new industry suffers a major accident. The course of wisdom in our opinion would be to prevent that first major accident, to protect the developing industry by maintaining the highest possible safety standards. It is not practical to expect the Atomic Energy Commission to fully police itself.

Not all of industry will spend the money necessary for high safety standards unless an adequate system of inspection and regulation is maintained. There is little likelihood of the necessary regulation and inspection while the industry is being promoted into existence. In the absence of these necessary improvements all we can do is to hold meetings such as these, consult with each other, and urge our respective points of view. I close by urging serious consideration of the principles enacted into statute by our overseas cousins in London, England.

St. Louis Postal Employees Protest Newly Devised Speedup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in Congress I have received correspondence from individual employees of the postal service complaining from time to time about various rules or practices in the Department, or about supervisors, and so on, and sometimes these complaints have been found to be justified and sometimes they have been merely personal complaints or so-called gripes of one sort or another. I make this observation so as to avoid any misunderstanding over the material I am now inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by unanimous consent, for the letters which follow are not in the pattern of the "gripes" I referred to above. I include them in the RECORD because they are from men I know to be responsible and conscientious.

Most of the postal workers whom I have come to know over the years are dedicated to the service and are proud of their work. We long ago came to recognize the postal employees as among the most conscientious and loyal and hard-working of all of our citizens. But, in recent years, I am sorry to say, many postal workers have been disillusioned about the service by the attitude they have discovered on the part of the top officials of the Department here in Washington—an attitude which seems to hold that most postal workers are drones and incompetents.

In recent days I have received a number of communications from postal employees in St. Louis describing a new procedure in effect in the post office in St. Louis, on orders from Washington, apparently as a test preliminary to the use of the same procedures in all post offices. Under it, clerks are required to keep tabs on the number of letters they process per minute each hour of the day, and a substantial group of employees has been assigned to the task of double-checking these performance reports. Apparently work norms are then set which, according to information I have received, are based on the output of the fastest, most experienced clerks.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF NEW RULES

I am impressed with the correspondence I am receiving which describes the nervousness which, I am told, is becoming something of an occupational disease among postal clerks in St. Louis. If so, it is a deplorable thing.

I received one letter which was different, however; this was from a career employee of 24 years who claimed that the new procedure was justified because some employees have been constant offenders who took advantage of coffee breaks and so on and who avoided being disciplined by having the union intercede for them. But I am struck by the fact that this is the only letter I have received along this line whereas I have received many from employees who find the new procedure definitely unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service look into the incidents and situations described in the letters I am placing in the RECORD. If the new work rules are fair and equitable, then we should have that made clear. If, on the other hand, they represent the kind of unfair speed-up responsible leaders of the postal employees in St. Louis claim—and I have always found these officials of the postal organizations to be as dedicated to the good reputation of the service as any Post Office Department top executive in Washington—then I think these practices should be eliminated. In either event a full investigation is justified.

The correspondence referred to above is as follows:

[Local No. 8, 1906–59, 53 Years of Service—St. Louis Post Office Clerks' Union of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks—Affiliated With American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organization, St. Louis, Mo., Labor Council, Missouri State Labor Council—Post Office Box 241, St. Louis 3, Mo.]

FEBRUARY 1, 1960.

Hon. Mrs. LENOR K. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: There is enclosed herewith a copy of a motion which was adopted by the January 1960 meeting of Local No. 8, N.F.P.O.C.

The distribution guides system referred to in the motion was installed in the St. Louis post office along with 66 other large post offices throughout the country beginning January 18, 1960, and in our opinion is nothing more nor less than a speed up system, the use of which should not be tolerated in the postal service.

There has recently been introduced in the Congress H.R. 10029 by Representative RHODES and H.R. 10033 by Representative WEIR which would prohibit the use of such systems in the postal service and it is our hope that you will give these measures your wholehearted support.

During the past several years there has been a substantial increase in the number of supervisory personnel and other higher paid employees of the post office and it has been our observation that the major function of these people has been to invent and operate systems which have for their purpose an increase in production by rank and file employees.

It is our belief that the use of these systems such as the W.P.S., B.M.T., E.P.O.M.'s, distribution guides, etc., by which the Department subjects the rank and file employees to pressure and harassment have not always accomplished what we feel should be the major objective of the postal service and that is the speedy and expeditious delivery of the mails.

We are not opposed to the efficient operation of the post office, in fact we have always subscribed to the belief that the post office is entitled to at fair days work for a fair days pay, but we believe that efficiency of opera-

tion should be based on the objective of securing speedy delivery of the mails rather than as an excuse to hire more higher salaried help to harass the rank and file employees for the purpose of securing more and better statistics.

In this office we have seen a substantial number of clerks transferred from their duties as distributors to that of compiling statistics and the major function of most of our line supervisors seems to be to keep records of the work production standards program. The distribution guides system has further diverted more clerks from their duties as distributors to that of checkers and a whole crew has been assigned to compute the production percentages from the form 2311's.

Anything which you can do to help secure a realinement of the objectives in the postal service from the worship of the fetish of production and the compilation of statistics to the expeditious delivery of the mails will in our opinion be an improvement which will benefit both the postal employees and the mailing public.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Respectfully,

JOHN W. MACE,
President.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 28, 1960.*

Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Congresswoman from Missouri,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Hon. Mrs. SULLIVAN: No doubt by this time, you have been informed or have heard about the situation just brought into existence in the St. Louis post office, which is that of an efficiency method much to the regret of all the clerks upon whom this program has been enforced and as well upon the supervisors, many of whom are in the same opinion of us clerks, that it is not good for all concerned.

With these thoughts in mind, therefore, I write to you asking your assistance in endeavoring insofar as possible to eliminate this terrible situation. Although this program as yet does not affect all clerks, as I understand in the course of time it will, and furthermore it is to be installed in 66 other offices. Now I will endeavor to briefly explain or describe it to you. To begin with, this plan was mandated by the Department in Washington and, of course, our own Postmaster Bakewell can do nothing more than to follow orders. When the clerk comes on duty (he or she), a report card is handed out by the supervisor. On this card the clerk, in the course of the 8-hour routine, and for substitutes it is longer, every move during that period must be recorded. Even so much if a clerk must take a necessary break from his task for personal reasons or to secure refreshments from the vending machine, that time must be noted on the back of his report card. Each task has its own particular number as far as mail throwing and every tray of mail is tagged by the supervisor and his assistants (other clerks appointed for this duty). The clerk must retain these slips in possession until relieved from that task for another duty and such slips are checked by the supervisor before release and noted on his card. Certain standards have been set up by the Department for each clerk to reach in order to attain good efficiency—the figure for each tray is 0.25. And every clerk since the system went into effect is doing his or her best to throw as many trays of mail as it is possible to gain more tags. Of course, this will eventually gain for that clerk a good mark. But the sad consequences of the situation are, that many a good clerk is becoming nervous and excited, held in a tensity, like being shackled to a case while throwing mail, fearing to speak to the clerk aside him or her, and placing the clerks in a state of exhaustion while throwing mail with eyes of supervision watching and checking. The slips are tallied against the time a clerk was at the case and by reason of figures set up as standard, the rate of efficiency is given the clerk on this report card the following day. Also, if you can still follow me, a clerk cannot touch a tray of mail, unless the supervisor places a slip on it. Often the supervisor is not on hand or performing some other important task and the clerk must wait for the slip, thereby causing a delay in the separating of the mail and often missing a dispatch.

It seems to me, personally, that this method is also a manner in which unionism can be broken down. It is a sad affair, Mrs. SULLIVAN, for in our office it seems that all clerks, members or not, look toward our organization for progress and relief from strain and other deals as it were enforced upon them by the powers that be. Many a good clerk due to this strain and stress is becoming quite nervous and as a result not making the efficiency standards which the Department desires. Many of them oldtimers, good and faithful servants for many, many years in the postal service, then to be inflicted upon by this sort of situation. It is absolutely ridiculous. I am sure you will agree. If supervision canont determine who is a good clerk and who is not just by mere personal judgment, then surely it cannot be determined by placing figures on paper. Such principles must be determined by careful checking and observations of an individual's actions before judgment can be issued as to good or bad. As you will no doubt agree with me, there is strength in body and by such we can fight as a body to secure the benefits and rights due us. But when we are shackled and chained as it were to a mail case and when the pressure of mandatory action is strained upon us, then it is when we fight for our rights as public service employees to the bitter end. We have the duty to give the public prompt mail service, but we cannot under the pressure just inflicted upon us.

So, Mrs. SULLIVAN, in behalf of all the clerks in the St. Louis office, I ask in all kindness will you endeavor to have this efficiency program abolished insofar as it is possible. I am sure you would not like to work under such mandatory action as we are now being forced to do. For further detail on this method of antilabor tactics, I would suggest you contact our national officers in the Federation Building and I am quite sure they will cooperate with you to this extent, in the event you have not as yet been informed. Please excuse this lengthy letter, but I have endeavored to brief you on the situation. Don't know if I done a good task or not. At any rate, Mrs. SULLIVAN, I know you will cooperate in our efforts, and I await your response with interest.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH P. CELLA,
Financial Secretary, Local No. 8, National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 25, 1960.

Hon. KEN HECHLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was with considerable interest that I read your statement relative to peepholes in the post offices. Having spent better than 37 years in the St. Louis Post Office and visiting many others I can appreciate your statements. While it is true, as Mr. Harding states, they are designed primarily for watching employees suspected of stealing or tampering with the mails, I have heard employees state they had been warned by supervisors that they should discontinue certain practices as inspectors might be watching. The mere thought of having someone spying on you strikes terror to the hearts of many people and something should be done to correct it. We appreciate your efforts.

There are, however, several gimmicks in the larger post offices which, if anything are of much more fearsome nature. I refer to the work performance standards program and the recently installed distribution guides system both of which have been installed within the last 7 years. These projects have been held as whips over the heads of postmasters, supervisors, and clerks and have helped to drive many good employees from the postal service.

The work performance standards program is supposed to provide "an equitable basis for sound measurement of group performance." This is an expensive affair requiring much paperwork and takes productive employees fram mail-handling jobs for its administration. It has encouraged supervisors to select first teams, work bulky mails in preference to first come first served, and use various other practices to establish good records. Further, it has caused much dissatisfaction and ill-feeling among supervisors and supervisors as well as supervisors and clerks. I understand that this project was sold to the Post Office Department by the firm which supplied us with our present Director of the Budget.

The latest and most terrifying of all, however, is the distribution guides system which made its appearance in the St. Louis Post Office on January 18. I am enclosing one of the letters sent to each of the employees concerned and which supposedly thoroughly explains the program and to leave the impression that it is a harmless operation which is sought by many employees. To date I have been unable to locate any distributor who has wanted such a program.

Methods Handbook, series M-19, titled "Distribution Guides System," supplied by the Post Office Department, among other things contains the following:

"If, after the above procedure has been observed, a determination is made that a distributor has not attained a satisfactory level of performance, the matter will be referred to the installation head, for further evaluation by him and members of his staff under the provisions of part 715, Postal Manual. It should be noted in this connection that the distribution guides system is not established for the purpose of determining the need for disciplinary action. With respect to the individual employee, it is a program of assistance and guidance.

"The chief accountant will be responsible for maintaining form 2312, Accounting Period Record of Individual Daily Performance, and preparing a list each accounting period of individuals whose performance is less than 100 percent; this is to be submitted concurrently to the installation head and General Superintendent of Mails.

"Form 2311, Individual Daily Record of Performance. (Prepare original only.) Returned to employee for disposition.

"Form 2312, Accounting Period Record of Individual Daily Performance. (Retained for 1 year in office of chief accountant.)

"Form 2313, Summary of Individual Performance. (Prepare original and two copies.) Retain for 3 years copy for PM and Regional Operations Director.)"

You can see from the above, all is not sweetness and light. Employees were not informed that a record of their performance was to be kept on file for a year. They were not informed that a group report was to be sent to the regional office and kept there for 3 years. They were not informed that if they did not attain a satisfactory level of performance that his or her record would be referred to the postmaster who in turn will be guided by chapter 715 of the Postal Manual and that part 715.52 in turn reads as follows: "When the supervisor evaluates performance as being unsatisfactory, and the employee does not improve following appropriate discussions, counseling, or reassignment, appropriate action will be initiated for separation of the employee from the service.

(See part 717. Separations.)". In other words, despite all promises, they are forever in danger of disciplinary action or removal so long as this project remains in operation.

Mr. Congressman, let me take you on a trip through the St. Louis Post Office as a day in the life of a clerk. Picture, if you will, you arrive at the employee's entrance a few minutes before reporting time where you must show your badge in order to get into the building. You then proceed to the locker room which is lined with inspectors galleries. For a few minutes you may stop in the cafeteria or swing room and then proceed to the time clock on the workroom floor. At the timecard rack you pick up your timecard and assignment card, ring your timecard, and travel to the outgoing letter section. As you approach the division you are greeted by a sign approximately 2 feet high and 3 feet long, which states in large letters:

"Distribution guides, work center 3, outgoing letter section, minimum production rate 2,340 per hour, 39 per minute."

When you report to your supervisor he takes your timecard and your assignment card. In return he heads you your individual daily record of performance and assigns you to a case which is also numbered. You remain at this case until your supervisor moves you. You place your name, your timecard number, your title, the date and time you enter the unit on this card, commonly known as form 2311.

You then pick up the slip which indicates (in hundredths of an hour) the minimum time in which you are expected to distribute the mail on the ledge in front of you. These slips are retained by you until such time as taken up by your supervisor. When you have finished with the ledge of mail before you, you are given additional mail similarly tagged. When you have completed the assignment, you enter your nondistribution time and the time you are leaving the unit on your 2311, your supervisor gives you credit for the slips or tags you have accumulated and checks you out.

You then pick up your assignment card and move to the next assignment, which more than likely is the secondary division. Here again is an overhead sign of the same proportions to greet you. It says:

"Distribution guides, work center 4-24, outgoing letter section, minimum production rate, 2,280 per hour, 38 per minute."

Here you give the supervisor your assignment card, enter your starting time on your form 2311, and go through the same procedure until you finish the assignment or lunch time arrives. In this operation, on many occasions, you are required to collect the mail you are to work. You must first stop and have an employee measure your mail and supply you with the slip for your production credit. You must then weigh the mail and enter the weight on the proper WPS sheet. Then you pocket the credit slip and go to work.

At lunch time you check out on your performance card, check with the supervisor, pick up your assignment card, proceed to the time card rack where you exchange your assignment card for your time card, ring out on the time clock, hand your time card to the timekeeper who replaces it in the time card rack. After lunch you go through the same operations, being greeted by the same signs, etc., until the end of the day.

This, Mr. Congressman, is the regimentation with which a postal clerk must contend from day to day. Can you blame employees for leaving?

I realize this is a long letter, in fact far too long. It is, however, a serious situation. Regardless of sugar-coated phrases and promises it is definitely intended to increase production. If not, they certainly would not go to the terrific expenses involved. I would estimate it takes some 25 or more employees out of useful production to compile and prepare the records. Further, all the forms required are costly to print and obtain. As you walk up the aisles you can sense the tension. People who used to be friendly barely give you the time of day as you go by. Employees complain of the kind of mail they work, the type of case they work at, and the idea that the other fellow gets the breaks or cheats. The supervisor, instead of supervising, spends most of his time checking slips, cards, and answering questions, further damaging operation efficiency. It is a crime being perpetrated on thousands of hardworking, loyal employees who are well aware at the close of the day they have performed an honest day's work. It takes us back beyond the so-called dark ages and is something which I seriously doubt Congress would permit in outside industry.

I urge that you add this to your other projects and help enact legislation which would forever forbid such systems in the Government service. If I can be of assistance in any way, please advise me.

Very truly yours,

CARL SETJE.

Pot Calling Kettle Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Journal and Guide, Feb. 6, 1960]

POT CALLING KETTLE BLACK

Representative GRAHAM BARDEN of North Carolina, who is chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, has announced that he will not be a candidate to succeed himself when his present term expires.

Under the seniority rule in Congress, the next committee member in line for the chairmanship is Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York.

Congressional comments and editorials in some of the Nation's leading newspapers have raised various objections to Mr. POWELL.

One of these is that he is a "racist", and that he is not otherwise qualified for the chairmanship. He is accused of a bad attendance record.

One newspaper stakes frankly that Mr. BARDEN, the outgoing chairman, "was not over-qualified for the chairmanship which his long years in the House handed him." But, it says, "yet he stands tall in the saddle when compared to his prospective successor, ADAM POWELL."

Our definition of a racist is a man who wants all of his rights for himself but wants to deny the same rights to the Negro or other groups. That trait distinguishes the very people who are trying now to make a case for excluding Mr. POWELL from the chairmanship.

Mr. POWELL has contended for civil, educational and economic rights for members of his race, but he has not at any time asked that people of any other race be denied these rights.

The approved "racist" seems to come within the category of those who want rights for themselves but would deny them to Mr. POWELL.

Unfortunately, Mr. POWELL is under the shadow of a Federal court trial in March for an alleged income tax violation. Whether he is guilty of this offense we will leave to the courts to decide. But, in passing, we want to say this: It is on the record of the southern Members of Congress and many of the Nation's press members to label any Negro who asks for his legal rights a "racist".

Some of the criticisms raised against Mr. POWELL are stupid and vicious.

We were sorry to see such an able editor as Mr. Ralph McGill join in destroying public confidence in Mr. POWELL before he had been given the chance to show what he could do as chairman of the committee.

Shrimp Is the No. 1 U.S. Seafood Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 1959, I introduced a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota.

Identical bills were presented on the same date by a large group of Members from the States of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Alabama, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, and Washington. We were all gratified to have as an original sponsor our colleague from Florida, the Honorable SIDNEY HERLONG, a distinguished member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, to which this legislation, including his own bill, H.R. 8769, has been referred.

This united movement was brought about by the united and unselfish action of every segment of the shrimp industry.

These bills were introduced during the closing days of the last session and we are confident that numerous other Members will introduce similar measures shortly because this is not anyone's pet project. It is the carefully considered proposal of the entire shrimp industry. It has the overwhelming support of producers, processors, canners, and breeders from the gulf coastal, south Atlantic and northwestern areas. It is sponsored by the National Shrimp Congress, Texas Shrimp Association, Southeastern Fisheries Association, Gulf Shrimp Canners Association, and other groups.

I am encouraged to know that the Louisiana Shrimp Association has taken a leading part in the movement. At a meeting recently held in my congressional district, Mr. James H. Summersgill, president of the association; Mr. Jack Lewis, president and general manager of the Twin City Cooperative; Mr. Sebastian Cardinal, secretary of St. Mary Fishermen's Cooperative; Mayor C. R. Brownell, of Morgan City; and other

outstanding public spirited citizens in attendance stressed the common theme that if the shrimp industry is to survive every segment of it must work together to fight the import menace and the threat of possible exhaustion and thus the preservation and wholesome development of this valuable natural resource.

The National Shrimp Congress, Inc., with headquarters in Tallahassee, Fla., issued a statement proving with facts and figures that shrimp is the No. 1 U.S. seafood industry, listing the numerous other related industries having a vital interest in a thriving and profitable shrimp industry, describing the valuable contribution made by shrimp processors to the general industry, illustrating the problems that are common to producers and processors, pointing out the serious threat of shrimp imports, and explaining the need for and objectives of the proposed legislation. This statement, which I now make part of my remarks, is the result of long research and rather exhaustive studies and represents the combined thinking of leaders in every facet of the shrimp industry:

SHRIMP IS THE NO. 1 U.S. SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

The various fishing industries of the United States represent a large capital investment in vessels and shore equipment and provide employment, directly or indirectly, for thousands of Americans. The shrimp industry is the largest of the seafood industries. Principal domestic production comes from the Gulf and South Atlantic States, with significantly developing production in the far Western States of Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska. Of the 12 producing States, the largest producer is Texas, followed closely by Florida and Louisiana

It was estimated by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries that in 1956 there were about 7,533 vessels engaged in shrimp fishing in the South Atlantic and Gulf areas alone. This included 3,715 vessels and 3,818 motorboats. Construction of the larger vessels continued on a heavy scale through 1958, increasing the heavy investment of shrimp producers. It is estimated that today there are approximately 5,000 of these larger craft, mostly of wood construction, with a few of steel construction. A modern and well-equipped shrimp trawler costs approximately $50,000. This represents, in the larger craft, a replacement value of $250 million.

RELATED INDUSTRIES

Partially or heavily dependent upon shrimp production are a number of other important domestic industries. These include:

(1) Manufacture of engines, propellers, pumps and accessories.

(2) Manufacture of electronic equipment, radios and depth recorders.

(3) Ice plants and refrigeration equipment.

(4) Fuel and oil suppliers.

(5) Ship, chandlery: anchors, ropes, cable, nets and marine supplies.

(6) Trucking and transportation.

(7) Ship construction.

(8) Marine railways doing hull repairs and overhauling.

(9) Marine insurance

(10) Box factories.

(11) Repair shops: engines, electronics, rigging, salvage, etc.

The annual operating cost of one of the typical 65-foot shrimp trawlers furnishes related supply industries approximately $10,000 per year, or a total for the large vessel fleet of $50 million.

SHRIMP PROCESSORS

About half of the domestic shrimp catch goes to domestic processors who prepare shrimp for market in packaged consumer form, canned, cooked and peeled, cooked and breaded, uncooked breaded and in other specialty packs. Processors have played a major role in developing the U.S. shrimp market. Besides their heavy investment in plant equipment they have spent and are spending millions of dollars in advertising and promotion to create an expanded market. They maintain high standards of quality control and pay U.S. scale wages to their American employees. They cannot compete with low labor foreign packers. Since the best quality of processed shrimp comes from using the fresh, rather than the frozen kind, the reduction of the domestic supply would normally lead processors to establish processing plants in other countries, thus reducing the demand for the fresh domestic supply and reducing or eliminating their American employees.

PROBLEMS ARE COMMON TO PRODUCERS AND PROCESSORS

The unprecedented influx of foreign shrimp from new countries has caused a market glut which hurts producers and processors alike. Some of the product comes from areas with little or no quality control and indifferent sanitary inspection. American processors have an inspection service approved by government, assuring quality, sanitation, and good packing methods. The import glut drives prices of raw shrimp below the level at which the American producer can compete. It makes the processor insecure. He cannot depend upon a steady supply of fresh domestic shrimp which makes the best consumer pack. He may be driven competitively to produce an inferior pack which will inevitably damage his reputation which has been built up at heavy advertising cost. The housewife may have a bargain day, but will turn from the inferior product. Against the direct competition of processed items, the domestic processor is helpless because foreign wage scales in some shrimp producing countries are from 9 to 30 cents a day.

The producer today can scarcely pay his present operating costs, much less the deficit he has incurred during the past 15 months because of excessive imports. He is heavily in debt to suppliers, his insurance payments are lagging, and the banks and financial institutions which carry boat paper have had to make adjustments on monthly mortgage payments to carry the producer along. The waterfront is uneasy. No one wants to foreclose a shrimp vessel lien because under Admiralty law the effect is like going through bankruptcy; after preferred liens are paid the lesser ones get so much on the dollar—if there are dollars left. There is no market for shrimp vessels sold under foreclosure, so millions of dollars hang in the balance, hopefully praying for better domestic production and slightly higher prices for shrimp—and for relief from heavy imports.

THE IMPORT PROBLEM

The consumer demand for shrimp in the United States cannot be met entirely with domestic production. Some imports are required to meet the demand and to maintain an orderly market which will not permit the price of raw shrimp to go too high. Up through the year 1957 this delicate balance was fairly well maintained. The principal imports came from well-established fisheries in Mexico, Panama, and Ecuador, where modern shrimp trawlers are used, and where costs of production (production plus freight) compare favorably with the United States. Shrimp are found in many parts of the world, equatorial to arctic. Countries which had been indifferent producers now eyed the U.S. shrimp market and tooled up for heavy production which would increase the flow of U.S. dollars to them.

Fifty or more countries now export shrimp to the United States. Imports in 1951 were 41.8 million pounds, and came from only 18 countries. In 1958 imports were 85.4 million and the market glut commenced. In 1959 imports were approximately 100 million pounds and accurate fishery information exists to show that some of the latecomers have plans for subsidized and private production of substantially larger amounts.

With all facts available and a valuable U.S. fishery facing ruin, all segments of the domestic shrimp industry met to study the situation and to attempt to evolve a solution. They did not want to go to government for dole or subsidy. Preliminary talks with responsible Government officials indicated that normally bankruptcy must come first, then assistance would be forthcoming. But the industry bill, H.R. 8769 looks for preventive medicine now rather than surgery later. This bill has the overwhelming approval and support of all segments of the domestic industry and is a fair approach to the problem, nationally and internationally. It provides for an increasing supply of imports, based upon historic quotas. It would help to stabilize the foreign producer as well as the domestic producer, because it would provide an orderly and stable market in the United States, the chief consumer of shrimp.

THE INDUSTRY SHRIMP BILL

Philosophy: An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Actual calamity is in sight. Domestic shrimp industry represents investment of over $1 billion.

Facts of case: The United States is the most important world market for shrimp. Domestic production is about 60 percent of U.S. consumption. U.S. production relatively static, consumption slowly increasing, market can absorb perhaps additional 10 million pounds annually (if sales pushed) without serious problems, increase will have to come from abroad. U.S. market built up by expensive sales promotion principally financed by United States and Mexico, largest importer. Same factors ruin domestic producers ruin Mexico and Panama, perhaps others.

Foreign trade aspect: Nearly 50 countries export shrimp to the United States. This is good—should continue. U.S. dollars in foreign countries help them and increase purchasing power for U.S. commodities. Unrestricted imports make widely fluctuating market which will wreck both United States and foreign producer. (Example: Mexico—$30 million shrimp exports per year.)

Cure: A formula which encourages foreign imports but stabilizes them on a per-country basis so each country may intelligently plan its own development of shrimp industry for its own food consumption plus an assured dollar export credit.

Formula: (A) Use historic basis for calculating base: (1) Average of last 5 years, or (2) 1958 imports (or January–August 1959 plus 50 percent), whichever highest.

(B) Countries exporting over 5 million pounds, 5 percent annual increase; countries exporting 1-5 million pounds, 10 percent annual increase; countries exporting less than 1 million pounds, 25 percent annual increase; new countries, provisional quota, 100,000 pounds.

(C) Run geometric increases for 5 years, through 1964. Each country will have had opportunity to build up its industry substantially. Then apply global quota in 1965, with guarantee to each foreign country that in 1965 its basic quota will not be less than 1959–64 average, and in no case less than actual imports in year 1964.

(D) Over quota on unprocessed shrimp, 50 percent ad valorem duty; processed shrimp, 25 percent ad valorem duty; no im-

ports over quota. Separate quotas for processed and unprocessed shrimp.

Summation: A benefit to underprivileged countries by stabilizing importing market and distributing benefits impartially. Still tough on domestic producers, who must primarily bear cost of developing market for increased U.S. consumption, but possibly save them from extinction.

Cost to Government: Little strain on Treasury (Customs). Estimated that some unprocessed shrimp will come through in excess of quota, paying duty. Receipts there and from duty on processed shrimp should exceed administrative costs.

Effect on consumer and U.S. producer: Will result in lower market price than past 5-year average. Part of reason for high market was uncertainty of production. U.S. producer can live with somewhat lower prices, provided stable market available for product. Inefficient producer will properly go out of business. Probably tough 3 years ahead due to large stocks foreign shrimp now in freezer storage.

Support: Overwhelming support from producers, processors, canners, breaders, gulf coast, South Atlantic, Northwest, though some fear too liberal as to imports. Supported by National Shrimp Congress, Texas Shrimp Association, Southeastern Fisheries Association, Gulf Shrimp Canners Association, Louisiana Shrimp Association, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it would be too much to expect that everyone will agree with every statement made by the National Shrimp Congress, Inc., but I urge my colleagues in the House to give careful thought to their considered views on this vital and necessary legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all realize that quota legislation presents far-reaching domestic and foreign problems and has a long row to hoe before adoption by the Congress. I submit, however, that we have ample precedent for the approach submitted by the shrimp industry. For example, this proposal follows the general pattern of the Sugar Act. Let me illustrate.

There are two cane sugar producing States and some 19 or 20 beet sugar producing States. There are as many or more States with shrimp along their coasts.

Sugar is a very important domestic industry. So is shrimp.

Nevertheless, we produce less sugar than we consume. The same is true with shrimp.

Many foreign countries have always wanted a share in our domestic sugar market. That has always been the case in connection with our domestic shrimp market. With respect to shrimp, however, our Government has unfortunately encouraged foreign competition. Thus, through our various foreign-aid programs, our Government has made it possible for foreign producers to build larger and larger shrimp fleets and place them in a position to demand a higher and higher share of our domestic shrimp market. It is no wonder then that imports in 1951 were 41.8 million pounds and came from only 18 countries, while in 1958 imports were 85.4 million pounds and came from over 50 countries. In a very real sense, therefore, our domestic shrimp industry is the victim of our official foreign policy and has a right to expect corrective legislation.

The Sugar Act was first adopted in 1934 and has come up for review before the Congress and reenacted with comparatively minor modifications a number of times since 1934. Over the years, the Sugar Act has been recognized as a valuable instrument of foreign policy. I am confident that it will be renewed this year.

The underlying philosophy of the Sugar Act is to provide fair treatment to and protect both the domestic producers and consumers of sugar and at the same time to fairly allocate the difference between our domestic production and consumption to foreign producers. That is the underlying philosophy of the proposal of the domestic shrimp industry.

The Sugar Act is not a perfect piece of legislation and much is left to be desired in its administration. I doubt that the pending proposal will prove to be a perfect solution of the manifold problems of the shrimp industry.

Still, with all of its faults, I think responsible people will acknowledge that the domestic sugar industry could not live without the Sugar Act. And I am convinced that responsible people must acknowledge that the domestic shrimp industry cannot live very long without some form of quota legislation and that the present proposal is definitely one in the right direction.

A Report on an Investigation of Federal Civilian Personnel Problems in the Far East

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of submittal and the text of my report to the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, on Federal civilian personnel activities in the Far East, with its appendix. I think it will prove interesting to many of my colleagues and to a large portion of the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE,
February 9, 1960.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is submitted herewith a report of my investigation of Federal civilian personnel matters in Japan, Okinawa, and Taiwan during the period November 5 to November 15, 1959, inclusive, in accordance with your letter to the Secretary of Defense dated September 4, 1959. The report contains recommendations and findings developed during the course of the investigation.

Except for deep concern about the form of the rotation policy which employees have been hearing about in the Far East and with respect to housing, no general employee complaints were heard. Morale and conditions of work seemed excellent. It is my impression that, on the whole, civilian personnel in these areas are doing a first-rate job and are enjoying their work overseas. Most of them appeared to be fully aware of the importance of their roles in maintaining our strength in the face of the threatening challenges of international communism.

It is my hope that our committee will take such steps as are necessary to provide a continuing forum, as a matter of policy, for these oversea employees, as well as employees here in the United States, so that the committee may be more fully informed with respect to oversea personnel administration and the employees may be assured of all due and appropriate consideration for their problems.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to learn more about personnel problems of the Federal Government. This experience has given me a new and deep appreciation of the general responsibilities resting on you, as our chairman, and on each member of our great committee.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES IN THE FAR EAST

This report sets forth, in summary form, recommendations for strengthening Federal civilian personnel administration in the Far East and findings developed in an investigation of personnel matters in Japan, Okinawa, and Taiwan, conducted by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, during the period November 5 to November 15, 1959, inclusive, under authority of a letter from the chairman of the committee to the Secretary of Defense dated September 4, 1959. Mr. PORTER is the first member of the committee personally to investigate personnel matters in the Far East.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reemployment legislation: That prompt and favorable consideration be given by the committee to the official request of the Department of Defense for legislation to grant reemployment rights to employees of that Department who are assigned overseas.

2. Housing: That the appropriate executive agencies investigate oversea housing policies and conditions for Federal civilian employees and make recommendations for appropriate changes in policy and legislation including, but not restricted to, the following:

(a) Cutting off further shipments of household goods overseas and having basic needs furnished by Government.

(b) Establishing a program to purchase housing for civilian employees off as well as on bases.

(c) Coordination and reviews of existing restrictions by commanding officers overseas with respect to areas and price range.

(d) Giving civilian employees housing allowances under a system identical to those given their military counterparts.

3. Competitive status: That the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the Department of Defense join in devising improved procedures so that certain nonstatus employees in oversea areas may have better opportunities for achieving competitive status.

4. Coordination: That regulations having to do with identical activities be issued by the Department of Defense rather than in three somewhat different versions by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as in the case of the recent teacher pay adjustment legislation.

5. Duty limit on gifts: That section 321 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be amended to increase the limit on duty-free

goods from $10 to $50 but only with respect to Federal civilian employees assigned overseas.

DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reemployment legislation: Over one-half of the U.S. civilian employees now in Japan have been out of the United States for more than 5 years. Almost one-half have spent more than 5 years in Japan. Here are the figures:

Department	Total in Japan	More than 5 years in Japan
Air Force	1,774	524
Army	1,465	850
Navy	752	306
Total	3,991	1,680

Rotation of personnel is, of course, the rule for military and Foreign Service personnel. It should also be the rule for other Federal civilian personnel. A person overseas too long tends to get stale. Most of them want to come home. Some who do not want to come home should be required to do so.

Oversea employees are roughly divided into three groups approximately equal in number: schoolteachers, clerical and junior administrative personnel, and senior administrative and technical personnel. The need for rotation is almost entirely with respect to the last category.

Reemployment legislation by itself will not accomplish rotation. It will make assignment of our best personnel to oversea posts easier. The resultant vacancies will help make places here in the United States for those overseas now.

The chief difficulty now is that an employee overseas has no assurance that he can find a comparable job if he decides to go home. The Army operates an interchange service. It lists employment information about persons who want assignments in the United States. The system has been a failure. Commanding officers prefer to transfer or promote from their own personnel rather than take a chance on someone from overseas and having to wait for him.

Reemployment of oversea employees who do not now have reemployment rights will have to be accomplished by executive, not legislative, action. We cannot create jobs, nor should we attempt to require by legislative action the arbitrary return of oversea employees for stateside employment. We can and should urge that the Department of Defense take stern measures to see that qualified employees from oversea assignments are permitted to fill vacancies here in the United States.

Administrative action can be effective. For example, the Air Materiel Command of the Air Force is now in the process of returning upward of 50 high-grade (GS-9 to 14) employees who have been overseas for more than 5 years to positions in the States at not less than their current grades. This is purely a voluntary program and is being conducted successfully because the command headquarters here in the States has put itself actively behind the program and is taking immediate and direct interest by requiring stateside field installations to place qualified oversea employees in appropriate vacancies.

It is believed that the proposed reemployment legislation is a far better approach to the rotation problem than, for example, action taken by the Army recently to restrict promotion opportunities for employees with 5 or more years of continuous service overseas. The Air Force was considering a similar policy but has since rejected it. The Army has also eliminated it. It is plain that the military departments are deeply concerned with what is known by some persons overseas as the "homesteader" or "rice paddy daddy" problem.

This problem was discussed, during the investigation, with commanding officers, personnel specialists, and more than 300 civilian employees. The overwhelming concensus is in favor of the proposed legislation and policies to establish a system of rotation. They believe such a system would benefit both the employees themselves and the Government. The greatest fear of the employees is that arbitrary action may be taken against them simply because they have been overseas for a long time.

The legislation in question is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959. The proposed bill was discussed with a member of the committee staff and Department of Defense personnel officers in December 1959. According to the staff member's estimate, technical work on its provisions could be completed in one staff session. It is hoped that such a session can be arranged at an early time and that the committee chairman may consider introducing the bill as revised.

On the basis of the facts developed in this investigation, it is important that hearings on this bill, when introduced, be scheduled as soon as possible. It is essential that both oversea and stateside employees understand the intention of the legislation and that they have ample occasion to express themselves as to details. Morale is particularly important and precarious in oversea areas.

Additional information in more detail with respect to length of service overseas is appended and further data will be furnished from Japan shortly for committee consideration.

2. Housing: The amount and quality of housing were constantly deplored in interviews with employees. Apparently military personnel feel the same way. In the Tokyo area there is a shortage of available privately owned housing. What is available and adequate is costly.

Under existing regulations most of the available Government family type housing is allotted to military personnel, which means that civilian employees must largely turn to the local economy. Various regulations govern the cost and quality of the housing they can rent. It is felt that the Department of Defense could, after a proper study, do a better job of administration with respect to civilian housing.

For example, under current policies within the Tokyo area each military installation is assigned a particular geographic area in the vicinity. Employees must have the rent they pay approved within the areas assigned to the installations in which they live. It was learned that in some areas housing was going begging and in other areas there were serious shortages. An overall joint military committee or other board should be established to set standards and to coordinate housing policies for the entire Tokyo section.

Of course it is realized that the rollback of our forces in Japan has been relatively recent and drastic. The concentration of forces in the Tokyo area has caused these problems. They should be studied and met as promptly as possible.

The shipment of household goods is expensive and, it appears, unnecessary, particularly if a rotation program goes into effect. Plenty of good basic furniture is available overseas. It is suggested that storage costs in the United States for a period of 3 years would normally be considerably less than shipping charges figured for one round trip.

Purchase of housing for civilians, and perhaps also construction of new housing for purchase, may well save a substantial amount of money. This would also give a stability to the housing arrangements not present with some rentals.

It may be that a more satisfactory way all around for providing housing would be to give civilians a set amount for housing just as is done for the military where Government housing is not available. The Air Force officially favors this change of policy. It would save the headaches of keeping complex accounts and of trying to evaluate living quarters. Any savings on quality would mean extra cost to the recipient. It is understood, however, that in many cases, particularly in those areas where there is a large concentration of employees, current allowances for private rental housing are not sufficient to meet actual costs.

This is by no means a comprehensive study of the housing situation in Japan, Okinawa, and Taiwan. No such project was attempted. Certainly enough was said about the situation to warrant the conclusion that the appropriate agencies should conduct a thorough investigation and include exploration of the suggestions listed herein.

These figures, supplied by the American Embassy in Tokyo on November 10, 1959, will provide an idea of the magnitude of the expenditures for housing.

Fiscal year	Number of families	Quarters allowances
1958	14,645	$18,452,700
1959	13,428	16,919,280
1960	12,127	15,317,820

3. Competitive status: The competitive service was extended to oversea areas in 1955. Since that time, in a number of instances, employees in certain jobs have been converted from appropriate civil service registers to competitive status. In other instances, some of which were brought to light during the investigation, no such conversion was possible. The reason for this was either that under current procedures they had not as yet come within the reach of civil service registers or that there were no appropriate civil service registers under which they could apply for examinations. Such a situation should be corrected. The result now is that individuals feel they are being treated unfairly and the Government often fails to make the best use of abilities and training.

4. Coordination: A plea for coordination would seem to have a basis in fact where the activity is not affected by functional differences. Teachers who are teaching service families' children should not be under different regulations depending on their departments. Many teachers were interviewed during the investigation. Their chief concern was with the interpretations to be made of the Pay Adjustment Act (Public Law 86-91). Teachers are in close touch with their colleagues working in other installations. They see no reason why the governing regulations for all teachers overseas should not be identical. Their view seems justified.

5. Duty limit on gifts: In 1942 Congress enacted a law allowing servicemen to send home duty-free gifts worth less than $50. Several civilian employees expressed the opinion that this is discriminatory inasmuch as their limit, as for other nonservice citizens abroad, is $10. It would appear that the same reasons which prompted Congress to increase the limit for servicemen abroad apply with equal force for Federal civilian employees assigned overseas.

PROCEDURES AND COMMENTS

Circumstances prevented Hon. Robert J. Corbett, of the committee, from participating in the investigation as planned and as authorized by the chairman. The Department of Defense, upon request, assigned Mr. Joseph P. Hochreiter, Deputy Director for Civilian Personnel, Air Force, who recently returned to Washington after 2 years as Director of Air Force Civilian Personnel in

Europe, to assist in the investigation. Mr. Hochreiter attended briefings with commanding officers, personnel officer interviews, and meetings with civilian employees. His assistance was extremely valuable. He was able to settle many problems on the spot.

Ten separate installations were visited, eight of which were in Japan and two in Okinawa. On Taiwan, because of a shortage of time and because is was Sunday, arrangement were made to meet the personnel officers and civilian employees at the hotel headquarters for the investigation.

Schedules for visits to all installations were arranged in advance, including an announcement to be made to all civilian employees at each installation that any complaints or comments could be presented in personal interviews. This procedure was most constructive. About 150 employees were interviewed and conferences were held with at least 150 other employees at general meetings, luncheons and one dinner. Also, a final interview session was arranged at a civilian-noncommissioned officers' club in Tokyo for those employees who were missed earlier in the week.

Both military and civilian cooperation was of a very high order. Without it the very heavy investigative schedule never could have been fulfilled. Mr. John T. McConathy, director of civilian personnel, Fifth Air Force (Japan), acted as the theater coordinator and was extremely helpful. Although by mutual agreement he did not sit in on the interviews, he was always nearby for consultation. In many instances, problems brought out by the investigation were settled immediately with his assistance.

Because of traffic conditions in the Tokyo area, helicopters were used for travel whenever the weather permitted, thus saving considerable time. The usual procedure, in accordance with committee policy, was to pay respects to the installation commander, ask him and his personnel officer about civilian employee morale and related problems, and then proceed to interview the employees who had gathered in response to the advance announcement. When there was time, civilian employees were visited on their jobs and a number of informal conversations were held with employees.

APPENDIX

LENGTH OF CONTINUOUS SERVICE AND OTHER STATISTICS FOR U.S. CITIZEN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF U.S. AIR FORCE IN JAPAN AND KOREA, AT GRADES GS–7 AND ABOVE (DECEMBER 1959)

1. Length of service: Total number of employees, 503. Of total, number of employees with continuous service of: up to 5 years, 132 (26 percent of total); 5 to 10 years, 182 (36 percent of total); over 10 years, 189 (38 percent of total).

Over-10-year category, includes 6 with over 14 years' continuous service; 74 with over 13 years of continuous service; 49 with over 12 years of continuous service; 36 with over 11 years continuous service; and 24 with over 10 years of continuous service.

2. Reemployment rights to positions in United States: Of total of 503 employees, 23, or 5 percent, have reemployment rights to positions in the United States.

3. Tour in United States since first oversea assignment: Of total of 503 employees, 19, or 4 percent, have served in a civilian position in the United States since their first assignments overseas.

4. Marital status: Of total of 503 employees, 361, or 72 percent, are married.

5. Occupancy of Government family type quarters: Of total of 503 employees, 97, or 19 percent, occupy Government quaters; in actuality this means 97, or 30 percent, out of 381 (married) occupy such quarters, since only married employees are eligible for family-type quarters In addition, these 97 employees would be those among the GS–12 and higher category, since under current policy civilians below GS–12 are not eligible for family-type quarters.

NOTE.—While the above covers only Air Force employment, it is considered that Army and Navy statistics covering the same factors would be quite comparable.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Farm Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in the budget message sent to the Congress this year by the President, he retreated from the administration's previous stand that REA borrowers be forced into the private money market. However, the President reiterated his request for an increase in REA interest rates. The February 1960 issue of Rural Electrification magazine contains an editorial which sets forth a number of questions that should be answered before any consideration is given to this budget message proposal. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The senior Senator from Minnesota [HUBERT H. HUMPHREY] ably recounted the history of the congressional struggle against the administration's plans to weaken the rural electric cooperatives during the past few years in a speech he made last summer at the annual meeting of Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative at Ellsworth, Wis. Because of the timely nature of this speech in regard to the administration's proposals concerning the REA loan rates, I ask unanimously consent that this speech be printed in entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAVING THE QUESTIONS UNANSWERED

Growing opposition in Congress to the President's proposal to eliminate the interest rate ceiling on Government borrowings, along with sweeping criticism outside Congress of the whole tight-money high-interest policies, is of considerable importance. Home Builders Association delegates, for instance, have assailed the policy for having obviously failed to curb inflation, for boosting interest rates beyond the legal limits of usury, and having forced a return to financing methods proved unsound 30 years ago.

It is against this background that President Eisenhower's proposal for raising REA interest rates appears ill timed and certainly unsympathetic toward REA borrowers' future financial burdens.

First of all, taking the proposal for boosting REA interest rates alone, the President wants to peg future loans at what is a modern-time maximum rate by using the market yield on long-term issues as a measure. If the ceiling on long-term issues is lifted, as Ike also proposes, REA borrowers would be burdened for 35 years with even higher rates than that.

Despite the reduced estimate of administrative charges he proposes borrowers pay on future loans, a restudy shows that this plus pegging to recent Government interest rates would force REA borrowers to pay over 4½ percent.

What about the effect of this 125-percent increase in rural electrics' interest rates? Nobody yet claims there has been a definitive study of the impact this would have on REA borrowers.

Now REA Administrator Hamil says borrowers' feasibility is beyond question, and adds that the interest rate adjustment Ike proposes would not work a hardship on borrowers generally.

It must be obvious that feasibility is relative to the type of load and area a rural electric system is bound and limited to serve. It's equally obvious that feasibility is affected by interest rates and other costs.

The administrator's apparent qualification, that there would be no hardship effect for some borrowers, raises again the question as to which other ones should be let go by the wayside. Also what happens to the quality of service other systems will be able to afford, if all of their future borrowing must be at rates of possibly far more than at 4½ percent? Getting a little more specific, what about the generation and transmission program, the security of present loans to marginal borrowers, some not meeting the REA debt services earned ratio, and what about the whole rural telephone program? Is Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson's philosophy toward marginal farm operators to be applied toward rural electric service? Are families living in sparse, low-income rural areas to have the alternative of paying exorbitant electric rates or simply doing without electric service?

And finally turning to the matters of fixing REA borrowers' administrative costs, when is the Department of Commerce and when are other agencies of the Government going to start operating on that principle too? What has happened to the administration officials who protested that they would not do this to REA until it were applied to other Government agencies?

There's not much new in the budget message proposals this year. And the old questions are still unanswered.

THE FARM CHALLENGE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, at annual meeting of Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative, Ellsworth, Wis., Saturday afternoon, June 13, 1959)

There is no gathering of any kind which gives me more pleasure than a meeting of the members of a cooperative, folks joined in a common endeavor to make life better for everybody. So I am glad to be here and happy for the opportunity to greet you, to wish you good fortune in the continued health and strength of the Pierce-Pepin Electric cooperative, and to discuss ideas with you on present farm problems and prospects ahead.

And it is also a source of real pleasure to be here today with my good friend, cooperator and fellow legislator, your outstanding Congressman—LESTER JOHNSON.

LESTER JOHNSON actually started the Wisconsin Democratic revival back in 1953 when he won this congressional seat in a special election. Things have been looking up for the Democrats ever since, not only in Wisconsin, but all over the country.

But LESTER'S victory meant more than a new era for Democrats. It also meant a great deal to all farmers, Democrats and Republicans alike. He has become a real champion of agriculture in the House of Representatives, has been a great help—and privilege—for me to have such an able partner on legislation of importance to Wisconsin and Minnesota dairy farmers as the Humphrey-Johnson dairy bill and the Johnson-Humphrey Milk Sanitation Act establishing national standards under the Public Health Service.

He has arranged for hearings on poultry and egg problems in the House next week, and I am working in the same direction in the Senate.

You are fortunate in Wisconsin in having other good friends of agriculture—such as my good friend Senator BILL PROXMIRE, and your capable Governor Gaylord Nelson. BILL PROXMIRE can always be counted upon to stand solidly with friends of agriculture. He is an effective member of our Senate committee.

While I am mentioning Wisconsin names, I cannot overlook another young man who has made a great and continuing contribution in your behalf. He is Bob Lewis, one-time editor of the Wisconsin REA News, the boy from the Wisconsin family farm who has never forgotten his first loyalties. His father, George Lewis, pioneered the REA cooperative movement in Wisconsin, and Bob has carried on in the same tradition of service. He was formerly administrative assistant to Senator PROXMIRE. I am so pleased that Governor Nelson has Bob as his right-hand farm adviser—his agricultural coordinator. Bob Lewis is a man who knows what he is fighting for.

In all fairness, I might add that agriculture welcomes and recognizes friends from either major political party. We who put the welfare of farm people above partisanship appreciate the consistent support of Republicans such as Senator MILT YOUNG of North Dakota and your own Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who have refused to go along with this GOP administration's wreck-the-farmer policies.

THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS FIGHTS FOR REA

After 10 years of fighting battles for farmers in Washington, I know something about who you can count upon and who you cannot. The sure test of faithful performance is a consistent record of support for agriculture throughout the years.

What really counts, is having people in public office who really care—and who really understand your problems, and want to do something about them.

That certainly goes for the REA, as well as general farm legislation.

I believe in all kinds of cooperatives, but I have a special place in my heart for the rural electric cooperatives. You have not only brought light and power to the rural areas of America, you have also strengthened the entire farm cooperative movement by teaching more farmers the value of working together to help themselves.

Our rural electric co-ops have developed strong and courageous leadership because of the very necessity to resist continuing attacks upon your great program. If there is a single destructive trick that foes of your organizations have not used or tried to use in the last 6 or 7 years, I cannot name it. I know—because I have been in the thick of your battles, shoulder to shoulder with men like Clyde Ellis of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Perhaps it appears that we have just lost a round in our most recent REA fight—the attempt to override the President's veto on the Humphrey-Price bill. But let me tell you something; it was a mighty hollow victory for foes of REA, when two-thirds of the Senate voted in your behalf, and we only missed by four votes having a similar two-thirds vote in the House.

I am proud of that fight, and my own part in it—with your backing. When we found out 2 years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture was attempting to take over the loanmaking authority of the REA Administrator, I insisted that Secretary Benson come before our Senate Committee on Government Operations to explain what he was up to.

I acted in good faith, because Secretary Benson had promised in 1953 not to change the operational pattern of REA if he were given authority over its functions under the President's reorganizational plan.

You may recall that Ezra "took a walk," and refused to appear—even though my official authority as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization called for acting as a watchdog over his administration of the authority given him.

Secretary Benson virtually hid out until Congress adjourned. So when Congress returned, my first act was introduction of legislation restricting his authority and returning it to the REA Administrator where it belonged.

This time Secretary Benson could not escape coming before our committee—and he was unable to convince a majority of the committee he had acted in good faith. The result was the enactment of the Humphrey-Price bill by both Houses of Congress.

Yet, it was vetoed, despite the expressed intent of Congress as to how the program should operate. And the Republican Administration, from the White House down, exerted every pressure in the world to sustain that veto.

We lost by just four votes. And, I don't think I have to remind you, four Republican votes in Wisconsin for REA could have turned the tide in your favor.

More was involved than just this simple REA organization act. If we could have broken the back of government by veto, it would have opened the door to great strides forward in giving farmers other help they have been asking for: a better farm program, seeing that farmers have a chance to earn a decent farm income while at the same time cutting down the tremendous losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Yes, if four Republican Congressmen from Wisconsin had voted differently, our immediate legislative future for agriculture would have looked a great deal brighter.

Yet even in supposed defeat we have served notice on REA-wreckers that a vast majority of this Congress is not about to let this great program be crippled. And—we have put the brakes to efforts of this Administration to hike your interest rates on REA loans. That alone was worth the effort.

THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS SUPPORTS IMPROVED FARM LAWS

Now, I want to talk to you today about more than just the great REA program.

You are farm people. The purpose of your REA cooperative is to better enable you to do a good job as farmers. Farming is your business. Yet it is even more—it is your way of life.

I am sure that uppermost in your minds is the future of American agriculture—and the extent to which your Government is going to help you, or neglect you, in your struggle for economic justice—in a time of serious economic distress.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as a longtime friend of American agriculture—your problems are of grave concern to me.

They should be of serious concern to all citizens, urban or rural—for we all have a stake in what happens to agriculture.

The Democratic Party has received a powerful mandate from the farm people of America to right the tragic wrongs that have been done to American agriculture under the Republican Administration in Washington.

Remember, it is the Republican program that is such a mess today—as much as they would like to duck responsibility.

It is the Republican program, and it has been Republican bungling that has made such a costly mess of it—without producing any effective results for farm people.

It is high time for some changes to be made.

But it is only fair to warn you that the Congress is working under extremely serious and inescapable limitations. We cannot do everything you wish we would do. We cannot do everything we want to do.

First, we are working under the limits imposed by the President's veto power. I think it is only fair and accurate to expect that the President will veto any bill we might pass which will do anything substantial to raise farm prices.

This means that Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers to what can be passed by a two-thirds vote—over a Presidential veto.

Secondly, Congress is limited in what it can do for farmers by the veto power which is held by the Secretary of Agriculture.

You have seen how good farm programs can be ruined by unsympathetic administration. The power of the Secretary of Agriculture to negate the intent and spirit of Congress is great.

The Secretary's power to veto by administrative action limits the good that Congress can do for farmers to those things that are so simple, so direct, that the results can come through to the farm in spite of all the foot-dragging and hostility that it will encounter as it passes through the Department of Agriculture's hands.

Despite these severe handicaps, at least some of us in the Democratic Congress are determined to develop a workable program that will help the farmers of America.

You can mark it down as absolutely certain that the Democratic Congress will not let the administration "pull down the temple" of agricultural programs completely in its final hours, as it has seemed determined to do.

The Democratic Congress will never, never, never give Ezra Taft Benson the zero-parity floor he has asked for. We will not give him the marketplace no-parity gimmick he has asked for either.

The Democratic Congress will not allow the administration to get away with putting a penalty tax on the refunds that your cooperatives pay to their patrons.

The Democratic Congress will not let the administration jack up REA interest rates, nor throw the REA co-ops to the "wolves" of Wall Street.

You can count on that. You can bank on it. You can bet your economic lives on it—and that is exactly what the stakes are in agricultural policy today. For while the administration has a powerful veto weapon to use against Congress when it tries to help the farmer, we have a veto power of our own when it comes to acting on the administration's plans to harm the farmers. And we will use it. We will not give up a single inch.

This tragic era for agriculture—the dark era of Ezra—has had a good and constructive result along with all the misery and waste. So it seems to me, at any rate.

It has made us grow up and come of age in our thinking about farm policy.

We now realize that the real argument in farm policy should not be over methods and details. The real argument is over basic objectives.

THE FAMILY FARM'S FUTURE IS AT STAKE

Are you for a program to help the family farm? Or are you against the family farm? That, my friends, is the real issue, the real dividing line, in farm policy debate today.

Almost any farmer in America can think up the general outline of a farm plan that will work—if there is a will to make it work.

Methods are important. Details are important. Some will work better than others. Some well-intentioned ideas might not work at all. We need highly skilled technical experts and conscientious administration to carry out our farm programs. But our trouble is not for lack of ideas and conscientious, skilled people to put them into effect. The Department of Agriculture is overflowing with fine, dedicated career public servants—who could make a farm program work and work well, if they were given a chance.

Regrettably, the public attitude toward agriculture has been so deliberately distorted that we need to mobilize better understanding on the part of all American people as the first step toward the new and better farm program some of us are seeking.

America's farm policies need to be reexamined and clarified in terms of objectives sought in the Nation's interest—not just in terms of political slogans or cliches designed to turn city resident against farm resident, and even farmer against farmer.

Before we can enact any effective new farm legislation, we need to make clear what our purposes and objectives are.

That's what some of us are trying to do in Congress now, while we are working on new and better legislation.

All the legislative history behind the development of farm programs in America confirms that our objective and purpose has been to assure the American people of a continued abundance of food and fiber, to offer America's farmers an opportunity to achieve economic equality with other segments of our economy, and to preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life.

In more recent years there has been added a new objective in the interest of the entire Nation—the purpose of using our abundance as a fuseful and effective humanitarian arm of better international relations.

Repeatedly, the Congress of the United States has restated its intent to uphold these objectives, in one way or another.

But these objectives are being challenged. We have heard our blessings of abundance criticized as a curse.

We have heard that even 90 percent of equality—let alone full equality—is more than farmers are entitled to in our economy.

We have heard disturbing yet increasing talk of encouraging a complete change in our historic pattern of farming, to put more emphasis on bigness and efficiency, less on human values and problems of rural living. We have heard less concern about perpetuating our family farming pattern, and more and more about giving way to the pressure of mass operations.

Serious questions of public policy are involved, if we are to cross that line.

It is not a change of direction toward which we should be allowed to drift or be pushed, without fully knowing the consequences.

The most damaging product of the age of Ezra is the dangerous erosion of America's will to do justice for her farm people.

For the first time in the history of our Nation, a cancer of doubt has arisen in the public consciousness as to the merit of our

family farming system—the most efficient agricultural production system in the world.

The swift rise of vertical integration provides the mechanism whereby big concentrated business and financial interests can extend their domination over agriculture. This will leave the farm family on the farm. But it will take away its economic independence. The farmer will be told what to grow and where to sell, and the absentee-corporation farm director will control what the farmer gets for his efforts. This is but corporate collectivism, with private agricultural commissions.

This ominous forecast for American agriculture holds a powerful, fascinating allure for all too many people in our country today. Its allure has been heightened immeasurably by the discouraging, demoralizing shambles that the Republican administration has made of our farm programs. There is a growing sentiment in our country for just giving up on the farm problem.

This sentiment is strong among those who do not understand the tremendous values and strengths in our family farming system, nor the unusual problems which farm families must face. There are millions and millions of citizens in our population who are far removed from the soil. Their number is increasing year by year. Domination of agriculture by centralized corporate power appeals to many of them as an easy way out of the farm problem.

And it appeals even more strongly to those who simply do not care about what happens to farm people.

But I am one of the people who care, and so is LESTER JOHNSON here, and so is Senator PROXMIRE. And I believe that there are many more elected representatives like us in the Congress of the United States.

WE NEED A NEW AND BETTER FARM PROGRAM

Rather than stumble and drift along blindly because of a vacuum of sound farm policy leadership from the present administration, farm people and city people alike need to do some soul searching, and some honest appraisal of what we really want—and the alternatives we face. Perhaps I can be helpful in that direction today, by outlining to you my own guidelines for trying to develop a new and better farm program.

We need an agricultural stabilization program far less costly to the American taxpayers than the present inexcusable mess—yet one that is far more effective in its protection of family farmers and their contribution to the American economy.

We can, and must, have both.

We need an agricultural stabilization program that provides more equality of opportunity for agriculture to keep pace with the rest of our expanding economy in terms of income, yet one that does not make the farmer dependent on the Government for that income.

We need a program that recognizes the need for and encourages farmers to help themselves through cooperative action for bargaining power in the marketplace and for whatever production adjustments that may be necessary to make the best use of our human, soil, and water resources.

We need a program that recognizes and is tailored to the vast technological changes, yet does so without sacrificing the human and social values of our traditional American pattern of family owner-operated farms.

We need a program that recognizes the farmer's stewardship responsibility for conserving productivity of our land for the sake of future generations, yet recognizes too that the entire Nation shares that same responsibility—and must share in the cost of seeing that it is properly done.

We need a program that really does something about surpluses—making use of what we have, and adjusting production to keep from building up more beyond the level of possible need.

Above all, we need a national food policy closely meshed with our farm policy, so that we can better gear our productive resources to the needs of humanity at home and abroad—instead of producing for Government storage bins.

If the choice facing us rests between abundance and scarcity, consumers and farmers alike have a vital stake in abundance—wisely used. Farm abundance has done more to check inflation and the increase in the cost of living than any other single factor in our economy.

Until we as a nation face up to our social responsibility of deciding what we are going to do about the areas of hardship and suffering in our own midst—and to what extent we are willing to share our potential abundance with hungry peoples of the world as a force for freedom—until these questions are resolved, it appears morally wrong to insist that American agriculture drastically curb its output below levels for which human need exists.

Society must recognize that in the long run, it pays the price one way or another.

Is it not cheaper, and far better, to enlist our food abundance in waging peace, than to be faced with enlisting our sons and mobilizing our economy for war?

Is it not cheaper, and far better, to invest some of our abundance in raising the living standards of low-income groups in our country, rather than turning to a scarcity philosophy that can only force upon food costs to all segments of our society.

American agriculture is offered no alternative other than following the pattern of monopoly industry, in cutting back its production to the point where it can receive more income for less output—it will be consumers of the Nation who will pay the bill.

Farmers would like to produce in abundance, if that abundance is wisely used, and they can receive a fair return for their investment, their managerial skill, and their labor.

Yet there is no reason why farmers alone should subsidize other segments of our society already receiving a greater proportionate share of our national income, nor any reason why farmers alone should bear the costs of producing to meet the needs of underdeveloped areas of the world, in the interests of America's foreign policy.

If consumers want the price protection of always having a little more than enough to eat, if the Nation wants the valuable asset of abundance in a world of need, then the public must recognize that there is a public interest stake in Government providing a climate of conditions in which farmers can survive economically.

You cannot do it by writing off farm people as second-class citizens, who are not to share in the general prosperity and progress of the Nation.

You cannot do it by throwing farmers on the mercy of the free market for what they sell, when the costs of what they buy are bolstered and supported by all kinds of built-in protectors.

Food is basic to national life.

Price protection, farm credit, conservation assistance—all such farm programs are but means to an end, not the end itself.

There is no simple answer to achieving these objectives, no one panacea for the entire farm problem. Neither can any one bill meet all the problems we face.

But reasonable men should be able to agree on combining an entire kit of economic and program tools in order that each commodity may be handled in the manner best suited to its unique needs.

We need more adequate credit designed to family farm requirements. We need better conservation programs. We need more research directed into utilization of our abundance. We need a food stamp program to increase consumption among our aged, our handicapped, our dependent children and our unemployed. We need greatly expanded uses of our food internationally under a "Food for Peace" program.

Yet with all of this, we need the Government's cooperation with farmers toward more adequate income protection and production adjustment. We can do it through combined use of income equalization payments to producers, through marketing orders and agreements, through orderly marketing loans and direct purchases, through marketing quotas, through payments in kind in some instances, through greater rural development aid and through Government sanction of farmers banding together to help themselves when they develop and accept programs to do so by majority vote of producers.

Far from regimentation, such a program offers the real freedom farmers need—freedom from poverty, freedom from economic domination, and freedom of choice as to the alternatives they prefer in seeking to avoid the hardship of the wildly fluctuating free markets over which they now have no control.

These are not pie-in-the-sky proposals. They are sound and practical and should be achieved, if American agriculture mobilizes its forces and carries its true story to the rest of the American people.

THE FARMER'S BILL OF RIGHTS

And with such a program, I am sure, we can at long last secure for all agriculture assurances which I have termed my "Farmer's Bill of Rights," as standards from which farmers should never retreat.

They include:

1. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

2. The right for improved standards of rural living.

3. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

4. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

5. The right to public cooperation and assistance in conserving and saving the soil.

6. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

7. The right to decent land tenure which encourages the desirable goal of farm ownership.

8. The right to a democratic voice in his own farm program.

9. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

10. The right to a long-term program of food reserves to protect consumers against costly scarcity.

11. The right to assurance that land reclamation development will result in establishment of new family farms, not factories in the field.

12. The right to the entire Nation's support for use of food and fiber as a force for freedom throughout the world.

These, I believe, are the basic rights of American agriculture.

They are not new rights. They are not rights of special privilege, gained through misuse or abuse of tremendous power over the lifelines of the Nation's food supply.

Rather, they are rights of historic precedent, earned by the great and continuing contribution of agriculture to America life—the fulfillment of the Nation's needs in peace or war, in good times or bad, at personal profit or loss.

They need to be restated now only as a guiding beacon of light, cast upon the darkness of present confusion over America's farm policy.

They must be just as zealously guarded against forces which seek to destroy them, as we guard other historic rights, privileges, and responsibilities of freedom in our democracy.

One Exception to the Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, belatedly the Navy is at last asking for crash production of nuclear-powered missile-firing submarines.

In this connection, it might be well to note the progress being made by the Navy with funds already available for the nuclear-submarine program.

With that in view, I am including in the RECORD a statement by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine, as reported by the Associated Press in yesterday's metropolitan papers:

RICKOVER SEES PERIL TO A-SUB LEAD

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover says he fears the United States may lose its lead over Russia in nuclear submarines because of meddling by Pentagon high ups in the work of his team of naval atomic experts.

"We must maintain our lead in atomic submarines and nuclear propulsion," Rickover said.

"If we don't, we will give up 10 years of advantage, and that is what I'm afraid is going to happen to us because of the vast amount of interference to which my organization is subjected."

Rickover, sometimes called the father of the atomic submarine, appeared recently before the Senate Space Committee and Preparedness Subcommittee. His testimony, given in secret, was made public yesterday, after being screened for security reasons.

Asked about the overall contest between Russia and this country, Rickover replied:

"I am frightened by what appears to be a tendency in some quarters to prefer letting this country sink to second place," he said. "We cannot afford to be second in anything that affects our security. We must lead, or we must have parity at a minimum. If we don't have parity we will lose our freedom."

Rickover said he has to transfer younger naval officers who work with him or they would not qualify for promotions under the Navy rotation system.

Asked why they were denied promotions under him, he replied:

"Well, they are not liked. They rub people the wrong way. They are not courteous in situations that demand courtesy.

"They are more interested in getting the job done than in apple polishing, and the routine people whose toes are stepped on take it out on them."

Rickover pictured himself and his top atomic technicians as "subject to daily and constant petty harassments * * * by petty minds who are placed in positions of authority."

He said the naval atomic experts must spend so much time writing reports and explaining matters to a constantly changing group of superiors that it is almost impossible to get on with the job.

In the 12 years since he began design and construction of the world's first atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, Rickover said, he has been under 48 different bosses.

CALLS PENTAGON "BIG JUNGLE"

Rickover said "the Pentagon today is a big jungle * * * no one could possibly control that outfit with its large number of people."

He said—as he has before—that "it would help to arbitrarily reduce the number of people in the Pentagon by 20 or 30 percent." There are 30,000 or so military and civilian personnel in the mammoth Defense Department headquarters here.

The World Is in Motion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Congress and people of the United States will have to come to grips with the direction in which Europe—free Europe—will move during the next few months in this the first year of the new decade. More specifically, we shall be called upon to decide whether this Nation will join Canada in entering membership of a new Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation, the OAEC, which was proposed by Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon last January 12 in Paris. The OAEC, plans for which are being worked out in conference by a special committee, is designed to take the place of the OEEC which, with its 18 member countries, is in danger of an open economic division between the members of two blocs relative to trade and tariff policy. A lucid analysis of the divisive effects of a split between the Common Market (he Inner Six), the Free Trade Area (the Outer Seven), appears in the Christian Science Monitor for February 10. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 10, 1960]

THE PROBLEM: WHICH WAY TO UNITED EUROPE?

When the European Free Trade Association was formed last fall, one observer remarked jokingly: "One can hardly see Europe for the mass of European organizations."

There is, indeed, a multitude of associations, communities, and commissions of all sorts that bewilders the layman and sometimes even stumps the expert.

It all began while World War II was still being fought—not to mention the plan for a united Europe worked out in the 14th century by Pierre Dubois, or Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi's Pan-Europe Movement of 1922, or French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand's unification efforts of 1930.

But during the last war some of the European statesmen became convinced that only new and closer forms of cooperation would make it possible to forestall recurrence of such catastrophic adventures as Hitler's attempt to impose a new order on the Old Continent. While some of those plans were based on the assumption of continuing friendly cooperation between East and West, and some centered on rearranging relations between the Balkan States, others envisioned an at least partial merger of the smaller Western European States.

BENELUX LONE WAR SURVIVOR

Of all those plans only the Benelux project survived the war. It provided for a customs union between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. Benelux was founded in 1947 and started operating on, first, a moderate scale in 1948. In the past 12 years the scale of operations has been gradually widened though by no means all of the problems posed by competing industries and agricultures of the three member states have been solved.

Broader European organizations came into being between 1947 and 1950, sparked by the Marshall plan of 1947 and the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950.

An offspring of the Marshall plan was the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), comprising 18 Western European States as regular members and the United States and Canada as permanent observers.

Of the other organizations the most important ones are the 15-member Council of Europe, with its seat in Strasbourg; the 6-member European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), with headquarters in Luxembourg; the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), with its seat in Paris, the 6-member European Economic Community, better known as the Common Market, with its seat in Brussels; and as the most recent one, the 7-member European Free Trade Association (EFTA) which held its founding meeting in Stockholm last November.

All these are, so to say, official organizations in which the governments are holding the membership cards. In addition there are many unofficial associations, such as the European Movement, the roof organization of the six most prominent groups advocating European unification; the European Parliamentarian Union; and the European Academy, a nonpartisan association of politicians and representatives of all sciences.

EDUCATED YOUTH FAVOR UNITY

How deep into the masses the roots of all these organizations have penetrated is difficult to say. The conclusion drawn from admittedly superficial observations suggests that there is among the educated youth of most Western European countries a definite feeling in favor of a unified Europe—or, at least, of formation of some larger multinational units—but that most of the people have given little, if any, thought to the question.

An interviewer traveling from France through Italy, West Germany, Austria, and Greece to Turkey cannot expect to find many people who would be able to tell the difference between the Common Market, the OEEC, and the EFTA, even though their countries belong to either one or two of them.

The main difference between the Common Market and the EFTA may seem to be one of customs policy. The Common Market foresees not only the complete abolishment of customs barriers among its six members—France, Italy, West Germany, and the Benelux countries—but also enforcing of identical custom tariffs against nonmembers.

This provision is bound to have unsettling effects on the trade prospects of nonmembers. A typical example is provided by Portugal, leading world exporter of cork.

AUSTRIAN TILE THREATENED

West Germany, which in 1958 bought 45,702 tons of cork and cork products from Portugal, had no customs duty on the raw material and a duty of only 4 to 7 percent on cork stoppers. However, the Common Market members, Italy and France, both of which are minor cork producers, had a high tariff on imports. From now on, a tariff lower than the Italian and French ones but much higher (15 to 19 percent) than the West German one will be obligatory for all Common Market members. What will happen is that the price of cork products in most of the Common Market countries will rise but also that Portuguese exports will shrink.

A similar blow threatens Austrian manufacturers of so-called hard-fiber tile—a building material—for which Italy offered an excellent market. Until the end of 1958,

Italy levied on all imports of hard-fiber tile, regardless of the country of origin, a duty of 25 percent. Since the beginning of 1959 the duty for imports from Common Market members has been reduced to 18 percent, putting the former Austrian suppliers at a severe disadvantage and forcing them to look for customers elsewhere.

Neither Austria nor Portugal are in the fortunate position of a number of American firms which, in anticipation of tariff increases, have established branch factories in Common Market countries which are to enable them, as it were, to continue selling their cakes and eating them, too.

WORLD MOVEMENT ILLUSTRATED

In contrast to the Common Market, the EFTA—composed of Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal—while also aiming at gradual abolishment of mutual customs barriers between its members, allows each of them to set its tariffs for imports from nonmembers at whatever level it considers necessary.

But the main difference between the two organizations is more fundamental than the contrast between tariff rigidity on one side and flexibility on the other.

The Common Market has an unmistakable supranational tendency, something which the EFTA shuns. Among the provisions of the Common Market statute are the lifting of restrictions on the movement of services, labor, capital, and business enterprises; the coordination of monetary and fiscal policies; the establishment of a common agricultural policy; and a far-ranging equalization and standardization of social institutions and programs.

This is an undertaking of near-revolutionary implications, opening the road to a merger of governments as an ultimate step. The (American) Committee for Economic Development, in its report of last year, "The European Common Market and Its Meaning for the United States," did not overstate in declaring: "The chief lesson of the Common Market may be that it shows us once more, and dramatically, that the world is in motion—on the economic front as on others."

Yet, combined with its supranational tendency, which many consider to be desirable, the Common Market has some undesirable features built in. One of them is an inclination toward self-sufficiency as a goal with economic as well as political motivations.

This has become apparent in the Common-Market proposals for formulating a joint agricultural policy. The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung wrote about the draft a few weeks ago that it shows the unbridgeable gap between the existing policies of the member countries and the intention of the Common Market Commission to set up a far-reaching protectionism.

Another of the less desirable features of the Common Market is the possibility—one could almost say probability—that France and West Germany will enter into a struggle for its domination. It goes without saying that any deterioration of good-neighborly French-German relations would weaken the West's position toward the East.

The political implications of the Common Market are seldom mentioned by the member nations. But they are clearly felt by the Benelux countries and lately by Italy, too, while the West Germans have become most outspoken critics of the organization's disrupting effect on Western European trade as a whole.

REVERSAL OF TREND URGED

In a full-page article of last December 5, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung came out in favor of reversing the isolationist tendency of the Common Market and called for gradual lowering of customs duties all over Europe and allowing the individual states to set their own custom tariffs vis-a-vis non-European countries.

The paper warned that failure to find a pan-European solution will lead to an economic partition of [Western] Europe that can never be undone.

Similar thoughts must have occurred to the authorities in Washington, and that is why Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon last January 12 in Paris, unveiled a plan for establishment of an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation (OAEC) to include in addition to the 18 OEEC countries the United States and Canada as full members. Details of the plan, its scope, mode of operation, and rights and duties of its members are now being worked out by a special committee.

Since congressional approval is needed for United States membership in the projected OAEC, Congress will be faced with the momentous decision to choose—or influence—the direction in which Western Europe will develop.

Communist Countries Are Spending Vast Sums To Prove Americans Are Cultureless Barbarians—U.S. Arts Council Needed

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizens of Delaware, Samuel E. Homsey, has written me to say that Communist countries are spending vast sums on propaganda to prove that Americans are cultureless barbarians.

Mr. Homsey, a leading member of the American Institute of Architects, testified for that organization in support of a bill sponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], and cosponsored by others including myself, to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. This legislation was recommended to the Congress by President Eisenhower in his 1955 message on the state of the Union.

Mr. Homsey writes that—

I feel that this legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts is of prime importance at the very time when the Communist countries are spending many dollars on propaganda to prove that Americans are cultureless barbarians. If Congress fails to enact this legislation they will be playing into the Communist hands to prove the point.

The Soviet Union gives very large sums to the fine arts and sends its leading artists abroad. This is the most effective cultural propaganda the U.S.S.R. engages in, and it is often contrasted with the lack of financial support for the arts by the United States, even by our best friends.

Some time since, the New York Times commented editorially that—

Practically every other civilized country (and some not so civilized) has recognized that the Government has a proper interest in promoting the arts, and in promoting them with cash. It would be a mark of maturity and enlightenment if we were to do the same.

The Nation's Capital, as a study made at my request by the Library of Congress proved, does less than any other major U.S. city for the fine arts.

In a recent statement Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY declared:

Washington must have a cultural status at least equal to its position as the political, military, and economic center of the free world.

It lacks such a commanding cultural status at this time. In fact, the New York Times recently compared Washington unfavorably with the provincial city of Tiflis, U.S.S.R.

I have introduced legislation for the purpose of depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used by the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Washington Opera Society, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia.

Commissioner David B. Karrick of the District of Columbia has written that—

I strongly endorse funds for the National Symphony Orchestra with which I am thoroughly familiar, having served on its board for many years before becoming a Commissioner. I know its needs and appreciate its high standards. I would perhaps likewise approve funds for the Corcoran Gallery, if I were more familiar with its resources and needs.

More recently Commissioner Karrick declared—

The expenditure by the municipal government is small. This is irrelevant.

I include as part of my remarks Mr. Homsey's letter as well as several other views on the subject I have been discussing:

WILMINGTON, DEL., *February 3, 1960.*

The Honorable HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McDOWELL: Your letter of January 18 containing the material on the Federal Advisory Council on the Arts was delayed because of incorrect address.

We both appreciate your strong support of H.R. 2569. In 1955 I was appointed one of three architects to represent the American Institute of Architects on the Committee on Government and Art and I attended numerous meetings and have kept in touch on the activities of this committee. I believe that in 1951 President Truman authorized the Commission of Fine Arts in Washington to undertake a study of governmental activities along the lines set forth in numerous statements.

The American Institute of Architects supports wholeheartedly the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

I disagree with some who have opposed the bill and the work of the Committee on Government and Arts. They have seemingly read into the bills or proposals numerous undercurrents and offcolor fictions.

Mrs. Homsey and I feel that this legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts is of prime importance at the very time when the Communist countries are spending many dollars on propaganda to prove that Americans are cultureless barbarians. If Congress fails to enact this legislation they will be playing into the Communist hands to prove the point. We are grateful for your interest and we speak on behalf of many enlightened citizens.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL E. HOMSEY.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 9, 1959]

ANEMIC MUSE

Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., has a point in his comment that Washington, as a political entity, "does less than any other major U.S. city for the fine arts." Comparisons are treacherous, especially between cities with markedly different traditions. Nonetheless, a survey made by the Library of Congress at the request of Mr. MCDOWELL gives support to his assertion.

Of the 38 other cities surveyed, most spend considerably more than Washington for civic cultural activities—and the sample ranges from New York (which spends about $2.6 million annually) to Scranton, Pa. (which has averaged about $28,740 per year for the past decade). The amount in Washington's budget allotted for civic cultural events is the comparatively anemic sum of $16,000—of which about $10,000 helps support the Watergate concerts.

Of course, Federal and private contributions help close the gap. The National Gallery of Arts, as its name implies, is supported by all the people. Private support makes possible many concerts, including the Budapest Quartet series at the Library of Congress.

Nine of the cities surveyed help support the community orchestra whereas the District government contributes nothing to the National Symphony. In times past, the District Commissioners have asked Congress to authorize a contribution, and perhaps Mr. MCDOWELL's prodding will help win more support for this minimal civic obligation in a world capital. Certainly there are many competing claims on the local budget which must be taken into account, but there is no justification for the District contributing less to the fine arts than Evansville, Ind. (population, 135,000).

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 1960]

MUSE IN A MIRE?

New Yorkers never tire of chiding Washington for its neglect of the fine arts. "In Culture, Is Washington a Hick Town?" asks an article in the New York Times magazine by Music Critic Howard Taubman. On the whole, Mr. Taubman concludes that it is. It is tempting to brush away criticisms like this as the gibes of a provincial who is obviously envious of Washington's physical felicities. But the sad fact is that the Capital is laggard in its provisions for the arts, and its backwardness invites criticism, however annoying, from the mandarins of New York.

Compared with other world capitals, Washington is poorly served in the realm of the performing arts—even, as Mr. Taubman notes, in comparison with a smaller capital like Brussels. More damaging is the contrast between Washington and other American cities. Cleveland or Boston, for example, provide a fuller cultural life than does the Nation's Capital.

There are reasons for this contrast. More than in other cities, politics predominates locally, and this tends to crowd out the arts in a city overdedicated to government. Lack of home rule helps to stifle civic initiative and community enterprise here. More than other cities, Washington is populated by transients who donate their efforts (and endowments) elsewhere. But even when these limitations are acknowledged, Washington can and should do more to provide a better balanced cultural program worthy of a capital and more representative of the Nation.

Various community efforts—the National Symphony, the Opera Society, the Washington Ballet, and the Arena Stage—offer convincing evidence that the Capital basically is neither indifferent nor apathetic. The lack of adequate facilities, however, severely handicaps the growth of these still youthful enterprises. That is what makes so important the ultimate success of the proposed National Cultural Center.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 22, 1960.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I have under study your memorandum slip of January 5 suggesting that I send my comments on your proposals for cultural activity in Washington.

Although my letter is brief, my consideration of the suggestions has been lengthy.

First, I believe that an International Olympiad of Arts and Sciences, held biennially, would be admirable, although I have reservations on the use of the word "Olympiad," which, to me, suggests athletic games.

Second, I would favor an appropriate memorial in Washington to President Woodrow Wilson and to President James Madison, but I do not understand your expression "living memorial." If it means scholarships, grants for research, study, and travel, it would be essential to assure that such grants were not given to unworthy applicants because of political and other pressure. This can be arranged. It would not be, however, unsatisfactory to erect appropriate memorials to these two statesmen.

Third, I thoroughly approve of strengthening any group fighting to prevent the road-builders from converting Washington into an overgrown, hyperthyroid, cloverleaf for the benefit of those living outside its limits.

Fourth, I strongly endorse funds for the National Symphony Orchestra, with which I am thoroughly familiar, having served on its board for many years before becoming a Commissioner. I know its needs and appreciate its high standards. I would perhaps likewise approve funds for the Corcoran Gallery, if I were more familiar with its resources and needs.

Trusting that these brief but carefully considered suggestions may be of assistance to you, I am, with cordial regards,

Very sincerely yours,

DAVID B. KARRICK,
Commissioner.

WWDC RADIO REPORT TO THE PEOPLE, FEBRUARY 6, 1960, BY COMMISSIONER DAVID B. KARRICK, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Three weeks ago I was asked on this program whether I considered Washington a hick town, this question being directed toward the cultural opportunities in Washington. I answered emphatically in the negative, though without adequate background then to support my conclusion.

Let us look at the matter for a moment more specifically, to outline these cultural opportunities in Washington, and the advantage that Washingtonians take of them.

First, the National Symphony Orchestra, under the brilliant leadership of Howard Mitchell, gives about 60 local concerts a season, bringing guest artists and conductors from all parts of the United States and from foreign countries. About 3,000 season tickets are sold for each night with the attendance varying above or below this, according to the fame of the soloist, with slightly smaller attendance without one. There are always adequate seats at these concerts.

And in addition to the performances of our own National Symphony, there are concerts by visiting orchestras—the Boston Symphony, the Philadelphia Symphony, and other leading American and foreign orchestras visit us periodically.

In addition to the symphony concerts, there is chamber music at the Library of Congress, the finest in the world, with the best groups of America and Europe, all of which play to a capacity audience.

There are concerts every Sunday, September through June, at the National Gallery with a capacity attendance. Also the Phillips Gallery has from five to eight concerts a month. The seating capacity is limited but there are amplifiers in other rooms, with the audience sitting on the stairs when no seats are available.

The Washington Opera Society, far from making a good beginning, as was mentioned in a recent press article, is a successful operation which gives about three performances a year at the Lisner Auditorium.

These performances are well attended. In addition, we are promised this year three performances of American operas by the New York City Center Opera, for those whose tastes run more to contemporary composers.

But I have saved for the last of the musical opportunities of Washington the magnificent performances of great choral and oratorio works at the Cathedral where, under the skillful leadership of Paul Calloway, the great organ, the National Symphony, and the Choral Society of Washington, sometimes aided by the Cathedral Choirs, perform music unequaled anywhere else in the country.

All of the foregoing indicates two things; that there is an abundance of music available in Washington, and that Washingtonians attend.

Mr. Patrick Hayes, the impressario, says that Washington is an excellent ballet city, with a combination of resident and visiting companies. The Washington Ballet Guild, a local organization, gives four or five productions a year, one or two with the National Symphony.

This year, also, we shall have the New York City Ballet, the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo, the Chicago Opera Ballet from our country, and the Royal Danish Ballet and the Royal Ballet of England (formerly Sadlers-Wells) from Europe, each to give several performances in the Capitol Theater with an expected attendance of 90 percent.

Then, too, consider the beauties of Washington's architecture, which are dismissed in a recent newspaper article as consisting of building after building. Anyone who can so casually dismiss the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, the Archives Building, the Library of Congress, the Cathedral on Mount Saint Albans, that perfection of English Gothic architecture, the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, and the Mosque on Massachusetts Avenue, is so obviously unable to discriminate and appreciate architectural beauty that little can be said to convince him.

For pictures we have first of all the National Gallery with one of the finest collections in the world, in a building which even empty is sufficiently beautiful to justify a visit.

Then there are the Freer Gallery, the Corcoran Gallery and the Phillips Gallery. Surely with these four institutions there is an abundant opportunity to view paintings and sculpture, and for those who wish to study, there are the excellent lectures at the National, Corcoran, and Phillips Galleries.

And any discussion of cultural opportunities of Washington must include the Smithsonian, with its great treasures of art and interest.

On drama we are admittedly weak with only the National Theater and the Arena Stage offering different types of professional performances, but there are the amateur groups, such as the Howard Players, the Kensington Players of Montgomery County, Georgetown University's Masque and Bal, the Maryland University dramatic group, and the excellent musical and dramatic works offered by the Speech and Drama Department of the Catholic University under the able guidance of Father Hartke.

In continuation of points of dramatic interest, the Folger Shakespeare Library is unique in the world, for in all probability nowhere else outside of Stratford-on-Avon, if there, is there as fine a collection of Shakespearean and works on the Elizabethan Theater. Furthermore, those who wish to add to their study of classical drama a more

intimate knowledge of the world's greatest poetry, may do so.

It has been impossible to mention all of our cultural outlets in a brief talk. Admittedly we do not have everything, but we have such an abundance of cultural opportunity and such good attendance, that it is ridiculous to contend that we are not a cultural city.

A part of this contention seems to be based upon the fact that the expenditure by the municipal government is small.

This is irrelevant.

The opportunities are here, Washingtonians enjoy them. And if visitors do not, that does not justify deprecating Washington's cultural standards.

A Call to Disarmament by Clement Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Clement Davies, longtime leader of the Liberal Party in Great Britain, member of Parliament, and president of the World Parliament Association, is among the most effective leaders for world disarmament and the rule of law. His letter in the London Times for Thursday, December 31, deserves the attention of all Americans who search for practicable ways in which to make our peace less precarious.

Under a previous consent, I include herewith the text of the letter:

A REMARKABLE YEAR

Sir, before the year 1959 closes should not attention be called to the fact that it may take its place as one of the most remarkable years in the history of man?

From time immemorial man has resorted to arms and though treaties innumerable have been made they have been, almost invariably, broken. Though men realized the need for and the value of the establishment of the rule of law within the confines of their own tribe or nation or territory, they have been unwilling to extend the application of the rule of law as between nations.

This century has witnessed the greatest and most destructive wars in all history, yet it is in this century that the first real world efforts have been made to abolish war and establish permanent peace. The Hague conferences, the League of Nations, and the Charter of the United Nations have failed to achieve what was and is so ardently desired by all peoples. The arms race is increasing and the threat to mankind is more menacing.

The Hague conferences, the League, and the United Nations Charter have failed largely because no country has been prepared to relinquish its independent sovereignty although it has become obvious that national sovereignty is today largely a myth, for no country can act on its own with complete disregard for the views and actions of others. All efforts at partial disarmament have failed: they have failed because fear dominates all our thoughts and fear is born of mistrust. That is the position today. Yet in this year of 1959, for the first time, there has been throughout the world a demand for complete disarmament under proper and complete control and that disputes should be settled by reason and not by force; in short, the rule of law should be established throughout the whole world. For the first time—

1. The three strongest powers, Britain, the United States, and Russia, declared to the world before the United Nations Assembly that they favored complete disarmament covering both the conventional as well as unconventional weapons.

2. The 82 nations through their representatives at the United Nations Assembly declared unanimously that the most important question of the day was complete world disarmament.

3. At the NATO Parliamentarians Conference held in November at Washington the parliamentary representatives of the 15 NATO countries voted unanimously—

(a) That a fair and permanent peace among all nations will not be achieved and maintained until there is among all nations, except for the maintenance of internal law and order, disarmament of all weapons, conventional as well as unconventional.

(b) That such disarmament should be carried through and under thorough and complete international control and inspection.

(c) That the nations of the world would agree to settle their dispute by reason and not by force and submit them to international judicial decision.

(d) That the nations of the world would establish, in order to prevent breaches of the law and to assure that such decisions are obeyed, a sufficient and effective international police force.

Of course, there is a vast amount to be done before this great objective—namely, a fair and permanent peace—can be achieved, but, surely, it is right to record that 1959 was the first year when this objective was declared as the universal desire and that to achieve it there must be universal complete disarmament under effective control.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CLEMENT DAVIES,
President of the World Parliament Association.
HOUSE OF COMMONS, *December 29.*

Dr. Hector Garcia, Distinguished Texan and Founder of the American GI Forum, Endorses Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, thousands of Texans and many residents of many other States have announced their support of the plan to create a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island. But of all these, none of the endorsements of this project have been more colorfully stated or given me greater personal pleasure than that of Dr. Hector Garcia of Corpus Christi, Tex. There are several reasons for my gratification of Dr. Garcia's support on this undertaking. But I believe the most important to me is that I pesonally know from experience that in him, and in the remarkable national veterans group which he founded, we have an exceptionally capable and courageous ally. It has been my great honor and privilege to have him fighting shoulder to shoulder along with me in all of my battles for good government in Texas. He and his GI Forum members are the kind of men who will be where they say they will be, and take a stand for the right when you need them to take one. The National GI Forum is a great national patriotic organization of military service veterans of Latin origin. Dr. Garcia is an oversea American Army surgeon of World War II, with an impressive record of leadership in Texas and the Nation.

Dr. Garcia's counsel and leadership in behalf of the Padre Island National Seashore project will be a real boost to our cause. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the exceptionally clear and historically outstanding statement by Dr. Garcia, entitled "A Picturesque History of 'The White Island."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PICTURESQUE HISTORY OF "THE WHITE ISLAND"

(Statement by Dr. Hector P. Garcia of Corpus Christi, Tex., before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favoring the proposal to establish a national shoreline park on Padre Island, Monday, December 14, 1959)

Senator FRANK MOSS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee and other members of this committee, my name is Dr. Hector P. Garcia. I am a resident of Corpus Christi and an American citizen, and property owner on Padre Island. I am a physician by profession and have the honor of being the founder of the American GI Forum of the United States. I am representing the American GI Forum of the United States, a veterans organization composed primarily of American veterans of Mexican origin with groups in 23 States and in the District of Columbia.

I wish to thank you gentlemen for your visit to our Texas shore and personally wish to thank you for permitting me to present my reasons why the American GI Forum favors the establishment of Padre Island as a national shoreline park.

The historical background of Padre Island is abounding with all of the excitement and adventure of the greatest of romantic novels. Padre Island is surrounded by centuries of mystery on its shores. Padre Island still has the promise and allure of hidden Spanish treasures, but more than that Padre Island is the longest island in the United States which still preserves its natural beauty as God created it.

Padre Island, an island along the Texas Gulf of Mexico coast, is approximately 120 miles long and was named after Padre Balli, a Spanish priest who found shelter and refuge from the Mexican Revolution in the early 19th century. It has been said that Padre Island has the longest and most versatile solid sand beach in the whole world.

The history of Padre Island from recorded history begins in June 1519, barely 27 years after the discovery of America when the Spanish admiral, Alonso Alvarez de Pineda, was sent by the Governor of Jamacia, Francisco de Garay, to look for a sea passage to the Orient. With four small vessels Alonso Alvarez de Pineda explored and carefully mapped the entire coast of the State of Texas and explored the Gulf of Mexico from Florida to Yucatan, and on June 24, 1519, entered the bay of where we are now meeting and named it the "La Bahia del Cuerpo de Christi" honoring the Roman Catholic feast day of Corpus Christi. De Pineda was the

first white man to see the beautiful romantic sandy island which today we call Padre Island.

In 1520, Governor Garay sent an expedition under Diego de Camargo to colonize the Rio de las Palmas which is the Rio Grande River. A fort was built there and this gives claim to one of the oldest settlements of the United States. This fort at the Rio de las Palmas was probably close to the south tip of Padre Island. Again, in 1523, Governor Garay in person led an expedition into the present Texas coast.

Nuno de Guzman, Governor of the Province of Panuco and Victoria Garayana wherein Padre Island was located, sent his cousin Sancho de Caniedo to take possession of the Rio de las Palmas, the territory wherein Padre Island was located.

On April 15, 1528, Panfilo de Narvaez started on his expedition from Tampa Bay. With him was his Treasurer Alvar Nunez Cabeza de Vaca. On November 6, 1958, Cabeza de Vaca became shipwrecked in Galveston Island with several of his shipmates and lived amongst the Indians for several years. Cabeza de Vaca became the first European to live on Padre Island. Cabeza de Vaca lived amongst this Texas coast until he escaped and traveled on foot reaching Culiacan, Sinaloa Mexico on May 18, 1536. The greatest Odyssey of living man happened among this island whose natural beauty we are trying to preserve.

In the month of January, year of 1553, a shipment of gold, the largest ever to leave Mexico with 1,000 passengers sailed from Veracruz. However, the ships were overcome by a hurricane and 300 living survivors out of the 1,000 were shipwrecked on Padre Island about halfway between Corpus Christi and Brazos Pass. Of all the 300 men, women, and children only 3 lived through the ordeal by the fierce Carancahuas and their long arrows. One survivor stayed with the treasure ships for 1 whole year. In 1554 Captain Angel de Villagrana was said to have recovered some of the gold. But even today the gold and silver of the Spanish galleons are awaiting someone who may be lucky to find the treasure.

And of course we still remember Robert Cavalier, Sieur de la Salle who entered Padre Island through Matagorda Bay and established the first French settlement protected by the sand dunes of Padre Island at Fort St. Louis at the Bahia del Espiritu Santo. From 1684 to 1689 the French had a claim to Texas and Padre Island also.

The Lafitte brothers (Pierre and Jean), pirates by trade, staked their hideout and headquarters along the Padre Island shores also. They left it, it is rumored, about 1821. But it is also said that they left a fortune in gold and silver in Corpus Christi pass near the Oso Creek and another valuable treasure at the mouth of the Nueces River as it flows into the Bay of Corpus Christi.

The brief sketch of Padre Island history will prove the value of the island as a national shoreline park by keeping the heritage that is so American. But there are many other reasons why we must preserve this beautiful island as it is today for the benefit of all that want to come and enjoy it.

The island is not only rich in beaches, shells, dunes, but it is the habitation for many thousands of wild animals, specially geese and ducks. It is a paradise for fishermen and a beautiful place for camping. On the south end of the island along the mainland we already have a Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge, and on the other end of the island we have the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge.

We are a veterans' family organization and we feel that Padre Island should be preserved as a national shoreline park because:

First, we feel that as veterans we want all the natural beauty of our country preserved for the benefit of all its citizens. This can be done only by maintaining Padre Island as national shoreline park. We are not in favor of its beauty being marred by man-made buildings, obstacles, and fences which would not only destroy its beauty but in time would become dilapidated, worn-out, and then Padre Island would be another slum in this area. We do not want its beauty and its length blocked by big hotels and buildings which in time would take the best of the beach and leave a small beach corner for the poor people who could not afford to pay for expensive suites or cottages.

We feel, as veterans, that Padre Island as a national shoreline park would be within the means of all our citizens, poor and rich alike. We are worried that many of our poor people in this area of Texas would not be able to visit a modernized, developed, manmade Padre island beach.

We had a convention of the American GI forum here 2 years ago. We had people from California, Colorado, New Mexico, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Utah, Arizona, Oklahoma, Missouri, Indiana, Minnesota, and many other States. We had many attractions but their greatest thrill was their visit to this primitive, enchanting, mystifying island which, by the oldtime Spaniards, was called La Isla Blanca (the White Island).

But perhaps no one can explain the beauty and the fascination of the island as well as Frank Goodwyn and perhaps the real and important reasons why Padre Island should be a national shoreline park are quoted in his book, "The Lone Star Land," by Frank Goodwyn. To quote Mr. Goodwyn:

"The camp meeting spirit is also apparent in the recreational activities of the Texas people. The 40-odd public parks under State control are equipped more for camping and picnicking than for the combination of landscape and night club which characterizes the world's famous playgrounds elsewhere. A salient example of how the State's natural recreational assets are affected by its religious principles is the way a primitive retreat in the shadow of the southern gulf coast's booming industries has been used by Texans.

"Fronting the Gulf of Mexico with 116 miles of almost solid hard sand beach, the longest in the world, Padre Island is an exposed sandbar. The wind has done the same thing to its sand that it does to the gulf water: rolled it up in waves. The sand waves are desert dunes moving much more slowly than those of the gulf, but always moving just the same, being swept sometimes gently, sometimes severely, sometimes brutally by the everlasting trade winds. The sand is fine-grained and pure. Under the midday sun it sparkles, but in contrast to the foam caps and the clouds, it is a creamy yellow which becomes first golden then gray as the sun sinks.

"Arid and wild, Padre Island is never the same from one day to the next. Every wave, every gust of wind, gives it new contours, new esthetic effects. Sometimes its low spots are covered by water so that it becomes two islands, or three, or four. Then a fresh breeze will blow the water away and the island will become whole again. Sometimes a cluster of rough grasses will anchor the sand of a dune for awhile, and then free dunes will bend around it or bank up against the grass until they cover it. There is no certainty here, no security, no hope or permanence. All is changing and unpredictable. The only thing you can count on is that there will be more change, more sun, more wind, and more violence.

"But the island's very aridity, poverty, and primitive insecurity give it a value all of its own for Corpus Christi and the Rio Grande Valley. Two new causeways, one at each end of the island, make it possible for citizens to go there any time they wish. Travelers and natives can revert to the semi-savagery there. A working girl, having slaved for weeks in the service of civilization can bare her body to the lashing of the briny waves and the reviving ultraviolet of the sun. Under the velvet of freshly created clouds, glittering like the sea foam in the sunshine or tinted with amber and silver by the moon, she can become a cave, woman again for a day, or an evening, or at night. She can live for a few hours as Eve lived before the serpent tempted her with the knowledge of good and evil. Workingmen can take their wives and children to go temporarily wild in the sand and the sun.

"Many attempts have been made to tame and develop Padre Island to plant civilized settlements there. All have failed. If you set out domestic trees or palms there, the sand will starve their roots, the sun will suck out their sap, and the wind will blow them down. Hotels have been built between the gulf shore and the dunes of Padre. The breakers have risen without warning to crash against their walls and their joints have swollen. Their rafters have expanded and cracked in the damp air. Their roofs have caved in. They have been condemned."

Speaking of tourists, Mr. Frank Goodwyn continues:

"But most of those who come to Texas prefer the comparatively sinless and more invigorating pursuits of swimming, fishing, and camping under God's wide open sky. Padre Island, with its beaches facing both the gulf's great breakers on the east and the smooth water of the Laguna Madre Bay on the west, with its 272 different kinds of fish, with its continuous resistance to all efforts at permanent development, with its stiff winds from the Gulf Stream and its stiff laws from the State capital suits them fine."

The American GI Forum, its members, and their families and especially their children go on record wholeheartedly and enthusiastically endorsing Padre Island as National Shoreline Park. Not only are we speaking of the American GI Forum of Corpus Christi or Texas but we are speaking of the American GI Forum veterans of 23 States. We, as veterans feel that one of the things we fought for and some of our relatives died for was to preserve the natural beauty of our country and make available all of its beauty and grandeur equally to all members of this great democracy.

For many hundreds of thousands of poor citizens in this area, Padre Island is the only recreational area available to them and for many migrant workers the only vacation that they and their children have is their sojourn to the beautiful "Isla Blanca". To some of these Mexican children the only gems and jewels in their life will be the beautiful shells they will find in this, our natural land. Help us preserve this island for all the world to see and enjoy, as God created it for all of its children.

Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, February 12, 1960, feeling that it expresses the opinion of the vast majority of people in this country. The Democrats can shout all they want to about national security but near-

ly every thinking person in this country has absolute trust in the President. They know that he is probably the best man we have to maintain our national security. I hope every Member of the House will read the enclosed editorial and take it to heart:

COUNTERATTACK

The President has hit back hard and effectively at those critics who have questioned the good faith of his administration and who charge that our national security is being sacrificed on the altar of a balanced budget. Mr. Eisenhower made these points:

1. He is primarily concerned with the real needs of the Nation, not a balanced budget.

2. He wants the country to be strong and safe.

3. He has been in the military service a long time, and he has listened to all the arguments, pro and con, with respect to our defense needs.

4. He has done the best he can, and has based his decisions on one and only one consideration—what is best for America.

5. Finally, he is not running for any office. In other words, selfish political considerations do not enter into his judgments.

This may not silence the critics of the President and his program. But it will blunt the cutting edge of their weapons. For it is obvious that Mr. Eisenhower is telling the truth, and the great majority of the people will believe that he is telling the truth. He may be mistaken, of course, in some of his judgments, but the burden of proving this rests with the critics, and they have not proved it. Nor do we see how it is going to be possible for them to do so. If they continue with their headlong attacks on the Eisenhower program two results, we think, are predictable: The critics will end up with a king-sized headache, and the people are going to get tired of listening to them.

Address by Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, Before Joint Session of the General Assembly of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] addressed the legislature of his own State at Atlanta. I have in my hand excerpts of remarks the Senator made at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts of remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I wish to observe that they contain many notable, sound constitutional thoughts and principles applicable today as they were applicable in all decades before and, furthermore, that they are full of commonsense and practical values, which certainly need to be applied and reapplied in our public affairs.

I do not think any person in the Nation is better qualified—and few are as well qualified—to express himself on these major matters than the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. President, I think the address represents American Government at one of its pinnacles, in that an experienced Senator, who is also a former Governor, returned to the State legislature of his home State to make a report, discussing the far-reaching problems of the day as well as constitutional principles. I commend to the membership of the Senate and to the American people a careful reading of these fine remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts of remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA AT THE STATE CAPITOL, ATLANTA, FEBRUARY 8, 1960

A great national debate is now raging over the adequacy of the American Defense Establishment to meet the threat of Soviet aggression.

Some of the highest officials of our Government have reiterated time and again that our defense is completely adequate. It is asserted that there is no real missile lag and that all is well on every front.

It has always been my view that partisanship has no place whatever in the defense of the United States. Bombs from enemy planes or missiles will not make any distinction between Democrats and Republicans if the ultimate tragedy of all-out war cannot be avoided.

I do not believe that our defenses are as weak as some of the administration's critics charge, but I am equally convinced that the policy of the present national administration involves an unnecessary gamble with world peace and our national security.

Our only real deterrent to the therat of atomic attack is our Strategic Air Command and man-operated bombers. The greatest industrial Nation on earth continues to endure the shame and humiliation of repeatedly taking second place to the Russians in all phases of the contest for priority in space.

I am, by nature, an optimist. However, I cannot accept the rosy picture of some officials of our Department of Defense. It is impossible for me to feel comfortable with the assurances of even the highest officials while the Russians continue to present frightening evidence of their great lead in the rocket and space race. The fact that they are testfiring missiles of almost pinpoint accuracy a distance of 8,000 miles into our Pacific backyard underscores in red the continuing Communist threat to world peace and the security of our country.

At every dramatic evidence of Soviet missile achievement, some official arises and attempts to dismiss it with a wave of the hand. That any person of normal intelligence should fail to be impressed with the gravity of the Russian threat in this area is incomprehensible to me.

I applaud and support the aim of this administration to achieve a balanced budget. I insist, however, that first things come first and that a balanced budget must not be achieved at the expense of our military muscle.

In maintaining our Nation's defenses, nothing should be left to chance. It will be the last folly we are permitted to commit if we let down our guard against the ever-present possibility of Communist attack. Future generations of Americans, serving as Soviet slaves will forever curse us if we fail to take every necessary step to insure our national safety and security.

Despite Khrushchev's beguiling words and friendly smiles, he has yet to prove his sincerity by agreeing to an enforcible plan for world disarmament. Unless and until he does so, the one last hope of mankind rests squarely upon the maintenance of American military might.

Head-in-the-sand complacency is no substitute for missile equality. The American way of life is too valuable to be jeopardized by pennywise, pound-foolish economies in the most vital activity of our Government. There are many areas of national spending that can be reduced or eliminated without impairing the defense effort or materially injuring the country.

My mind completely rejects the argument that a multibillion-dollar foreign aid program can serve as a substitute for superiority in intercontinental ballistic missiles in saving the free world.

If, beginning in 1953, we had diverted only a billion dollars a year from foreign aid to missile development, the United States would today be preeminent in the rocket race. Had we exercised this minimum degree of prudence, there would be no cause for fright over the spectacular Soviet successes in space. We would have been spared the humiliation and loss of prestige of our secondary role.

I can understand how the foreign countries of the earth can clamor for American dollars, but I am constantly amazed that those in charge of our Government are willing to gamble our destiny on a national program geared to preeminence in gifts to foreign powers at any cost, even the acceptance of a secondary position in missiles that can carry hydrogen bombs 10 times faster than the speed of sound.

I must also confess a degree of incredulity over some of the rose-colored and politically flavored reports one hears these days about the state of the American economy.

It is true—as widely proclaimed—that the economy generally has climbed to new heights of prosperity. In spite of the steel strike, 1959 turned out to be a banner business year and the outlook for 1960 is even brighter.

But it is also true—though not so loudly proclaimed—that 1959 was one of the most disastrous years for our farmers since before World War II. The Department of Agriculture itself forecasts a further drop in net farm income during the present year.

Obviously, all the talk of recordbreaking prosperity dose not include the farmer. He is not even receiving a token—much less a fair share—of our unprecedented prosperity and wealth. The farmer is rapidly becoming the forgotten man of the American economy.

An administration that has spent billions in foreign aid, much of it to develop and build foreign competition with American agriculture, still clings to the position that the American farmer must go it alone.

Benson's approach to the farm problem has been to lower price supports and prices in an effort to reduce surplus production. Actually, his program has served only to depres farm income and increase our agricultural surpluses.

Though he poses as an advocate of economy who will "get the Government out of agriculture," Benson has spent more money during his 7 years in office than all his predecessors put together since the Department of Agriculture was created in 1862.

Even the Russians have demonstrated the appalling fallacy of the Benson approach. Khrushchev has applied the Benson plan in reverse by decreasing farm prices in order to encourage his farmers to produce more to overcome Soviet shortages.

The President's only prescription for curing the farm problem is another dose of "old Doc Benson's" magical cure-all—further reduction in price supports. This peculiar prescription is far more likely to kill than cure the patient.

There is little chance of reaching a workable solution to the crisis confronting American agriculture so long as Benson continues

to preside over the Nation's farm program. He has persuaded the President to veto every effort by Congress to relieve the farm crisis.

I am extremely hopeful that his regime will come to a long-overdue end after the November election regardless of who is elected President. Any change in the Secretary of Agriculture is bound to be for the better. This is one of the few bright spots I see ahead for us in the forthcoming presidential campaign.

There are other phases of the economy that take on a somewhat less rosy color when viewed objectively and from a nonpolitical perspective.

One of these is the specter of runaway inflation that continues to haunt the stability of the economy and the soundness of the dollar. It is a thief that is robbing us of the fruits of our labor today and cheating us of our hopes of comfort and security tomorrow.

In the past deficit spending by the Federal Government has been a major factor contributing to the inflationary spiral. But a determined effort by responsible members of both parties to curb the wild socialistic schemes of the Federal spenders has resulted in the prospects of a balanced budget this year and next.

Big Government spending, of course, is not the only cause of inflation. Labor-management contracts that result in increased wage benefits and higher industrial prices—all dutifully paid for by the helpless consumer—push the inflationary spiral higher and higher.

The steel settlement, in which the Vice President played such a prominent role, seems certain to add to the inflation pressures. Although we may be spared the cost of Mr. NIXON'S settlement until after the November election, steel prices are certain to be raised eventually to cover the liberal wage concessions.

His handling of the steel strike deprived the Nation of its best chance in 20 years to prevent the labor and industrial giants from conducting their power struggles at the Nation's expense. Had NIXON not exerted so much pressure to force an agreement on inflationary terms, I believe Congress would have enacted effective legislation to protect the public interest from similar situations in the future. He certainly has laid himself open to the charge that his efforts were politically motivated.

Whether or not the charge is true, I devoutly hope the Nation will be spared Mr. NIXON'S excursions into the field of labor mediation in the future. I doubt that the country can stand many more of his settlements.

This is destined to be a fateful year for Georgia and the South. Our enemies are marshaling their forces against us at every turn. In many respects, 1960 may be one of the most momentous and crucial years for the South since 1860.

The insidious campaign to harass the southern people and to destroy the southern way of life is being pressed against us from all sides.

Those of us in Congress who cling to such fundamental beliefs as constitutional government and States rights have felt the full brunt of this vicious attack for years. But the battle extends far beyond the confines of the Federal Congress in Washington. It has fanned out into our own State and into every county and community in this State.

The people of Georgia—and you, their elected representatives and spokesmen—have come face-to-face with the devious drive to uproot our traditions and to destroy our institutions.

I have always had an abiding faith in the strength, courage, and determination of Georgia's General Assembly and Governor to defend our State against all its enemies—foreign and domestic.

Let me assure you of this: I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the members of this general assembly and with the Governor in this battle to protect the sovereign State of Georgia and to preserve the way of life of our people.

The battle that lies ahead will be hard—both for you here and for Senator TALMADGE and myself in Washington. The situation confronting our people and our State will demand the best of each of us.

In frankness, I must say that we face great odds in Congress against the conglomeration of miscalled civil rights legislation that has been introduced to punish and harass the South.

Since this is a presidential election year, there will be greater pressure than ever to make the South the Nation's political football. The NAACP, the ADA, and similar rag-tag, leftwing groups are pulling the strings on their puppet politicians and demanding passage of the most extreme and vicious legislation.

A stable of presidential and vice-presidential hopefuls—wearing both party labels—are eagerly dancing to the tune of the pressure groups in hope of currying favor with the minority bloc vote.

Congress has been deluged with all manner of proposals under the catch-all banner of civil rights. More are being introduced every day. As soon as one of the moguls of the NAACP or the ADA thinks up a new scheme, there is a stampede among the radicals for the dubious honor of sponsoring it. It often happens that the same bill is introduced several times by different sponsors.

The current fad in civil rights circles is some form of legislation to place under Federal control and operation the election machinery that belongs to State and local government.

This shows a startling lack of originality on the part of those who scheme up these civil rights proposals. Federal control of elections got a pretty good tryout—and became a national disgrace—during the first reconstruction. Under those earlier laws, local elections were taken over in the North as well as the South and a presidential election was stolen.

The sponsors of these iniquitious proposals can't decide on the best way to go about federalizing the elective process. One group, including Senator JAVITS, wants to do it through a system of Federal registrars. The Attorney General, on the other hand, proposes to put voting referees in charge of southern ballot boxes.

These proposals, though differing in approach, have the same end result. They would put the counting of the votes under the direction of Federal bureaucrats.

Their passage, in effect, would be a declaration that all State and local governments are bankrupt and should be placed in the hands of a Federal receiver. Sooner or later, all the elections would be decided in Washington. If that tragic day ever comes, we will have traded our birthright of constitutional government for a Federal dictatorship.

The proposals to federalize the election process should be opposed by thinking people in all parts of the country. True, these bills are aimed at the people of the South today. Tomorrow, another section of the country might find itself the victim of the onrushing Federal juggernaut.

These vicious schemes must be fought—and will be fought—to the end.

I pledge to you that I will oppose them to the limit of my endurance and to the extent of my ability.

We will leave no stone unturned—no rule of the Senate unused—in this battle to protect States rights and constitutional government.

I confess I do not know how much longer the South must serve as the doormat for the ambitious leaders of both national parties.

Certainly there is no comfort for us in the ranks of the Republican Party. The heir apparent to the GOP crown already has taken his stand with the NACP. He is, in fact, one of their most prominent honorary members.

Our own party has virtually deserted us. The proud democracy of Jefferson and Jackson has become the captive of a leftwing element that is barely Democratic even in name, but which is trying to recast the party in its image.

Many of this gang of phony liberals and party wreckers have publicly advocated driving the South from the house of our fathers.

The South is entitled to better treatment from the party that it has nurtured, supported and revered for almost as long as it has the Constitution. We are entitled to the measure of respect and influence within the party that our years of loyalty have earned.

No section of the country can rival the South's long record of Democratic loyalty. But party loyalty is a two-way street. Those who kick the South in the teeth at every opportunity must not expect us to keep turning the other cheek forever.

The South has no intention of abandoning is loyalty to the Democratic principles that it has ever held. But it owes no loyalty to self-styled Democrats who flout and despise the true Democratic faith.

The patron saints of the democracy—giants like Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson—built the party upon the solid rock of the Constitution.

That is where the South stands today. Others may seek to subvert that fundamental premise of the Democratic Party, but the South will keep the faith.

We have taken our stand on the Constitution of the United States. And there we propose to remain.

Invoke the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time a very pertinent editorial which appeared in the February 7, 1960, issue of the Sarasota News, one of the leading daily newspapers in my congressional district. The editor is only one of the many Americans who are concerned about our foreign policies. I hope my colleagues will give serious thought to his remarks.

The editorial entitled, "Invoke the Monroe Doctrine," follows:

INVOKE THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Soviet Deputy Mikoyan is in Cuba, and the Monroe Doctrine gets another kick in the teeth. It has been nicely timed to stir up more reaction that will follow President Eisenhower wherever he sets down his jet liner in South America. Our Nation is so weak and appeasing that nothing has been done to counteract this sly aggression by the Soviet Union.

If President Eisenhower really wants to go down in history as a real President, strong and aggressive, this is the time for him to invoke the Monroe Doctrine. Now.

The Russians have no right to meddle in the affairs of the North and South Hemispheres, now or tomorrow.

The planned trip of the President of the United States to South America can well turn out to be another form of appeasement and there will be a further loss of face by this Nation in the eyes of its weaker but antagonistic neighbors. To date, we have only one friend south of the border, and that is the Republic of Mexico. The South American situation is about to blow up in our faces and in the meantime, we sit and try to feed the baby a candy bar when he is about to spit in our face.

The damage in Cuba cannot be undone because we are weak in our foreign policy, definitely without direction and playing a situation by ear—and a deaf ear at that—when we should be clubbing Castro and his Communists over the head with the butt end of a marine's automatic rifle.

The Republican administration better take heed between now and the first week of November because if they flub this one, they will have nothing to talk about. The people are getting fed up with his phony talk of peace at any price by both political parties. We have lost the friendship of Cuba by both factions, due to our lack of positive approach. The Cuban Communists hate us, and those who hoped for relief will now turn leftist in despair, just as we have forsaken countries of Europe behind the Iron Curtain.

Please, Washington, wake up before it is too late. Do something before our backyard is covered with termites—Communist termites.

There Are Real Opportunities for Business and Industry To Thrive in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, both Senators from West Virginia have spoken in this Chamber concerning an article in the February 6, 1960, issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Roul Tunley entitled "The Strange Case of West Virginia."

Lest there be misunderstanding created by this story, West Virginia, in spite of its unemployment percentage and distress in some of its labor surplus areas, is attractive to business and industry.

Since the Post article and our remarks in the RECORD, my attention has been directed to reactions from heads of firms doing business in West Virginia.

From F. J. French, president of the General Chemical Division, Allied Chemical Corp., New York, N.Y., I received a thoughtful letter, one paragraph of which I quote as follows:

I was very much interested in the remarks made by you in the Senate on February 1 with respect to the Saturday Evening Post article by Roul Tunley. My company's opinion with respect to the opportunities for industry to thrive in West Virginia is best illustrated by the fact that our hydrobuoric acid plant at Nitro, put into operation as a new plant only 14 months ago, is now in the process of being substantially expanded.

Mr. President, from the February 10, 1960 issues of the morning Charleston Gazette and the afternoon Charleston Mail, both published at Charleston, W. Va., I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an open letter to the people of West Virginia by Stanley L. Evans, chairman of the board of the Evans Grocery Co., with main offices at Gallipolis, Ohio, which is a tribute to the ability of West Virginians to defeat adversity, and a statement of faith in our State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF WEST VIRGINIA

DEAR FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS OF WEST VIRGINIA: The recent article published in a national magazine has given rise to much controversy about the economic future of the State of West Virginia. Evans supermarkets is a West Virginia corporation vitally concerned with your State.

In 1929 Evans supermarkets became a West Virginia corporation when we built our first store in your State. That year was a time of great national economic depression. There were those who doubted our belief in West Virginia, but our confidence remained unshaken. Thirty years later we can look at 11 supermarkets and know the rewards of serving your State.

In those years our organization has followed the growth and development of a great State. We have experienced proof of a higher living standard by the changed eating habits of our customers. The per capita consumption of U.S. choice beef is above the national average. Your acceptance of national brand food shows an increasing awareness of quality food.

West Virginia has pioneered again in the automation of the coal industry. In pioneering, we are all faced with immediate problems today that other States and other industries will feel in the coming years. But your State is deep within these industrial and economic problems now. There is a parallel between this time and 31 years ago when Evans built its first store in West Virginia. Evans supermarkets maintains a firm faith in your State today, as in yesteryear.

Since 1955 Evans has organized and effected building of the only shopping centers in southern West Virginia; Gateway at St. Albans and Eastern Heights near Huntington, completed late last year at the cost of over $1½ million. This year Evans will build two new supermarkets at Smithers and Kanawha City, investing an additional one-half million dollars. This is our faith in West Virginia.

Our business is feeding millions of West Virginians who are responsible for our success. We are proud to be a West Virginia corporation serving fine people and a great State.

Sincerely,

STANLEY L. EVANS,
Chairman of the Board, the Evans Groeery Co.

Years Not All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, we in New York State are proud of our stalwart colleague, JOHN TABER. Although he represents the 36th District, he has become so identified with New York State that we all feel we can lay some claim to him. His integrity, his courage, and his innate ability to adhere to the straight line of principle, have provided a worthy example for younger Members of Congress. Recently JOHN TABER announced that he would run for reelection this fall. We in the 43d District of western New York congratulate the counties of Cayuga, Chenango, Courtland, Ontario, Schuyler, Seneca, Tompkins, and Yates on their further recognition of distinguished and able representation.

As an illustration of the strong bond of affection and respect felt by the people of upstate New York for JOHN TABER, I include the following editorial from the February 11 issue of one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Salamanca Republican-Press:

Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn, has become nationally known as an advocate of economy in the Federal Government. As ranking minority member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, he has had much to do with keeping Uncle Sam's expenditures down. The fact that he is to seek election to his 20th term in Congress, and that he has been assured the support of the GOP chairman in his eight-county district, therefore is of more local interest.

As Mr. TABER will be 80 this spring, his candidacy runs counter to views expressed the other day by Prof. Ronald Turnbridge, British expert on old age. He says all political leaders should be retired in their early fifties. Application of that rule would make quite a hole in the ranks of the world's leaders, past and present. President Eisenhower and President de Gaulle are both 69, Harold Macmillan, the British Premier, and Nikita Khrushchev of Soviet Russia are 66. West Germany's Konrad Adenauer and Korea's Syngman Rhee would have been out long ago, both being past 80. The ranks of our would-be Presidents also would be diminished. Senator Lyndon Johnson is 51; Senator Stuart Symington is 58; Adlai Stevenson is 59. We could still choose among Senators KENNEDY, who is 42, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, 48, and Vice President NIXON, who is 47.

Turnbridge's dictum recalls the joking remark attributed to a famous Canadian physician, Sir William Osler, that everybody should be chloroformed at 40. Turnbridge himself cannot be putting in a claim for a political career. He is 53.

Mr. TABER has knowledge and experience of great value to the Nation.

A Friendly Climate for International Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance to our economy of encouraging private investment abroad cannot be too strongly emphasized. The protection of our international investors against expropriation in violation of international law should be the immediate concern of legislators. The revocation of the Connally reservation governing U.S. par-

ticipation in the International Court of Justice at The Hague, will be a significant factor in creating such a climate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by H. Struve Hensel, chairman of the Council for Private International Development, and a dispatch in the Christian Science Monitor of February 6, 1960, by Neal Stanford, on the same problem.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENSEL URGES SENATE TO REMOVE CONNALLY RESTRICTION ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN WORLD COURT

H. Struve Hensel, chairman of the Council for Private International Development, today urged the U.S. Senate to remove the Connally reservation, which governs U.S. participation in the International Court of Justice at The Hague, and thus serve notice to the world that we are sincere in our advocacy of the rule of law.

"Adequate protection of private property," said Mr. Hensel, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, "is possible only when the rule of law—as distinguished from brute and other kinds of force—is established." He added, "There is no rule of law when either or both parties to a dispute can refuse to submit the question to judicial determination.

"And that is the precise result of the Connally reservation which makes it possible for the United States to refuse to submit matters to the International Court whenever we feel the matter should be handled domestically. How can we expect to lead others when we hang back?"

Mr. Hensel explained that the council was organized as a study, planning, and advocate group to improve the climate, both domestic and foreign, for private international investments of all types. He said that the interest of the council in removal of the Connally six-word restriction stems from the fact that international agreements for the protection of private investments, which are an objective of the council, can have no meaning unless disputes arising under such agreements can be brought before an arbitral tribunal that has power under international law to render decisions.

"I believe it is the concensus in America," Mr. Hensel said, that peace, security, and progress in the world can only be attained and ensured by fruitful cooperation among all peoples on a basis of international law and mutual confidence.

"Private investment can be induced to move into foreign countries only if there can be created in such countries a favorable protective climate for investment and the rights to profit therefrom. A protective climate can be assured only through observance of the rules of law and the enforcement of those laws by an international tribunal.

"The International Court of Justice at The Hague is such an international tribunal. Unfortunately, the United States has taken the stand that it will be subject to the Court only on its own terms—that it be its own judge of the cases that can be brought against it in the Court.

"As a result of the Connally reservation, nine other countries were persuaded to insist upon somewhat similar reservations. Furthermore, if the United States makes a claim against another nation, that nation, by the doctrine of reciprocity, may refuse jurisdiction of the Court just because the United States has reserved such right. Our reservation has hurt our own cause and is a real obstacle to the establishment of a rule of law in which we honestly believe.

"It is interesting to note that Britain, France, and India recently have repealed their self-judging reservation."

COURT OPERATIONS LIMITED

Mr. Hensel explained that, since the International Court, an arm of the United Nations, operates within narrow limitations, the Connally reservation was entirely unnecessary. The Court can consider only the cases which the parties submit to it, and matters especially provided for in the United Nations charter or in treaties. In all cases, disputants have resort to the United Nations Security Council in the event another party fails to abide by the Court's decision. The United States has veto power in the Security Council.

"Therefore, our country has ample protection against improbable actions by the Court which might relate to purely domestic matters, said Mr. Hensel.

"The United States, so heavily involved in international trade and investment, can only gain through international observance of rules of law, but rules of law are effective only when enforceable. Expropriation, confiscation, discriminations and other perverse acts against private foreign investments can be minimized only when all nations observe the rules of law and participate in the means for their enforcement.

The Council for Private International Development includes among the members of its planning committee: Former Secretary of Interior Oscar L. Chapman; Judge Homer Ferguson, former U.S. Senator from Michigan; Prof. Arthur Larson, director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, and special consultant to President Eisenhower; Hon. John Slezak, chairman of the Kable Printing Co., Mount Morris, Ill., former Undersecretary of the Army; David D. Ryus, general manager, Time-Life International; and other prominent Americans.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 6, 1960]

REVOKING SIX LITTLE WORDS

(By Neal Stanford)

The Senate, from all appearances, is preparing to reverse itself on a major piece of international legislation. Time and events and experience are the explanation.

The issue is the 1946 Senate reservation to U.S. adherence to the then new International Court of Justice. By that reservation the United States kept the right to determine what was a purely domestic matter—and therefore outside the Court's jurisdiction.

The reservation, known as the Connally amendment (after Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) contained only six little words. But those six were enough to allow American acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the Court to apply only when the United States wanted it to.

The six words were tied onto an article of the resolution stating that the Court's authority did not apply "to matters • • • essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States (and here come the six words) as determined by the United States." This self-judging reservation, in effect if not intent, quite obviously nullified the major purpose of the resolution to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Now President Eisenhower has come out for abolition of the Connally amendment, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota has a resolution before the Senate (S. Res. 94) aimed at its repeal.

It should be noted that at the time support of a self-judging clause was bipartisan. In fact, the first Senator to suggest such a reservation was former Senator Warren Austin, Republican, of Vermont. He made such a proposal before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. But the committee threw it out and called for favorable Senate action without any self-judging reservation. It was on the Senate floor that Senator Connally offered the amendment eventually incorporated in the resolution.

The arguments that won Senate support of the amendment stressed concern that the Court might take a dangerously broad view of what was an international question and thus interfere with U.S. policy on such things as immigration, tariffs, and matters relating to the Panama Canal.

As might have been expected, once the United States had written a self-judging amendment into its acceptance of the court's compulsory jurisdiction, other nations followed suit. Mexico, France, Liberia, the Union of South Africa, India, Pakistan, the Sudan, and even the United Kingdom took similar action.

However, attitudes toward such an amendment have gradually changed. India, France, the United Kingdom have dropped their self-judging reservations. Even as far back as 1946 and 1947 the American Bar Association passed resolutions calling for elimination of the proviso reserving to the United States the unilateral right of determination as to what constitutes a matter essentially within its domestic jurisdiction.

Time and events and experience more and more suggest that the self-judging amendment is actually disadvantageous to the United States—according to Secretary of State Christian Herter who the other day opened the hearings on the Hill on deleting those "six little words" inserted by ex-Senator Connally.

For one thing, experience has shown that such a reservation can seriously limit a country's ability to take other nations into court. This was proved in the Norwegian loans case involving France where Norway claimed on the basis of reciprocity the right to decide whether France's claims against it were domestic or not. The court upheld Norway's right to invoke its adversary's self-judging reservation.

After 14 years' experience the Senate is now apparently preparing to accept the view that the court does not have jurisdiction over domestic matters and no Connally amendment is needed to make that clear.

The court is composed of 15 judges from 15 nations—elected for 9-year terms by the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council. Sitting on the court today is an American judge, Green Haywood Hackworth. Only two of the 15 are from Communist countries, the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

Its jurisdiction is narrow—limited to cases which the parties submit to it and matters especially provided for in the U.N. Charter or in treaties. Its statute on compulsory jurisdiction covers only legal disputes concerning interpretation of treaties; questions of international law; existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of international obligation; and the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

In other cases both parties to a dispute must agree to let the court handle it. If a party fails to heed a court decision, the other party can take it to the U.N. Security Council—where the United States, as well as the U.S.S.R., has a veto.

Twenty-four Area Redevelopment Groups Are Working at the Community Level To Eliminate Chronic Unemployment in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during debate concerning area redevelopment legislation the inference has been drawn that the residents of the areas of chronic unemployment in the Nation are doing little to solve their problems.

In the United States there are nearly 1,200 area redevelopment groups representing that many communities in the United States who are toiling daily to rehabilitate their economy by the expansion of existing industries and attracting new ones. These groups have raised millions of dollars to finance their activities through voluntary contributions at the local level. In addition, millions of man-hours have been contributed by individuals who have given freely of their time and effort in traveling for the purpose of making contact with new industries. Some of these groups have enjoyed some success while others have not, yet they are not discouraged and continue their efforts to solve the unemployment problem. These men and women who comprise these community groups are entitled to the commendation of the country as a whole because of their fight to restore the economy of their communities within the framework of the free enterprise system of the American form of Government.

In my congressional district in central Pennsylvania, 24 communities have organized a like number of redevelopment groups and it is a pleasure to list these active organizations and commend them for their labor of love and sacrifice in behalf of those unfortunately unemployed. The list follows:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT GROUPS

Wm. H. Wade, ex vice president, Altoona Enterprises, Inc., Penelec Building, Altoona, Pa.; Paul Walker, Bellwood-Antis Industrial Development Corp., Tipton, Pa.; Martin Burket, Claysburg Fund, Inc., Claysburg Pa.; J. S. Tate, Duncansville Planning Commission, Duncansville, Pa.; J. Howard Reid, Chamber of Commerce, Hollidaysburg, Pa.; Robert L. Hoover, Martinsburg Booster Association, Martinsburg, Pa.; Paul Grannas, Morrisons Cove Industrial Development Corp., Martinsburg, Pa.; Albert Shope, Chamber of Commerce, Tyrone, Pa.; Cecil Walker, Chamber of Commerce, Bellefonte, Pa.; James E. McNeish, Chamber of Commerce, Moshannon Building, Philipsburg, Pa.; Neal Barraclough, Port Matilda Area Development Council, Port Matilda, Pa.; Ronald R. Rumbaugh, State College Area Chamber of Commerce, State College, Pa.; Robert S. Musser, president, Community Development Association, Millheim, Pa.; Andrew Popycock, Jr., Beccaria Industrial Development Commission, Beccaria, Pa.; George Gaylor, Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa.; Paul W. Winslow, Tri-County Community Development Association, Coalport, Pa.; Frank Hoffman, Clearfield County-Moshannon Valley Industrial Development Corp., Curwensville, Pa.; William F. Schneider, president, DuBois Board of Trade, DuBois Deposit National Bank Building, DuBois, Pa.; Clifford Hubler, Kylertown-Cooper Township, Industrial Development Committee, Kylertown, Pa.; William Strange, Morris Township Industrial and Residential Development Association, Morrisdale, Pa.; Joseph Dixon, Citizens Development Association of Wallaceton Boro, Wallaceton, Pa.; Milton Westover, chairman, Citizens' Committee, Westover, Pa.; Chester Skonier, Industrial Development Committee, Ramey, Pa.; John Redding, Osceola Mills Development Committee, Osceola Mills, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1 the following report on the current status of area redevelopment legislation in the 86th Congress was sent to each of the area redevelopment groups listed above and is self-explanatory.

The report follows:

CURRENT STATUS OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION, FEBRUARY 1, 1960

Because of the great interest in the industrial development of this congressional district, the following report reveals the current status of area redevelopment legislation designed to provide aid to the Nation's 144 labor surplus areas commonly described as "pockets of chronic unemployment." These areas include the Altoona labor market of 53,600 persons of which 8.8 percent or 4,700 are unemployed. The Clearfield-DuBois labor market of 35,500 persons is also included of which 13.8 percent or 4,900 are unemployed.

When the 85th Congress approved the first area redevelopment bill in 1958 the vote in the U.S. Senate was 46 to 36; while in the House of Representatives the vote was 176 to 130. When the bill reached the White House it was not acceptable to the President and for that reason, he vetoed it. Since there were not sufficient votes in either branch of Congress to override the veto no effort in that direction was made.

When the 86th Congress convened in January of last year a fresh start was made to try to enact an area redevelopment bill. In this connection, the Douglas-Payne bill was approved by the U.S. Senate last spring by the close vote of 49 to 46. A similar bill was reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency which is now bottled up in the House Rules Committee (eight Democrats and four Republicans). Regardless of the pressure that is being applied to the House Rules Committee by a bipartisan group of which I am cochairman, prospects of getting the legislation to the floor of the House are very dim.

The situation is simply this. The administration will not take the Douglas-Payne bill which will cost nearly $400 million on the grounds that it is entirely too high; while on the other hand the sponsors of the Douglas-Payne bill insist that the administration bill which will cost around $60 million is too conservative. When one reviews the votes in the Senate and House on area redevelopment legislation, it is readily apparent that the two-thirds majority necessary to override a veto cannot be secured. This means unless a compromise is worked out there will be no area redevelopment legislation during the 86th Congress.

It is common knowledge that for years I have been sponsoring area redevelopment legislation in Congress the cost of which would be around $150 million or a compromise between the cost of the Douglas-Payne bill and the administration bill. My efforts at the moment are directed toward trying to convince both sides that our only salvation is for the House of Representatives to approve the administration bill since there is overwhelming evidence that passage of a compromise bill is impossible.

With the Senate having passed the Douglas-Payne bill and if the House passes the administration bill, then the legislation would be referred to a conference committee of both Houses comprising five Senators and five House Members. These conferees could then communicate with the President and proceed to work out a compromise that would be acceptable to the White House. My conviction is that unless this procedure is followed the 144 pockets of chronic unemployment in this country will not receive any legislative relief whatsoever from the Congress of the United States.

In conclusion, my activity over the years in behalf of area redevelopment legislation is well known. I have constantly sought to keep such legislation out of the political arena and for that reason, I have strongly supported a bipartisan effort to try to secure enactment of such vital legislation because hunger and poverty arising from unemployment should not be made a political football. Therefore, I sincerely hope that both sides in the controversy over area redevelopment legislation will look facts squarely in the face and resolve to do something practical to solve the situation by enacting a bill which will serve as the starting point of a sound area redevelopment program.

For Rural Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 12, 1960, issue of the New York Times with reference to S. 2830, the library services extension bill, which I introduced for myself and 53 cosponsors on January 14, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1960]

FOR RURAL LIBRARIES

Public Law 84–597, which expires June 30, 1961, is known as the Library Services Act. It was enacted in 1956 to provide such services to rural areas of the United States. The act authorized $7,500,000 annually for 5 years for grants-in-aid to the States.

Behind these sentences lie 4 years of constructive activity by the State library extension agencies, which by means of State and Federal moneys have brought library services to 30 million Americans in communities of 10,000 or less that never had any library service or enjoyed only inadequate services. The Library Services Act has brought to Alabama, 4 new regional libraries; to Idaho, the first trained administrator for the State library; to Mississippi, a statewide conference on book selection; to Ohio, bookmobile grants to 5 counties; to West Virginia, centralized book-ordering services.

The multiplicity of libraries in the great urban centers dulls the senses to the want of the rural areas. In order to help the rural areas continue their newly established services S. 2830 has been introduced in Congress. This bill is an amendment to the Library Services Act. Its purpose is to ex-

tend for 5 more years the authorization for appropriations in order to continue the services already developed and also to bring them to at least 40 million people who as yet have not received them. Unless S. 2830 is acted on favorably in this Congress there will be no consideration for funds for library services for the 1961–62 fiscal year. It is hoped that this bill, which has the backing of 52 Senators, will find the remaining support necessary for enactment.

Great Decisions and the Crisis of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Hon. CHESTER BOWLES, delivered an important address at the University of Louisville. This address was one in the distinguished lecture series in which the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Louisville Times and their affiliated radio and television stations WHAS and WHAS-TV bring to the university outstanding personages to discuss important matters in fields of their special competence.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] lived up to highest traditions of this series and I include herewith the text of his address:

GREAT DECISIONS AND THE CRISIS OF 1960

(By the Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, Member of Congress, former Governor of Connecticut and former Ambassador to India, the distinguished lecture series, University of Louisville, Ky., February 9, 1960)

It is an honor and pleasure to appear before you tonight.

I am particularly glad to do so in conjunction with the Foreign Policy Association's valuable program, "Great Decisions—1960," which will be holding your attention during the next 8 weeks. For it is about great decisions and their role in shaping 20th century America's relations to the world that I shall speak.

This first year of the 1960's promises to be an eventful one for all of us. It is a year not only of transition into a critical decade, but of feverish political activity and momentous decision.

Between now and July the focus of all Democrats will be on that still nameless man who will be their Presidential nominee. Between July and November, their energies will be given to electing him.

Although the probable Republican nominee is not so nameless, we can expect a similar Republican concentration on the immediate problems of this election year.

History, however, cannot be made to stand still. The forces which shape our destiny move relentlessly on, oblivious to political debates, nominating conventions, and public opinion polls.

Tonight, therefore, I suggest that we look beyond the current political pulling and hauling to consider these forces and our recent record in coping with them.

What will historians say from the perspective of a generation or so hence about America's influence over the course of events in the mid-20th century?

I believe they will agree that we Americans faced at least five decisions in the first 60 years of our century, each of which had a profound effect not only on our lives but on the course of world history. In the first two of these decisions, our response was disastrously wrong; in the second two, it was brilliantly right; and the fifth still hangs in the balance. I shall list them briefly:

First, was our tragic failure in 1919 to join the League of Nations and to throw our power and prestige behind a program to perserve the newly won peace.

Second, was our equally costly failure to understand the revolutionary upheaval in China and its relevance to our future security, following the collapse of the Manchu Empire in 1911.

Third, was our success in meeting the Nazi threat to Western Europe.

Fourth, was our brilliant and decisive response to the challenge posed by the postwar economic and political chaos in Europe.

Fifth, and finally, we now face a deepening crisis in India's economic and political development which may determine, for good or ill, not only the course of events in Asia and Africa, but the future relationship of the whole underdeveloped world to the Atlantic powers, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and Communist China, on the other.

The adequacy of our response to this fifth challenge is at present uncertain.

Now let us briefly examine our reaction to each of the first four areas of decision in the hope that it may provide us with a fresh perspective in dealing with the fifth.

There is little need for more than a brief reference to the consequences of our failure to join the League of Nations in 1919.

In 1917 the United States had entered World War I as an innocent newcomer to international politics. Fortunately, we entered it under the leadership of a President who realized that the world of 1914 had vanished forever.

Recently, it has been fashionable to dismiss Woodrow Wilson as a visionary. And yet his vision was rooted in a higher realism, a clearer sense of the nature of reality, than almost any of his contempories.

Over and over again Wilson warned us that if we rejected his vision and seceded from the emerging world community, we would not only "break the heart of the world" but that we would pay for our failure in blood.

"There will come, sometime," he warned us, "in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men of America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the people of the world."

But the habits of isolationism were still strong, and its advocates skillful and determined. We had acted generously enough, they said, in sending our boys overseas to "solve Europe's problems."

Now it was time to bring them home, to keep them home, and to accept Mr. Harding's call for a return to normalcy.

And so Woodrow Wilson was repudiated, and his League of Nations was rejected. America, which could have provided the spirit and the sinews necessary for world order, turned its back on the future.

The historical judgment of 2000 A.D. upon America's withdrawal from world responsibility in 1919 will be severe.

Now let us consider the second great area of decision which grew out of the challenge of the Chinese reevolution.

In 1911, after 2,000 years of remarkable continuity, the Chinese Empire came to an end. It collapsed under the combined effects of internal decay and the impact of the West. With it collapsed the ideology of Confucianism which had acted as a social cement for much of China's long history.

Now since the mid-18th century Americans had had a special regard for the Chinese people and many close connections with China. American merchants, missionaries, doctors, and teachers had traveled to China by the thousands. Additional thousands of young Chinese had graduated from American universities.

With our acquisition of the Philippines in 1898 and our "open door" policy, America became a Pacific power with an officially declared interest in the preservation of China's territorial integrity.

We were admirably positioned, therefore, to understand the physical and psychological needs of the emerging new China and to exert a positive and perhaps decisive influence over economic and political developments there.

Yet we were so busy watching the soaring stock market, listening to our new jazz bands, and enjoying the benefits of our booming economy that only a handful of farsighted Americans were even conscious of the challenge.

When in 1920 and 1921 Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the Chinese revolution urgently asked for substantial loans with which to further the unification and economic development of China, we abruptly turned him down.

And so, after a similar turndown in Western Europe, Sun Yat-sen reluctantly turned to Moscow for the help which the Atlantic Nations had denied him.

Although the Bolsheviks were still wrestling with one another over the internal problems generated by their own revolution, they recognized the stakes which were being played for in China and eagerly grasped the opportunity. Had not Lenin himself asserted that the road to Paris runs through Peiping and Calcutta?

By 1923 Soviet technicians, political advisers, and capital began flowing into China.

At the Washington Disarmament Conference the year before, the Harding administration had compounded our failure to help bolster the Chinese economy by agreeing unilaterally to dispense with a major part of our new Navy. By this action we turned over effective military control of the Western Pacific to Japan and opened the door for the series of aggressions which later led to Pearl Harbor.

In 1927, when Sun's successor, Chiang Kai-shek, turned against the Communists and outlined his plans to establish a modernized non-Communist state, we were granted another opportunity to retrieve past mistakes. But once again we were content with a policy of benevolent aloofness.

In 1931 the Japanese Army moved into Manchuria. Firm American action there might still have checked Japanese aggression and given China her chance. But once more the opportunity was lost.

At the League of Nations in Geneva, crisis-weary Britain and France refused to act. And in spite of Secretary of State Stimson's earnest efforts to assert American leadership from Washington, our Government was unwilling to go further than moral lectures and the ineffective doctrine of nonrecognition.

There is no need to dwell on the grim and unhappy story of China since 1931. The 1930's found us caught up in our own problems, unwilling to provoke the naval power of Japan or to give the wobbly Chinese Government the assistance it needed so desperately.

No one knows precisely when we finally lost our capacity to influence events in China.

Some observers assert that as late as 1941 a comprehensive American military, political, and economic effort might have provided an effective democratic alternative to communism. By the end of the war, however, it had become clear that nothing less than massive American military intervention could change the course of events. In view of our

war weariness such drastic action was not even proposed.

So it was that we failed to meet the second great foreign policy challenge of our century. We will live with the consequences of this failure for generations to come.

The third challenge was one which we belatedly but effectively recognized and met.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt had a powerful sense of history. He understood that we had sprung from Europe and were irrevocably a part of Europe. He understood that a Europe under Nazi domination would mean a world in which America's own freedom could not long survive.

Beginning with his "quarantine the aggressor" speech in 1938, Franklin Roosevelt began gradually to move the American people toward a similar understanding.

In early September 1939, when the Nazis moved across the Polish border, our first instinct was withdrawal and isolationism.

Yet the old myths of self-sufficiency were weakening. We had begun belatedly to recognize the interdependence of nations. And so in Britain's darkest and finest hour we came to her support.

In the following years American industry and military power provided the decisive power that crushed the totalitarian forces which American membership in the League of Nations might have kept from exploding into aggression in the first place.

The fourth challenge began to take shape soon after the end of hostilities in Europe.

Western Europe's cities were in ruins from years of bombing and street fighting. Food, fuel, and building materials were inadequate. The entire European economy was on the verge of collapse, with mounting inflation everywhere.

In the meantime a few hundred miles away in East Germany and Poland stood nearly 200 Soviet Army divisions ready and able to roll, almost unopposed, to the English Channel.

The American people had been looking eagerly to a crisis-free future of peace and plenty. We had disbanded our armies, put our ships in mothballs, converted our defense factories to peaceful production, and settled down again to enjoy the world's highest living standard.

Then, suddenly and alarmingly, thoughtful Americans began to sense the new threat to world peace which was rapidly taking shape.

The initial Soviet move was aimed at Greece and Turkey, where the balancing power of British diplomacy and military forces, which had traditionally blocked Russia from the Mediterranean, was no longer effective.

Simultaneously all through Western Europe Communist parties which had been effectively associated with resistance to Nazism were vigorously on the move to sow confusion, to establish united fronts, and ultimately to seize power.

At this critical moment we were fortunate to have in our State Department a man with a deep-seated sense of Europe's past and of our relation to Europe's future. I refer to Dean Acheson, who perhaps more than any other American understood the nature of the challenge and our responsibility to meet it.

We were equally fortunate in having as our Secretary of State in 1947–48 Gen. George Marshall, a towering figure of integrity and intelligence.

In Harry Truman we had a President whose raw courage and unswerving sense of purpose will assure him a privileged position in the history of our times.

And in Congress there were Vandenberg of Michigan, Herter of Massachusetts, Russell of Georgia, Fulbright of Arkansas, and many other men of vision and toughness—Republicans and Democrats alike—who understood what was required of us and who did not hesitate to act.

The men and the crisis came together, and the result was a brilliant creative national effort that checked the Soviet military, political, and economic threat, rebuilt the foundations of a new free Europe, and in all probability saved us from a third world war.

The Truman doctrine for the defense of Greece and Turkey was followed by the Marshall plan for the economic and political recovery of Western Europe, then the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the military defense of Western Europe, and the dramatic Berlin airlife with which we demonstrated we had the will as well as the resources.

In 1949 through the point 4 proposal of aid to underdeveloped areas, we again broke new ground to create the working framework for a constructive partnership with Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

These were years of brilliant, creative, nonpartisan response to an unprecedented challenge. They were years in which our leaders led, and the American people, aroused and informed, responded with the dedication and intelligence which mark a great Nation.

We come now to the fifth in this series of momentous situations which have tested us Americans in the first 60 years of this century.

This fifth challenge is now only gradually coming to be understood. But unless we muster the determination and the means to cope with it, the price of failure may be even more costly than our failure to understand the challenge posed by the upheaval in China.

In the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th, world peace could be said to rest almost exclusively on the balance of power in Europe. Since the end of the Second World War, this has been fundamentally changed.

Hundreds of millions of Asians and Africans who once responded to orders from London, Paris, and The Hague have become free from colonial control. Inevitably the emergence of these new and underdeveloped nations has given American foreign policy new and far broader dimensions.

The situation has been further compounded by the fact that this revolutionary development has occurred at precisely the time when our modern technology is widening the already highly explosive gap between the rich white minority, most of whom live around the North Atlantic basin, and the poor colored majority, who live largely in the southern hemispheres.

Meantime, moving towards the forefront in world affairs, is the new Chinese giant, intent on overnight industrialization, with 630 million dynamic people, a doctrinaire, aggressive leadership, inadequate natural resources, and a tempting military vacuum rich in much that China needs, just beyond her southeastern borders.

Finally, there is the Soviet Union, with a steel capacity of 60 million tons, an annual rate of industrial growth nearly three times our own, graduating twice as many engineers and scientists, and with enormous military power.

Since her early clumsy efforts in China, the Soviet Union has understood the decisive importance of the underdeveloped areas. In recent years her leaders have developed a new flexibility, new subtlety, and new economic and political skill in dealing with them.

Against this complex background the decisive significance of India comes into clear perspective. Her population is equal to that of Africa and Latin America combined, her resources are substantial, her geographic position strategic, her government democratic and fiercely independent, her future highly uncertain.

The physical and strategic importance of India is further underscored by her immense political importance. Hundreds of millions of Asians and Africans are coming to see that the only practical political and economic alternative to the ruthlessly totalitarian program of Communist China is the pragmatic approach of democratic India.

If India with all her advantages of able leadership, a competent civil service, trained technician, substantial resources, and the great tradition of Gandhi, fails in her attempt to bring widening economic opportunities to her people through democratic means, how could less well endowed new nations hope to succeed?

And if they in their frustration throw in their lot with Communist totalitarianism, what happens to the global balance of power?

But let us also consider the impact on these same nations if India succeeds; if India achieves a satisfactory measure of economic growth and of political stability, if the billion or more people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America see that the people of India have been assured individual freedom, increasing justice, and a sense of personal belonging, as well as more food, clothing, schools, hospitals, and houses—then the cause of orderly growth in the decisive underdeveloped areas through non-Communist means will have won a crucial victory and the outlook for a rational and peaceful world will be greatly improved.

The challenge to American policymakers growing out of this unprecedented combination of forces began to be apparent in the early 1950's. Several of us who were directly exposed to these forces at that time stressed the need for an entirely new American response to what we believed to be the new realities of world power in Asia and Africa.

But in diplomacy, as in other forms of human endeavor, old habits of mind often persist long after their relevance has passed. While the Soviet Union has been learning new tactics and developing new sources of power, the United States has clung on to old responses and old concepts.

Indeed, until recently India's significance has been obscured by official irritation over Indian neutralism, confusion over India's economic prospects, and lack of understanding of the profound consequences of the Asian and African revolution in which India stands as the central force.

In April 1956, India finished a successful first 5-year plan. Her second 5-year plan, scheduled for completion in April 1961, will fall somewhat short of its relatively modest objectives. The bolder third 5-year plan which follows may be politically, as well as economically, decisive—not simply to India but to the long arc of non-Communist, but uncertain, new nations which stretch from Korea to Ghana.

Since 1951 the United States has provided India with considerable capital, many technicians, and large quantities of wheat. If India is to fulfill her minimum political and economic objectives, this program must now be sharply increased.

Our aid must be long term and adequate. It must be given wisely, sensitively, and without political strings. It must be provided not as a substitute for other badly needed grants and loans to smaller nations, but as an additional effort in behalf of nations whose strategic importance is paramount to the future of two whole continents.

Now let us look the situation squarely in the face: No one can be sure that an adequate, well administered American aid program will assure India's success. Nor can we predict that without such aid India and the other new nations will certainly collapse and that communism will become the major force in the underdeveloped continents.

Yet our present capacity to tip the scales on the side of freedom is very substantial indeed. Thus the fifth great foreign policy decision of our century comes into focus.

Are we willing to throw our weight onto the scales on what may be democracy's ultimate test in Asia?

Are American leaders prepared to call once again on the American people for forthright, understanding, creative political and economic action on a question of profound importance to their future?

To an undetermined extent the President's recent trip to Asia appears to have opened the administration's mind to the opportunity and the challenge. Yet now as in the case of the four other critical decisions, timid men in high places are counseling postponement and inaction.

They are saying now, as they said of the Marshall plan, "A major effort in Asia and Africa is a political impossibility in an election year."

"How can we act effectively under a divided Government with the President of one party and the Congress of the other?"

"The American people simply do not understand the needs—and they are tired of crises anyway."

"America cannot afford the money, and even if we could, it would be inflationary."

"Congress will never agree to the necessary long-range planning."

Now these are the selfsame defeatist arguments which in 1947 and 1948 were thrown at the Truman administration and its bipartisan supporters in Congress, when they proposed to rebuild and defend Europe.

To their everlasting honor and glory, these men set aside political advantage to reject these arguments out of hand.

They took their case to the American people, told them what was needed, and won their overwhelming support.

Today our total national output of goods and services is double what it was in those days. There are idle men and idle resources ready to be put to work. The inflationary consequences are immeasurably less. And the total additional cost of a truly adequate economic effort in all of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is only half the cost of the Marshall plan.

In 1947 and 1948 our leaders acted with insight and courage. As a result new life was breathed into Europe, new political and economic foundations were created on the ruins of the old, and 400 million war-weary people were set on the high road to prosperity, freedom, and peace.

In 1960 are we prepared to act in behalf of freedom not only in crucially important India but other parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as we did in behalf of Europe in 1947?

Are we ready to recruit the necessary able men and women—regardless of party—as we did in the days of the Marshall plan?

Are we ready to bypass the custodians of the past who seek our aid largely to bolster their own privileged positions and to work with the democratic builders of the future?

I believe the American people are ready to be told the requirements. And once informed of what needs to be done, I believe they will offer their support as they offered it in the years following the war, and that we will then proceed to add one more brilliant chapter to the history of democratic government in America.

I do not say that our failure to act will set the Red army marching through the streets of Washington or even New Delhi.

What I do say—and I say it with profound conviction—is that half-way measures may cause us to lose democracy's last opportunity to influence the course of events in Asia, and ultimately in Africa and Latin America as well.

In this century we have thrown away two similar opportunities to help produce a more secure world. On two equally decisive occasions we acted wisely, boldly, and well.

The fifth great foreign policy decision of our century is now at the top of our national agenda: What do we propose to do about it?

One Man's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a weekly newspaper editor in Plains, Mont., has written a telling commentary on some of the so-called children's television programs. I ask unanimous consent to insert the column in the Appendix of the RECORD. It appeared in the January 21 issue of the Plainsman, and was written by the publisher, Mr. Don Coe.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plainsman, Plains, Mont., Jan. 21, 1960]

ONE MAN'S OPINION

Sometimes we wonder if it's worth it—all this argument over what TV system is best for Plains. These fits of depression usually come after watching some of the shows channel 4 sends out over the air. We mention channel 4 because that's the only one we look at. The other channels undoubtedly as bad.

This mood was brought on primarily by a program we were fortunate enough to miss. Mrs. C. rarely watches a show by herself but the kingpin of the family had the set on and when he left it blared away without any watchers although Mrs. C. did hear snatches of the conversation.

Let me tell you about it.

It was a shoot 'em up western and the bad guy had succeeded in alienating the affection of the beautiful blond wife of the good guy. To make a half hour story short, the good guy didn't cotton to the idea and, in effect, told the bad guy to keep his cotton pickin' hands off his blond.

And, as in all westerns, there was some shooting and the good guy got it pretty bad where it hurt most—but he wasn't quite dead.

When the bad guy stepped up to put another bullet into the good guy to finish him off, the blond had a touch of remorse and begged him not to do it. The clincher comes next, when the bad guy, obviously intent on putting the good guy out of his misery, says, and we quote: "It's the Christian thing to do."

That was enough for Mrs. C. who broke race records in turning the thing off, so we really don't know if that Christian act of murder was ever carried out.

This thing confuses us quite a little, because it might be possible these episodes have been going on all the time and as we get older we notice them more. Or, more probable, it could be that script writers are gradually adding a little more of the seamy side to each show in the assumption we'll never notice it.

But when such things as the above take place, and Dobie Gillis' father repeatedly says "I'm going to murder that boy," in a show designed especially for teenagers, it's getting to be more than we can swallow.

And we're not purists, either.

The Municipal Government of Washington, D.C., Starves the Fine Arts at the Very Time the Soviet Union Is Spending Vast Sums To Prove Americans Are Cultureless Barbarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of Delaware, and one of the country's leading architects, Samuel E. Homsey, has written me to say that Communist countries are spending vast sums on propaganda to prove that Americans are cultureless barbarians.

It is important to note, in this connection, that a study made at my request by the Library of Congress shows that the municipal government of Washington, D.C., spends less money on the fine arts than any other major U.S. city. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia seems content to let the Federal Government or private benefactors support the arts. Such a course would be unthinkable in any European capital city or, indeed, even in any large provincial city in Europe or the U.S.S.R.

The Library of Congress reported on the financial support given the fine arts by 38 U.S. cities: Baltimore, for instance, gives $448,588; Philadelphia $789,760; St. Louis, $320,007.53; Los Angeles, $196,998; Kansas City $155,789; San Francisco $817,256; and New York City $4,718,824. The study showed Washington, D.C., which is considerably larger—and richer per capita—than San Francisco, gives only $16,000 to the fine arts. This sum compares favorably only with the $12,500 which Hagerstown, Md., gives to the fine arts.

In a provocative article entitled "In Culture, Is Washington a Hick Town?" by its distingiushed music critic, Howard Taubman, the New York Times said on December 27, 1959, that—

> Compare Washington with a small capital capital like Brussels, which has opera, ballet, orchestra, theaters and a highly cultivated population, and the outcome is to our discredit. Compare Washington with a provincial town like Tifiis, more than a thousand miles from Moscow. The Soviet city beyond the Caucasus has an opera house, a ballet, four professional theaters, several children's theaters and a proud cultural tradition.

I have cosponsored with Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a bill to provide that 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia be set aside in a special fund to defray in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the Washington Opera Society, and other nonprofit art and cultural programs of the Nation's Capital.

In introducing a companion measure to by bill in the Senate, which has been cosponsored in the House by our able

colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], and others, Senator HUMPHREY said—

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have consistently supported measures to improve the city of Washington and to make it an even more beautiful and pleasant city in which to live. I shall continue to support such programs because I believe it is in the best interest not only of the city of Washington but the United States itself. After all, Washington is a picture window through which the people of other nations look and draw their judgments about America. Washington should represent the artistic and cultural aspirations of the American people. Unfortunately, all too little has been done to promote the arts in the Nation's Capital.

I include as part of my remarks the New York Times article entitled "In Culture, Is Washington a Hick Town?"

IN CULTURE, IS WASHINGTON A HICK TOWN?—AS THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND A WORLD CAPITAL, WITH VISITORS FROM EVERY LAND, IT MUST, IT IS ARGUED, BECOME A SHOWPLACE OF THE BEST WE HAVE TO OFFER

(By Howard Taubman)

WASHINGTON.—The indictment is often made: Washington is a hick town culturally. Residents of the Capital and its environs respond indignantly that this is a canard invented by supercilious New Yorkers and envious foreigners. They marshal evidence and arguments in defense. Their voices rise, their emotions become involved. Are they sensitive about the charge? You bet they are. If they weren't, they add, would Washington have made the cultural advances scored in recent years?

What is the truth? Is Washington a hick town or a world capital when it comes to culture? No one can seriously assert that the city exercises any influence in the arts that compares even remotely with the shadow it casts in politics and economics. No one can dispute the thesis that compared with capitals like London, Paris, and Moscow, the American Capital is a provincial community in the arts.

It is unjust, Washingtonians protest, to equate their city with such capitals as London, Paris, and Moscow, because they are world metropolitan centers comparable with New York. But it is not that easy to clear Washington of cultural responsibility. At home and abroad it bulks as a great international center.

Throughout the year hordes of sightseers invade Washington. They come from every part of the country, in family groups, in fraternal and civic delegations, in school units. They make the stations of the national monuments. They gape at the buildings, for the greater part, so unvaried, ponderous, and official. Nevertheless, they bring respect and affection. They are moved by the city's closeness to the history that is their heritage. They even poke into the museums. Watch them in the National Gallery—groups of plain Americans standing before some of the great masterpieces the Western World has produced. They may not grasp the nuances of achievement, but they are stirred by the works of art. For many it is a first encounter with an original of Raphael or Rembrandt.

As the Nation's Capital, Washington has another mission besides being a tourist center. It is the city to which the diplomats of nations around the globe are sent. It is the city to which heads of foreign states, great and small, come to visit and negotiate, and so do their ministers, parliamentary leaders, military men, and other principal government servants. It is the city which provides foreigners with an official image of the United States.

There is awareness of this truth in the effort of Government leaders, residents of Washington and interested citizens elsewhere to obtain a national culture center for the Capital. Congress has authorized such a development, the architectural plans were made public recently, and a nationwide campaign for $61 million will soon be launched.

Everyone agrees that Washington is no longer a village, set implausibly on a dank flatland beside a tidal river to make sure that local interests would not exert too great a pull on the Federal Government. It has grown not only into the central seat of a world power but also into a big city. Metropolitan Washington, which includes the city proper and the bedroom communities in Maryland and Virginia, has a population of about 2 million and is expanding so rapidly that it is expected almost to double its size within the next two decades. It is big enough to have its own major league baseball and football teams. What has it to show in a cultural balance sheet?

In the plastic and graphic arts it has cause for satisfaction. Its public museums and its privately run galleries provide a lively representation of the classics and the contemporary scene. Institutions like the National Gallery, with its splendid collection; the Corcoran Gallery, the Phillips Gallery and the Institute of Contemporary Art have varied services that cover not only painting and sculpture but also music, lectures, and films.

In music the rating is variable. The National Symphony is a vigorous, ambitious ensemble, not yet first rate but steadily improving. The opera society is capable and aims high as far as it goes, but it is merely a brave beginning. Chamber music is abundant and of high quality, thanks to endowments entrusted to the Library of Congress. There are concerts by touring attractions, programs in the churches and schools, amateur events in town and out in the suburbs.

In the dance there is very little. The Washington Ballet, which was begun a couple of years ago, is still in the formative stages and ventures on an occasional performance. Otherwise, dependence is largely on visiting companies.

In the theater the record is poor. If it were not for the Arena stage, it would be miserable. There is only one other home for professional theater, the National, which plays host to tryouts and road companies. The Arena stage, with its sense of adventure and continuity, has developed a faithful audience and looks at last to be secure. But it has had a struggle, and even today its public represents a tiny fraction of the audience that the National Capital should assure. There are amateur efforts scattered throughout the area, and the work of the colleges, particularly Catholic University, has been unusual in years gone by.

Reading, of course, is one of the prime pursuits in Washington, which is essentially a white-collar city. There is the inevitable concern with studies and reports, and presumably someone reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, though no one has ever accused it of having much literary quality. Books on government and politics and foreign affairs, whether philosophical or gossipy, have a higher currency than in most cities. But genuine literature is a minority preoccupation.

Probably the leading indoor sport is conversation. People don't dine out at glamorous eating places. They meet in social gatherings in the home. Here the life of the mind and spirit is cultivated, if it is cultivated seriously, through books, records, and good talk. There are, of course, many thoughtful, sensitive people in Washington, and their conversation is capable of ranging widely over the gamut of human concerns. In this respect the Capital is like a college town with an impressive intellectual elite. But how often does conversation go beyond the immediate events and personalities of the day's news?

How does Washington compare as a cultural center with other capitals? Let us agree not to judge the city by the criteria of London, Paris, and Moscow, which are their nations' largest urban communities. Let us even skip Rome, which is not Italy's principal economic center but which offers the grandeur of antiquity and the renaissance as well as opera house, ballets, theaters, orchestra, conservatory, and art in abundance.

Compare Washington with a small capital like Brussels, which has opera, ballet, orchestra, theaters and a highly cultivated population, and the outcome is to our discredit. Compare Washington with a provincial town like Tiflis, more than a thousand miles from Moscow. The Soviet city beyond the Caucasus has an opera house, a ballet, four professional theaters, several children's theaters, and a proud cultural tradition.

What is the explanation for Washington's shortcomings? You hear a variety of excuses:

The city is not an industrial center, has no big business and not enough huge fortunes, and these are the sources which nowadays supply the sinews of artistic activity.

The city has a large transient population dependent on the whims of the national electorate every 4 years. As proof of what this means culturally it is pointed out that patronage for plays and concerts in 1953, the changeover year in administrations, dropped sharply.

Like it or not, the city's business, after all, is politics and government, and while its residents embrace a substantial percentage of intelligent, cultivated men and women, they have no choice but to concentrate on affairs of state rather than on artistic trends.

Washington's high society, with honorable exceptions, does not find satisfaction in supporting the arts as extensively as in other great capitals because it is absorbed in a social whirl involving bigwigs in the Government and the diplomatic corps, not forgetting visiting potentates. It has become more glamorous to be a persistently successful hostess than a devoted supporter of the arts.

There is merit in these reasons, though the cause lies deeper. Washington is what it is culturally because it reflects, more truly than it knows or perhaps would like, attitudes prevalent in many parts of the land. But that is not a compelling excuse. For the Capital should set the tone; it should lead. It is not good enough to let Washington off by saying that standards in the things of the mind and spirit are ordinary in many parts of the country.

Granted that the most popular entertainments on television, the successful films and many bestselling books do not meet lofty criteria; granted that in this great prosperous country professional theaters outside of New York are scarce; granted that only a small percentage of our people listen to great music and look at great paintings; granted that the sales figures of the most dazzling bestsellers are a small percentage of the potential reading public, these things do not absolve the Capital City of responsibility; on the contrary, they increase it. Washington should be in the vanguard. It should be a proud national showplace in the arts.

The thousands of American visitors who stream through the city each year should be encouraged not simply to go sightseeing, but to expose themselves to fresh experiences in the arts. The National Symphony, thanks to Mrs. Herbert May, a woman of wealth, devotes a number of weeks in the spring to free concerts for visiting school boys and

girls. But these youngsters should also encounter an eye-opening diversity of theater, opera, and dance. Their fathers, mothers, elder sisters, cousins, and aunts should also find in the Capital a choice and inspiring invitation to cultural adventure.

Thanks to the pressure of the cold war and the competition with the Soviet Union, we have assumed the duty of sending our cultural emissaries abroad to prove that our aspirations touch the mind and spirit as well as the body's comforts. The Congress has appropriated about $2,500,000 each year to help defray the cost of these expeditions of orchestras, soloists, dance troupes, lecturers, and jazz units. And the program has won wide approval.

But think how impressive would be a far-ranging and penetrating cultural life in Washington itself. The Ambassadors and Ministers and their staffs would relish it and report back home accordingly. The foreign visitors, who come in increasing numbers in the era of the jet plane, would not have to be sold a bill of propaganda goods; they could see and hear for themselves.

In the long run, societies and nations are esteemed for their humanity and humanism, not their wealth or might. Their values are revealed most searchingly in the caliber of their learning, science and culture. Washington should be the steadfast showcase of our values. And in the arts this showcase should be large, diverse and vivid. It should embrace what is established and indisputably great, and it should encourage a ferment of new creative ideas. To take the theater as one example: If New York is the sharpest testing ground of commercial productions, why shouldn't Washington set the Nation an example of how exciting a chain of permanent repertory that could be?

But how are such enormous goals to be encompassed?

In the first place, the energy in Washington itself must be released. In a city where policy is made my a few top officials, the habit of initiative has been lulled in many able and imaginative people. The permanent residents, and they are preponderant, must bestir themselves. They must support their institutions and help to create new ones. They should fight hard to prevent the image of the Capital being formed by innocents and know-nothings whom the voters continue to elect and who play a part in making policy for us all.

Seasoned observers in Washington insist that the caliber of our public servants, elected and appointed, has risen markedly. The old Washingtonians and the new who believe in the destiny of the Capital must join hands to promote it.

Secondly, there must be an awareness in the highest echelons of leadership that lipservice in the arts is not enough. The men with informed tastes in the arts in executive, legislative, and judicial positions of importance should propound large-visioned ideals and programs. They must be active and unremitting supporters of all that adorns and ennobles life. When they take action they should be sure that they are acting knowledgeably and wisely.

The National Culture Center, whose noted architect, Edward Durell Stone, recently made public his designs, is a spectacular case in point. The drawings and blueprints suggest that Washington will get another stately mansion, a vast, domed temple devoted to the performing arts. Congress has voted an attractive 10-acre site near the Potomac. There are detailed reports on how the setting will be beautified. One hears that the multipurpose structure will contain an opera house, a concert hall, a theater, auditoriums, a grand salon useful as a ballroom, restaurants, and outdoor terraces.

One discovers that the center will be employed for elaborate state occasions like inaugural balls and the reception of distinguished foreigners. One is cheered by the news that it will become a tourist attraction for Americans not even interested in the arts. One reads that a Cabinet member thinks that the center will give the coup de grace to the scornful criticism "that America is culturally a primitive nation."

Unhappily, there is little or no discussion as to what will be performed or who will perform it in the various performance areas. Presumably the National Symphony and various touring attractions will have a new forum. But there is no mention of anything else that is indigenous to Washington, of anything that has been created out of the Capital's own ingenuity and enthusiasm. The Arena Stage and Opera Society, both homegrown and worthwhile, have scarcely been consulted.

Thirdly, there must be an adequate financial basis for progress. Consider the case of the National Culture Center again. The hope is that it will be financed by contributions from individuals and institutions all over the United States. But will ceaseless money-raising campaigns be required to fill it the year round and year after year with vital presentations? The boxoffice, we know, will not turn the trick. Is the answer some sort of Government subsidy?

Strong men blanch when such a suggestion is made in Washington. But some congressional voices have been raised in favor of a national instrumentality for promoting and aiding the arts. The problems are manifold, and the touchiest would be the danger of political interference. But if the alternative is to let nature take its course, which means a moderate, instead of a brilliant cultural position for the Nation's Capital, possibly enlightened Government help can be worked out by men of good will. There is no hue and cry against a Government subsidy of $44 million for an ocean liner like the *United States*. If the Culture Center needs something more than the Government's moral support, let it be made available.

A New Yorker does not wish to be misunderstood. He does not criticize the National Culture Center because he is jealous that another city may come close to matching the forthcoming Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts. As a loyal American he welcomes Washington's cultural center and hopes that in time it will be duplicated in other cities throughout the land.

However, neither plans for a building nor the grand and beautiful new edifice itself should be the ultimate goal. A cultural center justifies itself by the artistic life it generates. A new cultural center in Washington can be useful and crative, but it must be conceived with a vision of what it will create.

This vision must be part of a larger one that encompasses the noble role the Capital should play in the Nation's cultural life. For all the progress Washington has made in recent years, gigantic strides remain to be taken, and the best efforts of all of the city's elements, including the Government, will be needed to make the capital a proud showplace of a humane people's artistic concerns and achievements.

We Should Promote Demand for Dairy Products Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the world today is becoming a smaller place—because of technological and scientific advances—in which to live.

The interests of nations—economic, political, military, cultural—are becoming more closely interrelated.

We realize, of course, that the nations of the free world, to outstrip the Communist competition, must depend upon healthy economies.

In view of these factors, it is increasingly important, I believe, for more and more of our industries, including agriculture, to attempt to find new markets at home and abroad.

The high costs of labor, operations of dairy and farm equipment, taxes, and other expenses, of course, make it difficult for U.S. dairy products to compete on the world market.

This is one of the underlying reasons why I have, again and again, stressed the need for ever-greater research to provide more new ways of utilizing the components of dairy products for home consumption, as well as for competing in international trade.

During recent years, for example, dairy surpluses have amounted to no more than 5 or 6 percent of the total output of the entire dairy industry. However, these surpluses have had a disproportionately oppressive effect on the dairy economy.

If, through creative research, ways, and means could be developed for disposing of this 5 or 6 percent or more of our output, the economic outlook of the dairy industry would be substantially brightened. New markets would be of tremendous help.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer printed an informative editorial entitled, "We Should Promote Demand for Dairy Products Abroad."

Believing the editorial reflects the need for an effort for the development of international markets for the fine products of the dairy industry, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Feb. 6, 1960]

WE SHOULD PROMOTE DEMAND FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS ABROAD

During the last few years dairy surpluses have been running no more than 5 to 6 percent. This surplus is that part of our milk production which we cannot sell to private buyers at support price level.

The Government buys these surpluses to maintain milk prices at or near support level.

Most of this surplus milk goes into cheese, butter and dry milk. With stronger cheese prices in our own country, little has been sold to the Government in recent months. Even the purchase of butter has been dwindling.

Today most of our surplus production goes into nonfat dry milk. Turning surplus milk into nonfat dry milk and taking it off the domestic market is now the biggest single factor in supporting milk prices.

In the process of keeping up milk prices the Government has become the Nation's biggest market for nonfat dry milk. Last year the Government purchased around 40 percent of all the nonfat dry milk made.

Nearly 90 percent of the nonfat dry milk the Government buys is either donated or sold to people overseas. If we add to the Government's overseas shipments that sold

for dollars through commercial channels to foreign buyers, we find that 40 percent of all the nonfat dry milk we produce goes overseas.

So far the dairy industry has been little concerned about this important part of its market. We have largely taken the attitude that Government buys the dry milk, let Government worry about selling it overseas.

And yet can we really afford to take this attitude?

Granted that our Government's donation to foreign countries hardly constitutes a market. Many foreign buyers have purchased nonfat dry milk from the U.S. Government because they could get it at bargain-basement prices or pay for it with their own currency.

But if the people of today's poorer countries learn to like our products, they may well buy them tomorrow when they do have the money. Let's take one example.

For sometime our Government has sold the Japanese Government U.S. surplus foods for a Japanese school lunch program. If these Japanese youngsters learn to like our products, there's an excellent chance they may become important purchasers of them in the future.

Japan is well on her way to becoming one of the world's important manufacturing countries. In the future she undoubtedly will have the dollars to buy our farm products if she wishes to.

Well aware of the importance of foreign markets, wheatgrowers now maintain promotion offices in foreign countries. Like dairy surpluses, much of the U.S. wheat going overseas moves through Government programs.

But the wheatgrowers realize that foreign users must like U.S. wheat if they are going to continue to buy it without U.S. Government assistance. The wheatgrowers know that it is important to build future markets now.

Few farm groups have had so much experience in promoting its products on the home front as the dairy industry. We have done an outstanding job teaching consumers the high nutritional value of dairy foods.

It's time we applied this same knowledge to our overseas markets. We can and should build a geninue demand for our products overseas. And nonfat dry milk would be an excellent place to start.

U.S. Spending Peak of $579 Billion During Ike's Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the RECORD an exhaustive study of Federal spending, written by Mr. Paul Martin, chief of the Washington bureau of Gannett News Service. It appeared in the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News.

I offer this article for the perusal of the Members because of its intrinsic value and the high journalistic standing of its author. The article follows:

U.S. SPENDING PEAK $579 BILLION DURING IKE'S TERMS—EISENHOWER TAX TAKE TOPS 20 YEARS OF THE NEW DEAL

(By Paul Martin)

(The constantly mounting national debt and current operating costs of Government frequently inspire comparisons of national administrations of the last three decades as to money spent and tax revenue demanded. Not always are comparative figures immediately available for a comprehensive picture, but here they are, broken down into their respective categories by the chief of the Gannett News Service Washington bureau for those who would like to get a good view of the fiscal affairs of Government under Presidents F. D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

WASHINGTON.—Since President Eisenhower has submitted his last Federal budget to Congress, it is possible to compare Government spending under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations.

On the assumption that the President's budget estimates will prove to be reasonably accurate for 1960 and 1961, here is what the record shows:

SPENDING

In the 8 fiscal years (1954–61) for which President Eisenhower is responsible, Government spending out of the Treasury general fund will amount to $579.1 billion.

That is 14½ times as much monetary gold as there is in the entire world.

It compares with Government spending of $399.4 billion under former President Truman in his 8 fiscal years (1946–53).

Eisenhower will spend $180 million more in the same period of time than Truman, or 46 percent more.

The spending record for 20 years of the New Deal under Roosevelt and Truman amounted to $755.2 billion, or three-quarters of a trillion dollars.

TAXES

Eisenhower will collect revenue totaling $564.2 billion in his 8-year fiscal regime.

This is 17½ times as much as the total amount of U.S. currency as there is in public circulation today.

It compares with total revenue collections of $372.8 billion during 8 Truman years.

Eisenhower will collect $191.4 billion more taxes than Truman, or a little higher than 50 percent more revenue.

The Eisenhower tax take in 8 years will be more than all of the $536 billion in taxes collected during 20 years of the New Deal.

DEFICITS

President Eisenhower has had four balanced budgets, and four with deficits, for a net deficit of nearly $15 billion during his administration.

Former President Truman had three balanced budgets, and five with deficits, for a net deficit of $26.3 billion during his 8 years.

Despite a solemn pledge to the voters in 1932 to cut Government spending by 25 percent, former President Franklin D. Roosevelt never presented a balanced budget to Congress in his entire 12 years in the White House.

The aggregate deficit for 20 years of the New Deal amounted to $252.3 billion. It accounts for the bulk of the $290 billion national debt today.

Total Government spending in the first 145 years of the United States as a nation amounted to only $113 billion, compared to the astronomical sums which have been collected and spent in the last 28 years.

PUBLIC DEBT

When Harry S. Truman took office as President in 1945, the national debt stood at $258.7 billion.

Interest payments amounted to $3.6 billion a year, and constituted 3.7 percent of all Federal expenditures. Under Truman, interest payments on the public debt rose to $5.9 billion a year.

When Dwight D. Eisenhower became President in 1953, he inherited a $264 billion national debt from the New Deal.

Since then, the public debt has climbed to more than $290 billion. Eisenhower has had to ask Congress on a half-dozen occasions to raise the legal limit on the public debt.

The distressing fact is: These 16 years under Truman and Eisenhower have been the most prosperous America has ever known; yet in net balance there has been no reduction of the national debt.

On the contrary, the debt has gone up under Eisenhower, and interest costs on the debt have risen even faster.

Interest costs have gone up by $3.1 billion, or nearly 50 percent, inside of 8 years. Debt service in the 1961 budget is estimated at $9.6 billion, or 12 percent of all Federal expenditures.

It has cost American taxpayers $61.4 billion to pay for interest costs on the national debt under Eisenhower, compared to interest costs of $44.3 billion under Truman.

PROSPERITY

There are other factors which should be reckoned in the general economic picture. For instance:

U.S. population has increased by 25 million under Eisenhower, compared to 17 million under Truman, creating a larger demand for Government services.

Whereas the gross national product (total output of all goods and services) gained by $39½ billion under Truman, it has jumped by more than $150 billion under Eisenhower.

Personal income has gone up $130 billion under Eisenhower, compared to $102 billion for Truman. There have been substantial gains in both family and per capita income under Eisenhower.

The consumer cost of living as measured by the BLS price index jumped 47 percent in the postwar period under Truman. It has risen less than 10 percent since Eisenhower took office.

In the inflationary period of the Truman regime, the value of the American dollar dropped by 25 cents. It has gone down 4 cents under Eisenhower.

In general, the Eisenhower administration has been a period of greater prosperity, increasing economic stability, and more public confidence in the future.

Nevertheless, it has also been a period of tremendous Government taxing and spending.

CONGRESS

Part of Eisenhower's problem has been the question of "divided Government." For 6 out of his 8 years, the President has had to deal with a Congress ruled by the political opposition. And Congress controls the purse strings of Government.

When Eisenhower took office, with a Congress of his own party in 1953–54, he cut $10.8 billion from the Federal spending budget Truman had proposed for the 1954 fiscal year.

Eisenhower reduced Government spending to a low of $64.6 billion in 1955. Democrats regained control of Congress in that year.

Government spending has been going up ever since, due in part to new programs voted by Congress, due in part to actions taken by the administration.

Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, of the Senate Finance Committee, claims that 75 percent of the increased spending has been for purely domestic-civilian activities, not related to national defense.

Government spending under Eisenhower reached a peacetime peak of $80.7 billion in the 1959 fiscal year, with a record peacetime deficit of $12.4 billion. The previous peak was a $9.4 billion deficit under Truman in 1953.

Truman's budget ranged from a low $33.8 billion in 1948 to a high of $74.6 billion in 1953. During the Truman administration, Government spending averaged $50 billion a year.

During Eisenhower's 8 years in the White House, Federal spending will average $72 billion annually.

Here are significant areas of public spending:

DEFENSE

A major political controversy today concerns whether President Eisenhower has provided adequately for national defense, particularly in military missiles and space activities.

The record shows that Eisenhower has provided $310.1 billion for the Armed Forces in 8 years, compared to $198.2 billion under Truman in the same period of time.

Under Eisenhower, the Pentagon has gotten $112 billion more in military appropriations, or 57 percent more than Truman provided for national defense.

There was erratic planning in the military budget with great ups and downs under Truman. His military expenditures ranged from $45 billion in 1946 at the end of World War II, to a low of $10.9 billion in 1948, to a new peak of $43.6 billion in 1953, last year of the Korean war.

Under Eisenhower, the military budget has been more consistent. It has ranged from $35.5 billion in 1955 to $41.2 billion this year, averaging around $39 billion a year over his 8-year tenure.

Here's a comparison of the military budgets under Truman and Eisenhower:

[In billions]

Truman:	
1946	$45.0
1947	14.3
1948	10.9
1949	11.9
1950	12.3
1951	20.5
1952	39.7
1953	43.6
Eisenhower:	
1954	40.3
1955	35.5
1956	35.8
1957	36.3
1958	39.1
1959	41.2
1960	40.9
1961	41.0

FOREIGN AID

Amounts indicated for military spending are exclusive of additional sums which the Government has spent on atomic energy, foreign military assistance and other defense-related activities.

The postwar record of the U.S. foreign aid program is nearing the $100 billion mark in sums made available for overseas spending through a variety of devices including loans, grants and other forms of assistance.

By the end of his term, Eisenhower will have spent approximately $2½ billion more on foreign aid than Truman did. The record shows that Truman spent $41.3 billion on foreign aid, compared to $43.8 billion spent or obligated under Eisenhower.

The President is asking Congress for new spending authority of $4.2 billion in 1961, a hike of approximately a billion dollars over last year.

At the end of the last fiscal year, there was a carryover of $12½ billion in unexpended balances or new appropriations for foreign aid.

AGRICULTURE

Perhaps the most distressing financial problem of the Eisenhower administration is the matter of farm subsidies for surplus commodities that the American taxpayers don't want and can't use.

Congress has continued, year after year, what is basically the old triple A New Deal price-support program that was devised during a depression, and has long since outlived its usefulness.

Under present estimates, farm subsidies will cost taxpayers a total of $38 billion under Eisenhower, compared to losses of $16 billion under Truman on the price-support program.

Peak spending under Truman was $6.4 billion during the last fiscal year of the Korean war in 1953. The low was $5.75 million in 1948.

The lowest bill for farm subsidies under Eisenhower was $2.6 billion in 1954. Net expenditures on agriculture have run above $4 billion in every year since, reaching a peak of $6.5 billion in 1959.

Farm spending estimates are $5.1 billion this year, and $5.6 billion for 1961.

Foreign aid expenditures and farm subsidies together account for almost half of the total U.S. national debt today.

Stacy May on East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the characteristics of the Soviet economic offensive, in contrast with those of the free world, were delineated by Stacy May of New York, one of our most distinguished economists, in an address delivered at a conference in Washington sponsored by the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Dr. May addressed himself particularly to the question of the free world doing more business with the Soviet bloc. He made the point that a policy of disrupting international trade by dumping goods, especially on unsuspecting newly developing and uncommitted nations, under the auspices of the Soviet-controlled state trading monopolies was a dangerous one.

The way to protect ourselves against damage which more extended trade with the Soviet bloc nations could result in—

Says Dr. May—

is by insisting that Communist bloc nations conform to the same regulatory discipline that we ourselves apply to the trade of free world nations—under GATT antidumping and nondiscriminatory principles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the text of Dr. May's presentation on January 27, 1960, before the Committee for a National Trade Policy.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST-WEST TRADE AND FREE WORLD INTERESTS

(By Stacy May)

There are three separate prongs of a trident thrust that characterizes the Communist bloc economic offensive: (1) the first in importance is without doubt a propaganda and infiltration drive aimed at bringing as much as possible of the world's economy under centralized state controls operating under Communist motivations and ideology. The focus of this drive is directed mainly upon the 1.3 billion inhabitants of the so-called underdeveloped free-world nations, and its principal instrument is the contention that only the Communist system is capable of providing the rapid pace of economic advance that can satisfy the aspirations commonly termed the revolution of rising expectations, (2) the second prong, aimed at the same geographical area, is represented by the Soviet bloc entry into the field of offering development aid and technical assistance to non-Communist nations—a relatively recent drive which may be said to have started about 1954, (3) the third prong is the recently intensified effort of the Soviet block to participate to a greater degree than it has in the recent past in East-West trade.

Soviet development aid preponderantly takes the form of low-interest-rate loans repayable in a manner that closely parallels private transactions in free world trade that normally are not classified as development assistance at all. Thus it would not be inappropriate to compare the total Soviet economic aid commitments to non-Communist nations from 1954 to mid-1959 of $1.6 billion (of which not over one-half had actually been drawn down) with net private capital flows from the United States and Western Europe to underdeveloped areas of about $2.5 billions in 1956 alone, and to say that the assistance component of the Soviet transactions could be measured by the difference between its average 2½ percent interest rate charges and the higher return charged or expected to accure on the Western commercial transactions.

Such an accounting would entirely leave out of consideration of U.S. bilateral aid from World War II to mid-1959 of $19.4 billion, $9.1 billion from other Western industrialized nations, and $3.3 billion of development loans and economic assistance from the IBRD and other United Nations affiliated agencies. In the Western bilateral assistance a very large component represents grant aid upon which there is no interest charge or amortization requirement at all.

Although the Communist bloc comprises something over 33 percent of all the world's peoples, and produces about 25 percent of all its goods and services, the combined international trade of all Communist nations amounts to only about 10 percent of world trade. The preponderant portion of this trade flows between fellow members of the Sino-Soviet bloc. By no definition could they be classified as among the trade-oriented nations.

The weight of their trade in the free world trading system is even less impressive. In 1959 Communist countries supplied only about 3.4 percent of free world imports and took only 3.3 percent of free world exports, both fractionally lower than their percentage position in 1958. This contrasts with a relative position amounting to 6 to 7 percent which the countries now embraced in the bloc accounted for in 1928, 1937, and 1938. The East European satellites conduct about half of the bloc's East-West trade, Communist China about one-sixth, and the dominant U.S.S.R. only about two-sixths.

Upon what evidence, then, is the assumption of an intensified trade drive on the part of the bloc premised? In part, at least, the explanation lies in the very short time perspective upon which most of those who recently have been paying attention to problems in this field operate. East-West trade as a proportion of total free world trade had been declining steadily from a

relative position comparable to current levels in 1947 and 1948 to a scant 2 percent of total free world trade in 1952 and 1953. From that point on, it has been increasing very substantially in absolute magnitudes, and much more modestly in relative terms. By looking only at the year-by-year growth in the value of East-West trade transactions over a 6-year period an impressive and often an alarming case for bloc permeation of free world trade markets could be established.

However, there is much more to the picture than has been set forth above. Upon a selective basis, and reflecting at least to an important degree Communist bloc conceptions of where particular advantages might be served in cold war strategy, trade with particular countries outside their orbit has been built up to proportions that dwarf those pertaining to East-West trade generally. Thus East-West trade for the year 1958 accounted for the following percentages of the total trade of these countries:

	Percent of exports	Percent of imports
1. Egypt	44	29
2. Iceland	35	32
3. Syria	31	12
4. Yugoslavia	29	28
5. Iran	26	9
6. Finland	25	26
7. Turkey	24	18
8. Uruguay	21	5
9. Greece	16	7
10. Austria	14	11
11. Jordan	10	3
12. Malaya-Singapore	10	5
13. Hong Kong	6	31
14. Burma	3	12
15. Afghanistan (1956)	28	36

In each of the above cases the degree of trade dependence upon the bloc is considerable enough to wield some influence, and in most of them a bloc interest in exerting such an influence is not too difficult to conjure up. There does seem to be evidence of an increasing Soviet bloc recognition of the role that trade can play in forwarding its general strategy, and of a readiness to exploit this at least upon a selective basis even in cases where it means importing or exporting limited supplies of commodities where the exchange offers doubtful advantage to the bloc in strictly economic terms.

There are additional signs, however, that can be read as reflecting a clearer interest in promoting exchanges that have a more direct economic motivation. In the early thirties the U.S.S.R. exported considerable quantities of butter that certainly was not in surplus supply to pay for crucially important imports of foreign machinery. More recently short-supply timber has been exported along with tin and aluminum, and the future may well see increased offerings of such items as petroleum, grain and diamonds from U.S.S.R., consumers' durables from the East European satellites and textiles from Red China if chemical manufacturing equipment and other wanted machinery is available from the West. Additionally, an increasing proliferation of Soviet participation in world trade fairs may well be motivated by an interest in increased trade as well as for the general propaganda value of demonstrating industrial progress.

MAJOR DIFFERENCES IN THE TWO TRADING SYSTEMS

No generalized description of any trading system can be drawn without qualifying exceptions, but it is not difficult to distinguish major differences in the dominant patterns of free world and Communist trade.

It may be said of trade between free world nations that, characteristically:

(a) Transactions are conducted by private trader-purchasers seeking the best values in terms of price, quality and service in whatever markets they are offered, and sellers seeking the most profitable outlets for their products wherever such outlets are to be found.

(b) Most transactions are conducted in transferable currencies. The money earned by exports from one country to another may or may not be spent upon the exports of the latter; that will depend upon whether or not it can offer something that is wanted on attractive terms.

(c) The principle of nondiscrimination is generally observed. Each major trading nation within this system, by subscribing to GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—has agreed that the prices and terms governing its trade with one member of the system shall apply to all others equally, with any exceptions to be submitted to GATT for approval.

On the other side, it may be said of trade conducted by Communist bloc countries that, characteristically:

(a) It is handled by state trading monopolies, organized to handle all foreign trading in specified lines and generally responsive to Foreign Department political direction. There is no internal competition with respect to any foreign sale or purchase transaction.

(b) Payments for imports on the Communist side are generally made in nontransferable currencies, that is they must be spent within the Communist country in question for export goods offered by one or another of its state trading monopolies. Often, there is a barter arrangement calling for specific amounts of goods to be exchanged on either side, and most of the bloc trade with free world countries is conducted under bilateral trade and payments agreements negotiated on a government-to-government basis.

(c) By their very nature, these bilateral agreements are custom made, and the prices on both sides of the negotiated exchanges are individually bargained. Therefore, discrimination between customers in these transactions is the rule rather than the exception. When Mr. Khrushchev declares that "It is high time to do away with the bankrupt policy of discrimination in trade * * *" he clearly is thinking of Western controls over strategic trade, or possibly of U.S. restrictions on credits to countries willfully in default of financial obligations to the United States. There is no indication that he is even considering modification of the Soviet trade practices that are inherently discriminatory.

WHICH PATTERN OF TRADE ARRANGEMENTS SHALL GOVERN?

Before we jump to quick conclusions about the advantage to free world countries of expanding importantly their trade with the Communist bloc it is relevant to ask: Under whose terms of reference is such trade to be conducted?

Since in recent years only 2 to 3½ percent of free world trade has been with the bloc, it might be assumed that such East-West trade as exists would be conducted under the established rules of the system predominant in size.

If such an assumption were made, it would be false. Paradoxically, to use the kind of metaphor that spiced so much of Mr. Khrushchev's speech here, the Communist tail in this case has been allowed to wag the free world dog. It is estimated that over 70 percent of all East-West trade transactions in a recent year were conducted between countries in which Communist initiated trade and payments agreements were in force.

When the typical trade transaction is between competing private business entities on one side and monolithic state monopolies on the other, many of the issues that our antitrust law structure was created to resolve are raised in an acute form. I shall not elaborate the point, since the implications will be obvious to this audience.

Let me cite a few examples of "nuisance descriptions" by the Soviet bloc:

1. On the matter of nondiscrimination in export pricing, which is basic to the maintenance of competitive relationships in the free world trading system, a recent study of the Rand Corp. shows:

(a) A wide divergence in prices charged by the U.S.S.R. for wheat shipments in a given period to various West European countries; wheat sales to Norway carried a price tag 25 percent higher than contemporary shipments to Sweden, the United Kingdom and Holland.

(b) Similarly, there was a 25 percent spread between the high and low prices on U.S.S.R. cotton shipments to Finland, France, England, Italy, West Germany and the Netherlands with Finland on the high price end and Holland on the low.

(c) Less drastic but appreciable discrimination appeared in the prices charged Italy and France for Soviet crude oil shipments during 1957.

(d) Quite generally, the Soviet charged its East European satellites more and paid them less for imports and exports respectively than it charged and paid in comparable trade transactions with free European countries. This conclusion was based upon a study of 40 Soviet exports and 20 imports that were traded by the U.S.S.R. with both its satellites and Western Europe during each of 3 recent years.

This last reference may be important chiefly as an example of the cost to any nation of a dominant reliance upon the U.S.S.R. as a trading partner. Alternatively, it may be evidence of Soviet pricing in free world markets at less than economic levels in order to win entry there. In either case it is difficult to see how this record of discriminatory pricing can be reconciled with Mr. Khrushchev's claim of adherence to the principle of nondiscrimination.

2. There is a comparable record that shows persistent violations of the rules against dumping set up through GATT accord.

Under GATT definition, dumping takes place when:

a. The sales price for an exported item is set at a figure lower than that charged for the same item under like circumstances to domestic market buyers.

b. Export sales to a foreign buyer in one country are priced lower than those made to a customer in another country.

c. Export sales are made at a price lower than cost plus a reasonable markup for sales expense and profit.

On each one of these counts it is feasible to document a case demonstrating that dumping is a prevailing characteristic of Communist bloc export practice, or at least of U.S.S.R. practice.

On the first count, a number of studies reveal that U.S.S.R. internal prices on a wide variety of raw and semifabricated materials that are also exported average about double the export price quotations when the latter are transmitted into rubles at the relevant rate of 5 to $1.

The second criterion of whether or not exports are offered to one market at prices lower than those charged to another is merely a restated definition of price discrimination. A number of instances of differential export pricing that amounts to discrimination already have been cited.

On the third test, of whether or not export prices are less than production cost plus reasonable sales cost and profit, the nonavailability of relevant Soviet accounts makes the marshaling of conclusive evidence difficult. But the pattern of certain U.S.S.R. metal offerings on Western markets in recent years presents strong circumstantial evidence of pricing below cost.

Tin offers one example. As of mid-1955 the U.S.S.R. internal price for tin ingot was quoted by official sources at a price some 10 times the wholesale price then prevailing in the U.S. market. Although the U.S.S.R. is a consistent net importer of tin, it exported 10,000 tons in 1957 and 17,000 tons in 1958, at a time when the market was vulnerable, at prices well below world market range and below the price which it was then paying its Chinese supplier.

Needless to say, this brought prompt and vehement charges of dumping from Bolivia, Indonesia, Malaya and Thailand, and after quotas were placed on U.S.S.R. shipments by a number of importing countries, Russia agreed "voluntarily" to limit its 1959 tin exports to 13,500 tons.

Aluminum offers a second example. After an initial earlier fling at aluminum exports, followed by a year's withdrawal, U.S.S.R. intensified an aluminum export drive in 1957, once more at a time when world supply was in overproduction. The effort was focused on the British market, with prices quoted at from 1¼ cents to almost 2 cents under prevailing quotations with a stipulation that these margins would be maintained if the Canadian price were cut. As in the case of tin, U.S.S.R. internal prices for aluminum had been reported previously as considerably higher than world market.

Canada stoutly protested, and in the face of threatened reprisals, the U.S.S.R. agreed to cut its annual shipment rate from 22,000 to 15,000 tons. Again there is a presumptive but unprovable case of a deliberate attempt to disrupt a market. In any event, the form of the bid, with its agreement to cut price by a stipulated margin below any price that Canada might quote, is one that demonstrates a complete divorce between internal cost considerations and price quotation.

Certainly, I have given enough documentation to show that, even at its present small dimension, Communist bloc trade can do considerable mischief to free world markets if they allow it to be conducted on Communist terms. If this trade were to continue growing at the rate of the past 5 years, it might well bulk sufficiently large 10 years hence to become a menace instead of a nuisance. It is the part of wisdom to insist now that East-West trade be conducted according to the rules that the West has established and which it enforces with respect to the trade of one free world nation with another.

HOW TO ENFORCE GATT RULES

At least with respect to the Soviet bloc undermining of free world price structures by dumping, a procedure and an organization for preventing this is at hand in the GATT regulations and the structures of NATO and SEATO.

As I have previously indicated, dumping is forbidden by GATT and definitions of what constitutes dumping are spelled out in objective terms in which the moot question of intent plays no part. If the fact of dumping can be established, a violation is established even if an innocent motivation could be proved.

Under GATT regulations, its 36 members controlling 80 percent of all world trade are authorized to impose antidumping or countervailing duties whenever there is evidence that foreign goods are entering their markets upon a basis that violates GATT principles of commercially tenable pricing. Such duties may be high enough to offset the margin of dumping or subsidizing that is involved. This action may be invoked either to protect the competing business interests of the importing nation or those of other supplying nations with which it deals.

In cases where there is presumptive evidence of dumping without clearly documented evidence, provision is made for requiring a bond or cash deposit equivalent to the amount of the antidumping or countervailing duty assessable, and the burden of documenting the legitimacy of the pricing formula can be placed upon the seller. This formula might be of particular usefulness in dealing with state trading agencies that conduct their businesses without the degree of public accounting normal in Western practice.

Thus a procedure is in existence for insulating the free world trade structure from arbitrary Communist bloc pricing that is alien to our standards and can be harmfully disruptive whatever its motivation. These GATT provisions are, however, permissive rather than obligatory and they have been used only sporadically to date. Further, there is no provision under GATT for concerted rather than individual action.

We do have, however, in NATO and SEATO two groupings of nations specifically designed to promote collective free world security in all its aspects. All but two of the NATO nations (Iceland and Portugal) are members of GATT as well. So are Australia, New Zealand, and Pakistan of the SEATO group. Between them, the GATT affiliated NATO and SEATO members represent about 50 percent of all free world foreign trade. It would be highly appropriate for these organizations to work out a common policy and course of action to be pursued under GATT rules in the interests of economic security.

In addition to the suggested common policies with respect to the enforcement of GATT's antidumping and nondiscriminatory principles, there might well be a common policy of refusing to make sales to Communist bloc countries except upon a transferable currency basis. This is the present U.S. policy, and more recently it has been adopted by the United Kingdom and West Germany as well. If the practice were generalized, it would do much to keep trade with the bloc on the part of weaker free economies from turning into a trap from which there is no escape.

It seems quite clear to me that the answer as to whether or not increased free world-Communist bloc trade is desirable or undesirable turns on the question of whether such trade is conducted under our concept of fair trade practice or theirs.

The fact that their deals are always made through State trading monopolies generally directly responsible to Foreign Office control, while ours are generally made by independent private traders makes it possible for the Communist bloc transactions to serve political rather than economic ends whenever that serves their purposes. They can turn on or off sales to particular countries or in particular commodities at will; their pricing can be economic or be flagrant dumping in any particular case.

We can protect against the most obvious damage that such trading can inflict upon our system by insisting that this minority portion of our trade conforms to the same regulatory discipline that we apply to the intertrade of free world nations.

The particular formulas would need careful working out and could be adjusted to allow reasonable leeway; but I think that the principle I have put forth is one of commonsense, moderation and equity.

With proper safeguards, I believe that genuine benefit could be derived from the increased world trade between countries operating under disparate economic systems. I am convinced that this will only ensue if such trade is operated under rules that are compatible with the free world trading system.

If I may be permitted to paraphrase an old aphorism that was revised by Robert Frost, the poet:

"Good ground rules make good traders."

Farm Retail Price Spreads for Farm Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of economic life that increased efficiency in productivity brings a reward of higher earnings for workers in our American society—for all workers, it seems, but the American farmer.

It is a paradox of our times that for the farmer this rule works in reverse, and as his productive efficiency increases his reward decreases. In effect, the farmer's prices are on an escalator going only one way—downward. This is graphically pointed out in the following editorial which appeared in the February 13 issue of the Packer:

FARM-RETAIL PRICE SPREADS FOR FARM FOODS

Charges for marketing farm-produced foods rose 1 percent from 1958 to 1959. This increase was smaller than it had been for most years since 1947. In 1960, marketing charges probably will show some increase, reports the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

Prices received by farmers for these foods were 7 percent lower in 1959 than in 1958. This decline in the annual average farm value was the first since 1956. Lower prices for hogs, frying chickens, and eggs were largely responsible for the decrease. The relative stability in marketing charges and decline in farm prices reduced the farmer's share of the dollar consumers spent for farm foods to 38 cents in 1959—2 cents lower than in 1958.

Retail prices of farm foods decreased in 1959 for the first time since 1955, but the annual average still was the second highest on record. Retail prices of these foods probably will not change greatly in 1960 as increases in marketing charges will partly offset lower average farm values.

Operating costs of food-marketing firms probably increased slightly in 1959, but the increase apparently was smaller than in most recent years. Hourly earnings of food-marketing employees rose 4 percent, continuing the upward trend, but improvements in output per man-hour offset some of this increase. Prices of goods and services which marketing firms buy rose slightly. Railroad freight rates were about the same as in 1958.

Marketing margins for fruits and vegetables, like those for most other food products, have risen since World War II, but the rate of increase for these products was less than the average for all farm food products in the "market basket." In 1959, marketing margins for all fruits and vegetables averaged 32 percent higher than in 1947–49; retail prices of these products were up 23 percent from 1947–49 and prices farmers received for them were up 11 percent. Much of the increase in marketing margins during this period occurred in 1951, 1952, and 1958. Farmers received 29 cents of the dollar consumers spent for fruits and vegetables in 1959, compared with 33 cents in 1947–49.

The retail cost, farm value, and marketing margin for the fresh fruits and vegetables in the market basket dropped slightly in 1959 from the peak levels reached in 1958. Unfavorable weather late in 1957 and early in 1958 curtailed the supply of some fresh products, and sharp increases in prices and

marketing margins followed. In 1959, prices averaged lower as a result of larger supplies of most products and the decline in prices was accompanied by decreases in marketing margins. Much of the decrease in the farm value and retail cost of the fresh fruits and vegetables group was caused by decreases in prices for oranges from the high levels reached in 1958 when the supply was reduced by unfavorable weather. The marketing margin for oranges also declined slightly.

The moderate 1959 decrease in the annual average marketing margin for the fresh fruits and vegetables group was the first decrease since 1954. Th 1959 average, however, was still 44 percent above the 1947–49 average, and the farm value was up about 6 percent.

Although marketing margins for fresh fruits and vegetables decreased in 1959, the farm value declined more, causing a reduction in the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar. Farmers received 34 percent of the dollar consumers spent for these products in 1959, compared with 35 cents in 1958 and 41 cents in 1947–49.

Unique Development in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there came to my attention a most interesting and significant article written by Joe Borkin, an attorney of Washington and formerly an official of the Justice Department, relating to a unique development in Indonesia.

The article was written several months ago, but its meaning, both to Indonesia and the free world is just as important as though Mr. Borkin wrote it yesterday.

An independent and free Indonesia is vital to the welfare of the United States. Thus, we are delighted with the excellent progress reported in the article regarding the establishment of a common language for the several thousand islands that make up that country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA LEARNED A NEW TONGUE TO MAKE REVOLUTION POSSIBLE

(By Joseph Borkin)

DJANARTA, August 15.—Perhaps the first country in the world which used language—and an alien language at that—as a weapon of revolution—celebrates the 14th anniversary of its declaration of independence August 17.

It is the Republic of Indonesia and it is no accident that its national motto is "one nation, one people, and one language."

Thirty years ago the 80 million Indonesians scattered over some 3,000 islands in an area of 900,000 square miles spoke 38 basic native languages and 200 dialects. Ninety-three percent of them were illiterate, or nearly so. Dr. Ahmed Surkarno and other early leaders of the revolution decided their movement had little chance under such conditions. They simply couldn't reach the people.

They decided on a heroic solution—they would simply teach a population as large as that of Germany an entirely new language—and teach them to read it as well as speak it.

They chose Malay because its simplicity made it easy to teach, proclaimed it the official language of the revolution in 1928, and named it "Bahasa Indonesia"—or simply "Indonesian."

(Javanese, an indigenous tongue with a rich literature, had also been considered. But even though about half the population spoke it—in contrast to a comparative handful speaking corrupt Malay—its structure was felt to be too complex.)

The revolution's missionaries soon began literally to spread the word through the huge group of islands. It was a slow and discouraging task and by the time the Japanese overran the islands in 1942, one still largely unaccomplished.

Ironically the displacement of Dutch colonsists by Japanese militarists gave the program the impetus that assured its early success.

The Japs intended eventually to establish their own language in Indonesia, but their immediate aim was to eliminate every vestige of things Dutch. As a first step, they replaced Dutch as the official language by Indonesian—a tongue with emotional acceptance because it was the language of independence.

The result was a minor convulsion, since Dutch was an essential element of the Dutch Indies economic, political, and social fabric. Teachers had to learn Indonesian and Indonesian replaced the Dutch language in every school. It became a necessity for government offices and traders.

Laws were now promulgated in Indonesian. Public announcements, official correspondence, credentials, and publications had to be written in the Indonesian language. Like a river with many tributaries, it flowed through the Indonesian population. Bahasa Indonesia became a bar not only against the return of the Dutch colonial aim but also, with poetic justice, against Japanese efforts to foist the Japanese language and culture upon the Indonesians.

ONE HUNDRED MILLION SPEAK IT

The proclamation of independence in 1945 found the new language well on its way. By 1950, when independence was formally achieved, practically every Indonesian spoke Bahasa Indonesia.

Bahasa Indonesia now is taking its place among the languages of the world. The classics of the West are being translated into Indonesian. Cervantes, Steinbeck, Shakespeare, and Hegel, are but a few. Equally significant, some translations from the Indonesian are making their way into English and courses in the language are given in a number of American universities.

It is already one of the liveliest languages of Asia and, including the Malayan Peninsula, is the national tongue of over 100 million people. Neither French nor German can boast this total.

On the Retirement of the Honorable Max L. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year the city of Glendale, Calif., will lose its outstanding postmaster, Max L. Green. He will retire after having completed over 25 years of service. I feel it is entirely fitting, therefore, that I call attention to this fact and make it a matter of public record by expressing herein the thanks and appreciation of the citizens of Glendale for his outstanding service to his community during these many years.

The period in which Postmaster Green has served so well has been a very important one in the history of Glendale. Under his able guidance the post office has grown and improved with the needs of our city so that it has increased its number of employees from 95 in 1935 to 436 at the present time, and receipts in 1959 amounted to $2,846,632 as compared to less than $300,000 in 1934.

We deeply regret his leaving, yet at the same time rejoice with him in the knowledge that he will now have the time to enjoy the pleasures of retirement. We extend to him our very best wishes for his happiness in the future.

American Government and Industry Should Give Special Attention to Plant Locations in Distressed Areas; British Have Such a Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I noted in a recent issue of the magazine, Business Week, that British automobile manufacturers plan to increase their 1960 capital outlays 50 percent over 1959's figures.

Another impressive feature of the Business Week item was the revelation that the British Government "has succeeded in persuading several of the biggest companies to build new plants in areas where unemployment is prevalent, not in the crowded London or Midlands region where most auto plants are now situated."

The article reports also that the Ford Motor Co. of England is believed to be planning new plants away from its base in London.

We have heard much talk, Mr. President, from the present national administration concerning the strength of our free enterprise system and the importance of cooperation between industry and government. Of course, I agree there is need for this cooperation. But surely the field of activity in which the British Government has been active and with apparent success, is one in which the President and administration leaders about him might give more meaning to their glittering phrases in general prosperity.

Certainly, this is an administration which should have influence with American business and industrial leaders in persuading them to locate new plants in distressed areas of chronic unemploy-

ment as the British manufacturers are doing in Great Britain.

One would suppose that a predominantly business-minded administration in this country—if it were willing to explore the British method—could accomplish as much with American manufacturers as the British Government has with its industrialists.

I commend the Business Week item from its "Business Abroad" page to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Apendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH AUTO MAKERS TO BUILD PLANTS IN AREAS WHERE WORKERS ARE IDLE

British automobile manufacturers plan to increase their 1960 capital outlays 50 percent over 1959's figures.

The Government has succeeded in persuading several of the biggest companies to build new plants in areas where unemployment is prevalent, not in the crowded London or midlands region where most auto plants are now situated.

British Motor Corp., the largest auto maker, is expected to put up a tractor plant in Scotland and an auto assembly line in Wales, with Government financial help. In both areas, thousands of coalminers are losing their jobs as the European coal glut forces the pits to close.

Ford of England is also believed to be planning new plants away from its base near London.

The Truth About the Bomarc-B Firing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment from the Boeing News sets the record straight and shows why sometimes defense contractors feel it necessary to get facts to Members of Congress and the public through the medium of newspaper advertisements:

A week ago last Friday a Bomarc-B missile was fired from Cape Canaveral. As had been the case with news coverage of many missile flights, press stories following this Bomarc firing were almost totally contradictory.

The fact is the flight was a major success from an engineering point of view. In the eyes of both Air Force personnel who monitored it, and the Boeing people who conducted the flight, the new Bomarc passed with flying colors the major obstacle in its entire test program. In this flight, as in previous launches of the B, the new solid rocket boost system performed satisfactorily in all respects.

It was erratic action in the new-type ramjet engines which provide cruise power for the B-missile that had plagued the earlier flight tests. In the most recent flight, the ramjets gave evidence of meeting all requirements. This ability of the ramjets to function properly is considered to be the only major hurdle preventing the new missile from living up to the enviable reliability record already established by earlier Bomarc-A.

Why then reports that the flight was not a success? Following the excellent ramjet performance, there occurred an apparent random failure which affected the missile's guidance equipment and terminated the flight considerably short of its programed course.

Although this equipment had demonstrated almost total reliability in more than 60 prior flights, in this test it failed.

Educational Program for Retired Military Personnel in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD a statement of mine regarding a new educational program instituted in Rhode Island for retired military personnel in the Narragansett Bay area. This statement will give the Members of the Senate a report on this new educational activity in Rhode Island and so I feel sure will be of interest to them. All of those who helped inaugurate this new educational program are to be commended, especially Dr. Michael F. Walsh, Rhode Island's commissioner of education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning on Monday, January 25, 3 courses in professional education will be offered to approximately 90 members of the military personnel in the Narragansett Bay area of Rhode Island who are anticipating retirement and who are desirous of entering the teaching profession at the completion of their military service. The courses to be offered are educational psychology and principles of guidance. Two of these courses, educational psychology and principles of guidance, will be offered at the naval training station, and one, educational psychology, will be offered at Quonset Point. The courses will run for a period of 16 weeks, each class being of 2½ hours duration, and carrying three academic credits at the Rhode Island College of Education. The purpose is to enable these men to secure enough credits while they are in service so that they would be certified to teach in any State in the Union.

This program is the result of the efforts of Dr. Michael F. Walsh, Rhode Island commissioner of education, who 3 years ago approached Adm. Ralph E. Earle, then commandant of Narragansett Bay, and proposed to him a program that might be established for military personnel who were looking forward to the day of retirement. Admiral Earle encouraged Dr. Walsh to pursue the study. Since that time, a number of conferences were held with the military in the Narragansett Bay area.

In the fall of 1959, during the administration of Adm. Henry E. Crommelin, a meeting was held with Capt. Charles O. Cook, Jr., and Comdr. Roland S. Wilson at the naval training station. The program was thoroughly discussed and it was decided to send out a questionnaire to the officers on the base to determine the number who might be interested in working toward a teaching profession. Thirty officers expressed an interest. These men were invited to a meeting with Captain Cook; Commander Wilson; Dr. Fred Donovan, vice president of the Rhode Island College of Education; Dr. William Flanagan, director of graduate studies, Rhode Island College of Education; and Dr. Walsh. Plans were established for registration, screening candidates, and determination of subject matter. It was decided to begin with professional courses and to follow these with courses in methods of teaching science, math, languages, and also courses in administration and finance. The courses will be credited by the Rhode Island College of Education which will become Rhode Island College in July 1960. This college has the responsibility for teach education in the State.

Dr. Walsh believes that these programs will serve a twofold purpose. In the first place, it will create an interest among naval personnel to enter the teaching profession and at the same time provide an additional source of supply to school administrators who are in search of qualified people to enter their classrooms. Secondly, and as equally important, it will provide an excellent opportunity among the military personnel for a second vocation. Many of these men will be retiring at a comparatively young age and will be in search of some type of occupation to interest them in their leisure hours. The field of education is a most desirable one for such an outlet.

Dr. Walsh presented the programs to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in Washington and expressed the thought that the GI bill of rights might be amended to make it possible for military personnel either to use their GI money for this purpose or to be allowed to draw from it as a loan to defray expenses for the course. This matter is still being studied.

The development of these courses has been made possible through the interest of the State department of education; the Rhode Island College of Education; Adm. Ralph E. Earle and Adm. Henry E. Crommelin, both commandants of Narragansett Bay, now retired; Adm. Benjamin E. Moore, the present commandant of Narragansett Bay; his aide, Capt. Charles O. Cook, Jr.; and Comdr. Roland S. Wilson.

Mr. Lincoln's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy—as a Representative of Mr. Lincoln's own Illinois—to include a moving editorial published on February 14, 1960, in the New York Times. These words, briefly spoken, do more than recall a stirring period in the history of the United States; they serve as a clarion call to all of us in these troubled times to let the life of Mr. Lincoln—his compassion, his humanity, and his dedication—be the motivation of our current thought and action:

MR. LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

President Lincoln was 56 years old on this day 95 years ago. He had had a busy 2 weeks. He had been down to Hampton Roads for a fruitless conference with three Confederate commissioners, one of whom, Alexander H. Stephens, Vice President of the Confederacy, was an old and once valued friend. Mr. Lincoln had held Cabinet meet-

ings on February 4, on the evening of February 5, on February 7, and on February 10. Failing in his attempt to get a bloodless agreement with the dying Confederacy, he had tried to persuade his Cabinet to accept a plan to pay the rebellious States $400 million for their slaves if they ended their resistance by April 1. The Cabinet would have none of this plan. Mr. Lincoln filed it for future reference, sighing perhaps as he thought of the lives that would be lost because the war must continue.

It was clear enough to him, however, that the Union arms were about to prevail. General Grant during the week preceding Mr. Lincoln's 56th birthday, had pinned Robert E. Lee down in front of Richmond, and General Sherman, having marched from Atlanta to the sea, was coming north to deal in North Carolina with the army of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston. The old Confedcrate stronghold of Charleston, S.C., was in Union hands, the Shenandoah Valley had been devastated, there would be no more Gettysburgs. Nevertheless, men were dying and women were weeping. Lincoln's late pictures, at the end of that winter and the beginning of that spring, showed his face drawn, haggard, and lined with pain.

Mr. Lincoln worked on his birthday, which fell on Sunday in 1865. He commuted what he thought was the death sentence of a Confederate spy who had been arrested in Cincinnati. He endorsed the appointment of Daniel M. Taylor as a West Point cadet. He issued passes for two women who wanted to cross Grant's lines. It cannot positively be said that the Lincoln family and friends did not celebrate that birthday of 1865, but it is hard to find a record of any celebration.

Mr. Lincoln was given to dreams and forebodings. A little later that year he was to dream of going into the East Room of the White House and of finding a coffin and being told by one of the guards: "This is the President; he was killed by an assassin." He had another dream of being on a ship moving at a funeral pace to some unknown destination. But he could not have been entirely unhappy on that birthday in 1865. The end of slaughter was in sight. The time for compassion and forgiveness was close at hand.

On that Sunday, February 12, 1865, Lincoln had only 56 days to wait until that Palm Sunday when General Lee and General Grant met at Appomattox and signed the articles of surrender. He had only 61 more days until that Good Friday evening when John Wilkes Booth blotted out his conscious life forever in the box at Ford's Theater.

History is easy to endure after it is over, but not while it is going on. Beyond all doubt Mr. Lincoln would have asked nothing on his birthday in 1865 except the end of bloodshed and the preservation of the Union. What he got, and never knew about, was immortality. This last conscious birthday of his was the beginning of countless birthdays that will be remembered, and that will serve as an inspiration to these reunited States as long as human life on this continent shall exist.

The Nike-Zeus Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERWIN MITCHELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over whether we are making the necessary defense effort continues to rage. What we will do or will not do about the Nike-Zeus weapon system plays a prominent role in this argument. There appeared in the Baltimore Sun of February 1, 1960, an article by Mark S. Watson which I commend to the attention of all Members of this body.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NIKE-ZEUS DISPUTE—ANTI-ICBM MISSILE IMPROVED BUT FUNDS FIGHT IMPERILS IT

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Through the screen of extreme secrecy that is properly thrown about the development of the Nike-Zeus—the Nation's sole existing project for active defense against enemy intercontinental ballistic missiles—the scientists now permit a few cautious peeks.

As a result, certain encouraging developments in that expensive and incomparably important enterprise can be reported:

1. The whole project—missile, radar-detection, appraisal of the fast-coming target, and systems operation alike—has made conspicuous progress in the months that have passed since the Sun made its extensive survey of the Zeus project last spring.

RADAR IMPROVED

2. The power of the radar tubes has been increased. This permits both a longer reach out toward the target's point of origin, and a sharpening of the image of that target.

3. In turn this permits more effective discrimination between a genuine missile nose cone (which protects the warhead and which, hence, must be intercepted) and the decoys that a shrewd enemy would employ to deceive the radar-analysis operators (and on which the defender must not waste his time).

4. Tracking technology, which in this respect is wholly in the laboratory stage, is progressing in the process of linking the tracking-radar to the decoy-discrimination apparatus. This increases measurably the short period of time available for successful interception of an incoming enemy ICBM.

5. The integrating of the immensely complex system of far-out radar with the further-in tracking radar and with the missile control is thereby advanced.

6. The missile itself is improved in two respects since last spring. Thanks to an improved fuel combustion, the propellent system now is assured a still higher thrust, which means, alternatively, greater reach or swifter arrival on target. The airframe has been simplified and strengthened by an almost complete elimination of fins, and provision of vernier rockets to keep the missile on course.

7. The importance of this quickened speed for the missile is very great, chiefly in that with fewer seconds required to get it on target, added seconds are available for the elaborate radar and computing mechanisms to see the enemy ICBM, distinguish the essential nose cone from the deceptive decoy, verify the course and speed the nose cone, and thus guide the Zeus missile toward the actual ICBM's path, and intercept the ICBM.

These improvements constitute a marked advance in a very promising project. That they provide absolute assurance of ultimate success is not true.

No weapon ever provides 100-percent success, and no project with such appalling difficulties as face an anti-ICBM weapon is described as a certainty save by the most reckless prophets. But its promise is better than it was.

How much better is the question. And how much better it must be before it can get from the Defense Department the full-ahead order—and the vast amount of money that an order calls for—is the question that sharply divides scientists and technologists of very great stature.

Specifically, that is the question that determines how much money, and for precisely what purposes, will be channeled into the Zeus project this year. Over one specific item—application of the $137 million that Congress last summer definitely ticketed to the Army for a preproduction engineering item (not a production item)—the division of opinion is very deep.

Numerous Army scientists are firmly in favor of spending the money now, and Army planners as well; the planners for reasons of gravest implication to national safety.

DR. YORK OPPOSED

Dr. Herbert F. York, the Defense Department's powerful chief of research and engineering (he ranks third in the Pentagon hierarchy, subordinate only to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense) is just as firmly opposed, and accordingly, the President's budget message stated explicitly that the $137 million "will not be used" pending the results of testing.

Debate on his point could be endless. The cost of research development, test and evaluation, is very great but with the new weapons the cost of production is enormous. The financially cautious view is that until testing shows the project to be just about perfect, one must not gamble with any funds except those actually required for development and evaluation.

Others disagree violently, pointing out, first, that no weapon in history has ever proved adequate for 100 percent resistance to any enemy or ever will. Second, that it is unwise to delay the tooling up for production. Hitherto, in most major weapons developments the need of getting a new weapon not only "proved" but also ready to get into service has justified starting the production program while the development is still in process.

MOST OUTLAYS JUSTIFIED

This has led, on occasion, to large defense outlays that certainly were not justified by results. But in countless cases (as with new air weapons in particular) it has led straight to the prime objective—having the Nation's military forces equipped at the earliest practicable date with a usable weapon of enormous value in awing an enemy.

Right there lies the mass of today's controversy. It far overflows the Pentagon and the arms industries, and reaches the Halls of Congress, which last summer on this issue differed profoundly with the White House, and may do so again.

It seems clear that for purely development work the Army's scientists and industrial laboratory associates will have for the present the money needed strictly for that purpose, hence the President's assurance of adequate money for "research."

But whether that is enough to meet the larger situation is the issue. The proponents of Zeus contend that progress to date gives adequate assurance of the new weapons system's enormous usefulness, first as an adequate counter to any enemy ICBM that exists today, second as an all-important operating device upon which to build still more effective anti-ICBM's of the future, to counter the still more efficient ICBM's that must be expected.

That the Zeus, which could be made, tested, and in production by 1963, can indeed cope with such an ICBM as today's Atlas is stated confidently by Army scientists, and does not seem to be doubted by those of the Defense Department.

The Defense Department scientists' anti-spending stand is based, rather, on their

conviction that Zeus, as now designed, will not be able to cope with the improved, decoy-equipped ICBM's that presumably will be in enemy hands by the time Zeus is in American hands, that is, in 1963.

CONSIDERATION IGNORED

And here, it is apparent, the debate moves over into new territory.

The Army's grave warning is that, by delaying the preproduction engineering expenditure, actual production of the missile (when finally ordered) willl be delayed. Specifically, a Zeus, effective against today's ICBM's (and still more sophisticated types up to a point) could be ready in 1963. And that is the very year of the much-discussed missile gap, when defense against enemy ICBM's would seem to be vital.

But the delay imposed last year, and now threatened for another year, means that even the Zeus that now is on the way could not possibly get into production until 1965. (The Army's research chief lately spoke gloomily of the sixties.) And such a delay in defense capability is not lightly dismissed.

Worry on this aspect of the case goes all the way to the top of the Army. The worry is based upon a consideration familiar to all military men, yet strangely ignored in the public debating thus far. To summarize it:

An aggressor, free to plan his strike to suit his own capabilities, surveys his prospective victim with thoroughness, examining all the victim's resources with which the aggressor's tactics must cope. The larger—and more varied—the powers of resistance, the more cautious must the aggressor be, lest he be thwarted in his initial attack and ultimately beaten down.

Hence the insistence by the United States more farsighted military on American possession not only of sufficiently large, but also of sufficiently varied, weapons systems. For example, were this country's powers limited to the Strategic Air Force, powerful as it is, an enemy aggressor would be able to concentrate all his own massive powers against that one force.

NAVY A DETERRENT

But when to SAC the United States adds its widespread naval task forces headed by its efficient aircraft carriers, here is another deterrent, and the enemy must now prepare to cope with two major forces instead of one, and disperse his forces accordingly.

Now add the Navy's missile-launching submarines (both for Regulus and the coming Polaris) and there is another enormous deterrent on which the enemy must calculate. Add the Tactical Air Force (to which aerial refueling has provided a strategic power of its own) and also the medium-range missiles now being deployed with oversea ground forces, and the enemy's planning is still harder. The current addition of American ICBM's provides the newest and toughest task.

Yet if, facing all these retaliatory weapons, an enemy is able to concentrate his first-blast ICBM's on the most important targets, with a fair chance that all his ICBM's will make hits of a sort, his war-planning is so greatly simplified that alarmists have predicted a war might begin and end in a single day.

DEFENSE WEAPON VITAL

On the other hand, if there should be a defense against enemy ICBM's, capable of intercepting a fair proportion of them, no such confident plan of aggression is possible. A substantial defense, in other wards, is a very real deterrent to aggression. It always has been. Even the Air Defense Command's chief, who does not always see eye-to-eye with the Army, has strongly urged a speedup for Zeus as a factor in air defense.

Here then is a fundamental military consideration strangely ignored in the reasoning that creation of such a massive defense can wait for a year or two more, beyond 1963, in order to save $137 million.

The soberest of Army planners warn that it cannot wait; that the much-discussed "missile gap" is due in 1963 and so admitted by the very people who have imposed upon Zeus' development a production delay that will postpone delivery from a possible 1963 to a probable 1965.

This is surely the largest gamble of all. It is true that if the scientists' full hopes are unfounded, the refusal to spend the added $137 million for preproduction engineering will permit saving money.

But it also is true that, if the Army scientists' hopes are largely sustained, one more major deterrent will have been rejected, for reasons of "economy," and in the very year when need for every possible deterrent is most acute.

That is, during the critical 1963–65 season, Russia would be able to plan ruthlessly, knowing that America would not have, during that period, either for American military installations or for American cities, an active defense against Russian ICBM's. If there ever was a gamble, this is it.

The technical anxieties about what a successful anti-ICBM must be capable of doing can be discussed only guardedly. A major cause of worry is the expected enemy device of adding fluff of some sort to the actual missile.

This fluff would, on schedule, be blown off from the incoming ICBM for the specific purpose of deceiving search-radar, which thus would send defending missiles up into space on a false scent, allowing the real enemy missile with its thermonuclear warhead to plunge through on its mission.

Such a possibility has long been recognized—so long that from time to time this country's defense authorities have mentioned publicly development work on "Quail" and other decoys, intended for like purpose. But at the same time the Zeus researchers have been working just as steadily to enable Zeus to counteract these anticipated decoys.

MEASURES LISTED

A few cautious approaches to the problem can be mentioned:

1. The massive, heavy nose cone of the enemy ICBM can be expected to reflect a clear image. Lighter material would have a quite different weight drag, would fall behind the cone in its flight, and thus be recognized as fluff. This has been demonstrated with Atlas itself in the Mariner tests, conducted in clear air. Thicker air provides difficulties.

2. An object speeding in space creates about it an ion sheath, which has characteristics varying with the object surrounded. Swift recognition and analysis of those characteristics should permit Zeus' brain to ignore the harmless objects and concentrate on the nose cone.

3. The amplitude of the signal from space also varies with the placement of observing radars. A vital part of Zeus is its use of more than one radar, providing dual scrutiny.

4. Infrared observation permits its own discrimination between objects covered with ablative material and other objects. It can be doubted that an enemy will spend great effort in coating his fluff with ablative so as to imitate his nose cone precisely. He might more profitably create a second genuine nose cone.

5. Scintillations that radar gets from imitations of the nose cone in varying attitudes provide their own identifying evidence.

CONVINCING DECOY DOUBTED

The Zeus faction of scientists expresses great doubt that for many years to come any nation will develop a decoy that can deceive all the discriminating devices now in existence, plus those that will presumably come along in time.

It is an interesting fact that certain industries that are not in the Zeus group have (for their own purposes), been devising special decoy suggestions that might defeat Zeus.

These have been studied critically, and then methodically cranked into the work of the "counter-counter" inventors of the Zeus group, to the very real advantage of their research on Zeus itself.

There is an undeniable advantage in getting started. Work upon a major project occupies the attention of new technologists and new industries and adds them to the number previously engaged, and thus tends to increase the whole body of national knowledge and skills.

It is well known, too, that a thing-in-being affords special impetus, and work upon it stimulates work on something better. The case of the Air Force Navaho missile comes to mind. That once-promising venture never came to reality, and the $800 million that its development cost has inaccurately been termed "waste."

Quite to the contrary. The work on Navaho's engine actually permitted a leap forward in producing the engines for Thor, Jupiter and Atlas. Similarly the work on Navaho's guidance system was transferred to the Hound Dog missile, advancing by perhaps years the readiness of that vitally important air-to-ground missile, and also of its successor now under development.

Moreover, all this expedited development and preproduction engineering permit a leap forward not only in production but also in the training of personnel, which is almost equally important. The more good men are set up in enterprise, the better the progress in general improvement.

Atlas itself was a "crash" program, and a very expensive one, and properly so because of the urgent need for an ICBM that would work even after a fashion. Its start was lugubrious with a long series of initial testing failures. With faults corrected, Atlas now has taken its place as an apparently reliable weapon—and America's only ICBM in readiness. Reliance on it is so great today that the "waste" of its development is forgotten.

DESPAIR CONDEMNED

One cannot listen to counsels of despair—"There is no possible way to intercept an ICBM"—without amazement over such helplessness in high places. To think that the newest offensive weapon is the ultimate weapon, with nothing to overcome it ever, is to ignore both history and horsesense.

The offensive and the defensive are historically in eternal competition, with each type of weapon hailed as "supreme" until its counterweapon appears. A decade ago there was no way to halt a mach 2 airplane, but there is today. That is why the Air Force is hoping for its mach 3 B–70. A look back in 1945 is profitable.

The United States' World War II antiaircraft artillery (the twin 40 mm. and 90 mm.) could get an enemy plane of that day only by luck and massing of fire, so the expenditure of shells to bag a single plane was enormous. But the post-1945 Skysweeper (with automatic tracking and computer) was some 20 times as good, and was successful.

PLANES FLEW HIGHER

Then newer planes regained superiority by acquiring both higher speed and greater altitude—only, in turn, to be vulnerable to the new Nike-Ajax when it came into being.

Still newer planes came, and in turn the best of them now can be winged by Ajax's successor, Nike Hercules, which can shoot still higher and use atomic warheads to supplement its other powers. By one method of calculation Hercules is about 400 times as effective as anything of 15 years ago—keeping well ahead of the airplane it guards against.

Now comes the ballistic missile, which defies anything now in existence, and thus

regains the lead for the offensive over the defensive. Yet ahead is Zeus, which, still 3 years or more distant (its components are due for testing both in the Southwest and in the Pacific during the next 2 years) assuredly will be able to handle today's type of ICBM. The need will be for a Zeus II to handle a better ICBM.

Kaiser Aluminum Plant at Ravenswood, W. Va., Celebrates Fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, February 15, 1955, ground was broken at Ravenwood, W. Va., for the mighty plant of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.

This giant metal-producing facility employs 2,800 persons with an annual payroll of over $19 million.

Recently, an itinerant writer for the Saturday Evening Post tried to throw a few rocks at West Virginia in a badly distorted article which misled the Post editors to print that West Virginia is a dying State. The establishment and growth of the Kaiser plant, along with scores of other rapidly expanding industries in the Ohio and Kanawha River valleys, indicate that instead of "dying," West Virginia is on the threshhold of tremendous industrial expansion.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1,000-mile stretch of the great Ohio Valley from Pittsburgh to the Mississippi, $10 billion has been spent in industrial expansion during the past decade. Industry during this period has spent $800 million in the State of West Virginia.

Why does any industry decide to establish in West Virginia? Specifically, why did Kaiser decide to locate this vast installation in West Virginia? The Kaiser officials have given the answers to these questions publicly.

Within 500 miles of the Ohio Valley live half the people of the United States. Within 500 miles of Ravenswood lies 70 percent of the total aluminum-consuming market in the United States. Therefore, Kaiser has found, and other industries will also find, that West Virginia is located in a unique geographical position where she has access to raw materials, and proximity to a tremendous market.

The other favorable factors cited by the Kaiser Corp. in selecting West Virginia are the following:

First. Availability of inexpensive power in proximity to fuel sources.

Second. Availability of labor on both a qualitative and quantitative basis.

Third. Diversified types of transportation.

Fourth. Availability of easily developed sites.

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have had an opportunity to tour the great Ravenswood plant, to watch the operations in some detail, and to talk with the workers. I can subscribe to the statements of the Kaiser officials that West Virginia labor has proved to be adaptable, conscientious, and highly productive. According to a statement by one former Kaiser official, H. B. Benedict:

Adaptability of the labor force met our most optimistic expectations. We have been highly delighted with the efficiency and ability of our 90 percent West Virginian work force to learn the relatively complex skills of our operations. After more than 2 years of operations of portions of our plant, production superintendents report the recently trained mill and equipment operators—most of whom had never seen the inside of an aluminum fabricating facility—within months ran the costly equipment with the skill of 10-year men.

Whenever I go through the Ravenswood plant, I always ask to see 25-year-old Billy Ray Ward of Haven Heights, New Haven, W. Va., who runs the giant 168-inch hot rolling mill with cool efficiency. Billy Ray is typical of the thousands of eager and able West Virginians who have been trained to perform complex work with dependability and thoroughness.

Everybody recognizes that West Virginia has an unemployment problem. We cannot blink at the fact that our unemployment rate is the highest in the Nation. Yet, for purposes of industrial expansion, this can be turned into an asset, because it means that any industry has a large labor supply on which to draw.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons which I believe, contrary to the statements in the Saturday Evening Post, that on this fifth anniversary of the Kaiser ground breaking, West Virginia faces a prosperous and expanding industrial future.

At this point I ask to include a news article and also an editorial from the Ravenswood News, February 11, 1960:

KA MARKS FIFTH YEAR IN COUNTY

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.'s giant metal-producing facility in Ravenswood marks 5 in the valley Monday with no ceremony, but with vigor and enthusiasm for the future.

Carl Sullivan, works public relations manager, said no official ceremonies are planned, although the plant has drawn both national and international attention to the valley and West Virginia. Virtually an around-the-clock operation, Sullivan said, "The works plans to mark this one with activity and productivity, proud of our growth and facing the future with vigor and enthusiasm."

Monday is the occasion of the fifth anniversary of groundbreaking for the works' fabrication plant. In the 5 years since that event, the once fertile farming acres now comprising the plant site have grown into the Nation's largest and most modern fully integrated aluminum-producing facility, giving Kaiser a bold entry into the eastern market and focusing national attention on the valley's industrial potential.

Actually two plants in one, the Ravenswood works' machines, methods, and men have drawn experts and officials from most of America and many of the industrial or soon-to-be industrial nations of the world for on-the-spot inspection of ultramodern aluminum production techniques and equipment almost since startup. Now, 5 years later, the same sort or drive is continuing, Sullivan said, with no effort being spared to keep the Ravenswood works a pacesetter for the industry. He cited recent additions such as the new 2-Hi bright strip mill putting Kaiser squarely in the standard bright strip market and the recently installed 30-million-pound plate stretcher providing stress-relieved aluminum plate in a size previously unobtainable, as cases in point.

Kaiser came to the valley seeking dependable power supplies, available labor, and strategic location to market—and found it. The first major aluminum producer to locate in the area, Kaiser has molded around these requisites an industrial giant geared to meet the growing demands of American industry and the American consumer for increasing amounts of aluminum.

Today, the works' two plants, the reduction plant and the fabrication plant, produce both primary aluminum and aluminum sheet, plate, and foil, with a rated yearly capacity of 145,000 tons, of primary aluminum annually, and near limitless capability in rolling and finishing operations.

Now employing some 2,800 persons with an average payroll in excess of $1,500,000 monthly, the Ravenswood Works passes its first 5, as Sullivan puts it, "Going strong and confident of significant and steady progress in both the industry and the valley."

BEST WISHES

Monday, Kaiser Aluminum will celebrate the fifth anniversary of its arrival in Jackson County. On February 15, 1955, ground was broken for the mammoth aluminum plant which now employs more than 2,800 workers.

We're not unaware of the problems which have faced Ravenswood and Jackson County because of the plant and the consequent influx of workers: problems of adequate housing, expanded school facilities, more retail establishments, better facilities by utilities, more recreational outlets. There have been problems, many of them, and will continue to be problems for some time to come.

But the blessings have been great. The plant has provided employment for many of our citizens, created jobs for people providing goods and services to the aluminum workers; encouraged growth of facilities within the county; enabled our youngsters to set their sights higher. The plant offers hope that county youth may obtain gainful employment here without leaving the borders of West Virginia.

Our sincere best wishes to Kaiser Aluminum personnel upon the fifth anniversary in Jackson County. May your future years here be blessed with continued happiness and prosperity.

The Shoe's on the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE SHOE'S ON THE OTHER FOOT

For years labor leader George Meany sat by as boss of the American Federation of Labor and literally watched Negroes go hungry because his AFL craft unions would not permit them to work on union jobs in the building trades.

When A. Philip Randolph pointed out this discrimination against Negroes on the floor

of the AFL–CIO convention, Mr. Meany publicly profaned him and attempted to chastise Mr. Randolph. Meanwhile, the discrimination against the Negro went on.

A few days ago, however, the chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education announced that he will not seek office again and that on the basis of seniority the chairmanship of that important committee will pass into the hands of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Mr. POWELL promptly announced that when he becomes chairman of the Committee on Labor and Education he is going to change some things—particularly with regard to the way the interest of the Negro has been treated.

Now comes Mr. Meany to announce that he thinks it is simply "terrible" that Mr. POWELL will be the head of this all-important committee dealing with labor and education.

We'd like to say to Mr. Meany that we don't think it's terrible.

The way we see the shoe simply is now going to be on the other foot.

What's so terrible about that?

Does Mr. Meany think it is terrible that Negro bricklayers can't work on the new House of Representatives office building because his bricklayers local won't let them join?

Did Mr. Meany think it was terrible when the present chairman of the Committee on Labor and Education spent million of dollars to build and improve schools where Negro children were not allowed to study?

Why doesn't Mr. Meany speak out against the Jim Crow unions on New York's waterfront?

Congressman POWELL will change some of these things when he takes over this all-important committee. And the changes he will make will be within the letter of the law as spelled out by the U.S. Supreme Court.

One of the things Mr. POWELL will see to is that no Federal money is provided for education unless it is for the education of all Americans.

Is that being a racist? If it is we need more racism in America.

In attacking ADAM POWELL, George Meany has performed a disservice to the labor movement, a disservice to himself and to his country. He has particularly hurt his country because his open show of bigotry gives aid and comfort to the Communist world which will certainly use it as propaganda fodder.

As to Congressman POWELL—he needs no defense from George Meany. This attack on him simply is further proof that he stands virtually alone among Americans as the Nation's No. 1 fighter for the civil rights of all Americans.

POWELL today, possibly more than any other American, is demanded that this great Nation practice what it is preaching.

There is nothing racist about that.

Omni-Range Station for Great Bend, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, in order to promote safety and full utilization of the Great Bend municipal airport in carrying out the economic needs of oil, agriculture, and industry in central Kansas, the Kansas State Legislature has adopted a resolution calling for an airway communication and navigation station to be located in the vicinity of Great Bend. I would like to call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to this resolution. It reads as follows:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

"Concurrent resolution urging and requesting the members of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to support the location and establishment of an airway communication and navigation station in the vicinity of Great Bend, Kans., and the incorporation of the same as a part of the Federal airways system of the United States of America

"Whereas, the city of Great Bend, Kans., is served by Continental Airlines and is the center of oil, agricultural and industrial activities in central Kansas; and

"Whereas the Great Bend municipal airport which serves these activities is located on the intersection of routes V–132 and V–10N of the Federal airways system; and

"Whereas the traffic generated by this airport warrants a detailed study and investigation as to the feasibility of locating an airway communication and navigation system (Omni) as a part of the Federal airways system; and

"Whereas in order to promote safety and full utilization of the Great Bend municipal airport in carrying out the economic needs of oil, agriculture and industry in central Kansas, an airway communication and navigation station should be located in the vicinity of Great Bend, Kans.: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the members of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to support the location and establishment of an additional airway communication and navigation station (Omni) in the vicinity of Great Bend, Kans., and the incorporation of the same as a part of the Federal airway system of the United States of America. Be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each member of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives of the United States and the Senate of the United States."

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body February 1, 1960.

JOSEPH W. HINKLE, Jr.,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 5, 1960.

JESS TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Aims and Operations of IDA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a summary of the purposes and operations of the International Development Association, the proposed new financing institution for the less developed areas to be affiliated with the World Bank, which is now awaiting action by member governments desirous of joining the Association. IDA was conceived as a means of financing development in newly emerging countries, promoting and increasing productivity, and raising living standards. These purposes will be accomplished by providing funds on terms as required by individual development programs, bearing less heavily on the balance of payments than conventional loans. The summary of IDA's aims and operational structure appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, February 8, an official publication of the Department of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDS LOANED FOR DEVELOPMENT—NEW AGENCY FORMED WITHIN WORLD BANK

Articles of agreement of the International Development Association, the proposed new financing institution to be affiliated with the World Bank, are now ready for acceptance by prospective member governments.

By authorization of the Bank's executive directors, the text of the articles of agreement, together with a report by the executive directors drawing attention to certain features of the articles, is being transmitted to the Bank's 68 member governments. The next step will be for governments desiring to join IDA to take whatever legislative or other action may be required to accept membership and to subscribe funds. The articles provide that IDA will enter into force when governments whose subscriptions aggregate at least 65 percent of total initial subscriptions have accepted membership. The articles will remain open for signature by original members until December 31, 1960, and the earliest date on which IDA may come into being is September 15, 1960.

A preamble to the articles states the conviction of the signatory governments that mutual cooperation for constructive economic purposes, healthy development of the world economy, and balanced growth of international trade foster peace and world prosperity; that higher standards of living and economic and social progress in the less developed countries are desrable, not only in the interests of those countries but also for the international community as a whole; and that achievement of those objectives would be facilitated by an increase in international flow of capital, public and private, to assist in development of the resources of the less developed countries.

The main features of IDA, as proposed, are as follows:

Purposes: The main purposes of IDA are "* * * to promote economic development and increase productivity and thus to raise standards of living in the less developed areas of the world included within the Association's membership, in particular by providing finance to meet their important development requirements on terms which are more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those of conventional loans, thereby furthering the developmental objectives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, hereinafter called 'the Bank' and supplementing its activities."

Membership and initial subscriptions: IDA's membership is to be open to member countries of the Bank. Initial resources proposed for IDA are $1 billion, an amount which will be obtained if all existing member countries of the Bank join IDA and thereby accept the subscriptions assigned them. IDA subscriptions are to be roughly proportionate to subscriptions to

the Bank's capital. Thus the United States would be the largest shareholder, with a subscription of $320.29 million. The United Kingdom would be the next largest, with $131.14 million. Voting rights in IDA, as in the Bank, will be roughly proportionate to subscriptions.

A unique feature of IDA is that member countries are divided into two groups for purposes of subscriptions of funds, as shown in the accompanying table. Subscriptions will be payable over a 5-year period, and the countries of both groups will subscribe 10 percent of their initial subscriptions in gold or freely convertible currencies. Different provisions are made for the two groups, however, for the remaining 90 percent of their initial subscriptions. The first group, the 17 more industrialized member countries of the Bank, will pay their 90 percent in five equal installments in gold or freely convertible currencies, whereas the second group, the 51 less developed countries, will pay their 90 percent in their national currencies, which IDA will not be free to convert into other currencies or to use to finance exports from the country concerned without its consent. The executive directors have expressed the hope that the more developed of the second group of countries will soon be in a position to release from these restrictions at least some part of the 90 percent of their subscriptions.

Operations: The articles are drafted in general terms, giving the Association wide latitude to shape its financing to meet needs as they arise.

IDA is to finance development in the less developed member countries and the less developed dependent and associated territories included within membership of member countries. IDA financing shall be for purposes which, in its opinion, "are of high developmental priority in the light of needs of the area or areas concerned and, except in special circumstances, * * * for specific projects."

In their report transmitted to member countries with the articles of agreement, the executive directors point out that IDA is thereby authorized to finance "any project * * * which will make an important contribution to the development of the area or areas concerned, whether or not the project is revenue-producing or directly productive. Thus projects such as water supply, sanitation, pilot housing, and the like are eligible for financing, although it is expected a large part of the Association's financing is likely to be for projects of the type financed by the Bank." The executive directors state that the words "specific projects" are understood, as they are in the Bank's practice, to include such proposals as railway programs, agricultural credit programs, or groups of related projects forming part of a development program. IDA will not provide financing if it is available from private sources on reasonable terms or could be provided by loans of the type made by the Bank.

IDA will impose no conditions that the proceeds of its financing shall be spent in the territories of any particular member or members; it will in general follow the practice of the Bank in encouraging its borrowers to make use of international competition in the placing of orders for goods and services. IDA will also follow the Bank in disbursing its funds to recipients only to meet expenses in connection with a project as they are actually incurred.

IDA's financing out of initial subscriptions is to take the form of loans. Broad latitude is provided for the loans; the forms and terms shall be such as IDA may deem appropriate. This procedure will permit the Association to provide finance in any of a number of ways, for example, by providing for lenient terms of repayment, such as loans repayable in foreign exchange with long maturities or long periods of grace, or both, or loans repayable wholly or partly in local currency, by lending free of interest or at a low rate of interest, or by some combination of the foregoing.

IDA may provide financing to a member government, to the government of a territory included within IDA's membership, to a political subdivision, to a public or private entity in the territories of a member or members, or to a public international or regional organization. Unlike the Bank, which must obtain a governmental or a comparable guarantee when lending to a borrower other than a member government, it is left to IDA's discretion whether to require such a guarantee. IDA is directed to cooperate with other public international bodies and member countries providing financial and technical assistance to the less developed areas and specifically to enter into formal arrangements with the United Nations.

IDA shall not interfere in the political affairs of member countries or be influenced in its decisions by the political character of the member or members concerned. Only economic considerations are to be relevant to IDA's decisions.

Resources and use of currencies: IDA is to keep the adequacy of its resources under regular review. The first review is expected to take place in the first 5-year period, and subsequent reviews at intervals of approximately 5 years thereafter. General or individual increases in subscriptions may be authorized at any time.

IDA may also enter into arrangements to receive from any member, in addition to its own subscription, supplementary resources in the currency of another member provided the member whose currency is involved does not object. For example, the United States has indicated it might offer to IDA some of its holding of foreign currencies arising through sales of surplus commodities under Public Law 480. The provision of such supplementary resources would not entitle the subscribing member to any additional voting rights.

Organization and management: The structure of IDA is adapted to administration by the Bank. Thus IDA is to have a board of governors, executive directors, and a president, all of whom will be holders of those positions in the Bank, serving ex officio in IDA. The governors may delegate to the executive directors the same broad powers as have been so delegated in the affairs of the Bank. The Bank's officers and staff are to be appointed, to the extent practicable, to serve as such in IDA, which accordingly will have no separate officers or staff, at least initially. Should a different course appear desirable at any time sufficient flexibility is afforded to permit the appointment of officers, other than the president, and staff, who would be concerned solely with IDA's affairs.

Other articles contain detail provisions for such matters as withdrawal or suspension of membership; status, immunities, and privileges; amendments; interpretation and arbitration; and signature and entry into force.

Initial subscriptions proposed for IDA

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

GROUP I

Australia	20.18
Austria	5.04
Belgium	22.70
Canada	37.83
Denmark	8.74
Finland	3.83
France	52.93
Germany	52.96
Italy	18.16
Japan	33.59
Luxembourg	1.01
Netherlands	27.74
Norway	6.72
Sweden	10.09
Union of South Africa	10.09
United Kingdom	131.14
United States	320.29
Total	783.07

Initial subscriptions proposed for IDA—Con.

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

GROUP II

Afghanistan	1.01
Argentina	18.83
Bolivia	1.06
Brazil	18.83
Burma	2.02
Ceylon	3.03
Chile	3.53
China	30.26
Colombia	3.53
Costa Rica	0.20
Cuba	4.71
Dominican Republic	0.40
Ecuador	0.65
El Salvador	0.30
Ethiopia	0.50
Ghana	2.36
Greece	2.52
Guatelama	0.40
Haiti	0.76
Honduras	0.30
Iceland	0.10
India	40.35
Indonesia	11.10
Iran	4.54
Iraq	0.76
Ireland	3.03
Israel	1.68
Jordan	0.30
Korea	1.26
Lebanon	0.45
Libya	1.01
Malaya	2.52
Mexico	8.74
Morocco	3.53
Nicaragua	0.30
Pakistan	10.09
Panama	0.02
Paraguay	0.30
Peru	1.77
Philippines	5.04
Saudi Arabia	3.70
Spain	10.09
Sudan	1.01
Thailand	3.03
Tunisia	1.51
Turkey	5.80
United Arab Republic	6.03
Uruguay	1.08
Venezuela	7.06
Vietnam	1.51
Yugoslavia	4.04
Total	236.93
Total	1,000.00

Governor Boss' Opening Address to the Fifth Guam Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, among the many pleasant duties and responsibilities which I enjoy as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are those connected with our offshore territories and flag areas. Last fall, our committee made an extended trip to the Pacific where we visited American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. On Guam we met in special session with the members of the Guam Legislature at which time we were told of some of the major territorial problems. We were impressed by the capable manner in which the members of the legislature

were coming to grips with their tasks and the fine spirit of cooperation that existed between them and Acting Gov. M. G. Boss. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of our colleagues the opening address Governor Boss presented to the legislature on February 1, 1960. The address, which points out special pressing problems on Guam, is as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE MARCELLUS GRAEME BOSS, ACTING GOVERNOR OF GUAM, TO THE OPENING SESSION OF THE FIFTH GUAM LEGISLATURE, FEBRUARY 1, 1960

Mr. Speaker, members of the Fifth Guam Legislature, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed auspicious and worthy of note that as we assemble for the ensuing legislative session we do so in an atmosphere of good will which pervades the entire Territory. The best of relationship and good feeling presently exists between the several branches of our civil government, the several military commands, the business community and other Federal agencies and departments located here in Guam as well as at the seat of our National Government.

Included in this list is also one foreign government which has recognized Guam by maintaining a consulate here. I refer to our friend and neighbor to the west, the Republic of the Philippines, and its able, amiable, and genial representative, Consul Rizal G. Adorable.

This is so, and as it should be; for Guam has many difficult problems. But even the most difficult problem is more easily resolved if attacked in a climate of good will, sincere cooperation, and friendly good faith. As notable examples of the foregoing, Guam has been signally honored on two recent occasions, first, by a visit by the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, followed almost immediately by a visitation by six members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Congress, viz., Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, subcommittee chairman, Hon. JACK WESTLAND, of Washington, Hon. B. F. SISK, of California, Hon. DON MCGINLEY, of Nebraska, and Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii. None of these fine officials has constituents on Guam. Guamanians have no votes to give any of them. Yet all gave freely of their time and energy in a deep and sincere effort to learn our troubles and assist in their solution. We are very appreciative of this, and it is our sincere wish that they do it again, soon and often.

In my opinion, the three most urgent and pressing problems confronting the government and people of Guam, are electric power, reorganization of our government, and the Agana Swamp.

ELECTRIC POWER

It is only natural that daylight savings time is distasteful, irritating, and the subject of much complaint. Frankly, however, I am amazed that there is not much more complaint than there is, and the only explanation for the general acceptance of the inconvenience is an apparent realization by the general public of the crisis that is rapidly approaching in our available electric power. We have almost reached the bottom of our kilowatt barrel; and everybody knows it. All electric power on Guam is generated by the Navy. The prime mission of the Navy is national defense, and not to furnish logistic support to the civil community. Nevertheless the Navy gives us a firm power allocation of 9,450 kilovolt-amperes although we have contributed nothing to the cost of the present generating facilities. Yet, despite daylight savings, we frequently peak almost 12,000 kilovolt-amperes; and our power requirements, as well as those of the military, are steadily rising. Something must be done—and immediately.

Through the cooperation of the legislature in postponing this session, it was possible for me, accompanied by your speaker the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, to attend a series of conferences in Washington, D.C., with officials of the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy. There the problem was analyzed and discussed, and alternate proposals for solution agreed upon. The rest is now up to us.

Naturally the permanent solution is construction of additional generating facilities. This will be done; but this takes from 30 to 36 months to achieve. Two alternative proposals have emerged from our recent Washington conference: One is for the Navy to construct a new powerplant with government of Guam contributing to the cost in proportion to its present and projected use of the total power generated—in this instance, roughly one-third.

The alternative proposal is for the government of Guam to build the new plant itself, using the power thus generated to supply our own needs, and selling the excess power to the Navy to supplement its present output. Personally I favor this alternative, for this presents us with a challenge and an ideal opportunity for the government and people of Guam to show ourselves as well as the rest of the world that here is one major problem which we are capable of surmounting and solving on our own. When I left Washington, I had a firm conviction that your speaker concurred; however, I am sure he will report to you himself; and when Mr. Madden, our chief officer of the public utility agency, returns, he will have some firm facts and figures which will be presented to you, first in an informal conference, and then by special message—and together we can then make the decision.

However, even if we should contract immediately for the construction of a new plant, at least 2½ years would elapse before it could be in operation. In the meantime something must be done as a stopgap; otherwise we will run out of kilowatts.

As an interim solution to our immediate problem, the Navy proposes to bring to Guam a so-called mobile unit now located on the west coast, to be installed near the present Piti plant. This unit has a capacity of 10,000 kilovolt amperes, and should take care of all our anticipated needs until well after the completion of the new powerplant; in fact, I am convinced that this should relieve the situation to the extent that, for a reasonable period at least, there is no apparent reason why we cannot dispense with daylight savings time. The Navy cannot do this, however, without our cooperation and participation in financing the project. It is estimated that our share of this cost will not exceed $200,000. I am submitting a bill which will authorize this expenditure, and I sincerely request its immediate passage. Time is important, for in order to get this mobile unit out here installed and in operation by not later than early July, we must notify the Navy on or before the 15th of February that we have the money available to defray our share of the cost.

Also, I am requesting appropriation of an additional $600,000 to our power sinking fund. This would bring this fund up to $2,100,000, which would place us in a much better bargaining position when we commence negotiations for new plant construction.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Section 7(c) of the Organic Act of Guam provides:

"The Governor shall, from time to time, examine the organization of the executive branch of the government of Guam, and shall determine and carry out such changes therein as are necessary to promote effective management and to execute faithfully the purposes of this Act and the laws of Guam."

So far as I can learn or observe, it is apparent that no particular effort has been made in the past to comply with this directive by the U.S. Congress. As a result, the executive branch of this government has grown like Jack's Beanstalk; and we now find ourselves confronted with an oversize bureaucracy which could well (and, incidentally, it does) appall even official Washington. To illustrate: The President of the United States manages to get along fairly well with 9 Cabinet Members; the Governor of the Virgin Islands also has 9 (departments); but the Governor of Guam has 15.

I have reliable and authoritative information that the Government of Guam has more employees than the government of the city of Norfolk, Va. with a population of over a quarter of a million.

The prospect of an operational budget aggregating almost $10½ million, is fantastic. Yet that is what we now have, and it is inevitable that the trend will be for more and more.

This leaves too little for necessary and badly needed capital improvement.

We must retrench—and action cannot longer be deferred. While I shall go into this in greater detail in my subsequent budget message, it must be remarked here that in my opinion, no further cuts are possible unless we start to cut out programs and people. To maintain this comparatively huge bureaucracy in the style to which it has become accustomed, takes over 80 percent of all our income from all sources. We must prepare for the time when the U.S. Congress takes a new look at our fiscal structure and dries up some of these sources.

The prospect of saving money through more efficient administration, coupled with more and more insistent demands from official Washington and increasing complaints of those who are footing the bill, all combine to produce the ineluctable resolve that the time has come when the congressional mandate of section 7(c) can no longer be ignored.

This was recognized at the last regular session and a step toward partial solution was taken culminating in the execution of a contract with the firm of John A. Donaho and Associates for a thorough survey and study of our classification and pay scales. This survey is now in progress; but this alone will not suffice.

I urgently recommend appropriation of not to exceed an additional $70,000, together with authorizattion for negotiation and extension of said contract so as to include a comprehensive survey, study and recommendations for complete reorganization of our entire governmental structure. If both surveys are conducted simultaneously, it is believed that the aggregate cost can be materially reduced over the probable cost of separate and piecemeal surveys. A bill for this purpose is being presented for your considerattion; and I sincerely and respectfully urge its favorable consideration and early enactment.

AGANA SWAMP

While the Agana Swamp has always been a nuisance, an eyesore, and an ever-increasing health menace, the principal reason I have listed this as a matter of urgency at this time is, right now, for the first time (and possibly for the last time) we are presented with a practical and practicable means for doing something about it.

This government owns about 48 acres, located on both sides of what is known as the Swamp Road. Adjoining this government-owned land are many small parcels of privately owned land—all forming what is known as the Agana Swamp—all completely worthless and, as I said, an eyesore as well as an ever-increasing health menace. Fed by several large springs in the vicinity below Sinajana, the Agana River courses through

the middle of the swamp, and empties into Agana harbor.

Reclamation of this 48-acre tract of government land would require a dirt and coral fill of three to four feet, or approximately one-half million cubic yards of fill. Ordinarily a project of such magnitude would be economically as well as practically impossible; for overburden in such vast quantity would normally be unavailable, and even if located, could not be moved for much less than $1.50 a yard.

However, in connection with a pending project for lengthening the air strip at the naval air station, the Navy has recently awarded a contract to a private contracting firm for the removal of over 3 million yards of dirt and coral and with the cooperation of the local Navy command (as well as the contracting firm) we have an opportunity to secure all the material we need, as the same is moved by the contractor, haul it to the swamp and fill it in—all at a cost conservatively estimated at 40 cents per yard. Should we take advantage of this opportunity, some private landowners adjoining our Government-owned tracts, have already indicated a desire to participate in the project, and thus render the entire area of worthless wasteland into a valuable tract, which, judged by land values in that civinity, should more than liquidate the entire amount spent under this proposal. Also, any excess fill could be used to complete necessary fill for the Paseo de Susana Park, which still needs approximately 50,000 yards.

I strongly urge favorable consideration and early enactment of a bill appropriating the sum of not to exceed $200,000 for this purpose. And here, again, I respectfully suggest that time is essential, for if we are to take advantage of this opportunity, we must act before the primary dirt-moving operations get underway. Such an opportunity may never come again, and I hope this will receive your favorable consideration; for I am sure I need not elaborate upon the benefits which would ensue the successful accomplishment of this project.

OTHER PROBLEMS

The emphasis placed upon the foregoing subjects is not calculated to belittle the importance of many other problems confronting us, or to ignore that they exist. Many of these will be dealt with in detail by special messages from time to time. A few will receive brief mention here. Some of them must await later sessions; for there is too much to be done for us to hope for immediate successful resolution of all problems.

One distressing problem which is becoming increasingly serious is that of:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

I have no intelligent sure-cure remedy to offer; for this cannot be forthcoming until we have facts—many facts. I do feel, however, that something must be wrong, or lacking, in our homes, our schools, our laws, and our courts, which combine to contribute to the production of these tragic consequences.

It is my present intention to set up a special committee to gather these facts, study them, and offer suggestions. Before doing so, however, I prefer to wait a reasonable period in the hope this Legislature may have some suggestions or advice. Naturally I would ask one or more Members of this body to assist in the project.

In the meantime, I strongly recommend that you give serious consideration to enactment of legislation to repeal the ridiculous provisions of our law which presently prohibit disclosure of the names of juvenile offenders.

This would enable the public to know the identity of the offender and—more important—what the court did to him. (Instances of repeated arrests of the same juvenile offenders are far from rare).

Publication of the names of the parents of juvenile offenders would do much to resurrect the long-forgotten institution of parental authority and discipline which, through indifference or neglect, has atrophied almost to the point of extinction.

I sincerely urge adoption of such legislation and further recommend consideration of the advisability of legislation placing a higher and more stringent degree of responsibility upon parents for the wrongful acts and delinquencies of their minor offspring.

STATE OF THE TERRITORY

There is no involuntary unemployment on Guam; at least this is true to the extent that any Guamanian, who is able and willing to work, can find employment.

On the mainland, even in so-called prosperous times, unemployment runs into the millions; while at present here on Guam, there appear to be many more jobs than people to fill them.

This anomalous situation results principally from two things:

1. The recent policy of the Immigration Department for the hurried phase-out of all alien contract labor employed by the civil community.

2. Employment by the government of Guam of all available labor on projects in competition with private enterprise.

I firmly believe it is an obligation of the government of Guam and of the people of Guam, to take all reasonable steps to correct this condition of imbalance. Skilled workmen and mechanics must be trained to replace their alien counterparts in the local business community as they are forced out. To this end, an appropriation was made by this legislature, at its last regular session, to finance the establishment of a vocational or trade school. Despite several delays—some unavoidable, some inexcusable—the work is now progressing and it is expected that classes will start about the middle of this month. A similar program which provides part-time work in on-the-job training for students, is well underway in our high school, and is receiving gratifying support from the local buisnesses.

To fill the void in unskilled and semi-skilled labor, efforts must be continued to transfer excess labor forces from government employment to private employment. This program is well underway, but it must be continued.

Before concluding, it should be noted that administration of our new insurance code is well underway. Like all new programs, there have been some rough spots, but these are being ironed out. It is gratifying to note that a new rate schedule just promulgated by the insurance commissioner provides a 40 percent reduction in rates for typhoon insurance, and a 10 percent reduction in workmen's compensation insurance rates; and I am informed that these reductions were agreed to by the insurance companies affected.

Our proposed budget was delivered to your finance chairman around January 20, and copies should be available to your members now. My budget message will be presented separately; and I hope to get it to you later this week.

In conclusion, please pardon a personal note. While I have always felt that no public official should be given special commendation merely for doing his duty, I would be less than candid if I did not thank you with all my heart for your kind and generous gesture manifested in the adoption of Resolution No. 155. Of course, these expressions are mere words, but they are not empty words; for they are supported by a 26-month background of true friendship, fair dealings, and sincere cooperation on the part of each one of you.

We have not always agreed in the past. We will not always agree in the future. But we know that we can be in honest disagreement, yet retain friendship and mutual respect. We can meet, discuss, disagree, later resolve and agree upon our problems, and still retain and preserve that integrity and independence of our respective branches which is so essential to our American concept of government; for we are partners, working on the same team, for the same goal: the betterment of our land and its people. I thank you, I thank you very much.

California Schoolgirl, Lois Sterk, Writes Essay on "What We Expect of Our Legislative Representatives"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do, I am naturally pleased and feel it an honor to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and all the other Members of this great Congress the text of one of the winning essays in the recent essay contest sponsored by the California Real Estate Association in statewide competition.

Miss Lois Sterk resides in the great 23d District which I represent, this my 14th year in Congress. Miss Sterk is now a distinguished student in the State of Michigan but the residence of her parents and herself is Bellflower, Calif. Since the young lady chose the subject of her essay to be "What We Expect of Our Legislative Representatives," together with the fact that she was one of the top contestants, I was pretty sure that all the Members of Congress would be pleased to have this young American's brief observations in support of her chosen essay theme.

I am sure also that you and all the other Members reading same will join with me in congratulating her on her worthy achievement.

The essay follows:

WHAT WE EXPECT OF OUR LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES

Political knowledge, good judgment, and the ability to present his opinions are not the only requirements a legislative representative must meet. He must have a deep love for his country. His work is often difficult and thankless, and at such times monetary gain and prestige are not enough. More rewarding is the realization that he has a role in the development of America and her affairs. It naturally follows that he will promote her ideals of "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Our fathers, realized, and we and our leaders must also remember, "That nation is blessed whose God is the Lord."

We hear a great deal about campaign promises, but a good Representative forms a platform and tries to carry it out. A Representative acts as a servant of the people, and, as such, must abide by their wishes, as long as these wishes are in accordance with his platform and convictions. It is also necessary that he be able to reach his decisions with good judgment and act accordingly.

A legislator must be an outstanding individual and citizen. As an individual it is necessary that his integrity be above suspicion. His homelife must be a happy one, and he should be able to get along well with other people. As a citizen, he must love America and carefully observe all Federal, State, and district laws. In short, a Representative must be a good example to others.

In order to have good government, we must have good Representatives. But something never to be forgotten is that in the end good government depends on us, the people. It is our obligation to be good citizens, for a government can be no better than the people it represents.

More Economical Processes in Defense Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 3, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, February 7, 1960, points up the continuous efforts of the Supply and Logistics Section of the Department of Defense to encourage development of new and more economical processes in defense production. I am proud that the Cyral Bath Co., located in the 23d District of Ohio, which I represent, is playing an important part in these efforts. The article follows:

SPACE METALS HARD TO HANDLE—PENTAGON SEEKS NEW PROCESSES—ORDINARY TOOLS CANNOT DO JOB

(By Allen M. Smythe)

New processes rather than new machine tools are needed to handle the light heat-resistant exotic metals required for components in the supersonic aircraft, ballistic missiles and spaceships of the future, according to top Pentagon metallurgists. Ordinary machine tools cannot fabricate these new hard metals that are vitally necessary for air vehicles that travel 16,000 miles an hour and which must withstand temperatures in the thousands of degrees.

The new metals now being developed for these space-age weapons and vehicles include titanium, columbium, beryllium, tantalum, molybdenum and zirconium. New processes now being studied by the Pentagon to handle these metals include explosive forming, ultrasonics, electric erosion, ultraspeed grinding, chemical milling, and radial draw forming. Assistant Secretary of Defense E. Perkins McGuire (supply and logistics) has been directing his department to develop and encourage the use of new processes that are both efficient and inexpensive. "We are anxious," said Mr. McGuire, "to use any new process or equipment that will aid production and reduce the costs of modern weapons."

One new process that has been studied for more than a year by defense experts is called explosive forming. Developed by Convair it is used to form titanium and beryllium parts for their new medium bomber, the B–58, which flies at twice the speed of sound. It has limited application but has been used in some special parts that were too hard to be fabricated by modern machine tools.

The Pentagon has recently been studying the use of cold stretch forming. Hard metals that cannot be cut or extruded can be stretched if enough hydraulic power is used. Between the yield point and the breaking point the metal will "flow." If determination is made accurately of a point just above yield point the metal can easily be compressed against a die.

A second seminar using moving picture and technical discussion was held this last week in the Pentagon demonstrating use of radical draw formers. This machine literally stretches rods and sheets around a curve while it is being pressed across its cross section at a point or line which is in tension just above the yield point. Electronic instruments control the pressure to insure the tension is held in narrow limits above the yield point, regardless of variations in the metal.

The machine, made by Cyril Bath Co. of Cleveland, is used to make the titanium nose and other structural parts of the Atlas ICBM missile. It is also being used to make titanium, beryllium and molybdenum parts of the J–93 chemical fueled jet engine. This powerplant is being developed by General Electric for aircraft with speeds above three times that of sound.

The Pentagon meeting was held for metallurgists and production experts of the three armed services. Also attending were representatives from the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Space and Aeronautics Administration and other interested Federal agencies. Although the meeting was unclassified, the press was excluded.

Plywood Imports on the Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, recently the management of the Harbor Plywood Mill at Aberdeen, Wash., which employs several hundred workers, announced to its employees that the plant was closing down for 1 week.

Reason given for the closure was that "the industrywide order file for plywood is generally at its lowest point in several years."

A number of other plywood plants in Oregon and Washington have announced similar closedowns. Some plants have closed for an entire week. Others have gone to a 3- and 4-day-a-week operation.

About the same time that the management of plywood plants were announcing curtailment of production due to inadequate orders the Secretary of Commerce reported that plywood imports from low-wage-, low-living-cost foreign nations into the United States increased by a whopping 49 percent during the first 11 months of 1959 over the same period of the previous year.

As more plywood imports have poured into our country from low-wage foreign nations, American mills have been compelled to curtail production and lay off employees thereby reducing the income of these workers.

The Commerce Department reports that 1,200,000,000 feet of plywood were imported into the United States in the first 11 months of 1959. These huge imports have curtailed the income of plywood workers and of the loggers and other suppliers who provide logs and other materials to plywood mills. This also has reduced the profits of plywood mill operators. It has resulted in the loss of individual and corporation income tax revenues to the Federal Government.

The growing menace of growing plywood imports from low-wage nations should suggest to Congress that some restriction on plywood imports through quota limits is urgently needed. The situation in 1960, unless speedily corrected, is likely to be worse for the plywood industry and its workers. The national domestic prosperity should not be permitted to erode because of too heavy uncontrolled imports.

A Woman Holds Key to Guarded Jury Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, inspiring to all of us who are interested in and strive for good government on every level are the stories of persons who give freely of their time and energies to their fellow citizens through Government.

Such a citizen is my constituent, Mrs. Fred Batson, of Bessemer, Ala., who is now serving her second year on the Jefferson County jury board and has just been named chairman of the board.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, the newspaper story on this fine lady's contribution to our local jury system as it appeared in a recent article by Mrs. Alyce B. Walker in the Birmingham News:

A WOMAN HOLDS KEY TO GUARDED JURY BOX

(By Alyce B. Walker)

The name of the chairman of Jefferson County's Jury Board isn't in the county jury box, because the chairman is a chairwoman.

Makes no difference that she, Mrs. Fred Batson, of Bessemer, is an expert on the subject, Alabama women can't serve on juries.

Ours is one of the three remaining States with such a legislative restriction. Yet, strangely, by a 1953 legislative act, women can serve on the three-member Jefferson County Jury Board.

Strangely, too, it's women who are usually hired to make the biennial canvass of the county to gather names of potential jurors—male jurors of course.

RECENT BREAKTHROUGH ON FEDERAL JURIES

This exclusion of women from jury service doesn't apply to Federal courts and in recent months there has been a breakthrough of Alabama women serving on Federal juries.

One of these days we, the women, are going to be required to fulfill this suffrage obligation at local and State levels, too, so I went to headquarters to learn about procedures for becoming a juror.

A conference with Mrs. Batson, Sheriff Holt McDowell and J. F. Chestwood, chief clerk for the jury board, was a real lesson in this aspect of democratic government.

For instance, when I suggested that we photograph Mrs. Batson with the jury box, I didn't know I was proposing a picture that probably has never before been made. That jury box is as guarded as the crown jewels of England.

GUARDED LIKE CROWN JEWELS

It is kept under double lock in a vault in the sheriff's office. Only the jury board chairman and the presiding probate judge have keys to the two locks on the box itself. One of these, on the side of the box, is only unlocked every two years. The other that fastens a small, round opening in the top is unlocked only for the presiding judge to reach in his hand and draw out names when a jury is needed.

The big, dark green iron box with a crank on one side for mixing up the names, is filled the last Tuesday of August every 2 years. At that time, if there are any names left in it, they are torn up and a whole new collection put in.

There are two such boxes in Jefferson County—one for the Birmingham area and the other in the Bessemer Courthouse for that part of the county.

The law requires that the number of names in the box be at least 6 percent of the population, based on the last census. There were 43,000 names in the last Birmingham box, and 8,000 in the Bessemer one.

CARDS CONTAIN NEEDED INFORMATION

Names are printed on small white cards, along with home and business addresses, occupation and precinct number in which the person votes. At least one Christian name must be on the card. Initials are not allowed.

These cards are filled out after the jury board has compiled a jury list from information gathered in the door-to-door canvass of the county. The roll lists only names of males between ages 21 and 65, who are generally reputed to be honest, intelligent and are esteemed in the community for their integrity, good character and sound judgment."

The jury specifically excludes persons known to be habitual drunkards, those afflicted with a permanent disease or physical weakness that renders them unable for service, and anyone who has been convicted of any offense involving moral turpitude.

Also excluded is anyone unable to read English, unless that person, meeting all other requirements, is a freeholder or householder.

SCREENING DONE BY CHIEF CLERK

This screening of jurors is done by the chief clerk of the jury board and his assistants. Every name is checked in a variety of ways. This includes checking against fingerprint records in both the sheriff's office and the city recorder's office.

Mr. Cheatwood estimated about 10 percent of the names submited must be discarded for the aforementioned reasons.

It isn't likely that a person will have to do jury service but every 4 years, for after the cards have been prepared, the jury board sets aside those bearing names of persons who have served as jurors during the preceding 2 years. These names, however, are held in reserve, to be used if the jury box is depleted before expiration of the 2-year refilling date.

When a jury is needed, the presiding judge draws names from the box 2 or 3 weeks in advance so the sheriff's office will have time to find the people. He usually draws more than the necessary 12 names for a panel in case some of them have moved out of the area or have become ineligible for other reasons.

SHERIFF SERVES JURY SUMMONS

The sheriff serves the jury summons either by registered mail or in the hands of one of his representatives.

A receipt of the summons is returned to the sheriff and then only by special permission from the presiding judge can a person be excused from service. If the person is excused for some temporary reason, his name goes back into the box for possible recall.

Sheriff McDowell lauded Jefferson County's jury setup as one of the finest in the country. He cited with pride the reduced number of requests for excused service and particularly commended those employers who make up the difference between the $6 per day jury service fee and their employee's regular salary.

But what about this jury board, presided over by Mrs. Batson, giftshop owner, mother of one son, active worker in her church and Salvation Army auxiliary?

SIMILAR BOARDS IN ALL COUNTIES

There are similar boards in all the State's counties, appointed every 4 years by the incoming Governor. Jefferson County's board, however, differs in that membership is staggered and on a 3-year basis.

The board is required to meet once monthly. The chairman can call other necessary sessions. Members, designated as commissioners, receive $50 monthly. In addition to preparing the jury roll and filling the box, they employ from civil service candidates the necessary clerks to operate the office.

Mrs. Batson became interested in the board through her husband who, as member for three terms and chairman when he died, was responsible for many of the board reforms. Now in her second year, she was last week elected chairman by her cocommissioners, George Clayton and Walter P. Palmer.

The chairman feels very strongly that women should serve on juries—but on a voluntary basis.

In Defense of Reuther: Whoa, Senator Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News, Saturday, February 13, 1960:

IN DEFENSE OF REUTHER: WHOA, SENATOR GOLDWATER

We do not exactly make a habit of leaping to the defense of Walter P. Reuther, but we find ourselves unable to swallow the accusations made in a planned report from Republican members of the Senate Labor Rackets Committee.

Our Washington correspondent who has an advance copy of the document secs it as an attack upon Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the front-running candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. The trick is to get at KENNEDY by attacking Reuther and the candidate's brother, Robert F. Kennedy, former chief counsel of the Rackets Committee. Guilt by relationship, as it were.

As was to be expected, the GOP approach makes much of the long delayed extradition of UAW muscleman John Gunaca to Wisconsin where he was wanted in connection with Kohler strike violence. We, too, complained about that bit of nonfeasance, attacking it as exemplified subservience by a governor catering to UAW desires. But the new criticism goes far beyond that to call Michigan "a privileged sanctuary for the protection of criminals against extradition and punishment" and to assert that "reasonable people must conclude that the legal and political processes of Michigan no longer are controlled by its citizens."

If reasonable people are able to believe that, the Lord save us from the thoughts of the unreasonable.

The report continues, "* * * that corruption, misappropriation of funds, bribery, extortion and collusion with the underworld exists within the UAW as they do in those other unions whose derelictions have been so widely publicized."

This statement is obvious nonsense.

We don't approve of Walter Reuther's insatiable desire for power. We don't like his social philosophy. We think his free pouring of union funds to control elections both violates the law and threatens our democratic system. Certainly we abhor the UAW assumption that violence is all right if that's what it takes to persuade workingmen that they had best follow UAW policy.

But the UAW is no Teamsters Union and Reuther is not a Jimmy Hoffa. We doubt if any major union has been more free of corruption and collusion with the underworld. We do not believe Senator GOLDWATER, chief of the report's authors, has the facts to prove to prove to the contrary. If he has, he should specify them. If he hasn't, he might better get some blue pencils and edit the bunk from his forthcoming report lest, by violating verity, it convince citizens that all complaints again the UAW are unfounded.

Hangover Haywire Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Elmira (N.Y.) Star Gazette of February 11, 1960. May I also call attention to H.R. 9781 which I have introduced and which would repeal on January 1, 1961, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

The editorial follows:

TIME TO HALT FARM GIVEAWAY

President Eisenhower has spoken out on the vexing domestic problem of farm products largely due to economic distortions induced by years of Federal interference.

His message to the Congress combines a review of a costly surplus with a plea for remedial realistic legislative action.

The President is talking about big money—money that comes from the pockets of taxpayers and handed out under a program devised in the lavish giveaway days of the New Deal.

"It defies commonsense," the President said, "to continue to encourage, at a cost of many millions of tax dollars, the building of ever larger excess supplies of products that, as they accumulate, depress farm prices and endanger the future of our farmers."

The wheat situation was the principal target of the President's call for relief.

"Federal funds tied up in wheat," he declared, "approximate $3½ billion. Although this means that well over 30 percent of the total funds invested in inventories and loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation goes for wheat, this crop provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from sales of farm products. The Government sustains a net cost of more than $1,000 a minute—$1,500,000 every day—the year around to stabilize wheat prices and income."

The figures have been cited many times. In the time it has taken to read this type, 1,000 taxpayer dollars have been shelled out in a fantastic scheme that should have been revised or thrown out many years ago.

Election year is probably the worst possible time for Eisenhower to call for action. Lawmakers don't like to rock the boat. The taxpayer is forgotten—except when his bill is due. Then his pockets are invaded by the tax collector, and money so extracted is spent at the rate of $1,000 a minute to perpetuate one of the New Deal's major contributions to haywire economics.

Establishment of Washington's Western Lands National Monument in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the resolution adopted February 5, 1960, by the West Virginia Legislature, urging the passage of legislation to authorize the establishment of Washington's Western Lands National Monument in West Virginia. Passage of this legislation would make possible the preservation in our national park domain of some 35,000 acres of land owned by George Washington along the Ohio and Great Kanawha Rivers.

The resolution follows:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Resolution pertaining to Washington's Western Lands National Monument

"Whereas the West Virginia Historical Society, through the efforts of its Washington's Western Lands National Monument Committee, is promoting the establishment of Washington's Western Lands National Monument, which would include the prehistoric and historic sites in the area encompassed by the eight tracts of land owned by George Washington in the Ohio and Great Kanawha River valleys; and

"Where bills on the proposal were introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress by U.S. Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT BYRD in the Senate and by Representative KEN HECHLER in the House, on last June 4 and 5: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein)*, That the Legislature of West Virginia in regular session, 1960, do endorse this project; and that the clerk of the senate be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to West Virginia's congressional delegation, urging the passage of Senate bill 2120 and House bill 7603, 'To authorize the establishment of the Washington's Western Lands National Monument in the State of West Virginia.'"

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, adopted by the senate on January 26, 1960, and by the house of delegates on February 5, 1960, according to the records in my office.

J. HOWARD MYERS,
Clerk, Senate of West Virginia.

Big Political Stink Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence in the composite judgment of our people when they have an opportunity to know all sides of an issue. As a lawyer I have never quarreled with the verdict of a jury where the jurors were given all of the facts in the case. I have no fear for the future of our democratic form of government if the people are provided with the facts on all public questions. Mr. Speaker I am also confident that when the American people are fully informed they will not shrink from responsibility but will make every and any sacrifice necessary to meet the challenge. Misinformation, half-truths, and secrecy will certainly destroy democracy.

Mr. Speaker I make this point today in the midst of the "great debate" over our national defense, the most important issue of our time because it involves our very survival. I cannot help but feel it is wrong to stifle debate in this matter with the argument that it might cause a potential enemy to miscalculate. Of course, some details on weapons should not be paraded about, but generally speaking, if there are any soft spots in our defense posture, I am sure our enemies have already learned about it through their own intelligence systems and if an honest debate reveals that we are more powerful than our enemies this will give even greater insurance against enemy miscalculations.

Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the February 11 edition of the Mansfield News Journal which appropriately indicates that a calm and intelligent discussion of the facts can remove fog and confusion in the critical area of our defense:

BIG POLITICAL STINK BOMB

The great controversy over U.S. military preparedness continues to rage in the arena of public opinion. The warriors surge back and forth, but they don't seem to get much of anywhere.

The arguments, involving top military figures and even the President, go on and on: there is a serious missile gap, there is no missile gap; the Nation has decisive deterrent force, there is a deterrent gap; we're behind, we're ahead.

The champions of conflicting viewpoints have created such a furor that neither they nor the spectators have any sensible idea what the outcome will be.

The need, quite obviously, is to have the dust cleared away and the uproar quieted so that the public can see who is winning. Unfortunately, it is almost certain that this will not happen. Too many divisive factors—partisan political considerations, interservice rivalries and the like—are at work.

There is no one who can rise above the heat of battle and say definitely, "This is how we stand."

And yet, something approximating such an unbiased voice needs to be heard.

If it is not heard, those who represent the people cannot have a sound basis on which to make decisions that may have a profound effect on national security. The budget will be kicked into a cocked hat. Military progress will become unplanned confusion.

Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, the recently retired Army missile expert, said in a speech the other day that military and scientific "gobbledygook" has kept the truth about the missile race from the public. He urged that "the cold, stark facts" be presented to the public.

For what it is worth—and in full awareness that such data can be extracted only with great difficulty from the mass of conflicting views—we add our voice to his.

Let's have less ax grinding, and more facts.

The public is already sick of seeing national defense used as a political stink bomb.

Director of Chicago's Largest Vocational High School Fears Shortage of Skilled Mechanics Within a Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from a letter I have received from James W. Crowe, director of the Chicago Vocational High School, which I think should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Crowe heads the largest vocational high school in Chicago and is one of the outstanding authorities of the Nation in this field of education. The excerpts from his letter follow:

I might add that I am very much concerned with the current educational trend to heavily emphasize the so-called academic studies, and the gradual curtailment of the vocational and practical arts program. It seems that our educators feel that everybody must learn science, mathematics, and foreign language—apparently on the premise that anybody can become a skilled mechanic. If this trend continues unabated, one of the results, as I see it, will be a drastic shortage of skilled mechanics within a decade.

I might point out that we never read in the paper about the failure of our missiles to go into orbit due to design. The usual reason is "mechanical failure." Just within the past 2 weeks we had one of the rockets perform perfectly, and a week later another one of the same design failed miserably. It appears to be quite obvious what they need is not more theorists and research scientists, but better draftsmen.

In line with this trend, I know that the University of Illinois has made a new requirement that, by 1963, all enrollees in the university must have 2 years of foreign language, and a total of 12½ units of academic

work for admission to the university. This means that either we must accept the fact that CVS graduates cannot enter the University of Illinois or that we must curtail our vocational program and add a foreign language. This requirement of the university is simply another indication of what I mentioned earlier in this letter.

Ruling Against Special Ability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit Free Press on Saturday, February 13, 1960.

The editorial follows:

DEFENSE THRIFT—RULING AGAINST SPECIAL ABILITY

A more objective view of the Federal Budget Bureau's decision on the use of Government-owned defense plants might be possible if the jobs of thousands of Michigan workers were not at stake.

The ruling, designed to force the use of private plants to produce such things as tanks and other automotive equipment, would add to a private manufacturer's bid the cost differential they enjoy by using Government facilities.

The claim is that those defense contractors who use such Government-owned facilities have an advantage over others who might like to bid on defense contracts.

Michigan installations that could be affected by the order are the Detroit Arsenal in Warren and the Sterling Township missile plant—both operated by the Chrysler Corp.—and the Muskegon Arsenal. The Sterling plant employs 10,000 workers, the arsenal another 400. The Muskegon Arsenal, operated by Continental Motors Corp., has 800 workers.

At stake immediately is an order for 720 M-60 tanks and 212 M-88 tank recovery vehicles.

Such equipment—like most all wheeled vehicles—has been the prime defense product of Michigan since the Detroit area in World War II worked for and earned the informal title of "Arsenal of Democracy."

The production of automotive defense items has been recognized since then as a Michigan specialty, so much so that the Army's Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, which has charge of wheeled and track vehicles for all branches of the Armed Forces, is based in Detroit.

In addition, the Defense Department since being taken somewhat by surprise by the Korean war, has maintained that key defense plants must be kept operating even in peacetime—particularly those known as GOCO (government owned-contractor operated) plants that produce items not available as regular commercial products. Tanks and heavy ammunition, for instance, would fall in this category, but standard automobiles and trucks would not.

Hence, while there might be some saving by awarding contracts to manufacturers who are willing to invest their own money in plants and equipment to make strictly military items, it very possibly could be offset by the additional cost to the Government if the Michigan plants must be maintained in operating condition by the Armed Forces.

A closer examination of the Budget Bureau's ruling might show that its new policy is pennywise but poundfoolish.

Other than these considerations that stem from Michigan's much respected and traditional role of an experienced and ready hand in the production of military land vehicles, there are the thousands of trained workers who form the backbone of Michigan's know-how in the field.

A very short while ago, Detroit and all of Michigan was of concern to the rest of the country because of the unusually high rate of unemployment. It was urged at the time that defense contracts be channeled into Michigan to relieve the hardship of those without jobs.

Now that Michigan is nearly recovered, it appears paradoxical to put into effect a new ruling that might throw out of work thousands of people trained to preserve one of the most important phases of the Nation's defense structure.

Not only for the jobs at stake, but because of Michigan's continuing contributions to the Nation's military readiness and the need to preserve this area's specialized ability to produce wheeled vehicles for the Armed Forces, the ruling should be reconsidered—not only for Michigan's good, but because the cost in the long run may be greater if the concentration of skills and effort present in this State are scattered by bureaucratic ruling.

North Dakota Needs Highway Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the curtailment of railway mail service in many communities in my State of North Dakota. The following resolution which was passed by the city council, city of Jamestown, indicates a desire for the establishment of a highway postoffice system to provide much needed service to many communities in North Dakota:

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the city council of the city of Jamestown, N. Dak., that curtailment of railway mail service to communities which comprise the trade area of the city of Jamestown is being considered; and

Whereas such curtailment of railway mail service will result in inadequate mail delivery to the communities said trade area because of suggested "closed pouch" mail service; and

Whereas U.S. Port Office Department has inaugurated highway post office service in other communities, which type of service would give even better service than that obtained through railway mail service: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the city of Jamestown, That the proposed Jamestown to Minot highway post office service be encouraged and established and that the U.S. Postal Department and the congressional representatives of North Dakota be requested to support and consider such a proposal.

Attest:

F. P. GILRONAN,
City Auditor.

Approved:

WM. WESTLEY, *Mayor.*

Grassroots Opinion Opposes Farm Acreage and Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced H.R. 10350 to end the present farm subsidy program I have received strong indication that the American people are fed up with agricultural supports which cost billions of dollars a year and are a failure so that farm income goes down and Government-owned surpluses go up.

Here are some samples of grassroots opinion.

The editor of the American Agricultural News Digest in New York wrote:

I want you to know how heartily I approve of your farm bill calling for repeal of the entire farm program and the restoration of a free economy to farmers.

A wheatgrower from Prosser, Wash., wired:

Congratulations on your stand on farm program.

A businessman from Shelton, Wash., said in a letter:

Commendations on your proposal to repeal price suport subsidies of agricultural products.

From Boston came this message:

Congratulations on honesty over expediency, Congressman.

A housewife in Seattle put it this way:

It was certainly wonderful to read in the Seattle Times of your present endeavors in regard to the discontinuance of price supports to farmers. This issue has been a political football so long that something really needed to be done.

Here are some other comments:

One of my pet peeves is the so-called farm supports and the soil bank. Reduce the scandalous cost of financing this program of paying the farmer and cost of storage.

Where there is starvation, I would say take off all price supports and use the surpluses for that purpose.

Price-support programs were instituted to prevent the sudden collapse of prices as occurred following the First World War; to maintain high-level supports amounts to rank injustice to the rank and file of our citizenery; i.e., tends to maintain a high cost-of-living level, which in turn brings on the constant turmoil for higher wages, and this latter trend will, if not definitely checked, lead to ungovernable inflation.

I think agriculture price supports should be abolished.

Regarding problem of excessive Federal grain storage, farm price supports, etc., I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Agriculture support—silly. Cut 'em out.

I favor reduction of agriculture price supports.

We urban dwellers who are not farmers recognize that the Federal price-support bill

had as its basic motive the gaining of farmers' votes, but resulted in enormous surpluses while consumers are paying increased prices and paying income taxes to pay the farmers.

All price-support subsidies should be repealed.

Price supports should be abolished; it is a detriment to the farmer and the whole Nation.

This farm program is a disgrace to the Nation. Since we spend $1½ million a day for storage, I'm in favor of giving the foodstuffs to needy people overseas.

The farm program is a dismal failure. Every legislator who believes in the American way should support your bill.

I am delighted to read in the morning paper that you introduced a bill to repeal the entire farm-support program.

If we are to continue economic aid, it should be with the surpluses of wheat, cotton, and what have you, thereby reducing cost of storage, etc.

Yes, on reduced farm programs—drastically reduced and reevaluated.

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., the Angry Voice of Harlem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the November issue of Esquire magazine:

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.: THE ANGRY VOICE OF HARLEM

(By Dan Wakefield)

On a humid Sunday afternoon in Harlem, the Reverend Dr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., stood in the pulpit of the Abyssinian Baptist Church—not, at the moment, as his people's minister, but as their congressional Representative—and spoke of the Power Elite, David and Goliath, Tammany Hall, and Jericho. That morning he had appeared in the same pulpit in the flowing black robes of a minister of the Lord, his bearing stern and erect, but now in the afternoon his head was slightly bent and he wore with his three-button dark-blue suit a trace of mortal weariness. His unmistakable dignity was altered, though not in the least diminished, by the change in role and costume. Mixing the troubles of Job with the threats of the Hidden Persuaders, he looked out over the audience with the confident command of a concert conductor, leading the people to a state of passionate acclaim more common to revival meetings than political rallies. At one point he stopped, removed his black-rimmed glasses and leaned forward to explain that the reason he was always especially honored in Washington by the consulates of the new African nations was not because of his personal achievements, but because he represented the people of Harlem.

"Because," he slowly, deeply intoned, "I—am—you."

And the roar came back from the audience: "Yes. Yes."

Yet ADAM POWELL is as different in most respects from his congregation and constituents in Harlem as perhaps could be possible. His skin is light enough to pass for white, his income averages around $40,000 a year, his education includes a B.A. from Colgate, an M.A. from Columbia, and a D.D. from Shaw University; he has traveled from Bandung to Berlin, from Manila to Madrid, and only once since 1950 (because of illness) has he missed attending the Salzburg Music Festival; until recently he propelled himself through the streets of Harlem and Washington in a much-publicized Jaguar or a Nash-Healy sports car. (POWELL says the Jaguar was 8 years old and the Nash-Healy second-hand, and therefore no longer a mark of his affluence—though surely they remain a mark of his taste.) The 336,441 people of New York's 16th Congressional District have returned him to Congress by overwhelming majorities for 8 consecutive terms, and if he is, as charged by his enemies, a "demagogue," then he is quite a different kind from the Huey Long variety, who appears to the masses he directs as a personality with income and intellct no different from their own. The masses who support him do not see their reflected image in ADAM POWELL—but rather the image of what they, even as American Negroes, might become.

In the teeming world of Harlem, the Nation's largest Negro ghetto, the unwritten laws of political life that operate in the rest of the Nation are often reversed. On the national scene, it has become an accepted political cliché that a candidate is cursed by being labeled an egghead, and must show himself to be "just one of the boys." In his second attempt at the presidency Adlai Stevenson constantly fought against his public image as an intellectual and aristocrat, and as part of that effort adopted as his emblem the shoe with the hole in it. ADAM POWELL is as likely to appear in public with a hole in his shoe as is Aristotle Onassis. Whereas Stevenson attempted to bring the language of his speeches down closer to the level of the crowd, POWELL raises the language of his speeches above their heads—and in Harlem they scream for more. When asked once on an interview program what his Harlem constituents felt about his high standard of living, POWELL said: "Well, I wouldn't say they hold it against me; in fact, I think the people of my community love the fact that I live like I do and yet I am with them in their fights. * * *"

Not only his financial independence, but his light-colored skin could allow POWELL to put himself above the battle for Negro rights, and both he and his enemies feel that this is another factor that adds to his appeal. "One of the things that gives me strength," POWELL says, "is that people say, 'Here's a guy who could live white, be white, but he isn't—he's part of our community.' * * *"

Besides the lack of necessity to be "like the crowd," one of the significant facts of political life in Harlem that runs counter to the national mood is the spirit of militancy and noncompromise. POWELL has been both a creator of this spirit and, perhaps more importantly, a product of it. In the midst of the "age of Eisenhower," when leaders of both political parties are noted for their tendency to veer toward the middle of the road, the dirtiest word in the vocabulary of Harlem politics is "moderation." This does not mean that Harlem is, or has ever been, a hotbed of political radicalism in the broad sense; it does not mean that Harlem voters are necessarily opposed to moderation or even conservatism in matters such as foreign aid, atomic testing, government ownership, offshore oil, or natural gas. It means that there is only one real political issue in the community—civil rights—and on that issue there can be no compromise. Muted by the distribution of congressional districts that sliced up Harlem and gave the Negroes of New York City no majority in any district and no representation in Congress until the reapportionment of 1943, Harlem wanted the strongest, the most uncompromising voice it could find when it finally had the chance to make itself heard in Washington. It chose, by a combined total of 78 percent of the vote in all three primaries—Democratic, Republican, and American Labor Party—a 35-year-old minister named ADAM POWELL.

The first political hero born at the Harlem polls could claim, if not for himself at least through his father, the old-time qualifications for American political success that long have been closed by the 20th century to his white contemporaries. POWELL's father—the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell, Sr.—was born in a one-room log cabin in Franklin County, Va., and taught himself how to read by studying the Gospel of St. John one winter by firelight. The family's life was so obscurely rural that he didn't know what town they lived near. He saw a clock for the first time in his life at the age of 10; a train at the age of 11. From such beginnings he raised himself to study at Yale University and eventually take over the pastorship of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, New York's second oldest Baptist congregation and the oldest Negro Baptist congregation in the North. He built it into one of the largest Protestant churches in the world, with more than 10,000 members, and under his leadership it housed itself in the Gothic structure of stone and steel that it now occupies on Harlem's 138th Street, at a cost of $400,000, which the church paid off in 4 years. Samuel Cluff, a veteran deacon of the church, recalled recently of the Rev. Powell, Sr. (who died in 1953): "He was three men in one—a great leader, a great preacher, and a great financier."

ADAM Jr. would never have to worry, as his grandfather once had, over whether the family would be able to pay the $1 monthly rent on a log cabin. He was born in New Haven in 1908 and 6 months later the family moved to New York, where the Reverend Powell, Sr., took over the well-heeled congregation of the Abyssinian Church. ADAM, JR., would never experience the wounds of poverty and slavery; but he learned them as a living part of his heritage, as surely as the son of an aristocrat is taught the meaning and responsibility of his family background. At the age of 10, ADAM POWELL, Jr., climbed on a chair and traced with his hand the letter "P," 9 inches high, which was burned in the back of his grandfather, a branded slave.

POWELL's own personal burdens, as befitting the advance of his family up the scale of American society, were less certain and more complex. His maternal grandfather was white, and his own complexion was light enough to make him slightly suspicious to both Negroes and whites. POWELL likes to tell the story of his first violent encounters with prejudice on the streets of New York:

"When I was about 12 we moved into 136th Street and we were one of the first Negro families there. Well, there were always fights between the Negroes and the Irish—we called 'em 'Micks.' I remember one night my mother sent me out to the bakery and I was stopped by a bunch of Negro kids and they beat me up because they thought I was white. The next night I went out and a gang of Irish kids beat me up because I was a Negro. Later that week, another group of Negroes stopped me and they said, 'What are you?' I said, 'Mixed.' Well, they thought I said 'Mick,' so they beat me up."

Just 10 years later, after POWELL had returned home to Harlem with a B.A. from Colgate to become assistant minister of his father's church, there were few "gangs" of any kind in the neighborhood who would have mistaken his race or his power. In the

fall of 1930, as the great depression hit Harlem like a hurricane, POWELL's father organized a community-relief bureau at the Abyssinian Church and put his son in charge. Young ADAM became the dispenser of some of the few good things in the lives of thousands of Harlem Negroes who needed food, clothes, and shoes. He was a new, bright, and educated face, backed by the most powerful church in the neighborhood, and he soon was looked to for bigger things. That same year a group of doctors who were banned from Harlem Hospital because they were Negroes came to young ADAM to ask for help. The 22-year-old POWELL organized meetings, picketings, delegations to medical and city officials, and culminated the protest with a mass march of 6,000 Negroes on city hall. The board of estimate was in session, and POWELL, as chairman and representative of the throng outside, got a hearing, and stated his demands. The eventual results were not only the granting of practice in Harlem Hospital to the five doctors, but the establishment of an interracial staff.

"All my life" POWELL was later to write of the day at city hall, "I had prepared myself for that opportunity. That day when I saw 6,000 Negroes streaming to city hall by car, bus, subway, and elevated lines I knew we had within our hands a powerful weapon that could shake the earth—a weapon which, if disciplined and mastered, should cut through the false democratic veneer of America into the rotting cancer of racial prejudice and bring to pass every dream of our unlettered, branded grandfathers. We set out to use that weapon. * * *"

Exactly how great POWELL's own part was in using that weapon has since become a matter of controversy between his supporters and his enemies. His detractors charge that the "real work" was done by the many other groups and individuals on the scene at that time of Harlem's first political awakening. It was a time when Harlem was surging with protest, pickets, and action, and POWELL himself admits: "There were others before me and others at the same time—I was not the first one or the only one." But POWELL was the one who organized a neighborhood "coordinating committee" that was, like POWELL himself, in the midst of all the great happenings: the picketing of stores on Harlem's great thoroughfare, 125th Street, that brought the first Negro right to work as well as buy in his own neighborhood; the picketing of neighborhood drugstores that ended with all of the Negro pharmacists in Harlem employed; the first token employment of Negroes by the city light and telephone companies; the first Negroes hired as salesmen in the community for the beverage industries; the first mass rent strikes; the first mass protest meetings. NAACP Executive Secretary Roy Wilkins, who was critical of the flamboyant oratorical style and personal egotism of POWELL's book, "Marching Blacks," nevertheless wrote in his review of it that:

"It is not to be denied that he [POWELL] played a leading role in mobilizing inarticulate sections of the Harlem population during the dark and seemingly pathless days of the great depression. He taught them how to ask and work for what they needed, and what, it may be added, was due them. Now patiently, now in frenzied, near-demagogic speeches, he taught them and he led them. If he asked them in return to send him to the city council and then to Congress they still, in all honesty, have the best of the deal. The new power he has taught them to use is cheap at the price."

The people of Harlem have agreed with that judgment in overwhelming numbers for 18 years, from the time they sent him as the first Negro to sit on the New York City Council in 1941, the first Negro from the East to serve in Congress in 1945, and throughout his latest and bitterest test when they sent him again, overwhelmingly, back to his eighth term in Congress in 1958.

In the spring of 1958 he was dumped by the regular Democratic organization in New York City (Tammany Hall) on grounds that he was a "traitor" to the party because he supported Eisenhower in 1956. Despite his long-tested appeal as a votegetter, the city leaders of the Republican and Liberal parties were just as solidly opposed to giving him their endorsement. In his long career, POWELL has been unswervingly faithful to two beliefs, both of which, in their own way, can be painfully disturbing to political party leaders: the first is Negro rights, and the second is what he calls political independence and the party leaders call disloyalty.

In his early days on the city council, POWELL told an interviewer: "Under Father Abraham, the Negro was blindly Republican, and under Father Franklin, he was blindly Democratic. Those were large mistakes. * * *" The Negro, he said, should never become a "party wheelhorse." POWELL has remained impeccably consistent to that early-stated principle of inconsistency. He has supported whatever party or candidate could help him or his cause at the moment, including the extreme leftist American Labor Party, the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party; he has endorsed politicians ranging from the American Labor Party's Congressman Vito Marcantonio (in his early days in Congress he voted with Marcantonio against such measures as the Marshall plan) to, under the proper conditions, the South's LYNDON JOHNSON.

It was not too surprising that when the Tammany leaders dropped him in the spring of 1958, the city leaders of the Liberal and the Republican Parties—who had also been bruised by his broken-field running—refused to pick him up. As the Negro newspaper, the Baltimore Afro-American, editorialized, "At the moment it looks like everybody is against ADAM but the people."

The people were the Negroes of the largest ghetto in the Nation's "most liberal" city, and the opposition to their chosen representative by the downtown leaders of the city's political parties bitterly emphasized Harlem's separation from the outside world. And it further increased their already heavy resentment to Tammany Hall and its local functionaries who carried out the wishes of the machine above the wishes of the people. As the Reverend James H. Robinson of the Church of the Master, one of POWELL's most outspoken critics in Harlem, wrote at the time of the campaign, "The Democratic leadership both of Harlem and this city seems neither to have fully understood nor accurately gaged the basic political attitudes, unspoken but deep resentments, and desires of the people of Harlem. * * *"

The three main complaints raised against POWELL, not only by Tammany Hall but by almost the entire white liberal leadership of the city, happened to be matters either of little consequence or of great popularity to the majority of the people of Harlem. The first complaint, given as the official reason for his ouster by Tammany Chief Carmine DeSapio, was that POWELL had supported Eisenhower in 1956. To that, Harlemites could only point out that the Dixiecrats who bolted the party were welcomed back and lost no party seniority in Congress because of their defection. The second complaint, which rankled deeply among the white liberals, was POWELL's introduction of the amendment to the Federal school construction bill which would have blocked funds to segregated schools, and thereby further dimmed the hope of the bill's passage. But among the people of his district, that amendment was one of the most popular measures that POWELL has ever introduced. It was backed by the NAACP, hailed by the Negro press, and was one of the main reasons cited by A. Philip Randolph, the only Negro vice president of the AFL–CIO, in his endorsement of POWELL. When Joe Overton, a rising young leader in Harlem and the new president of the Manhattan NAACP, was recently asked what he thought was POWELL's most important achievement in Congress, he answered without a moment's hesitation: "The Powell amendment to the school-construction bill." The final complaint against POWELL raised by outsiders was concerned with his indictment for income tax evasion. But in the long-exploited and economically deprived community of Harlem, the charges of holding back money from the Government caused no great consternation; such troubles failed to impair the image of Joe Louis in Harlem and will hardly impair the image of ADAM POWELL. Some indication of the community feeling can be found in the fact that on the Sunday after the indictment was brought, seven ministers of Harlem churches preached sermons in POWELL's defense.

So the issues of POWELL's dismissal were stated, the lines were drawn, and a Democratic primary in Harlem between two Negro candidates quickly became, in many of its overtones, a racial contest. The most highly publicized and perhaps least meaningful aspect of the racial nature of the campaign was a remark by POWELL made at a rally of his own campaign workers that Carmine DeSapio, head of Tammany, and Hulan Jack, Tammany's principal Negro functionary and the Borough President of Manhattan, had better not walk the streets of Harlem, or "We won't do what the Communists did to the Nixons in South America, but we will make it mighty uncomfortable for them." The NAACP quickly issued a public statement disassociating itself from this type of extreme racialism; POWELL and others of his supporters who had been at the meeting quickly claimed that it was said jokingly and was not meant to be, nor was it, taken seriously by the group that heard it.

Strictly speaking, it was not a "racial" attack at all, in that POWELL made no discrimination in his choice of targets: One was a white man, one a Negro. And in fact one of the main themes of POWELL's campaign, though it received far less publicity, was, as he declaimed at one rally, that the Negro today could not simply base his struggle against any one racial or political or geographic group, but that "the enemies" now were "phony liberals of both races." The deepest racial aspect of the campaign lay not in oratory but in the actual separation of sentiment and alinement for and against POWELL; every major Negro figure in American life, from Philip Randolph to Sugar Ray Robinson, Thurgood Marshall to Martin Luther King, were for him; the liberals of the white community who had most often been the Negroes' allies were almost all against him. "That alliance," wrote Murray Kempton in the liberal New York Post, "can never be the same."

At a rally at the Abyssinian Baptist Church after Tammany Hall had announced that it would run Harlem's city councilman Earl Brown against POWELL in the Democratic primary, Jackie Robinson stood before the packed assembly and expressed the terms in which so many Negroes saw the contest:

"I don't intend to get myself into politics. But I don't believe this is a political issue between Dr. POWELL and Earl Brown. Brown is a fine man and he has done a fine job, but this can't be a battle between Brown and POWELL. This is a chance for Negro America to show its unity."

Tammany's withdrawal of support from a Congressman whose district had shown massive support for him during 17 years of political life was the final affront—not only to Harlem but to Negroes everywhere who felt that political parties had used them, bossed them, and rarely consulted or respected them.

The heat of the campaign was as much stirred by resentment against Tammany as it was by enthusiasm for POWELL. And POWELL himself, with his usual talent for finding and striking the nerve of any public issue, proclaimed:

"The one main issue in this campaign is that the downtown political bosses shall recnize and respect with dignity the responsible will of the people of Harlem."

It was not, as Jackie Robinson said it could not be, a battle between Brown and POWELL. It was a battle between Harlem and Tammany Hall; between Negroes and a white-run political machine that had given them little in return for their vote and was telling them now whom to vote for. Earl Brown, the mild-mannered, talented, and hard-working city councilman whom Tammany pushed into the role of political suicide against POWELL, later reflected on the nature of the battle: "I was an orphan in the whole damn thing."

And POWELL—as usual—was a symbol.

It is POWELL's particular political genius that he has managed to make himself a symbol—not only of the Negroes but more specifically of their protest—and that all of his public actions reinforce that image. There were many others who fought in the economic protests of Harlem in the thirties, but their names are largely forgotten now, and the one name remembered as the champion of those times is ADAM POWELL. He lets no one forget it.

In the spring of 1959 POWELL went to speak at a meeting of local 1199 of the Retail Drug Workers Union, which was fighting to organize the 30,000 workers—mainly Negro and Puerto Rican—of the city's voluntary hospitals, most of whom were averaging less that $40 a week, sometimes for a 6-day week. POWELL had picketed with this union in the thirties when it organized the drug-stores in Harlem, and he told the audience of hospital workers who were fighting for union recognition:

"Tomorrow night at 6:30 when you walk the picket line at Knickerbocker Hospital, I am going to walk it with you—I am an old picket walker too. * * *

"Oh, yes. That's right," rose up with the cheers from the crowd.

When several hundred workers walked back and forth the next night in front of Knickerbocker Hospital, ADAM POWELL walked with them, carrying a sign which said: "A $30 a week wage is a disgrace to our country." When he left, he had to hold up his hands for silence to quell the spontaneous cheer that broke out.

A few hours later POWELL walked into his political club on 145th Street, a large cigar in his mouth, and explained to a few of his workers that when he left the picket lines, "I went down to '21' just to have a drink, but the people I was with made me stay for dinner."

Thus refreshed from the wars of the oppressed with a dinner at "21," ADAM POWELL sat down at the desk in front of the rows of folding chairs and prepared to serve his constituents. A columnist in the Negro paper, the Amsterdam News, had reported that week that POWELL had been absent from these Monday club meetings for the past 4 weeks while busy consulting with Fidel Castro in Cuba.

It is one of the inside Harlem complaints about POWELL that he spends too much time globetrotting to foreign political events instead of taking care of his own district. But his dramatic safaris have bolstered his image as a champion of the colored races everywhere. He has made Harlem conscious of the struggle of colored peoples throughout the world, identified his own career with that larger struggle, and used it as a lever to prod the U.S. Government with the need for solving its own discrimination problems. "Men like Nasser and U Nu don't give a damn about natural gas or rigid price supports," he has said, "but they do care about the way this country treats its black citizens." POWELL has dramatized the U.S. Negroes' connection with the world's colored population by participating in ceremonies of statehood at Ghana, at the founding ceremonies of the West Indies Federation, and, most importantly, at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African nations. The State Department sent no U.S. representative to Bandung, but POWELL went on his own, held a press conference with the Communist reporters and befuddled them by saying that the Negro was making such progress in America that it was now a distinction to be a Negro in the United States. On his return, the House of Representatives passed a special resolution praising him for his action at Bandung. As for his recent attentions to Cuba, POWELL says what happens there is of importance to the people of Harlem because there are thousands of Negroes from the West Indies in Oriente Province, "And besides, I think the people of my district are interested in freedom everywhere."

POWELL is often away on such junkets as the conference with Castro in Havana—but when he is home in Harlem he knows how to make the appearance go the farthest. At most political clubs the leader stations himself in the back room and only grants entry to special cases. When POWELL comes to his club he sits at the front of the room in full view. "I do it on purpose," he says. "It gives the people a better feeling."

POWELL's club is the outgrowth of his battle with Tammany, and the base of operation for carrying out his pledge to destroy Massa Carmine DeSapio's plantation philosophy that fills his log-cabin clubhouses with Yes-suh Uncle Toms. After his victory over Tammany in the primary, POWELL gave his support in the fall to Democrat Averell Harriman in the New York gubernatorial race, in return for reinstatement in the Democratic Party and the hope of preserving his benefits of seniority in Congress. But he reserved the right to war against the Tammany district leaders who had opposed him, and has maintained the club for that purpose.

POWELL's critics claim that before he mobilized the club for the Tammany war he was seen even less by his constituents, and that few people in the district even knew the address of his local congressional office. Even some of his supporters claim that he tries to do too much and does not spend enough time with the more unglamorous and routine work that a Congressman performs by being regularly available to the people of his district. POWELL's concern with "the People" expresses itself in the capital-letter sense of the term. Perhaps the best analysis of his attitude is summed up in a story that he tells about himself:

"A few years ago I took a Rorschach test. The doctor who analyzed it said: 'There's nothing wrong with you, except that you're crazy about people, but unable to love an individual person.' "

Yet POWELL has the ranks behind him, and many of them who are quite aware of his shortcomings forgive him all else for his record on civil rights. The New York Times, which has often been very critical of POWELL, declared once: "Even his most severe critics admit that he has done more to dramatize the civil-rights issue than any other man in modern times."

He has introduced more civil-rights legislation than any other Congressman—a total of 67 bills and 22 amendments on civil-rights issues during his 7 completed terms in Congress. Few of these measures have actually passed, but they have often been later incorporated in party platforms, in omnibus civil-rights bills, and in changes of Government policy. POWELL describes the nature of his record in the House as an unrelenting pressure to keep before Congress the question of civil rights and equality for all American citizens. His critics claim that he relies on nothing but oratory, and doesn't do the hard spadework necessary to bring the issues to passage—but often his oratorical protests alone lead to quick and real accomplishments.

A dramatic example of his successful use of this technique has been chronicled by Robert J. Donovan, the New York Herald Tribune correspondent who was given access to White House files to write his book on the inside story of the early years of the Eisenhower administration. On June 4, 1953, POWELL sent an unexpected telegram to Eisenhower (the unexpected telegram is one of his favorite weapons) saying: "The hour has arrived for you to decisively assert your integrity. . . ." He said that while Ike was proclaiming the principles of nonsegregation in Federal institutions, his subordinates had "virtually countermanded" those principles: schools and other facilities were still segregated on many military bases, and 47 veterans hospitals still practiced segregation. Donovan said Ike was "put out" that POWELL hadn't consulted with him before sending a public telegram, but nevertheless dispatched an aid to confer with him. The aid pledged that action would be taken if POWELL would make a statement that he was satisfied that things would be changed. POWELL did, and things were changed. Donovan says that after this conference, "Segregation was soon abolished on all Navy bases where it was still practiced. Indeed in the months to come the desegregation of all the Armed Forces, which had begun in the Truman administration, was for all practical purposes completed." And the desegregation of the veterans hospitals, which the NAACP had been fighting to accomplish for a number of years, was finally made fact.

POWELL is only one of four Negroes in the present Congress, and although he is undoubtedly the best known, he has neither the longest tenure nor the best reputation as a legislator. WILLIAM DAWSON, a Negro who is the Representative from Chicago's South Side, has served in the House longer than POWELL and has often been called "the most influential Negro in Congress." His approach is almost the opposite of POWELL's—he is known as strictly a party man, and seldom raises his voice in the kind of individual protest that POWELL has made a specialty. The difference in the two men is perhaps best summed up in a remark of Louis Lautier, Washington correspondent for the national Negro press association: "Whenever you talk to DAWSON, it's not supposed to be for publication; when you talk to POWELL, everything's for publication." DAWSON is known as a congressman's congressman and has won respect and influence as a legislator through his hard work in the important routine and the unglamorous toil of committee duties.

POWELL's political nonconformity has earned him the opposition of most of his fellow members on the powerful House Committee on Education and Labor, which is headed by North Carolina's GRAHAM BARDEN. BARDEN and the southern members of the committee have looked upon POWELL with disfavor for the obvious reason of his militant stand on civil rights. His switch to Ike in 1956, plus the Powell amendment to the school-construction bill, alienated him from the liberal members. This twin opposition cost him a subcommittee chairmanship which his seniority (he is the second-ranking member on the committee) entitled him to. When the new Congress convened in February of 1959 the Education and Labor Committee members voted to bypass the seniority rules and let Chairman BARDEN make the assignments—which obviously meant no subcommittee chairmanship for POWELL. When POWELL expressed his surprise that many of

his Democratic colleagues had voted against him on this, Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, snapped back: "You are not nearly as surprised as we Democrats were when you announced that you would support Eisenhower in 1956."

On of the colleagues on the committee who felt that POWELL was treated unfairly pointed out privately that the liberals who were angry with him about the school amendment didn't take into consideration the fact that the man who got the subcommittee chairmanship on labor POWELL was entitled to by seniority was PHIL LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia, who was against the entire Federal education bill, and has a stanch antilabor record to boot. This colleague went on to say that many of the committee's members were critical of POWELL because he doesn't come often to hearings, "But there are a lot of people on the committee who don't come any more than he does. I'm sorry that he doesn't do more—he's a brilliant man and a brilliant speaker, and he could do a lot more for his people. But then these are sins of omission or neglect and could be charged against any number of Congressmen. They certainly aren't good reasons for depriving him of a chairmanship. If we have seniority rules we ought to use them."

On POWELL's other committee, the House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, he has a much better relationship with his colleagues, and this year was named as chairman of its Committee on Mines and Mining. "The atmosphere is completely different on that committee," POWELL says. "We get alone fine. I just don't have much to do with the Education and Labor Committee—it's humiliating.

Though DAWSON may be more respected among all his colleagues, it is POWELL who has established himself as the main voice for his people in Washington—not only in behalf of the Negroes of Harlem, but throughout the country. Louise Dargan, POWELL's Washington secretary, says that nearly half of their office mail comes from people outside POWELL's own district—mainly from Negroes in the South. Of the Negroes in Congress, DAWSON no doubt has the most legislative power; he is the workhorse. POWELL—once again—is the symbol.

The POWELL symbol is many sided, and includes not only the aspect of protest for Negro rights, but the possibility of high-style living—financially, educationally, and socially—for a Negro in present-day American society. The motto of the Abyssinian Baptist Church last year was "joyous living," and as a leading practitioner of that creed, its pastor has come under heavy criticism, though mostly from outside his own community. Julian Mayfield, who has written several recent novels about life in Harlem, says: "Anyone who thinks they can hurt POWELL by criticising his trips to Europe and his sports cars is just out of touch with Harlem. The people are proud of that, and anyone who criticized him for it would only drive the people closer to him."

POWELL always answers back frankly in defense of his way of life—in all its aspects—as was illustrated recently on a television interview with the probing TV reporter, Mike Wallace:

Wallace: Newsweek continues to say: "He [POWELL] is and always has been a great one for the ladies." Now that is a Newsweek magazine comment.

POWELL (interrupting): Now, Mike, you are too, aren't you?

Wallace: Indeed, yes.

POWELL: Yes, I thank you.

Wallace: Uh, that is a comment about your style of living?

(Pause.)

POWELL: Yes, go ahead.

Wallace: I'm curious to know your reaction.

POWELL: I have no reaction. I'm a normal human being.

In later recalling that exchange in the interview, POWELL said that after the show Mike Wallace asked him why he got such a grin on his face when he was asked about the ladies. "I told Mike that I was thinking of the time when Hazel (POWELL's wife, the pianist Hazel Scott) was playing in Miami Beach and a reporter went up to her and said there were reports that I was going out with women in New York, and she said, 'Well, what do you think he is, a homosexual?'"

POWELL is still married to Hazel Scott, his second wife, and although she is living in Paris, POWELL has told reporters that they are "on the friendliest terms."

"People criticize me for being a high-liver," POWELL says, "and say that I'm a minister and yet I've been divorced, and that I like my wine and women. Well, take a man like Paul Tillich, who is a capstone of Protestantism. No one condemns Tillich for being a high-liver, but he's been divorced too and there was an article about him in Time that said he fashioned much of his philosophy in drinking sessions. Even said he keeps a bottle of brandy in his desk—Hennessy, they said." POWELL smiled. "Personally, I prefer Cordon Bleu.

"By the way," POWELL asked, "Do you know Tillich's work? My Easter sermon was about his philosophy of religion."

POWELL never hesitates to introduce the most complex intellectual concepts in his sermons, and the congregation is often stirred to revival-meeting fervor by a presentation of the latest ideas in philosophy, sociology, or theology.

Rather than the threat of damnation after death of the hope of eternal reward, POWELL's sermons, like his political speeches, are centered on the promise of fulfillment in the here and now. And also like his political speeches, his sermons preach the doctrine of nonconformity:

"We Americans live a dull life. We punch the clock and we turn on the TV and the hi-fi and that's it. The women's magazines even plan your meals for you now. We have whole lives planned for us—I tell you, break the shackles of routine and dullness and act as an individual. Start daring, start being imaginative. If a thousand people are walking single file, that's the signal to break ranks."

POWELL's own use of that doctrine was explained most revealingly in an interview in his office at the back of the Abyssinian church. Leaning back in the chair behind his desk, POWELL puffed on a cigarillo and answered questions with the carefree frankness and flamboyance he has made his trademark (pausing to say once: "I don't mind being called 'flamboyant'—that's a kind of antichrist term among the cult of mediocrity"). When asked if he still intended to run for mayor of New York, or some other high city office, as he had announced in December of 1958 in the New York Herald Tribune, POWELL said:

"I don't ever intend to run for city office. I say things like that just to keep the boys off balance. Just like when I said recently that I might support LYNDON JOHNSON for President. Most things in politics today, in fact in our whole society, are dull and routine and predictable. As Samuel Hoffenstein once wrote, most people's motto is, 'Come weal or come woe, my status is quo.' It's the cult of mediocrity—you have to shake 'em out of it."

POWELL took a puff on his cigarillo and smiled expansively. "My philosophy is, don't let 'em be at ease in Zion."

The greatest hope for changing the status quo in race relations, POWELL said, lies in the South:

"More and more I'm coming to realize that the northern liberal is increasingly hypocritical and the southern liberal is increasingly honest. Negroes know this; Negroes accept this. I have great hopes for something daring to happen in the South. The day a white stands up in the South who has enough stature and talks the truth, you'll see a new day. The future of the Nation rests on how the Negro and the white in the South move out of their orbit and thrust ahead to a new pinnacle. I believe the future of America resides in the South, in the daring relationship of the whites and Negroes."

As for his own role in the future and its battles, POWELL said:

"I've been in public life for 29 years—that's a long time—and I've just about had it. Integration is almost a fait accompli in the schools. The next fight is in housing, and that will come in the next 5 years. I think the ball is rolling now and I don't think anyone can stop it. There are a few last things I'd like to do, though—for one thing, unite the Negroes and the Puerto Ricans.

"Another thing I'd like to do is see some of the younger fellows raised up into leadership in Harlem; and, also, force the labor movement in New York City to get its perspective again regarding the Negro. The Negro has been pushed aside by the big 'liberal' union."

As POWELL talked of the "few last things" he wanted to do, he hardly looked like a man who had reached the end of his career. He appears much younger than his 50 years, and only the first scattered shots of gray in his black mustache and his thick black hair give any clue of advancing years. Yet he has had a good deal of trouble with his health for a man his age:

"I'm not a particularly well man, you know. I need 10 hours' sleep a night. I've had heart attacks in 1947, 1952, and 1957—not coronaries though, not really serious. The doctors say it's due to overtaxing, overwork."

When the questions were over, POWELL led the way out to the two-tone brown station wagon belonging to the Abyssinian Baptist Church and drove down 125th Street. As we passed the Alhambra Theater, POWELL slowed the car and pointed a finger: "You see that movie? Up until about 15 years ago, Negroes who went there had to sit in the balcony."

The station wagon picked up speed again, gliding past the neon lights of the main drag of Harlem. It is a Harlem that still remembers when its own people had to sit in the balcony in their own neighborhood theater, a Harlem that is tired of humility as well as humiliation, and found in the man behind the wheel of the station wagon a spokesman to shout its pent-up protest to a world that had so long failed to listen.

Anniversary of Birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we celebrated the anniversary of the birth of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, the Polish general and national hero who came to America to fight under George Washington in the Revolutionary War. To the high-school students of history, Tadeusz Kosciuszko is

known as one of the European officers who came to America to fight for the cause of freedom. In his own native land of Poland, he was the military leader leading his countrymen in battles against the powers which were partitioning his country.

Mr. Speaker, today as never before, he remains an example of the courageous, never-ending fight for freedom that has marked the history of the Polish people. At the present time, when Poland is under the domination of the hated Soviet imposed Communist rule, Kosciuszko remains a vivid source of inspiration and a constant source of strength to the people of Poland in their determination to some day enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Criticism's Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the editorial "Criticism's Critics," appearing in the Washington Post of February 14, 1960, which I include in my remarks, is sound and timely.

As the editorial states:

The attempts to stigmatize the exercise of criticism are far more frightening than the bogeys of a garrison State which apologists are so fond of making.

It would be a sad day for America if the efforts of some Republicans were successful in silencing voices who do not completely agree with the President on what policies relating to our national defense are for the national interest of our country.

When dedicated Americans are trying to arouse public opinion to the necessity of increasing our national defense, to accuse them of "politics" is not only dangerous, but is a sign of weakness on the part of the administration.

The American people are entitled to all of the facts and information possible, together with information as to the military strength and power of the Soviet Union, in order to form a sound public opinion.

When charging "politics" Republicans should answer the question "Are Generals Taylor, Gavin, and others playing "politics" in their effort to warn and alert our people?"

In the national interest Republicans are playing a dangerous game when they play this type of politics.

The editorial follows:

CRITICISM'S CRITICS

President Eisenhower has always disliked wrangles, and it is hardly surprising that he deplores the controversy aroused by criticism of the defense effort. In this criticism no one has questioned the President's own sincerity in doing what he thinks right. What has been questioned is Mr. Eisenhower's judgment about the measures necessary to maintain American primacy and about the military expenditure the country can stand. In contrast with the proposed $41 billion military budget, the United States in fiscal 1953 sustained a military budget of $51 billion when the gross national product was some $100 billion less than it is today.

The argument frequently advanced by others that such criticism is injuring the country is more serious—and specious. Vice President NIXON—whose condemnation of a "numbers game" in missiles is in interesting contrast, as Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, to his own performance of a few years ago on loyalty-security cases—has opined that too much talk about the United States becoming a second-class power might cause a potential enemy to miscalculate. Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN observed after a White House conference the other day that security "should be safeguarded" and that "the comment on the submarines we have compared to the Soviet Union, the number of ships in different categories compared to the Soviet Union, the discussion of bases—I don't think that these things ought to be paraded across the front page."

Such premises seem to us fallacious on two counts. The first is the notion that the Russians are being treated to a lot of information they do not already have. If their intelligence is half as good as there is reason to think that it is, they have a pretty accurate knowledge of what the United States possesses in military capacity.

The second is the implication, connected with the above notion, that such knowledge should be secreted. It may be important to safeguard the details of weapons, but in the broad sense a deterrent is only as good as a potential adversary believes it to be. Most of the criticism of American defenses concerns inadequacies two or three years hence, some of which may yet be remedied. If present military power is as great as defense officials say that it is, then the administration ought to want the Russians to know about it. That is the way to prevent miscalculation.

Some of the criticism may indeed be wrongly based or ill-informed. But for administration spokesmen to imply that criticism of the defense program is therefore destructive—or to insinuate as General Twining did the other day that there is something disloyal in questioning the performance—is to assume a degree of sacrosanctity and infallibility that Americans have not customarily accorded their national leadership.

How, pray tell, are persons who are just as sincere in their concern for the country as the President is in his to attempt to increase the defense effort except through public comment and discussion? The attempts to stigmatize the exercise of criticism are far more frightening than the bogeys of a garrison state which apologists are so fond of invoking.

Anniversary of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 12 marked the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Perhaps no other American has represented the principles of truth and honesty more so than Lincoln. Little children in their grammar school classes learn early of the hardships that were Lincoln's and how he fought to educate himself and make of himself a better man.

He exemplified the courage and conviction of somebody who wants to go someplace. He proved that a person can rise even from the very humblest beginning. Sacrifice played a great role in Lincoln's life.

It was 100 years ago that he was elected to the highest office in the land—the President of the United States. Amid dissenters and those who called him a rube from the prairies of Illinois, he rose above these people and served brilliantly and wisely. He never will be forgotten.

At this time, it might be well for all Americans, especially elected officials who are probably more in need of example than anyone else, to read of Lincoln's life which was full of devotion to the people and the task to which they elected him.

Silver and Copper Interplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Herbert Bratter which appeared in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of December 10, 1959. Mr. Bratter, an expert in the field of money and precious metals, titled his article "Copper Strikes Bring Silver Issues to the Fore Again."

The article follows:

Because the copper strikeshave shut down mines, smelters, and refineries through which U.S. newly mined silver finds its way to the market, the white metal, nowadays used in a growing number of industrial products, has become scarce, the Treasury has been called upon to supply large amounts of silver to industry and mining interests are busy behind the scenes trying to make something out of the situation.

Were it not for Treasury sales of silver to industry, the latter today would have to fill its needs from imported metal. The intensified demand would cause world silver prices to rise. American mining interests would be happy to see that happen. But the sales which the Treasury is making to industry by virtue of powers granted by a 1946 law have the result of keeping the world price of silver from rising. This riles the silver bloc in the Senate. The miners desire a two-step program: (1) Stop Treasury sales to industry, thus making industrial consumers buy their silver on the open market at free market prices; (2) compel the Treasury to issue silver certificates against all the "free silver" it now holds, with the result that it will have to go into the open market and buy whatever silver is needed for subsidiary coinage and pay for it the going market price.

Apart from mining interests here and abroad, developments affecting silver are being watched by manufacturers—the so-called silver users—and by commodity traders. The silver users, who are organized in an association, were behind the 1946 law that first empowered the Treasury to sell silver to industry. They, of course, oppose the proposition that the Treasury cease selling unmonetized silver to industry at 91 cents an ounce so long as silver purchase laws are on

the statute books. What would please silver traders, particularly members of the Commodity Exchange, Inc., would be repeal of the silver transactions tax which was enacted in 1934 as part of the Silver Purchase Act. That 50 percent tax made it impossible to continue trading in silver futures, which is the business of the Commodity Exchange. Prior to 1934, during the period when silver purchases were being advocated in the Congress, the Commodity Exchange provided a futures market where demand and supply could be paired off by producers, users, speculators and governments with demonetized metal to sell.

WHAT THE MINING CONGRESS WANTS

Although mining interests have been subsidized for years they never relax their efforts to go out after more. A resolution passed by the American Mining Congress in September seeks to get the Treasury to stop selling silver to industry at anything less than $1.29 an ounce, as compared with its selling price of 91 cents. If the Treasury acceded, the price of silver all over the world would rise. The resolution asks that this step be taken to preserve "the Treasury's dwindling supply of free silver for future subsidiary coinage requirements."

But the very next sentence in the AMC resolution asks Congress to monetize all presently held "free silver," which means freezing it by issuing silver certificates against it and putting them into circulation. If that were done, the silver would not be used for making subsidiary coins. That is the miners' purpose: to freeze the silver.

At the September meeting an officer of the New Park Mining Co. proposed that the Government pay western miners $1.29 an ounce "to encourage production of additional needed silver" and simultaneously "eliminate a special sales price to selected buyers" in industry. Sales of free silver, he added, "artificially affect the world market price, penalizing the miner." No mention was made of the fact that the world price of silver has been artificially affected for years, due to silver purchase legislation, to the benefit of silver miners and other silver sellers everywhere.

Naturally, the silver users object to any steps which would increase the price of silver. Any increase in the return or price received by U.S. mine producers of silver, they say, would cause the world price of the metal to rise as well. A 10-cent-an-ounce increase, while putting $3,500,000 into the pockets of a few big copper-lead-zinc-silver mining companies, would cost U.S. industrial users $10 million a year. Of the latter sum, $6,500,000 would go to foreign suppliers, including the U.S.S.R. At a time when the Administration is exerting itself to restore balance in our international payments, an unnecessary increase in the price paid for foreign silver makes no sense.

With silver bullion increased 10 cents an ounce, consumers of silverware and other products using silver would find themselves paying still more, allowing for markups. Thus, a proposal which would curtail market supplies and add to the money supply—as the American Mining Congress wants to do—would be doubly inflationary.

Normally, when the price of a commodity is increased, there is a tendency for production of that commodity to increase. But a higher price for silver would not exert a corresponding stimulus to mine production for the simple reason that the bulk of our silver comes as a byproduct of other nonferrous metals. In most such mines the prices of copper, lead, or zinc, are much more important than the price of silver.

INDUSTRIAL USES GROWING

As one close observer puts it, the industrial demand for Treasury silver has been running wild this year. The copper strikes have not only shut off domestic newly mined supplies, but also foreign supplies, since customarily foreign ores and concentrates containing silver are treated in plants in this country.

Several times in recent years the Treasury has felt it desirable to use its legal power to sell surplus silver to industry, but never heretofore on the current scale. Demand for Treasury silver started in March, when nearly 3 million ounces were required. The next 5 months demand fluctuated between 1.6 and 3 million ounces. In September the Treasury authorized sale of 4,500,000 ounces to industry; and in October 6,300,000 ounces.

Time was when the chief uses of silver were for coins, tableware and jewelry. The fast development of photography, including motion pictures, has resulted in an annual consumption of about 30 million ounces of silver by that industry alone. Overall consumption in U.S. arts and industries during recent years has run in the neighborhood of 90 million to 100 million ounces a year, but the proportion going into silverware has been declining, thanks in part to the popularity of stainless steel, while that used by industry has been growing.

Today not a missile goes aloft from Cape Canaveral, not a jetplane from Idlewild that does not contain some silver. A good 25 million or more ounces of silver are used each year in the United States in the form of solders and brazing alloys in refrigerators and air conditioners, electric appliances, aircraft and rockets. About 19 million ounces are estimated to go into electric contacts in appliances and electronic equipment. More than 1 million ounces are said to be consumed in ceramic colors and pigments. About 1½ million cunces are used in making silver-zinc batteries for jet aircraft, missiles, and portable TV's; and silver-cadmium batteries for portable equipment. Also, silver goes into such miscellaneous products as mirrors, pharmaceuticals, dental alloys, plating of fine copper wires, medical and scientific instruments.

In certain high-temperature applications, as in space vehicles, silver is ideal. The importance of the Treasury's surplus, or "free silver" stocks is thus apparent at a time when regular sources are inaccessible.

About two-thirds of silver consumed by U.S. arts and industries today goes into industrial products. Research is finding new uses every year. During World War II new brazing alloys of silver were developed by Handy & Harman. The automobile, the airplane, and the telephone, for example, all call for the use of silver in their structure. And the demand for silver in high temperature applications in guided missiles, jet, and rocket aircraft has soared.

Silver is a noble and versatile metal. It resists corrosion and so is ideal for chemical vessels and the lining of metal cans. Silver nitrate is used in hair dyeing and making indelible inks. Extremely ductile, a gram of silver may be drawn out into a wire 180 meters long. Malleable, silver may be beaten into a leaf 0.00025 millimeters thin. In making phonograph records a thin deposit of silver is employed in making the matrix.

STEADY DEMAND FOR COINS

The quantity of silver consumed in U.S. coinage is large and the need grows both as the population and business increases, but also as coins are worn through circulation or lost. Actual consumption of silver in mint coinage operations varies in accordance with both public needs and the convenience of the mint bureau. From time to time the mints make silver coins for stockpile, as it were, anticipating future needs. During the last 10 fiscal years 383 million ounces of silver have been consumed in the production of U.S. subsidiary silver coins. While this gives an average of 38.3 million ounces a year, the actual figures range from less than 11 million ounces in fiscal year 1950 to 60.4 million in 1954.

Silver used in the manufacture of U.S. subsidiary coins (dimes, quarters, and half dollars)

[In millions of fine ounces]

1950	10.8
1951	30.9
1952	56.3
1953	56.1
1954	60.4
1955	16.8
1956	17.2
1957	48.0
1958	49.4
1959	36.5
Total	382.6

For many years the Treasury has been able to meet its coinage needs by drawing on free silver in its general fund. It has not had to go out into the open market to buy silver.

UPS AND DOWNS OF TREASURY'S FREE SILVER

The free silver held by the Treasury, that is, the silver bullion not required as backing for outstanding silver certificates, has fluctuated considerably over the postwar years. If the supply of free silver ever should be exhausted and the Treasury should have no way of replenishing the supply, future coinage needs of the U.S. Mints would have to be supplied by purchases on the silver market.

In mid-1945 the stock of free silver in the Treasury was about 696 million ounces. The lend-leasing of silver to allied governments was not yet completed. In July 1946, when the free-silver stock was down to about 216 million ounces, Congress passed the second Green Act, authorizing the Treasury to sell silver bullion to industry. Substantial industry purchases of Treasury free silver have occurred on four main occasions, when market supplies were reduced by strikes or by heavy purchases for coinage by Saudi Arabia and France.

The Treasury provides an unlimited market for newly mined domestic silver and the part thereof which represents seignorage (profit to the Treasury) is added to the free silver stock. However, by the end of 1954, the free silver was down to only 13.7 million ounces. Since then, owing to the return of silver by governments to which it had been lend-leased during the war for coinage purposes, the Treasury's free-silver supply was 194 million ounces on October 22, 1959. Some 24 million ounces of returned lend-lease silver still being processed on September 30 had not yet entered the free silver account.

Free silver in the Treasury on selected dates

[In millions of fine ounces]

June 30, 1945	696
June 30, 1946	219
June 30, 1950	170
June 30, 1954	16
Dec. 31, 1954	14
June 30, 1956	55
June 30, 1957	98
June 30, 1958	173
June 30, 1959	212
Oct. 22, 1959	194

HOW THE TREASURY MAY REPLENISH ITS FREE SILVER

The additions to the Treasury's free silver stocks arising from the seignorage on newly mined domestic silver turned over to the mints are of course limited. Whenever the price of silver is above the statutory price which the miners may demand of the Treasury, newly mined silver is sold on the open market. The Treasury receives domestic newly mined silver only when the price is not above the statutory price. Small amounts of "silver bullion ordinary," ob-

tained through the refining of newly mined gold, also are added to the free silver account.

There is another way by which the Treasury may add several hundred million ounces of silver to the stock available to it for the coinage of subsidiary cash or for sale to industry. It may tap the huge hoard of silver bullion and standard silver dollars now being held as security for silver certificates. This may be done without new legislation.

More than $2 billion of currency in the form of silver certificates are in circulation, forced on the public by the strategic power of the western silver bloc in the Congress, particularly in the Senate, under the silver legislation of 1878, 1890, 1918, 1933 (Executive proclamation), 1934, 1939, 1946, etc. Earmarked as special security for these silver certificates are 1,741 million ounces of silver. Of this, about 515 million ounces represents silver certificates of $5 and $10 denominations. If all these 5's and 10's were replaced by Federal Reserve notes, the 515 million ounces of silver would be released for transfer into the free silver account. Unfortunately, the Federal Reserve System may not issue Federal Reserve notes in $1 and $2 denominations. It would take only a simple act of Congress to similarly release for use the other 1,227 million ounces of certificate-reserve silver which today lies idle in Government vaults because no one wants to handle it.

There is nothing in the law to prevent the Treasury from withdrawing silver certificates from circulation. The reserve silver released by such withdrawal of course was monetized when the certificates were first issued. On the Treasury books, therefore, it would be entered in the free-silver account at its "monetary value" of $1.29 an ounce. Were the Treasury to sell any such silver to industry at any price less than $1.29 it would be incurring a loss. But the Treasury's subsidiary coinage needs are another matter. The subsidiary coins have a lower silver content than standard silver dollars. The "monetary value" of silver in subsidiary coins is $1.38 an ounce. If the Treasury withdrew silver certificates from circulation and used their silver backing in making 10 cent, 25 cent, and 50 cent coins, it would chalk up a profit, the difference between $1.29 and $1.38 an ounce.

AN UNSUSPECTED WINDFALL COMING

Thirty years ago last July the Government began substituting the present size banknotes for larger size ones. Now, a full generation later, more than $31 million of large-size silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 have failed to turn up. Most of them may be considered lost. Yet by law the Treasury is holding for the redemption of these notes some 31 million standard silver dollars containing in the aggregate over 24 million ounces of silver. Legislation has been introduced for the administration which would authorize the Treasury to write off, in effect, the certificates believed to be permanently lost.[1] The Treasury would then be free to issue new certificates against the silver thus freed. If the new certificates are issued in $5 and $10 denominations, the procedure mentioned in the above paragraph would be open to the Treasury.

WARTIME LEND-LEASED SILVER RETURNS

As authorized by the Congress, the U.S. lend-leased nearly 411 million ounces of silver to eight foreign governments for coinage purposes during the fiscal years 1943–46. Having in mind the experience with the Pittman Act of 1918, under which monetary silver was sold to India with the proviso that the United States would replace every ounce of the metal after the war by purchases on the open market, the silver Senators of World War II days insisted that the silver lend-leased be replaced by the recipient countries. Apparently the Senators believed that those countries would have to buy substantial amounts of silver on the market, thus boosting the postwar price of silver.

But it did not work out that way. Rather than buy silver in the market, lend-lease debtor countries decided to call in coins from domestic circulation and thereby accumulate the silver they were obliged to return to the United States. In place of the silver coins so withdrawn those countries issued either silver coins of lower fineness or other types of coins. The return of the lend-lease silver moreover rescued the Treasury from a corner into which the silver mining interests saw the Treasury being driven.

As shown in the table of free-silver stocks accompanying this article, these had shrunk from 219 million ounces in mid-1946 to only 14 million by the end of 1954. With the mint bureau consuming silver for coinage at an average annual rate of 38 million ounces, it would have been only a question of time before the Treasury would have had to go into the open market and buy silver for coinage; or so it seemed to some. With the return of lend-lease silver, by June 1959, the free silver was again up to 212 million ounces. This source of replenishment of Treasury free silver is, however, drawing to an end. Of the 411 million ounces lend-leased, 375 million had been returned by September 30, 1959. Still due are only about 14 million ounces from Pakistan, which, created after the war, assumed part of India's silver debt, and Saudi Arabia, which owes some 21 million ounces. The 35 million ounces still due to be returned by these two countries will be enough to keep us in dimes, quarters, and half dollars for about 1 year.

Lend-lease silver shipments, by countries

[In millions of ounces]

Australia	11.8
Belgium	.3
Ethiopia	5.4
Fiji	.2
India	[1] 226.0
Netherlands	56.7
Saudi Arabia	[2] 22.3
United Kingdom	88.1
Total	410.8

[1] Original loan to India divided for return as follows: India 172.5 million ounces; Pakistan 53.5 million ounces. India's portion has all been returned.

[2] Slightly over 1 million ounces of this were lost in shipment and hence are not due for return. No lend-lease silver has yet been replaced by Saudi Arabia.

DATA SHOW SUBSIDY TO MINING INDUSTRY

At times of shortage in the silver market, when the Treasury feels it necessary to sell silver to industrial users, the domestic mines are able to sell their product in the open market at better than the Treasury's statutory price for newly-mined domestic silver, which is 90½ cents. Whenever the market price is less than that, it is to the mines' advantage to sell to the Treasury. To the extent that the market price is less than the Treasury's buying price, the mines are subsidized. That they have availed themselves of the subsidy is indicated by the figures for Treasury purchases of newly-mined silver. Industrial users also are subsidized when the Treasury sells them silver unobtainable otherwise, or unobtainable at as good a price.

Following are the figures since fiscal year 1950. For convenience of reference, sales by the Treasury to industry are shown in a parallel column. Some of the sales were made to other Government agencies for experimental purposes, the manufacture of medals, etc.

Domestic newly mined silver purchases and sales by the Treasury to industry and other (act of July 31, 1946)

[In millions of fine ounces]

Fiscal year	Purchases	Sales
1950	38.2	
1951	38.1	1.6
1952	38.8	(1)
1953	35.7	
1954	33.7	(2)
1955	34.7	(3)
1956	15.5	10.3
1957	6.6	7.4
1958	26.2	(4)
1959	20.4	11.2
Total	287.7	30.7

[1] 8,543 ounces.
[2] 2,326 ounces.
[3] 2,513 ounces.
[4] 36,455 ounces.

Under the 1946 act almost 10 times as much silver has been bought from domestic mines as has been sold by the Treasury to industrial users and other Government agencies.

Miners complain that Treasury sales to industry "compete with newly mined domestic silver." So they do. It is ironical to hear the miners complain over the subsidizing of silver users with silver the Treasury acquired in subsidizing the mines. Silver which the mines were unwilling to sell to industry because, by a law they had put on the books, they could get a higher price for it from the Treasury they now (later) object to the Treasury's selling to industry at the same price. Silver mining, which has been benefiting from subsidies since 1878, has the nerve to complain that "Treasury sales of silver are interfering with the operation of the laws of supply and demand."

TREASURY SALES TO INDUSTRY

From mid-1954 through October 1959 industrial users of silver have bought about 13.4 million ounces from the Treasury. Monthly sales have ranged from as little as 2,000 ounces to as much as 5.8 million ounces. The latter figure was recorded in the first 23 days of October 1959 and is attributable to the closing of mines, smelters and refineries by strikes. Sales by fiscal years have been as follows in millions of fine ounces:

1954–55	[1]
1955–56	10.3
1956–57	7.5
1957–58	0
1958–59	9.9
1959–60 [2]	13.4

[1] 2,023 ounces.
[2] Through Oct. 23.

Copper strikes caused heavy demand for free silver sales by the Treasury in the summer of 1955 as well as recently. Large demands also occurred in the fall of 1956, due to the delay in the arrival in London of Australian silver because of the closing of the Suez Canal as well as due to strikes.

SILVER IN 5-CENT PIECES MAY BE WORTH EXTRACTING SOMETIME

The ordinary "nickel" coin is made 75 percent of copper and 25 percent of nickel. The wartime shortage of those metals caused the Government to issue 5-cent pieces composed 35 percent of silver, 56 percent of copper and 9 percent of manganese. Nearly 49 million fine ounces of silver were used in making such 5-cent coins from 1943 to 1946. Such coins were issued to a total face value of over $43 million and most of them are still outstanding. These silver-bearing "nickels" are a potential source of new supply for the market. Those now outstanding contain more than 48 million ounces of silver.

Theoretically, when the market price of silver is 88.9 cents an ounce, 20 of the war-

[1] S. 1177, H.R. 5691 and H.R. 6678.

time 5-cent pieces contain $1 worth of silver. The price of silver now is about 91⅜ cents an ounce. This means that 20 of the wartime 5-cent pieces contain about $1.15 worth of silver, plus copper and manganese. Why are the coins then not being withdrawn from circulation and melted down for their metallic content? There is nothing illegal about it. The answer lies in the cost which would be entailed in culling the silver-bearing 5 cent pieces from circulation and shipping them to a processor for refining. It probably would cost more than 15 cents to get the $1.15 worth of silver out of 20 wartime "nickels." The refining cost alone might be 3 cents per ounce of silver recovered, according to one estimate.

But suppose the market price of silver rises a few more cents? The higher the price goes, the closer comes the time when melting the coins will be profitable. The silver-bearing 5-cent pieces are identifiable by a large letter P shown on one side. Machines exist which will separate silver and nickel 5-cent pieces. Several are in use at the mints to help the Government withdraw worn silver "nickels" from circulation. If the price of silver rises enough, we may see schoolboys prospecting for silver in their piggy banks.

Pan American Airways President Receives Defense Transportation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Transportation Association recently presented to Mr. J. T. Trippe, president of Pan America World Airways, an award for his pioneering in air transport and for Pan American's outstanding contributions to the national defense.

In accepting this award, Mr. Trippe sounded a warning that historically the nation which is first in transportation is usually first in world leadership and that as soon as a nation suffered from a second-class transportation system it became a second-rate power.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article pointing up the features of Mr. Trippe's talk, written by Gene Shumate and published in the Washington Daily News of February 10, 1960:

Juan Trippe, president and board chairman of Pan American World Airways, Inc., warned yesterday that the Nation that loses the No. 1 place in transportation loses world leadership.

"Historically, this has been the case," he said. And he said America today faces loss of its transportation leads.

HONORED

Mr. Trippe spoke before the National Defense Transportation Association meeting at the Statler-Hilton, where he received an award for pioneering in international aviation.

America started rising to transportation leadership, he said, when the Yankee clippers showed their heels to competition. This was followed by a vast network of railroads, a solid merchant marine, and finally civil aviation.

The danger Mr. Trippe sees to the U.S. position in transportation boils down to this:

THINNER SLICES

The world transportation market is like one big melon. Foreign airlines, for instance, are joining together in smaller administrative units to get a bigger slice.

Europair is forming. It'll be an association of six national airlines of countries in the European common market, joining together to beat American competition.

In recent years, U.S. air carriers have been competing with one another on parallel routes, giving foreign carriers a chance to take advantage of their weakened conditions.

Aeroflot, the Russian airline, is now operating in 16 countries, looking for more, "and will soon be knocking on our door," Mr. Trippe said.

He said what's needed is for transportation regulatory agencies to examine policy to determine if it's wise for American-flag carriers to keep clobbering one another while foreign competition flies away with the passengers.

Council Loses a Minority Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, James R. Frazier, who has announced that he will not be a candidate for reelection to the San Leandro City Council, has been a good member of that council. He did not always agree with the majority members of the council and at times was accused of being an obstructionist but anyone who knew Jim Frazier realized that this was not the reason for the position he took.

He is a conscientious man of strong convictions and is not afraid to stand up for what he believes is right. San Leandro is the better for having had a Jim Frazier on its city council. I know that even those who disagreed with him will admit that he was a fine public official guided only by the dictates of his conscience. I can understand why he wants to leave public office because I know his wife and family and his devotion to them is what prompted his decision.

The following is an editorial that appeared in the San Leandro Morning News on February 9, 1960:

COUNCIL LOSES A MINORITY VOICE

James R. Frazier, often a minority voice on the San Leandro City Council, has decided not to run for reelection.

This saddens us, although we know Frazier has the best of reasons. He wants to spend more time with his family.

It saddens us because he has been a good councilman. More cities could use men like him on their councils.

He is devoted to the idea of protecting the rights of the individual, with decisions based upon the law, not on the judgment of men.

Frazier, who has served as district 4 councilman for the last 6 years, believes the present council is a good one, although possibly balanced too much in one direction.

"And I think the next election (April 12) will make it even more so," he added.

Often a lonely dissenter, Frazier feels that there is a definite cleft in council power. He places Mayor Jack Maltester and Councilmen Valance Gill, William Swift and either Kenneth Cheatham or Robert Taylor on the heavy side, leaving himself and Councilman Alvin Kant in the minority.

He thinks that incumbents Gill and Cheatham will be reelected and that Candidate William Suerstedt will win the district 4 seat. And Suerstedt, he believes, will side with the majority in most controversial issues.

"The votes have been pretty scattered in the last few months," he said, "because there hasn't been any real hot political issue that would show lines of demarcation."

However, he recalls prior commission and board appointments that he opposed because he felt they were political payoffs.

"It was mainly the paying off of political debts that caused the split early after the formation of the present council," he said. "I tried to pick the men on the basis of their qualifications, ability and willingness to serve."

He opposed the appointment of Suerstedt to the planning commission, now admits that Suerstedt is doing a good job.

His philosophy of government? "Basically," he said, "it's to protect the rights of the individual, with decisions based upon the law, not on the judgment of men. I think that many times we've let principle slip by for the sake of expediency."

He mentioned the controversial Parrott Street extension as an example. Frazier thought that the decision to extend Parrott from East 14th Street to Washington Avenue was made for the sake of bringing commercial development, rather than because it was needed to improve traffic circulation.

"We said we needed the street for better circulation," he said, "but emphasis was on getting the commercial development rather than the traffic circulation. Such thinking is wrong where a principle is violated."

Frazier said he once walked out of a closed meeting where the issue was being discussed. "I walked out because they tried to poll the Council," he said.

"If you establish a philosophy, you should live by it," he added. "It's not hard to live up to a principle."

Frazier's biggest accomplishment, he believes, was pushing through the rifle range at the foot of Davis Street. He worked hard over recreation commission opposition to get the range approved for the Optimist Club, which, among other things, conducts gun safety courses for youngsters.

Frazier is not seeking reelection, because he wants to spend more time with his family: wife, Faith, sons, John, 6½, and Carl, 3.

"The work was very enjoyable, but the one danger of public office that you have to be aware of—this way of life actually becoming a way of life. You begin to like being in the public eye. It's hard to shake once you get into it. You lose sight of a lot of other personal things."

James Frazier has served San Leandro well. We hate to see him bow out of city politics.

At important times, he has provided the minority voice that is so essential to the workings of democracy.

A Salute to the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 8, 1960:

A SALUTE TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 50th anniversary today.

In the 50 years since the Boy Scouts of America received their incorporation in the District of Columbia in 1910, they have grown to the point where today there are more than 5 million active men and boys in the organization.

Just about everyone knows the contributions the Boy Scouts have made to society. However, we feel that Delmer H. Wilson summed it up extremely well when he addressed the Palmetto Area Council in Rock Hill last month.

Wilson, national director of the division of personnel of Boy Scouts, said:

"Scouting isn't just camping and tying knots. Scouting is taking a young boy in his formative years and teaching him the 15 virtues of the scouting code. We teach them to pack these virtues into their lives so that they can draw on them in later years."

"We're also guiding them into citizenship in their early years. The boys are not just stumbling into citizenship. They're growing into citizenship, not waiting to be good citizens when they're adults. They're becoming good citizens now."

We add our salute to the millions of Boy Scouts of America, past, present, and future. The first 50 years have been well spent in laying a solid foundation for a worthwhile organization.

Telephone Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Southwest Messenger Press, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on a subject of great concern to us all:

TELEPHONE TAX

What would elimination of the 10 percent Federal excise taxes on phone service and the transportation of persons mean to you? It would mean savings which the taxpayer can actually see and feel, the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois charged today, and a few examples will illustrate this point.

Using an actual householder's phone bill (January 1960) elimination of the tax would mean a phone bill of $6.30 instead of $6.93—a saving of 63 cents on 1 month's bill. Here is the computation: phone bill, $5.20 plus 10-percent tax thereon of 52 cents; toll calls of $1.10 plus 10 percent thereon of 11 cents—total bill paid of $6.93 (which includes 63 cents Federal tax). Over a year's time, this phone user would be better off to the tune of $7.56.

Again, using an actual example, let us see what the elimination of the 10-percent Federal tax on the transportation of persons would mean to a John Smith. John makes a weekly trip from Springfield to Chicago, and the price of such a round-trip coach ticket is $10.29. If the tax were nonexistent, he would pay $9.35, or 94 cents less. Over a month's period of time, he would have at least $3.76 more in his pocket; and, over the year he would have $48.88 more in his wallet to see an occasional show or bring most welcome presents to his wife and children.

These taxes were emergency measures passed during the war years. The emergency has long since come and gone. It is estimated that these two taxes, if continued, would together produce $450 million in fiscal 1961 revenues.

Repeal, on the other hand, will result directly in lower phone bills and transportation costs, since the savings would be passed directly to the consumer.

The World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. I am receiving a certain amount of mail on the subject of the President's proposal, which is before the Senate to withdraw the Connally reservation relating to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. I find that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the original Senate resolution, adopted in 1946, calling for the deposit of a declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and also about the Connally amendment itself.

In the February 11 issue of the New York Herald Tribune there appears an excellent column on this subject by Walter Lippmann. It is about as clear a commentary on the subject as I have seen, and I think I have read almost everything that has been written.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Lippmann's article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD COURT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on a resolution which, curiously and remarkably enough, was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and has the ardent support of Vice President NIXON. This, as Mr. K. might say, is an instance where a shrimp has whistled.

The Humphrey resolution has the full backing of the administration and it is likely to command the support of the Democratic leadership There are, to be sure, dissenters who are seriously worried that the acceptance of the resolution will be an abdication of American sovereignty.

But they are a small minority as compared with the huge nonpartisan majority which includes so many of the leading lawyers of the country.

The Humphrey resolution would repeal what is known as the Connally amendment to the original Senate Resolution 196. This resolution, which was adopted in 1946, called for the deposit of a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. This is the court set up under the Charter of the United Nations. The United States was perhaps its leading advocate.

Before the Connally amendment was adopted the 1946 resolution said that "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation" the United States accepts the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice "in all legal disputes" which come under four classes of cases.

The International Court is to have compulsory jurisdiction in a dispute about (1) the interpretation of a treaty, (2) any question of international law, (3) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation, and (4) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The 1946 Senate resolution says expressly where the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court shall not apply. Of these reservations, the important one is that the Court shall not have jurisdiction in a "dispute with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." The question was then raised in the Senate as to how it was to be decided whether a matter is or is not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

The Senate answered this question in 1946 by accepting the Connally amendment which added six words to the original text. Because of this amendment, the question of whether a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States is to be "determined by the United States." This is the amendment that both Senator HUMPHREY and Vice President NIXON want to repeal.

As the law stands today, the U.S. Government has the right to exclude the Court whenever it desires to do so, without having to prove or to argue its position when it declares that the case is "domestic." This means that while we have agreed to compulsory jurisdiction in legal disputes, we have in fact reserved the right to stop the Court's proceedings. As a result, no other nation with which we have a dispute can be compelled to come before the Court. What is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. Under the Connally amendment we cannot be sued without our consent. But equally we cannot sue anyone else without his consent.

This reduces the International Court of Justice to a kind of small sideshow. It is no doubt the reason why, despite all the international disputes with which the world is beset, the International Court has so few cases before it.

The question raised in Congress now is whether our Government or the International Court itself shall decide whether a matter is domestic. The dissenters, who believe that the Connally amendment must be retained, argue that the Court might take jurisdiction in a dispute which challenged our tariff laws, our immigration laws, our currency laws, our administration of the Panama Canal. These fears, though understandable, are groundless. If the Court took jurisdiction in domestic matters, it would be violating its own statute which expressly limits its jurisdiction to international legal disputes.

It is conceivable, although it is in the highest degree unlikely, that the Court might violate the law which created it. But if it did that, there would be a remedy. We would have an indubitable grievance and we would be entitled, legally and morally, to challenge the Court by political action in the United Nations.

There is, therefore, no risk which would leave us helpless. On the other hand, the advantages of building up the jurisdiction of the Court are very great. Perhaps the most important of these advantages is one that the Vice President pointed out in an address last April. If the richer nations, like the United States, are to export capital to assist the underdeveloped countries, there must be legal security for the investments they make. To create that security the International Court can have a big part to play.

Indeed, in view of what is happening in this hemisphere to affect American property abroad, we have an interest that every property dispute, as with Castro today, should be decided by a court and not be left to propa-

ganda, agitation, coercion, and force. But if we want to be able to go to court to protect our rights, we must be willing to go to court when someone else has a grievance against us.

A Great Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, while in Kansas City last Thursday it was my extreme good fortune to attend a luncheon meeting during the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association's Annual Convention at the President Hotel, which is just across the Kaw River from my home in the great State of Kansas. The principal speaker on that occasion was our distinguished colleague from Nebraska, the Honorable LARRY BROCK.

Possibly because he is a past president of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association, possibly because he knew his subject thoroughly, or possibly because Congressman BROCK delivered his address so well, those who packed the large dining room listened with rapt attention.

The content of that address, however, was of such quality, Mr. Speaker, and the issues were so clearly set forth that every member of the association and each one of the guests sat motionless until the speaker had concluded.

Although it is not possible to set forth the extemporaneous remarks of our colleague which so greatly pleased his audience, I do request, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman BROCK's prepared address be included in the extension of my remarks as I know the Members of both bodies will enjoy reading this splendid speech:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN LARRY BROCK, DEMOCRAT, NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE CORN BELT LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL CONVENTION, KANSAS CITY, MO., FEBRUARY 11, 1960

Mr. President, members of the association, and friends, your officers were kind enough to extend an invitation to have me address you on this occasion of your annual convention which invitation I deem a distinct privilege, particularly because of my personal activities as a cattle feeder in Nebraska for many years. It gives me the feeling of visiting with my very close folks and associates in the cattle business back home and affords me the opportunity of discussing a subject with which I am not only familiar and intensely interested, but also one that is very close to my heart.

We in the United States, and particularly those located in the Middle West and the Western States, are justly proud of our accomplishments in the excellent breeding and feeding of good cattle. It took many years of hard work and sacrifices to reach the peak we now enjoy, notwithstanding the periodical eras of bad weather, drought, and economic factors which sometimes bring about low prices for cattle. Before getting into the stipulated theme of my subject, let us momentarily dwell on the creation of the cattle business and its rugged progress over the many years.

The Bible tells us that cattle were created before man. They came first with God in his creation of the beasts of the earth. Bossy headed the list of the 6th day's work, while Adam, who was "given dominion over all," came last.

Assuming creation as being 4,000 years before Christ, we find from Moses' history that Abram was an extensive and successful cattle breeder and was, beyond any doubt, the first man to engage in the cattle business.

Geographically, there are five natural grazing grounds for cattle, located in central Asia, South Africa, South America, Australia, and on the Plains of America. The first is the larger in extent than all Europe the second is as great; the third, half as much; the fourth, as large as South America; and the fifth, the boundless plains of the United States, containing over a billion acres.

These pastoral lands of ours have never been understood or appreciated over the many back years. It was, however, freely predicted that one day this Government would derive more taxes from the grazing country than from the best of the agricultural regions.

Yes, the livestock industry has come a long way over the years. In 1869, the whole of the livestock industry in the United States was estimated to be worth $1.5 billion, and there were then about 75 head of cattle to every 100 people. Rapid growth in our population has, of course, changed that ratio over the past 90 years.

The trend of the industry since 1900 has been one of improvement. The breaking up of most of the big cattle companies in the late eighties and the early nineties resulted in a marked temporary reduction in the total number of cattle in the Western States. With the passing of such concerns, however, there soon came into existence many moderate-sized herds, which were better managed and cared for than were the cattle in the so-calle bonanza days.

An educational campaign was waged by the Government to discourage the overgrazing of the public domain. Ranchers saw the wisdom of growing feed and hay, to be fed livestock during the severe winter weather. The need of improved blood was recognized about this time and thousands of purebred beef bulls were purchased in the East and introduced into the range country.

This was the beginning of a new and improved era in the national cattle business. In a few years, the beneficial effects of these radical steps were plain to be seen. Not only were the cattle of the West greatly improved in beef type; not only were the losses of cattle during the severe winter months materially reduced; not only were the ranges growing better instead of worse; but it was also true that the West was actually carrying more cattle than formerly. Smaller, better managed herds resulted in an increase of the total cattle population.

This increase continued steadily from the late nineties until 1907, at which time there were more cattle, other than dairy cows, in the United States than there had ever been before, and the majority of them was found in the States west of the Mississippi River.

The new cattle industry was now really on the move, aided and abetted with the advent of expert advice on the care and treatment of diseases of cattle, the advent of better transportation facilities, better marketing facilities, and the more recent outlook trends as to the favorable periods for buying and selling livestock.

It has been estimated that as of January 1, this year, there were almost 7.5 million head of cattle on feed in 37 States. In 26 States, excluding the Southern States, there were 9 percent more cattle on feed than at the same time last year, breaking all January 1 records for numbers. Sometime next month, we will get more accurate figures as to the present total population of all cattle from the Department of Agriculture.

To illustrate the tremendous growth of the cattle business, it is well to observe the cash receipts report for the sale of cattle and calves in the year 1958. This figure has been estimated to be upward of $7.5 billion, and the figure for 1959, which has not been tabulated as yet, will not be too far away, despite the smallest slaughter in 7 years. The meat processing and packing industry had receipts of some $14.8 billion for the year 1958, and this figure for the year 1959 is estimated now to go over $15 billion. These figures should give you some realistic pictures of the gigantic growth of the livestock business.

Despite the bottom falling out of the price of corn, which incidentally has seriously damaged the hog market, we in the cattle business have been somewhat fortunate to be able to hold on to fairly good market prices thus far. This optimism, however, should not delude us into thinking that the present prices will hold. Rather, prices may tend downward, based on several years of high output and continuing lower prices, but not sufficiently so to cause an acute market break, as occurred in the early fifties.

For the past 50 years, the statistical chart curves of cattle and corn have worked closely together—the cattle price curve following the price of corn. There have been periods of droughts, shortages, etc., and other factors which at times caused cattle prices to average much higher on the statistical charts than did corn, and for these periods their historical relationship was farther apart. It is noted, however, that when these periods of unrest in the cattle industry subsided, the historical ratio of cattle prices to the price of corn was again restored. This formula is holding fairly true at the present time, with $1.04 market corn and $26 prime cattle. It is this historical relationship, plus careful scrutiny of the outlook for cattle, which leads me to predict that, if we hold to $1 corn by next fall we will have $23 cattle.

We in the cattle business, who have worked hard to build up our investments, naturally are greatly concerned with any problems that might threaten the financial security and the progress of the industry. We have several facing us right now but I would put special emphasis on the increased importations of livestock and red meats from foreign countries. Despite many urgent representations to the Secretary of Agriculture, and his numerous promises to alleviate the situation, these imports are continuing to increase on a scale that will eventually threaten the very existence of some portions of the livestock industry.

During the past year, practically since assuming office in the Congress, I have continuously contacted the Secretary of Agriculture imploring him to take some decisive action to impede or halt these foreign meat shipments, particularly when we are in a depressed domestic livestock market. Despite the best of assurances, that were not worth the paper they were written on, nor the verbal utterances, nothing has been done and the imports of livestock and red meats increased during the year 1959, to a point where this influx of foreign meats now equal 9 percent of our domestic production.

During the year 1958, meat imports to the United States amounted to 826 million pounds. This figure represented a 243-percent increase over 1956 imports and a 178-percent increase over 1957 imports. For lamb and mutton, the increase of such imports for 1958 represented over 1,700 percent, as compared to the 1956 figures. The importation of all meats to the United States in the year 1959 amounted to over 1 billion pounds, and there is no letup in sight at the present time.

The dollar value of meats imported to the United States, July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959, amounted to approximately $275 million. This figure was substantially increased

during the last 6 months of 1959, as departmental figures will show as soon as they are published. To illustrate a point, the dollar value of meat imports in 1956 amounted to only $210 million, and in 1957 the figure was only $287 million, whereas in 1958, for the entire year, the figure climbed to $512 million, clearly showing the upward trend and spiraling of such importations.

Now that we have disposed of the statistical portion of this talk, let us turn again to my representations to the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson, in reply to my constant appeals to halt meat imports had the audacity to inform me that he had no visible authority to take decisive action or impose quotas on imports. My rebuttal to him referred to section 22, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act, which authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the President to take such action when the necessity arises whereby the importation of any commodity has an adverse effect on the domestic market. Neither the Secretary or the President has recognized this necessity to date, but it did not take the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association too long to recognize this necessity. They have filed a protest with the U.S. Tariff Commission, requesting an investigation of present increased importation of sheep and lambs, lamb and mutton into the United States. The Commission has already scheduled hearings on this complaint and the investigation will have full-dress public airing beginning March 23. This is just a beginning and the other segments of the livestock industry in the United States can be guided by the action of the first group.

It is my personal observation that in this fight to control the importation of livestock and red meats, we can expect little, if any help from Secretary Benson, or as long as the present national administration is in power. The only recourse left to save the industry is to appeal to the Tariff Commission or any related agencies with sufficient authorative powers, to investigate the situation and focus public attention on the ultimate destruction of an American made institution, if these conditions are permitted to continue.

Your attention, no doubt, has been focused on the ever-increasing amount of canned meat products showing up on the shelves and counters of grocery stores and supermarkets all over the United States. Many of these canned pork and ham products are imported from Poland, a country which can ill afford to export any meats beyond its borders. Due to Soviet domination, and their greed for American dollars, these exports are literally selling the meat right out of the mouths of a starving people who at best can't produce enough meat for their own country. This is the real crime of our imports from Poland. You can be assured that the Polish farmer is not getting the added income from these exports to the United States. A very close friend of mine faced up squarely to the situation when he said, "I would be ashamed of myself if I ever sat down to eat a Polish ham. I could only visualize hungry Polish children standing with their faces pressed to my dining room window, watching be eat their food."

The importation of canned meat products from South America, Europe, and the low countries are not the only problem facing the domestic industry. Last year, meat exporters from Australia and New Zealand announced that they would lease numerous larger merchant vessels, to add to their then current fleet of vessels importing meat to the United States. This was shortly followed by their announcement to build an additional fleet of larger refrigerated vessels for the same purpose. These proposed additions apparently have not satisfied their appetities for fast movement and quick turnover of profits since a recent announcement from New Zealand stated their meat producer's board has plans to use huge cargo planes to deliver fresh meat to this country in 19 hours. That is faster than some domestic producers can get their product from the range, or the feeder lots, to Omaha or Chicago. If the New Zealand people can get their air project off the ground, it will certainly mean stiffer competition for our domestic producers.

This air travel for imported meats is not exactly new. They have been importing meats from Iceland to the United States for the past year, and are doing very well with it. Their imports are on the increase and they will soon become a real threat to the domestic producers.

Our problems of imports are not wholly confined to the livestock industry. The automible manufacturers in Detroit have been hard hit by the mass importation of small automobiles from various European countries. They literally tore up their projected production sheets and plans for newer models of the lower priced American cars and have gone into production on small scale type of cars to compete with this growing threat to the stability of the industry. The American textile industry, particularly in the New England and Middle Atlantic States, has become stagnated and is fast becoming a lost art in these areas due to the infiux of textile products from foreign countries located throughout the world. Japan and Hong Kong, China, have stepped up their exports in this field, as well as in clothing, toys, and novelties of every description from sports equipment to making the American flag. The lower priced china industry in the United States is losing ground fast to similar industries exporting from Europe, Japan, and Hong Kong, and the recent steel strike materially increased imports of cheap foreign steel.

It is time that a quota system be set up to protect dying American industries. While the United States is still the wealthiest country in all the world, it is no longer the unchallenged leader. Our massive Federal deficits have fostered monetary inflation, and labor and management bargaining have brought on wage-price inflation, resulting in excessive production costs, that have not only priced themselves out of the foreign markets, but in many instances have also priced themselves out of a great portion of the domestic market.

Much of the responsibility for the increased foreign imports rests with our past and present foreign trade agreements. It is about time we took a long look at the adverse effects of our export-import business on American industries before again committing ourselves to further extensions of the foreign trade agreements when they expire, unless some mandatory quota provisions are included therein for the protection of our home industries.

Another serious threat confronting the livestock producers, and the meat packing industry as well, is the entrance of the major chain stores into these industries, which has created new problems arising out of the integration taking place in cattle feeding, processing, and marketing. These major chains have violated their historical agreement with the processing and packing industry, to stay out of each other's field of operations. The purchasing power yielded by these major food chains is slowly but surely destroying the protection once enjoyed by the livestock and agricultural producers, the small business processors and retailers, as well as the American consumer. Livestock and agricultural producers are coming to realize that the increased concentration in food retailing, as practiced by the large chains, means fewer buyers are purchasing a greater share of their products, and their bargaining position is being substantially weakened. The potential of this mass purchasing has enabled them to negotiate contracts that provide very thin profit margins, and without escalator clauses geared to the market. As a consequence, the producer, the processor, and the supplier are constantly in trouble.

Legislation has been introduced to amend the provisions of the 1921 Packers and Stockyards Act to be invoked by the Federal Government agencies to ban current practices of major packers and chainstore operators, which circumvent competitive bidding in terminal markets to buy direct from producers and feedlot operators. The effect of these practices is to force down the market value of livestock, since purchases are not made under the same terms required at a central terminal. Savings in this direct buying formula are not passed on to the consumer but are retained as additional profits by the purchaser, meanwhile the livestock producer is forced to take less for his product.

The House Select Committee on Small Business has undertaken an investigation of these practices, as well as looking into the major food chainstores' absorption of more than 3,000 locally operated food stores within the last 3 or 4 years, also why, over the past 10 years, food chain sales have increased 64 percent more than independent sales. Legislation has recently been introduced to amend section 7, of the Clayton Act, by providing for the strengthening of our antimerger laws, and would help small business where the merger movement is sweeping away competition and creating monopolies.

There is no question that livestock producers and feeders in the Middle West are experiencing daily the adverse effects resulting from the market control owned by the major food chains. It is like an ominous cloud hanging over our heads.

Our Laws Shouldn't Be Aimed at All Sportsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, persistent attempts of a few individuals, seeking laws and regulations to restrict the millions of sportsmen who regularly use firearms for hunting and target, skeet, and trapshooting, is a matter of serious concern.

Their success would seriously curtail a healthful, mind-and-body-building, form of recreation enjoyed by millions of Americans.

Those who urge such suppressive action are apt to base their appeals upon emotion, rather than fact.

This is pointed out in the excellent editorial in the February 13, 1960, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which places firearms accidents in perspective to accidents resulting from other normal activity. In perspective, firearms cause relatively few accidents; and their recreation use should be encouraged.

The editorial follows:

GUN LAWS SHOULDN'T BE AIMED WILDLY AT ALL SPORTSMEN

There have been wild shots in hunting. Occasionally an inexperienced Nimrod will mistake his father-in-law for a moose, with tragic results. These unfortunate episodes

echo in legislatures—all too often in the form of bills as misdirected as the shots. On the perennial issue of firearms control, State legislators may be swamped by emotional appeals.

Some of these movements spring from genuine and legitimate concern. Frequently, however, they involve widespread repression of American sportsmen because of a few isolated accidents. In other instances campaigns against firearms have resembled arbitrary total disarmament programs. One such, in a large Eastern State, was launched by a seemingly hysterical radio commentator. He whipped up more than 10,000 signatures to petitions for a bill which would have very nearly prohibited peashooters. The bill was killed in committee only when thousands of hunters and target shooters reminded their legislators of their constitutional right to possess firearms.

Much of the immediate problem over firearms arises from the overflow of our large cities, east and west, into what have been traditional hunting areas. Some hunters jeopardize the rights of 15 million decent and thoughtful sportsmen by gunning around the fringes of schools, parks and the playpens of small children. Local measures should be sufficient to cope with the persistent few. Hunting license examinations, similar to driving tests for motorists, could provide an additional means of control.

Any discussion, to be effective, should avoid emotional excesses and statistical misguidance. One figure, widely circulated of late, is that 14,000 Americans were "killed by guns" in a single year. Actually, as Government sources confirm, more than half of those "killed by guns" either committed suicide or were shot down while committing serious crimes. Homicides or deliberate killings by firearms decreased from 6,995 in 1930 to 4,010 in 1957 despite the great population increase. Nor can the decrease be directly attributed to stricter gun regulations. New York State, with one of the earliest and most rigid firearms laws, still reported proportionately more gun slayings than the New England States, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and a dozen others.

As for accidental deaths, 2,369 in 1957 were blamed on guns. The fatality rate from all forms of accidents was 56 per 100,000 persons. Motor vehicles caused 22.7 of these deaths, falls accounted for 12.1, fires and explosions for 3.7, and drowning for 3.1. The rate for fatal firearms accidents was only 1.4, scarcely above the 1.2 deaths from suffocating or choking on food.

No one seriously suggests banning automobiles, stairways, water, matches or eating because they sometimes cause deaths. To attempt to place blanket restrictions on firearms would be equally farfetched.

Ford of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following column by Raymond Moley which appeared in the February 15 issue of Newsweek magazine. I heartily agree with Mr. Moley's sentiments regarding our distinguished colleague, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., of Grand Rapids. Mr. FORD is truly one of the finest young Members of the House and we of the Michigan delegation are very proud of him.

The article follows:

FORD OF MICHIGAN

(By Raymond Moley)

No, this piece is not about the automobile man you hear so much about. Nor is it about my favorite "pea pickin' minnesinger," Ernie. It is about GERALD R. FORD, Jr., who represents the Fifth Michigan District in the U.S. House of Representatives. Watch this Ford. This may be a Ford year in a manner you are not expecting.

From time to time in this space I am inviting readers to consider certain Members of the House who ordinarily are so buried in useful committee work that they are likely to be obscured by the less useful forensics of the Senate. These humble servants are the ones who have guarded the pockets of taxpayers. In the past few years the House has saved us billions of dollars and has killed many a cracked-brain bill passed in the more radical Senate. The House works while the Senate talks. The Senate is more eminent. The House is more practical. It is closer to the people, and the majority of Americans are conservative; they work, save, pay their debts, and keep things going.

How unlike the expectations of the men who made the Constitution in 1787, when people like Hamilton were talking about the passions of the House and the sedative influence of the Senate.

VANDENBERG'S PROTEGE

At the core of the business of the House are a number of seasoned Democratic committee chairmen. Over the years they have mastered the vast affairs of our sprawling Government. They are the patient conservators of our public affairs. Alongside them there has grown up in the past 15 years a fine, vigorous group of young Republican minority Members. They work together, Democrats and Republicans, in our interest, mingling the wisdom of age with the drive of youth. High among these representatives of a genuine Republicanism is GERALD FORD of Michigan.

Forty-seven years ago, as an infant, he was legally adopted by his stepfather, who was a highly respected leader in the civic and political affairs of Grand Rapids. He taught the boy the meaning of civic responsibility and in 1948 he and his friend and fellow townsman, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, encouraged the young lawyer to run for Congress. He won in that Democratic year with a margin of 27,000. His majorities since have ranged from that figure to more than 50,000.

GERALD FORD has attained considerable seniority over the years. He is a member of the House Republican Policy Committee. He is also ranking member of the appropriations subcommittee on defense. This suggests a handy man to have in this campaign on the defense issue.

THE VOTING RECORD

In the ADA record of voting by Members of Congress, FORD agreed with them twice and disagreed seven times. He voted generally conservative in the first session of the 86th Congress—against "backdoor" spending, against the housing bill vetoed by the President, for the Smith bill to protect the right of States to legislate on communism, for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, for legislation to permit higher interest on long-term bonds, and against the public works pork barrel. In almost all cases he has sustained the President. His diligence is shown by the fact that in 12 years he missed only 47 out of 1,872 rollcalls.

As a candidate he has color and force. He served 47 war months in the Navy with distinction. He was a member of champion football teams at the University of Michigan, all all-America member of the 25-year team selected in 1959, played with the college All Stars against the Chicago Bears in 1935, and while at the Yale Law School was assistant football coach and boxing coach for freshmen.

FORD and Vice President NIXON, born in the same year, have been warm friends since they served in the House together. NIXON is not inclined to place much emphasis upon traditional rules in selecting vice presidential candidates—geographical, religious, or ideological balance. The new concept of the office calls for a young man, sympathetic with the President's policies, capable of representing the President at home and abroad, and young enough to learn the duties and responsibilities of a President. In conjectures about the Republican ticket, it will be well to keep FORD in mind.

Fight the Dark—Light Another Candle for Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1960, I had the distinct privilege and honor to speak before the members of the First Hungarian Reformed Church located at 344 East 69th Street in my congressional district. The leader of the church is Rev. Imre Kovacs, a true descendant of the spirit of that great Hungarian liberator, Louis Kossuth. Inspirational talks were given by Rabbi Joseph Gelberman of the Bal-Sherm Little Temple and by O. D. Dempsey, assistant minister to the Abyssinian Baptist Church, which our colleague, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, heads. Their words on brotherhood were inspiring and thought provoking. It was a pleasure to participate in this brotherhood rally, and I believe my words on this occasion might prove of interest. They are as follows:

Reverend Kovacs, Rabbi Gelberman, Reverend Dempsey, my good friend James Siket, members of the First Hungarian Reformed Church, and brethren, it is appropriate that on this day of affection and friendship, St. Valentine's Day, that we should speak of brotherhood.

We gather here today to reaffirm our belief in the dignity of man and to protest against the neurotic personalities who seek once again to revive religious hatred, second-class citizenship, and segregation. We believe that we are our brothers' keepers and that Cain shall be unable to destroy his brother Abel.

Many years ago the world thrilled to the words of our Declaration of Independence, "all men are created equal." In that declaration our forefathers declared the dignity of man as a principle and that declaration of of independence changed the course of history for over 180 years. Just as these United States followed this political, religious, and moral principle in its march to greatness so did the liberator of Hungary, Louis Kossuth,

declare the truth that Hungarians want freedom with brotherhood.

In the past 15 years ominous clouds have darkened our views and beclouded our vision. We no longer look to this earth, but are racing to the moon and to the planets beyond. While we preach brotherhood, ambitious men and bolder and more disciplined peoples are developing the means of destruction and annihilation.

Only yesterday a fourth nation, France, dropped an atomic bomb in the Sahara Desert. Its President, Charles de Gaulle, rejoiced because French scientists had demonstrated success in mastering the methods of total destruction. We ended a phase of World War II when our airmen dropped atomic bombs upon Japan and destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We were the masters of the world without the will or inclination to dominate or rule. Then we developed the hydrogen bomb and became smugly complacent. We dawdled and relaxed, and in October of 1957 we were rudely awakened and shocked when Russia projected a satellite into earth's orbit. As the satellite orbited around the earth, we wondered whether the beep-beep which it emited was a signal of impending doom or a harbinger of a greater and more glorious future. Like the hare which slept until it was too late, we fell asleep and now are trying to overtake the tortoise which is moving with unbelievable speed. Russia has thrust a lunik rocket to the moon and even taken a picture of the dark side of the moon. It has landed an intercontinental ballistic missile within 2 miles from its target after a flight of 7,000 miles. While Russia professes peace, its spokesman, Khrushchev, boasts of its military might and Russia brandishes its arsenal of missiles and destructive weapons. We are trying to keep pace, but our success in that regard is subject to doubts.

We, in turn, have developed our missiles, whose names, Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, bespeak atheistic gods. We have developed the Bomarc missile, and our anti-missile missiles like Nike-Zeus and Nike Hercules. We are racing to compete for we do not believe Russia's profession of peaceful intentions and we enjoy a nightmarish and uneasy peace. We know and the world knows, however, that we have the deterrent capacity to destroy this world and like Samson the power to destroy the temple with all the Philistines within it. It is ironical that man who is trying to conquer outer space cannot control himself upon this earth.

What shall we do? In my view we should instill in our children the eternal truth that we, white or black, Italian or Hungarian, Jew or Gentile, are our brothers' keepers and that we are children of God. We should pray that those who are at the levers of control of government should believe in the dignity of man and in his inherent worth. We must recognize that the world's natural resources were meant for the benefit of all mankind and not for the benefit of a select few of the aggrandizement of power by a state. We must recognize that laboring people should have the right and opportunity to earn a decent wage under healthy conditions. We must recognize that our freedoms should be protected from overzealous prosecutors, ambitious public officials, and bigoted neurotics.

We must hold high the torch of liberty to spread light where there is darkness, to spread understanding where there is hatred, to provide education where there is ignorance. In this way we shall develop the mystic bond of brotherhood which makes all men one, we shall fulfill our mission on earth and earn our eternal reward.

The Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the Port of New York Authority, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter dated February 3 addressed to the editor of the Asbury Park Press, Asbury Park, N.J., and signed by John J. Clancy, a commissioner of the Port of New York Authority. Mr. Clancy's letter is in reply to the editorials of the Asbury Park Press, which I recently inserted in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N.Y., February 3, 1960.

EDITOR, ASBURY PARK SUNDAY PRESS,
Asbury Park, N.J.

DEAR SIR: A copy of the editorial which appeared in the Asbury Park Sunday Press on January 17 has been brought to my attention.

We believe it essential and in the public interest that the citizens of New Jersey and New York have factual information regarding The Port of New York Authority, their joint self-supporting public agency. Established by a port treaty in 1921, the two States assigned to the port authority the responsibility of developing transportation and terminal facilities and of promoting and protecting the commerce and trade moving through the great bi-State Port of New York.

The 12 commissioners of the port authority—6 from each State—are appointed for 6-year terms by the respective Governors, with the consent and approval of the State senate. They serve without compensation. The minutes of the commissioner's regular monthly meetings are sent immediately to each Governor who has the power to veto the board actions of his State's commissioners. Further, all of the port authority's facilities have been developed only after enabling legislation has been adopted by the legislatures and signed by the Governors of the two States. The final authority on what their joint public agency can—and cannot—undertake therefore rests with the Governors and the legislatures of the two States.

In setting up their new agency, the two States gave the port authority neither the power of taxation nor the right to pledge the credit of either State. Its entire program therefore must be carried out on a self-supporting basis, without burden upon the general taxpayers. It obtains all of its revenues from those who use its transportation and terminal facilities. It borrows all of its capital funds for financing new projects from purchases of its revenue bonds on the basis of the port authority's credit, its sound prudent management and ability to meet its financial obligations.

VEHICULAR FACILITIES

Under bi-State legislation adopted in 1931, the two States assigned to the port authority the responsibility for unifying, building, and operating all interstate bridges and tunnels within the New Jersey-New York Port District. The 1931 act requires the port authority to study and recommend the need for new interstate crossings but states that no additional bridges and tunnels can be undertaken without express authorization of the two States.

In every instance in which we have carried out the responsibility given to us by the two States—the construction of the three bridges between New Jersey and Staten Island, the Holland Tunnel, the George Washington Bridge, and the current addition of a lower level, the Lincoln Tunnel and its recently constructed third tube—the Assembly and the State Senate of New Jersey and New York have specifically and in almost every case unanimously adopted the necessary enabling legislation. I might add that our undertaking of these six interstate bridges and tunnels has had the overwhelming support, indeed the urgent insistence, of public officials, the general public, and the press to proceed promptly with these critically needed public vehicular facilities. As a matter of fact, we have often been criticized by these same groups for not building the bridges and tunnels fast enough, and even today there is a vocal demand for more vehicular capacity to satisfy the vehicular-travel demand.

Of course, enabling legislation in New Jersey and New York authorized our construction of the port authority bus terminal, as well as the new bus station at the Manhattan Plaza of the George Washington Bridge. These two terminals are designed to serve in a dignified, convenient, and comfortable manner the mass transit requirements of commuters by bus between northern New Jersey communities and Manhattan. These daily bus commuters number over 60,000 from north Jersey, primarily Bergen, Passaic, Essex, and Hudson Counties, as compared with 68,000 New Jersey rail commuters. At both bus terminals, direct ramps from the trans-Hudson crossings keep all interstate commuter buses off the local New York City streets, thus completely eliminating this former source of traffic congestion and expediting the movement of commuters within the city.

It should, of course, be recognized that our six self-supporting interstate tunnels and bridges are only links in the overall highway system of the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area. Obviously, all of these highways, parkways, turnpikes, and other expressways are financed and built by municipal, county, and States agencies as well as the Federal Government—and not by the port authority. These arterial highways, as for example the Garden State Parkway and Routes 34 and 35 in Monmouth County, were built by State agencies to meet the intra-area needs of the local communities and their citizens as well as to permit people in the other parts of the State and metropolitan region to reach the area served by these routes.

It is evident that the economy, welfare, and growth of the New Jersey shore have benefited from these State of New Jersey arterial highways. Obviously, the same benefits are enjoyed by every area in this great bistate region as a result of the State highways which for the past 40 years have been brought into being by the will of our citizens through their legislature and Governor. Would you prefer that New Jersey withdraw from the automotive age and return alone of all our great States to the economy and inconvenience of the horse-and-buggy days? It is doubtful that with the removal of vehicular conveniences the welfare of the people of New Jersey could be protected with reliance entirely upon rail service.

This relationship of port authority bridges and tunnels to the general highway system is substantiated by the minimal effect of

trans-Hudson traffic on local Manhattan street congestion, despite some popular and perhaps deliberately promoted misconceptions to the contrary. The actual figures on such travel, not only for the vehicles which use our own tunnels and bridges but those which enter Manhattan Island from the other sectors of the region—Westchester, the Bronx, Queens, Brooklyn, etc.—show that only 1 out of 25 cars within the central business district of Manhattan south of 61st Street used the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels. Only 6 out of every 1,000 people entering the area in the peak period on a business day reach the central business district of Manhattan by automobile through the Holland and Lincoln Tunnels. Obviously, even some of these proportionally few persons, such as salesmen, professional people, and others, must use their cars since no conceivable transit system or even car pools fill their requirements in reaching their scattered and usually multiple destinations in the metropolitan region.

Even this minimal effect on local Manhattan streets is now being reduced by new projects such as the trans-Manhattan expressway which the port authority is building at the George Washington Bridge, the Lower Manhattan Crosstown Expressway which is being built by the State of New York, and the Narrows Bridge which is being built by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority. These new Manhattan north and south bypass routes are of particular importance in removing another source of traffic congestion since more than half of the total trans-Hudson motorists have neither their origin nor destination on Manhattan Island. Significantly, all of these projects are on the Inter-State and Defense Highway System which is being brought into fruition as a result of the President's Federal highway program.

In addition, consideration should be given to the development by the port authority of specific facilities aimed at reducing the number of automobiles which enter Manhattan during the peak hours. These include the Lincoln Tunnel parking lot which the port authority built 5 years ago, about 1 mile west of the New Jersey portal of the Lincoln Tunnel. Prior to 9 a.m. each day, the lot now receives nearly 1,000 cars containing persons, primarily commuters, who complete their journey to Manhattan by means of shuttle bus into the port authority bus terminal in midtown Manhattan. As part of our planning for the second deck of the George Washington Bridge, we are also constructing a 500-car parking lot adjacent to the Bridge Plaza in Fort Lee which will serve uptown Manhattan in a similar manner.

PORT AUTHORITY VIEWS ON TRANSIT

On many occasions the port authority has stated before legislative hearings and at other public meetings, in letters to public officials and commuter groups and individuals and in statements to the press that the mainline commuter railroad services must be maintained between New Jersey communities and the Manhattan business district. Our position has always been that both rail and highway transportation are essential to the welfare of the people of the New Jersey-New York metropolitan region.

It is for this reason that the port authority made available over $800,000 to the Metropolitan Rapid Transit Commission when it was established by the two States in 1954, so that it might undertake its recent comprehensive interstate transit survey. I might note that the commission's recommendation in 1958 of a $600 million bistate transit loop to serve New Jersey rail commuters was rejected by the New Jersey State Legislature.

It is for this reason, too, that the port authority has devoted its attention and study to the rail rapid transit problem for more than 30 years and has repeatedly submitted its findings and conclusions on the subject to the Governors and Legislatures of New Jersey and New York, other public officials, and the press.

Under bistate legislation adopted last year, the port authority is cooperating with the State of New York in administering that State's program of financing the acquisition of new railroad passenger equipment. The State of New York has authorized the advance of $20 million for the purchase and lease of such equipment and also contemplates State guarantees, after a constitutional amendment, for any special bonds issued to finance car purchases. To the extent that New Jersey commuter railroads have any similar requirements, similar port authority action could be authorized in New Jersey under the bistate legislation.

During the almost 40 years of its existence, the port authority has made many studies of the possibility of joint or consolidated rail freight services in the port district. It was this rail freight problem—not rail passengers—which the two States had in mind when they created the port authority in 1921 and approved the 1922 comprehensive plan of rail freight belt lines and unified terminals. The port authority has made many efforts throughout this entire period, but without success, to persuade the railroads to adopt measures which we were confident would reduce their costs and expedite the handling of freight. We stand ready to assist the railroads in this manner today.

Since 1926 the port authority has been almost continuously engaged in various studies of rail transit, diligently seeking a solution of the financial problems involved in the operation and improvement of rail transit and commuter operations within the framework of the port authority's method of financing public projects on a self-supporting basis. We have searched through the years for any plan or type of service or combination of facilities or new technological developments that might afford any basis for the hope of a self-supporting transit operation in the New Jersey-New York area. All studies by the railroads, transit experts, the port authority and many others, however, have demonstrated conclusively that commuter rail transit (which is utilized only on a 20-hour-a-week basis) cannot be operated on a self-supporting basis and that it cannot be financed by revenue bonds based upon the net revenues of rail transit operations. Almost daily accounts of the worsening financial plights of the New Jersey and New York commuter railroads, the New York City Subway System, the railroads and transit systems in this and other metropolitan areas confirm the serious deficit nature of rail commuter services.

In the New Jersey-New York area, the deficit for commuter railroad and subway operations amounts to about $150 million a year. Those who argue that the port authority should assume all over even a portion of the New Jersey commuter railroad deficit must at the same time acknowledge that others would then argue that the bi-State public agency should provide funds to help make up the huge deficits of the New York City Subway System, ferry services and the commuter railroads in New York State.

Some have also suggested that "contributions" be made by the port authority, to the financing of the New Jersey railroads' equipment, trackage, and terminals. Under such reasoning, the State of New York would have an equal right to demand "contributions" for the subway and railroads on the east side of the Hudson. Obviously, the end product of such use of port authority funds, even if it were legal, would be the complete dissipation of revenues pledged to the payment of its operating expenses and for the interest and amortization on its bonds and the destruction of the credit so vital to the revenue bond financing of its essential public facilities.

There is no legerdemain by which transit deficits are going to be eliminated by either private carriers or other agencies. The only answer to the maintenance of essential services must be some measure of public support or financial relief to the private rail carriers or tax support for public transit operators.

It is ironic to suggest that the port authority assume financial responsibility for rail transit. Actually, as we have shown in our reports, the port authority couldn't even finance the rail transit system itself, under the financial limitatitons set by the legislatures of the two States when they established their joint public agency and under the financial and legal commitments to its bondholders. Yet, proponents of such financing would saddle this agency with a load that would pull down the entire terminal and transportation structure now in existence and required in future programs in the interests of the welfare of the people of the two States and the Nation.

The legal impossibility for the port authority to underwrite the New Jersey and New York commuter railroad and subway deficits is not for lack of what may be called charter powers. Technically, under the 1921 Port Treaty, the port authority has the statutory authority—as distinguished from the statutory responsibility—to undertake railroad operation. The legal impossibility results from the absolute incompatibility between such underwriting of deficits and the port authority's duty, as set by the two States, to be self-supporting and to fulfill its contractual commitments to those who lend it the money to carry out its public program.

As my fellow Commissioners and I stated before a hearing of the New Jersey Assembly in November 1958, the port authority does not regard an arterial highway program or the provision of other essential transportation facilities as a substitute or alternative for a program of maintaining and improving rail-passenger facilities between New Jersey and Manhattan and throughout the port district. A sound solution to the problem of maintaining and improving rail facilities cannot, however, be developed through the destruction of the port authority's comprehensive program of providing on a self-supporting basis, the modern port and terminal facilities that are indispensable to the employment and continued economic welfare of the people of northern New Jersey and New York.

Today, these 21 facilities serve all modes of transportation—water, air, vehicular, and rail. They represent a port authority investment of about $1 billion and include the six interstate bridges and tunnels, six marine terminals, four regional airports and a heliport, a union bus terminal, two union motortruck terminals and a union railroad freight terminal. It is of interest that the union bus terminal in mid-Manhattan and the uptown bus station, now under construction at the Manhattan plaza of the George Washington Bridge, will handle 60,000 daily New Jersey bus commuters, or almost as many as the 68,000 daily rail commuters from New Jersey.

As will be noticed, these transportation and terminal facilities form the very foundation of the prosperity—present and future—of the people in this, the world center of all types of transportation and trade. It is significant that the 21 public transportation and terminal facilities of the port authority generated employment for almost 56,000 people who earned about $347 million. The very prosperity of the entire bistate area is dependent to a major extent on the continuance of the ability of the port to handle efficiently, expeditiously, and economically the many millions of tons of waterborne commerce each year. The port jobs alone provide livelihood for at least 430,000 people and furnish the support for one out of every

four people who live in the New Jersey-New York port district. The best interests of the people who live in northern New Jersey and New York City demand that the facilities which serve all modes of transportation must be maintained and expanded to meet the economic welfare and growth of this metropolitan region.

The port authority is cooperating to the best of its ability with the transportation offices recently established by the two States to deal with the transit problem and is assisting them so far as it is feasible for us to do so. We stand ready, as always, to assist in any way possible in the search for solutions to the problem of maintaining essential rail transit services.

JOHN J. CLANCY,
Commissioner,
The Port of New York Authority.

Juvenile Delinquency—National in Scope, Local in Cure with Federal Guidance and Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Society of Medical Jurisprudence of New York conducted a panel discussion at the Academy of Medicine in New York City on February 8, 1960. Through the invitation of my friend, Edward S. Blackstone, chairman of the committee on program arrangements, I was a happy participant. Judge Phillip B. Thurston, justice of the domestic relations court, also spoke on the subject of juvenile delinquency as seen by a judge of a New York City court, who deals daily with the problem. I discussed the topic from the point of view of Federal and State legislation and what the local community could do to prevent the occurrence of juvenile delinquency and the rehabilitative measures which the community could properly take.

Clifton F. Weidlich, Esq., president of the society, presided. My speech follows:

Mr, Chairman, Judge Thurston, Mr. Weidlich, Mr. Blackstone, members of the Society of Medical Jurisprudence, I desire to speak to you about the broad subject of juvenile delinquency. I wish to talk about the nature, the extent of the problem, its causes, prevention, and control and what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

Juvenile delinquency is a problem of many facets. Everyone sees the problem from his own point of view. Each sees it in terms of his own area of concern. The lawyer certainly views it as a legal problem with consideration of specific violations and the application of appropriate remedies. Doctors view it as a psychiatric and psychological problem. Some recent suggestions indicated that we can predict a juvenile delinquent at the age of six. Certainly many men of religion and public-spirited citizens view it as a moral, religious, and ethical problem involvong the values by which men order their lives and those of their children. Certainly this problem involves a threat to a stable social structure and the failure of individual children and people to adjust to society. A person with a broad view regards it as a problem of personal development that affects not only the delinquent but the church, home, synagogue, schools, and various health services. In any event, whatever the view, it presents a challenge to governments—Federal, State, and local, and to parents, home, and churches. While this problem is national in scope, it certainly can be cured locally with the financial assistance and guidance of Federal and State Governments.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF PROBLEM

In the past it was our custom to consider juvenile delinquency as exclusively a local problem.

Today we recognize that the problem is national in scope and local in cure with Federal and State guidance. Recently I read an editorial in the Daily News which quoted a person saying that children were disrespectful to their elders, belligerent, and were gathering in lawless gangs. That person was Socrates, the famous Greek philosopher whose murmurs were terminated by hemlock.

By a strictly legal definition there are about 2 million children in our Nation today in the age group between 10 and 17 who have a record of one or more adjudications before juvenile courts. These are our legal delinquents.

But these statistics do not include cases of delinquency which are settled by juvenile police squads and other law-enforcement agencies—nor do these statistics include, of course, the undetected youthful violators. We have a statistically unknown degree of delinquency in our Nation.

So in speaking to you tonight about our national problem of juvenile delinquency, I would like to use as my definition of the term those persons under 21 years of age whose conduct includes all unlawful or persistently antisocial behavior.

There have been many words written and spoken about juvenile delinquency and our "lawless" youth. I was happy to see an article in a national magazine (Newsweek) a few weeks ago on our good teenagers—the other 98 percent of our children who are growing up without gangs, guns, and goofballs.The other 2 percent have given us a decade of delinquency. 1958 marked the 10th straight year in which juvenile delinquency increased in our Nation. 1958 was the 10th year in a decade which saw the appearance of children in our juvenile courts increase more than 2½ times.

This tremendous increase in youthful lawlessness and crime has started us all asking ourselves what the causes could be. Just as many words could be bandied about blaming parents, schools, churches, mass media, public and private morals, individual maladjustment and a variety of other causes.

CAUSES OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

My own conclusions about these causes, conclusions which I have reached after a considerable study of the problem, particularly while I was with the New York Temporary Commission on Youth and Delinquency, are that there are three major causes for this youthful violence and delinquency.

The first, and to my mind, the basic cause for this ever increasing rate of juvenile crime and delinquency is a breakdown in respect for authority, both for the State and for the family.

Secondly, there is a breakdown in the family because of increasing divorces, the absence of parents from the home and its corollary, a lack of love and affection. We find also, of course, in certain instances that the "smother love" of the overly protective parent brings about juvenile delinquency.

Thirdly, the youth of our country have a feeling of frustration, of not being wanted. This feeling gives rise to a rebellion within them, so that they are truly rebels without causes. They experience a feeling of not being wanted in the home, in the school group or in the community. They struggle for recognition and desire to be recognized in some form or another.

Recently, I read an article which outlines 12 simple ways to develop a delinquent. As a parent, which of them have you done?

First, they said to begin with infancy by giving the child everything he wants. In this way he will grow up believing that the world owes him a living. Second, when he picks up bad words or dirty words, just laugh at him. That will make him think he is cute. Third, never give him any spiritual training until he is 21 and then let him decide for himself. Fourth, praise him in the presence of all the neighbors. Show him how much smarter he is than the neighbor's children. Fifth, avoid as you would the plague the use of the words "wrong" or "don't." He may develop a guilt complex. Sixth, pick up everything after him—his books, his clothes, his shoes, so that he will know how to throw burdens on others. Seventh, let him read anything he wants. Have no concern whatsoever as to what goes in his mind. Eighth, quarrel with your husband or your wife frequently in the presence of your children. He will know what parents think of each other when the fire of love is burning low. Ninth, give him all the spending money he wants. Never let him earn anything on his own. Tenth, satisfy every craving of the child, gratifying every sensual desire. Eleventh, take his part against the police, the teachers, the neighbors; they are all prejudiced against your child. When your child comes home from school with low marks tell him that his teacher is prejudiced against Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Italians, or any other minority. When your child complains that the cop on the beat told him to break it up and move along, tell him that the cop is a crook and on the payroll of the local bookmaker. Twelfth, and finally, in your program be sure that when he finally gets into real trouble always defend him yourself and say, "He is a good boy, his companions led him astray."

FEDERAL ACTION

It is in the area of research that the Federal Government has given us so much needed leadership and assistance. Some of our Federal agencies and our Congress are devoting time, taxes, and toil also to help us find the most effective vaccine to inoculate our children against juvenile delinquency back in our communities where our children are—in our homes, schools, churches and all our communities' institutions.

It is particularly fitting, it seems to me, that much of this research and technical assistance to States in the field of delinquency has centered in our U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For juvenile delinquency affects our children's health, education, and welfare as much as the food they eat, the water they drink, or the books they read.

Recognizing that this menace had reached national proportions, the Children's Bureau, which is concerned with the health and well-being of all our children, delinquent and nondelinquent, established a Division of Juvenile Delinquency Services, in 1955. This Division gives technical assistance and consultation to juvenile courts in many of our States on such matters as detention care, courtroom procedure, and court-community agency relationships.

We have about 3,000 juvenile courts throughout our country and yet service in many of these courts has not, for the most part, been able to keep up with developments either in the volume of services needed or in the application of up-to-date methods and principles for dealing with children and youth. The Division, though it does provide

consultation and technical assistance to many of our courts, is not adequately staffed to meet all requests in this field to develop guides and standards which are so greatly needed.

This Division of Juvenile Delinquency Services also offers technical assistance to States and communities in the training of personnel. It is alarming, I think, that about half of the counties in our country have no probation services at all for youth. In the other half where some probation services exist, we find that only about 1 out of 10 of the probation officers have had any specialized training for their jobs. We are also told that about 4 out of 10 of our 2,000 local probation officers who work exclusively with children do not have a college degree and are not eligible for advanced training. And our detention homes and public training schools are also for the most part staffed with unskilled, untrained people

It is in this area that the Division of Juvenile Delinquency Services tries to help us on a national level by offering as many services as possible to help local agencies to expand their inservice training for these people working directly with our kids and to help in getting more trained people into the field.

This Division also collects and analyzes our statistics on juvenile delinquency, does research toward establishing goals and guides for our local institutions which handle delinquents, and encourages and gives consultation to communities in their search for improved methods of combating delinquency. Certainly you and I know that more consultation with States and community institutions and more correlation of all our delinquency data is not going to cure delinquency. But the guides, the packaged knowledge and the exchange of experience we can get in this way can be invaluable if it is properly used.

The Federal Government also conducts a program of research, training and consultation in the mental health aspects of delinquency. In this area we are looking for immediate aids for our national problem of delinquency and we are also looking for aids of a more basic nature which will help us to increase our knowledge about juvenile delinquency—that is useful, everyday knowledge that we can put into practice for a long term cure. It's this kind of research that is badly needed. And again, it's this kind of research which costs us the most precious time. We here in the local communities are so busy trying to put out the fire that we haven't too much time left over to shop around for a better fire truck.

During 1959, the National Institute of Mental Health made 84 grants to institutions and individuals for research in juvenile delinquency. These 84 grants cost $1,113,000—a lot of money. But compared to the cost of public services for delinquents—that is our courts, police, detention facilities and institutional care—which is conservatively estimated to cost $200 million, the cost spent in research for more effective treatment, prevention and rehabilitation of our delinquents is small indeed.

This research sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health is destined not only to help us save in the money costs of juvenile delinquency, but it will help us save other costs which count most, that is the cost of family distress, loss of productive years, personal unhappiness, and human life. These costs cannot be measured.

Specifically, some of the grants made by the National Institute of Mental Health in 1959 were for 14 studies in treatment methods; 15 grants for general theory and personality studies; 7 studies of delinquency and the schools; 14 studies in family structure and attitudes; and 4 studies in drugs and delinquency. These studies deal with some of our most basic problems in the treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquency.

One of these research projects which the National Institute of Mental Health conducted during 1959 was centered in New York University and the Lower East Side Neighborhood Association. Another project sponsored by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health is one in Quincy, Mass., known as the South Shore Courts Clinic project.

They hope that findings from this research project will give us some treatment classification procedures that can be used by some of our untrained or partially trained people in the field.

The appropriate committee of the U.S. Congress has not been indifferent to this national menace, either. Since 1953, a special subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in our Senate has been studying juvenile delinquency. Just last fall they were here in New York to hold hearings on juvenile gangs, a problem of serious concern to you and me. This same subcommittee has held similar hearings throughout our country and has collected and disseminated valuable knowledge about the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Last fall a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives held hearings on this national problem in relation to Federal legislation in this field. These hearings on juvenile delinquency at the community level have not only been useful in stimulating local concern but they have also been informative to the House of Congress as to what the Federal Government can and should do in this field. They have helped us all by alerting us to the Nation's concern with juvenile delinquency and even its international implications. The boy of today is no different from the boy of yesteryear. The Greek philosopher Socrates told us youth gangs were prevalent in ancient Greece. The only difference, in my opinion, between the gangs of today and those of yesteryear is the use of instruments of destruction. A prankster today would not be considered a Huckleberry Finn, but a young man crossing interstate lines may be violating Federal law.

I believe that where a weapon is used, punishment should be swift and heavy.

Many of the crimes committed by juveniles today involve violation of Federal law. The theft of an automobile if involved in interstate transportation of the vehicle would bring a young man or woman into Federal court. Matters relating to runaway children and narcotics could also bring a child into a Federal court.

The U.S. Congress has recently passed some legislation, however, which related directly to some of these legal matters. During the 85th Congress, H.R. 12650, which prohibits the interstate traffic of switchblade knives became law—Public Law 85-623. During the same Congress we enacted Public Law 85-796, a measure which has resulted in the prosecution and arrest of pornographers who were unreachable. The most important feature of this law is that it allows prosecution at the point of delivery as well as at the point of deposit of obscene matters sent through the mail.

During this same Congress, we passed another law, Public Law 85-752, which contained a section which raised the age limit from 22 to 26 for those youths covered by the Federal Youth Corrections Act. This is a rehabilitative approach to the offender rather than a punitive one. I regret that the State of New York has postponed the effective date of Youth Act which extends secrecy to cases involving youths of 19 and 20. This postponement in my opinion is shortsighted and unwise.

During the 86th Congress, several bills relating to juvenile delinquency have been introduced by both Houses. None have become law.

Among the measures introduced were bills in both Houses which would provide for Federal assistance projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of our national juvenile delinquency control problems.

Other bills in both Houses were introduced to provide assistance to and cooperation with States and institutions of higher learning for the training of qualified personnel for work in various fields involving the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency.

Two of our most urgent problems are personnel and practicable controls.

We, here in New York, have seen the benefit of our youth camps. One bill was introduced in the Senate last session and some 13 similar bills were introduced in the House to apply this basic principle on a national level. The intent of all these bills is to set up a Youth Conservation Corps whereby young men, usually between the ages of 16 and 21 could participate in planned conservation projects on public land. These boys would be aware that they were doing something necessary and worthwhile in the conservation of State resources. Those in favor of this measure have pointed out that the same sense of satisfaction and resulting change in attitude is frequently not found in training schools where work is designed to help the boys keep busy, and has no other meaning—and the boys know it.

We talk a great deal about rehabilitating the juvenile delinquent and the youthful offender, but we do very little about it actually. Governments have a Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde complex, a helpful aspect and a harmful attitude. We little realize that when a boy gets into trouble he is actually condemned to menial employment and to second-rate citizenship.

Almost every agency of government interposes its strength to keep this child from becoming a useful citizen and losing himself in the anonymity of everyday life. A boy, after making a mistake, may receive the blessing of our youthful offender law, gets a break and, being released resolves to walk the straight and narrow path. He applies for a job—civil service closes its doors to him. He cannot become a police officer because the police department under the leadership of its police commissioner not only refuses appointments to boys who have made one mistake, but also extends the principle of refusing appointment to a boy whose father has been a convict. The boy cannot even get a job cleaning the streets because civil service will not approve or certify him as qualified. He cannot get a liquor license because the ABC and the State liquor board will refuse him a license. He cannot even become a barber because that requires a license. If his crime has been a serious one, the docks and waterfront are closed to him. The State civil service also closes its doors. He can't get a Government clerical job—the Post Office Department will not even let him carry letters. The electricians and plumbers reject him, as a license is required. If he wants to drive a truck, he needs a driver's license and perhaps he cannot even get a driver's license. If he wants to be a grocer, he finds himself handicapped, because he might need a beer license and can't get it. Where is he to turn?

If he tries to enter the Armed Forces, he may be rejected. With respect to the situation in the Armed Forces and the discharges which servicemen receive which are "less than honorable," I believe the situation is worse than it is in civilian life. Any boy who receives a discharge less-than-honorable finds that he has forfeited almost all of his civil rights either in government or in private industry. Many young men have come to me crying for the opportunity to ob-

tain employment, but are prohibited from doing so because they have received a general, undesirable, bad conduct, or dishonorable discharge. Only an enlightened public can solve this problem for it is certain that government agencies will not accept a boy who has anything less than an honorable discharge. In past years we prided ourselves in seeing that our Constitution struck down the vicious bills of attainder and the doctrine of corruption of the blood. In practice in our country we see the horrible consequences of this nonlegal bill of attainder in the practice of government to deny jobs to boys with a conviction or to refuse him civil service because of an arrest or a discharge less than honorable.

During my senatorial career in the New York State Senate I made a recommendation and introduced a bill which redefined the term "arrest." A person who has been adjudicated a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender should not be considered as a person having been arrested. I would give him at least one chance. In this way, a boy would be able to say truthfully, as on a civil service questionnarie, that he has never been arrested. We public officials or personnel officers will not knowingly take the responsibility to give a juvenile delinquent or youthful offender a position in public employment. We act this way because we know that if a government employee who was a former delinquent trangresses once again, a newspaper will call for the removal of the public official. It requires courage for a public official to give such a boy an opportunity in public employment and there are very few with such courage. Despite these obstacles some boys rehabilitate themselves. I salute them.

You gentlemen are steeped in law and in modern psychiatric and psychological approaches. In your field of endeavor you may find answers which may prove more realistic than mine or more attainable. I exhort you to use your intellect and experiences to the solution of this problem. It is the common concern of all of us.

Some Are Born Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes on February 11, 1960:

SOME ARE BORN GREAT

As William Shakespeare so wisely expressed it long, long ago, "Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon 'em."

A review of the history of nations will reveal that few men are actually born great—that is if we are to evaluate greatness by their final accomplishments.

True greatness does not depend upon the acquisition of great wealth nor the assumption of great power, politically or by sheer strength of arms. True greatness depends upon certain other qualities which, alas, are not found too often in those whom the world has acclaimed as great. Those who are born truly great will achieve their destiny despite all odds. Nothing can prevent them from the final fulfillment of their greatness.

As for those who achieve greatness, we might place in this class men who have become wealthy by the use of a certain business acumen and a certain disregard for their fellowmen in rising to their positions of wealth. But these are not truly great.

As for those who "have greatness thrust upon 'em," they are for the most part opportunists, rising on a surge of popular enthusiasm to positions of power politically, but when their final achievements are summed up impartially, it will be found that they are the least great.

Without discussing the history of other nations and confining ourselves strictly to the boundaries of our own country, when we look back upon the men who have become leaders in government, industry, or politics, we find very few upon whom the mark of true greatness has descended.

Our country has been fortunate, indeed, that among those who have become important in the development of our Nation, we can count at least two men, who stand above their fellows and who can be said to have reached the greatness to which they were born.

We refer here to George Washington and Abraham Lincoln—one the father of our country and the other the saviour of our country. As we see it, there can be little doubt as to their greatness—greatness of mind, greatness of inspiration and greatness of courage to accomplish and, above all, the greatness of humility.

Intellect plus inspiration, plus courage, plus humility, make them stand out above all other men this country has developed over the years. The only men who can be ranked along with them to some degree might be those missionaries who explored our wilderness, bringing the Gospel of Christ to the Indians and, if need be, giving up their lives in their desire to spread truth. These men, also had inspiration, courage, and humility.

The anniversaries of the birth of Washington and Lincoln occur during the month of February and our citizens, recognizing their worth, have set the days apart.

Though born nearly a century apart and, to use an old cliche, "poles apart" insofar as their early training and education are concerned, the innate greatness with which the Creator endowed them could not help but assert itself as each faced a crisis which, on the one hand might have meant the end our our country before its history had even begun and on the other hand the disunity of our country which could have meant the road to ruin.

Two writers, as far apart as Cicero and our own Ralph Waldo Emerson, have discussed the meaning of true greatness. Cicero, the Roman, wrote that "All great men are truly inspired." Emerson wrote, "Great men are sincere." Washington and Lincoln embodied within them both inspiration and sincerity and with these virtues the sublime virtue of humility.

Just as Washington at Valley Forge knelt down in his tent and prayed that the cause for which he and his troops were fighting might win out in the end, so, also, did Lincoln, through the bitter 4 years of the Civil War, realize that without divine guidance the cause in which he believed—the constant union of our States—could not be preserved.

It may well be that in the not too distant future our country may be facing another crisis which, if not met bravely and firmly might bring about our destruction. God grant that if such a situation should arise, in His wisdom and kindness, He shall again smile upon us and give us another leader who can measure up to Washington and Lincoln. More than that, we could not ask.

Politicians—A Tribute From a Noted Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Joseph F. Menez, chairman of the Department of Political Science of Loyola University, of Chicago, recently gave a talk at the 11th annual convention of the Christian Family Movement at Notre Dame University in which, as he writes me, he paid a small tribute to hard-working politicians.

I appreciate that all my colleagues are statesmen, but I suspect that even in the most statesmanlike there is more than a bit of the politician, certainly in the sense sought to be conveyed in Dr. Menez' most readable remarks, which follow:

POLITICS AS A VOCATION

(By Dr. Joseph F. Menez)

The topic assigned me is "Politics as a Vocation." I should like to discuss almost the heart of politics, namely, the politician, the most sophisticated of all political animals. Now the Greeks had a word for city-state, polis, and in our day this has a new connotation. You might say, it's a good word gone wrong. Professor Maurice Klein writes in the Antioch Review that he always asks his classes in government to write down what the word "politics," our off-shoot of polis, means to them. He gets various answers but to far too many, it means "dirty business" and other similar perjoratives. "When I hear that word, I feel like spitting," one wrote. "Wire pulling," "underhandedness," "dog eat dog," "where connections more than ability counts," "corruption and graft," and so on. The practitioner of politics, the politician, is assaulted with the same basic language.

All one has to do is read "The Last Hurrah" to know what has happened to the boss. The systematic welfare state, the decline of patronage, the rise of organized labor as a political force, the flight from cities into the suburbs and the subsequent rise of the independent voter, not to mention the improvement of mass education, intellectual communication, and a high standard of living—all have taken their toll of the "boss." Thus, the kind of person that these students are talking about doesn't exist. The political boss, says Cabell Phillips, "is almost a mirage, a gaudy memory of a gaudy past, a specimen which time has rendered almost extinct."

What does exist, though, is the Leader. As John Flynn wrote in "You're the Boss" the "Boss" is you—if you want to be. "The humblest worker in the ranks," he says, "has the right any time to challenge the top leadership. Whether he does so because he honestly believes the topman is a bad leader, or simply because he himself has an eye on the highest rank, his success or failure depends on his ability to attract to his new banner a sufficient number of other workers to unseat the leader he has challenged."

If you look in the Oxford Universal Dictionary, as I did, under "politician," you'll find among other definitions the one given by Adam Smith nearly two centuries ago as "that insidious and crafty animal, vulgarly called statesman or politician." James

Freeman Clark thought that a politician was always looking out for the greatest good for the greatest number but the greatest number is No. 1. "I'm not a politician," said Artemus Ward, the American humorist, "and my other habits are good." Mark Twain, a cynic of the first order, knew a great deal more about literature than he did about politics for how else could he have said "it can probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinct native American criminal class except Congress." Finally, we can recall Hilaire Belloc's statement, "Politics, politicians, you know how it is," he said, "you see a slimy pond, with a lot of insects swimming around in it and you go off to bed and next morning, there they all are, still mucking around in dirty water. That's politics. That's politicians for you."

Now whatever the reasons may be, there is little doubt that the politician in American literature has really taken a beating. This is the reason, I suppose, why Ben Franklin said "the first mistake in public business is to go into it." Another, I suppose, is because of the hard work involved. Eugene Gilbert, president of the Gilbert Youth Research Co., asked young people this question: "Would you like to be President of the United States?" Only 8 percent of the boys and 2 percent of the girls answered yes. One boy said: "I can't see any young boy who'd like to become President with the problems and the world tensions surrounding us today. It's just not worth it."

In "Laughing With Congress," ALEXANDER WILEY prints this ditty:

"He'll find, should he win
The office sought, that
One day he's sworn in
The next, sworn at."

Horace Greeley, you will remember, ran in the election of 1872 and admitted he didn't know at times whether he was running for the White House or the crazy house. Artemus Ward remarked that it is easy enough to see why a man goes to the poor house or to the penitentiary. "It's because he can't help it. But why he should voluntarily go and live in Washington, is entirely beyond my comprehension." Humorist Will Rogers' profound comment was that all politics is applesauce. It was, no doubt, nonsense like this that prompted a fiery tempered legislator to answer a constituent thus: "Sir," he said, "my stenographer, being a lady, cannot type what I think of you. I, being a gentleman, cannot think it. You, being neither, will understand what I mean."

Politicians are supposed to say one thing when they mean another. "There's just one role for politicians all over the world," wrote John Galsworthy. "Don't say in power what you say in opposition; if you do, you only have to carry out what the other fellows have found impossible." Politicians, after all, reflect their constituencies. One time Gladstone, Prime Minister of England, was reproached for having said one thing while running for office and doing another thing while in office. This does not mean one gives promises before being elected with no thought given to carrying them out; it only means that one cannot be absolutely pinned down. In our own country, was Mr. Dulles insincere in first thinking the Bricker amendment (which would have restricted the President in the conduct of foreign affairs) was good and then later bad when he was Secretary of State? Are judges or courts insincere when they reverse themselves? We do not have to labor the point that one yardstick is being applied to politicians and another to everyone else.

Edmund Burke, who certainly knew something about politicians and was himself one of the very highest type, had this to say about compromise, another area in which the politician is misunderstood. "All government, indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue, every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniences; we give and take, we remit some rights, that we may enjoy others; and we choose rather to be happy citizens than subtle disputants." This does not mean giving up principles. It does mean that in most of the issues one takes a half loaf. It is amazing that when the politician compromises we think he is splitting hairs, or that he's being weak and yet he does only that which everyone else does—except publicly and perhaps, let us admit it, more forthrightly. For politicians to compromise is not immoral any more than it would be for someone in private life. "Indeed," says Marshall Clinard, "Were today's politicians to adopt such a standard they would almost certainly be rejected by the voters as idealists, dreamers, crackpots or visionaries."

Just as the engineer runs a train, a group of politicians runs the party. It's as simple as that. "Party," said Edmund Burke, "is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed. For my part, I find it impossible to conceive that anyone believes in his own politics or thinks them to be of any weight, who refuses to adopt the means of having them reduced to practice." We make this refusal all the time. We are really a nation—if I may use a vulgarity—of beefers. We claim to know what's wrong and yet millions don't vote regularly. At the same time we do nothing about politics, we have the temerity to point the finger of blame at those who do.

It is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out the proper means toward those ends and employ them with effect. This means organization: it means assessment. The Jeffersonians, at the turn of the 19th century, organized, looked over the situation, saw what had to be done, and then adopted the means to effect the end. The Federalists, by contrast, didn't do this and they perished as a political party. A President like Theodore Roosevelt understood this. To his friends who warned that people of his class did not go into politics, especially low politics in the market place, he replied: "that if this was so it merely meant that the people I knew did not belong to the governing class, and that other people did—and that I intended to be one of the governing class; that if they proved too hard-bit for me, I supposed I would have to quit, but that I certainly would not quit until I made the effort and found out whether I really was too weak to hold my own in the rough and tumble."

What we sometimes do not understand is that the politician is a specialist. He's a specialist in the art of governing and in overlooking the affairs of the Nation. We forget Woodrow Wilson's remark that "politics ought not to be considered as a mere occasion for oratory, but as a branch of the national business." Especially is the politician an expert in human affairs for he spends more time, more energy and more thought in 1 week about politics than we do in 52 weeks.

Former Democratic National Chairman, James Farley, said that politics was a science because it was a "scientific approach to handling human beings." Leonard Hall, his counterpart, believes that politics is an art. He said: "When we speak of a science we think of something that can be measured at all times. There are too many intangibles in politics, like human nature and human progress." To Justice Felix Frankfurter "government is itself an art, one of the subtlest of arts. * * * It is the art of making men live together in peace and with reasonable happiness. * * * One of the shallowest distains is the sneer against the professional politician." It is, I think, a little of both, a little of an art and a little of a science. It is an art because the handling of men to form a peaceful community is a very high art, and a science because there is a science of administration. The politician sees the nuances of administration and of public policy, the vagaries of people, especially as voters, and the importance of issues. To sneer at him, or write him off as a nincompoop, untalented and busy with low concerns, is not only doing violence to the truth but it comes close to meaning that representative government, and that means party government, is a failure.

Does one have to lie and cheat to be a politician if one concedes grudgingly that party government is necessary? Is Wendell Phillips right when he said "politicians are like the bones of a horse's foreshoulder—not a straight one in it" or John Gay:

"That politician tops his part,
Who readily can lie with art."

"If you look down through history," said Leonard Hall, "that kind of politician doesn't last very long. A politician's greatest asset is his word. If his word isn't good, he doesn't last long." Agreeing with Hall, James Farley wrote: "I can truthfully say, I have found more truth telling, more sincerity, and more human feeling among politicians than among any other group with whom I have been associated. Basically, politicians are very decent people." The clearest headed politicians are most careful not alone on the basis of ethics but also on the basis of practicality for many a politician has had a promising career ended because the voters doubted his promises. Duane Lochard of the Connecticut General Assembly relates this anecdote: "I had accepted an invitation to give a junior college commencement address * * * and was torn between the obligation to my host and my duty to vote on the bill (involving the primary). The majority leader, Senator Joseph Longo, gave assurances that the matter would not be put to a vote before I returned although he knew the vote would be against him. The appointment was kept. I returned hours later and did, in fact, vote against the majority leader who had held the bill." This specific instance of politicians keeping their word, not only among themselves but to the constituencies, can be multiplied many times.

As Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY has noted, people are honest until proved to be crooks, while politicians are considered crooks until they prove themselves honest. Prejudices are comfortable and it is so easy to set politicians aside and attribute to them failings that nobody else is supposed to possess. In addition to being suspect, politicians are often accused of having pigmy mentalities. Thus, in "The Twilight of the American Mind," Walter B. Pitkin wrote that politicians are the semifailures in business and the professions, men of mediocre mentality, dubious morals, and significant commonplaces. This might be true of hack politicians as it is true of huckster businessmen, run-of-the-mill professors, or has-been actors. Which is to say, it proves nothing. Working under the searchlight of public opinion (you can't see it, but as James Russell Lowell said, it has, like the atmosphere, 16 pounds to the square inch), is no easy task. Politicians claim none of that passion for anonymity or personal privacy that their critics insist upon. I don't think one could find a similar group of people, individually selected as in Congress, who would have as much talent and as much know-how as politicians.

The American sport is to picture the politician in stereotypes. He's short; he's fat; he smokes cigars; he's a "deese, dem and dose" character; he's a man with no education and hardly eats his food with the proper instruments. I think this false but comfortable picture is due partly to the fact that we

like a scape-goat class, to whom we can attribute all the shortcomings of society in order to divert attention from ourselves. And yet, government which is out of sight, out of mind, out of touch—as Walter Lippmann put it—is made comprehensible to you and me because this politician stands between a complex and intricate piece of machinery, and a simple individual who does not know how or where to turn when he is in trouble. Though he may be socially and publicly rejected, opposed, and reviled, the politician is on the job 24 hours daily. In Boss Rule, J. T. Salter, the foremost authority on the political boss in the United States, puts it this way: "The world is so big it is like a thousand billion dollars; it is beyond comprehension. An incident in war or peace may bring it home to us, but, for the most part, it is the politician that cuts the world down to our size or helps bring up up to its size. And that is the permanent need now to see the world realistically * * *" Nor does the politician shudder at human nature nor try to remake the voter. He works with what he has and takes the voter as he sees him. He doesn't say "I could have more votes or better voters or more intelligent voting if I had better constituents." If you are in the habit of counting your blessings, then, said Bishop John King Mussio, count politics in, for the politician * * * is a dedicated man with a high mission and a stewardship entrusted to him by God. He confers a real boon upon his fellow men by a service that is indispensable in our modern society. And, inasmuch as politics carries out, in its sphere, the purposes of God in regard to man, the politician is likewise, in an official way, a servant of God. This is a dedication that puts the politician in very high company.

It is imperative, then, that exemplary Catholic young men of exceptional intellectual and spiritual qualities aspire to the work of the politician."

He doesn't read a lot of books and he doesn't do very much abstract thinking, because he's too busy. He's on the job all the time because he has no office hours. He's a man of action, says Salter, whose lungs and liver and stomach are continually assaulted. He subscribes to Mr. Truman's dictum, "If you can't take the heat, get out of the kitchen." I suppose this is the reason that Adlai Stevenson said once that "running for public office is something like being inebriated. If there is anything bad in a man, it will bring it out." It takes no great thought to realize that a politician could not go far in politics, with the opposition training its searchlight on him, if he were politically or morally vulnerable.

A man who can test his strength every year, or every 2 years in a ward, or a city, or a nation, and if he loses start from scratch again to build up an organization—this man is an optimist. Most of us tend, first of all, to refuse to be tested; if we are tested and lose, we quit. The politician is in the business of making friends. When he approaches us in a friendly manner we contemptuously say: "He's trying to get my vote." Of course he is trying to get your vote and mine in the same way the grocer uses friendliness to court our trade. The politician knows that the stranger votes for his opponent as readily as does his enemy. In this connection, it was said of President William McKinley (the remark is attributed to Uncle Joe Cannon, Speaker of the House) that he courted the people so assiduously and had his ear so close to the ground that it was full of grasshoppers. The politician, thus, is often the one man in the community who knows what is going on in some cases rivaling the priest or the minister. He is rigidly contemporaneous, says William White, a close student of politicians. He is not concerned for the most part with ultimate aims or with history but with the election returns today. He is interested in meeting people and getting votes. For this reason, quipped Paul Lazarfeld, in politics familiarity does not breed contempt; it breeds votes.

Politicians are people of considerable tolerance. Here is a breed of men who can't afford to hate; who can't afford to be stickmad; who, if not friendly, are courteous to everyone. For the most part, they can forgive and forget for they understand the high prices of personal hatreds. RICHARD NIXON'S success is partly based on this formula. "Once a battle is over," he said to Earl Mazo as recorded in "RICHARD NIXON, A Political and Personal Portrait," don't hold grudges." NIXON wouldn't, says Mazo, hesitate to utilize his worst enemy if he felt that person was the only man for the job. Columnist William White reports the story of a reformer who discovered to his shock that a local character had become a faithful campaign associate of the reformer's politician friend. Complaining, he said: "You told me a week ago that fellow was an S.O.B." The politician replied: "Yes, son, but now he's our S.O.B." The moral of that story is not that the politician doesn't know right from wrong but rather that the politician would rather be caught dead than forced into lengthy explanations because he knows that such explanations and alibis are costly. It is simply that the longer one is in politics the older he is at his art. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once remarked, "the young man knows the rules, but the old man knows the exceptions."

Politicians are always being put on the spot in a way the priest, the professor, the banker or the candlestick maker is not. A reporter asked Charles Evans Hughes during his unsuccessful 1916 campaign against Woodrow Wilson, "What would you have done when the *Lusitania* was sunk." "Why," said the Justice, "if I had been President, the Germans wouldn't have dared to sink her." When Howard McGrath was Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, he appeared on "Meet the Press." The program was nearly over; if some reporter were to ask a nasty question now, there would not be time for an answer. Sure enough, the question came. It involved former Governor Michael Curley of Massachusetts who had been sent to jail for using the mails for fraud. The question was this: "Why did Mr. Truman pardon Curley?" In the seconds left for him to answer what could have been better than the one he gave? "To get him out of jail, of course."

In summary, then, who is the politician, what is his breed, what is his stock in trade? The following gem, from J. T. Salter, is short but adequate:

"(1) . . . stick everlastingly at it; (2) they know that the Kingdom of Heaven is taken by violence; (3) they live decades among their people and learn to judge their wants; (4) have a flair for getting along with people; (5) have problem-solving ability; (6) understand that politics is the science of the possible; (7) are able to dramatize their appeal so as to effectively capture favorable attention; (8) often have an unusual memory for names and people; (9) can gage public sentiment and strength of various group attitudes; (10) have the kind of courage that enables the possessor to risk all on the outcome of an election and than be able to start building anew in case of defeat; and (11) have enough vision and imagination to see over the district for which they are candidates, whether this be a township or all 48 States. They understand that in politics the race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong, and that a smile and a genial manner may be more convincing han logic unadorned."

Let's praise the politician a little instead of always knocking him.

The North-South Problem: Breaking the Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the recent annual report of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., written by Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of its board, there are several perceptive messages which I want to call to the attention of my colleagues.

Sir Oliver uses the term "north-south problem" to refer to the general problems of the relationships of the industrialized nations of the north of the globe to the underdeveloped and developing countries that lie to the south. He observes:

In 1947 the balance of the world turned on the recovery of Western Europe; now it turns on a right relationship between the industrial north and the developing south.

He speaks of the "vicious circle" arising from the fact that low living standards and free broadly democratic societies cannot produce sufficient savings for the rapid economic development demanded in these societies.

He points out that the circle can be broken in one of two ways:

It can be broken by tyranny which, by enforcing hardships on the people and holding down their standards of living, forces the savings for rapid development; or it can be broken by the inflow of capital from outside, giving a free society the chance both to develop and to remain free. In coming years for country after country this vicious circle will be broken one way or the other. We have already had evidence in the Middle East how real and how urgent these problems are.

Consider Sir Oliver's comments on the new regional groupings for trade:

The idea of the unity of Western Europe is the one creative political idea that has emerged since the war. We do not know yet whether the idea will successfully translate itself into reality, but if the notion of one country, one society in Europe is to have any validity it must gradually clothe itself with economic meaning. Any country, Britain or the United States, which failed to recognize this would put itself in the wrong with history.

The United States, and for that matter Canada, is troubled at the possibility of a recovered Western Europe, even though split in two, building discriminatory fortifications, with North America—and of course Japan—left on the outside. It does not seem to me in the interest of the outside world to try to break down these European groupings, still less to favor one against the other. There are bound to be regional economic groupings in the world half way between the single nation states of today and the universality of all the nations. The plain fact is the world is too big, and the individual nation is too small. Regional groupings are a natural occurrence. The United States sometimes forgets that it is both a great Nation and a large regional group.

The true interest of the international community is to see that the existing two groupings merge in the end, so that the dream of the free movement of men, goods and ideas comes true in Western Europe, and in addition to work with the six and the seven, or

with the group that may emerge, so that together we progressively lower economic discrimination in the free world.

Sir Oliver also recommends that the United States set free $12 billion worth of gold—which he says is nearly one-third of the entire gold stock of the free world—on its present immobilization as backing for Federal Reserve notes and deposits.

Under a previous consent, I include Sir Oliver's discussion on this point and the conclusion of his extremely able report:

CHANGE POSITION OF THE DOLLAR

The third issue we have to face is the changed relationship of the United States to us and to Western Europe implied in the scale of the deficit on the American balance of payments in 1958 and 1959. For the 2 years together this is likely to have been of the order of $7 billion, with a loss of gold approaching half that amount. The United States cannot, and of course will not, live with a deficit on this scale for long, but, as compared with the rest of us, the Americans still have comfortable reserves, with the corresponding advantage that they have time to decide on and apply a sensible course of action.

The one surely disastrous way of dealing with this problem would be for the United States to attempt to rid itself of a deficit on the balance of payments by one drastic surgical operation. It is obvious why the consequences of this would be disastrous for all the neighbors of the United States in the free world. But it would also be disastrous for the United States because it would mean risking, and probably losing, a considerable part of that large area of the world won for freedom since the end of the war. It is of vital importance to all of us that the Americans do not try to shrug off their difficulties by a large and violent lurch of policy, and I do not think that they will do so.

It follows, therefore, that the means by which the American deficit on the balance of payments is reduced must be numerous. Something of everything that helps must be done; no one line must be pressed to its logical extreme. What does this mean in more detail? There are the things which the United States will wish to do and the things which we and Western Europe should undertake to ease the strain.

One measure already adopted by the United States is to campaign for more manufactured exports from the United States to other industrialized countries. How easy it must be for manufacturers in a vast economy like that of the United States to think of exports only as marginal and not understand the relevance of their efforts to the national balance of payments. Further, given that in certain limited lines of export American products are a little dear as compared with those of their competitors, there are steps which the United States can take internally to change this situation. And there is one suggestion, aired by at least one well-known American economist, which could be relevant. It is that the $12 billion of gold—nearly one-third of the entire gold stock of the free world—at present locked up as backing for Federal Reserve notes and deposits should be set free for effective use. There are those who would oppose such a step on the ground that it might aggravate fears of inflation among the American public. It is, of course, for the American authorities to decide where the balance of advantage lies. I wish only to offer one or two comments, based on our own experience, which suggests that if the United States decided to take the plunge the water may not really be as cold as it thinks.

RELEASE OF STERILIZED GOLD?

It is now 30 years since the Macmillan committee pointed out that the effect of holding gold as backing for the currency was to forbid the Bank of England to use its gold for the only purpose for which it is held or could be used, namely the settlement of international payments. The committee therefore urged that central banks should give collective consideration from time to time to the question whether it would be in the general interest that the legal requirements in force in different countries as to gold reserves should be relaxed or tightened. It is now 20 years since virtually the whole of the Bank of England's gold was swept into the Exchange Equalisation Account, thus setting it free to help finance the war in its early stages. These transactions were received with complete indifference by the British public and it can be stated categorically that in the inflation that has taken place since 1939 the fact that our note issue has been entirely a fiduciary issue has played no part whatever.

If the United States were to liberate their $12 billion of sterilized gold, therefore, this step would not lack precedent and would be quite in line with a natural process of evolution in the management of money. Nor are the advantages of such a step related solely to the fact that the United States happens to be losing gold at present. Both sterling and the dollar are important reserve currencies. Over a period, international exchange reserves will have to grow steadily if world trade is not to be hampered by a shortage of liquidity. Since the gold component of the reserves (assuming an unchanged gold price) will expand only very slowly, we must look to a continued growth in the foreign exchange component. This means that the short-term liabilities of financial centers like London and New York will tend constantly to expand in relation to their gold holdings. Hence it is very important, for the preservation of world confidence and the prevention of disruptive flights of hot money, that those liabilities should have the effective backing of all the gold that can be mustered for use.

Quite apart from American action, it is clearly the job of a recovered Europe to dismantle dollar discriminations in trade which had their justification in an earlier period. This has already happened on a considerable scale and can go further. Convertibility of European currencies as against the dollar has already gone a long way. In Britain we have pretty well abolished the travel allowance for dollar countries as well as others. We have repaid in advance our drawing of $250 million from the Export-Import Bank, and we have freed most of our imports from quota restrictions. I should agree also that in our part of the world we should stand ready to work out afresh fair shares in constructive help to developing countries and I should suppose that an increase in effort and contribution should come from the recovered nations of Western Europe, including Britain.

Here there is one point which should be made: It is important that the Americans do not expect too much. They are so disproportionate to the rest of us in the size of their economy and the vast power of their productive machine, their standards of living so much higher, that what in fact is fair can easily seem the reverse. It is our job in Europe to do more: We shall help, but we cannot stand in the shoes of the United States. Nor is it the case, as is sometimes assumed abroad, that Britain has been doing little for the development of developing countries. If we take the countries of the Commonwealth alone, the British Treasury has stated that in recent years private investment has averaged about £150 million, public loans and grants £88 million, a total of around £240 million. This is equivalent to more than 1¼ percent of the average national income for the 3 years 1956–58.

Beyond this, everyone is aware that countries faced with difficulties in the balance of payments are subject to internal political pressures. In the period since the war the United States, by economic aid and expenditure abroad on a very large scale, has created conditions in which international trade has expanded freely. It has provided a growing market for imported goods, free from quantitative control, apart from a few well-known exceptions. It has progressively reduced the level of the tariff under the reciprocal trade agreements program. On occasion the straight line of policy has to become a little wavy in places to accommodate an existing political situation. But there is all the difference in the world between a rare concession and a breaking of the line. This last would be to deny that leadership of the free world which history in this half century has given the American Nation.

These are among the problems which face us in 1960, and now that our economy has been rebuilt and is reasonably strong we can give attention to them. It is important that we do so. For one thing it is expected of us by our friends both across the Atlantic and in Western Europe. For another we owe it to ourselves, since only in this way can we make time our ally.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of February 13, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congresman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 13, 1960)

The defense capability of the United States is provoking lively debate in the House and throughout levels of government. Normal interest in maintaining the necessary military strength is augmented now by factors (1) election year politics, and (2) the approach of yearly appropriations for defense. Every year Congress is warned, even "scared" by some who fear economy-mindedness in Congressmen. Lost in the muddy water of political controversy are these facts: (1) U.S. retaliatory strength in overall destructive ability is greater than Russia's. The United States is No. 1 in the world. (As the President, Secretary of Defense Gates, and Joint Chief of Staff Twining have all stated.) This overall strength is what is vital and necessary and not outmatching Russia in every single department, weapon by weapon; (2) security considerations—that is, preserving our military plans and secrets—are out the window as we are forced publicly to discuss all military matters. There is a great difference between coverup or concealment in the name of security, and the sensible refusal to divulge our plans to the enemy, a prudence difficult to maintain in the heat and thoughtlessness of political controversy. Some of the critics who seek to discredit the President and the administration for political gain have a record that does not bear scrutiny. In the critical years following World War II, the Democrat Administration and Congress failed to pro-

vide funds for missile research and development, even though the need was stressed before congressional committees. Only under this administration, now attacked by these critics, has missile development been expanded. In the 7 fiscal years, 1954 through 1960, this administration has been responsible for nine times the expenditures (and emphasis) of the preceding 8 fiscal years. The question now, Is a continual airborne alert needed? Our time in Congress would be better spent in constructive study, rather than in purely political controversy.

The agriculture situation was again highlighted by the President's message to Congress. The President stressed the need for freeing the farmer from government red tape and subsidy, using wheat as an example. Wheat as one of the subsidized crops costs taxpayers $1.5 million per day or $1,000 a minute. It represents $3.5 billion, or 30 percent of the CCC inventory, yet accounts for only 6 percent of the cash-crop money received by farmers. The ridiculousness of this situation is obvious. The President put the responsibility for a solution squarely up to the legislative body, the Congress. In this way, he is focusing a merciless spotlight on those to blame. The President can only do his best to administer the laws Congress hands him. His only control is his veto power and the threat to exercise it. The President has made it clear that he will approve any constructive approach that the Democrat leadership in Congress may adopt; but he has served notice that high, rigid price supports or direct payments to farmers (the Brannan Plan) are not the answers. Now, it's up to Congress. Just as in the case of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, the people may force action over-riding the leadership in the House and Senate.

The election year Congress is already producing some new conflicts. The ambitions of the Senators aspiring to the Presidency has resulted in quick passage of legislation. It is interesting to observe that the traditional House-Senate comity or friendship may be strained as the Senate steals the spotlight and gets the credit (or blame?). Two of these bills, now passed, will come to the House: (1) The clean elections bill is now pending before the House Administration Committee. This bill involves political expenditures and reports. The "joker" is in extending the law to cover local primaries, considered by many an invasion of States rights. Yet the bill doesn't curb union bosses from extracting dues from union members to spend contrary to their wishes in campaigns. The bill passed 59 to 22 with both Texas Senators voting for it; (2) A new Federal-aid-to-education measure passed 54 to 35, with both Texas Senators voting for it. The $917 million per year for 2 years is a massive dose, and is the foot in the door, with no upper limit once adopted, as I see it. Federal control, of course, must accompany Federal spending. Underlying the bill is the bland assumption that any school shortage or educational shortcoming (wherever such may indeed exist) proves there is the need for Federal solution and bureaucratic control. This is a short-sighted solution, in my view. Nevertheless, as it is presently controlled, Congress appears determined to "aid" in local education.

Heavy mail from home indicates that a lot of Dallas people share my concern over the Humphrey move in the Senate to eliminate the so-called Connally resolution from our agreement to accept World Court jurisdiction in international disputes. I can see no valid reason why the United States should unilaterally surrender a single iota of our sovereignty in this way—why we should forego the right, jealously guarded by others, to determine for ourselves which disputes are essentially domestic in nature, and hence not subject to the mandate of any international organization or authority.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Senator Jennings Randolph Delivers Significant Address at Boy Scout Award Dinner in West Virginia; Speech of Cecil Dodd Is Also Noteworthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], is to be complimented for the thought-provoking address he delivered last week at a Boy Scout award dinner at Wellsburg, W. Va.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, and because few organizations in this country have contributed more to our achievements and progress as a democracy than have the Boy Scouts, it seems to me to be especially appropriate to call the attention of my colleagues to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S inspiring remarks of February 11, 1960, on the occasion of the 5th annual dinner of Air Explorer Squadron 150, Boy Scouts of America, Fort Steuben Area Council, held in the American Legion Post 34 Home, Wellsburg, W. Va.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, WEST VIRGINIA, AMERICAN LEGION HOME, WELLSBURG, W. VA., FEBRUARY 11, 1960

We are gathered to honor the achievements of these youths as Eagle and Silver and God and Country Scouts. Tonight's award dinner has the added significance of marking the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America.

These 50 years have seen scouting grow from a handful of lads under enthusiastic but inexperienced leaders to a membership of over 5 million, led by thousands of practiced and devoted Scoutmasters. During this half century some 27 million boys have been enrolled as Scouts, and more than 8,500,000 adults have devoted themselves to scouting leadership. Thus, these principles and values have sustained the early experience of a large segment of the men alive in America today.

These figures offer some indication of the quantitative advancement during the 5 decades of existence, but they say nothing of the qualitative contributions of scouting to the lives of Boy Scouts as individuals and to America as a whole. In the last analysis, this contribution cannot be measured or weighed, but it may be at least suggested if we view the Boy Scout purposes in relation to the meaning and values of a free democratic society.

The purpose of the Boy Scouts of America, as stated in its incorporation papers, is to promote "* * * the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues * * *." It is of the very essence of these principles, as of the values of a democratic society itself, that they may not be imposed from above. To become viable and real these values must be perceived, embraced and made meaningful in the living experience of the person himself.

The sense of patriotism of the Scout is not one which can be legislated or promoted by executive decree; rather it must be generated out of the individual's own awareness of the meaning of America and his responsibility to maintain the values of our free society.

First among these values is the right of the individual to achieve excellence in whatever fields his character and abilities enable him to qualify. In this respect, there is no organization more closely geared to the meaning of democracy than the Boy Scouts. For in every aspect of their program, the Boy Scouts are dedicated to that personal achievement of excellence, and to the development of those qualities of character and citizenship on which a healthy democracy is based.

This is no mere pleasant pastime to fill the vacant hours of a growing boy. Though admittedly, scouting is also fun—as it should be—the values it seeks to instill are fundamental ones of high moral purpose. And they have never been more important to us than they are today, when we are thrown in mortal contest with an alien and despotic philosophy which would seek to reduce the free citizen to an automaton of the state.

There is much talk today—and much of it is pointed and wellplaced—concerning the general lack of moral purpose and aspiration in American life. Our philosophers and educators—and some of our political leaders and press commentators—have seriously questioned whether the traditional values and aims of American life can survive the rising tide of our preoccupation with material possessions and material prosperity. I am not prepared to predict the outcome; though I am hopeful concerning the strength and integrity of the American spirit. However, I will say without question that the condition I have referred to poses little threat to one who has truly embraced the principles and aims of the Boy Scouts.

I mentioned a moment ago the importance of Scouting as a means of advancing American values in relation to our contest with the totalitarian philosophy of Communism. But there is another reason for the growing importance of scouting which is unrelated to our competition with communism—and perhaps of greater significance in the long pull. I refer to the effect upon the individual of the changing structure of American life itself.

Though we may agree that the opportunities available to American youth today are broader in many respects than those offered to their fathers, it cannot be doubted that in some fields they have become restricted and diminished. The growing urbanization and complexity of American life, and the encroachment of our cities and suburbs upon field and forest have increasingly limited the prospects for the individual youth to achieve by himself those skills and abilities promoted by Scoutcraft. When we were a Nation of farmers and small townsmen these skills and capacities which provided the foundation for self-reliance came by natural due course to most youngsters. But now, with much of our population centered in the metropolitan areas, scouting has become increasingly important as the chief, and often the only means, of exposing millions of young boys to kinds of experience which elsewhere have passed from the American scene. In this respect also, Scouting therefore serves to perpetuate and extend some of the fundamental virtues of the American heritage.

Finally, we would be remiss if we failed to acknowledge the contribution of Scouting in the field of international living. Today, under the impetus of people-to-people exchange programs, the newest—and sometimes most effective ambassadors in the world—are the boys and girls and the young men and women in such programs as the international farm youth exchange, the experiment in international living, and the student exchange program. These young people are discovering with joyous wonderment that the barriers between people can be broken and that understanding and brotherhood can be realities and not merely the fictions of a utopian dream.

And not least among the achievements of these young people are those recorded in the annals of Scouting. The activities of Scouting are carried on today in 141 countries, colonies, and protectorates throughout the free world, with programs in some 90 countries having received help from the World Fellowship Fund of the Boy Scouts of America. In addition, Friendship Fund scholarships have enabled more than 100 leaders from 30 countries to attend our national training school for Scout executives at Schiff Reservation.

Thus it is that in the field of personal and individual development, in contributing to the meaning of American life, and in extending the range of international brotherhood, the Boy Scouts continue to exercise an ever-increasingly fruitful and creative influence upon contemporary experience. The records of previous Scouts offer a constant and living challenge to those who come after them. I am confident—as are the parents here tonight if we may judge from the representatives of the present scouting generation at this event—that our challenge will be met, and the goals of scouting will be pushed ever forward.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, also on the program for Boy Scout award dinner with the senior Senator from West Virginia, was Cecil B. Dodd, manager of industrial relations at Weirton Steel Co. division of the National Steel Corp., where many workers from Ohio are employed. He is cochairman of the Health and Safety Committee of the Fort Steuben Area Council of Boy Scouts, and spoke on "The Privilege of Being An American."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that extracts from Mr. Dodd's speech be printed following the extracts from Senator RANDOLPH'S address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts from Mr. Dodd's speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a signal honor to be invited to speak at this 5th annual dinner honoring the 50th anniversary of Scouting and presentation of silver and eagle awards. I also deem it a privilege to appear on the same program with West Virginia's distinguished U.S. Senator, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who in more ways than one, is a good scout. In fact he was an active member of the Boy Scouts of America in his youth, and later served as a Scoutmaster. JENNINGS and I have been good friends for a great number of years, a friendship which has endured regardless of our individual political affiliations and one which I prize most highly. JENNINGS is truly a friend of man. When you have heard him speak, I am sure you will agree with me.

While thinking about what my subject should be this evening, I gave consideration to the 12 laws of scouting but realized that you who are hearing me would be far better versed in these laws than I because of your direct contact and exemplification with them in your day-to-day living. However, a boy who has passed through the several stages of scouting and adheres to its 12 laws—a Scout is truthworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, reverent—cannot help but be a better citizen in the community, a better husband, a better father, and a better believer in the supreme diety of his choice.

I care not for a man's race, creed, or religion. Denominationalism for a large part is following the faith of our fathers. There are as many roads to God as there men to trod them—therefore it behooves us all to respect the other fellow's beliefs and religion because we are all seeking as our final reward a life of eternity in heaven. May God prosper each of us in his own way.

A life of contentment and peace of mind is far more gratifying than one of riches when it is accompanied with jealousy and resentment. On this subject I speak from personal experience.

One hundred and fifty-one years ago, there was born a male child to a pioneer West Virginia mother in a log cabin in Hardin County, Ky. That child in manhood suffered political defeat at the hands of the electorate six times before he was finally elected an assemblyman to the Illinois State Legislature. Yet, this often defeated man was the one chosen to lead this great country of ours through its greatest crisis—the Civil War, 1861–65—only to be cut down by an assassin's bullet from the pistol of the depraved actor, John Wilkes Booth, on the evening of April 14, 1865, while attending a performance of "Our American Cousin" at Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C.

Surely his firm but kindly hand at the helm of our great Nation at the time of its possible dissolution was the one greatest factor in the perpetuation of the greatest heritage of men of all ages have been privileged to enjoy. He was a tall man in stature but more so in principle. Lincoln will be immortal until the end of time because of his belief in God, his humility, and his devotion to the rights of his fellow man.

This heritage and privilege is being endangered by a new philosophy or way of life, which has been growing in the last two decades. I refer to the 10 basic ideas of the totalitarian system of government which are opposed to our system—the democratic way—under which we all enjoy certain privileges as American citizens. Each of these 10 basic ideas furnishes sufficient material for an entire volume so I will only enumerate them with brief comment on each.

1. Man, according to democratic ideas, belongs to God, but under totalitarianism he belongs to the state.

2. The masses, under democracy, are freemen, but in the totalitarian scheme of things men must follow the dictator.

3. Supreme loyalty is to God and humanity in a democracy, but supreme loyalty under totalitarianism is to the nation.

4. Persons are of the highest value according to democratic views of Christians and Jews, but power has the highest value under communistic and fascist totalitarian rule.

5. Religion, under the democratic precept, is universal, but it is national according to the totalitarian idea.

6. Education is the development of the individual in a democracy, but under totalitarian communism or fascism it is considered nothing more than indoctrination.

7. According to the democratic ideas of Christians and Jews, government is by consent, but it is a matter of compulsion under totalitarianism.

8. The press, radio, and television are free agencies for public service in a democracy, but they are media of government propaganda in a communistic or fascistic totalitarian state.

9. Methods, under the democratic concept, are of faith and good will, but methods are instruments of fear and hatred in the totalitarian scheme of things.

10. Under democratic ideas other nations are included in mutual aid arrangements, but under totalitarian communistic and fascistic plans other nations are marked for conquest.

Most certainly this enumeration shows each one of us, old and young alike, that we must expend every effort to assure the continuance of our present way of life.

The youth of our Nation should keep sacred the Scout oath, "On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and to my country, to obey the Scout law, to help help other people at all times, to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

Our adults should fully subscribe to the pledge of allegiance, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

We all should add the practice of the four Oxfordian absolutes: Honesty, unselfishness, purity, and love, to our daily life. Then our great American heritage handed down to us by the supreme sacrifice of our forefathers—the privilege of being an American—with God on our side—will endure forever.

A National Lottery Would Yield $10 Billion a Year in Additional Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, if Mark Twain were alive today he would undoubtedly revise his famous words about the weather to a more meaningful expression, such as: Everybody talks about taxes but nobody does anything about it.

In the 8 years that I have been a Member of this House, I have often heard many Members express deep concern over the excessive individual income taxes.

I have heard responsible Government officials admit that the present tax structure is oppressive and in need of reformation.

The President, in his state of the Union message to this Congress, acknowledged the fact that the American people are pressured by the heavy burdens of taxation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, everybody has been talking about the high taxes but nobody has done anything about it. This is not only a sad but disturbing situation especially when we read reports that the average taxpayer must work 2¼ hours of his 8-hour day to pay the taxes levied on him by Federal, State and local authorities.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows, or should know by now, that our fiscal picture is not bright at all. As a matter of fact, with the cost of Government operation on the rise, the outlook for future tax relief is most discouraging.

So, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to not only talk about taxes but do something about it. The Members of this House should stop pussyfooting and face this issue squarely and sensibly. All I ask is that this House show some courage and pass my bill for a national lottery.

A national lottery would pump into our Treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue. With this new revenue we can give long-awaited tax relief to our wage earners and also help reduce our ever-growing national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, with a national lottery we would not only be talking about taxes, but doing something about cutting them.

Debating Military Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Henry A. Kissinger, a young Harver professor, has contributed significantly to current thought on America's strategic world position. He is recognized as one of the outstanding thinkers of our times on America's defense against Communist aggression.

Yesterday, the New York Times printed a letter written by this very able man on our defense policy. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, and an editorial entitled "Needed: A Mightier Shield," which was published in Life magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1960]

DEBATING MILITARY POLICY—PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ON CRITICISM OF DEFENSE PROGRAM QUESTIONED

(The writer of the following letter is the author of "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy." He is associate director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The President says he deplores public argument by military experts regarding our

defense policy. Prior to this, he had called his critics parochial and had invoked his superior expertise in the subject. It is impossible, of course, for laymen to pass judgment on a debate of such technical complexity. They have a right to insist, however, that the categories of the debate be properly put.

The charge of parochialism can easily be pushed too far. As currently used it seems to mean that those who most deeply concern themselves with a given problem and who bear the immediate responsibility for it are thereby disqualified from having a valid opinion.

It is, after all, of some significance that two Chiefs of Staff of the Army, the current Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Commander of the Strategic Air Command have been convinced that our present course is potentially disastrous. To be sure, they are not necessarily right. But in the President's use of the term "parochial" it seems to mean that the mere fact that they are the senior officers in their services implies that they are inevitably wrong.

One of the very serious problems of the present period is that the expertise acquired in the period up to and through World War II is almost completely irrelevant to the contemporary strategic problem. When weapons can traverse continents in half an hour and can destroy whole Nations, rules of thumb learned in a more secure period simply do not apply.

ORDERING AIR ALERT

The President said that it was time to order an air alert when there is an indication of an attack. It is true that with conventional weapons a period of preparation was usually required prior to an attack. In the era of missiles and nuclear weapons, where the forces in being are constantly ready, an aggressor cannot afford to give any warning of surprise attack and does not have to. Whatever the utility of our military program, the President's argument with respect to air alert is dangerous and beside the point.

The President correctly insists that the debate involves essentially a question of judgment. All judgment, even the most lofty, can be wrong. The ordinary citizen, in trying to make up his mind on so technical a subject may want to keep in mind, however, the penalties of a mistake.

If the proposals of Generals Power and White are accepted and prove to be wrong, we will have spent $500 million too much for a number of years. If the program of the President is adopted and he proves to be mistaken, we will have forfeited our national existence.

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *February 12, 1960.*

[From Life magazine, Feb. 15, 1960]

NEEDED: A MIGHTIER SHIELD

President Eisenhower's defense budget is dangerously deficient. He has great military experience and deep confidence his $41 billion program is adequate. But harsh facts argue it isn't.

The harshest fact is that by the President's own intelligence estimates, the Soviets by 1963 will have twice as many ICBM's as we—enough, by SAC Commander Thomas Power's warning, to wipe out all our bases and retaliatory planes in one salvo.

A further glaring fact is that we do not have to accept this inferiority. In the judgment of men closest to the problem, we could double our current rate of missile production just by doing all that we can. By 1963 we could match the 400-missile Soviet stockpile which our own estimates say the Russians will then have. Despite this, the President is taking the calculated gamble of doing less than we are capable of doing during the next 4 critical years. It will take that time to make fully usable our most effective deterrents—the quick-firing, solid-fueled Polaris and Minuteman, one hidden in submarines, the other in hardened underground bases. To understand just how big the gamble is, Americans must also remember that their Government has generally underestimated Soviet capabilities, and that the new figures giving the Soviets only a 2-to-1 lead are themselves much reduced from previous estimates.

The problem is not to match in any particular number of Soviet missiles but to make certain the United States has so much striking power that a Soviet commander cannot dream of knocking it out in one sudden blow. This is necessary not only to deprive the Soviets of any temptation to risk a total attack but to neutralize the campaign of political threat and attrition which a pronounced Soviet military lead would allow Khrushchev to wage. In order to do all that needs to be done we are convinced that the United States must spend on defense, at the very least, $2 billion more than it is now planning. This money should be devoted to the following purposes, in order of priority:

Closing the missile gap: The production rate of the already proved and operational Atlas can be doubled within a year to give us 150 (against 75 now planned, and a reduced estimate of 100 for the Soviets in 1961). Work should begin at once, with highest priorities, to get these Atlases out of exposed positions and into deep, hardened bases. This can be done in 18 months. Since Atlas works, we should cancel the redundant, and so far inefficient, Titan and apply the remaining funds toward doubling Atlas. And every dollar that can make Polaris and Minuteman operational faster must be spent.

Safeguarding SAC: To preserve our deterrent during this period General Power believes we must have SAC capable of assuming, when the situation requires it, a 24-hour alert with a striking force always aloft. To make this possible a year hence, we must start now to provide the additional B–52's, tankers, crews, fuel, and spare parts which will be necessary. This isn't being done. Moreover, in order to preserve the most effective bomber-missile "mix" in our deterrent, full production should be begun on the 2,000-m.p.h. B–70 program.

Space and missile research: We need to step up our efforts to develop an effective anti-missile missile. We need to extend the electronic early-warning stations (see p. 38) to help us spot a Soviet missile's firing anywhere on land or sea. We should step up our space programs with emphasis on satellites for early-warning and reconnaissance. This could be done faster and cheaper if the President would close the artificial separation of "peaceful" and "military" space projects. They cannot, in fact, be separated. The Soviets make no such distinction.

Shelters: An immediate start should be made at providing shelters from radioactive fallout. Fully developed, a shelter program might save 80 million or more American lives. A serious start on shelters would in itself deter the enemy from trying a knock-out blow.

So much for immediate needs for adequate defense. They do not meet the argument which Generals Ridgway, Gavin, and Taylor, in succession, have stressed: that our preoccupation with "massive retaliation" is leaving us without adequate forces, airlift or new equipment to fight "brush fires" which may have to be met with orthodox forces and weapons. This issue also demands debate, decision, and, very likely, action. But since we have committed ourselves, above all, to a strategy of nuclear deterrence, we must certainly make sure that that program is adequate. As of now, it is not.

The Observance Never Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the official observance of National Boy Scout Week has ended. This year's observance was particularly significant because it marked the golden anniversary of the Scout movement in America.

While the official observance is over, the spirit of scouting will never die. The observance really never ends, as Mr. Fred G. Turner, editor of the McAlester (Okla.) News-Capital, has so effectively stated in an editorial in his newspaper for February 12, 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE OBSERVANCE NEVER ENDS

The official observance of the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America ends this week. McAlester people have read and heard of what the scouting movement has done in the past 50 years, and for what it stands.

This week a speaker told city business and civic leaders that:

"Scouting is established upon a spiritual foundation. The Christian spirit promoted the daily good turn of scouting. And doing a daily good turn crowds out other types of actions which are not good turns. Scouting doesn't teach any particular religion, but it encourages it at their camps and in their programs.

"The scouting program is universal. And it is available to all boys.

"It is based on the feeling of satisfaction, which is gained through service to others.

"It is a program which boys want. They have fun together, and it helps them to grow.

"Scouting provides a program in which parents and sons work together. It is a vehicle for developing family unity.

"And the Scout oath and laws make scouting different. Leaders and boys alike pledge themselves to the Scout code. It catches hold of boys at a young age. And it stays with them through life."

Because of this spirit and meaning of scouting, it came into being in America.

The Boy Scouts of America came into being through the good turn of an unknown British Boy Scout. A large bronze statue stands at the Gilwell training center, near London, bearing this simple but eloquent inscription:

"To the Unknown Scout Whose Faithfulness in the performance of the 'Daily Good Turn' Brought the Scout Movement to the United States of America."

William D. Boyce, Chicago publisher, was bewildered in foggy London in 1909 while seeking a street address. The British lad offered his services. The boy led the American to the address and when Mr. Boyce offerred a shilling tip to the lad, the boy saluted, thanked him and said, "Sir, I am a Scout. A Scout does not accept tips for courtesies and good turns."

Mr. Boyce, who had 20,000 to 30,000 boys on his sales force, was dumbfounded. After he completed his errand, he accompanied the British Scout to the office of Lord Baden-Powell, founder of the Scout idea. Here he caught the vision of Baden-Powell. He returned to America and incorporated the Boy Scouts of America.

Through this same spirit the Boy Scouts of America will keep on growing and training boys in its traditions.

The official observance of the 50th anniversary of scouting will end this week. But observance of the scouting spirit will continue during the whole year—and every year.

The Problem of Internationalizing the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del.

This editorial comments very favorably upon Senator AIKEN'S suggestions to the Congress in his recent Latin American report:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO EXPLORE

Senator AIKEN, Republican, Vermont, says the time has come for the United States to explore dispassionately the idea of internationalizing the Panama Canal He is right. The Suez Canal has been internationalized, if that is the right term, under conditions that leave much to be desired. America's exclusive rights with respect to the Panama Canal are a source of friction with Panama and suspicion elsewhere in Latin America. They are also a talking point for Communist propaganda in this hemisphere.

The question should be when rather than whether. Eventually, internationalization is sure to come. If we wait too long, it will come in ways we won't like. If we rush idealistically ahead without taking today's practicalities into account, we'll make a mess of things.

President Eisenhower has said that he does not intend to agree to internationalism of the canal while he is President, and we think he is right. But it is not too soon to explore dispassionately the whole idea, as Mr. AIKEN proposes. Just this week the President, at his press conference, spent some time discussing Panama's desire to fly the Panamanian flag beside ours in the Canal Zone. The tides of change are plain to see and it is better to be ready for them than to be swept off our feet by them.

A lot of problems would be involved in internationalizing the canal. Panama gets a considerable part of its national income—about one-fourth at this time—from the Canal Zone And while the importance of the canal to American defense is diminishing, we cannot disregard its relation to hemispheric security.

If we don't arrange at the right time for internationalization on terms that don't conflict with our national interests, says Senator AIKEN, we shall one day face the Hobson's choice of either defending the canal by force or withdrawing completely. Neither prospect is attractive. So let our policymakers think about it. Under what conditions and at what time would it be to our advantage to have the Panama Canal under international control?

A Time for Great Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address given by the Honorable Alf M. Landon to the Traffic Club, Topeka, Kans., on January 21, 1960. I am sure that each Member of Congress will find Mr. Landon's remarks of interest:

A TIME FOR GREAT DECISIONS

This being a national election year there is a barrage of claims and countercharges by ambitious candidates and party leaders.

There is nothing unusual about that.

But there never has been a time when it was more important for American voters to keep those claims in proper perspective and to keep the far-reaching decisions confronting us in proper proportion.

The major national decisions we must face up to in the coming election are of worldwide, as well as national, significance.

Quoting from a recent Research Institute Bulletin:

"Inflation, labor crises, are the key issues of business, pulling nearly twice as many first and second rankings as any of the other nine issues listed in the institute survey.

"The Soviet challenge to America is third, closely followed by the rising cost of doing business. The next business problem is tight money, which received far fewer mentions in the poll.

"Compared to these, such potential campaign issues as the farm problem, civil rights, economic growth, even national defense, are apparently of minor importance to business executives today."

Now these economic issues and international policy issues are closely tied in with the political policies of the administration in power and the administration to be elected next November.

None of them can be separated from politics.

According to our all-time custom, the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government will be arriving at their solutions not only with the long-view effect in mind but the November election.

That is the trial-and-error method by which a republic functions. And that is the contest for possession of leadership that has gone on throughout history since the first tribal government was formed.

It would take much—too much—time for me to discuss and to do justice to all the important issues listed in the Research Institute survey. I have heretofore discussed most of them in separate talks. Tonight I will attempt to hit the high spots only. If I were listing them I would name inflation, national defense, and the Soviet challenge to America. Actually, with the possible exception of civil rights, they are inseparably related.

In late 1933 an Englishman, Lord Keynes, sold the Democrat administration on his theory of planned inflation and a managed economy. There was nothing new in that. Many countries at different times have tried that to their sorrow. It had always ended in financial and political chaos resulting from debased money. As a result of their experience, all of the nations of the free world stuck to the old-time tested orthodox fiscal policies of trying to balance their budget, except France and the United States of America.

As you know, after the Second World War France grew steadily weaker economically, militarily, and politically, until in desperation De Gaulle was called back to save his country from total collapse and anarchy by reversing the soft money policy—for the stability created by orthodox fiscal policies. Now France is on her way—with the West Germans—to return to their old role of balance of power in Europe.

Soft money versus sound money has been a recurring issue in American politics—in the 1780's, the 1812 War period, the Jackson administration, the 30 years following the Civil War. Of course, other economic factors were present, but sound money contributed to national stability and prosperity. Since the 1930's the soft money policy has been with us on and off, and the warning signs have been flying. Fortunately, since 1940 our reserves and the relative weakness of other countries have served to bolster us. Recently however, the dissipation of our reserves and sound international reconstruction have caught up with us without our realizing it.

I think very few Americans know of that situation or that the United States is now working on its third year of unfavorable balance in foreign trade. Here is a representative comment from the Spectator, an English publication of worldwide prestige on economic and political affairs.

Heading its comment "The Dollar Crisis" the Spectator said on November 13, 1959:

"The fact that we British have gone out of our way to repay the $250 million loan from the Export-Import Bank, which was not finally due until 1965, is sufficient proof that the American Treasury is seriously worried by its continuing loss of gold. If the foreign holders of dollar balances, who are not as friendly and helpful as we are, were suddenly to get the idea that the dollar was overvalued, the flight from that currency would be so quick that the next announcement from Washington would be a refusal to sell gold. But we have not yet come to that point. The calculating foreigners are waiting to see what sort of settlement—inflationary or no—is reached in the steel strike.

"This is worrying Mr. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, greatly, for he is not used, as we are, to being an international banker with inadequate reserves.

"Even if the American Treasury succeeds in cutting foreign aid and military spending by as much as Mr. Anderson's target, the basic weakness of the American payments position will remain. Japan, Germany, and Europe have all recovered from their war shortages and are no longer dependent on America for the satisfaction of their vital needs in steel, coal, machine tools, and other manufactures. The recovery is so complete that European exports of manufactured goods have been expanding at the expense of American manufactures, not only in the world markets but in the American domestic market itself. The rise in American costs is not only hitting their exports but causing their own manufacturers to build factories abroad. It seems that the trend in world trade is at last going against the dollar."

That—in a nutshell—describes a fundamental change in our great country's position financially—a fact that we Americans can continue to ignore only to our own peril.

I have always believed as long as we keep our money sound we can survive other political errors we might make and correct them in the light of experience.

Our national defense is in reality based on sound money. We must be prepared to pay the cost to escape the fate of a conquered people. Despite the constructive steps in

1959 to reach a peaceful solution of foreign relations, we are living in a world today where political ideas are being established and maintained by loaded guns, tanks, atomic energy bombs, murder and assassination.

So far, little progress has been made to settle the conflicting confusion and contradictory statements between high-ranking generals, civilians, and our Commander in Chief on the status of our national defenses. That surely makes the Pentagon a weak spot in the heart of our military organization that can be fatal to our security as a free people, despite our President's assurances of America's overall military strength. I believe there are legitimate questions being raised about the status of our national defense, by competent authorities like Generals Taylor, Gavin, and Ridgway, who cannot be charged with political motives.

There are bound to be differences of opinion on how to fight an atomic war and what equipment is best, because there never has been an atomic war.

That's all being planned in theory. But there is a world of difference between theory and practice under war conditions.

It is apparent that the Pentagon is not so organized that it is efficient in resolving those differences. That causes a costly waste of both public money and time in bringing our military equipment and plans up to date. For illustration, there are 61 different bureaus and committees dealing with missiles. We are trying to run our huge Military Establishment by a committee arrangement with a revolving chairman instead of one bossman. We need a general staff with a chief, or strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Defense. The blame for the confusion and disputes between the military services rests with the Congress in the organizations created in the original miscalled Unification Act.

Personal diplomacy by the heads of governments in the conduct of international affairs is also something new in the world. That takes the initiative away from the heads of the State departments and is a dangerous technique in inexperienced hands because it can be a case of too many cooks spoiling the broth.

However, because of his experience and his personality and his talent for conciliation, our President won a great victory for the minds of men, a fight we have heretofore been losing. President Eisenhower by his visits to other great nations strengthened the cause of peace, based on freedom and justice, all over the world.

Our President broke through a false conception of America, created by years of Communists' false propaganda.

As the symbol to the world's masses, of a friendly America instead of a belligerent America, our President has achieved a tremendous change in world thinking.

Permitting American books—plays and broadcasts to reach the Russian people—and greatly increased cultural and travel exchange between Russians and Americans—following Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United States—opens the way for popular understanding of America's good faith in policies that promote higher spiritual, moral and materialistic standards of living for all peoples.

A turning point of those far-reaching consequences—once established—is hard to reverse—even by an absolute dictator of Premier Khrushchev's position—and it certainly is going to be harder for the Soviet's elaborate and efficient organization for manipulating and chaneling popular thinking to sell the Rusian people the old Communist line on America's decadence.

Another factor of importance is the excellent way we handled our exhibit in the Moscow Fair to reach the crowds. In the Near East fairs are a great attraction. They draw big attendance from wide areas. The Soviet has had the best of us there because they spent more money effectively than we did—in a more attractive way in exhibits that appealed to the thousands of visitors more than ours did.

These cultural and tourist intangibles are a real factor in promoting and cementing better relationships between governments and arriving at international understanding that are to the interests of the respective countries to keep. It does seem that the Iron Curtain is no longer effectively keeping out the encroachment of the modern world.

I do not think we can or should expect any great dramatic settlement of momentous questions like West Berlin or international control and disarmament of nuclear weapons at one summit meeting.

The words of that beautiful old hymn "One Step Is Enough for Me" should suggest what can best be accomplished—for the longer war is postponed and the greater the thaw in the hitherto freezing Communist atmosphere—the harder it will be for the Soviet hierarchy to prepare common people in the Communist countries for a full scale assault on the Western democracies.

In broad terms—I think the base of our new foreign policy that is beginning to emerge is that—without yielding on fundamental ideas—"two or more systems of government could live side by side without mortal danger to either"—the ultimate result of the bitter fratricidal wars of the 16th Century, according to Mattingly in his recent book "The Armada."

There will be many zone issues on the right and on the left and in front. The world's temperature will shoot up and down. There will be periods of chills and fevers. All the time we must keep our powder dry—and maintain a balanced deterrent power.

That is really the key to our whole economic foreign and military policies. If on balance America and the free world lose military position—we tempt the aggressor.

On the other hand—fear of the growing economic and military power of the free nations might cause jittery action on the part of the imperial Communist hierarchy.

Another development that affects the international political situation and can greatly affect American industry is the consolidation of six European countries, called the Inner Six, in a free trade area eventually designed to lower existing tariffs between themselves, but can raise trade barriers against outsiders, if desirable. That caused somewhat similar organization of seven other European countries into what is called the Outer Seven. France and West Germany are in the first bloc, and England in the second.

The potentialities of these two groups economically can, and undoubtedly will, not only benefit their internal social, economic, and political life in their respective countries, but ours as well, if their organization means freer trade in the world.

Since the breakup of the Roman Empire, all of these countries have been repeatedly at war, both as allies or foes. Treaties between all of them have been made and broken, and made again. This is the first time in all these centuries that a widespread area has been formed for trade purposes alone, and it can mean much in all other areas, both geographically, politically, and economically.

Despite the world trade potential involved in these two groups, there is one sure factor foreshowed in the new economic era ahead. That is that our United States is going to meet and face growing competition from an increasing variety of foreign products. No longer is it a question of how much the consumer can and will stand. The price of products not directly affected by lower foreign prices will be indirectly involved through the intricate relationships of one product to another and a jittery dollar.

Therefore, it behooves both labor and management to realize that a mutuality of interest is a sounder base for our complex industrial life than Government control. It is high time for us Kansans to realize that the Kansas Federation of Labor is just as important to the growth and progress of our State as our State chamber of commerce. Those two fine organizations must be seeking areas where they can work together for the welfare of all Kansans.

Just as America has a new emphasis in our international relations on mass public thinking, so we need a new concept of industrial relations in our great country based on the premise that a shutdown of a basic industry and railroads involves mass public rights.

A decision is inevitable one way or the other. Either labor and industry leadership is going to adopt new attitudes toward each other that result in their arriving at orderly and equitable settlement of their mutual problems or the Federal Government will adopt new methods of fencing both in.

Once again I point out that control by the Government has expanded. The Wagner Act begat the Taft-Hartley Act; the Taft-Hartley Act begat the Landrum-Griffin bill. And along the way some illegitimate State legislation called right to work.

The handwriting is plainly on the wall of what to expect in the way of further Government control over personal and property rights—in the event of another major strike.

Before the steel strike was settled U.S. Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, proposed an industrial court and with broad and sweeping power—with final jurisdiction and no appeal to the judicial processes. Former Gov. Adlai Stevenson proposed compulsory arbitration—limited to specific basic industries—by congressional legislation. Governor Nelson D. Rockefeller proposed compulsory arbitration by Presidential proclamation. That would be an enormous increase of Presidential power. U.S. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has introduced a bill in the present session of Congress providing that the Federal Government can seize and operate basic industries in the nature of a receivership in the event of a strike. The wages, rules, and working conditions remain the same until a fact-finding board appointed by the President arrives at a decision.

The corollary of either of the above proposed legislation would be fixing the prices by the Federal Government. We can all recall the redtape—the delays—the changes and the confusion that marked that Government function in the last war.

Another decision that we must face up to is our national policy on railroads. Modern all-out war calls for all-out defense. The entire life of a country is involved. No factor in war is greater than transportation. Despite hydrogen bombs and jet bombers, missiles, atomic submarines, firing interrange missiles, the old principle of General Mosby of "getting there fustest with the mostest" is still elementary. Therefore, our great railroad transportation systems are a vital part of our national defense as well as a necessity in our complex industrial life. Partly through the ineptness of some railroad management, in meeting the competition of new forms of transportation—and partly through paying dividends—that should have gone into capital expenditures—our Nation's railroads are having economic difficulties. One way to restore sound national transportation systems is to reverse over a half a century of public policy against mergers by railroads. When that policy was first established—the railroads had no competition. You either shipped by railroad or by

horse and wagon. When you traveled you either rode the cars or you traveled by horse and buggy or by "shanks mare." Now that is all changed. Therefore, in order for a prosperous railroad system to continue to furnish the necessary efficient service required by America in either peace or war—they should not only be permitted but encouraged under strict supervision by Government agencies—to merge or to enter new fields of transportation—whichever fits their individual needs. I believe such a public policy is sound today for the railroads as well as the general welfare. The Interstate Commerce Commission recently said in reversing its long established antimerger policy:

"The position of the railroads has deteriorated steadily in recent years with the accelerating transportation revolution."

The long view suggests that our Government agencies permit the railroads to meet that situation constructively by mergers that mean saving in operation as well as preserving services for the areas of population involved. But they must keep a stern eye on financing terms and under no circumstances permit profits to be paid out in dividends when the roadbed—trackage—the equipment—and their service needs money for improvements.

Another decision we must face up to is a national policy on land use. The able Secretary of Interior, our native son—Fred Seaton—said in his 1958–59 report:

"It is the Department's conviction that sound conservationwise use and orderly development of our resources will insure a steadily higher standard of living—not only for today's citizens but for multiplying millions of future Americans."

If we do not put into operation better and more complete conservation measures in the development of our land—the time will not be far off when the farm problem will become the food problem for the American people. That trend is obvious. Children and even people in middle life will be faced with that necessity.

I believe the soil bank offers the best solution to America's farm problem—efficiently administered as a conservation measure and not politically administered for the next election. Our land must be kept in the hands of individual owners. We must not force the ownership of the land into the hands of big corporations.

Our great country has just ended the most prosperous year in its history. It looks as if 1960 will even better that record—providing the present Congress follows the sound fiscal recommendations of President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message and that he is not interrupted by domestic politics in his successful campaign for a still larger field of worldwide cooperation. I say that as one who vigorously and promptly supported President Franklin Delano Roosevelt at critical periods in his foreign policies.

On his part, the President should act promptly to eliminate what he himself has described as the "archaic methods" in the Pentagon that take almost half the national appropriations. Last week decisions were speeded up by new procedures established by the new Secretary of Defense. It's not a question of whether the President has asked Congress for sufficient appropriations for adequate national defense.

The question is the waste of that money and the loss of valuable time in arriving at final decisions because of those "archaic methods."

Congress itself is to blame for the weak and cumbersome Unification Act.

Finally, labor and industry must realize if our country is to keep on growing now is the time for long-range planning and better cooperation on the part of both.

America needs not only political statesmen but labor statesmen and industrial statesmen with an abiding sense of public responsibility.

Peaceful cooperation—to be effective and successful in world long-range planning—must start at home.

As President Eisenhower said:

"To me it seems almost absurd for the United States * * * to seek * * * cooperation among nations unless we can achieve volunteer, dependable, abiding cooperation among the important segments of our own free society."

The Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, entitled "WILEY Urges Strong Muscular Mutual Security Program," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES STRONG, MUSCULAR, MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today urged the adoption of a strong, muscular, mutual security program.

"The security of our country, the peace of the world, the future of freedom, may well depend upon what we, as a nation, are willing to dedicate to promote order, respect for law and human dignity, and deter aggression in the world," Senator WILEY said.

"As a nation—rich in resources, economic strength, industrial power, military might—we, without seeking it, have become a world leader. Our future may depend upon how well we discharge that great responsibility.

"As of now, we can be proud of our conduct in this field. In the postwar era, the American people have dedicated substantial volumes of manpower and resources to curbing aggression and promoting peace. Because of this, the climate of freedom is better, the outlook for preserving peace is brighter, the prospects of more nations to assume their rightful roles in world affairs, by self-determination, are more promising today than ever before in history.

"Now, what of tomorrow? The danger to world peace has not lessened, unfortunately. The Communist bloc is increasing its strength and capability for war.

"Can we, then, safely diminish our efforts to prevent aggression by the evermore powerful Communist bloc?

"The answer is 'No.'

"In the face of the continued threat of communism, President Eisenhower's comprehensive recommendations for carrying on an effective program to strengthen the chain of nations allied to deter aggression and promote economic progress deserves speedy, sympathetic consideration by the Congress.

"SCOPE OF PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

"As we know, the President's recommendation of $4.175 billion includes: $2 billion for military assistance; $724 million for support of defense establishments in 12 countries; $268 million for special assistance programs to promote stability, undergird economies, and combat the encroachment of communism in selected countries deemed significant to the security of the free world; $700 million for the Development Loan Fund; and the remainder for other special programs.

"What does this mean in terms of our national effort in dedicating resources to world peace?

"In total, it amounts to less than 1 percent of our estimated gross national product of about $500 billion for 1960. In relation to the U.S. defense budget, it amounts to about 10 percent of what we are spending on our defense program alone. For these expenditures, the allied air, sea and land forces of the free world are multiplied many times. In the evaluation of experts, mutual security—dollar for dollar—still provides more defense power than any other program.

"Economically, it is significant that funds for mutual security—for the most part—are spent to buy goods, materiel, equipment, right here in this country. As a result, a substantial number of jobs—annually about one-half million—are created for the American workers.

SIGNIFICANCE OF A STRONG PROGRAM

"Overall, the enactment of a strong mutual security program signifies:

"(1) The dedication of the United States to world peace;

"(2) A sense of responsibility in carrying out our role as leader of the free world;

"(3) Assuring our allies that we stand shoulder-to-shoulder with them against aggression;

"(4) Assurance to less developed nations that we recognize a need for establishing a world climate in which they, by self-determination, can attain their national goals.

"Overall, the effort, too, will keep alive the ideal of America—a country which, with the maximum of freedom, established the highest standard of living for its people in the history of the world; and yet, at the same time, is willing to be concerned with, and give assistance to, the less-developed and less fortunate nations of the world. While this is humanitarian, there is also a high degree of self-interest in such a program.

"Unless we are capable of deterring Communist aggression, the U.S. security is threatened. Unless the world succeeds, also, in wiping out economic conditions in which people exist, as the President has stated, 'on the ragged edge of starvation'—thus creating hotbeds of unrest, trouble and a breeding ground for infestuous communism—these will all serve as threats to peace.

"Naturally, Congress will need to examine and evaluate the President's recommendations for the mutual security program carefully. As deemed feasible and advisable, recommendations for constructive supplemental or alternative revisions should—and will, I am confident—be made in the program.

"Nevertheless, in the interests of our own security, as well as our overall effort to promote conditions in the world that would best foster peace—the Congress should give favorable approval to—and, I believe, the majority of our people will support—a strong, muscular mutual security program," Senator WILEY concluded.

Cub Scouts Honor Members of the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Branches With Boy Scout Badges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, especially so during this, the

50th anniversary of the founding of Boy Scouts of America, to list the following names of Cub Scouts from my district who have honored members of the executive, judicial, and our legislative branches with Boy Scout Badges.

These Cubs, their Packs and leaders are to be highly congratulated for their wonderful efforts during the week of February 7-13—indeed, the year around—for their efforts in reminding us of our country's heritage, and in helping to build a stronger America of tomorrow.

Alexandria District: Johnny Andrews, Steve Branam, David C. Clark, George Cushman IV, Jimmy Ferer, Warren Holmes, Spencer Howell, John Komoroske, Dorian Lester, Stephen Lyons, Luther Nassett, Jr., Dennis Eston Oyler, Mark Rosenberg.

Arlington District: George Baker, Scott Barnthouse, David Bennett, John A. Berud, Ted Bush, Jack Chiles, Robert J. Collins, William Craddick, Michael Doyle, Charles Dulaney, Jr., Larry Eckley, Kenneth Evans, Michael Hickey, Michael Ingram, Terrell Jackson, Timothy Johnson, Bryan Madden, Richard Millies, Dennis Rogers, Daniel Schecter, Richard Scheele, Philip Schulman, Alan Steckley, Grant Wallace.

Fairfax District: Jimmy Adduci, Charles Avery, Jr., John Bailey, Barry Barchard, David Bragg, Max W. Brake, William Campbell, Anthony Christ, Fayne Currence, James Davies, Robert Flake Dry, Jr., William Felchner, Stephen Finlayson, Sandy Finner, William Glickert, Ronnie Greaser, Stephen Grebok, Russell B. Hall, Douglas Hays, John P. Langford, Douglas Lindsay, John Morris, Richard B. Moyer, James Murphy, Robert Myers, Robert Nash, Jr., Jim Ogle, Lochlin Page, Charles Rodgers, Carl Slagle, Bruce Smith, Bruce Snyder, Steve Stebbins, Blake Sweeney, Eric Thamm, Norman Lee Thienel, Gerald Upton, Rodney Winterbottom, Walter Wing Woo.

America's Missile Posture Seen as Problem for Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's Missile Posture Seen as Problem for Reds," by David Lawrence, which was printed in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 15, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S MISSILE POSTURE SEEN AS PROBLEM FOR REDS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—Maybe the Soviets ought to be worried about the "gap" question. For it begins to look now as if the United States is not only the strongest military power in the world today but, if the Soviets do get their 300 missiles into the operational stage by the end of 1962, the United States will have by that time, too, more than 500 effective missiles equipped with nuclear bombs and able to reach all targets inside Russia.

Since many of these American missiles would be fired from movable bases, it is not going to be possible for the Soviets to prevent the deterrent power of the United States and its allies from becoming effective even if they try a surprise attack.

These conclusions can be drawn from the impressive testimony, just made public, given last week before congressional committees by Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations.

The Soviets are reported to have planned to operate 150 intercontinental missiles and 150 intermediate missiles by the end of 1962. The first group could supposedly destroy bases in this country, and the others could be aimed at allied bases overseas.

Admiral Burke says that it has been found difficult to get even one missile fired at a specific time, and that to fire 150 or 200 simultaneously to arrive at all targets coincidentally is impracticable.

So the potential enemy has to worry about the retaliatory power that may be directed against it in the law between firings of its own missiles.

IN AMERICA'S ARSENAL

First, there's the Polaris missile developed by the United States. No equivalent is possessed by the Soviets. The Polaris will be ready for use this autumn. It can be fired from submarines, and later it could be fired from cruisers. It can be carried on fleets of fast-moving merchant ships.

One submarine armed with Polaris missiles, according to a statement by the Secretary of Defense last year, carries as much destructive power as all the conventional bombs dropped by both sides during World War II.

"We have tested this missile," says Admiral Burke. "We have fired this missile from various types of launchers from under water, so that we know what it will do. We have tested the tubes. We have tested the warheads. We have tested all the components.

"We anticipate no difficulty whatever. It is just a question of putting the systems together now, which will take a couple more months. * * * This missile—warhead—will be many times the size of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima."

The admiral revealed that there will be a total of 32 operational Polaris missiles by the end of this year and 80 at the end of next year and 128 by the end of 1962.

Now, these Polaris missiles are relatively cheap. They cost only $1,500,000 apiece. They can be deployed far and wide—an arsenal that could be kept moving all the time.

But while all the Polaris missiles planned for submarines are to be operational by 1962—that is, about 128 in all—to this strength must be added the Atlas long-range missiles that the United States has already in operation and the Titan long-range missiles which are about a year away. The present production plan calls for 270 of these long-range missiles by the end of 1962.

Then there are the Thor and Jupiter intermediate-range missiles—to be based in Western Europe. The first of these are already in place in Great Britain. Soon there will be more squadrons in position in Italy and Turkey—all capable of reaching any vital target in the European area of the Soviet Union.

Adding the 128 Polaris missiles to these 390 land-based missiles makes a grand total of about 518 effective retaliatory missiles.

MORE TO COME

On top of this will come the Minuteman, which will supersede the others as the prime missile on land in 1963. This is a mobile missile like the Polaris. It can be moved on freight cars. Some bridges and overpasses will have to be increased in height to move the Minuteman around on trains or trucks, but, anyway, all or a large share of these will not be constantly in fixed positions where an enemy missile can find them.

With Polaris missiles roaming the high seas and Minuteman missiles moving around this country and intermediate-range missiles based on the territory of our allies and our manned airplanes carrying nuclear bombs, the deterrent power of the Western alliance today and in the foreseeable future is so formidable that it justifies in every sense the momentous declaration of General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who said to a congressional committee on February 9:

"On the basis of all the information available to me, and in view of the mission and locations of our retaliatory weapons systems, I just do not believe that any nation possesses the ability today or in the foreseeable future to attack us or destroy us without receiving unacceptable damage in return."

That's the whole missile controversy in a nutshell, and it explains the confidence about the outlook felt by President Eisenhower and the three military Chiefs of our Armed Forces. America doesn't like to do any saber rattling; but if it is forced on her by misguided politicians, plenty of missile rattling can be done.

Russia: No Trucking, Tovarich, as Seen by E. A. Hills of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by my very close boyhood friend, Mr. Ed Hills, of San Francisco, Calif., on his recent visit to the Soviet Union. Mr. Hills was part of a group of northern California businessmen headed by Cyril Magnin of San Francisco who spent some very interesting times in Russia this past year. As a dedicated American and one who has no prejudices, but is certainly an excellent observer, I am very happy to insert this extremely timely and interesting report in the RECORD and commend the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to its importance as a document of personal observations of a citizen of the United States while in the Soviet Union. The report follows:

RUSSIA: NO TRUCKING, TOVARICH

(By E. A. Hills)

Truck transportation is one of the few things that the Soviet Union forgot to "invent" before the Americans.

What passes for highway or local trucking in Russia is slightly less modern than the flivvers Mack Sennett's Keystone Kops drove decades ago.

A visit to Sputnikland this August revealed to me a lamentable lack of trucking know-

how in the nation that put a rocket on the moon. No American backwoods one-rig operator would do business with Russian equipment that I saw. He couldn't afford it.

We were 39 San Francisco and Sacramento area business executives and professional men who toured Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev—the three largest Soviet cities—to determine close up if increased trade between California and Russia was feasible, or even desirable.

I was concerned chiefly with inspecting the Red version of local and long-haul trucking. But I soon found Russian life so distressing that I felt like whistling "Stars and Stripes Forever" at every turn. Russian disinterest in trucking positively shocked me.

However, Russia's saddest shortcoming is housing. Only top government and party people have private homes in the big cities. Everyone else exists in dingy apartments. German bombs and shells made 30 million Russians homeless in World War II. Government urged more births. Big city industry brought hordes from the farms. The need brought a government crash program for apartment building as the quickest, cheapest means to house the greatest number soonest. Most private homes were wrecked and replaced by brick and concrete structures that soon became shoddy and began to fall apart.

We were well briefed before we left Washington. We got both sides from State Department and Russian Embassy experts. But Vice President NIXON gave us the best insight. He knew. He had just come from his historic model kitchen debate with Nikita Khrushchev at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

Howard Gilmore, of National Envelope Corp., San Francisco, and Envelope Corp., Los Angeles, and I had arranged a cocktail party at the Carlton the night before leaving Washington. Senator TOM KUCHEL and Congressman JACK SHELLEY promised to be there. TOM supplemented our invitation to NIXON and we were delighted when the Veep's secretary called to say that he would join us. We invited Cyril Magnin, our delegation chairman, to assist us in greeting Mr. NIXON. He came for 15 minutes, stayed 90. He warned us that we would see a land where the boast was better than the fact. He said that scores of features would be described as the world's best but that we would see for our ourselves that they were old hat, or, at best, secondary.

We got the drift when we landed at Moscow airport. Parked along the taxiways were 15 or 20 big Tupolov jet airliners. They obviously were not in service, or going to be. This was the first apparent instance of unsound planning. Some big shot had targeted completion of these jets on a long range program and they were delivered. But Aeroflot, the state airline, had no use for the aircraft. Lacking a private enterprise economic pressure to utilize the jets on delivery, Aeroflot need not worry about a reasonable return for each unit in its fleet. How long would United or American stay in business with 15 or 20 idle DC-8's or Boeing 707's?

Maybe the parked planes were a propaganda display of Soviet might for arriving Westerners. We got the same reaction when we rolled along the wide airport boulevard to Moscow which was lined with new five-story apartment buildings separated by park and garden areas. We found later that they were less than impressive when viewed from the rear. There was lots of building in Moscow but with quality in inverse ratio to quantity.

The Soviet desire to show off mainfested itself again when we arrived at the 30-story Hotel Ukraine, biggest and newest in the Soviet Union. It has 1,026 accommodations, from single rooms to 6-room suites. It has 100 baby grand pianos but no wastebaskets. Its ornate lobby is a quarter-mile long but it has only four working elevators. Its architecture is that of U.S. skyscrapers built when grandpa was in grade school.

When I asked to see a typical truck freight terminal, I drew blank looks from our Intourist guides.

Moscow has plenty of wheels. But they haul humans. Private autos are for government and Communist Party officials. Everyone else rides mass transit. The streets are filled with modern trolley cars, trackless trolleys, buses and taxis—all government-owned. The subway is one of the world's best, with cathedral-like stations, latest rolling stock and 1½-minute operating headway.

Trucks? Every so often you saw a beatup 1½- or 2-ton rig that appeared to be World War II surplus. The loads might be cobbles, or cartons, or machinery, or household furniture. If the latter, the moving family rode on top of the sticks. One doesn't trust precious furniture out of sight in the Communist "land of plenty." Invariably there was a driver and two helpers on each uncovered truck, no matter how light the load. No labor shortage in Moscow.

You couldn't identify wrapped cargo, even if you could read Russian. There is no competition in state industry, so no need for labels on merchandise, let alone on shipping cartons. The trucks bore no lettered designation—just numbers. They are state-owned, so why label them?

But I was convinced that there must be some large-scale trucking. They've copied most everything else we have. I was loaned a car by Chad McClelland of the U.S. exhibition, so that I could look for myself. Leaving central Moscow's well-paved streets, I soon bumped over cracked pavement or cobbled roads. Reaching the outskirts, I came upon the answer to "no trucking." The main intercity highways were but crude, two-lane, narrow roads like you would find in remote sections of our Western States. A fleet of American rigs would shatter the pavement in a half-day's use.

I was struck by the great number of women doing man's work. They drove trucks, loaded them with cobbles. They followed trucks, raking asphalt shoveled off by other girls.

Leningrad gave me a closer look at trucking. My insistence brought me to a large bus and taxi maintenance yard. Squads of women manicured the vehicles on wash racks. Women mechanics worked in shops that were primitive compared to ordinary facilities in California communities. I told the guide this still was no trucking operation.

The answer was a visit to a nursery home for children of trucking employees. The parents see the kids once a week. The quarters are clean, ample and cheerful. This is typical Russian. Everything for kids is first rate, for today's tots may be tomorrow's commissar. Once again I asked, "Show me the terminal where their parents work."

So they relented, took me to Leningrad's biggest truck yard. What a shock. It was large, yes. But a terminal to load and unload cargo, no. Why? Simple. There is no intercity trucking, period. You can blame it on the weather. Or Soviet economics. Or both.

Because trade is noncompetitive and state owned, there is no widespread dispersal of production plants. You make the product, whether it be beer or beds, close to the point of consumption. You don't have to worry about another brand competing with you from a plant 500 miles away. But what about the raw materials? You don't grow wheat or range cattle in the city limits. The answer to long hauls is railroad or canal barge transportation.

Even if central and northern Russia had adequate highways, they doubt that they could be kept open in the heavy winters.

I suppose a potent third deterrent to trucking is lack of fuel.

The Leningrad truck yard didn't compare with anything of similar size in the United States. Here was a large, motley assortment of World War II surplus, uncovered pickup trucks. Vehicles from this pool were assigned to all government and industry needs in the area.

The largest equipment that I saw were low horsepower diesel two-axle tractors hauling single-axle semitrailers of about 10-ton capacity. They had secondary two-axle trailers of about 5-ton capacity to run in tandem.

Officials proudly showed me heavy duty, low bed open trailers capable of large machinery hauling. But I looked in vain for a power unit capable of pulling the low beds. Maybe the trailers were like the jets at the airport—not going anyplace soon.

The diesels had air for brakes. Tires resembled a cheap U.S. grade. There were no driver refinements in cabs, or steering aids. There were no clearance lights such as we must have over here.

Here, then, was another sad Soviet paradox.

Out to beat the world in rockets and missiles, the Russians, by neglect of trucking and highway development, contradict their boast of military supremacy. What of the lesson that the U.S. Army Transportation Corps taught the world when the historic Red Ball Express trucks helped to defeat Germany? What if the Russians attempted a land war in western Europe? Railroads and canals can quickly be destroyed by today's missiles. But there's always a way ahead with a truck and even a makeshift road. It seems to add up to another colossal Soviet misplan.

The housing picture is equally bleak, in spite of the Red crash program of apartment building. Mile after mile, you see five-story structures. Taller buildings must have elevators. So the Government, as landlord, restricts housing to five-story walkups.

The older tenements were built when plumbing and ceramics were short. So they have no pipes and Ivan and his family must trudge down to snowy backyards to use a Chic Sales. Even new structures lack indoor toilets. But these are modern so they employ chemical toilet trailers parked in the rear. Even the newest buildings' sides are criss-crossed with outdoor plumbing. The out-fall pipes to the sewer mains are laid over ground, not trenched.

Many apartment houses have but one bathroom to a floor. But the typical setup is two or three families sharing a bedroom-parlor, kitchen and bathroom. You don't pick your roommates. A government bureau tells you where to live, period. The People's Court is jammed with cases evolving from room-sharing. Some complain because the forced neighbor cooks nauseous food. Or that Mr. Neighbor has pecked around the suspended drapes that separate families sharing one room. Three families can cook and eat together, if sociable, or suffer long waits to use the facilities separately. Lining up to use the bathroom before work or school presents more problems.

Experienced construction men of our group were amazed at slipshod workmanship and lack of building maintenance. A minimum of mortar tries to keep brickwork joined. Details of floor and wall finish would be rejected by any U.S. building inspector. Cabinet work is horrible. If a drawer slides properly or a door doesn't jam the sill, you are surprised. The paint is atrocious and soon peels.

Building mechanics are paid on piecework basis. A flat sum is allotted for a building project. So the sooner a job is completed, the higher pay for all hands. There's always another job of waiting. There are

bonuses for exceeding monthly quota and completing a job before target date. There is some building inspection but the incentive to rush the work seems to be the accepted procedure, regardless of the crudity of the finished product.

We saw a massive housing project in Kiev which, when completed in 1963, will house 25,000 in 200 five-story buildings. The "massiv" will include a cinema, polyclinic, nurseries, kindergartens, stores, laundromats, and barbershops (20 cents for a haircut). They are planning parking for 200 cars—for 25,000 persons. None of the 8,000 already housed there drives a car home.

Apartments in this "massiv" are hailed as tops. We saw a typical apartment for a family of three which has a 9½ by 15½-foot living room, a 7½ by 15½-foot bedroom, a 6 by 8 kitchen, and a closet-sized bathroom. That figures about 10 square yards of space per occupant which about equals the smallest U.S. prison cell (so they tell me).

But this accommodation offers sheer privacy compared to multiple-family housing. This lack of privacy tends to lower the birth rate. That's understandable. Many mothers will undergo legalized abortions rather than cramp one more child in a dingy room that would give a U.S. skidrow flophouse resident claustrophobia.

Poor workmanship isn't restricted to the poor comrade's abode. The swank Hotel Ukraine baffles visiting western engineers. They don't know what holds it together. Windows are wide but it takes an engineer to open them. Doors stick, drawers defy you to open them. The plumbing rumbles. You wait maybe 15 minutes for an elevator. You cannot walk up or down, the stairways are locked. There are no outside fire escapes. You ask your floor clerk what you do in case of fire and she replies haughtily that there cannot be a fire in such a fine building. There is a clatter when each of the three shifts goes off duty because the oncoming force has to take inventory, down to the last bathroom glass and sink stopper. If anything is missing, the chambermaid is docked. If a glass is missing, the guest is besieged until he comes up with it or promises to pay.

We were cautioned in Washington to watch our talk in our rooms because the quarters are often "bugged" with hidden microphones. One night as we were turning in, Gilmore loudly sounded off his bitter feelings about Khrushchev and all the Russians. He implored me to get out of the country on the first available plane, with him. I made vivid cautionary gestures, pointing to the lamps, the chandelier, the phone, and other possible "bug" locations. Gilmore halted suddenly, catching my silent warning. Then in a sonorous, changed voice, he barked out "Why Ed Hills, I am surprised at you. I am amazed that you would say such nasty things about the chairman and this nice country." If there had been a "bug," it would have recorded the thud of a flying shoe that missed Howard by a whisker.

Aside from trucking and housing, here are a few capsule observations:

The Russian man in the street greets Americans politely, but with few words. Young Russians seek to trade medals or pictures of Soviet big shots for chewing gum or ballpoint pens which are not on sale in the stores.

All, young and old, plead for you to say that America wants peace and won't attack the Soviets.

There are stores everywhere. And there are kiosks on the sidewalks also selling stuff. I guess it keeps a lot of people busy.

The big GUM department store is jammed with people. Everything sells for cash and there is some buying, but a lot of looking, too. Clothing is high. Mens' shoes run from $40 to $100 a pair. Wool dress goods are $15 a yard. A man's ordinary suit sells for $150 and the better grade price is $200. A secondhand suit that is wearable is ticketed at $120. That is the value of 45 days' pay for a skilled workman.

Food is also expensive. Bread and cabbage are reasonable but meat and better foods are priced above the laborers' abilities to buy. Vodka costs $5 a fifth so Ivan must give up almost 2 days' pay for a bottle.

Most men in the street wear coats and trousers that do not match. Their shoes are sandal-type (less leather). Most wear open-collar sport shirts (saves on neckties) and hats are a rarity. There is no such thing as a stylishly dressed woman. Their uniform seems to be a cross between a housedress and the type of frock you would pick up in a bargain basement. A serviceable woman's blouse sells for $30 and inferior nylon hose run from $1.70 to $2.60. And they seem to run soon after they are bought, too.

GUM seems to do a big business on minor luxury items. How do people afford it? Most couples work while their kids are kept free of charge in nurseries. Rentals are low, so are utilities. Medical care is free. Income taxes are petty. Education is gratis and university students are paid salaries and subsistence. There is incentive pay, as mentioned before. Demand for more consumer goods is such that heavy electrical industries, for example, have had to convert some production to electric shavers.

The classless society myth explodes when you see well-dressed men and women in the cafes and theaters. These are the executives of government, party and industry who are rewarded much better, percentagewise, than their opposite numbers outside the Iron Curtain. They splurge on expensive foods and wines. This affluence reaches into the lower echelons of bureaucracy where there is influence peddling in assignment of living quarters, upgrading or workers' pay and bonuses and granting of other supposedly unobtainable privileges.

In summation, I found that happiness seemed as absent as good trucking in the Soviet Union's top cities. I did not find in my 12-day tour a single pedestrian, transport worker, shop clerk, hotel employee—in fact anyone—who looked or sounded truly satisfied with things as they are.

Give me San Francisco or Los Angeles where the odds on a smile are a million to one over Moscow, Leningrad, or Kiev.

"The Governor and His Lady"—Wm. Henry Seward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a book has come to my attention which should find a large readership—especially in this election year when Republican Party programs for the future will be judged by the people in the light of Republican traditions and of the accomplishments upon which my party was founded. "The Governor and His Lady" by Earl Conrad is the story of William Henry Seward, who as Governor of and Senator from New York, and as Secretary of State to President Lincoln, practiced so well so much of that philosophy which the Republican Party was formed to represent; and which continues to this day the basis for much of President Eisenhower's liberal-conservative policies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a book review from the New York Times of January 31, 1960, reviewing Mr. Conrad's book.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE COUNSELOR TO A PUBLIC MAN

("The Governor and His Lady." The story of William Henry Seward and his wife, Frances. By Earl Conrad. 433 pp. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.)

(By Ishbel Ross)

None of the wives of famous Civil War figures lived more obscurely than Frances Adeline Seward, the girl from Auburn who married William Henry Seward when he was establishing himself as a young lawyer in upstate New York. She stayed on in her father's house while her husband grew in fame as Governor of New York State; as U.S. Senator; as Lincoln's Secretary of State, and finally as elder statesman to the Nation.

Yet when she died it was said of her that she was the noted lawyer's own counsel, that she and Thurlow Weed alone had been able to sway him, that she continually fought his tendency to compromise, that she was strongly antislavery and radical Republican while Seward remained at heart the Unionist and moderate Whig. She did not hesitate to disagree with William Henry on matters political, philosophical, and domestic, and she regularly let him know her opinions. But most of her counseling was done by letter, since the Sewards were rarely together.

Earl Conrad, newspaperman and the author of many books on various facets of the national scene, offers factual evidence of Frances' political influence through the correspondence of both of the Sewards, from which he draws freely for this joint biography. It enables him to throw fresh light on the statesman's personal views and the burning amibtion that all but carried him to the White House. Seward, the advocate of the oppressed, the pacificator as war approached, the right hand man of Lincoln in moments of crisis at home and abroad, the finagler and diplomat, is vividly presented by Mr. Conrad, but the underlying theme of his book is his relationship with his wife. He nourished her ego by a "lifelong love letter * * * that was one long apology for not being with her as much as she wished." He revealed more to her than he ever did to his political associates, and he was half-apologetic to Frances when he yielded to expediency. She was his conscience if not his guide. She, in turn, wrote an endless series of letters to him, which were a litany of woe as often as a source of inspiration.

Invalidism was the key to this extraordinary marriage. Mrs. Seward lived her life largely in the sick room, although her mental vistas took in the world. Her indispositions ranged from depression over a shower of rain to rheumatism that totally disabled her in her later years. She bore five children, one of whom died early of smallpox, and her own health declined with each accouchement. As the years went on she was unable to tear herself away from the shelter of her childhood home and used every pretext to avoid joining her husband and facing the responsibilities of official life. Mr. Conrad applies to Mrs. Seward's story the contemporary psychological interpretation of neurosis induced by frustration.

William Henry finally forced her to move to Albany, where she stayed for 9 months, the longest period she was ever away from Auburn. She was with him only briefly during the days of his greatest fame in Washington. Frances viewed him as a great man, set apart, and she had ample tolerance for the life he led away from her. She knew that her real rival was the political game

and that his friendship with Charlotte Cushman and his liking for the company of clever and attractive women had no fundamental bearing on their marriage. In the end he always returned to Auburn, and when he did their relations were most harmonious.

Frances was taller than her russet-haired and shambling husband, with the trembling upper lip, the large nose, the beguiling manner and worldly spirit. She was of "reedish build," with an oval face and full throat. She was well read and studied to keep abreast of political affairs. But she did not like to entertain, or to have people fawn on her because of her husband's achievements. There was Quaker blood in her veins, and she had an independent spirit.

She would not put herself out, even for Abraham Lincoln, and chose to ride in her own carriage instead of in his on a day when she felt indisposed. The President was surprised to discover that she was more radical than her husband. She was wary of Mrs. Lincoln, who regarded Seward as a sneaky abolitionist and was suspicious of his loyalty to her husband. But Mr. Conrad is particularly successful in showing how Seward subdued his envy of Lincoln and worked wholeheartedly for him and with him.

Frances never recovered from the horror of the night that the President was assassinated and her husband and sons were attacked. Two months later she was dead, and all of Auburn, as well as the war leaders, attended her funeral. Her husband outlived her by 7 years and in the final stages was considered a garrulous old man. But Seward's work has reverberant echoes down the years. He negotiated 40 treaties. He signed the Emancipation Proclamation with Lincoln. He put through the purchase of Alaska, and Mr. Conrad draws an interesting picture of the bargaining with Baron Edouard De Stoeckl that preceded this transaction.

The Governor and His Lady is written in episodic style. The author races along with a wealth of picturesque detail, catching the high moments in Seward's half century of public life. It is not fullbodied biography in the political sense, but it makes interesting reading. Primarily it is the Governor's story. Frances' life in itself was flat and colorless, but by channeling their histories together in a strong current of mutual love, endurance, and esteem, the author offers a fresh conception of Seward the man as well as Seward the statesman, and gives status to a wife whose character and ideals transcended her physical limitations. He is the first to focus the spotlight on the shadowy Mrs. Seward.

All through his book he indulges in the debatable use of imaginary dialogue. Since he is deeply versed in Seward history and grew up in Auburn, the sense of environment is so faithfully conveyed that the reader is not jarred into total incredulity. But his technique affects his book as history. Mr. Conrad is at his best in creating period atmosphere. His picture of upstate New York is fascinating and authentic, from his nature observations to his understanding of small-town politics and the forces that propel a man of destiny.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania made a brave and, for a while, untroubled entrance into the family of free nations. From February 16, 1918 until invaded again at the start of World War II by, first, Nazi Germany and later by Soviet Russia, Lithuania earned the reputation of a model Republic. She was one of those nations to learn at an early date of the frail value of agreements with the Soviet Union. This little nation, which turned to the Soviets for help, felt the embraces of the bear. Russia scrapped their Mutual Assistance Treaty of 1939 and earlier nonaggression and peace treaties of July 12, 1920 and September 28, 1926. An illegal puppet government was forced upon the people, and on June 15, 1940, Russia fraudulently annexed Lithuania.

Since that date, it is estimated that over 500,000 Lithuanians have been deported to Siberia, or murdered.

Today only refugee Lithuanians and friends of Lithuania in the free world can observe that country's anniversary of independence openly. But we can feel confident that through radio, and other means, the word will get back to those patriots who have to observe their independence anniversary in secret. We are not commemorating an independence that has died. It still lives in the hearts of the people. It is kept alive through the determination of a proud people. The observance here today can remind them once again that we have not forgotten them.

Under Secretary Morse Visits Butler County, Ky.; Lauds Rural Development Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, last December the Honorable True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, who also acts as national chairman of the Rural Development Committee, visited Butler County, Ky., in connection with ceremonies honoring the county for its very fine RDP accomplishments. In the January 1960 issue of the Kentucky Department of Agriculture Bulletin, there appears a description of this visit and of the program. As one who is personally interested in the expansion of this self-help rural development program and who is proud of the program in Butler County, Ky., I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kentucky Department of Agriculture Bulletin, January 1960]

UNDER SECRETARY MORSE VISITS BUTLER COUNTY; LAUDS RURAL DEVELOPMENT WORK

For those who may have some skepticism about the value of the rural development program (RDP) in Kentucky the Bulletin editor would suggest that such persons pay a visit to Butler County. There they will see firsthand just what the program of rural development can do to a community.

The rural development program which has been dubbed "operation bootstrap" is a plan of self-help. While its expressed objectives are to improve living standards and increase job opportunities, RDP has many intangible assets that cannot be identified as easily as freshly painted buildings, community-owned buildings, newly paved roads, etc. Unseen, but, nevertheless, just as present, are the community bonds forged by working together toward a common goal—civic pride and spiritual rebirth.

Under Secetary of Agriculture True D. Morse was aware of these intangibles when he visited Butler County last December 14 and 15 in connection with ceremonies honoring the county for its RDP accomplishments. Morse, who is National chairman of the Rural Development Committee, described Butler County as one of the outstanding members of the rural development program that is now being conducted in 30 States and Puerto Rico. The Under Secretary declared that the Butler County accomplishments during the past 3 years is perhaps tops for any county in the Nation.

Speaking at the dedication of the New Sharer Community Center building, the Under Secretary lauded the 59 member Butler County Rural Development Committee which brought together the county's combined town and rural leadership. He also pointed out that the success of the Butler County RDP should in a large measure be credited to the unanimity of purpose of the 23 agencies and organizations working together, representing State, National and local agencies as well as private organizations. (The Kentucky Department of Agriculture is a member of the Kentucky Rural Development Committee and is represented by Assistant Commissioner Vinson on the executive committee.) Dr. E. J. Nesius, associate director of extension, is State chairman.

Morse who also visited the Reedyville Community Center listed the following accomplishments that had been brought about in Butler County largely through the stimulus provided by the rural development efforts:

1. A $46,700 health center has been erected.
2. The main street in Morgantown has been renovated with several new business buildings being built.
3. A fire engine has been obtained—which cut insurance rates in half.
4. A new post office building is under construction.
5. Sixteen acres of land was purchased for developing a fairground, recreation center, and park. The cost is to be approximately $17,500 to $20,000.
6. The rural development county committee has sponsored two dairy shows.
7. A County Fair was held for the first time in 2½ years.
8. An Artificial Breeding Association has been organized.
9. The dairy cattle of the county were tested for Bangs disease.
10. About 40 new houses have been built in Morgantown the past 2 years; this is more construction than there has been in the past 20 years.
11. Work is being done to eliminate the slum section with a public housing project.
12. Five industrial sites have been located.
13. Town-county relationships have improved considerably. Farm-City Week has been observed for the past 2 years.
14. Loans are easier to obtain as a result of changed attitudes.
15. One grade A and two grade C dairy routes have been started.
16. A Vegetable and Fruit Growers' Cooperative was organized.

17. The communications committee has succeeded in establishing a better telephone system for several communities. Telephones have increased as a result.

18. All agencies are cooperating and are being coordinated under the rural development program to do more effective work.

Through the Community Improvement Contest with $1,950 in prizes and eight communities participating these improvements have been brought about:

(a) Many remodeled houses.

(b) Huge increase in running water being installed in houses.

(c) Several new houses being built.

(d) Hundreds of additional head of livestock added.

(e) Roadsides and fence rows cleaned out.

(f) Mail boxes renovated.

(g) Two new community centers, costing about $10,000, were erected.

(h) Four schoolhouses have been bought for community centers; three already remodeled; the other to be reworked within 2 months.

(i) Community spirit and cooperativeness is much more prevalent.

(j) A new blacktop road in two communities.

(k) A drainage program, costing $15,000 or more, which involves 13 people in one community.

(l) Thousands of acres of improved pasture.

(m) Strengthening of several existing 4-H Clubs and new ones added.

(n) Cemeteries have been cleaned off and are being kept neat.

(o) Community signs to identify communities have been erected.

(p) Social and economic structure of communities is being strengthened.

Wilson Hourigan, area agent in rural development, made these observations:

"County-level activities alone will not do the job. Social and economic development is not limited to or determined by county lines, but takes place in an area and evolves about a trade and service center. Nor will area-level activities in themselves solve the social and economic problems. They need the interest, support, and participation of the people of the county and communities, levels as well."

James Thompson, president of the Sharer Community project, recognized these facts when he admonished his listeners at the community house dedication that Sharer is now only on the first step up the ladder toward the realization of its potential as a community that is so attractive that nonresidents would like to make their homes there.

We see rural development as something besides community betterment. Here in Butler County we have witnessed a demonstration of what can be accomplished when everyone, be it individuals, private organizations, or public agencies, work together toward a common goal.

We of the State department of agriculture are pleased that we had a small part in helping these people to improve their communities and possibly broaden their horizons.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today, we commemorate the independence of Lithuania. The people of this small country have played an important role in the history of Europe, once creating a barrier between the Tartars to the east and the Germanic tribes to the West. But the unhappy fact of geography has brought tragedy to them over the centuries since their period of historical greatness. During the 18th and 19th centuries, overwhelmed by superior numbers, they were encompassed within the czar's extensive realms. But they resisted his efforts to Russify them. And following the collapse of the ancient Russian Empire during World War I and the bloody war between Bolshevik Russia and Poland, the Lithuanians finally obtained their independence.

They used their liberties responsibly and well. While independent, their countryside flourished and their factories grew. But less than two decades later, they were again overrun by Russian forces. World War II saw Germans drive out Russians and then Russians drive out Germans. And finally, at the end of that tragic conflict, Lithuanians were integrated into the new Soviet empire.

And there they have remained. Many have been deported, others have been dragooned into the Kremlin's plans. Still others have fled for their very lives.

Those of us in this country, who are free to commemorate this anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence as Lithuanians at home are not, have laid upon us a peculiar responsibility. For Lithuanians know what is lost when freedom is lost as more fortunate peoples who have never lost their freedoms may not know. Let us therefore dedicate ourselves to living in our freedom as worthy, responsible citizens, striving to perfect ourselves to make our maximum contribution to our society, and living at peace and with trust with our neighbors. In this way Lithuanians demonstrate to their fellow Americans their understanding of the trust that is upon us all, freemen.

Address of Hon. Charles H. Silver at Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the happy prospect of a world at peace and all its energies devoted to the benefit of mankind was forecast in an address by one of New York City's most honored citizens, Charles H. Silver. He is president of the Board of Education of the City of New York and presided at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner on October 27, 1959. On this occasion, Mr. Silver paid tribute to the memory of Alfred E. Smith, one of New York State's most distinguished sons, and to the ideals which are being perpetuated by the foundation in his name.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Hon. Charles H. Silver on this occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, OCTOBER 22, 1959

Each year I find renewed pride and pleasure in coming before you as chairman to welcome our honored guests and the faithful friends who have gathered to keep alive the memory of Alfred E. Smith and the great foundation you have helped to sustain in perpetuation of his name and ideals.

I rejoice again in the presence of so many familiar faces—and new ones, too—whose hearts and minds are drawn here through devotion to the symbol of the "Happy Warrior" and dedicated to the cause of charity and peace.

The very concept and continuing success of these annual events give proof—in a care-burdened world—that there are some who do care. Too much of mankind is still concerned with its own personal needs and interests. This makes it all the more necessary for us to give thought to the well-being of others, to reach the heart of world problems, to see the hunger, the pain, the want and injustice that still exist in many corners of our world.

Recent events indicate that the great powers of the world are beginning to understand that a peace based on mutual fear is no peace at all. We are not yet confident that the forces of science, unleashed in appalling immensity, will usher in a richer and more rewarding future. It has all happened so quickly. It is difficult to revise our thinking to the incredible realities of the space age.

But we do know that, unless men of faith and courage take stock of our achievements and point the direction in which they will be used, these forces can bring an end to the progress of civilization, silence to our cities and death to their people.

This is inevitable unless—and it is a very great unless—we remember the prophetic teachings, the importance and the sanctity of life, so that, regardless of creed, we combine our strength and efforts toward brotherhood and good will—and justice for all men.

The surging tide of international events washed up on our own shores an emissary from abroad who has the self-confessed power, by his decision alone, with no man's leave, to throw the lever which could erase the past and present and any hope of a future for all people, including his own. He came on a mission whose major message expressed the hope that all nations disarm. We do not know whether it was really news or just noise.

We must receive this message with caution. It is not easy to accept the exalting vision of an olive branch of peace waved by the man whose implacable tanks crushed a freedom-loving people's blood into the paving blocks of their peaceful streets in Hungary, in Poland and in so many other areas and episodes of shameful conquest.

But all people should weigh carefully any call to beat our swords into plowshares no matter from what source it comes. For never was the need more great for genuine understanding among nations than it is today. Never was the desire more strong for freedom and peace throughout the world than it is in our time.

Yes, a call for disarmament must be heard but we will not forget that its advocate has waged relentless war against our way of life. We can only wait, and consider and pray, and keep our guard up. We can only listen to the man and remember the cautious motto of Al Smith: "Look at the record."

Yet, here is a matter well worth considering. If our current average expenditure of almost $40 billion a year for destructive and defensive armaments could be diverted to other purposes, what an enormous potential for good this would create.

Medical centers could rise on every hand. We could provide adequate care for the emotionally disturbed, curb juvenile delinquency, build better educational systems, offer adequate salaries to teaching personnel, train an ample number of scientists, and house every family in our land in decency and comfort. We could do all this and still have such a surplus that no worthy project to advance art or culture would remain neglected. All this could happen not only for us in this land, but, throughout the world, the hungry and impoverished could see the dawn of a new day.

In the wake of military disarmament and moral rearmament, all nations, renouncing war, could enter into a commonwealth for the betterment of life, the dignity of man and the service of God.

I am glad that I have been able to express these thoughts, so faithful to the guiding spirit of that immortal governor of our State in whose name and honor this dinner is given, before its present Governor—Nelson A. Rockefeller.

And I enjoy this opportunity of addressing myself, as well, to one of the able young legislators in whom the future of our nation and its principles are entrusted. The uncompromising courage he brings to any office strengthens the belief that his own profile in history will add still another chapter to his inspiring book, "Profiles in Courage." I refer, of course, to the crusading Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Finally, I am happy that our own city's foremost champion of the rights of man is with us in the person of our mayor, Bob Wagner.

My friends, as president of the board of education, I am, of course, best acquainted with the excellent work of our public school system. However, let me tell you, just briefly, a few facts about the great Catholic parochial school system of this city. Its 13,000 teachers provide instruction for approximately 370,000 children. It would mean an additional cost to the city of $750 million for housing facilities, $120 million in annual operating expenses, plus many millions of dollars for teachers' salaries, if this were a municipal obligation.

I think we can salute this tremendous contribution to the youth of our city.

Under the sponsorship of His Eminence, during the past school year 35 new elementary and 6 new high schools have been constructed, and 24 buildings have been modernized and expanded. This is in addition to the many hospitals, homes, nursing schools and institutions of higher learning, 17 of which have been dedicated by His Eminence in the past year alone.

For such noble work, we give thanks to the Catholic parochial school system and to you, Your Eminence, whose faith has strengthened you as a great humanitarian and moving force in the advancement of education.

In closing, I express, on behalf of our foundation, my heartfelt gratitude to you and to all our honored guests for your presence here tonight and for your resolve to protect the imperishable destiny of our people so that freedom and decency may conquer the forces of darkness.

May we go forth into another year dedicating the days ahead to brotherhood and justice and to the triumph of truth.

This is the pledge that has brought us together.

God grant the perpetual endurance of this greatest democratic nation on the face of the earth.

An Outstanding Record of Achievement in Washington, the Performance of the Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important officials of our Government is the Comptroller General of the United States. This official, who serves directly under the supervision of the Congress, is the watchdog of the American Government. By his diligence and efficiency he protects the American taxpayer and without his assistance it would be impossible for Congress fully to discharge its responsibility over the Federal purse strings.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is particularly fortunate in the person of the individual who presently occupies that post, Hon. Joseph Campbell, of the State of New York. Not only has Mr. Campbell done an outstanding job in this position of high responsibility and has demonstrated the kind of forthrightness and independence which should be the hallmark of a comptroller general, but he is also a very warm and friendly person. Besides that, I am particularly pleased that he happens to be a constituent of mine, coming from the beautiful and historic village of Cooperstown in Otsego County in my district in upstate New York.

For this reason, I was particularly pleased to read the other day in the Ostego Farmer, one of the newspapers published in Cooperstown, an editorial which appeared praising one of the unique achievements of Mr. Campbell, one of the most distinguished citizens of that community. This editorial demonstrates that Mr. Campbell has exercised his concern for economy and a judicious expenditure of the taxpayers' money even in his own agency. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

GOING THE RIGHT WAY

A memo from the office of Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, indicates the least number of employees on the payroll of his Department since 1940. Present number on the rolls is 4,997. Peak employment in this Department reached 14,904 during the latter part of World War II years. There were nearly 6,000 on the rolls when Mr. Campbell took over in 1954. Mr. Campbell has been able to bring about a reduction in each successive year. We suspect that it has taken some doing, and have a feeling that not many departments or bureaus at Washington have been thus handled.

During the same period the number of employees in the Post Office Department increased 40,357. According to Tax Foundation there has been an increase of over 83,000 workers in the various Federal civilian agencies in the 1954–59 period.

Congratulations to Mr. Campbell. It would be wonderful if some of the other departments at Washington would try as hard.

The Condition of the Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary from the Janeway Publishing & Research Corp. dated January 19, 1960, on the disappointing lag in our Federal highway program.

Janeway Service warns that the highway program is being drastically curtailed. In my judgment, the administration has failed to provide the management and financing of our vast highway program which is demanded by such a far-reaching project.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Highway slowdown: But if Washington's money-raising operations are draining liquidity out of the spending stream, its spending operations are not feeding it back in on anything like a compensating basis. Herewith an audit of the most overtouted of all Federal spending programs—highway construction.

It is the Federal Government's contribution which is decisive for highway construction at any given time. Right now, for example, the Federal Government is sponsoring some $4.5 to $5 billion of new highway construction in process. During fiscal 1960, the Federal Government has the authority to obligate $2.7 billion for new highway construction. During the first half of fiscal 1960, however, the Government obligated only $900 million of new highway money. But the average leadtime between obligations and actual expenditures is no less than 19 months. This means that the disappointing level of Federal highway obligations during the first half of fiscal 1960 will force a correspondingly disappointing level of Federal highway expenditures during the first half of calendar 1961—when the boom is officially scheduled to begin running out of steam but when, instead, the slump now building up may already be seasoned. Any catchup in highway obligations during the current half can't be expected to benefit highway expenditures until well after the new President has been installed in the White House.

Contratcors and vendors alike have been complaining that the on-and-off pattern of the Federal Government's highway program has been as disruptive as the now-you-see-it, now-you-don't pattern of its defense program, only more so. During the months ahead, contractors and ventors will do well to brace themselves for another period of disappointing delay—only more so—in the Federal Government's highway construction program.

Tribute to Juan T. Trippe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the contributions that Juan T. Trippe and his creation, Pan American Airways, have made to the Defense Establishment of our country.

During the past 2 years, since the appearance of the sputniks, there are many who have gone around decrying "doom" for us. There seems to be a feeling that American creativeness has gone forever.

I believe the American genius is as strong now as it has ever been and Americans are now, as ever before, striving to make the world a better place to live in. In our own time Mr. Trippe has single handedly thrust our country forward in the field of aviation creating new frontiers for us all. I cannot hope to improve upon the words used to describe the accomplishments of Mr. Trippe as has Mr. Charles Kraft on the occasion of the awarding of a citiation by the National Defense Transportation Association:

Our guest of honor, the dean of the air transport industry, launched his career in international aviation by the unusual process of leaving a profitable company which he headed and which had received the first domestic air mail certificate in 1926. He resigned from Colonial Air Transport, an airline which flew between Boston and New York, when that company decided it would be too great a risk to extend its route to Chicago and Miami.

In 1928 he formed Pan American and inaugurated the first U.S.-flag international air transport operation. This was only the first of many steps which advanced American aviation from a poor last to an unquestioned first place in world aviation. Other steps came in rapid succession—the first air service across the Caribbean—the first over the Pacific—the first over the Atlantic—the first around the world.

Today, three decades later and, in spite of far higher labor costs than foreign-flag competitors, the U.S.-air transport industry continues to lead the way in equipment, efficiency, and prestige. Today Pan American carries our flag to every country—no city in the world being further than a short day's flight.

Our guest not only has pioneered in the technical development of commercial aviation, but he has led the way in converting air transportation into a mass transportation business. He sought to make international air transport a vehicle to carry the average man at a price he can afford to pay. After World War II he initiated a campaign for greatly reduced air fares. Currently he is pressing for economy-level fares around the world.

He led the United States into the jet age when, 5 years ago, Pan American ordered 44 jet airliners, each with nearly the annual passenger capacity of a *Queen Mary*.

The rush to order U.S.-built jets by foreign-flag airlines in a follow-the-leader manner provided employment for thousands of skilled American craftsmen. It has helped maintain the position of the United States as the leader of world aviation.

The confidence of our Government in leadership of this caliber was clearly demonstrated when Pan American was selected by the Air Force to operate its missile base at Cape Canaveral.

In recognition of his countless contributions to the advancement of air transportation he has received almost all the known aviation awards, such as the Collier Trophy, the Daniel Guggenheim Medal, and the Harmon Trophy.

Many universities throughout the Nation have conferred honorary degrees upon him in recognition of—in the words of the citation from his alma mater, Yale University—"for organizing and administering a great new force in human life whereby space is forgotten and the ends of the earth are made neighbors."

As a U.S. Navy pilot in World War I he was able to contribute only one person—himself. World War II, however, found Pan American a growing company—and grow it did for its peak war effort found 88,000 employees working for their country under our guest's direction on every continent and on every ocean.

For Pan American's oustanding contribution to the war the U.S. Government awarded him its highest civilian decoration—the Medal of Merit. Even more important in this day of global tensions and brushfire wars, he has been awarded decorations by all the principal nations of Western Europe, the Middle East, the Orient, and South America as well. It is not surprising, therefore, that such an ambassador of international good will should have received more decorations from abroad than any other American civilian.

It is a pleasure to add the National Defense Transportation Association's Distinguished Service Award to the countless honors already bestowed on the man whose name is synonymous with air transport, Mr. Juan T. Trippe.

CITATION: JUAN T. TRIPPE, PRESIDENT, PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Through the leadership of Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, a potent instrument of national defense is readily available to this Nation in case of emergency. Through his efforts and foresight 65,000 miles of air routes have been developed around the world.

The value of this great air system to the country is best shown by the experiences of World War II. Within half an hour after the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941, the peacetime activity of Pan American ceased and the more than 20,000 employees of this company joined our Nation's defense.

Crews of Pan American were called in to give the military the benefit of their experience in oversea flight. Thousands of pilots were trained by Pan American and the company's maintenance facilities were placed at the disposal of the Armed Forces. Many strategic air bases were built by Pan American in various parts of the world. In addition, the long lines of communications of the company were placed into military activity.

Today the same guiding hand of Mr. Trippe has developed Pan American World Airways into a system of jet airliners capable of transporting passengers and cargo around the world in half the time it took in World War II.

Juan Trippe's capacity for organization, his management skill, his patriotism and leadership are in the highest tradition of the Nation.

Birthday of Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, three great emancipators were born in February. Washington freed this country. Lincoln freed the slaves. And Susan B. Anthony freed women.

Yesterday marked the 140th anniversary of the birth of this incomparable woman. Today it is clearly recognized that the rights which the women of our country enjoy are due in large measure to the dedicated efforts of this native of New York State who resided in my home city of Rochester.

Although her achievements have been universally recognized, nowhere have they received more tangible tribute than in Rochester. There, the home of Miss Anthony and her sister, Mary, from 1866 to 1906, at 17 Madison Street, has been set aside as a memorial to her great life and works. Mementoes of her activities leading to the 19th amendment have been carefully preserved, and the house is visited by a constant stream of admirers.

But Miss Anthony belongs to America and the world, not just to Rochester. It is therefore fitting that we pay tribute to her on the occasion of her birthday anniversary. It is appropriate that we recognize at this time her great sacrifices and the great personal abuse she suffered in fighting for a cause she considered just. It was a cause which we all know today was and is just.

Miss Anthony was born during a period when women were considered not the equal of their male counterparts. The equality women had shared with the men of this country in the pioneer days had given way to a kind gallantry of the superior toward the lowly.

With the fading of the pioneer days and the growing of the industrial system, women found themselves relegated to second place. They had no legal entitlement to the salaries they earned, could not enter into contractual agreements, and were considered far too delicate to be subjected to education or to concern themselves with the hard task of selecting public officials or running for office.

Susan B. Anthony was born during that era, and she, being of pioneer stock, protested vigorously these inequities. Because of the kind of woman she was, she knew no course but action. She campaigned militantly in the interest of womankind. She became a champion of economic justice as well as social and political emancipation. She campaigned vigorously for the vote for women, for in this she knew rested the only salvation for equal rights for women and freedom of human equality.

Miss Anthony, like Abraham Lincoln, stands as a champion of human justice. Although, like Lincoln, Miss Anthony did not live to see the fruits of her efforts, a large portion of the ideals for which she struggled so arduously and long have been realized. Women have gained the franchise and they are more and more taking their rightful places in the professions and in the business world.

But Miss Anthony's program will not be complete so long as there is any discrimination against women as, unfortunately, exists in some places and occupations. Women still all too often have to struggle for recognition which should rightfully be theirs. Men do not benefit when women work in a discriminatory atmosphere at substandard wages. Our democracy does not benefit when democracy is applied in 50-percent measure.

It behooves us all, then, to take a lesson from Miss Anthony. Her memory can be revered best by the realization that in our great country men and women have a common destiny which can be fulfilled only on the basis of equality.

I am delighted to call attention to the fact that yesterday was celebrated throughout New York State as Susan B. Anthony Day. By proclamation of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, the accomplishments and perseverance of this great teacher, humanitarian, and woman were recognized. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Governor Rockefeller's proclamation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

The rights which the women of our country enjoy today as American citizens are due in large measure to the stanch and untiring efforts of a native of the Empire State, a resident of Rochester, Susan B. Anthony.

One hundred and twelve years ago an event destined to be of worldwide importance took place at Seneca Falls, N.Y., the first Women's Rights Convention. Those who took part were in the position of being nominally citizens but actually deprived of a citizen's right to vote and share in the government of their community, their State and their Nation. Susan B. Anthony was a leader of this band of brave and intelligent women. She, and others with her, persevered in the face of prejudice, abuse and ridicule. In the end, their courage and tenacity prevailed. What they achieved is part of the goal for which we are today striving—equality of opportunity for all

The right of women to take part in government is today recognized as beyond dispute. The State of New York extended this principle when its legislature was the first to pass a law providing that women workers must be paid on an equal basis with men for equal work. This was one consequence of the movement that Susan B. Anthony led so valiantly.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1960, as Susan B. Anthony Day in the State of New York, and I urge the men and women of the State to join in paying tribute to that distinguished American.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 25th day of January 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

The Air University at Montgomery's Maxwell Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Montgomery, Ala., particularly the members of the Rotary Club there, deserve commendation for the hospitable manner in which they have opened their hearts and their homes to the many allied officers from other nations who study at the Air University at Montgomery's Maxwell Air Force Base.

This story of Alabama hospitality is related in the following article written by Starr Smith, public relations expert who served during World War II on the public relations staff of General Eisenhower. I believe Mr. Smith's article will be of interest to the Members of Congress, especially those who are associated with Rotary International.

The article follows:

MONTGOMERY MAKING MEMORIES—AIRMEN FROM AROUND THE WORLD GAIN VALUABLE INSIGHTS INTO THEIR HOST COUNTRY AS GUESTS OF ALABAMA ROTARIANS

When you think about it, the letter that appeared one day in the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser-Journal might have had overwhelming results. From a Belgian Air Force captain, it was an open invitation for "anyone in Montgomery" (population 150,000) to come to Brussels where "I can repay in some manner the citizens of Montgomery for the wonderful 5 months I have been so fortunate to spend in your lovely and hospitable city."

Capt. Charles Soumoy wrote the letter after attending the Air University at Montgomery's Maxwell Air Force Base, and the friendly warmth of Montgomery people was still much on his mind. Montgomerians have opened up their hearts and homes in the past few years to more than 1,400 Allied officers from 52 nations. Sparking this effort is the Rotary Club of Montgomery.

U.S. Air Force Maj. Preston Dean says, "Our allied officers learn a great deal about American manners and customs through their constant contact with Montgomery Rotarians. This is as important as their actual schoolwork."

Classroom instruction is done by U.S. Air Force officers. The curriculum includes an intensive English-improvement course, world politics, and major military subjects. Carefully chosen by their own Governments for leadership potentiality, graduates of Maxwell's Air Command and Staff College now have the top Air Force command in Chile, Iran, the Philippines, Paraguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Vietnam.

Montgomery is a city where the serene and subtle ways of the past blend harmoniously with a dynamic and progressive attitude toward the future. This successful fusion of tradition and spirited forward movement is most impressive to the allied visitors, and Alabama's continuing industrial and agricultural development is a constant source of interest.

Montgomery Rotarians—in gracious gestures of the South's celebrated hospitality—entertain the allied officers frequently at dinners, dances, sporting events, ladies' nights, and sightseeing tours. Thus a lasting bond of international friendship is being forged throughout the free world.

Philippine Col. Leonardo Miciano perhaps summed up the feelings of his colleagues when he said, "All of us had read much of Montgomery. But it was a surprise when we came here. It's a beautiful city and there is no tension. The men of Montgomery Rotary have given us good memories of America to take back to our own countries."

Address by Hon. Allen J. Ellender, U.S. Senator from Louisiana, Before the National Limestone Institute, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all of us are at times called upon to speak before various groups interested in the problems facing our country. This is a privilege of public office, and one which we accept with pleasure.

I was particularly impressed by a speech delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the 15th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute on January 21, 1960.

In his address, the Senator from Louisiana stressed the theme of conservation of our natural resources, especially our fertile earth. His penetrating remarks should be preserved. I feel certain they will be of interest and value to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the National Limestone Institute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, DEMOCRAT OF LOUISIANA, AT THE 15TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by making a few observations about the prospects of farm legislation. I am sorry to say that I don't believe that there will be too much forthcoming in the way of farm legislation this year. I introduced a bill 2 weeks ago in an effort to rectify the wheat problem, if possible. During the last session of Congress, the Senate and the House each passed a separate bill. When it went to the

conference committee, the membership on both sides agreed on a compromise bill. The Senate immediately agreed to the conference report, and CHARLIE HALLECK, and I believe Mr. Benson, got busy on the House side. The conference report was not agreed to there, so the Senate was required to adopt the House bill. The President promptly vetoed it. Now if the House bill had been signed by the President, it would have saved considerable sums of money. According to the experts, savings would have totaled between $500 and $600 million over the next 2 years, but, as I said earlier, the President vetoed the bill.

Now the bill I introduced earlier this year was somewhat along the lines of the conference bill that was not agreed to. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will enact a wheat bill along the lines of the one that I have introduced because if we don't enact a wheat bill that will assist in curtailing the surpluses that we now have on hand, the whole agricultural program may be imperiled. I shall do my best, as chairman of the committee, to have a bill enacted.

I was also asked to say a few words on the soil bank, as to whether or not Congress will enact a new Soil Bank program. I tell you that I do not believe that Congress should or will enact another soil bank program. It is my belief that the present soil bank program, which has not been on the statute books too long, has cost the taxpayers a little over a billion and a half dollars and surpluses are continuing to pile up. An effort I believe is going to be made to extend the conservation reserve portion of the soil bank but even that I hope will not be enacted.

Another point I would specifically like to bring to the attention of your organization is that the President of the United States failed to budget $250 million for the agricultural conservation program. I do not suppose any of you will object if the Senate and the House put into the bill $250 million before it is sent to the White House.

I would like to direct my remarks today to two very important subjects which, I fear, are often overlooked in this era of intercontinental missiles, trips into space and atomic power; namely, the need for continued and expanded conservation and preservation of both our natural and human resources.

As is often said, it is very easy to lose sight of the forest for the trees. I think that is happening today for in many respects we are overlooking the fundamentals that have made our Nation great.

Putting it very simply, we owe our present position of national strength, in large measure, to the proper development of our God-given natural resources which our forefathers discovered in this country.

The development of a widespread system of internal communications, such as highways, waterways, and railroads which made it possible for all areas of our country to be linked together so that all could share in our joint progress, set the cadence of our unprecedented march forward.

If we ever fail to give close attention to our transportation and communication facilities and to the proper use and adequate conservation of our water and land resources, then we need never worry about who gets to the Moon or Mars first. It just will not make any difference to us by that time. Our economic backs will already be broken.

The value of a well coordinated internal communication system was never made more obvious to me than during 1958 when I had the privilege of making an extensive tour of the nations of South and Central America. There, I visited countries that are immensely wealthy in natural resources, yet, they remain underdeveloped, principally because of a lack of adequate internal communications. I saw veritable treasure troves of natural wealth, but no means by which these resources could be made available for industrial and other uses.

I resolved then that if the countries of Latin America are to ever become strong and viable—both economically and politically—avenues of trade and communication must be created, much as the United States did in our early years, and as we have continued to do as our Nation has grown. In large measure, we owe our present position of world leadership to our ever-expanding network of highways, waterways, and railroads. The magnitude of this achievement becomes even more astounding when it is realized that our rise to world leadership has taken place only within the last 60 years. In short, in only six decades, we have been able to overtake and surpass other nations which were leaders of the then-known world before our country was ever colonized.

A review of our history should make it very clear that there is need for a continuous improvement of our internal communication system—particularly through up dating and expansion of the present highway construction programs, the development of new waterways, and the modernization of existing waterways, including our ports.

Yet, I fear that some shortsighted persons have felt that we have gone far enough in this field. This is a good example of losing sight of the fundamentals, to which I referred earlier.

If we of the United States ever decide that we have gone about as far as we can go, then that is as far as we will go. That day will mark the decline of the United States as a world power.

It is for that reason, among others, that I have supported—and will continue to support—the current Federal aid to highways program, as well as our long-range plans for water transportation.

I would like to give a word of advice to the planners of our highway programs: Despite the emphasis on interstate highway programs—which I agree are vitally needed—we must not overlook the less spectacular, but just as vital, fundamentals in that field, also.

We must remember that superhighways are of no use without connecting links. If the Interstate System is the very backbone of our road construction effort, then the primary system, the so-called A–B–C road construction program, provides the muscle and sinew.

It is my hope that the Public Works Committees of both the House and Senate will reexamine the entire highway construction program during this session of Congress, with an eye to giving the A-B-C programs proper emphasis.

It might even be desirable for Congress to reconstitute the entire Federal-local relationship that now exists in highway construction. Just because the existing program is apparently sufficient for our needs of today is no reason for us not to make plans for the future.

This brings me to the heart of what I would like to discuss with you today.

I fear that in too many places—yes, even in places of high position—there is a mistaken notion that we need not plan for the future—that the future will take care of itself. This ostrichlike attitude is glaringly apparent in the field of natural resources development, particularly in agriculture. Just because we happen to have a surplus of agricultural products today, this does not mean that it will always be the case.

Yet, there are quite a few people—and some are powerful and influential—who are asking why we should continue conservation and reclamation programs as well as farm research. They point out that we already have farm surpluses and they even cite projections of the Department of Agriculture that by 1975, because of increased yields and more efficient farming methods, we will need some 7 million acres less cropland than we now have in production, and in the soil bank, to grow sufficient food and fiber for our increasing population.

I am here to say, ladies and gentlemen, that such an attitude is more appropriately associated with ostriches than with officials of a government striving to maintain a position of free world leadership.

For one thing, I deny and disavow any so-called short-range planning. The United States of America is going to endure for a lot longer time than merely another 15 years, and it behooves us to plan accordingly. Fifteen years from now, my youngest granddaughter will be only 16 years old, and I want to plan for her future—all of her future, not just the first 15 years.

The population of the United States today is about 175 million. It has been predicted that by 1980, our population will rise to 244 million and by the year 2000, it will reach 329 million people.

What is more, the Census Bureau has estimated that by the year 2010—just 50 years away—we will have in excess of 370 million people, more than twice the population we have today.

This means that merely to maintain our present diet levels, twice as much food and other farm products as we consume today will be required 50 years from now.

In other words, by the end of the next half-century, farmers will have to produce twice as much food and fiber as they do today—and they will have to do it on less land, for it has been estimated that by the year 2000, some 80 million additional acres of some of our very finest cropland, will be lost to creeping urbanization and other factors well known to you. This 80-million-acre loss compares with only an approximate 25 million acres of land which will be added to our cropland by reclamation and related practices during that period of time.

Of course, it is possible that we could increase our cropland by reducing our forests—but this would be merely another example of shortsightedness. We must preserve and conserve our forest resources, not strip them bare, and put them to the plow.

Part of this increased production can come as a result of the great strides being made in the field of farm research. Between 1935–39 and 1956 farm research in this country resulted in production increases equal to the yields from 142 million acres.

Yet, even an expanded research effort is not enough to take care of our needs 50 years hence. The Department of Agriculture has projected that by 2010, our progress in farm research will have to increase by more than 1½ times.

Where and how will we produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the generations of as yet unborn Americans?

I say our solution can and must be found in both farm research and conservation and preservation of our two basic natural resources, soil and water.

The day is long past when the American frontiersman could just keep pushing west, bringing new lands into production.

Today, some 1 billion acres of land produce this Nation's food and fiber. If we were to follow the old methods of bringing production into line with consumption, we would need to double the amount of land now in use.

But the total land area of the United States is only 1.9 billion acres. In other words, even if we tore down every major city in the United States; if we made a garden plot of Manhattan; if we terraced and irrigated the Grand Canyon, and if we stripped our glorious national forests down to the soil

line, we would still have a shortage of land and we would still have to seek additional manner and means to feed and clothe our people. And remember, that's only 50 years hence.

This should make it very clear that we must take care of the land and water we have today.

Very simply, the situation is this:

We have a limited amount of land in this country.

More and more of this farmland—and I might point out that in many instances it is some of our best farmland—is being lost to growing urbanization, and erosion, among other things.

Our population is increasing.

Therefore, we must make plans now so that our children can grow more food on less land. We must take care of our God-given resources.

This can only come about through an increased realization of the value of good, realistic conservation programs; a continuation of a well planned series of experiments in agricultural research, and an unslacking drive to further improve our routes of internal communication.

As the projections made by the Department of Agriculture reveal very clearly—we must make plans now so that the coming generations of Americans will be born in a strong, self-sufficient nation. There can be no room for friction within our ranks. After all, we all seek one thing—the preservation and conservation of our natural resources and their utilization in the most practical manner.

It is true that there are many divergent views as to how best this can be accomplished, particularly in the field of conservation.

However, in my judgment, there is not only room for all existing types of conservation programs, but they are all urgently required, particularly those which have been successful in preserving our two most precious resources, soil and water.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am not unaware of the raging battles which we have had to fight in the past to preserve and maintain the various soil and water conserving programs presently being conducted by the Department of Agriculture.

It was not too many years ago that the Secretary of Agriculture sent the Congress a reorganization plan which held out the possibility of being used in such a way as to adversely shift the structures and functions of some of the existing soil and water conserving agencies. This reorganization plan met with the approval of my committee only after we received assurances from the Secretary that no such shifts would be initiated without first obtaining the approval of our committee.

I want to be particularly emphatic in telling this audience that my position has not changed, nor do I believe the position of the Agriculture Committee has changed, since that time. I do not propose to countenance, much less endorse, activities from any source whatsoever which have as their purpose the hamstringing or shackling of any existing agricultural conservation program.

The fact is that what agriculture needs today is unity, not dissension. What farmers need, and what farmers deserve, are peacemakers, not agitators. Those who seek to divide farmers from farmers, or farmers from consumers, are doing a great disservice to themselves, our agriculture, and our Nation's future.

It would be nothing less than folly for us to fail to work together as a team, in pursuit of our common goal. We must have unity in our efforts.

Today's newspapers are abundantly supplied with one very good example of how in disunity there is weakness. I refer specifically to the current missile lag, where, apparently, the members of our defense establishment are more concerned over who is going to have authority over what project, than as to the successful completion of that project for the betterment of our country. This is a lesson I think we should all heed.

What all of us strive for is the future of our children. We were bequeathed a legacy of a rich, fruitful land by our forefathers. They worked hard to develop it and to make a strong, vigorous America.

We can scarcely do less for those who will follow us.

I thank you very much.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I include in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times on February 16, 1960, which emphasizes the willingness of State and local authorities to provide the necessary public authorities to administer Federal assistance to commuter systems at the local level. The proposed tristate agency plan dovetails with my bill, H.R. 10343, which furnishes Federal loans to metropolitan authorities for improvement of commuter lines. This plan of the New York Metropolitan Regional Council is unique in that it is the first interstate approach to the commuter system problems. As in the case of a program being worked out in the city of Philadelphia, this plan anticipates Federal assistance. The article:

THREE-STATE BOARD IS PROPOSED TO HELP COMMUTER LINES—REGIONAL COUNCIL WOULD SET UP AGENCY FOR CHANNELING FUNDS—NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, CONNECTICUT BACKING SEEN

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

A new tri-state transport agency to deal with commuter problems was proposed yesterday by the metropolitan regional council.

It won immediate endorsement from Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, of Connecticut. New Jersey's Governor, Robert B. Meyner, promised prompt consideration. New York State support is expected to be forthcoming.

A joint New York-Connecticut inquiry into the financing and accounting practices of the New Haven Railroad was also proposed by the council. The project evoked immediate and favorable response from Connecticut. It will be presented soon to the New York State Public Service Commission.

The new commuter-aid program was evolved by the regional council, which represents 21 counties and 15 cities of the New York metropolitan region.

The program was submitted to Governor Ribicoff yesterday by Maxwell Lehman, deputy New York City administrator and executive secretary of the council, and Herbert Baldwin, of Westport, Conn., chairman of the council's transportation committee.

Mr. Ribicoff suggested that the tristate transport agency be set up by action of the three Governors of the States involved, because the Connecticut Legislature was not now in session.

The agency would consist of representatives of the three States plus representatives of the city of New York and the regional council.

The precise powers of the agency have not been entirely defined. However, its principal purpose would be to serve as a medium for channeling public aid to the commuter lines. It would be empowered to accept grants-in-aid from local, State, and Federal sources to be transferred to railroads. It would also be empowered to receive Federal loans such as will be proposed in a bill to be introduced in Congress soon.

Another function of the agency would be to ascertain actual deficits suffered by railroads in commuter traffic and establish formulas for allocating the deficits. It might also negotiate leases with the rail carriers, and set specific services that would be provided.

It would draft plans for the long-range improvement of services and possibly for the integration of some existing facilities. At the outset its sphere would be strictly rail, but broader activities involving other transport media would be envisaged.

FULL ACCEPTANCE LIKELY

The regional council met privately with Governor Meyner last week and outlined its plans to him. Mr. Meyner, it was learned, agreed to give the new agency prompt consideration if Governor Ribicoff would go along with the idea.

Mr. Meyner's reluctance to go forward until Connecticut support was assured was believed to stem from past differences that had prevented the development of a tristate approach to the transport problem. Mr. Ribicoff's support appeared to remove a major obstacle to setting up the new agency.

The agency has the strong support of Mayor Wagner and was expected to receive the backing of Governor Rockefeller.

Connecticut's public utilities commission already has underway an inquiry into the New Haven Railroad's finances. However, the proposed bistate inquiry would be much more penetrating. It would be directed toward two goals—a close examination of all of the New Haven's financial practices and methods of allocating costs in commuter service.

The regional council will now place the proposal for a bistate inquiry before the New York Public Service Commission.

PLEA IN WASHINGTON TODAY

WASHINGTON, February 15.—A delegation of State, municipal and eastern railroad leaders will descend on Washington tomorrow to lobby for low-interest Federal loans to aid the ailing railroad commuter services.

The group will include Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania, 10 city government heads and 1 deputy mayor and the top officials of 12 railroads. Mayor Wagner, of New York, will be on hand, as will a representative from the office of Governor Rockefeller.

They have scheduled meetings with the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Congress and with subcommittees of the House and Senate dealing with surface transportation. Sessions also are planned with Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce, and Robert Merriam, a White House assistant to President Eisenhower.

The program the delegation will urge, modeled on one developed for Philadelphia, calls for long-term, low-interest Federal loans to municipalities to buy and lease new commuter equipment. It also calls for a study of grants-in-aid to cities on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis for other improvements in local and regional rail transportation.

Other municipal representatives scheduled to be present are the mayors of Newark, Cleveland, Boston, Chicago, Philadel-

phia, Baltimore, Wilmington, Del., and Milwaukee.

The railroads to be represented by top executives are the Pennsylvania, Long Island, Lehigh Valley, Boston and Maine; Central Railroad of New Jersey; New York Central; Delaware Lackawanna & Western Baltimore & Ohio; Erie; New York, New Haven & Hartford, and the Reading.

Conference on Disarmament and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a group of prominent Americans recently concluded a conference on disarmament and peace. At the initiative of Michigan's Gov. G. Mennen Williams, who has sponsored in the past other conferences on questions of public interest, this conference was held on January 29–31 in Ann Arbor, Mich.

The conferees were from three main groups: physical scientists, political and social scientists, and present and former disarmament negotiators.

Among the signatories to the statement were Benjamin H. Cohen, former delegate to the United Nations and disarmament adviser to former President Truman; Dr. William Davidon, associate physicist at the Argonne Laboratory, LaMont, Ill.; Prof. Hans Morgenthau, visiting lecturer in political science at Johns Hopkins University; Prof. Eugene Rabinowitz of the University of Illinois, and editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; Prof. J. David Singer, department of political science at the University of Michigan; and Prof. Alfred Stern of the philosophy department at Wayne State University.

In view of this variety of backgrounds and wealth of experience and competence, the conclusions and recommendations take on special significance. They cover most of the key areas in disarmament.

I ask unanimous consent that the conclusions and recommendations of this conference be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the conclusions and recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DISARMAMENT AND PEACE CONFERENCE, INGALLS HOUSE, ANN HARBOR, JANUARY 29–31, 1960

The fundamental conflict between the Soviet bloc and ourselves is an unavoidable fact in the world today. This conflict can end in a nuclear holocaust. Or it may be resolved, slowly and painfully, through peaceful competition. The tremendous destructive capabilities of modern weapons are a major factor in building the tensions that can destroy our civilization, by impetuous action, by miscalculation or even by accident. Soon, not only the major powers but the rulers of other nations will be able to push a button and to start a chain reaction which may end in an all-out nuclear war.

We believe that effective arms control is necessary to deflect the conflict into less perilous channels. The time to act is now. Unlimited increases in retaliatory power, on both sides, will make the balance more unstable, and every new hand that holds the bomb makes its control more difficult.

The purpose of arms control, as we see it, is not just to mitigate the consequences of war, but to help prevent war itself. The Russians must share with us a common interest in arms control as a means to that end. The Western World has not sufficiently explored this area of common interest.

AN ESSENTIAL STEP

A workable agreement, with effective controls, to end testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, outer space, under water and underground, is an essential step toward the reduction of armaments. It would slow down nuclear weapons development; it would retard the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries; it would establish the first international inspection and control system in the field of nuclear disarmament; and it would be a precedent for real disarmament.

We recognize that under present conditions no detection system can be 100 percent effective. But the risk to our national security that some tests may escape detection must be weighed against the risk of allowing the negotiations to break down, and the arms race to continue unabated. Therefore, the proposed joint agreement among the nuclear powers to conduct a joint research program should be launched as soon as possible and, in any event, as part of the test ban agreement.

Of particular importance is the need to develop improved detection methods for small-yield or muffled underground tests. This research program might include nuclear tests carried out jointly, and under international supervision, including any nations interested in sending observers.

TEST BAN ONLY ONE STEP

A nuclear test ban agreement is only a first step. The next step toward nuclear disarmament may be to cut off the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, under effective international controls. So far only preliminary studies have been made. More comprehensive studies should be initiated by our Government immediately.

The final step of nuclear disarmament must involve the reduction and ultimate liquidation of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. We recognize the difficulties of reliable control of these steps but urge that they too be made the subject, without delay, of a comprehensive study. In addition to the cessation of nuclear weapons materials production, the major weapons delivery systems should be controlled. To this end the United States should purpose that all launchings of outer space vehicles should be subject to international inspection and permitted only for peaceful purposes.

SURPRISE ATTACK AND ACCIDENTAL WAR

The major powers must also act to reduce the danger of surprise attack. Although it appears to be difficult to guard against a deliberate surprise attack with massive nuclear weapons delivered by long-range missiles, the United States must take the initiative in improving existing detection systems and developing new ones such as the reconnaissance satellite. The better the detection system, the more timely the warning of surprise attack. The more timely the warning, the surer the retaliation, and hence the less advantageous the surprise attack.

Surprise attacks resulting from miscalculation or accident my be more easily avoided by improved detection techniques and the establishment of international inspection systems, in order to obtain better knowledge of the other side's intentions. The possibility of surprise attack with non-nuclear arms (or tactical atomic weapons) may be reduced by geographical inspection zones and agreements to thin out ground forces and armaments in areas of potential conflict. This thinning-out process might further reduce political tensions in whatever area it was applied.

COMMUNIST CHINA PARTICIPATION

In any substantial arms control program, the participation of Communist China must be considered. In any general reduction of conventional armaments, or in the establishment of inspection zones in Asia to guard against surprise attack, its participation is essential.

LIMITED WAR AND CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL

No arms control pragram is complete without attention to the problem of limited war. The immediate casualties are no less real than in a major war, and the danger of expansion is ever present. Prompt settlement of political disputes is the best preventative for limited war. But the major powers also have an obligation not to facilitate limited conflict through large shipments of weapons to areas of tension, such as the Middle East.

Simultaneously with, and independently of, the progress of nuclear disarmament, attention should be devoted to the limitations and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons. Such exploration may result in a conventional disarmament which would materially reduce the possibility of limited wars breaking out.

A NATIONAL PEACE RESEARCH AGENCY

The U.S. Government, as presently organized, is greatly handicapped in its pursuit of a stable peace, especially by way of arms control, by the haphazard treatment of the technological aspects of agreements to be negotiated with other nations. Our negotiators have great difficulty in obtaining the most recent, reliable data which have a bearing upon our negotiating positions. There is, therefore, an urgent need for a separate and independent National Peace Research Agency to supply the appropriate agencies of the Government with authoritative scientific and technical information. This agency will have the primary responsibility for the investigation of the technical aspects of disarmament proposals, and the development of international control and inspection systems.

The National Peace Research Agency would organize investigations of its own and would contract with already established institutions. It would make investigations on its own initiative and would act upon the request of other agencies of the Government.

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

For the permanent resolution of disputes among nations, the rule of law must be substituted for the rule of force throughout the world. The spirit of international cooperation must find expression in a full range of working institutions, from a strengthened United Nations and an effective World Court, to others not yet created or imagined. No longer can any nation or any group of nations achieve real security without providing for the common security of all nations. The extension of the rule of law cannot be achieved in a single giant stride; but the United States must seize every opportunity to strengthen international institutions. Furthermore, it is no longer possible for the economically advanced nations to be indifferent to the economic fate of the less advanced nations. For these reasons we suggest, for example, that the United States channel an increasing proportion of foreign aid through the United Nations; that it accept the World Court's determination of its own jurisdiction; and that it promote the establishment

of international scientific advisory groups to consider the technical problems of disarmament and other forms of international scientific cooperation.

Arctic Health Research Center at Anchorage, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the program and plight of the Arctic Health Research Center at Anchorage, Alaska. The center, first established by the Public Health Service in 1948 has made a successful start in the accumulation of knowledge about Arctic and subarctic environment and its relationship to man's health, but is being throttled by tight budgetary actions. This center, as the only facility of its kind under the American flag, needs strengthening as a very important part of our total health research effort.

The following portion of an article published in the Anchorage Times on October 10, 1959 under the byline of A. Robert Smith, Times correspondent of Washington, D.C., highlights the problem as a matter of national interest:

At one of his summer news conferences, Secretary Flemming was asked by this reporter about statements made by the director of the center that indicated increased funds would be needed or the center would gradually dry up as an effective research lab into the many unknown areas of man's health problems in a low temperature environment. Flemming said he would have to look into it, but at the next news conference he declared:

"The Surgeon General tells me that the (Public Health) Service has every intention of continuing and strengthening this research center. It is the only such facility on this continent and its work on the problems of low temperature areas of human health is a very significant part of our total research effort. The Arctic Health Research Center is, in fact, becoming increasingly important. With statehood, the development of exploration and economic resources will increase in Alaska, and with the growth of the jet air transportation the area's commerce and defense importance is increasing."

Secretary Flemming, in effect, confirmed Director A. B. Colyar's forecast when he noted that the center has had to continue operating on the same budget each year since it was established in 1948, while at the same time it has felt the pinch of increased costs during this period.

Flemming made it very plain that he is sympathetic to the aims and program of the Arctic Research Center. The obstacle to getting more funds lies not with the Secretary, but with the Bureau of the Budget which has vetoed requests for increases in the center's operating budget.

Some time ago, Flemming's Department drew up a statement of research goals that is tied in with the growth of Alaska's population and with rivalry from Russia in the field of conquering the problems of cold climate regions. It said:

"People from the United States going to Alaska will require standards of housing, waste disposal, water supply, heat, food, insect control, general sanitation, and health and medical services compatible with the standards enjoyed in the United States. The technical knowledge necessary to meet this demand is not presently available to us and will require considerable expansion of our research effort. The lack of this knowledge has impeded the population and the optimum utilization of these areas of the United States ever since we acquired Alaska in 1867 * * *. Unless we expand our present knowledge, the level of public health in Alaska will in the next decade fall far below any other part of the United States. Other nations with Arctic land areas, principally Russia, are now better able to populate and utilize these areas on a substantial scale than is the United States. Our goal is to eliminate this discrepancy and make possible the use of this vast land area."

Asian Center in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HIRAM L. FONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Asian Center in Hawaii," which appeared on the editorial page of the Korean Republic, Seoul, Korea, on December 4, 1959. The subject matter of this editorial is the proposed Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, which the Secretary of State, in his report to the Congress dated December 30, 1959, recognized "could constitute a valuable long-term contribution to the promotion of better relations and understanding among the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIAN CENTER IN HAWAII

Ideas of great inspiration do not come along very often—perhaps once in a generation.

We think one is developing now in connection with the suggestion that a center for Asian studies be established in Hawaii, the 50th State of the American Union.

The center would fill an important and increasing need. Many universities of the West offer various Asian studies, but there is a natural tendency to specialize, and there is no center that covers all the major languages and cultures.

Through such an enterprise, Asians would come to know more about themselves and each other. All countries and all peoples of the region presumably would be represented among both faculty and students.

Hawaii is the ideal location for the center. Its climate is a compromise, and acceptable to those from both temperate and tropical zones. But of even greater consequence is Hawaii's racial tolerance and integration.

Of all places in the world, Hawaii is that which gives most dramatic answer to the contentions of the racists. Not only has intermarriage taken place on a large scale, but peoples of diverse colors and creeds live and work together in harmony and without discrimination.

Now that Hawaii is a State, this will have mounting impact on the evolution of racial problems on the mainland. The Asian center could spread the ripples of similar influence in the direction of the Far East, where national differences pose many difficulties.

It might be well to establish the center on international ground, much as is the case with the United Nations in New York, and to place the joint administration in the hands of the United States and the participating free Asian nations.

The experience of such an endeavor would represent a long step in the direction of more effective international controls and security.

Concept of a Hawaii center of Asian studies and research should stir the imaginations of all who care about the amalgam of East and West and should bring the project to the point of implementation in the earliest possible future.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 42d anniversary of the independence of the people of Lithuania. Each year it has been a custom of the Congress of the United States to note this day as a tribute to the courage, faith, and patriotism of the Lithuanian people throughout the world and to encourage their continued fight against the communistic philosophy. We in the United States who have enjoyed freedom can sympathize more than any other people with the Lithuanians because we can recognize better the tremendous and admirable struggle they have maintained throughout the years against the tyrants of the Soviet Union. It has been 20 years since the Soviets first occupied Lithuania and even today the Lithuanians are resisting their old enemy with the same courage that they manifested during the first years of occupation. Let this day, therefore, be a constant reminder to the people of the United States of the evils of communism; let it also be a symbol of the meaning of courage and, finally, let it be a memorial to all of the people of Lithuania throughout the world.

I join with the Members of this House in honoring all those who strive valiantly for freedom which should be theirs and join in fervent hope that true freedom and independence will come to the people of Lithuania.

The Battle of Pea Ridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Ralph McGill in his column in the Washington Evening Star of February 11 discussed a little known, but very important battle of the Civil War. The Battle of Pea Ridge is not as well known as the Battles of Gettysburg, Bull Run, or Vicksburg, but the outcome of the Battle of Pea Ridge was a crucial turning point for the Civil War. This battle marked the end of any substantial Confederate threat west of the Mississippi.

I am pleased to report that this important engagement is being appropriately recognized by our Government. In the very near future the land upon which this battle occurred will be designated as the Pea Ridge Battlefield National Park. The land for the park has not cost the Federal Government 1 cent. It was purchased by the State of Arkansas for donation to the Federal Government. I am pleased to have been a coauthor of the legislation which authorized the establishment of this park. The Department of Interior appropriation bill contains funds for the initiation of the project, and I am hopeful that the park will become a reality in the near future. I know that all readers of the RECORD will be interested in Ralph McGill's account of this important battle. I ask unanimous consent to have his column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORY OF PEA RIDGE BATTLE OF 1862—SITE OF EARLY UNION VICTORY IN ARKANSAS CALLED WORTHY TO BE NATIONAL PARK

(By Ralph McGill)

Arkansas is asking the Union, in the centennial year of the Civil War, to accept the Pea Ridge battlefield as a national park. Governor Faubus has not insisted on segregation and the offer likely will be accepted. It should be.

This might serve to give to the largely abandoned Ozark farm area the dignity its name has denied. It was a small battle with large results. When the Confederates and their allies, a brigade of Cherokee Indians, were there decimated on March 8, 1862, the fate of the Confederacy was almost certainly doomed. Save for raids and a few futile maneuvers, the Confederacy soon thereafter ceased to exist west of the Mississippi River.

As long as they lived, the soldiers of Gen. Sam Curtis' Federal command remembered the Cherokee Indians and how they shot them out of trees like big squirrels. The Cherokees had never seen a cannon, much less heard one fired. They were armed with rifles and scalping knives, and Gen. Albert Pike, who had fetched them there, had great hopes for them.

But it was a bad day for the noble red man, and for Johnny Reb as well. Not long after the war began in 1861, General Curtis was maneuvering troops in Missouri and making gestures which indicated invasion of Arkansas.

Early in 1862 he made his move. He marched from Springfield across the Arkansas line to Pea Ridge, and there entrenched.

West Pointer Gen. Earl Van Dorn, who was in charge of the Southern forces, was an intelligent, able man. He knew what defeat would mean—loss of the western Confederacy and control of the Mississippi. He determined to smash General Curtis and sent out word for help.

Sterling Price's Missourians and Ben McCulloch's Texans marched to aid him. They burned rail fences along the roads at night, to light the way. It was cold and snowy in the Ozarks. General Pike hurried from Oklahoma with his hastily recruited brigade of Indians. Once General Van Dorn had his army, about 10,000 men, he advanced. He met, and drove back, a small artillery force near Bentonville, which retreated back to General Curtis' line. He, too, had about 10,000 soldiers.

General Curtis revealed a knowledge of fighting suited to heavily wooded areas and steep hill slopes. He felled trees in great profusion across the roads. And, more important, he camouflaged his cannon.

On March 8 the battle was joined. A gallant charge was launched by the Confederates, who were largely untrained and without combat experience. Suddenly innocent-looking clumps of bushes ahead of them flamed and roared. Heavy loads of grape and canister struck the gray ranks. In the first minutes three of their generals were killed. There were no orders. General Curtis' gunners worked madly at their guns, and the results were soon before them in the bodies of the dead and wounded, and the Confederates in retreat.

The Cherokees got their wind up at the first blast of artillery. The effect of the loads of grape made them panic. Many literally took to the trees. It was March. A fairly heavy snow was on the ground. The Indians in the leafless trees were huge targets against the background of white. General Curtis' riflemen gleefully shot them out of the trees, themselves whooping like Indians.

General Van Dorn took his men south, retreating slowly into Mississippi. General Curtis moved on southward to the Mississippi, occupying Helena on the river itself. It was his fate to perform well, but lose battles.

There was one Confederate who had a unique, if painful, experience at Pea Ridge. This was Sgt. Henderson Virden of the 2d Arkansas. In 1861, he went off to war from his farm at Pea Ridge. His regiment was marched back there by General Van Dorn. Some of the hottest fighting was on Sergeant Virden's own acres. He was badly wounded, falling in his own pea-patch, and was carried into his own house and laid out on the floor with others. He remained there to recover and rejoined his regiment, living out the war and returning to Pea Ridge.

Tribute to Msgr. Lucyan Bojnowski, a Great Priest and a Great Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, in the busy city of New Britain, Conn., a great American and a beloved spiritual leader will celebrate his 92d birthday.

Msgr. Lucyan Bojnowski, a truly heroic figure of a man, well deserves the tributes he will receive from the city for whose growth and progress he has been so largely responsible. His life has brought him honors and fame, but I know that he takes his greatest satisfaction from having helped the cause of humanity—a cause to which he has devoted a long and industrious life.

Born in Poland on February 20, 1868, he came to the United States and was ordained a priest in 1895. In that same year he was assigned to priestly duties in New Britain, the city with which he has been so closely identified for the 65 years since.

It is typical of the man that he helped built with his own hands his first church in New Britain, working alongside the ditch digger, the bricklayer and the carpenter. When the first Church of the Sacred Heart was completed and dedicated, he founded a Polish library, where he instructed hundreds of immigrants in English and other subjects and helped prepare them for citizenship. Next he established a newspaper, the Catholic Leader, a publication whose editorial influence has crossed the oceans. As an editor he won international fame, and some of the world's most illustrious figures engaged in correspondence with this busy Connecticut priest for whom the day never had enough hours.

He established an orphanage, which cared not only for Polish children but for youngsters of every racial background.

Far before his time, he saw and understood the desire of their elderly to spend their declining years in decent, homelike surroundings. The result was St. Lucian's Home for the Aged, which was a landmark in its field.

Monsignor Bojnowski, as his parish activities kept ever expanding, realized the need for trained, dedicated assistance. The result was the founding of a new religious order, the Congregation of the Daughters of Mary of the Immaculate Conception, whose beautiful Motherhouse now stands in New Britain.

He built schools, he built a new church. He gave friendly guidance to thousands on thousands of parishioners through the years. He was a community leader, in the forefront of every major civic enterprise. It was only natural, then, that a whole community rejoiced when, in 1946, this humble pastor was elevated to the rank of Monsignor of the Catholic Church.

In the heart of this man of God has always burned a flaming love of freedom. When World War I broke out, he saw at once the danger to the free world. Long before the United States entered the war, he was instrumental in raising large contingents of volunteers to leave for Canada, where they were trained for service overseas. When the United States declared war, he saw to it that the Polish-American families of his city contributed far more than their share of men to the services. He directed Liberty Loan drives; he visited camps; he kept in correspondence with hundreds of young men.

To the rectory where lived this simple man there came many of the great of the world, including Prime Minister

Paderewski of Poland, the legendary hero, General Haller, Archbishop Cieplak, Archbishop Dubowski, and many more.

To Monsignor Bojnowski have come many personal honors and awards. To name a few, he has received the Order of St. Lazarus, the Gold Star of General Haller, the Fidelitas Medal and the Order of St. George.

His has been a life of great achievement, but he has ever remained a simple, holy man. He has helped to build a city; he had been the spiritual guide for a large portion of that city's population. He has fostered a love of America and a love of democracy that for decades have influenced a whole community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to salute Monsignor Bojnowski for a lifetime of service to mankind, to America, and to the city he loves so dearly. Knowing him, I know that more important to him than the medals and the honors is the fact that we, who owe so much to him, love him for his simple goodness and the boundless warmth of his great heart.

Peace Through Understanding—The Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Fort Smith Southwest American of February 8 contained a short article concerning the activities of a group which is contributing a great deal to promotion of international understanding and good will.

The article explains how the Arkansas Foundation for the International Exchange of Students has contributed to the success of the student exchange program. The unselfish and dedicated work of the members of this organization has not been properly recognized. I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the fine work which they are doing to insure that foreign students at the University of Arkansas receive a good impression of our country and its people. The important work of this foundation is being duplicated by similar groups at colleges and universities throughout the country. Their contributions to the success of our exchange program are immeasurable.

I think that all Senators will be interested in reading this account of how one small group of citizens is helping us win friends throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELPING PEACE THROUGH UNDERSTANDING IS AIM OF ARKANSAS STUDENT FOUNDATION

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.—Promoting peace through understanding—that's the aim of the Arkansas Foundation for the International Exchange of Students.

The foundation is doing its part to advance peace through faith and confidence among people from different countries. To this end, the group works to bring foreign students to the University of Arkansas Fayetteville campus to study.

The foundation, 11 years old, brought 13 foreign students to Arkansas this year and was indirectly responsible for bringing a 14th.

Since 1949, when a group of university faculty members and students got together to form the foundation, nearly 125 students from other lands have rubbed elbows with Arkansas.

The students come from all over the world—Latin America, the Far East, Middle East and Europe.

When the foundation was established, its charter members felt that a movement to get foreign students to Arkansas was appropriate since it would bring them to the alma mater of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, whose legislation created the whole exchange program. The Fulbright Act for Educational Exchanges has since been described as the most profitable investment ever authorized by Congress.

The university has profited by it—and from other exchange arrangements that have come in its wake—by acquiring a continuing group of international students who leave a better understanding of the world's peoples with Arkansas and take a better understanding of America home with them.

Because the Fulbright act provides only for foreign students' travel expenses, the foundation must raise funds annually to cover the cost of a year's study at the university. The number of students the foundation can bring to the university each year varies with the amount of support given on the campus and throughout the State.

The foundation raises funds for board and room, fees and tuition. Because it is a State-supported school, the university cannot provide scholarships for foreign students.

Foundation support comes from individuals and from civic, religious, social, and service groups over the State. For example, the Arkansas Federation of Women's Clubs makes available $600 annually for the room and board of one woman student in a dormitory. Rotary clubs at Fayetteville, Rogers, and Springdale give continuing financial help. Fraternities and sororities contribute by giving room and board to some of the students.

How much financial support the students will need is known before they arrive. Every foreign applicant for a grant or scholarship to study in the United States is screened by the Institute of International Education in New York. The Arkansas foundation then selects from the list of applicants students most likely to work out well in the university community.

As a rule, the foreign students are good scholars. Some of them have obtained degrees at the university. Many are now teachers, scientists, business or administration leaders in their own countries

To aid in social adjustment, the foundation plans parties, helps in arranging tours through the State, and "places" foreign students in private homes during the holidays

Dr. Ann Riley Vizzier, assistant professor of history and president of the foundation, said:

"As we enter the second decade in the history of the foundation, we're looking forward to continuing this worthwhile and important program We hope to still better acquaint our international students with the people and customs of the State."

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged—XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most priceless assets a State or Nation can possess is its young men.

These younger men, growing into the period where they become the masons charged with construction of a better world, are an indispensable factor in the elan vital which energizes and inspires a Nation or State to improve itself and reach for greatness and growth.

Today, my State of West Virginia is losing its young men and the loss is more potentially catastrophic than the decline of our coal markets, the high unemployment in the State, or the pressing social needs facing West Virginia.

The annual report of the West Virginia Department of Veterans' Affairs, recently released, contains an almost-completed breakdown on the payment of the State's bonus payments to veterans who served in the Korean conflict.

On previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out that in proportion to its population, the State of West Virginia ranks first in the entire Nation in the number of its citizens who served in the Korean conflict. I have also presented official statistics to demonstrate that in proportion to its population West Virginia also ranks first in the Nation in the number of its citizens who were killed and wounded in the service of their country during the Korean conflict.

At the time of their service to the Nation, most of these young men were between 18 and 26 years old. This means that they are now between 25 and 33 years old—entering their most productive wage-earning years. At the threshold of their years of greatest energy and power, where are these young veterans? Are they in West Virginia, grappling with the State's social and economic problems and helping to build a better State for their sons and daughters? Are they able to find employment in the State so they, as West Virginia natives, can share in the Nation's prosperity and plan for a secure future?

The answer to this, sadly, is negative. The bonus payment report shows that a staggering total of 43.32 percent of the claims by veterans were received from West Virginians now living outside the State. This is an incalculable loss to the State.

A total of 48.25 percent of the cash paid out in the bonus program went out of the State. A total of 34,783 claims were approved to Mountain State veterans now gone from the State. They shared a total payment of $10,331,532. Conversely, 46,366 claims were approved for veterans still living within the State, totaling $11,033,383.

This means that almost half our State's young men, when they marched

home from serving their country, could not find suitable employment within the State, and had to go elsewhere to seek jobs.

The political subdivision which claimed the largest number of our veterans was not Kanawha County, the State's largest, with nearly an eighth of the State's population. It was the State of Ohio, which now houses 6,890 West Virginia veterans, compared with only 6,612 for Kanawha County.

My own county of Cabell, second largest in the State, was outdistanced by four States, although Cabell County contained 2,899 Korean veterans. These States were Ohio, 6,890; New York, 3,988; California, 3,645; and Virginia, 2,999.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about this grave situation. Our State has the capacity, the resources, and the desire for growth. But it cannot grow unless the manpower, such as is provided by these young men entering their most fruitful years, is able to stay in the State and make a living.

Recently an article in the Saturday Evening Post by an itinerant writer presented a rather distorted picture of West Virginia. Yet there is no denying the fact that there are pockets of unemployment and we are not enjoying the level of prosperity which other States enjoy.

Fourteen times previously I have pointed out that my State is grossly neglected by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and many other Federal agencies, in the allocation of facilities, personnel, and payrolls. If West Virginia could obtain only its just share in the apportionment of Federal facilities, it might keep many of these young leaders in the State, where they could provide invaluable contributions to the future welfare of West Virginia.

As Browning put it:

"Therefore I summon age,
To grant youth's heritage."

Mr. Speaker, the following table substantiates the tragic exodus of West Virginia's young people from their homeland:

Korean bonus payments to West Virginia veterans with West Virginia addresses

County	Veterans		Survivors		Grand total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Barbour	327	$69,450	14	$4,165	341	$73,615
Berkeley	786	195,410	25	4,775	811	200,185
Boone	696	166,715	23	5,040	719	171,755
Braxton	332	76,375	9	1,295	341	77,670
Brooke	632	158,964	7	1,655	639	160,619
Cabell	2,899	699,780	40	8,090	2,939	707,870
Calhoun	239	58,450	9	1,620	248	60,070
Clay	295	71,535	15	3,010	310	74,545
Doddridge	142	33,875	3	755	145	34,630
Fayette	1,502	364,495	57	12,085	1,559	376,580
Gilmer	173	37,845	6	1,395	179	39,240
Grant	174	38,145	9	2,310	183	40,455
Greenbrier	899	200,215	33	6,868	932	216,083
Hampshire	249	54,895	8	1,255	257	56,150
Hancock	962	227,165	10	1,900	972	229,125
Hardy	228	64,815	10	1,690	238	66,505
Harrison	2,138	518,170	38	6,995	2,176	525,165
Jackson	340	85,730	8	1,535	348	86,665
Jefferson	376	91,990	7	1,775	383	93,765
Kanawha	6,465	1,566,855	147	32,954	6,612	1,599,809
Lewis	456	111,180	25	5,330	481	116,510
Lincoln	432	97,530	11	1,835	443	99,365
Logan	1,458	336,055	42	6,248	1,500	342,303
Marion	1,800	449,165	26	4,620	1,826	453,785
Marshall	1,654	258,400	15	2,937	1,669	261,337
Mason	454	109,250	9	1,925	463	111,175
McDowell	1,528	353,520	62	11,395	1,590	364,915
Mercer	1,755	414,170	56	12,318	1,811	426,488
Mineral	584	146,760	11	3,045	595	149,805
Mingo	858	$199,210	30	$6,290	888	$205,500
Monongalia	1,478	353,650	24	4,910	1,502	358,560
Monroe	275	63,145	7	2,090	282	65,235
Morgan	218	53,425	4	500	222	53,925
Nicholas	542	122,900	17	2,724	559	125,624
Ohio	1,577	378,290	32	5,798	1,609	384,028
Pendleton	159	39,365	8	1,935	167	41,300
Pleasants	158	34,415	5	445	163	34,860
Pocahontas	217	51,535	5	1,030	222	52,565
Preston	614	143,310	18	3,195	632	146,505
Putnam	437	104,380	4	655	441	105,035
Raleigh	1,990	457,740	74	16,165	2,064	483,905
Randolph	669	161,325	28	7,140	697	168,465
Ritchie	247	58,470	9	1,750	256	60,220
Roane	338	82,725	6	1,000	344	83,725
Summers	367	80,695	11	1,950	378	82,645
Taylor	364	89,335	8	1,535	372	90,930
Tucker	230	61,110	9	1,720	239	62,830
Tyler	198	44,665	6	805	204	45,470
Upshur	350	79,870	15	2,980	365	82,850
Wayne	825	196,830	20	3,582	845	200,412
Webster	288	68,725	17	3,125	305	71,850
Wetzel	473	111,530	10	1,930	483	113,460
Wirt	93	23,880	4	720	97	24,600
Wood	2,121	534,210	36	8,875	2,157	543,085
Wyoming	745	176,475	18	3,070	763	179,545
Total	45,206	10,846,574	1,160	236,809	46,366	11,083,383

Korean bonus payments to West Virginia veterans with out-of-State addresses

State	Number	Amount
Alabama	253	$78,780
Alaska	26	7,585
Arizona	271	81,210
Arkansas	114	36,780
California	3,645	1,170,066
Colorado	304	94,650
Connecticut	124	36,035
Delaware	218	63,490
Florida	1,543	454,070
Georgia	678	210,170
Hawaii	99	29,130
Idaho	50	14,013
Illinois	828	241,310
Indiana	368	98,640
Iowa	39	11,130
Kansas	266	85,070
Kentucky	872	279,180
Louisiana	311	97,680
Maine	117	38,045
Maryland	1,957	556,100
Massachusetts	402	123,800
Michigan	1,108	295,500
Minnesota	75	22,010
Mississippi	112	35,175
Missouri	195	58,815
Montana	55	16,370
Nebraska	100	30,295
Nevada	65	21,080
New Hampshire	58	18,115
New Jersey	482	150,250
New Mexico	254	79,700
New York	3,988	1,315,152
North Carolina	700	213,355
North Dakota	14	3,865
Ohio	6,890	1,776,290
Oklahoma	242	78,950
Oregon	56	15,465
Pennsylvania	1,117	309,410
Rhode Island	106	35,405

Korean bonus payments to West Virginia veterans with out-of-State addresses—Con.

State	Number	Amount
South Carolina	522	$163,905
South Dakota	48	14,275
Tennessee	251	71,265
Texas	1,238	384,655
Utah	57	17,785
Vermont	17	4,325
Virginia	2,999	904,085
Washington	643	212,535
Wisconsin	97	27,725
Wyoming	31	10,025
District of Columbia	703	206,100
Canal Zone	66	23,375
Belgium	1	400
Bermuda	1	400
Canada	21	6,935
Colombia	4	1,380
Germany	4	1,525
Ireland	1	400
Mexico	1	300
Newfoundland	1	400
North Africa	1	345
Puerto Rico	11	3,225
Venzuela	1	400
Holland	1	400
Nicaragua	1	400
Total	34,783	10,331,532

Summary of payments

	Number	Amount
In-State claims	46,366	$11,083,383
Out-of-State claims	34,783	10,331,532
Grand total	81,149	21,414,915

Valuable Support for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a recent syndicated article, the great lady and distinguished American, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, gave a warm endorsement of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. As a sponsor of legislation to make this dream become a reality, I am delighted to have this bipartisan and family backing for this project. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from Mrs. Roosevelt's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MY DAY"
(By Eleanor Roosevelt)
JANUARY 28, 1960.

Congress has under consideration an appropriation of $889,400 for a memorial in Washington to Theodore Roosevelt. The de-

tails are in a published report on the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Celebration.

Fittingly enough, the memorial is an island in the Potomac River which would be made into a park to shelter the wild life Theodore Roosevelt loved so much. This park would be of great value to Washington's young people, as well as to their elders, and I hope that Congress will appropriate the money for it in this session so that the work on the memorial can be completed.

Theodore Roosevelt was my uncle. And although he was a Republican and not a Democrat, I think our citizens, both Republicans and Democrats, feel that he was one of our greatest and most colorful Presidents and that there should be a memorial to his memory in our capital.

True Discrimination: Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of February 12, 1960:

TRUE DISCRIMINATION: HATE

We have never tried or wanted to force ourselves in company or places where it was very obvious that we weren't welcomed or wanted. Indeed, to do such a thing is to invite a brush with the law, not to mention the more serious aspects of the act, such as the irreparable animosity which would result.

Up in our sister State of North Carolina Negro college students are staging "restaurant and cafe sitdown strikes" in an effort to force these establishments to serve them right along with white customers. Since Negroes weren't being served, it was, then, quite obvious that these cafes and eating places didn't want colored business, not on an integrated basis, anyway.

These demonstrations are, to say the least, ill-conceived and are being directed by students who apparently have not the forethought to realize that the ultimate damage to racial relations will by far outweight anything conceded them as a result of their seat-shining pranks.

The hate and lack of respect for some by a majority of the populace can make a person wish for hell itself. The meaning of the oft-used word "discrimination" has been approached only superficially, compared to what it will be if the Negro forces himself upon a white society and social custom where he is not wanted.

Discrimination, in the visual sense of the word, would disappear if the Negro succeeded in forcing himself into the white classroom, the white cafeteria, and other places displaying the "White Only" signs. In the place of the visual discrimination would come a far more damaging type of discrimination: HATE. Hate which burns in the heart, which is most effectively transmitted by icy stares, one to the other; in a collapse of friendships, in the complete collapse of cooperation between the races. This is discrimination in its worst, most damaging form.

And so we reiterate: these sitdown strikes are the brainstorms of Negroes who are not truly interested in the progress of their own race, else they would surely see that, in the end, their losses will by far outweigh their gains.

Burris C. Jackson: Cotton's Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to see a man receive recognition for his chosen work. Recently, Mr. Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, Tex., a man who has a long record of service to the cotton industry in Texas and nationally, was honored by being selected as "Cotton's Man of the Year for 1959."

Many publications carried stories about Mr. Jackson and his work, but the most excellent account which came to my attention was published in the Hillsboro Daily Mirror, Mr. Jackson's hometown newspaper. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the Hillsboro Daily Mirror of February 2, 1960, the story entitled: "Burris C. Jackson is Cotton's Man of the Year."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURRIS C. JACKSON IS COTTON'S MAN OF YEAR

Burris C. Jackson of Hillsboro has been named Cotton's Man of the Year for 1959, one of the top honors of the world cotton industry.

The selection was announced by the Cotton Digest, an international publication, that has been handling the man of the year in cotton for years. Some of the best known names in the cotton world have been selected in the past, and the requirements for selection are difficult to meet.

The article announcing Jackson's selection said that "it is doubtful if there has been a man who has given more freely of his time during the past quarter century to the American cotton industry than Burris Jackson. He has held many responsibilities that the industry gives only to a really top leader, and he has become a very potent spokesman for cotton."

"The mere enumeration of the positions that he presently holds will give an idea of his outstanding service and influence," the article stated, and it lists a number of his present positions, pointing out that he serves them all without compensation.

Jackson organized the Statewide Cotton Committee of Texas in 1937, the American Cotton Congress in 1940, and was one of the prime movers in establishing the National Cotton Association Council 21 years ago. He was president of the Texas Cotton Association in 1933, and has headed important committees every year since.

A leader in Congress said: "We trust Burris Jackson. He is well informed, and you can rely upon him. His loyalty is a thing to cherish."

Excerpts from the announcement say that "he is utterly devoted to his wife, Frances, who is herself, widely known and popular with cotton people. His loyalty to his friends and his ability to get things done are legend."

"At the age of 55, with more than 30 years of wide experience in cotton, Burris Jackson has become a senior cotton statesman."

The Hillsboro man is the son of the late Gen. Will E. Jackson, a pioneer cotton exporter, and prominent military leader, who was active in the business and civic life of Hillsboro and Texas for 40 years.

Burris Jackson married Frances Robertson in 1934. Her father was president of the Hill County Cotton Oil Co., Union Oil Mills, and Rio Grande Valley Cotton Oil Co. She is the sister of W. C. Robertson, Jr., of Hillsboro.

Cotton's Man of the Year will be presented a plaque with the inscription of some of his outstanding achievements.

L. C. Wannamaker Again Heads Camellia Society; Wife Shares Honors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of the Congress to honor, recently elected for the second time, a distinguished citizen from my district, Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, whose recent reelection as president of the American Camellia Society is a significant recognition of his service as president during 1959, and his outstanding contributions to the cultural world. Mr. Wannamaker has had distinguished service with the South Carolina Legislature, and eminent success as a lawyer and a banker.

I enclose an article from the Camden Chronicle which I would like to have placed in the RECORD. It tells the story of Mr. Wannamaker, and his lovely wife, and the story of a beautiful garden of nature, a camellia named the Gladys Wannamaker, honoring the devotion to things of beauty.

L. C. WANNAMAKER AGAIN HEADS CAMELLIA SOCIETY; WIFE SHARES HONORS

It was no surprise to Cheravians or even South Carolinians, that L. Caston Wannamaker was reelected president of the American Camellia Society at the national meeting in Jacksonville, Fla. Mr. Wannamaker had served a most successful tenure during 1959.

Sharing honors with her husband was Mrs. Wannamaker, who was featured in a delightful newspaper article in the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville. In a picture of the couple, accompanying the article, Mr. Wannamaker is shown as he pins the first lady of the American Camellia Society.

Twenty years ago Mrs. Wannamaker planted a single camellia bush in her home garden. There was nothing special about the plant—just one of many lush ones in the lady's garden.

Special things have stemmed from this particular gardening effort. Today her name is a familiar one to camellia fanciers all over the country.

They know her as Mrs. L. Caston Wannamaker, first lady of the American Camellia Society, and wife of the current president. They also know her as Gladys Wannamaker, the woman for whom a new variety of camellia has been named.

True she planted the first shrub, and true she took him to his first camellia show, but he has been taking her ever since. During camellia season, they attend a show every Saturday at his bidding.

The Gladys Wannamaker variety is a direct result of an idea he passed along when he was president of the South Carolina society several years ago. Mrs. Wannamaker relates that her husband suggested that

members of the group should begin experimenting with seedlings and should select the best one to be used as a membership promotion gimmick.

The chosen variety would become the property of the South Carolina society and in order for other fanciers to obtain a scion—they would first have to send in two new memberships to the South Carolina society.

Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Ashby, of Charleston, who care for over 15,000 camellia seedlings in their own garden produced that one, in thousands of seedlings, that matures and blooms with a superior and lovelier flower instead of an inferior one to that of the parentage. They named it Gladys Wannamaker as a tribute to their past state president's wife.

As far as the honoree knows, South Carolina's camellia society is the only group that has ever owned distribution rights on a variety registered with the American Camellia Society.

The Gladys Wannamaker is a particularly lovely variety, according to its namesake.

She describes it as a large, soft, semidouble bloom with golden stamen and four petaloids. It has dark, glossy foliage, is cold resistant, and does not shatter.

She adds that she could think of nothing more beautiful than the camellia to have her name tagged to.

Hull Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at a recent conference the Committee for a National Trade Policy reinstituted the Cordell Hull Award for service on behalf of trade cooperation. As we all know, it was awarded most deservedly to Speaker SAM RAYBURN. For the February 1 issue of Export Trade, B. A. Rittersporn, Jr., has written a lively and informative account of Mr. Sam's yeoman service for a liberal trade policy and has recalled the past awards. I recommend this article as a pertinent reminder of the problems which have historically faced a liberal trade program and as a source of ideas to overcome those problems.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HULL AWARD TO SPEAKER RAYBURN RENEWED LIBERAL TRADE HONOR—COMMITTEE FOR A NATIONAL TRADE POLICY CONTINUED TRADITION SET BY COFTE

(By B. A. Rittersporn, Jr.)

Speaker SAM RAYBURN received the Cordell Hull Award last Thursday, January 28, in Washington. The award presentation climaxed the Committee for a National Trade Policy's 2-day conference on "trade policy for the 1960's."

No one better deserves being honored in the name of Cordell Hull than the House's doughty "Mr. SAM." In recent years alone, the Speaker has repeatedly brought liberal trade legislation "through," despite fierce attacks of the High Tariff interests and often fainthearted support of the administration.

In 1955, for instance, Speaker RAYBURN literally snatched votes away from the protectionists as the House members filed out of their Chamber in a division on a key test of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension. Putting the heavy hand of national duty upon the shoulders of a half dozen Congressmen who strayed into the high tariff ranks—and with the political facts of life flashing from his eyes—the Speaker retrieved the votes necessary to pass the extension "intact."

Much of the credit for the extension of 1958 also goes to the Texan; he out-maneuvered the high tariff forces, lead by the late Richard Simpson, on every test.

The man who is to receive the Cordell Hull Award has, however, been honored by Secretary Hull, himself. He long ago singled RAYBURN out for his statesmanship, parliamentary skill and intense patriotism.

The praise stemmed, in part, from the close working relationship the two formed over more than 30 years of governmental service. Indeed, in terms of service, they were virtually contemporaries, for Speaker RAYBURN arrived in Washington in 1913, only 6 years after Hull.

A LIBERAL TRADE POLICY

Hull was battling for a liberal trade policy when young RAYBURN arrived. The Tennessean based all on this proposition: "* * * unhampered trade dovetails with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers and unfair economic competition, with war." As far back as 1916, he called for a "permanent international trade congress," thereby anticipating by almost 40 years the Randall Commission's proposal for an organization for trade cooperation—which may now be at least partially revived in some sort of Atlantic organization for economic cooperation.

But most importantly, of course, the award presentation commemorated Secretary Hull's historic role in creating the reciprocal trade agreements program—and honored SAM RAYBURN for the yeoman work he has done in carrying it forward. In addition, however, the award, as originated by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, has had the aim of setting up a standard around which liberal trade groups throughout the Nation can rally during the new session of Congress.

As a medium for alerting the Nation and galvanizing liberal trade supporters, past award presentations were great successes. The first to be honored in Cordell Hull's name was his protege, Senator ALBERT GORE. Hailing from the Secretary's hometown of Carthage, Tenn., Senator GORE naturally recalled a number of anecdotes from the days in which "Judge" Hull would gather with his constituents on the courthouse steps. But the Tennessee Senator, who led the rebellion against the administration's decision to duck trade policy progress in 1954, also made a characteristically fighting speech.

PROTECTIONIST INTIMIDATION

He told his audience—and the Nation—that protectionist intimidation of trade with Japan threatened the free world's strategic position in the Far East. The campaign against GATT, he said, would isolate the United States nullifying its military and aid pacts with the non-Communist countries of the world.

The Senator contended that tepid administration leadership in the field of trade had inspired the ugliest outbreak of protectionist lobbying since 1913. He recalled that President Wilson hadn't tolerated high tariff obstruction and had blasted the lobby with: "money without limit is being spent to sustain this (high tariff) lobby. * * * It is * * * serious * * * that the people at large should have no lobby and (should) be voiceless * * * while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and to overcome the interests of the public for their private profit."

SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Marshall Plan Administrator Paul G. Hoffman followed the next year, 1956, and won national attention with one of the first public analyses of the Soviet economic offensive. He said:

"There is a new element in the world situation which makes an effective and enlightened foreign economic policy even more imperative—and this is the new Communist economic offensive. Despite the startling repudiation of Stalin by Russia's new leaders * * * the basic goal of the Kremlin is unchanged. It is world conquest. But whereas Stalin placed great emphasis on periphery military action and threats of military action to make progress toward that goal, the new leaders put their stress upon offers of trade and economic aid.

"They are using trade to create dissension among the free nations and particularly to build up the resentment in all nations against the United States. Last February Mr. Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the Communist Party: 'Altogether they (the free nations) have more than enough grounds to be displeased with the United States, which is disorganizing the world market by carrying on unilateral trade, fencing off its markets from foreign imports * * * and other measures hitting hard at other countries.'"

CLARE BOOTH LUCE

In the last of its presentations of the Award, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education honored Ambassador Clare Booth Luce in December 1957. Always outspoken, Mrs. Luce addressed an overflow crowd at the Waldorf-Astoria—and reached the Nation as a whole with a speech that reverberated through the mass media for months.

She bluntly declared that the Nation must move rapidly and strongly toward the abolition of American protectionism. Immediate steps, she said, should include (a) dissolving the Tariff Commission; (b) doing away with escape clauses; and (c) forgetting about buy America.

Why? Ambassador Luce answered:

"Russia, we know, is forcefully wooing the Arab world, Africa, southeast Asia, and flirting with some of our Latin American neighbors. Her 'loverly' chocolate boxes and bouquets are the bids she makes for economic equality in the exchange of goods. Such evidences of both good will and good business are bound to make friends, if not brides of the nations so courted. And the sputnik and muttnik racing around the world every 90 minutes, threaten to turn some of these affairs into shotgun weddings. If the United States is going to court friends effectively, it will not only have to catch up in guided missiles, but reexamine the appeal of its economic policies, especially in the field of trade."

DOLLAR PROBLEM FORESEEN

With a remarkable prescience, Mrs. Luce also pointed to the danger that high tariffs might leave the United States with a muscle-bound dollar. She observed:

"* * * what will happen to the world value of the dollar if it is not readily available through trade? What people need and can't get * * * they will find a substitute for. * * * That has already been happening to the dollar. The system of exchange controls which so many nations have maintained since the war is really a system by which these nations try to protect themselves against the scarcity of the dollar * * * it is for them a substitute for the dollar. The more this system becomes a habit, the less necessary becomes the dollar to their trade. Thus * * * American products are discriminated against in the very markets we

need most. • • • A musclebound dollar can become just as bad for American trade as can a sliding dollar. Either kind is dangerous in the long run to the strength and influence of America."

OTHER PROMINENT RECIPIENTS

In addition to these important addresses by Senator Gore, Mr. Hoffman and Ambassador Luce, the award meetings are also memorable for the important messages contributed by Representative Frank E. Smith, Democrat, of Mississippi; Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey; ex-Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Republican, of Maryland; and Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York.

As an officer in the Committee on Foreign Trade Education from the beginning to almost the end (1953–58) I think all those who had responsibility in its work, in the East and throughout the country, should be proud of having given proof that everyday citizens can be mobilized to fight for a trade policy benefiting the Nation as a whole.

And we can now be glad that the Committee for a National Trade Policy has renewed the Hull Award. As a national institution, the award can assume great importance. Each year it can be the platform from which our foreign economic policy goals are set down.

That won't be an easy order. In the seventh decade of our century, world economic problems will be the most difficult to beset the Nation. Indeed, the trade policy equations of the mid-1950's already appear relatively simple.

To be sure, we shall probably always be confronted by me-before-all-others pleadings of a wide variety of marginal producers. These must be rigorously met; no matter how their yelps insult the intelligence, the frightening truth is that failure to reach a commonsense policy on wooden screws, woolknit gloves, steel flatware, etc., could become the little incident that wrecks an alliance.

But much more vast problems must also be confronted. The Hull Award's objectives, then: not only to commemorate the past, but to lead in signaling the future.

Production and Conservation of Coal in the United States Through Research and Development

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, we have been fully cognizant of the depressed situation which has existed in the coal industry for some time. House Resolution 400 authorized a special subcommittee to study the possibilities of a coal research program. The Department of Mines' present research in this field has long-range objectives which are obviously needed. However, unless an immediate solution to the present industry problem is arrived at, it is conceivable that the small and middle-sized operators will soon be bankrupt and unable to benefit by the Department's long-range findings.

But this is more than just an area or an industry concern—it is the concern of the entire Nation because, as we well realize, coal is so vitally necessary for our national defense. A few large producers would not be able to carry the load in time of a major crisis and I need not dwell on what would have been our plight in World War II had this industry been previously decimated.

It is apparent that the $17 million for research for coal in 1955 was not sufficient help, whether considered on its own with its own results, or when compared with the $280 million for research expenditures in, for example, the textile industry. H.R. 3375 offers a road to a solution—a solution which could be reached in a relatively short period of time and make the expenditure of further moneys by the Federal Government unnecessary.

I, for one, wholeheartedly support this bill because of the dual needs—our defense and our economic well-being—which are herein dealt with. It is a small enough price to pay in seeking a solution to this very important problem.

Agriculture on the International Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 2 months ago a meeting took place in New Delhi, India, which brought together representatives of the general farm organizations and cooperative marketing federations of the free world. The International Federation of Agricultural Producers is a shining example of cooperation between national groups on a nongovernmental level.

The problems of agriculture are not simply national in origin or in effect. All individuals and all organizations of the free world are profoundly concerned with the many problems of agricultural production and distribution. While we worry about having too much, in too many other countries the major concern is that they have too little.

The scope of the farm problem on a worldwide basis was stated with wisdom, understanding, and compassion at the New Delhi conference of IFAP by the president of that organization, Mr. James G. Patton, who is also president of the National Farmers Union of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the speech made by Mr. Patton before the International Federation of Agricultural Producers at the New Delhi conference.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF IFAP PRESIDENT JAMES PATTON TO IFAP NEW DELHI CONFERENCE

It is a significant and historic event when IFAP, a relatively young and still pioneering organization of farmers of the free world, meets in a new and vibrant India which is shaping the pattern of democracy in Asia.

Farmers in both the developed and the developing nations alike are faced with (1) volume of production varying unpredictably from year to year due to weather conditions; (2) marketing problems resulting from inability to store some perishable commodities except for brief periods and (3) supplies of most crops and many livestock products in excess of demand for short periods due to seasonal production and harvesting patterns.

Fluctuations in prices are even more serious because agriculture is still a small-scale industry, composed mainly of family units who, acting individually, cannot influence the volume of supply. They lack the resources to withstand prolonged periods of low prices without severe privation and lowering of living standards, not to mention the cutbacks in operating and production expenditures and inadequate operating capital which tend to keep farm income low over indefinite periods.

That is why farmers have found it necessary to join together in general farm organizations and in cooperative marketing and supply associations. That is why governments in practically all nations of the free world have found it necessary to lend their powers to the strengthening of the bargaining position of the agricultural producer.

There will have to be, in my opinion, even more cooperation between producers themselves and between producers and their respective governments—if agriculture is to gain its rightful place in modern economic society.

Representation from Indian agriculture in IFAP has broadened our overall perspective of the problems of producers in the free world. Unlike the developed nations, India and other Asian nations suffer food deficits. The solution to the problem of so-called surpluses in some nations and food shortages in others offers a challenge to IFAP that already has been acknowledged. While we have given attention to this paradox, we must rededicate our efforts to solve distribution problems. We must expand utilization of food and fiber and at the same time protect prices and income of agricultural producers, in the so-called food surplus nations as well as in the food deficit nations.

It is indeed a tragic state of affairs that governments of the nations with excess food stocks do not think in terms of utilization of such stocks to contribute to the growth and development of democracy in the free world, instead of continuing to think in terms of "burdensome surpluses" and "surplus disposal" terms which are commonplace in my country.

As farmers and as representatives of farmers in our respective countries, we know the force for good which is unleashed when food is distributed amidst hunger, when grass is made to grow where the land was bare, when water runs over parched soil and when a crop is saved from insects. It has been, and it should continue to be, the policy of IFAP to support U.N. and specialized agency efforts to overcome hunger, poverty, disease, and privation.

We are going to have greater quantities of agricultural commodities than the commercial market will take for many years. Our problem—and our challenge—is the utilization of this overage or surplus for the benefit of mankind and to do so without penalizing the primary producers.

Such additional emphasis on filling the social market will help to overcome the problem of inelasticity of consumer demand. But I do not look upon such a program as the complete solution to the price and income bargaining disadvantages which farmers and their organizations are constantly trying to solve.

Producers of primary goods in developing areas generally face just as great instability

of price and net income as farmers in the more developed nations. And inasmuch as important goals set by developing nations in both short-range and long-range plans for economic development are interrupted, the effect of instability of price and income in such nations is of disastrous proportions.

The significance of this problem is magnified by the fact that many of the less developed countries continue to rely both for their foreign exchange earnings and for incomes of a large segment of their population, on the export of one or two primary products. These countries face a problem of particular difficulty in reaching established goals of economic development. Without adequate foreign exchange reserves, reductions in earning from exports must be made up with help from the outside—or development programs are retarded and disrupted.

In the interest of stable and growing economies, if not for the welfare of primary producers, governments will continue to take action to support the prices of primary goods. We still have with us the same network of human institutional factors which gave rise to the World Food Board idea. But looking hopefully toward this goal will not solve our present problem of widely fluctuating prices in the world market and shortages in some areas in the midst of overproduction and "surpluses" in other areas.

The two major problems as I see the world agricultural scene are (1) the problem of utilizing effectively, the so-called "surpluses" which have accumulated, and will continue to accumulate, in some of the more economically developed countries—to promote effectively the advancement of the economies, especially the agricultural economics, of the developing countries, and (2) the stabilization at reasonable levels of prices of primary products moving in international trade.

What can IFAP do toward helping to solve these problems? We can study them at regional and general meetings and come to agreement as to practical forms of international cooperation. We can, with the help of officers and members of the Secretariat, present recommendations to international bodies with a view to having them implemented through intergovernmental action. This is what IFAP has been doing throughout its relatively brief existence. And I think that it should be a matter of pride that we have been able to agree, with virtual unanimity, on numerous forward-looking recommendations.

There have been a number of cases where intergovernmental action has been taken in line with suggestions made earlier by IFAP. In some of these it seems apparent that IFAP has exerted some real influence; but on the whole, IFAP, as representative of millions of farmers in the free world, has not had as much influence as it should have had. Why is this?

One reason is that we do not take IFAP's recommendations sufficiently seriously. We do not put anything like the effort into persuading governments to accept IFAP's suggestions as we do in the case of the things that concern us more immediately in our respective national spheres. I do not say that member organizations should give IFAP's recommendations top priority. I do think, however, that we should at least discuss them positively and seriously with appropriate officials in our respective countries.

IFAP is a very representative body in the sense that it now includes in its membership the great bulk of the general farm organizations and of cooperative marketing federations in the free world—particularly, in the more economically advanced countries. But, in spite of a number of welcome additions in recent years, it is still lacking in members from the less-developed countries. The main reason for this is that there are very few farm organizations eligible under IFAP's constitution, in these latter countries.

There are three kinds of agricultural organizations, which are very important in some countries—especially the less developed countries—which are not now eligible for IFAP membership. These are: (1) large State, or provincial, general farm organizations; (2) large regional marketing and supply cooperative associations, and (3) large, nationwide, commodity organizations. These kinds of organizations were not made eligible for membership in IFAP in the beginning. I was present at the early meetings when this decision was taken, but times and circumstances change and I feel that the time has now arrived when IFAP should seriously review its membership requirements—particularly as regards regional and commodity organizations.

It is increasingly clear to me that one of the great challenges facing us is that of convincing our respective governments that an intelligent food policy for the free world has implications far and beyond the short-sighted so-called surplus utilization aspect.

We need and must develop a world food policy. Such a policy would put wheels under the efforts of farmers in the developed nations to manage production gluts and to use food stocks to promote economic development in developing areas. Such a policy would aid in protecting established international commercial markets.

An important objective in the negotiations leading up to a world food policy should be the means of stabilizing prices of agricultural and other primary goods.

We have proven instruments in this connection, the use of which ought to be expanded. I refer specifically to the need for a whole series of international trade and commodity agreements to stabilize commercial markets of those goods that are important in world trade.

We ought to have an international development corporation under the United Nations as an integral part of the world food policy concept and to work in conjunction with international commodity agreements. The primary objective of this development corporation ought to be furthering economic development. Food and fiber should be available to be used wherever possible in operations of the development corporation.

Food and fiber are our most valuable and highly prized possessions. And yet those with vested interest in its processing and marketing hold the reins, too much of the time, pulling alway on the side of low prices to farmers, high prices to consumers—in many cases administered-monopoly prices—short supplies or artificial scarcity at the consumer level, and nonrecognition of the international social market.

Catering to the basic needs of mankind the producers of food and fiber hold the key to capitalizing developing areas of the world. Moreover, farmers everywhere, should seek and be given greater recognition as basic contributors to the building of industrial economics.

Member organizations of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers have the unique opportunity as the voice of farmers in their respective countries to take the lead in creating interest on the part of their governments in the attainment of greater international cooperation in the full utilization of food and fiber. A broader base than possible under individual action of governments is needed to rationalize production and distribution between social and commercial markets and at the same time assure farmers the opportunity to earn an equitable or fair share of what the future holds in the way of further economic growth and expansion.

I urge all members to use this opportunity. It is something which not only will help solve our own problems but will bring enduring benefits to all of mankind in the form of abundant good will, more lasting peace and greater dignity of individuals wherever they work.

In Worrying About the Missile Gap Let's Not Forget About the Threat of Limited War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the current debate on national defense has focused so much attention so dramatically on intercontinental ballistic missiles that there is a serious possibility we may have been overlooking the importance of also strengthening our ability to wage conventional warfare so as to deter those limited types of aggression which, the experts tell us, are still probably more likely will happen than all-out nuclear warfare.

If anyone doubts this possibility, let him consider the situation that already seems to be shaping up in Berlin.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 14 by Mr. Roscoe Drummond which very clearly and forthrightly points up this important consideration:

MISSILE BLINDNESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Has it ever occurred to you that we may be talking about the wrong thing in this great debate on defense which is erupting with such fury?

We are being assured by the President and others that we will produce enough missiles in the next 3 or 4 years so any Soviet superiority in ICBM's will not be a peril.

We are being warned by the defense critics of the President and others that there is no evidence that we are closing the missile gap and that in the near future we face a Soviet capacity to destroy us with missiles.

But isn't there a very serious possibility that the danger from the Soviet Union may not lie in missiles at all and that we are being induced to put our greatest attention on trying to avert what is least likely to happen?

And neglecting what is most likely to happen?

What is most likely to happen? I suggest that while missiles dominate nearly everything that is said in Washington in the defense controversy, we throw on the screen of our minds in large capital latters the following testimony which, buried in a welter of other matters and lost in the news, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, gave to Congress:

"In the next 4 or 5 years the danger of limited wars will be much greater than the threat of all-out nuclear war."

This isn't a sentimental foot soldier asking for more tools. This is the No. 1 sailor of the United States agreeing with every Army Chief of Staff since the end of the Korean war in 1953 when Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, with the support of the President began cutting down the ground forces.

I am not assuming to have an expert's opinion on exactly what the best balance of all our forces should be. I am simply joining with Gen. Matthew Ridgway, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, and Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, and Admiral Burke in questioning whether we may not, indeed, be putting far too many of our defense eggs in the big basket of massive retaliation.

Admiral Burke is not himself asking for a stronger, more modernized army. That is not his job. But he is expressing a judgment about the kind of military danger we face. He adopts the premise which justifies more attention to ground-force and airlift strength.

He is, in effect, warning against a military strategy which prepares almost exclusively to deter and fight a nuclear war, which he considers the lesser threat, while leaving the Nation not as well prepared as it should be to deter or fight a limited, nonnuclear war, which he considers the greater threat.

We must not allow ourselves to forget that from the day the Soviets exploded a hydrogen bomb, the United States and the Soviet Union entered the era of mutual deterrence. Neither side can resort to nuclear weapons without expecting retaliatory devastation.

This means that there is a built-in military resistance to resorting to nuclear weapons.

There is also a powerful political deterrence to using nuclear weapons. Under almost all conceivable circumstances a nation which first used nuclear bombs in any conflict would be condemned by every nonparticipant as a nation willing to imperil the lives, through radioactive fallout, of hundreds of millions of people.

We didn't use nuclear weapons in Korea—and not just for military reasons.

We wouldn't let the marines who landed in Lebanon even take a single tactical nuclear weapon ashore for fear of its bad psychological effect.

Now, if it is true, as many think, that we would not be the first to use nuclear weapons—large or small—this means that the Soviets can use their vastly superior ground forces to carry out a limited-war aggression and that aganist this kind of aggression we are in the weakest position.

On Admiral Burke's premise that "limited" war is a "much greater danger" than all-out nuclear war, shouldn't we be giving more attention to our nonnuclear capabilities—and not get blindly fascinated with missiles?

The Factors of Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on January 8, this year Mr. Carrol M. Shanks, president of the Prudential Insurance Co., at a luncheon of the Friday Forum, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, made an enlightened and instructive speech on the resources and opportunities in the great State of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTORS OF GROWTH

Today, I should like to bring you a bystander's reaction to the progress you are making in developing metropolitan Oklahoma City and your State into one of the Nation's important economic and cultural centers of influence. Perhaps I also can point out a few things that remain still to be done.

The task you have undertaken will not be easy. There is grim competition among hundreds of cities and areas for the kind of income-producing activities that make growth and development possible. Many of these areas are older and better established than yours and this puts you at a disadvantage. The need and demand for new industry is overwhelming, yet at any one time relatively few business organizations are expanding into new areas, few government agencies are planning new installations, and still fewer important businesses are moving. There are not enough to go around. They always have a buyer's market. They are being solicited these days not by tub-thumping promoters, but by capable technicians with facts, figures, and records at their fingertips. This is tough competition.

You may have chosen an opportune time to concentrate on this drive for new industry. I think you will be helped by continued and even stepped-up expansion in the national and international economies.

The much-heralded "golden sixties" would seem to be off to a good start. There should be a series of good years ahead of us. The long steel strike will leave its mark, but it should not materially affect economic progress in the coming year. Our economists at the Prudential expect the gross national product to reach a rate of a half-trillion dollars for the first time in history during the first quarter of 1960 and this should be only the beginning. By 1970, we expect a gross national product of $750 billion.

The economy will have occasional adjustments, possibly during 1960, and certainly in the years to follow; but there is no inevitable reason why they should be serious or lasting.

The final outcome of the "golden sixties," however, will depend upon the United States facing up to a few basic necessities and mustering the national discipline to accomplish what is necessary. The discipline would be mild. There would be no real deprivation or hardship. The end result, if we face up to our responsibilities, would be a far sounder, more stable, and faster growing economy for Oklahoma, for the United States, and for the free world.

First, our armaments must be stepped up where called for and maintained at a level which will enable us to contain and win brush-fire wars. It must be made clear to our enemies that a general war will not pay them. The cost involved should have full priority over all other expenditures.

Second, we must recognize certain international facts of life. The international value of our dollar must be maintained. International trade must be maintained and expanded. We must remain competitive, pricewise and servicewise, in international trade.

These things hinge upon what we do here in our own domestic economy.

The external and internal value of the dollar depend upon a reasonable balancing of the budget from year to year, upon sound monetary policy, and upon our putting an end to the wage-price spiral. We cannot condone inflation and still enjoy the international strength that has traditionally come from the soundness and integrity of our monetary system.

We are not now gaining ground in international trade: we are steadily losing ground to other countries who can supply more for less. We are teetering on the edge not only of being priced out of many foreign markets, but out of volume domestic markets as well.

We can no longer tolerate continuing wage rises which sop up all or more than all productivity increases, and price rises to cover increased costs. On the contrary, there must be price reductions, which, incidentally, have been the historic basis of expanding free enterprise. No one thing could help the farmers, for example, so much as price reductions in the things they buy. If we do not muster the discipline to do these things, the results, I believe, will be very serious and much more immediate than is generally realized.

Third, we must do the hard way some of the things the Russians can do easily. One, step up our savings. Two, channel more of our national income into modernization of plant and equipment. These are sound economic steps which the Russians accomplish by keeping consumer goods relatively unavailable—and by channeling savings through building a tax into the price of goods. We have to do it the democratic way. Make saving attractive: good interest rates are one way—education another. Savings, of course, would grow with the economy so that the volume of savings would be increased even at the present rate of saving.

Modernization of plant and equipment lifts our productivity—our true growth rate—and is a major influence in stepping up the economy. It enables a product which may now cost $10 to produce, to be made better for $8 or $5. This is one of the ways that some foreign countries have stolen the march on us—they lost their plants in the war, and these generally obsolescent installations were replaced with equipment far more modern than much of ours. This puts us at a tremendous disadvantage. As a matter of national policy we should give every incentive, such as speeded up depreciation schedules, to updating and upgrading of productive equipment. This is the true way to speed up our growth. The building of new plants and the modernization of plant and equipment provide one of our greatest generators of employment and income.

These items of action are simple, well known, and involve little or no hardship. They are well within our capacity to accomplish. I find myself unable to believe that we will not do them. Accordingly, I think the Sixties truly will be golden.

In addition to growth of the economy, there are many factors working solidly in your favor.

First, there are your natural resources. You have always had a full share of these. Mining, for example, has always been important; and Oklahoma's income from mineral resources far exceeds the average for all States of the Nation. Some of the newer developments in this sector, such as liquid petroleum products, will open up new avenues for expansion.

But in the long run, your most important natural asset is one you will soon have in ample quantity: water. Water is the critical resource in most of the country. Without ample water, there can be no chemical industry, no steel industry, and only limited operations in many other industries. It is safe to say that most areas of the country have water problems now, or will have in the near future; and any area with insufficient water has two strikes against it at the outset. Without the concerted and constructive action which you now have well underway, Oklahoma City might have become a two-strike city; but as it is, your water problems appear to be well along toward solution. Senator KERR has made this a personal project, and Senator KERR has a way of getting things done. I think we can safely assume that for you, water will be all asset and no problem before long—and this will give you a great competitive advantage.

Climate is another natural resource that will give you some help. An advantageous climate is not essential to industry in the way that it is essential to farming, but a favorable climate is one of the factors in an area that attracts people. In times of full employment, which is a large part of the time, workers as well as skilled technicians seek employment in places where they want to live, rather than simply resigning themselves to live wherever they happen to have a job. Our working population is remarkably mobile, and there is a mounting tendency for people to gravitate to places where they can find a good climate, good schools, good recreation facilities and cultural facilities.

This is why many of our best and most productive businesses—electronics, for example—often establish new plants where they find technicians and skilled workers living comfortably, rather than picking a site for other reasons, and setting out to bring in the help they need. People are still the most essential segment of any business enterprise and automation will not change this. Oklahoma City appears to be the kind of a place where technicians and skilled workers are living and liking it. A livable climate is an important factor in this. You may not be as fortunate in your climate as a few areas that are famous for climate, but your weather generally is favorable. Summer overheating can be remedied on the spot with air-conditioning equipment, and over the weekends by a short drive into some of the best vacation country in the world. Fortunately, you have plenty of outdoors, which has again become an important part of the lives of modern Americans. The developments at various nearby lakes, and at Texoma, plus the new areas that will come as a result of your water and canal developments, will stand you in good stead when you are attracting new people and new businesses. You can provide the kind of relaxation people are looking for, and incidentally this will help stabilize your population. Turnover of people can be most expensive to business, and there is growing evidence that nearby outdoor recreation tends to reduce the wanderlust.

The second basic factor working for you, at least as important as your natural assets, is your improved position as a major supplier to the ecutral and southwestern States area. With retail and wholesale trade now your most important economic sector, and with an efficient transportation network that places you firmly in the center of one of the Nation's most active markets, you have something that every business needs. But you can be sure that it will come as a surprise to most business leaders throughout the United States to learn that you have 42 million people, with a total income in excess of 67 billions, within a radius of 500 miles. This is a fundamental keystone for your future.

A third basic factor working for you is a resourceful population. Good people make good business—and therefore the people and their influences in a city loom large when a modern big business is contemplating a major move or expansion to another area. What makes good people? Attitudes, education, cultural facilities, provision for wholesome recreation, civic activities, churches, and clean, decent, effective political leadership are some of the influences that can be assessed.

On all these fronts, Oklahoma City has much to offer. The progress that civic enterprise is making in Oklahoma City is a monument to the constructive, wholesome attitude of your people. To the bystander, this indicates that the vast majority of your citizens are working together; they are attuned to the changes that progress will bring; they subscribe to the objectives of your leadership. You can have planned progress—a luxury denied many of the older centers, where the dissenters are often as numerous as the supporters for any civic project. This public support makes practical your effective and highly skilled, well-staffed chamber of commerce; it paves the way for such groups as Oklahoma Industries, Inc., which can plan, develop, and even finance industrial expansion; it creates sufficient latitude so that you can plan your metropolitan area as a coordinated, diversified, and integrated area that will stand the test of time. Most of all, it permits you to take time by the forelock and reserve areas you someday will need for roads or developments or reservoirs or industrial parks. The attitude of your people, and of their civic and political leaders, constitutes a good business climate. This is a precious advantage.

Any assessment of Oklahoma City would recognize its theater and symphony activities, its active church support, and its cultural activities in general.

Certainly your outstanding educational activities deserve special attention. Unquestionably, education, and the willingness to be educated, are basic raw materials of the future. We have lived through a generation of technological revolution; we have seen atomic energy and space become the subjects of popular discussion; we have a younger generation with a vocabulary of technical terms that would startle a reasonably well educated man of a few years ago. The quest for knowledge—and the need for it—in the years to come will tax the facilities of most educators and their systems. You here in Oklahoma have a long head start on most of the rest of the country.

There is, for example, the major research center at the university which will involve many hundreds of highly trained people; also, the center for continuing studies that will capitalize upon the demonstrated desire of adults in this area for more education, and is expected to train as many as 75,000 adults a year within 10 years. This is not a far-fetched hope when you consider that 30,000 enrolled last year. You will have your computer center and your research park—all within a few minutes of downtown Oklahoma City—which will provide business with facilities not readily available elsewhere. The university's projected building and curriculum for advanced studies by executives and professional people will supply a growing need—and again, a need that cannot be supplied so near at hand in most cities.

But the most striking and revealing of all the evidences of your attitude toward education is the frontiers of science program. This is a brilliant concept. You have heard that before—from experts. The impulse to launch it, and its continuing success, reveal a widespread urge for self-improvement and the determination to do something constructive about it. Such determination is not as common as it should be, but it has been an essential part of the life of this country. Frontiers of science represents a cooperative spirit between educators, civic leaders, and ordinary citizens which is far too rare. It tackles the problem of controlling and developing youth by catching the young mind and keeping it absorbed. It keeps adults alerted to the forces that are shaping our lives and our future. It provides industry with a forum for discussing its potentialities and responsibilities. But most of all, it nourishes the pioneering spirit, which is slipping away from the rest of us too rapidly—a situation which can produce disastrous results, because it is the growth and development of a pioneering spirit which is inspiring the newer nations. These include some that seek world supremacy and may achieve it if we become too complacent, too self-satisfied, and lose the spirit of adventure.

To summarize, not many other areas can match you in the record you can set down before an industrial leader who is considering a new plant, or a businessman who is planning for expansion:

1. A fast-growing industrial economy fortified by the expenditure of over a billion dollars for physical facilities in 8 years, and the commitment or expenditure of 107 millions for capital improvements during the first 6 months of 1959. This is a remarkable demonstration of your determination and purpose.

2. A labor pool that has proved to have an exceptional talent for quick learning, productivity, and steady working habits—this seems to be the testimony of the businesses that have moved here from elsewhere.

3. An extraordinary distribution organization which is growing and developing far beyond growth averages in the United States, and serves, primarily, one of the fastest growing markets in the country.

4. A transportation system that includes virtually an interstate highway center, a rail system that services the entire area and can pick up and deliver to 76 of the 77 counties in the State, airline facilities that serve 4 major lines, and plans for a canal system.

5. A tax arrangement that could well be the subject of an entire discussion—a system far better planned than most, and one that in many cases helps local industry improve its competitive position.

With such a gratifying list of assets, it might seem that all Oklahoma City has to do is sit on its hands and let the line form on the left—but it won't be that easy.

You are not without hurdles.

A substantial, but not insurmountable barrier is lack of public knowledge and understanding about this area. To many people, to those in the East particularly, Oklahoma seems far away and somewhat isolated. The development of your markets and the remarkable strides you have taken in urbanization are not widely known. The popular conception of Oklahoma is still colored by the Grapes of Wrath, and duststorms, and the surrey with the fringe on the top—and in the absence of the facts, this farfetched concept is nourished 7 nights a week by television westerns. You have tremendous sentimental acceptance, but wide business acceptance is yet to come. To do that part of your job will require an educational campaign as well planned, as meticulously applied, and as liberally financed as the work you have been doing to get your area ready for its future. It will have to be aimed at business leaders, but it will not be enough to convince them alone. Moving a business means transferring key personnel and often skilled craftsmen. If these people don't have enthusiasm for the move, it may be easier—and safer—for the business to go to some widely publicized area like California, where employees generally can be transferred without too much complaint. Your educational job is a job in depth. It will have to be done thoroughly.

Finally, you must realize that you are bucking a deeply entrenched tradition: business generally settles in the long-established centers because this is the easiest thing to do—everybody else did it first. The areas that have broken this tradition barrier—the South, for example—more often than not were helped by circumstances: for example, when western lumber resources became overtaxed, improved techniques in the paper and cellulose industries made inexpensive southern operations, where scrub trees grow rapidly, too good to overlook—so, much paper industry moved south. Overorganization in labor, obsolescence of mills and high taxes sent the textile industry out of New England into the South where labor was plentiful and operations were less complicated and expensive. Ample water brought heavy chemical operations to certain sections of the South.

Many of these businesses came to the South for reasons other than pure choice. Once they developed experience in the Southern States, however, it was discovered that here were ideal conditions for many industries—good labor, rapidly growing markets, good living conditions, reasonable taxes, and a satisfactory business climate. The industrialization of the South, once underway, moved ahead rapidly. This was good for the South, and has proved a momentous development for the Nation as a whole.

Businesses are not likely to be forced into Oklahoma as some were into the more heavily populated Southern States; you are not likely to have much circumstantial help. You cannot expect, in the near future, to have hordes of visitors, which was an important factor in planting the seeds of development in California and Florida. You will have to sell Oklahoma. You have to get your story told the hard way. But take heart: It is a good story.

When President Eisenhower opened your Frontiers of Science program, he said: "I hope that other States will follow your example."

The President was referring particularly to frontiers of science. I want to broaden the thought to encompass all those aspects of pioneering and progress you have demonstrated; all the things you are doing to forge a good way of life for yourselves.

Toward Clean Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the first major legislation passed by our sister body this year was the clean elections bill sponsored by the senior Senator of Mssiouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. Our colleague across the Capitol surely deserve the praise and gratitude of all citizens interested in good government for their action, on January 25, toward modernizing our horse-and-buggy election laws.

Legislation in this vital area has not been adopted by the Congress since enactment of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. Methods of campaigning for public office have changed dramatically during the years since that time, and it is surely time now for us in the House to match the statesmanship of the other House by enacting legislation requiring the fullest possible disclosure of funds used by, and on behalf of, candidates, allowing realistic campaign expenditures, and closing other loopholes that time has demonstrated exist in the 1925 act.

It is gratifying to me, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of my colleagues to the support being given this worthwhile cause by some of the outstanding newspapers of the State which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. I include as part of my remarks editorials from the Wilmington Morning News, and the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del.:

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Jan. 27, 1960]

STEP TOWARD CLEAN ELECTIONS

The new corrupt practices bill passed by the Senate is so much better than political wiseacres had believed possible that suggestions are being heard that the Senate passed it only because the House is sure to kill it. The wiseacres, who were wrong once, may be wrong again. But even if they prove to be right the fact that so good a bill has passed one Chamber of Congress improves the chances that it will eventually be made law.

Even a law as good as this bill will not finally solve the problem of how to limit campaign spending so that the winners are neither unduly committed to special interests nor men who virtually bought their way into office. Our anarchic party system is extremely difficult to regulate satisfactorily. But we do make progress.

The Corrupt Practices Act of 1924 has undergone constant change, and political professionals have found ways to evade their provisions. This process of revision and evasion will continue indefinitely, slowly approaching but never achieving perfection, until our practical political system—which is largely outside the Constitution—evolves into something more responsible and more truly national.

Meanwhile, one step at a time; and the Senate's passage of the present bill is a significant step. The bill sets more realistic limits on contributions—no individual could give more than $10,000 to one party. It sets more realistic expense ceilings—$12,000 for House candidates, $50,000 for Senate aspirants, $12,500,000 for presidential campaigns. As long as much lower ceilings prevailed, there was almost universal evasion. Perhaps the new ones can be enforced.

At present the State and local and special campaign committees which have done 75 percent of campaign spending are under no effective control because they are not required to report what they spend. The bill calls for reports when more than $2,500 is spent for a candidate for Federal office.

Another improvement is the provision applying to primary elections. In one-party States in the South, where nomination in the Democratic primary is tantamount to election, the exemption on primaries meant exemption from corrupt practices requirements. Why the representatives of any State would have the gall to insist on the privilege to remain corrupt is hard to understand, but it is a fact that the inclusion of primaries is the principal reason for southern opposition to the bill in Congress.

Its chances in the House are hard to assess at this time, but they look none too good. But if the House refuses to adopt an excellent bill which the Senate had the courage and statesmanship to pass, the voters are going to want to know why.

[From the Journal-Every Evening, Jan. 26, 1960]

CLOSING LOOPHOLES

It is greatly to the credit of the U.S. Senate that the first bill it has approved this campaign year is a sweeping revision of the outdated and ineffective law controlling election campaign spending and reporting. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which the new legislation is intended to replace, has as many loopholes as a venetian blind. The new one closes many of them.

For one thing, the Senate bill applies the law to primaries involving Federal office as well as to general elections. This makes good sense everywhere but it is particularly important in the States of the Southern bloc where a primary victory is tantamount to election.

In addition the bill requires, for the first time, detailed reporting by State and local committees and by presidential and vice-presidential nominees. It limits the total campaign contributions of any one individual to $10,000 in any calendar year. The present law limits individual contributions to any one candidate or committee to $5,000 but allows as many $5,000 contributions as an individual's purse can stand. And finally the present unrealistic limit of $3 million on Presidential campaigns, which has been consistently evaded, is raised to $12,500,000 and the limits in Senate and House races has also been raised to $50,000 and $12,500 respectively.

Both Delaware Senators, JOHN J. WILLIAMS and J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., voted for passage of the bill. They share credit for its passage together with Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri Democrat, who led the successful fight for the measure over the opposition of Southern Democrats and the Republican leadership.

It is already being freely predicted that the House will never approve the bill in its present form, even though it does not apply to this year's elections. The pessimists may well be right. However, they were dead wrong when they predicted that the Senate would never approve the key restrictions on spending in primary elections and on reporting by State and local committees.

We believe that the American public as a whole is solidly behind effective controls on spending and contributions to political campaigns. If it makes its sentiments known, the House may surprise us, too, and approve substantially the same reforms.

Cultural Activities in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early this month Mr. Patrick Hayes in his weekly radio program over WGMS argued most eloquently the need for greater financial support for cultural activities in the United States.

I was pleased that Mr. Hayes spoke out so favorably for the bill Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey and I are sponsoring to provide that one mill out of each tax dollar collected by the District of Columbia be placed in a special fund for grants to nonprofit organizations engaged in cultural activities. Such organizations would include the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery, and many other groups promoting opera, ballet, drama, and the fine arts.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hays' comments of February 7 over WGMS be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCAST BY PATRICK HAYES, WGMS, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1960

Good afternoon, during January Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota introduced into the House and Senate respectively a bill to provide a subsidy fund for music and the arts in Washington, D.C.

Each bill reads "To provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

It is a short bill, two sides of a page, and the definitive paragraph is this one: "All money in the special fund authorized by subsection (b) of this section shall be available to the Board to defray in part the expense of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and programs in arts and crafts, music, drama, speech, dancing (other than social dancing), lectures, forums, and other creative opportunities for leisure-time participation," etc. The Board referred to is the District of Columbia Recreation Board, established in 1942, and which now operates the citywide recreation program of Washington, including many musical and artistic endeavors.

The opening language of the bills refer to the practice common to many cities in the United States of giving financial support to civic-cultural activities. What other cities do this? In his speech in support of his bill, Senator HUMPHREY had this to say: "I was most interested in the study prepared last year by the Library of Congress for Representatives HARRIS B. MCDOWELL of Delaware, which revealed that Washington's budget has allotted for civic-cultural events only $16,000, of which about $10,000 helps to support the Watergate concerts. As compared with Washington, New York spends $2,600,000, Philadelphia $824,000, and Baltimore $448,000. The small city of Hagerstown, Md., only a short distance from the Nation's Capital, gives its Museum of Fine Arts $12,500 out of its regular annual budget, only $3,500 less than the entire amount that Washington spends out of its more than $200 million budget." This brings us to the point, the point of possible action. Last Sunday I argued for a bold national program of financial support for cultural activities, on a matching fund basis, with initiative and control at the local level in all instances. I am as opposed to Federal handouts as the next intelligent taxpayer, but I understand subsidy, regard the word and what it represents as honorable and good, and believe in that theory that says that government should do for the people and for private enterprise those things they cannot do for themselves which promote the general welfare and contribute to the common good.

My own remarks last week and today are concerned with the need of greater financial support for the cultural activities of the country, through Government subsidy at the city, State, and National level. I find front-page ammunition this morning on the front page of the New York Times, the article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., titled "Great Debate in Capital: Is United States Misusing Wealth?" Mr. Dale writes that in Washington these days there is much conversation involving politicians, civil servants, intellectuals, and many plain persons on the point that the basic trouble with American society is that we devote too much of our resources to increasing an already affluent level of private consumption and too little to public services of all kinds. The idea, says Mr. Dale, has been emerging gradually for about a year. Its two proponents most widely quoted are Walter Lippmann and John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard economist and author of the provocative book, "The Affluent Society." The conclusion of those who support the basic idea involved is that the Nation should spend far more on public purposes and raise more taxes as needed to finance the higher expenditures. At this point I will return to the more modest area of cultural activities and leave this broader debate to the politicians, economists, and national writers. But Mr. Dale's article, given front-page importance by the Times this morning, reveals that there is a wind blowing in the direction that we are talking about. Cultural activity represents high public purpose, to say the least.

Senator HUMPHREY and Congressman THOMPSON would have 1 mill out of each tax dollar put aside into a special fund here in Washington for supplementary grants to nonprofit organizations engaged in cultural activities. While the NSO and the Corcoran Gallery are mentioned by name, it appears that the plan would fit the Opera Society of Washington, the Washington Ballet, the Modern Dance Council, the Institute of Contemporary Arts, and many others. Would it work?

The first city to do this, to my knowledge, was San Francisco, back in the 1930's, or earlier, where 1 mill out of each tax dollar was put aside as a partial subsidy for the San Francisco Symphony and the San Francisco Opera Association. The mill plan, and outright appropriations of amounts of money whether based on the 1 mill formula or not, have spread widely throughout the United States. Not too many years after San Francisco began its plan of financing civic-cultural affairs, the State of Indiana passed a bill authorizing the city of Indianapolis to appropriate $50,000 a year for its orchestra and other local cultural activities. The New York City plan dates from the administration of F. H. La Guardia, when the city took over the old Mosque on 56th Street and made it the New York City Center we know today. The State of Virginia appropriates $10,000 a year to subsidize the Barter Theatre down in Abingdon. There is no area pattern, and all experience to date seems to be based on action at the local level, not the Federal level. But as I asserted last Sunday, what is going on is not enough, we are not keeping pace with the fast moving times, our overall cultural growth is lagging at a time when our available American talent is increasing and improving at an incredible rate that is a compliment to our cultural educators throughout the Nation. Where are these young artists and musicians going to go? What are they going to do? The establishment of a $100 million a year national fund, thru congressional appropriation, would double all local activity within a year. The estimated $180,000 that Washington would have from 1 mill out of every tax dollar could be matched from the Federal fund—the same formula could be followed in all cities. This would mean longer seasons for symphony orchestras, opera companies, dance companies, dramatic companies. It would mean bolder programs, such as the New York City Opera Co. will bring here late this month. It would stimulate our composers and playwrights. It would encourage young people to enter the field of the cultural arts for careers.

And all the dollars would remain in the United States of America, and their daily flow would find many of them getting back to the Treasury through the many direct and indirect taxes we all pay. Senator HUMPHREY and Congressman THOMPSON are to be commended for their imagination and initiative. Their 1-mill plan is a firm step in the right direction. They now need local support, in the press, and among the citizens of the District. Once such a local plan is working, here and in more and more cities, the national fund could be established. Indeed, I would argue for its establishment first and forthwith, as an incentive for applications for local grants, based on matching funds. To repeat, it works in building hospitals. It works, period.

It seems to me there could be no finer climate of opinion than now eixsts for the Humphrey-Thompson bills. Again today, Commissioner Karrick has a major statement on the cultural status of Washington, which the Washington Post and Times Herald puts on the front page. Mr. Karrick, like many a Washingtonian, is stung by the hick-town label put on the city by Howard Taubman of the New York Times several weeks ago. He makes a good reply. A better one would be his vote, together with the other two District of Columbia Commissioners, for the 1-mill plan and a civic-cultural subsidy fund.

The question remains—to subsidize, or to subside.

Thank God for Sputnik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles Evans, a 90-year-old educator who is recognized as the founder of the first PTA unit in Oklahoma and has served with distinction as a school superintendent and as a college president, recently returned to the city of Ardmore, Okla., in my district, where he had served as superintendent of schools for a number of years. His remarks at a meeting of the PTA in the elementary school in Ardmore which bears his name prove that his keen mind has been sharpened by the years. I ask unanimous consent that the account of Dr. Evans' address as written by Johnnie Riddle, managing editor of the Daily Ardmorite, Ardmore, Okla., be printed in the RECORD:

THANK GOD FOR SPUTNIK

"Today's pupils are being fed a soft diet of pale pablum—we could wind up with a generation of semiskilled idiots."

That's the belief of Dr. Charles Evans, of Oklahoma City, a 90-year-old famed educator who returned to Ardmore last night to address the PTA unit at the elementary school which bears his name.

"We need to apply more emphasis to the 'hard' subjects—mathematics, history, English, and science—and not just let a child slip through school.

"He needs to be taught how to live so he will be at least partly conditioned for the hard world he must face after leaving school.

"Not nearly enough emphasis is being placed on the cultural aspects of living. Life is much more than just working for a living and raising a family."

Dr. Evans, whose spryness is a thing to marvel, beamed as an oil portrait of himself was unveiled by a former student of his in Ardmore, S. N. Goldman, an Oklahoma City chainstore executive.

The portrait, commissioned by Goldman and painted by Richard Goetz, well-known Oklahoma artist, will hang in the hallway at Charles Evans School, according to Principal Buell L. Awtrey.

Dr. Evans, who was superintendent of city schools here from 1905 to 1911, is recognized as the founder of the first PTA unit in Oklahoma. The Ardmore group was first known as a mother's club.

"I am here to appease my own soul," the educator said at the opening of his address. "I'm not just here to speak to the Charles Evans PTA. I defy any of you to find another situation like this—a man 90 years old, an educator for 72 years, only 6 of which were spent in Ardmore, returning after 49 years to speak in a school that bears his name.

"I hope you invite me back 10 years from now. I'll come. And don't you take that lightly because I have neither an ache nor a pain."

Dr. Evans believes that "inequality is the worst thing that can happen to a student. That is what mothers have to fight for—equal opportunities for their children."

He lauded the late John F. Easley, publisher of the Daily Ardmoreite, for his contributions to education. "Mr. Easley helped build the schools in Ardmore."

Speaking to the teachers in the audience, he urged them to "teach children to use what they have—every ounce of it. Let them discover the joys that can be found in thinking."

Dr. Evans relishes the atomic age.

"Thank God for sputnik. It woke up the American educators. It proved we must have individual education, not the stereotype kind that does not offer a challenge to the bright student."

Evans started his teaching career in 1887 in Kentucky. He was superintendent at Marion, Ky., school system from 1895 to 1905, when he came to Ardmore.

The educator left here in 1911 to become president of Central State College at Edmond.

Next position in his outstanding career was as president of Kendall College in Tulsa in 1916–17. It is now Tulsa University. He was a member of the board of education in Oklahoma City from 1921 to 1925 and director of education extension at Oklahoma A. & M. College at Stillwater from 1921 through 1927.

Dr. Evans resigned his post as secretary of the Oklahoma Historical Society 5 years ago, after serving for 12 years. He is now chairman of the Oklahoma Civil War Commission, a Washington appointment.

Mrs. George P. Selvidge, Sr., a teacher under Evans here, introduced him. Arthur Straehley, a boyhood friend of the educator in Salem, Ky., gave the invocation.

A number of guests were present, including Mrs. Grace Carr, Mrs. Kate Galt Zaneis and Mrs. Mary Galt Cox, all former educators here under Dr. Evans.

Also Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Hall, Mrs. Hall was a former student under Evans; Dr. Otey Johnson; Marshall Wilson; George Selvidge; George Norris, and Jim Bruce assistant city school superintendent.

A social hour and inspection of the school building followed the ceremonies.

Flexible Benefits Under District Unemployment Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial entitled "Flexible Compensation," published in the Washington Post of February 15, 1960, dealing with the hearings which I have been conducting in the District of Columbia Committee on the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEXIBLE COMPENSATION

The principle of flexible benefits under the District Unemployment Compensation Act should have a strong appeal for Members of Congress. They are now being asked to change the rate of compensation for the fifth time. Even so, the benefits have been inequitable most of the time since the first payments were made in 1938. Indeed, experience has proved that it is impossible to keep the rates equitable in a period of inflation so long as the ceiling is expressed in a fixed number of dollars. Senator MORSE is doing a favor to his fellow legislators as well as to the unemployed by urging that the maximum compensation be tied to the average wage level.

It is really absurd for an overworked Congress to impose on itself the burden of changing a fixed dollar limit on unemployment compensation every time it becomes obsolete. Congress needs only to lay down the general principle to be followed, and this can readily be done by authorizing benefits in terms of a percentage of average wages. The District Commissioners, too, are to be commended for embracing this view. It could be advantageously accepted by the State legislatures as well as Congress.

Differences will persist as to what the percentage should be. The Commissioners would fix the maximum benefits at one-half the average wage of the District's privately employed, calculated annually. This would be $44 per week at present. Senator MORSE's bill would authorize benefits to a maximum of 67 percent of wage scales, using an average of Government and private wages, the equivalent of $69 per week. With interest on the reserve fund now paying 25 percent of the unemployment benefits, the adjustment ought to be on the generous side. Of course the wages-benefits ratio must be economically sound, but if it is to stand for any length of time it must also be recognized as being entirely fair to the unemployed.

An Unsatisfactory Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, one of the most outstanding newspapers in my district. I feel that this is an excellent article and one which merits the attention of the entire membership of the Congress.

Editorial follows:

[From the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, Feb. 10, 1960]

AN UNSATISFACTORY FARM PROGRAM

President Eisenhower sent a farm message to Congress Tuesday in the form of wheat surplus controls but the program offered little hope to the farmer. It might eventually wipe out wheat surpluses, but it might also wipe out many a farmer.

The President seemed almost glad to pass the buck to the Democratic Congress for he promptly added that he would support any logical alternative the Congress might offer.

The plain facts seem to be that the Benson farm program has not worked and won't work, yet Mr. Benson is determined that his program will continue with minimum alterations. As long as he is Secretary of Agriculture he is boss of the farm program and Mr. Benson hints that he might be willing to continue on as Secretary if Mr. NIXON is elected President.

The administration has saddled itself for 7 years with a program that has offered little relief to the farmer and has cost the Treasury billions. And now it seems quite hopeful of passing the blame on to Congress in this election year.

Transportation Blindspot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that we, in centers which rely on rail transit to serve urban and suburban communities, are not alone in our concern about the rapidly deteriorating commuter situation. A thoughtful editorial which appeared recently in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times recognized the national challenge involved in the commuter problem and recommends a long look at the whole picture.

I ask unanimous consent that this important editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION BLINDSPOT

A reasonably thoughtful businessman planning for the movement of masses of people into and out of his establishment would be adding entrances and exits instead of boarding them up or partly closing them.

But something like this is being done in the accommodations for the mass movement of people into and out of our huge population complexes—the Metropolitan New York City area, for example.

This is in the deterioration of rail commutation service, which has not been considered on our various levels of government as an integral part of the transportation mechanism.

New York's Mayor Wagner was sharply critical of the Federal Government's role—or lack of a role—in commutation recently in a speech in Chicago. He felt that the National Government had concentrated too much effort on highway and airport construction, at the expense of rails, and said he would favor Federal subsidies for commuter lines if necessary.

There has been a striking change in public and official attitudes toward the rails, as witness New Jersey Gov. Robert B. Meyner's proposal last year that commutation lines be subsidized from turnpike surpluses.

In Philadelphia, the city government, two railroads, and railway labor have formed a nonprofit organization for in-town and suburban rapid transit, with the city underwriting an estimated $2 million subsidy the first year.

Although the New Jersey plan failed in referendum, it and the Philadelphia plan are representative of the new view that rails

are the fourth wheel—along with automobiles, buses, and airlines—of the inter-city transportation machine. The others receive governmental aid in the form of highways and airports.

But not enough of this has been done and a closer look at the whole picture, rather than only parts of it, seems to be in order. To make the commutation picture even darker, the National Transportation Act of 1958 permitted railways to abandon losing commuter service without Interstate Commerce Commission authorization. Many schedules, running deficits largely because of federally built highways, were dropped quickly, instead of a means being sought to make them profitable.

It is not the problem alone of such centers as New York and Chicago; sooner or later, as great population complexes develop and grow all over the country, it will be a national challenge. For the rapid movement of masses of people into and out of our cities, the rails hardly can be improved upon.

Europe's Six Cite Inflation Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us within the Congress who have been working to hold in check the forces of inflation have often been criticized for overemphasis. I personally believe that the evils of inflation cannot be emphasized enough, so that all of our people—in every walk of life will do their best to hold the line. A newspaper article on the front page of the New York Times of February 13, 1960, evidences the deep concern of responsible officials in six European countries about the same subject. Under leave to extend my remarks the article is appended:

EUROPE'S SIX CITE INFLATION FEARS—WAGE-PRICE SPIRAL CALLED BIGGER PERIL THAN SLUMP

PARIS, February 12.—Finance Ministers of the six Common Market nations have concluded that inflation is a much greater cause for worry in the near future than the possibility of a recession, French Finance Minister Wilfred Baumgartner reported today.

The ministers go together in Paris for a 2-day session devoted to analysis of the economic situation and measures that could be taken to bring national fiscal policies into line. M. Baumgartner explained that the ministers had exchanged views on the various issues but had reached no official conclusions.

This was the third in a series of talks among the finance ministers of France, Germany, Holland, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Italy.

PICTURE OF EXPANSION

M. Baumgartner said that the situation outlined by the various ministers was generally that of economic expansion at the end of 1959, whereas a year earlier Europe was coming out of a slight recession.

The present situation seemed to be one of preinflation, he declared, but there had been no major effect yet on prices or wages from the inflationary pressures.

He noted that the situation varied in each country, although the broad general trend seemed to be about the same. Germany and Holland reported the highest rates of industrial activity.

Manpower shortages had been cropping up in many fields, M. Baumgartner said, and "we must follow a prudent course on salaries" not to fall into the trap of inflation.

COUNTERATTACK IN EUROPE

Until recently most West European nations had seemed to have developed exceptionally effective anti-inflation techniques, observers here said yesterday. Tight restraint on credit, high interest rates on borrowing and a degree of price controls in some countries have been among the chief checks employed.

As a result, price indices of nearly all the West European nations have shown only moderate and gradual rises. Even France, where the De Gaulle regime started sweeping financial controls, has in the last year been able to check its wage-price spiral while gaining new financial strength.

Success of the European battle against inflation has been attributed to the relative severity of controls, a heritage from the period of austerity following World War II.

The unequaled prosperity attained in recent years by the majority of West European countries, however, has been marked by mounting demand for consumer goods. Cars, appliances and other attributes of a higher standard of living have become the great popular goal. Installment credit has grown extensively, although it still is conservative by American standards.

Some of the consequences of this trend have shown themselves in recent months, notably through announcements by West German and British labor unions of plans for a shorter working week.

Conservation News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the intense interest throughout the Nation among sportsmen and outdoorsmen in the Federal programs of conservation, I have prepared a brief summary of some of the key legislative and administrative developments in this important field, beginning with the water pollution control bill which Congress has now sent to the President for action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my summary entitled "Conservation News."

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION NEWS

Water pollution control showdown nears: After a major effort by conservationists in the last session of Congress, the Humphrey-Blatnik water pollution control bill passed both Houses and will soon be sent to the President. According to the Outdoor News Bulletin of the Wildlife Management Institute, President Eisenhower soon will have the opportunity to show the American people where he stands on the proposal * * * which would double the existing program of Federal grants to municipalities for help in constructing State-approved sewage treatment plants. The bill's real hurdle is the White House. He has said repeatedly that he believes pollution control should be a State and local responsibility and recommended that Federal funds be slashed.

The cost of this vital program needed in cleaning up polluted waters amounts to no more than the price of one package of cigarettes per month for each of us. If Americans are to have ample water supplies for drinking, fishing and all other uses we must be sure that the President hears from us all.

Wilderness bill at critical stage: The wilderness bill seeks to avoid commercialization of the pitifully small remnant of 13 million acres in the centers of some of our national forests. Hearings have been held on this measure, S. 1123, which 18 Senators from both parties have joined me in sponsoring. I am hopeful it will soon be reported out by the Senate Interior Committee. In the Midwest the only national forest wilderness area is in the Quetico-Superior region on the Minnesota-Ontario border. Wisconsin has the marvelous Flambeau River State Forest wilderness which is protected by State legislation. Those of us who have been working with conservationists are grateful for their unreserved support for this effort to preserve a few remnants of our once great frontier for our grandchildren's grandchildren.

Pesticides and wildlife and human life: The recent "cranberry scare" over the use of chemicals in cranberry marshes, the Fire Ant eradication program using heptachlor in the South and the concern of many people over uncontrolled use of chlorinated hydrocarbons have made it imperative for an accelerated research program to discover the effects on human beings and wild animal life. As long as song birds only seemed to be threatened, there was little public agitation for stricter use of these chemicals except by my friends in the conservation movement. I was particularly pleased to see the resolution sent me by Mrs. Max Schmitt of Milwaukee, president of the Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin urging a Senate investigation of the effect of chemical pesticides and herbicides. As a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am calling this resolution to the attention of Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, committee chairman. It has been a great disappointment to me that the President's budget failed to provide for a speedup in the very modest research program now in progress. I am urging that the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be given adequate funds to do the job of protecting the lives of our citizens and our wildlife resources.

Conservation of wetlands: Our Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Dakota marshlands urgently require more attention from Federal and State agencies. These marshlands have an important effect on our underground water supplies, on regulation of our surplus runoff during critical flood stages and are the principal breeding grounds in the United States of our shrinking waterfowl resources. Conservationists have been urging a speeded up program of acquisition and leasing for some years. In 1958, I supported the increase in the Duck Stamp fee to accomplish this wetland conservation program. And I have long urged that government-encouraged wetland drainage be eliminated—as one means of cutting expenditures. With Congressmen HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, and GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, of South Dakota conferences have been held with Department of Agriculture and Interior officials. Agreement was reached that before any new wetland drainage was approved for planning or subsidy, clearance must be given by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. If these two Executive Departments fail to achieve this coordination

without legislation, I will join the two Congressmen in sponsoring a measure to require that this senseless and wasteful policy be halted.

Soil conservation being studied: You will be interested to know that a major analysis of our whole soil conservation effort is being undertaken by Resources for the Future (a Ford Foundation research group) in cooperation with the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. The purpose of this study will be to find ways and means for extending much-needed soil conservation practices on those lands not now being protected by these measures. As you know, terracing, strip cropping and other measures (such as those I saw on my trip through Wisconsin's pioneering soil conservation area last fall) require sizable sums of money. I am confident that this study will be helpful in meeting the problem of these unprotected millions of acres.

Parks and outdoor recreation: The astronomical increase in the number of families who spend their vacations camping in our national and State parks and forests is beginning to tax the facilities and personnel on these recreational areas to the breaking point. Conservationists, campers and other outdoorsmen all feel that those who use public camps will be willing to pay for this privilege and thus raise the funds needed for more and better facilities.

Tree farming at alltime high: News that the Nation's private tree-farm system has passed the 50-million-acre mark is pleasing to all of us concerned over future forest resources. It is good to know that so large an area of well-managed, privately owned forest land is being given intensive forestry practice. Several years back (1954) when the administration sought to cut forest firefighting funds, and appropriations for tree nursery stock, a group of us in the Congress banded together to assure that these vital programs would be continued. Without the protection of a forest firefighting force and without small trees grown at cost, private owners would lose heart in their efforts to manage their forests well. The more private conservation effort we can encourage now the less necessary it will be for the government to spend large sums in bringing back wasted lands in the future. In the three lake States we have over a thousand individual tree farmers.

Salt Grass Trail Awindin'

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and famous institutions in Texas is the Salt Grass Trail. Symbolic of early day Texas trail rides, it is the world's largest organized horseback movement. It originates at Brenham, Tex., which is in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, in February of each year. Its destination is the Houston stock show and rodeo in Houston, Tex.

The founder of this famous institution is Hon. Reese Lockett, mayor of the city of Brenham, who heads the Salt Grass Trail each year. Mayor Lockett is not only an outstanding mayor but also a successful businessman, farmer, and rancher.

In the February 1960 issue of Texas Parade, appears this article, "Salt Grass Trail Awindin'," by Shirley Insall Deviney, telling of the Salt Grass Trail and the splendid leadership furnished by Mayor Reese Lockett.

Because I know that the Members of Congress will appreciate this fine article, I ask consent to include it in the RECORD with my remarks:

SALT GRASS TRAIL AWINDIN'

(By Shirley Insall Deviney)

All along the Texas gulf coast a 15-mile-wide band of salt grass grows lush, tall, and green. To the cattlemen of the 1870's, it waved an invitation to winter their herds on the Coastal Plains. Steers did particularly well on salt-grass grazing, but sometimes the ranchers sent cows and calves down the trail, too.

One of these trails started in the Brenham area, and thousands of cattle, horses, men, and wagons journeyed along this route each winter.

Horseback riders and oxbow wagons still wind their way down the rutted trail to the coast each year—but it's all in the spirit of fun. And there's nary a beef in sight.

Known as the largest organized horseback movement in the world, the new Salt Grass Trail carries some 2,000 riders 80 miles overland each February. Their destination: The Houston Fat Stock Show and Rodeo.

Farmers, cattlemen, merchants, bankers, doctors, housewives, teens, and children make the annual ride. Their ages may range from 5 to 80. A movie or TV star goes along for part of the trip; this year it's Bob Horton, of "Wagon Train" fame.

Reese Lockett, cattleman and mayor of Brenham, instigated the return to the cow trail. As a former three-event man (saddle bronc riding, bulldogging, and calf roping), Reese had rodeo'd far afield, even taking part in a 1924 rodeo command performance in London for the Prince of Wales.

Though he'd settled down to rodeo directing in recent years, the rancher got to musing about the rugged salt grass cattle drives of pioneer days. Complaining of bad weather on his last plane trip to Florida, Reese told friends, "I'll never make another trip if I can't get there on my horse."

So when he was asked to be arena director of the 1952 Houston Rodeo, Reese trotted down from Brenham on horseback. With him rode three hardy friends; and a dozen other persons joined the group along the way.

Since the inception of this ride, many other cities in Texas and even in faraway Spain have started similar treks. Invariably, Reese is asked to serve as honorary trail boss.

As Salt Grass Trail boss, Reese's difficulty in keeping the antlike procession closed up and moving is like marshaling a parade over an 80-mile route. That the ride functions so smoothly is the result of ironclad rules.

Each group of riders has its own number, wagon, and wagon boss; and this group must stay together.

And 13 experienced horsemen serve as scouts (a polite word for policemen). Woe betide the rider they catch taking a nip when he hadn't oughter.

"We can't have public drinking on the trail; we've got too many women and children along," Reese said. "We all have a good time and holler like cowboys—but there's no misconduct."

Overexuberance is also controlled by a rule that each rider belong to the Salt Grass Trail Association.

Two more rules: No skinny mules or fat wagon tires allowed. Before small mules were banned, the whole procession bogged down in the mud. "Undersized mules can't make it, I tell you for sure," Reese scoffed. "And neither can rubber-tired wagons."

To remove last-minute kinks, a practice run parade is held in Brenham each year. Broken traces, tangled lines—all kinds of problems arise and are solved on parade day. Then the riders bed down at the Brenham fairgrounds.

Before dawn the next morning, sleepy men scramble to saddle horses and harness mules before Reese blasts "Roll out" on his cattle horn. Avoiding highways, the procession snakes its mile-long length across open country, stopping in Hempstead for lunch. No cooking facilities are available, so the women heat beans and fry bacon over open fires.

When the riders arrive at their first camp east of Waller, some are joined by pickup trucks bearing extra bedrolls and food. (Not one truck, van, or trailer is allowed on the trail, however.)

Camp life at night is gay, in a weary sort of way. Several cowboy bands always enliven the train, strummin' and singin' songs of the Old West.

Last year a bunch of riders staged an impromptu footrace—longhandles, boots, saddle slickers and all—just to see if they could still make tracks after riding all day. Surprisingly enough, all stepped pretty high.

If this year's February 23–25 trail ride is like most of its predecessors, you can describe it in just three words: cold and wet. Yet, despite bone-chilling temperatures, mud and driving rains, the riders always manage to survive the grueling stretches with few accidents. Those who bundle up in long handles and saddle slickers stay dry, warm and have fun. The few who don't are miserable.

The second day carries the cavalcade from Waller south through Hockley to the Paddock Ranch near Cypress. By this time, newcomers are trying to decide which part of their anatomy hurts the most, so they can rub it down with horse liniment.

As the riders near Houston on the third day, scores of youngsters fall in with the procession, basking in reflected glory. But it's easy to spot the real troopers who started in Brenham. Horses' heads droop, their riders are blistered and bruised, and wagon wheels creak as the drive along an old cattle trail nears its end.

The aching riders ease gingerly out of their saddles at Memorial Park. This is the busiest night of all, for it takes lots of soap and water to get horses and riders back to normal.

Next morning the procession files in triumph down Houston's Main Street, officially opening the 28th annual Houston fat stock show and rodeo.

Though SGT is the original, and largest trail, three other annual rides now converge upon Houston. This will be the fourth year for the Old Spanish Trail riders, who journey 200 miles from Logansport, La. The Tejas Trail, beginning at Lovelady, joins the Sam Houston Trail, starting at Montgomery. Both groups merge with the Salt Grass Trail at the edge of Houston.

Last year, SGT riders registered from six Eastern and Northern States. One group from France made a television film of the ride. And Don McClelland, a disc jockey from Halifax, Nova Scotia, came to take part.

One pair of dudes from Baytown, who had never sat a horse before in their lives, each took three hours' worth of riding lessons, then gamely mounted up. They lasted as far as the first night's stop.

What prompts 2,000 men, women and children to undertake the three-day grind.

Most of the riders say they do it for the chance to get away from everyday routine. Many say each ride will be their last; but most come back for more punishment next year.

Problems of the day are forgotten by the participants, whose main concerns during the journey are eating, the well-being of their horses and a few blisters. By the evening campfire a rider feels a close kinship with the pioneer Texan who fought to protect his longhorns on the open range, then drove them several thousand miles to market.

Reese Lockett thinks television westerns are partly responsible for the keen interest in trail rides, for TV shows the West in a glorified light: "I was once a cowboy on a ranch 40 miles from town," he said. "And I can tell you there's nothing glamorous about fixing fences, riding herd and pitching hay."

But the Old West still exists in the minds of practically everybody, as Reese pointed out in this anecdote:

The SGT riders execute a flank movement in which 80-odd wagons and the riders cross highways abreast in less than a minute. Before this mass crossing was perfected, wagons crossed one at a time, often snarling highway traffic for hours.

At one such bottleneck, a woman leaned from a car bearing an Ohio license plate—and proceeded to give the nearest trail rider a segment of her mind.

Doffing his dusty Stetson, the rider said with dignity:

"Sorry to disoblige you, ma'am, but one of the cowboys on our spread has headed for the Last Roundup. We're going to see he's laid under proper."

"Oh, I am so sorry," the Ohio woman murmured shamefacedly. She didn't say another word.

New Mortgage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of February 13, 1960, gives an excellent analysis of the so-called emergency homeownership bill now pending before the House Banking and Currency Committee. The bill relies on an emotional title to obtain support, as is clearly shown in the editorial:

NEW MORTGAGE BILL

A new housing bill introduced by Representative RAINS of Alabama has been approved by a subcommittee of the House Banking Committee. This proposed measure would not only call for the pumping of an additional emergency $1,050 million into the residential mortgage market under the special assistance program of the FNMA (Fannie Mae); it would at the same time alter beyond recognition the character of that secondary market for Government-insured residential mortgages.

Neither of the two implicit assumptions underlying the proposal to pump this huge additional sum into the market for residential mortgages will stand even superficial examination. One of them is that the economy is faced with an emergency that calls for such stimulants as this; the other is that the residential mortgage area is getting less than its fair share of the available supply of capital funds.

So far as the state of the economy is concerned, it is such as to indicate that the proposal to blow up mortgage demand artificially would not only be potentially inflationary on the demand side (for residential building has an exceptionally high multiplier effect on municipal and private spending) but it would lop off at a stroke nearly one-fourth the hoped-for surplus in the 1961 Federal budget. As to the lack of funds available for residential mortgages, this is true only if one believes that the Nation has a responsibility to maintain the supply of such funds at all times at a figure equal to or exceeding the recent previous high.

But more serious, perhaps, even than the provision for this huge sum itself are the terms on which it would be provided. For a year after the enactment of this suggested legislation it would, among other things, direct the FNMA to purchase any kind of Government underwritten mortgages so long as the title to the property was not in doubt; it would forbid the latter to dispose of any mortgage; it would prohibit it from paying less than par for any mortgage; and it would freeze the premium charge (which is now discretionary within a range of one-half to 1 percent) to one-fourth of 1 percent. (It is out of this premium that the reserve is created on which the Government insurance is based.)

In short, "Fanny May" would be transformed overnight from a revolving fund designed to provide a secondary market for insured mortgages on time when other purchasers were not available to a priming market that would buy all mortgages offered at fixed prices, presumably above the true market price, and at the same time be prohibited from liquidating any mortgage presently held.

It's "30" to Bill Arnold, Outstanding Texas Labor Leader and Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, because of the acts of a relatively few irresponsible and corrupt labor leaders, whose misdeeds have been used as a whipping boy to attack the great majority of honest and honorable union members, much has been spoken and written in condemnation of the workingman.

Today I want to call the attention of the Senate to a labor leader in Texas who was in every sense a model of what a responsible, honest, progressive, Christian citizen should hope to be, Wiliam Blaine Arnold, who before retirement recently was a leader in the San Antonio Allied Printing Trades Council and of organized labor in Texas for 35 years, died Sunday, February 7, 1960.

He was a labor official, a responsible citizen, a Christian gentleman, a dedicated Texan, and he is missed by all those whose lives he touched. They were many. The ranks of labor, and management, too, for that matter, need more men like him.

Both Bill Arnold and I have served on the board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority, that authority which has built six great dams on the Colorado River in Texas. Bill Arnold's service was dedicated, honorable, and efficient.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article from the AFL–CIO Weekly Dispatch for Friday, February 12, 1960, entitled: "It's Goodby and '30' to Bill Arnold."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S GOODBY AND "30" TO BILL ARNOLD—TRIBUTE PAID TO 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

Seventy-five years and 5 months after he came into the world, William Blaine Arnold, editor emeritus of the Weekly Dispatch, closed his eyes, murmured one last word: "Water," and slipped quietly into death after an illness of several months.

He left behind his widow, a son and a daughter, and uncounted numbers of men and women who looked upon him as a friend.

The Rev. R. K. Heacock of Highland Terrace Methodist Church, who spoke the last words, paid tribute to a long life, well used for the benefit of the labor movement and other causes which attracted Bill Arnold, affectionately known as "Uncle Bill" to many of his colleagues and coworkers. A deep religious feeling, he said, made itself manifest in the expressions of the veteran labor editor.

Reverend Heacock quoted from the last column to appear in the Weekly Dispatch under the widely known byline of William B. Arnold:

"We cannot build a fence around a little world of our own creation and thereby achieve peace * * * God made us creatures who need fellowship; we need one another. Our main problem is living in such a way as to be a blessing to others."

Masonic rites were conducted at the funeral in the Alamo Funeral Chapel and burial was in City Cemetery No. 4.

Death came at 5 a.m. Sunday, February 7, to the man who achieved a reputation for service not only throughout the State, but beyond the border of Texas as well. Great affection seemed to be one of the most characteristic responses which he evoked in others with whom he was much in contact.

It was this friendly, personal touch that enabled him to be most effective, both in serving others and in influencing others to serve.

Bill Arnold had given more than half a century of service and leadership to organized labor in San Antonio and in Texas. The value of that service was recognized and praised by men in high places in labor, industry, and government and by workers of the rank-and-file.

On November 15, at the 40th convention of the Texas Allied Printing Trades Council, tributes were paid to San Antonio's great labor leader and editor by his fellow printing trades craftsmen, by officials of the Texas State AFL–CIO, and by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, who was the main speaker on that occasion. Senator YARBOROUGH came to speak in the place of the former Governor, James V. Allred of Texas, who later became a U.S. district judge. Judge Allred had been scheduled to make the address until his untimely death intervened. Senator YARBOROUGH pointed out that it was a mark of special honor to Bill Arnold that Judge Allred had agreed to attend. Allred seldom went to public affairs after he became a judge and the fact that the former Governor had accepted the invitation to speak was in itself a high tribute to Mr. Arnold.

JOINED ITU IN 1910

Among those who joined in the tributes to Bill Arnold at the allied dinner was Wallace Reilly, editor and publisher of the Dallas Craftsman, who had been secretary of the Texas State Federation of Labor when Mr. Arnold was president. Reilly said, "Bill Arnold's advice and help to me was invaluable. He was an inspiration and help to

me and all who have known him. It is a great privilege to be able to pay tribute to such a great man as Bill Arnold."

In October, last year, Mr. Arnold retired from the post of secretary of the San Antonio Allied Printing Trades Council in which he had served for 35 years.

He had been a member of the San Antonio Typographical Union for 50 years, joining the organization in 1910. In 1912 he was elected delegate to the Texas Allied Printing Trades Council and held that position continuously, attending all conventions until 1958, when he was unable, for the first time, to go to the meeting in Houston. In 1912, also, he had been named delegate of his local union to the San Antonio Trades Council.

In 1924, he became president of San Antonio Typographical Union No. 172 and in 1925 was elected delegate to the International Typographical Union. In 1923 he was appointed as ITU organizer by President James Lynch and served in that capacity for 3 years. In 1924 he became secretary-treasurer of the San Antonio Allied Printing Trades Council.

He served as president of the Texas Labor Press Association for 8 years, was secretary-treasurer of the Texas Allied Printing Trades Council for 12 years, was vice president of the International Labor Press Association for 5 years, and became vice president of the Texas State Federation of Labor, and after 1 year was elevated to president, in May 1936. He served as president for 3 years, and then resigned. He also served as secretary-treasurer of the State organization for 4 months when the post was vacated by resignation and was chaplain of the State federation.

In 1937 he was appointed a member of the Lower Colorado River Authority by Governor Allred. After 2 years he became vice chairman and then advanced to chairman, in which post he served 2 years.

Senator YARBOROUGH, in his tribute to Mr. Arnold pointed out that the LCRA records and activities were always open to the public and that millions of dollars were spent under the supervision of the board of which Mr. Arnold was a member with scrupulous fairness and honesty in spite of great pressures attempted by certain contractor and lobbyist interests.

So careful and correct was the LCRA administration during Mr. Arnold's service that despite the huge amounts of money spent for great projects there was never a suggestion, never a breath of suspicion or criticism, Senator YARBOROUGH emphasized. This was a tribute not only to Mr. Arnold but to the basic honesty and integrity of the labor movement and its best leadership, he added.

Mr. Arnold also served 2 years as San Antonio licenses and dues collector and on many city boards and commissions, including the Municipal Advertising Commission, the 15-man board that wrote San Antonio's present city charter, the War Labor Board, and the San Antonio Library Board. At one time he was director of civil defense here.

He was greatly interested in aiding underprivileged boys, and was one of the organizer's of the San Antonio Boys Club.

He was executive secretary-treasurer of the San Antonio Advertising Club and chaplain of the 10th district of the Advertising Federation of America.

He was a 32d degree Mason and a life member of Alzafar Shrine.

Survivors are his widow, his son, Frank Arnold, Sr., his daughter, Mrs. Margaret Arnold Sahm, 5 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren.

Pallbearers were: Calvin Daniel, C. D. Simpson and Charles Hofer of the Carpenters Union; Regan Lofton of the Electrical Workers; G. Lee Carleton of the Typographical Union, and Jeff Forehand.

Crisis of Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, ever since I was mayor of Minneapolis, I have been deeply concerned about the deterioration of our Nation's urban centers. The critical problem of blighted cities and the necessity of large-scale projects of urban renewal is an important issue. The welfare of American democracy is at stake—decent living standards for our people, sound education for our youth, vital local government, and the integration of marginal economic and social groups into community life under conditions of liberty and equality.

Clearly the crisis of urban deterioration is a national as well as local responsibility and merits our immediate attention and forthright action. A healthy dynamic urban comunity life is indispensable to the maintenance of our democratic tradition and to the continuing development of American culture.

Recently I came across an excellent article on urban problems by Julian H. Levi entitled "Crisis of Our Cities," Vital Speeches, February 1960, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISIS OF OUR CITIES—THE DEPARTURE OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

(By Julian H. Levi, executive director, South East Chicago Commission, Chicago, Ill., delivered before the Citizens League of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, Minn., November 18, 1959)

I

It is a melancholy fact that in this mid-century, American cities all over this country are in grave trouble. The literature confirms this day after day. Within the month the New York Times summarized the Harvard University report on the New York metropolitan area. It stated:

"The New York metropolitan region was warned yesterday that the spectacular growth in its outer reaches had produced and was quickening the decline in its older cities.

"Industrial and residential blight, with accompanying loss of population, industry, trade and jobs, was pictured as spreading through these cities. It was predicted that urban renewal, at its present scale could not halt the decline.

"The warning came in the first published report of a $600,000 study of the region, which includes 16 million people in parts of 3 States. The 3-year study was directed by Harvard University."

Similar studies which have been made in other parts of the country reflect the same conclusions. We deal with two dynamic forces.

First. An ever-increasing urbanization of our society as a whole. Thoughtful students of population trends predict that within the next two decades the 140-odd metropolitan areas in the United States must house and accommodate an ever-increasing percentage of our total population. By the time of the next census it is estimated that 7 out of every 10 citizens of this country will be living in urban centers. Mechanization of our farms and the consequent increase in the size of our agricultural producing unit, further growth of our industrial complexes inevitably produce this result.

Second. An ever-increasing physical growth in the size of our urban areas with consequent great population movements from our central cities to the satellite suburbs. In some places in this country, this growth has been so pronounced that one planner describes Los Angeles, Calif., as "40 suburbs in search of a city." The social trauma and economic consequences of this suburban movement cannot be underestimated. The Harvard study stated:

"More and more, Manhattan is becoming the home only for the very rich and very poor."

The departure of the middle class from our great American center exposes painful vacuums. The backbone of municipal tax base disappears. While sources of income dry up and deterioration of property leads to lower assessments and lower revenues, increased densities and deteriorated living conditions develop increased crime, poorer health, greater dependency, more family instability. All of these factors at a time of diminished rate impose a greater governmental expenditure. It has been estimated in some situations that the city will be obliged to spend three or four times as much in the provision of services as the city is able to obtain from revenues within such an area.

In many parts of this country these difficulties are compounded by the advent of ethnic and racial changes. Central business districts find their future clouded by the loss of customers and purchasing power. Churches, universities and colleges find their environments incompatible with their functions.

We must recognize, moreover, that these realities are those of the market place. The American consumer, when he purchases his housing, of course, has a freedom of choice. If the central city is obsolete, unattractive, the customer will buy elsewhere.

Of course, we have a choice here. You can, for instance, decide that you will not do the things necessary to maintain your central business districts competitive with the outlying shopping centers. You can decide you will leave the customer with the assurances that he will find convenient parking for his car at Southgate and the privilege of a hunting license in downtown Minneapolis.

You can decide that public education in the suburb will equip the gifted youngster for a National Merit Scholarship, while the city schools lag behind, handicapped by a lack of open space and a deteriorated community about them. Some cities can decide that the quality of housing made available in the central city will be so poor as to be attractive only to those who cannot afford to live anywhere else.

A case might be made for each of these positions, but hardly in ethical or even economic terms. In our office we have an important useful device, incidentally conceived and manufactured by one of the great commercial enterprises of this State. The record of this success story has been due primarily to the fact that whatever that firm has offered to the customer has been excellent and competely competitive with the market. Even more pointed is the reminder that when we deal with the future of American municipal government we deal with the future of the American people. Youngsters, whose educational opportunities are thwarted by the slum school with its inadequate facilities, its lack of open space lose a great deal, but the Nation ultimately loses even more. It has been said that our greatest national asset truly is our young

people of inherent promise and ability. Whenever we fail in the realization of these abilities, the Nation loses a portion of its future which it can never replace.

II

Citizens in American cities, confronted with these harsh realities have begun to organize to meet the challenge. We have an American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods. We have many fine organizations such as yours in city after city. These efforts are sincerely inspired in a desire to improve our living conditions and standards. Incidentally, the fact that many of these movements find support in activities of merchants and property owners in the central business districts is not cause for their deprecation. So long as municipal finances are basically tied to the property tax, the maintenance of the major real estate tax asset—to wit: the downtown central business district—is much more than a matter of passing interest to the citizen in any municipality. It is only through the maintenance of these tax assets that the revenues necessary to the fundamental functions of local government can be obtained.

III

Yet when all of this has been said, what all of us are doing is too little and too late. Too little and too late because we really have not understood the basic forfeits of our battle, nor the rigors of the challenge before us. What is really at stake in the problems which confronts us are the fundamentals of American civilization and democracy.

Lewis Mumford in a remarkable address some months ago in discussing ancient civilization said:

"If I read the record right, the first beginning of urban life, the first time the city proper becomes visible, was marked by a sudden increase in power in every department and by a magnification of the role of power itself in the affairs of men. A variety of institutions had hitherto existed separately, bringing their members together in a common meeting place, at seasonable intervals; the hunter's camp, the sacred monument or shrine, the paleolithic ritual cave, the neolithic agricultural village— all of these coalesced in a bigger meeting place, the city."

And again Mr. Mumford said:

"The other function fostered by the city is the dialogue. Within the city you meet face to face people you might have spent all your life looking for if you wandered up and down the great river valleys. Here they were concentrated, and a meaningful exchange takes place."

So it is today. While a home in the country and the joys of the small town may excite nostalgia and envy, these places are by definition impossible for the main business of our civilization. You can't do great cancer research or great heart surgery such as you do in this great urban center in a convenient suburb. In fact, the history of one of the most meaningful enterprises of our generation in medical care was that when two country doctors began their brilliant careers, a city grew up around them.

Great educational institutions themselves create their own urban environment. We've all heard it said that the ideal education consisted of a student on one end of a log and Johns Hopkins at the other.

But today there would have to be a library, a laboratory, and perhaps a medical center and a hospital somewhere close at hand. Even more meaningful there would have to be the dialogue to which Mr. Mumford refers. A dialogue in which many skills, many disciplines and many tongues must participate. While those who live in the suburbs love music and opera, the symphony orchestra and opera house are inhabitants only of the American urban center.

What we are really saying is that the American urban center is essential to American civilization. Somewhere along the road between the industrial revolution and Henry Ford, the Jeffersonian picture of this country as a Nation of sturdy small landowners, farmers, and yeomen disappeared. Our civilization today, with its complexities requires an urban setting.

These observations are not intended to attack the heroism of the average commuter about whom E. B. White has said:

"Commuter—one who spends his life
In riding to and from his wife;
A man who shaves and takes a train
And then rides back to shave again."

IV

But our democracy demands a healthy urban setting. One of the most disturbing publications of recent years is an article written by Morton Grodzins which appeared in the October 1957, Scientific American entitled "Metropolitan Segregation." Here Dr. Grodzins, an imaginative and able political scientist, analyzes the political consequences to this Nation in the development of the segregated central city Negro ghetto, with its potential conflict with the segregated suburban hinterland. When we reach the point in our democracy where substantial political units of our local government are inevitably alined against one another, we strike at the heart of a free society. If Manhattan becomes only the home of the few very rich and the many extremely poor, we plant profound seeds of conflict and difficulty. Certainly the assumption of the ballot box is that the broad mass of American citizens within any given political unit will have a fundamental leavening and community of interest. We do not achieve this essential condition to the success of democracy when we eliminate the broad middle class from the equation. In our American democracy, we cannot permanently carry on if the American city, the smallest and most intimate political unit with which our citizens deal, is bankrupt, frustrated, and unable to proceed with its necessary services.

The moral of these considerations is clear—if we care about the future of American civilization, if we care about a healthy democracy then the business of the revival and maintenance of our cities is urgent, necessary, and immediate.

V

In practical terms, what are the applications of these concepts?

First. We have to rethink our notions of property rights. In the days before the knowledge of bacteriology and the spread of typhoid fever, for instance, it was perfectly acceptable practice for the owner of property upstream to discharge his sewage into the common waterway. Modern knowledge and practice has changed this. A man's ownership of riparian rights does not give him the right to distribute his sewage to the detriment of his neighbors.

By the same token, a fee simple title to a parcel of urban real estate does not afford the owner or anyone who holds title either above or beneath him the right to spew obsolescene, slum and blight upon his neighbors and the surrounding community. This concept must proceed further than the classic assumptions of the police power. An obsolete commercial structure amidst a central business district represents more than an individual misuse of land value potential. Such obsolescence destroys a part of the value of every other structure in the block. An obsolete residential structure even if maintained in accordance with minimum standards of health and sanitation can injure the future of every other house or apartment in the vicinity.

We also have to rethink the whole concept of value. In city after city over this country the acceptable practice in the enforcement of housing and building codes has been that we would enforce these codes short of real penalty to the offending property owner. Fines assessed against slum operations in most parts of this country have been so nominal that they constitute licensing rather than detriment.

In my own State, incidentally, our legislature largely as the result of the courage and determination of our mayor adopted a statute which provided that in an eminent domain proceeding, the court could disregard such value as came from operations in violation of city minimum codes or in the alternative that there could be deducted from the award the capital expenditure required to bring the property into minimum code condition. This past week, I asked one of the eminent appraisers in our community to apply this statute. I was met with the statement that he felt uneasy about this because this would result in the determination of awards at less than what he thought the going market rate was for such merchandise. The answer has to be that the bundle of rights which we describe as fee simple title does not include the right to receive a price calculated on illegal income nor on a structure maintained at less than the community standards, and if this means a decrease in fair market value—so be it. These assumptions will come hard in some quarters, but their acceptance is inevitable to the future of American civilization and democracy.

Second. We have to face up to the magnitude of the task before us. Those of you who have read the veto messages to the first two omnibus housing bills of 1959 will understand the observation that a substantial part of the political leadership of this country just doesn't understand the urgency of the task before us. If we believe that the future of this country depends on a healthy urban setting there can be no alternative but to find funds that are required to carry it out. A 2-year program involving Federal funds in the aggregate sum of $640 million in order to attack the urban renewal problems of the United States (a sum of money, incidentally, somewhat smaller than the amount made available for the support of potato prices), cannot begin to dent the problem. Moreover a governmental program directed towards the renewal and revival of our urban centers cannot be postulated on the basis of a 2-year program.

If we are serious about the task before us we must recognize that for the foreseeable future this program must be a permanent responsibility stretched over this generation.

Perhaps there is great justification in the aim of returning this program to the States and cities. But it is a grim jest to return responsibility locally without a corresponding release of taxing power to meet these obligations.

Budget allocations for urban renewal are, of course, political questions, but the future of American civilization and democracy had better also be debated. If an ever-increasing number of our people will live in urban centers, then the conditions under which they live and work, study and yes, just play, become a concern of urgent Government action and assistance.

Our requirement is the magic ingredient of any free society—the vision to see; the leadership to achieve; and the courage to persevere.

Some 400 years before the common era, Thucydides said it for us:

"Day by day, feast your eyes upon the greatness of Athens, until you become filled with the love of her; and when you are impressed by the spectacle of her glory, reflect that this empire has been acquired by men who knew their duty and had the courage to do it."

State Board of Health Official Says Missoula Is Poorest Sewered Large Municipality in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian of September 20, 1959:

STATE BOARD OF HEALTH OFFICIAL SAYS MISSOULA IS POOREST SEWERED LARGE MUNICIPALITY IN MONTANA

Missoula is the poorest sewered large municipality in Montana, declared C. W. Brinck of Helena, director of the environmental sanitation division of the State board of health, Saturday afternoon in a brief interview following participation in a panel discussion of the first Montana Planning Institute.

The panel subject was "Subdivision Control in Montana." Brinck spoke on "Utilities in New Subdivision"; Vernon R. Peterson, Missoula County surveyor and president of the Missoula City-County Planning Board, on "How Urban Land Is Controlled in Montant," and R. W. Christensen of Seattle, chief land planner, Federal Housing Administration, on "Good Subdivision Design."

In saying that Missoula is the poorest sewered large municipality in the State, Brinck explained that the city has the smallest percentage of buildings sewered. Not many years ago, he added, only 20 percent of the buildings had sewer connections.

The official reported that at present 62 Montana communities have sewage plants and 14 others have appropriated the money to build them but 13 other communities having sewers do not have proper sewage treatment plants. Missoula is one of the latter, he pointed out.

Brinck's remarks in the interview arose from a statement in his address that septic tanks and cesspools are causing a serious pollution problem in Missoula, Kalispell, Libby, Shelby, Billings, Glasgow, Laurel, Miles City, and other localities.

In his speech, he said, "Septic tanks are fine when there is plenty of land and if the soil is suitable for septic tanks. Cesspools are not recommended under any conditions. The problem with septic tanks has been that in many places they operate satisfactorily for a few years then, as the pores in the soil become clogged with grease and soap film, the liquid forces its way to the surface where it runs down streets and alleys and into neighbors' yards. Children play in it. Flies breed in it. * * *

"We also have had problems with wells. Most problems with privately owned and operated wells are from improper construction or improper sewage disposal in the neighborhood. Last year synthetic detergents in individual domestic wells were found in Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y. This caused the county health department to temporarily halt the completion of new wells in several housing developments. More restrictive rules were imposed on well locations and depths of wells. The detergents were traced to seepage from cesspools and septic tanks. In one subdivision in this area, 60 of 186 wells showed the presence of detergents. When the detergents are present, bacteria also may be found.

"In Montana it has been necessary for the Federal Housing Administration to refuse to insure home loans in two districts adjacent to Montana municipalities because of ground water being contaminated with sewage and affecting wells in the area. In another situation a sewage-contaminated irrigation ditch contaminated the ground water supply in adjoining wells."

In closing Brinck said "We have problems in Montana today with suburban water and sewer problems. These problems will continue unless we work together to solve them. Proper legislation is required. If we cannot provide proper water and sewer facilities for a given area, then that area should not be developed. At the present time your Montana State Board of Health can offer only consultation to you, the subdivider, and the moneylenders that may be interested.

"We do not think there should be a continuation of the problem where an individual will drill a well in front of his house, have a properly constructed septic tank in the rear and then have a neighbor construct his septic tank but a few feet from his already drilled well. This endangers the health and well-being of persons living in the area and the investment that the persons may have may be lost unless the situation can be changed. We can change it by proper planning and with proper legislation."

In response to questions asked in the interview, Brinck advised that Missoula has sewage problems in the southeast part of the city, Rattlesnake Valley, Orchard Homes, and other points in the city. He said Missoula has water pollution problems in Orchard Homes and other locations in and out of the city using wells.

The official would not make a prediction as to whether a request that Missoula be given additional time to provide adequate sewage and treatment facilities would be granted. He told Mrs. Thomas Payne, Missoula City Council member, that a mechanical sewage treatment plant does not smell if properly designed and operated but emphasized that it has to be properly designed and operated.

When queried in the interview about pollution of the Clark Fork River from the Waldorf-Hoerner Paper Products Co. pulp plant west of the city that caused concern for some time, Brinck stated that none was found in observations made during the summer.

Let's Break Down the Age Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues once again to the plight of so many older citizens in this country who find themselves too old to work but too young to retire. In an article in the February issue of Eagle, I have spelled out the facts. I have called this article "Let's Break Down the Age Barriers." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S BREAK DOWN THE AGE BARRIERS—EAGLE SENATOR OFFERS SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS OF HIRING MEN OVER 40

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

To see the widespread discrimination against older workers, you don't have to look any further than the "help wanted" section of most large city daily newspapers.

"Prefer men under 35." "21 to 40." "Age 25 to 45." These are the barriers which too often face older men and women who must find a job.

But the age limits in these advertisements tell only part of the story. The age barrier appears again in a less blatant form when the older job applicant turns up in an employer's personnel office.

"Sorry, the job has been filled." "Sorry, we are looking for someone a little younger." "Sorry, we only hire temporary workers over 40."

Is it any wonder that discouragement, frustration, and hopelessness overcome the older jobseeker? It is bad enough to be out of work, worrying about food, rent, children, and health expenses.

But even worse is the feeling, "No one wants me; I am too old to get a job and too young to get a pension." This is a terrible blow to any person's self-respect. Without a job, a man feels loss of his status as a breadwinner in his family and in his community, plus a terrible loss of his dignity as a human being.

By 1970 one-third of our population will be over 45 years of age. But older people will find it harder and harder to compete for jobs in the next 10 years. The high birth rates during and after World War II are going to bring a bumper crop of new young jobseekers into the labor force in the 1960's. Also, automation and new technology may displace many workers now holding good jobs.

In the past 10 years, relatively few young people entered the labor force, as a result of the low birth rate of the 1930's. Therefore, employers needing more workers had to hire and retain older people in spite of their reluctance to do so. This will not be the case, however, in the 1960's.

We cannot afford to waste any of our manpower. Our manpower—young and old—is our greatest resource in achieving prosperity at home and in meeting the challenge of Soviet competition abroad. The age barriers not only are wasteful, but have profound human and social consequences. Age discrimination may turn an able unemployed worker into a bitter, hopeless idler, a ripe victim for any demagogue's propaganda.

What is behind the reluctance to hire older workers?

Some employers claim that older people are less productive, too often sick or absent, unwilling to learn, prone to accidents, quick to "job hop," or hard to get along with. Like most prejudices, these ideas simply cannot be substantiated.

The facts show that older workers are as good as, or even better than, younger workers. This has been determined in studies by Government agencies, by universities, by labor unions, and by management groups. It is clear to me that age discrimination in employment stems from a few hasty generalizations—not from a serious study of the facts.

Employers often follow quick "rule of thumb" restrictions on hiring older workers. One frequently expressed concern is the added pension and welfare costs in hiring older workers. Because of this cost, younger workers—even those with a minimum of experience or training—are often hired instead of older men.

Obviously, employers must take account of any added costs in hiring older workers. I believe we must remove such roadblocks which often cause employers to discriminate against older people. It is not fair that we should ask an individual employer to bear alone the additional expense of pensions, welfare funds, or special training when hiring older workers. These are costs which our whole society should bear—and should be willing to assume.

Let me give an example from a Labor Department study last year (1959) of the steel industry. An employer's annual contribution to the pension fund for a worker who is employed at the age of 30 comes to $120 a year. The pension fund contribution for a new worker aged 45 is $214 a year.

You can bring this down to hourly costs. The steel company will be paying 6 cents an hour into the pension fund for the 30-year-old worker. For the 45-year-old worker, the steel company will pay almost 11 cents an hour into the pension fund.

So it is costing the steel company an extra 5 cents an hour or almost $100 a year in pension contributions to hire the older worker. I believe we must remove the temptation to discriminate against the older worker because of this added cost.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation to allow employers a tax credit to cover the added costs of hiring older workers. My proposal is now before the Senate Finance Committee. A companion bill, sponsored by Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, is also now before the House Ways and Means Committee.

My tax credit bill would allow an employer to figure out how much he is paying for the additional costs of hiring older workers—above what it would cost him if he were to hire the youngest age group which could do similar work. Then the employer could write off this additional cost as a tax credit against his income tax.

Suppose a firm hires two men for similar work—one aged 30 and the other aged 50. If pension contributions cost the firm $200 a year more for the older worker than for the younger worker, the firm could treat the $200 as a tax credit and deduct the entire amount from its income tax for that year.

This tax credit would be allowed for extra pension contributions, extra insurance premiums, extra training costs, and even extra medical and nursing staff needed where older people are employed. Any increased cost of doing business resulting from the employment of older people, above the expense of hiring younger people, would be treated as a tax credit.

Therefore, an employer who is thinking about hiring older workers will not have to worry about the added costs which might normally be expected. I am convinced that this tax credit bill would encourage many more employers to hire middle-aged and older workers and would in the long run be of benefit not only to the workers and employers but to the entire economy of our country.

Of course, the employment problems of our older citizens will not be solved by any one approach. Age discrimination has many faces—and we must act on many levels. Readers of the Eagle magazine are familiar with the problem. The Eagles' campaign for Jobs After 40 is making wonderful progress in educating employers on the value of hiring older workers. Also the Eagles' drive for legislation to outlaw discrimination based on age has speeded action by State legislatures to prohibit age discrimination in employment by private industry.

We have already a national responsibility, set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, to maintain full employment in our economy through all possible means.

This policy set by Congress has special meaning for older workers. When our economy fails to grow, when it falls into even a mild recession, older workers looking for jobs are hit harder because they cannot compete on equal terms in a tight labor market. It is harder to conquer age prejudice in employment when many younger people are also looking for work.

If we are to provide opportunities for older workers seeking employment, we must fulfill our national responsibility for full employment through an expanding economy. Recessions and depressions are bad enough—but a man who loses his job at the age of 55 or 60 may not be able to find employment even after prosperity finally rolls around.

In spite of rising prosperity, we have persistent pockets of unemployment problems of older workers.

Younger people who do not own their homes can pack up their possessions in a car and go across the country looking for work. But the older worker has a big investment tied up in a house he cannot sell, and he has more family and community ties to keep him from moving away.

Unless the community, the State, and Federal governments act together to bring in new industries, the valuable skills of these older workers will simply go to waste while they wait for the new industries and job opportunities that never come. I believe approval of the Area Redevelopment Act, which has passed the Senate, would help to bring new life and activity to these depressed areas with chronic unemployment problems and would be of particular help to older workers.

Even when they have needed skills, older people must face the fact that most large firms promote from within and do not want elderly beginners. They must spend more time visiting smaller firms, trudging around to more employment offices, to more potential employers than younger job applicants do.

We must face the fact that it is not easy for older people to find a job. We must give them extra guidance and placement services. And we should make sure that our systems of unemployment compensation do not leave them high and dry just when they need help most. In many States, unemployment compensation is grossly inadequate and far too short in duration. We must set up minimum Federal standards of unemployment compensation and provide special employment services to make sure that these people get the help they need and get it as soon as they need it.

It is heartening to see growing activity by public and private organizations to help older workers find jobs. More and more, both labor unions and management are becoming aware of the problems, the needs, and the abilities of older workers.

But we must set forth a national policy against discrimination because of age. I have joined in sponsoring legislation to prohibit age discrimination by private firms working on contracts with the Federal Government. This is a first step toward a sound national policy to break down the tragic, wasteful, and needless barriers of prejudice and discrimination.

This policy will reflect the wisdom and compassion of the American people in bringing new hope to those who now are unable to find employment—not because of lack of ability, but simply because of their age.

Mikoyan's Trojan Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to an editorial which appeared this morning, February 16, in the Chicago Sun Times. I am indeed very happy to see responsible newspapers calling attention to the tragic situation which is developing in Cuba, only 90 miles from Miami.

The more I see Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan's nefarious work in countries like Cuba, the more I am convinced that my warning before this very body that the United States is indeed making a tragic mistake by dignifying these Communist leaders with invitations to this country was sound and prophetic. The editorial follows:

MIKOYAN'S TROJAN HORSE

Vodka glasses must be clinking in the Kremlin over Deputy Prime Minister Mikoyan's slick trick in Cuba. Unfortunately, the self-congratulations are well justified. By binding Cuba to Russia in a long-term pact providing for extensive purchases of Cuban sugar and $100 million worth of credit for Cuba's depressed economy, Mikoyan has materially strengthened Russia's economic and ideological pipelines into the hemisphere.

Where do we go from here? Condemn Prime Minister Castro as an ingrate? He would snicker. Embargo U.S. purchases of Cuban sugar? Russia would increase its own purchases. Sit back and wait for Castro or the Cuban people to come to their senses? It could be a long, long wait. For the moment, at least, we seem to have Castro right where he wants us.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in further recognition of the 42d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I include under a previous permission a group of resolutions unanimously adopted on February 7, 1960, by the Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J., under the auspices of the Linden branch of the Lithuanian-American Council.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 7, 1960, BY THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 42D ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas February 16, 1960, marks the 42d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent Republic; and

Whereas in 1940, Soviet Russia, in violation of solemn treaties and declarations, did forcibly occupy Lithuania, and in 1944, following defeat of the German Eastern front armies, did again occupy Lithuanian territory in complete disregard of wartime policies and obligations under the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, to which Soviet Russia is a consignatory with other allied nations; and

Whereas international communism, by unprecedented and unorthodox methods has infiltrated into adjacent areas of the free world, using any deceit or stratagem to further its subversive attacks upon every institution of free society, including education, art, press, labor, agriculture, industry, and government; and

Whereas Soviet Russia proclaims peaceful intentions yet meanwhile asserting that the

future of mankind will be determined by scientific achievement and the development of new and terrible weapons of war; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania have bravely resisted all Soviet efforts to convert them to the Communist way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, This meeting express gratitude to the U.S. Government which has never recognized the purported annexation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia, and has consistently demonstrated a favorable attitude toward Lithuania's independence, and for allowing many refugees to find new homes in this country; and be it further

Resolved, This meeting respectfully recommend to our U.S. Government to abstain from entering into any discussions or agreements which would in any way recognize Lithuania's illegal occupation by Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, This meeting respectfully urges the U.S. Government refrain from any formal agreement with the Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore Lithuania's freedom and sovereign right; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian Herter; to the U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Robert B. Meyner.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.
VLADAS TURSA,
Secretary.

Production and Conservation of Coal in the United States Through Research and Development

SPEECH
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs Mr. ASPINALL, and the others who have worked so hard to bring this legislation to the floor of the House. As one who comes from a coal-producing area where we have a high rate of unemployment I can vouch for the fact that there is certainly need for additional coal research to establish new markets.

In three counties of my congressional district of southern Illinois, we have 7,000 less coal mining jobs today than we did 10 years ago. This had been brought about by mechanization and mine closures. Great hardship has been experienced by our people. Thousands have been forced to leave their homes and loved ones to seek employment elsewhere.

High freight rates and the foreign importation of residual oil have added to our loss of coal markets.

I had hoped that we could secure legislation setting up an independent coal research commission but the President would not approve therefore the bill before us today seems to be our only chance of getting on with an important job that is long overdue. It is my sincere hope that the Department of the Interior realizes the very serious need for this program and will exert every effort to implement it without delay. We need new coal markets. Mr. Speaker, we need new jobs. Let us hope this legislation will do both.

Eulogy to Franklin Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 30, I had the pleasure of attending the annual Roosevelt memorial dinner in Indianapolis. At that time, I was most impressed by the eulogy on the late and beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt given by my friend, Mr. John J. Dillon. Mr. Dillon is one of the outstanding leaders of the Indiana Young Democrats. His splendid message was well received.

I ask unanimous consent that this eulogy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY TO FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT JANUARY 30, 1960

(By John J. Dillon)

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Clergy, Senator Humphrey, Senator Hartke, Mayor Boswell, militant Democrats, young and old, "his life must be regarded as one of the commanding events in human destiny," said Winston Churchill, who himself history will regard as the only true contemporary of the man we honor this evening. It doesn't seem possible that 15 years have elapsed since the 32d President of the United States passed to his eternal reward.

It is commendable that the Young Democrats in this community each year have fostered a custom of honoring the man who had "a rendezvous with destiny." This is the seventh annual memorial dinner at which a few moments have been set aside to give warm and continuous praise to the greatest leader our beloved Nation and Democratic Party ever has had.

The Democratic Convention of 1932 in Chicago was deadlocked, with numerous candidates and stifling heat, when William G. McAdoo of California obtained the floor and shouted, "California came here to nominate a President of the United States. She did not come here to deadlock the convention * * * California, 44 votes for Roosevelt." Mr. McAdoo spoke the truth because these delegates nominated the man who was to be four times President of the United States.

All the country watched this convention with intense interest, because the country was immersed in the most devastating depression of all time. That the Democratic nominee would be elected President was a foregone conclusion, because, as one columnist so aptly paraphrased, "Hoover fiddled while the United States burned."

The delegates to the 1932 convention discharged their duties admirably. They chose a nominee completely equipped to lead the country out of the morass it was in.

He displayed an early interest in government. Born an aristocrat, he was educated at Groton, Harvard and Columbia University School of Law, but still he was in spirit and in reality a man of the people. It was while practicing law he was elected New York State senator from Duchess County by virtue of a house to house campaign in a traditionally Republican stronghold.

Having observed this young man's activity in New York, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, during President Wilson's administration, appointed him Assistant Secretary of the Navy after he had reached but 30 years of age. This was firsthand experience in the formidable task of preparing the United States for war and then in coping with the actual demands of a global conflict.

It was quite by accident that he was nominated at the 1920 Democratic Convention as a vice presidential running mate to James M. Cox. Governor Samuel Ralston of Indiana was instrumental in nominating the man who went to California only as a spectator. After their nomination, he and Mr. Cox journeyed to Washington to see an ailing and failing Woodrow Wilson. Both pledged themselves to the policies of the Wilson administration and to the League of Nations. It was more than 20 years before their promises could be kept. It wasn't until the second conflagration that he could convince the isolationist Republicans that the countries of the world should band together to try to attain lasting peace under the United Nations charter. It's interesting to note that, now that our opposition feels the tenor of the people, as he did long ago, they continually cry "peace and prosperity."

Today none of us thinks of this electrifying personality as a man who reached middle age a hopeless cripple. It was shortly after his campaign for Vice President, while vacationing with his family at Campobello, that he was stricken with infantile paralysis. He turned this plague into a living monument through his work with the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Through the nickels and dimes of children was developed the polio vaccine which today is looked upon as a Godsend by all of us who have little children.

It's understandable, isn't it, that each of the four times he was inaugurated as President, this deeply religious man took his oath of office on an old Dutch family Bible opened to the 13th chapter, 13th verse, of First Corinthians, "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." He was truly a charitable man. Even those interests who passionately hated him could not deny this.

As in his candidacy for Vice President, he received the 1928 nomination for Governor of New York quite unexpectedly. Advised by his doctors he might regain the use of his legs, he went to Warm Springs, Ga., for treatment. Told that to give up this treatment might defeat a cure, he informed Al Smith he would not under any circumstance be a candidate. Nevertheless, the Happy Warrior and his followers nominated him and he didn't know he was nominated until the day after the convention. In the face of nationwide Democratic defeat, he carried New York with an overwhelming majority.

Recognizing that he was needed by the country, a well planned effort to secure the Democratic nomination for President was led by such men as Jim Farley, Ed Flynn, Frank Walker, Joe Guffey, and Vincent Dailey. Some of you here tonight may remember the start of this campaign when Roosevelt spoke at the Conference of Governors at French Lick, Ind., in June 1931.

All the country watched with fascinated anticipation as the candidate for President

boarded a plane at Albany and flew cross country to accept the nomination.

The "Golden Voice" was never more eloquent than when accepting. He said, "I pledge you, I pledge myself, to a New Deal for the American people. Let us all assembled constitute ourselves prophets of a new order of competence and courage. This is more than a political campaign; it is a call to arms. Give me your help, not to win votes alone but to win in this crusade to restore America to its own people."

He kept his pledge immediately upon assuming office. Never had official Washington seen such activity as the first hundred days of his administration. He made 10 important speeches, sent 15 messages to Congress and sponsored 15 major pieces of legislation. This was the start of the Presidential career that led us out of the depths of depression.

He gave us social security. It's paradoxical that when the Republican chairman of Indiana, during the 1959 campaign, said social security should be torn out by the roots, he was summarily thrown out of his party's leadership. This is a far different attitude from that which the opposition party had during the thirties. You see, President Roosevelt forced the Republicans to assume some social conscience.

The people rewarded him by returning him to office, as he would have said, again and again and again. Even the austere and distinguished Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, said with a twinkle in his eye when swearing him in for the third time, "Mr. President, this is getting to be a habit."

We had all just about concluded that "happy days" were really here again when "that day which will live in infamy," December 7, 1941, was upon us. By almost superhuman effort, he led us through the most awful war the world ever experienced. But this war and the rigors of office were to demand from him that last full measure of devotion. It seemed to me, as a young GI, that there was a tremor at the bedrock foundation of our Government on that fatal day. The Commander in Chief of my whole generation had left this "vale of tears."

For an entire week commercials were omitted from our radios, and memorials to "that man" were given instead. Yet today, 500,000 people a year visit his Hyde Park home on the Hudson.

As a brilliant young Democrat, the Lieutenant Governor of Oklahoma, has said of him in a moving tribute, "He stood taller in a wheelchair than most men stand on two good legs."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt will be for every coming generation of young Democrats the shining ideal of all that is new and fresh in Government. Franklin Delano Roosevelt will be transformed during our lifetime to a towering legendary figure.

Thank you.

Navy's Polaris Can Give the Russians Something To Worry About by Way of a Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently in recent weeks spoken out about the tremendous potentialities of the Navy's Polaris missile submarine, and its relevance to the current debate on national defense that is raging in this country.

Nothing that I have read recently has pointed up the tremendous capacity of this weapon so graphically as has a report in the current February 22 issue of U.S. News & World Report, based on testimony of Adm. Arleigh Burke before a committee of the other body. On the basis of this testimony our effective development of Polaris can give the Russians a missile gap of their own to worry about.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article:

IT'S RUSSIA'S TURN TO WORRY ABOUT THE MISSILE GAP

(The missile gap everbody is talking about really spells trouble for Russia. That's the meaning of top military information just put before Congress. The United States has a whole arsenal of weapons in being and on the way—fast. Missile batteries are now in place, zeroed in on Russia. The versatile Polaris is almost ready. There will be 32 of them aboard two submarines at sea before this year is out. Movable missiles, riding rails and highways, will be another U.S. defense. There is scant comfort for Russia in the 1960 standings in the missile race.)

Maybe you're worried by the missile gap about which there is so much talk. Soviet Russia conceivably in 1962 may have 300 missiles that can plaster the United States while the United States will not have so many of equal 6,000-mile range.

Highly significant testimony given on February 9 puts a new face on that supposed gap. This testimony of Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has largely gone unnoticed.

On that day, Admiral Burke revealed to Congress:

The Polaris missile, developed by the United States, is perfected, and by autumn will be ready for use. During this year, 32 of these missiles will be aboard two nuclear submarines, ready to be fired in anger. These missiles are powered by solid fuel, can be fired under water. Their range of 1,200 miles can reach any important part of Russia.

The Polaris can be made in quantity. Its cost is relatively low—$1.5 million per missile. It can be mounted on railroad cars in Germany—movable bases largely invulnerable to destruction by missiles fired from Russia. It can be mounted on trucks. It can be mounted on innocent-looking freighters at sea. It can be mounted on naval cruisers.

Each missile could blow up a Soviet city. By 1961 there can be hundreds of these Polaris missiles. Russia has no comparable missile. She has no atom-powered submarine.

Other testimony of Admiral Burke indicated: Soviet Russia does have ballistic missiles that can be fired from submarines. Soviet threats, however, have centered on long-range missiles. Yet Russia in 1960 will have no more than a few dozen such missiles, compared with 32 Polaris missiles alone that can hit Russia. Thor missiles, liquid-fueled and mounted in Britain by United States, also can hit Russia. And they now are in place, ready for firing in substantial numbers. Jupiters will be operational in Europe soon.

If any shivering is to be done, official testimony now suggests, it should be done by Soviet Russia, not by United States.

MINUTEMAN SPEEDUP

There are other disclosures, also given little notice, which suggest that it is Soviet Russia that is on the short end of any missile gap, when all forces are considered.

Congress learned on February 10 that it would be asked to provide $1 billion to raise the clearance under bridges on main U.S. highways. On February 11 a report told that the Minuteman missile may be operational in 1962, instead of 1963. The Minuteman is a long-range Polaris, and will be able to hit Russia from bases in the United States. Also a solid-fuel missile, it can be mounted on trucks or railroad cars—movable bases—and will require higher clearance under bridges than now available.

It was Admiral Burke's testimony of February 9, however, that put a new light on U.S. power to destroy Soviet Russia.

From one exchange came this information:

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi: "You said in a very few months you would have the Polaris submarines op-operational?"

Admiral Burke: "We will have one operational in the fall, sir, and we will have a total of two this year."

Senator STENNIS: "When you say in a very few months you will have the Polaris submarine operational, to my mind that carries the idea—and I believe it does to the average American—that is saying we will be ready to hit them?"

Admiral Burke: "That is correct."

Senator STENNIS: "In war?"

Admiral Burke: "That is exactly what I mean."

Senator STENNIS: "We have a memorandum here that last year the Secretary of Defense made the statement that one Polaris submarine carries as much destructive power as all the bombs dropped by both sides during World War II."

Admiral Burke: "Yes, sir. This missile—warhead—will be many times the size of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. It is not a small one."

The range of the Polaris missile came into question:

Edwin L. Weisl (special counsel): "What percentage, what parts of Russia on the map could you hit with the Polaris submarine?"

Admiral Burke: "With the missile you will hit anything within—you can figure it out on a 1,200-mile radius."

Mr. Weisl: "Can you hit behind their Ural Mountains?"

Admiral Burke: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Weisl: "You could?"

Admiral Burke: "Yes, sir."

The admiral testified that on nuclear-powered submarines alone there will be a total of 32 operational Polaris missiles by the end of 1960, with 80 by the end of 1961 and 128 by the end of 1962. These will be in addition to liquid-fueled Thor missiles already operational in Europe and to be operational in increasing numbers in years just ahead. They also will be in addition to long-range Atlas and Titan missiles now based or to be based in the United States.

Soviet Russia, in other words, already is looking down the barrel of a loaded missile gun.

MISSILES ON TRAINS

Other missile vehicles soon will be in the process of being loaded as well.

A whole new class of these missile vehicles was revealed by the testimony of Admiral Burke. Questions were raised about using the Polaris missile on railroad cars, on cruisers, and on ordinary freighters.

From railroad cars in Europe, Polaris missiles could cover key industrial areas of Western Russia.

Admiral Burke had this to say:

"We in the United States publish before the missile sites are ever built exactly where they are. So they know where our targets are. So missiles on railroad trains are valuable, because they can be moved from one site, from one firing site to another."

Senator STENNIS: "You think it is practical, then, to put them on moving railway cars or on moving submarines and on moving surface ships? Is that right?"

Admiral Burke: "I don't think it is planned to fire the missiles on a moving railroad car. I think what they propose to do is to move it from one place to another."

Senator STENNIS: "I mean, move them around on railway cars. Now would you want to go further into this—putting the missile on the surface ships?"

Admiral Burke: "Surface ships are on normal routine duties anyway. There will be a considerable proportion of them deployed. They are there."

How widely the Polaris missiles now can be deployed in this way is indicated in the admiral's testimony, too. He said:

"We have 18 heavy cruisers that could be so equipped, and about half a dozen light cruisers. * * * In addition, if it were an emergency and we wanted to do it, you could equip merchant-ship types with the Polaris.

"* * * You could probably put a couple of dozen Polaris missiles on a merchant-type ship, and the rest of the equipment, so they could be used."

Figuring 16 missiles per vessel, that would provide a mobile arsenal of 384 Polaris missiles aboard cruisers, plus hundreds more aboard merchant freighters, compared with the 300 missiles with range enough to reach the United States which Russia is supposed to get, conceivably in 1962.

Russia, lacking oversea bases, must rely on these intercontinental ballistic missiles in order to reach this country, unless a Soviet version of the seagoing Polaris is developed.

On that question, there is this testimony—

Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa: "Do the Russians have the equivalent of our Polaris missile at this time?"

Admiral Burke: "No, sir. We estimate that they have a missile which is probably a much shorter range missile than our Polaris, but we think that they do have a ballistic missile which can be put aboard submarines, sir."

Suppose Russia, without Polaris-type missiles available, launched a massive attack by 6,000-mile ICBM's. Could she catch the United States by surprise and wipe out all retaliatory bases in this country?

Admiral Burke says not. His reason: "It is nearly impossible for us to get even one missile fired at a specific time, so getting 150 or 200 missiles fired all simultaneously to arrive at all places simultaneously is a tremendous number."

Any such attack, the admiral insists, could not be accomplished all at once, so that some retaliatory forces would have time to take off for counterattack against Soviet Russia.

FROM NOW TO 1963

How much retaliatory capability will the United States have in the years between now and 1963, in the form of missiles able to reach Soviet Russia? The new testimony provides these answers—

In long-range ICBM's—Atlas and Titan—there are several in operational status at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., at this time, with more to be added at Warren AFB in Wyoming in April. Production plans recently have been increased, with 130 Atlas and 140 Titan missiles now on order—for a total of 270 long-range missiles to be built before the Minuteman takes over as the prime missile by 1963.

In medium-range missiles—Thor and Jupiter—plans now call for 120 to be based in Western Europe within range of key targets inside Russia. The first of these intermediate-range ballistic missiles are in place now in Britain. Soon there will be five squadrons based there, plus two more in Italy, another in Turkey.

SHIPS AND TRAINS?

Polaris is in addition to these 390 big missiles on station. The plan now is to build 128 by the end of 1962 for use in submarines alone, with more to be turned out during this period if plans are approved for putting them on surface ships and European railroad cars.

That's a minimum of 518 effective retaliation missiles, each equipped with a nuclear bomb, all able to reach targets inside Russia, all to be in U.S. hands by the end of 1962, on the basis of official testimony.

MOVING TARGETS

By 1963 or sooner, Minuteman solid-fuel ICBM's will be added to this arsenal in quantity, based in large part on mobile missile trains. Each of these trains, consisting of a special car for the missile and others for the crew and launching equipment, will be traveling around the U.S. countryside so as not to provide a fixed target for enemy missiles.

At the same time, Polaris submarines will be roaming the high seas, invulnerable to long-range ballistic attack for the same reason. And a large portion of Strategic Air Command bombers will have a capability of being on continuous, armed, airborne alert. A good share of the Nation's retaliatory force, as a result, will be constantly on the move as a guarantee against being wiped out in a surprise attack.

It is the 1,200-mile Polaris, which can be produced much faster than the bigger, longer-ranged Atlas, that is being counted on to provide much of this country's strike-back power in the years immediately ahead. Hundreds can be turned out in a hurry if the Soviet steps up its missile output to dangerous levels.

With the final test of Polaris still ahead, how sure is the Navy that it will work? Admiral Burke comments:

"We have tested this missile. We have fired this missile from various types of launchers. We have fired the missile body from underwater, so that we know what it will do. We have tested the tubes. We have tested the warhead. We have tested all the components."

Later he commented:

"We anticipate no difficulty whatever. It is just a question of putting the systems together now, which will take a couple more months."

These are the reasons, now coming to light in testimony by high-ranking defense planners, why talk of a missile gap seems to be stirring no great concern among the top officials.

Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, summed it up while testifying before Congress on February 9, in this way:

"On the basis of all the information available to me, and in view of the mission and locations of our retaliatory-weapons systems, I just do not believe than any nation possesses the ability today or in the foreseeable future to attack us or destroy us without receiving unacceptable damage in return."

Summary of H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the many inquiries I have had regarding the various provisions of my bill, H.R. 4700, providing insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, I include as a part of my remarks a summary of the provisions of H.R. 4700 and I invite the attention of our colleagues to this very humane and worthwhile measure.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE AS PROVIDED FOR IN H.R. 4700

1. THE PROPOSAL

To amend old-age and survivors insurance so as to provide insurance against the cost of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services to all those eligible for old-age and survivors benefits or who would be eligible if they applied.

2. ITS PURPOSE

As people grow old, they need more medical care but usually have less money to meet its rising cost. Most of them cannot get adequate protection through private insurance, and a severe disability may mean financial disaster.

Individual health insurance policies are expensive; they usually exclude a preexisting condition; they may be refused or cancelled. Group insurance also is unavailable to most retired persons and aged widows since they have no employment connection such as normally is required.

Young widows and children similarly have low incomes and little opportunity to obtain private insurance.

Many hospitals have constant and serious financial difficulties because they have to provide free service to these people. Private charities and public assistance agencies frequently pay for such hospital care or help make up hospital deficits.

The proposal would transfer to the self-supporting insurance system a financial burden which now falls on individuals and private charities, and on public assistance financed by taxpayers. Thus it would work in the direction preferred by Congress.

Fifteen million persons would be eligible in 1960.

3. THE BENEFITS

(a) Hospital and nursing home services: Each eligible person would be insured against the cost of hospital care, including a semiprivate room and all the hospital services, medical care, drugs and appliances which the hospital customarily furnishes its bed patients. The insurance system would not pay the attending doctor's bills, except for surgical services.

Skilled nursing home services would be covered if the patient is transferred to the nursing home from the hospital and if the services are for the same condition or one arising from that for which he received hospital care. The care in the nursing home could be extended so that up to 120 days of combined care would be provided in a 12-month period but only 60 days could be hospital care.

(b) Surgical services: The insurance system would pay the cost of surgical services provided in a hospital, or in case of an emergency or for minor surgery, in the outpatient department of a hospital or in a doctor's office. Any individual may freely select the surgeon of his choice provided the surgeon has attained specified professional recognition (subsec. (c)(2)), except in cases of emergency or where the requirement of such certification is not practical. The cost of oral surgery by a dentist in a hospital would be covered.

(c) Procedures for insured persons: The insurance procedures would be like those already developed for patients covered by private insurance plans that provide service benefits.

A person eligible for hospital or nursing home insurance would, as at present be admitted to such an institution on his physician's referral. The patient could receive insured services from any qualified practitioner or institution which has agreed to participate and to be paid for services insured under the plan. In emergency situations, referral or prior agreement could be waived.

4. ADMINISTRATION

The program is to be administered by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The OASI system would use its existing recordkeeping system to certify eligibility, to issue insurance cards, and the like. For aged beneficiaries, this would mean paid-up hospital and surgical insurance for life.

Any qualified provider of services would have the right to participate. Payments could be made at such rates as are provided in each agreement, covering the actual costs incurred, or on some other mutually agreed basis. Widely used patterns for determining rates have been developed under Government and private programs.

The agreements are to stipulate that the payment at the agreed rates shall constitute full payment for the contracted services; the patient may not be billed for additional sums for the contracted services. Agreements of this type are now in effect under the Federal program for medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

The Secretary could make agreements directly with providers of services or with their authorized representatives. Group practice prepayment plans would be included.

The Secretary shall prescribe regulations and establish an Advisory Council. He may utilize the services of private nonprofit organizations to the extent that he determines that their utilization will contribute to effective and economical administration.

5. SPECIAL SAFEGUARD

Nothing in the bill shall be construed to give the Secretary or administering agencies authority over the internal management of participating institutions or over the practice of medicine or the manner in which medical services are provided.

6. EXCLUSIONS

Persons eligible for permanent and disability benefits are not included. The proposal does not apply to costs incurred in Federal hospitals, or in tuberculosis or mental institutions, or in other countries. It does not cover all types of nursing homes or apply to institutions that provide primarily domiciliary care. It does not apply to workmen's compensation cases unless arrangements are made to reimburse the insurance system. It does not include elective surgery, or nonsurgical medical services except those customarily furnished by hospitals as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients.

7. FINANCING

The bill would increase contribution rates of employers and employees by one-fourth percent each and of the self-employed by three-eighths percent. The health benefits would cause about half of the additions to total cost which would be met in these ways.

8. RELATION TO PRIVATE INSURANCE

The benefits would start 12 months after enactment. This would give time for adapting private insurance arrangements so that they supplement rather than duplicate the new benefits.

Daily News Joins in Support of Unification Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of a bill, H.R. 9874, to provide our country with a more efficient defense establishment by real unification of the armed services, I was happy to read the editorial, "Dollars and Defense," in last night's Washington Daily News.

I recommend that every Member of this body read the News editorial, which I am happy to place in the RECORD under unanimous consent.

Says the News: "There must be one military service, instead of three," and in this sentiment I concur most heartily.

Only by true unification, by sweeping away the layers on layers of assistant secretaries and organizing the Department of Defense on a functional basis, can we provide the best defense for our country. By the same unification process we could make possible the savings of billions of dollars a year for our taxpayers.

Following is the editorial in the Washington Daily News of February 15, 1960:

DOLLARS AND DEFENSE

With all the angry political debate over the state of the country's defenses, it is difficult, to say the least, to know just how we stand.

Confusion is confounded by suspicion that representatives of the high military command tend to view the problem largely through the eyes of their own branches of the service. The airmen want more supersonic planes and airborne alerts, the sailors more Polaris-carrying submarines, and the soldiers more power to fight "brush-fire" wars.

Out of this the impression strengthens that there must be one military service, instead of three—one uniform, one basic system of officer training, one source of promotion, one single devotion to national security without regard to the cut of the uniform of the man with the gun.

One need not impugn the motives of the advocates of the various services. Their viewpoints are the products of their different training and tradition, starting at an impressionable age in the military academies. However, though their attitude is honest, it is narrow; it has got to be changed.

Interservice rivalries have cost us billions in duplicated military equipment. More billions will not protect us adequately if the system is basically unsound.

This bears on a misconception, nourished daily by the alarms of politicians seeking election and some of the military seeking appropriations. It is that, if we just spend enough money, we will have and hold the necessary edge over the Russians. Despite our experiences all around the world, which should disillusion us, our faith in the magic of the dollar remains unshattered, apparently. It is a dangerous illusion.

From the walls of Jericho to the maginot line, history provides ample evidence that defenses—however costly—which produce complacency are easy targets for an enemy rich in imagination, even though poor in resources. And the Russians are poor in neither.

Not necessarily more money, but money more wisely spent, is what we need. And more assurance that our antipathetic military services are more interested in defense against Communist aggression, and less interested in defense against each other.

The Law of Diminishing Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been unusually alert for newspaper accounts, constituent letters and statements of business firms reporting the repercussions on business of the postal rate increases which were authorized in Public Law 85–426.

An article in the January 6, 1960, issue of the Greenfield, Ohio, Daily Times, has recently come to my attention, I believe every Member of the House of Representatives will be filled with apprehension when the implications of this news release are pondered.

The sharp decline in postal receipts in 1959 over 1958 in the Greenfield Post Office, as reported by Postmaster J. Paul Witt, is not the kind of figure that indicates progress and prosperity. The report singles out the increase in bulk third-class postal rates as the greatest factor contributing to the shocking drop in receipts. Decreased employment in local industry is also reflected in the statistics released to the Greenfield Daily Times.

In reading this story one cannot help asking himself if the present postal rates are not already bringing in to force the law of diminishing returns.

The article follows:

POSTAL BUSINESS NOSEDIVES IN 1959

Greenfield Post Office had business receipts totaling $329,006.24 during calendar 1959, a sharp decline from the office's all-time record high of $505,693.54 in 1958.

The annual summary report was prepared by Postmaster J. Paul Watt and was made public today.

The dropoff of receipts—$176,687.30—was attributed largely to the reduction of circular mailing by Wilknit Hosiery Co., Inc., particularly since bulk postage rates were increased last July.

The overall rate increases also contributed to the decline in business.

The year 1959 also brought some reduction in the volume of mail dispatched by the Greenfield Printing & Publishing Co.

On the other hand, the American Pad & Textile Co. increased its parcel post mailing.

The 1959 figure of $329,006.24 was the lowest registered by the office since 1955 when business amounted to $303,712.48.

Figures for other recent years include: 1957, $454,276.07; 1956, $394,039.01; 1954, $356,844.50.

The postage rate increases are continuing. Rates went up in some mail categories on January 1, and another one-half cent hike in bulk rates is scheduled for this July 1.

As nearly as the business year can be divided into quarters in the fiscal system now

employed by the Post Office Department, the quarterly receipts during 1959 were: $11,196.35, $61,063.01, $103,809.97, and $52,936.01.

In view of the effect of Wilknit mailings on the business volume at the post office, as well as the fact that the firm has been gradually reducing its personnel, the Times today asked Lowell Wilkin, president and general manager, for a statement as to prospects for possible business improvement in the new year.

In response, he said:

"We have taken on several new items and we are endeavoring to find others to help maintain volume, but what the prospects are I just can't say."

Food Explosion Versus Population Explosion, a Thoughtful Look to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about a so-called population explosion and what should be done about it. This is a serious matter, meriting our thoughts and attention.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a most interesting paper written by Dr. Nicholas D. Dietz, Jr., of Omaha, Nebr. This paper was recently published in the Social Justice Review.

The paper results from a serious study of future population growth by Dr. Dietz. He brings up a previously unpublicized relationship between diet and population and makes telling points about the untapped food production resources in the world.

I most earnestly commend this paper to anyone concerned about this matter:

FOOD EXPLOSION VERSUS POPULATION EXPLOSION — NATURE SEEKS COOPERATION, NOT FRUSTRATION

(By Nicholas Dietz, Jr.)

There is much genuine concern—even alarm—among very many well-meaning people about the imminent world "population explosion" following in the wake of the present "golden age" of both preventive and curative medicine. Many more people are surviving longer and better than ever before, especially in the so-called underprivileged countries. Ceylon, for example, aided by WHO (World Health Organization), has halved its death rate in only 10 years. It is a sober fact that world population is presently increasing at the impressive rate of 1.6 percent per year. Better understanding of nutrition and constantly improved methods of production and distribution of food are helping, too, for despite severe regional shortages, especially in protein, the evidence indicates that there is probably less malnutrition, as well as less disease, in today's estimated 2.8 billion world inhabitants than there were when the total was only the 1 billion or so of the mid-19th century.

FERTILITY OF HUNGER

The contribution from better nutritional understanding includes the important and relevant "fertility of hunger" theory of the noted Brazilian nutritionist, Dr. Josue de Castro of FAO (United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization). This theory correlates fertility with the intake of animal protein, that is, with the protein supplied by milk, cheese, eggs, meat, or seafood. The theory holds that very low animal protein consumption (common in undernourished, overpopulated areas) engenders a pathologic, hormonally induced hyperfertility by virtue of liver damage brought on by the protein inadequacy. The accompanying table of data for the year 1939 supports de Castro's theory, as do also some important and long-overlooked nutrition-fertility studies on six generations of albino rats carried out by Sionaker at Stanford University about 30 years ago and reported in the American Journal of Physiology. The table reveals that the birth rates in Formosa, India, and Japan, where animal protein intakes were relatively very low, were 2 or 3 times higher than the corresponding birth rates in Australia, the United States of America, and Sweden, where such protein intake was 6 to 12 times higher than in the other countries. If it is suspected that the large differences in the birth rate data were due to artificial birth control practiced in Australia, the United States of America, and Sweden, we would point out that a correction of the data for birth control would be too small to significantly alter the total picture, and we might add that the similar hunger-fertility data for the albino rats could not possibly have been influenced by any rat birth control.

Country	Average daily per capita animal protein intake in grams	Annual birth rate per 1,000 population
Formosa	4.7	45.6
India	8.7	33.0
Japan	9.7	27.0
Australia	59.9	18.0
United States of America	61.4	17.0
Sweden	62.6	15.0

In short, de Castro indicates that adequate protein nutrition tends to act as a natural brake, so to speak, on any "population explosion," whereas inadequate protein nutrition tends to accelerate it.

In any event, the question earnestly and constantly being raised in many quarters is: "Where will enough food ever come from as the population explodes, when very many people even now go to bed hungry at night?"

A common reaction to this threatening surplus of human mouths to be fed without enough food to go around, is that "after all—let's have the courage to face it—it is really a problem like that of an excess of rabbits at large vainly trying to scavenge enough food to keep alive." The suggested solution very often is the neo-Malthusian one: "Let's cut down the surplus of mouths by some humane, well-organized system of population control and thus bring about a realistic balance between population and food supplies. Naturally, we just can't kill off a lot of people or let them starve to death, as in the case of the rabbits, but we can achieve the same result by a humane program, government sponsored if necessary, of organized, systematic, artificial restriction of surplus births."

Unfortunately such an approach, well intentioned though it is, is actually not only in utter conflict with the innate dignity of man and the natural law which governs all men, but it also overlooks one of man's most cherished convictions—his strong and widely held faith in divine providence, which is supported by memories of such Biblical events as the providential manna supplied to the Israelites of old in the desert wilderness, and Jesus' miraculous multiplications of the loaves and the fishes to feed the hungry multitudes, not to mention the constant verbal teachings of Jesus, such as: "For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things" (Matthew 6), and "Do not be afraid; you are of more value than many sparrows" (Matthew 10).

The universal Judeo-Christian acceptance of divine providence is eloquently attested to, for example, by the wonderful story of Job's patient acceptance of God's will, by Roger Williams' choice of the name "Providence" for the capital city of Rhode Island in our colonial days, in gratitude for "God's merciful providence," and by the concluding sentence of our American Declaration of Independence: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence. We mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our Sacred Honor."

Furthermore, it is not at all axiomatic that the population explosion will long continue. The neo-Malthusians calculate that there will be standing room only for the 290 trillion people in the world by the year 2690 if the population explosion goes on unchecked. This would amount to 5 square feet per person, and is, in the words of the population expert, Father Anthony Zimmerman, S.V.D., "a good exercise in mathematics, but it is demographic nonsense." The plain fact is that the present rate of increase will be of relatively short duration by its very nature, and, shall we add, by the wisdom and providence of Almighty God. As we know, average infant survival rates have risen and average life spans of all have lengthened. Once the ultimate of most of the human race, as Father Zimmermman points out, there will be a marked slowing down of population expansion, on the basis of present fertility rates. Crude mortality rates will rise because of the large percentage of senior citizens; crude birth rates will decline because they will be measured against an increasing number of senior citizens. Furthermore, as De Castro points out, present fertility rates in overpopulated areas like India may be expected to decline if nutrition can be significantly improved—and it can be as we shall show presently. However, independently of the Da Castro theory and of any potential fertility decline due to atomic or other injury to human genes, Father Zimmerman foresees that there may be two more doublings of the human race before the population explosion ends and expansion then continues at a much slower pace. Two more doublings would result in a world population of about 11 billion.

Finally, the neo-Malthusian approach assumes that the present supply and distribution of good food cannot be greatly improved upon by man's efforts. Actually, this assumption is quite invalid, to say the least, in the face of all the scientific, economic, and historical evidence.

POTENTIAL FOOD PRODUCTIVITY

In a careful 5-year experiment near Essen, Germany, an engineer's family of six lived in excellent health on the products of 3 acres, which were supplemented only by salt, baking powder, lime, mineral fertilizer, and peat. On the basis of the estimate of Colin Clark, director of the Oxford Agricultural and Economics Research Institute, of about 19 billion acres of "good temperate agricultural land" presently available, the German experiment would indicate that these acres could supply a population of about 38 billion without a single improvement in existing agricultural techniques. Note that this estimate excludes lands in the Torrid and Arctic Zones, as well as potential but presently unavailable Temperate Zone lands. Actually a total of only about 20 percent of the earth's presently arable acreage is now under production, according to the U.S. De-

partment of Agriculture, and nine-tenths of the earth's total land surface is not under any production.

One of the countries which is most fearful of overpopulation, and as a result, has been promoting a "family planning" program as a population control measure, is India. And yet India can be said to be more truly faced with underproduction than with overpopulation. Of her 1 billion acres which can be cultivated, only 80 million were under cultivation in 1952. Rice and wheat are her two principal crops. But she was producing only 800 pounds of rice per acre, while Germany produced 2,000. If De Castro's "fertility of hunger" theory is correct, the population of the subcontinent of India (including Pakistan) has increased so fast—from 200 million in 1870 to 450 million in 1951—largely because of underproduction of foods and famines during the intervening years, not in spite of them. When hunger cuts down, say, 3 in every 10, nature, says De Castro, sees to it that 4 or 5 extra babies are produced, simply to insure race survival, so to speak.

The continuing agricultural crises of chronic surpluses and their inevitable economic consequences in the United States and elsewhere, are largely due to the extremely rapid improvement in farming efficiency whereby more and more food and fiber are constantly being produced on less and less acreage by fewer and fewer workers. Paradoxically, these crises are self-perpetuating in that they are in themselves very strong stimuli for the improvement of farm income through the achievement of constantly greater efficiency. For example, between 1954 and 1958, there was a 30 percent rise in the annual wheat yield per acre in the United States. In America the amount of food and fiber produced per man-hour of farm work has doubled in the past 18 years, and it is now costing the Commodity Credit Corporation the staggering yearly total of $1 billion—over $100,000 per hour—just to store our embarrassing Government-held agricultural surpluses.

MAN'S INGENUITY AND NATURE'S POTENTIAL

Despite large acreage losses due to erosion, immense highway and parking systems, airports, military installations, sprawling factories, mushrooming suburbs, etc., our agricultural soil bank acreages will probably continue to increase for some time, for farm machinery becomes ever more efficient and automatic. Greatly improved plant and animal strains and breeding practices continue to be developed, along with richer fertilizers, revolutionary plant stimulants, like gibberellin, more efficient animal feeding programs, better crop disease control and prevention, better insecticides, fungicides, and weedkillers, more crop rotation, irrigation, water and soil conservation, reclamation, improved weather forecasting, etc. Space satellites may revolutionize the science of meterology, with great obvious advantages to agriculture.

The manufacture of synthetic materials in factories is releasing large farm and plantation acreages once devoted to raising non-food crops, such as certain dyes, and more recently, fibers, plastics, rubber, etc. About one-half of the world's rubber supply is presently of high quality, factory-made material. Soap manufacture in this country now uses only one-third as much animal fat, such as lard, as it did only 10 years ago, because of the advent of excellent detergents made from petrochemicals. Rural electrification, many types of mechanization, mass production, and even automation are also releasing large acreages previously devoted to supplying food for farm work animals. Control of dread disease vectors, like the malaria-bearing anopheles mosquito and others, are releasing lush tropical areas which have been previously unavailable for agriculture or even for human habitation.

Large scale, soilless, rapid, and very efficient growth of protein, fat, carbohydrate, and vitamin foodstuffs (algae and yeast culture, hydroponics, etc.) has progressed well beyond the research and development stages. De Castro estimates that one tank-factory for algae-yeast culture could produce enough precious protein for 3 million people and enough fat for 1,500,000 people—the equivalent of tens of thousands of acres of arable land. Intensive chemical, biochemical, and engineering research would doubtless be able to achieve the commercial manufacture of edible oils and fats from petroleum. Similar research likewise would be able to achieve the commercial production of sugars from wood and other cellulose sources. Once science and engineering have adequately comprehended and finally duplicated the photosynthesis of foodstuffs by sunlight, the nutritional possibilities will be so tremendous that they will challenge the imagination.

Vegetation captures only 2 percent of the solar energy which falls upon it. Research is in progress to develop new patterns of leaves and branches which will intercept maximal amounts of sunshine, and new patterns of roots which, instead of spreading outward, will burrow deeper into the soil and hence closer to the water table, thereby providing an acreage economy by making it possible to grow plants closer together.

Canning, dehydration, the making of concentrates, refrigeration, deep freezing, and other commercial forms of food preservation, including the widespread use of a variety of safe chemical preservatives and a growing use of sterilization by nuclear radiation, are constantly contributing to the better conservation as well as the better distribution of food supplies. The possibilities of food preservation were dramatically illustrated by a banquet held at the Explorers' Club in New York some years ago. The menu included meat from an extinct prehistoric animal which had been safely preserved for thousands of years in subzero Arctic ice. The Admiral Byrd and other Antarctic expeditions have less dramatically but very practically demonstrated the efficiency of natural, long term, deep-freeze food preservation in the vast south polar continent Antarctica.

Scientific marine agriculture (the planting and harvesting of fish) can yield as much food per acre as can good land. Fresh water fish farming has been successfully promoted by FAO in Haiti and elsewhere. An acre of warm pond water is reported to produce almost 1,000 pounds of fish per year without artificial food or fertilizers in Haiti. Even a rice field can produce 300 pounds of fish per acre and also grow a rice crop.

Only 1 percent of the world's food at present comes from the 71 percent of the world's nonland surfaces, that is, from its rivers, lakes, seas, and oceans. So far, little or none of this food is vegetation. Surprisingly, an average square mile of ocean surface spontaneously produces about 13,000 tons of vegetation per year, which amounts to a world total five times greater than that from land. This in spite of so-called ocean deserts with inadequate nutrients because of lack of natural vertical circulation of nutrients from lower ocean depths. The National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council are studying ways of turning some of these ocean deserts into fertile ocean areas.

The recent, famous voyage of the raft, *Kon Tiki*, from Peru to the islands of the Southwest Pacific, demonstrated that harvesting with very fine mesh nets of the tiny ocean zooplankton (which feeds on the phytoplankton) can be achieved, and further that these plankton are both delicious and nutritious.

It is already feasible to desalt sea water rather cheaply, at perhaps as low as 20 cents per 1,000 gallons of fresh water produced. It is not at all unrealistic to foresee a day in the not too remote future when the demineralized water which land vegetation requires will be pumped inland from coastal areas by inexpensive solar, tidal, atomic or other available forms of energy. This will mean that gigantic desert wastelands, like Africa's Sahara, Asia's Arabia, Iran or Mongolia, the Australian desert or our own parched Southwest, will be able to blossom out and burst forth as nutritional paradises—paradises which will simultaneously be able to afford employment to uncounted multitudes of immigrants of many skills, because the water will be available for industry as well as for agriculture in these vast areas of hitherto untouched natural resources. The impressive desert transformations already taking place in Israel are but a faint glimmering of future possibilities. A substantial plant to demineralize about 1 million gallons of salt water per day is about to be constructed in California, the greater part of which State, as is well known, is quite arid. But this aridity has not prevented California from applying technical measures which have already made it, among its many other achievements, the leading agricultural State, and will soon make it the most populous of our 50 States.

SOLUTIONS IN SIGHT

These changes are occurring, or can be anticipated to occur, all over the world, as man makes better use of the earth's natural resources, as suggested by Pius XII. In fact, since 1948, as Father Zimmerman has stated, world food production has been increasing at about 2.7 percent annually, and industrial production 5 percent annually, whereas world population has been increasing at the significantly lower rate of 1.6 percent annually. As these changes take place, the challenging problem of distribution—half the consumer's food cost in the United States is still a distribution cost—will inevitably shrink in importance as new centers of food production rise up to shorten distances, and as distribution itself continues to expand and to improve in response to natural demands and to its own competitive economic pressures. Indeed, modern transportation and transportation systems, like the new St. Lawrence Seaway, can be foreseen as potential aids not only in bringing more food and other goods and trade more quickly to more people, but also by facilitating peaceful emigrations from overpopulated and refugee areas to newly developed and underpopulated food centers and bases which need worker-consumers and their skills.

An illustration in point is our newest State, Hawaii. Two centuries ago, infanticide was regularly practiced among the 100,000 Kanaka inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands, to balance the number of mouths against the apparent food supply. Hawaiians now number well over 500,000, and they eat better than ever because of an enlightened and prosperous agricultural economy in the wake of peaceful migrations of settlers of varied cultures and skills from the United States of America, Japan, Portugal, China, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Korea, and elsewhere. Many of these settlers migrated from surplus population or refugee areas. Hawaii has just peacefully and proudly chosen Hawaiians of three ethnic origins—Caucasian, Japanese, and Chinese—to represent them in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

A greater and more familiar illustration is, of course, our own continental United States, whose 178 million population has arisen from diverse surplus and refugee European peoples and others from all over the globe. All of them, working peacefully and diligently together, have made America, under God, not only the "melting pot of nations," but also the "greatest of nations."

An immediate emigration problem is being seriously espoused by the United Nations World Refugee Year program which has received the hearty endorsement of Pope John XXIII. We of the Catholic Central Union

(Verein) and the National Catholic Women's Union, together with our beloved central bureau and especially its esteemed director, know and endorse this work even as we have consistently done in the past. In the light of our present view of the overall population-refugee-food picture, we feel, I am certain, more assured than ever that as we work and as we confidently continue to pray "give us this day our daily bread," to the prayer's divine Author, our prayer will never be said in vain. It is not entirely inconceivable that men may even one day be confidently offering this same prayer to the God of all the universe, from nonterrestrial human colonies established by interplanetary space travel and migration.

In summary, then, does it not seem that in Almighty God's own good time, the much feared "population explosion" is really destined to be providentially slowed down of its own very demographic nature, while at the very same time it is being contained and balanced by enlightened and hard-working men of good will as they make much better use of the manifold gifts of God's creation—as they set off a veritable world "food explosion"?

"World explosion?" Yes. But a controlled and a useful explosion, a wise and a providential one; destined to carry bounteous new manna to modern peoples, new and astronomical multiplications of loaves and fishes to uncounted latter day multitudes.

Defense in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many statements, arguments and charges being made in regard to the adequacy of our national defense and the budget requests for that purpose for the coming fiscal year, I believe the nonpartisan article appearing in the Baltimore Sun on February 15 is worthy of careful reading by all Members of Congress.

The writer, Price Day, is on the editorial staff of the Baltimore Sun. He is an outstanding journalist and analyst, and his writings are always thought provoking and stimulating. For the consideration of the Members, I am inserting the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

DEFENSE IN POLITICS—PARTISANSHIP, BOTH KINDS

(By Price Day)

The glib way of describing the debate over defense is as a political fight, with Republicans arrayed on one side declaring that the defense planning is adequate, and Democrats in phalanx on the other crying that it is not.

In a degree that picture is accurate. The great issues of any election year, as defense is a great issue of this, are going to be used politically. Political considerations are involved, if not indeed uppermost, when Senator SYMINGTON waves papers to challenge administration figures on Russian missiles. Political considerations are involved, if not indeed uppermost, when Mr. Eisenhower makes a quick junket to Cape Canaveral; even though in a press conference the next day, with a straight face, he decries headline-seeking in matters of defense.

When Senators JOHNSON, HUMPHREY, and KENNEDY—each of them, like Sentaor SYMINGTON, a possible Democratic nominee—press the attack on the administration's defense policies, they are thinking of the political effects of their remarks. When Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, makes a public address in which he presumes expertness in the subtleties of intelligence estimates, he has politics on his mind.

This is not to say that the Senators named are concerned with politics alone, or that Mr. Stans is not convinced that he is right about the intelligence estimates. But they are all politicking. It is inevitable that they should be, and not improper. It is the way the country runs.

Developments within the past few days have shown, however—if the showing was necessary—that the defense debate is something more than a simple partisan argument.

As noted by Mr. Gerald Griffin in the news columns of the Sun yesterday, a new line of criticism on defense has appeared within the past week, on the theme that a larger effort in the whole defense program is required, and that the public would support it.

It is just another Democratic line of criticism, in the sense that its three most notable proponents, Representatives RAYBURN, VINSON, and CANNON, are Democrats. Where they differ from many other Democratic critics is in their established reputations for knowledge and for nonpartisanhip on large issues.

Mr. RAYBURN in one of his aspects is strongly partisan. There is no need to labor the point that in another he has for decades taken a consistently nonpartisan stand on defense and foreign policy. When he says that "we have not made anywhere near the progress we should have made in our defense," few people in Washington doubt the genuineness or the depth of his concern.

Similarly with Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who, as Mr. Griffin writes, is "generally considered to be one of the true experts on the Nation's Defense Establishment," this in contradiction to the President's suggestion last week that expertness in that field is confined to the Defense Department and to wearers or former wearers of general's stars. When Mr. VINSON says that during the past decade (a time covering more than the Eisenhower administrations) "we have worried about dollars when we should have worried about a more adequate defense," none but the radically partisan in the other party are going to accuse him of playing politics with the national security.

Mr. CANNON's case is the most startling of the three. When Mr. CANNON, a noted guardian of the public purse under whatever administration, says that more money ought to be spent on defense, people sit up and take notice.

Away from the Washington scene and its political labels, others also who do not qualify for the President's expert badge but who still speak from knowledge carefully gathered and painstakingly weighed are not altogether convinced that the administration's defense policies are adequate. One example: The report of the Russian-research institutions of Columbia and Harvard Universities, which in its section on defense doubts that sufficient account has been taken of the Soviet capabilities for local and limited warfare.

President Eisenhower said on Thursday that on questions of defense he tried to keep his own statements outside partisanship. It is undoubtedly true that in defense and foreign policy he believes himself nonpartisan. Indeed, it is unquestionably true that—Cape Canaveral junkets notwithstanding, for any politician must do things like that—he holds himself in these fields above party.

But at the same time he seems to deny nonpartisanship to others. He persists in dismissing as parochial any military opinions at odds with his even from men by his own definition expert. He appears to agree with those in his party who charge that the Democrats, from political motivations, are undermining the Nation's morale with their criticisms of defense policies.

Granted the election-year inevitability of vigorous politics on both sides, the issue is too important for debate to be stifled, or for opinion from any informed, earnest, and thoughtful source to be brushed aside.

U.S.A.: Second-Class Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, last year I received from Columnist Drew Pearson a complimentary copy of his book entitled "U.S.A.: Second-Class Power." After I read it avidly I was shocked, angry, and mortified. I asked myself soul-searching questions. How could our country, the United States, be second to any other country in military might and power? After all, did not the United States develop the first atomic bomb and terminate a phase of World War II by dropping this devastating atomic bomb on Japan destroying completely the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Did not the United States develop also the powerful hydrogen bomb more powerful than any other instrument of destruction? Did we not also in the Korean war develop our regard for mankind by refraining from using these weapons of total destruction?

I have continued to wonder as to our military position and reports from our President of the United States, our generals, and knowledgeable people, like Senator SYMINGTON, do not resolve these doubts. Is the American citizen satisfied that this administration has done everything to maintain our prime position which we enjoyed in the 1940's?

Is the American citizen satisfied that we are not a second to Russia in military power?

Do the statements of our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, which are contained in the following editorial published in the Washington Post this day, February 16, 1960, satisfy our quest for security and resolve our doubts?

The editorial follows:

CATCHING UP

Tass, the Soviet news agency, announced the first intercontinental missile on August 26, 1957. The first Soviet sputnik took flight on October 4, 1957. On September 13, 1959, a Soviet rocket reached the moon. On January 20, 1960, the Soviet Union reported the successful test in the Pacific of a missile that went nearly 7,800 miles and struck within 1¼ miles of its target.

Following are some of the comments of President Eisenhower during this progression:

"Let's take the earth satellite, as opposed to the missile, because they are related only indirectly in the physical sense, and in our

case not at all. Never has it been considered as a race." (October 9, 1957.)

"So far as the satellite itself is concerned, that does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota." (October 9, 1957.)

"It is my conviction, supported by trusted scientific and military advisers, that, although the Soviets are quite likely ahead in some missiles and special areas, and are obviously ahead of us in satellite development, as of today the overall military strength of the free world is distinctly greater than that of Communist countries." (November 7, 1957.)

"At this moment the consensus of opinion is that we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic missile development." (January 9, 1958.)

"With respect to the thrust * * * I do know that our plans, programs of development, are the kind that will put up any kind of missile or any kind of satellite that we believe will be necessary." (June 18, 1958.)

"There has been no place that I can see where there has been any possibility of gaps occurring." (August 27, 1958.)

"Today the so-called missile gap is being rapidly filled." (October 20, 1958.)

"We are rapidly filling the gap that existed; and in some ways I think that our scientists have already achieved what we would call even more than equality, particularly in types and kinds, even if not in numbers." (October 21, 1958.)

"The so-called missile gap of 6 years ago is speedily being filled." (October 22, 1958.)

"Today America—and all the world—knows that in less than 4 years we are rapidly closing the missile gap that we inherited. And sputniks have been matched by Explorers, Vanguards and Pioneers." (October 31, 1958.)

"It is absolutely fatuous and futile to try to balance, item by item, the progress of two great nations in their technology of defense. To disturb ourselves too much that we have not yet caught up with another great power and people with technical skill in a particular item, it seems to me to show a loss or a lack of a sense of balance." (January 14, 1959.)

"We do not believe that there is a relative increase in their capacity." (February 4, 1959.)

"Our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements." (January 7, 1960.)

"I am always a little bit amazed about this business of catching up. What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate." (February 3, 1960.)

"There are too many of these generals with all sorts of ideas. I cannot be particularly disturbed because everybody with a parochial viewpoint all over the place comes along and says that the bosses know nothing about it." (February 3, 1960.)

"The biggest problem there is in the United States today is to make sure that her own people * * * understand the basic issues that face us and form their own judgment." (February 11 1960.)

The Second Battle of Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, the action of the House today in approving the 1961 appropriation for the Department of the Interior leaves the status quo unchanged in the second battle of Gettysburg.

Much has been written in the past year about the efforts being made and some that should be made to save the Gettysburg Battlefield and other historical monuments from being overrun by unrestricted commercialization. Few more comprehensive and understanding articles on the subject have come to my attention than the one which appeared in last Friday's edition of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily. The article is written with malice toward none and with charity and understanding for all who are currently striving to resolve for everybody's benefit the second battle of Gettysburg.

I commend the article to the attention of all the Members who are desirous of having a better understanding and appreciation of the problems involved.

The article follows:

ON LINCOLN'S 151ST BIRTHDAY—NORTH LOSING TO VIRGINIANS IN SECOND BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

The 151st anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln finds the North losing the first skirmish in the Second Battle of Gettysburg.

The battle is for funds to save the historic battlefield from encroachment by commercial establishments and residential development.

A Department of the Interior official this week said further Federal purchases will not be made at Gettysburg in this fiscal year. He placed the blame on local officials who have not taken action to provide zoning laws to protect the field and surrounding land from encroachment.

A $450,000 congressional appropriation last year was earmarked for the Gettysburg and Manassas (Va.) battlefields and other historic Civil War sites with the string attached that the local authorities must provide zoning protection. At Manassas, site of the Battle of Bull Run, the zoning was rushed through and the way cleared for purchases there.

Officials in Gettysburg and in Cumberland township, where most of the battlefield land lies, have not yet provided the zoning protection. Gettysburg borough officials have not even started to plan for zoning. But that may not be very important to the battlefield since very little of the land where the fighting occurred is in the borough.

In the township, a planning commission is at work and has the help of Fels Institute, Philadelphia, in preparing for zoning. "We feel we must take it slow enough so that if we pass a zoning ordinance, it will stand up," Col. Thomas Nixon, chairman of the planning group, explained.

As a result, money already appropriated by Congress has been allocated to Manassas and elsewhere and none is left to buy land in Adams County.

Another $400,000 is recommended for further purchases of Civil War battlefield land in the year beginning July 1, but Congress is expected to attach the same zoning requirement.

FALSE IMPRESSIONS

The second battle has received widespread attention, through national publications and Sunday supplements. Some of the articles have promoted false impressions of the role of Gettysburg and Adams County.

The first false impression is that the battle is being waged by Gettysburg. Gettysburg and Adams County are involved almost as accidentally in the second battle as they were in the first. The town and county have their share of combatants but these represent a comparatively small portion of the total population.

The second misconception is that Gettysburg and the county are dependent on the battlefield. True, the site attracts thousands of visitors—the National Park Service estimates about 800,000 a year—and the visitors buy meals, lodging and souvenirs. Estimates of what they spend vary widely. The pessimists say $4 million, the optimists, $11 million. County officials estimate that less than 1 percent of the county's population is engaged in employment directly connected with the battlefield and related services to tourists.

It is because of this that the county commissioners feel wronged when they are charged with a lack of patriotism or with being unfeeling when they do not donate some $80,000 worth of county home land—which includes the site of the first day of battle—to the cause. If they were personally willing to do this, they would still be prevented from doing so because they have no legal authority to make such a donation. Aside from this, they feel that it is quite likely that they would run into considerable opposition from county taxpayers.

The commissioners are counting on using money from the sale of the land to help finance a new county home. If they give it away instead, the donation will be reflected in tax levies, and many Adams Countians who would like to see the battlefield preserved are not that enthusiastic about it that they care to foot so large a part of the bill.

The third false impression that there is imminent danger that the battlefield area will suddenly be turned into a section of garishly lighted beer parlors and honky-tonks. There are two kinds of pressures being felt—one is the population growth in the community which is creating a demand for housing, the other is the increasing flow of tourists and the demand for accommodations.

Houses and motels are abuilding in the community and with much of the battlefield land still privately owned, there is the danger that the pressure of rising land values will tempt owners to sell, regardless of how hallowed the ground may be in the eyes of others.

There are probably some half dozen commercial establishments already on land which even the most moderate of battlefield savers would like to see turned back to the State in which it was in 1863. One such place has been bought by the Park Service and bids are being asked for removal of the buildings. But buying this kind of property is expensive.

To bolster the effort, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association has been formed and is in the midst of a campaign to raise funds by donations so as to purchase some of the threatened land. This effort, while centered in Gettysburg, is not local but is fostered by persons from over a wide area. Governors of several States are members of its advisory committee.

This effort is not unlike the effort that followed the 3 days battle in 1863. The smoke had scarcely cleared away before visitors poured into town. There were the relatives of those who had fallen in battle and there were the curious. Two Gettysburg attorneys conceived the idea that the battlefield should become a memorial to the thousands who fell there. David McConnaughy wanted to preserve the field. David Wills thought it appropriate to establish a national cemetery there.

The ideas of the two men soon spread and State after State joined in the effort. Wills had been asked by Governor Curtin to look after the dead. Three weeks after the battle, Wills reported to the Governor that rains had washed away the soil from many of the graves and that "hogs and dogs are eating" the bodies. The Governor called

on Wills to contact Governors of other States of the Union and funds were appropriated so that the national cemetery became a reality in a few short months.

It was in November of 1863, 4½ months after the battle, that Abraham Lincoln came to Gettysburg to dedicate the cemetery. His simple and brief speech of dedication, the one he said "the world will little note nor long remember," has become one of the most widely known pieces of literature.

While Lincoln was wrong about the world forgetting what he said, he apparently was right when he said, "It will never forget what they did here." The number of visitors to the Gettysburg battlefield grows greater year by year.

While Wills was at his work of bringing the cemetery into being, McConnaughy was busy too. Governor Curtin recognized his efforts and on April 30, 1864, approved the establishment of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association. Money was raised and land bought. By the time a score of years had passed, about 800 acres had been acquired. In 1896 the land became the National Military Park of Gettysburg and was under the control of the War Department. Control passed to the Department of the Interior in 1933. By then the park had grown to 2,743 acres.

But even in 1933, much of the actual battle area remained in private hands. Indeed, little has been added to the Federal holdings since that time. While the land remained as farms there was little change. The threat that is posed today reflects the changes of the last 30 years—tourists are turning to motels and more people are touring.

Congressman JAMES M. QUIGLEY, who has been in the forefront in the second battle, told an audience in Gettysburg last year that the community would receive and deserve condemnation if it did not provide facilities for its visitors. This, he said, means commercialism. The important thing, he said, is to keep this commercial growth under control.

SOME OPPOSITION

The effort being made by the Cumberland Township Planning Commission is not without opposition. Last October, the township supervisors received a petition signed by 150 township residents demanding zoning be held up, at least until the voters of the township could be polled on the matter.

The situation locally is touchy, Nixon said. Local residents as well as officials are becoming resentful of implications that they are selfishly interfering with efforts to preserve the battlefield.

What is often overlooked is that whatever is done, particularly in Cumberland Township, will be costly to the local citizens and will do little for their benefit. Any land that becomes Government owned is lost for development, is no longer a source of taxes, and may even be an impediment in the conduct of business. If the surrounding area is zoned to prevent commercialization, the potential tax revenue loss is even greater.

The second battle is a battle for money. Some can be raised locally, but not nearly enough.

The battlefield is not the only problem. The old dormitory at the Lutheran Seminary, which served as a hospital during and after the battle, has deteriorated to the point that extensive repairs are needed if it is to be preserved. The seminary no longer uses the building and probably would have razed it long ago if it were not for its historic significance. Estimates on the cost of renovation run as high as $500,000.

The Adams County Historical Society is making some effort to maintain the building but it looks like a losing battle, unless some real money is available.

Then too, despite its close ties to Lincoln, the community has no statue of the 16th President. A year ago a drive was launched to raise a fund to commission a statue. But little has been raised toward this $75,000 project and in face of other campaigns, prospects do not look bright.

Resolutions for the Restoration of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1960, members from 67 organizations of the two Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, Mass., St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, the Lithuanian Aid Association, and the local branch of the Lithuanian Community of the United States of America, held exercises at St. Casimir's Parish Hall commemorating the 42d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

During these exercises, the members of the committee, the official delegates, and the more than 1,500 people in attendance unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions, which I am pleased to include at this point:

Whereas the Government of the United States stands ever firmly for the God-given and sovereign right that all nations, both large and small, have to be free and to choose for themselves their own political, cultural, and economic systems, and ever remains convinced that relations between all nations must be guided by justice and charity and governed by the principle of equality; and

Whereas Soviet Russia, having formally recognized in 1920 the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, 20 years later forcibly deprived Lithuania of her freedom and since then continues to this day to terrorize her people by oppression, dispossession, mass persecutions, and exile, and to deny them the right of self-determination by staging mock elections, thus converting Lithuania into another vassal state; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral nation ever advocating freedom for all peoples, made astounding advancement and progress in all fields of human endeavor during the years in which she enjoyed freedom (1253–1795 and more so 1918–39); and

Whereas Lithuania continues in her desire to have and enjoy freedom and constantly reminds the free world, "There is no peace without freedom; there is no security without self-determination"; and

Whereas the Government of the United States in 1940 denounced the Soviet Government for forcibly incorporating Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union and since then has maintained its present policy of not recognizing de jure the unjust absorption of those countries within the Russian orbit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States continue to remind the free world of the injustice committed upon Lithuania by Soviet Russia and by continuing its policy of not recognizing de jure the ruthless seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States, together with the other Western Powers, take appropriate and concrete measures to force Soviet Russia immediately out of Lithuania and to compel her to return to Lithuania all Lithuanians now exiled to and forcibly detained in Siberia and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That the free world ever remember that all nations, regardless of how small they may be, have a right to freedom and justice and that, should the spoils of Soviet aggression ever be recognized, the Soviet would be encouraged to grab other nations neighboring her present boundaries and the cause of world peace would be grievously harmed; be it further

Resolved, That due admission and full approbation of Lithuania as a member of the United Nations be made for thus she would be in a glorious position to state her just case to the entire world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Richard Nixon; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter; to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue; and to the press.

JOHN PIPIRAS,
Chairman.
JONAS PALUBECKAS,
Secretary.

Top News Award Goes to Hayward Daily Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Hayward Daily Review, published by Floyd L. Sparks, of Hayward, Calif., has won first place for the "best individual spot news reporting" of any California newspaper in 1959.

This is not the first time that the Daily Review has been singled out for honors in the newspaper field and I am very glad to include in the RECORD the narrative of Reporter Charles Peterson's stories that won this prize for the Daily Review, as follows:

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION TRIBUTE—TOP NEWS AWARD GOES TO REVIEW

The Daily Review won first place today for the "best individual spot news reporting" of any California newspaper in 1959.

A trophy signifying that honor was presented to Publisher Floyd L. Sparks this morning at an awards breakfast of the California Newspaper Publishers Association in Los Angeles.

The first place award for the Review, outstripping all of the State's other newspapers, including all the metropolitans was given in the Publishers Association Annual Better Newspaper Contest.

The Review award was for Reporter Charles Peterson's stories about Eden Hos-

pital doctors' operations on Billy Smith's famous leg.

The Daily Review first place citation read: "Best individual spot news reporting (judged on initiative and enterprise, thoroughness of coverage, accuracy, terseness, fairness and informative value and organization and presentation of material)."

The CNPA award marks the second first place the Review won for topflight newspapering in 1959.

Last fall the Review won a gold medal award in the California State Fair annual newspaper contest for the Review's reporting and editorials on the State college.

The Daily Review exclusively revealed the story of the historic effort to save Billy Smith's right leg in a front-page headline article published October 28.

Publication of the story followed several days after the Review picked up word that Eden Hospital doctors had apparently succeeded in a unique operation to graft a severed leg back onto a human being.

Discreet checks with Eden Hospital spokesmen indicated that an operation of some importance had been performed. They referred the newspaper to one of the doctors involved in the case.

This physician in turn checked with two colleagues who had played major parts in the initial operation, received a green light from the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association to discuss the case, and agreed to an exclusive interview with the Review.

The story burst like a bombshell on news wires the next afternoon. News services, radio networks, even foreign news media clamored for more details of the surgery.

Stimulating extra interest in the Smith story was its publication a few days after a Russian surgeon announced his plans to graft a human leg onto a girl amputee.

In the months that followed the first story, Smith appeared to do well, but this proved to be an illusion.

Failure of skin grafts to succeed as planned and infection which developed in Smith's leg bone and knee joint combined to prevent repair of the main nerve to the lower portion of the leg.

Last week, doctors reluctantly conceded that, as things then stood, the best result they could obtain by pursuing their efforts to save the leg would not be as good as Smith could gain from an artificial limb.

The operation to remove the famous leg was performed on Wednesday.

Reporter Peterson, 31, joined the Daily Review staff last June. He lives at 31350 Brae Burn Avenue with his wife, Camilla, and two children, Karen, 6, and Lance, 5.

A 1952 graduate of the University of Oregon, he served as a Navy communications officer for nearly 5 years. Following his release from active duty, he was on the staff of the Wall Street Journal in San Francisco for nearly 2 years.

He is currently president of the Association for Retarded Children of Southern Alameda County and is communications officer of Naval Reserve Electronics Division 12-25, Hayward.

More Grassroots Opinion on Present Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10350, introduced by me, would cut out the farm acreage and price support program. My bill would cushion the effect and in particular offer relief to the small farmer.

As I have previously indicated in my remarks, this repeal legislation is welcomed by the great majority of American people. In this connection, here are a few comments which came from communications received by me since I proposed repeal of all farm subsidies:

Overdue. Overdue.

This ridiculous situation must be corrected.

Let the market find its own level.

Eliminate price supports entirely.

The beef cattlemen and the fruit farmers have had no price support and I haven't heard any complaint. Neither has the small businessman had any guarantee that he will make a profit.

We are giving a lot of money to farmers who already have a lot of it.

Price supports should be taken off all products.

I favor total abolishment of agriculture price supports.

If we guarantee the farmer, how do we guarantee the rest of us?

It is sad to contemplate hungry children in many lands while foods rot in our granaries.

I would restrict aid to agriculture to no more than we give to industries.

Wouldn't it be better to forget our folly and start with some good sense.

Keep up the work on removing price supports. Farmers were once the backbone of the American economy; now they are only the marrow dependent upon the rest of the bone structure for support.

The farmers themselves thought some of the benefits they received * * * ridiculous.

Paternalism has ruined several other nations.

A continuation of the program as it presently exists can lead only to bankruptcy of the whole country including the farmers.

Why can't we take the price supports off entirely rather than have this excess surplus in wheat and other agriculture products.

I favor reduction down to absolute zero.

Do away with price supports and surplus wheat storage.

The farmer could work out his own salvation if let alone.

Let's stop this farce right now.

You have our complete support on your price support policy.

I was very glad to see in tonight's paper that you came out strong for repeal of all price props.

I am strongly opposed to this program as it now exists.

Absolutely.

This privilege has been so grossly abused.

Congratulations for your bill.

This is one I would turn back to the farmer; he is able to handle his business like any other investor.

Positively.

Farm price support should be stopped.

Why should farmers get so much aid.

Have just read that you are proposing repeal of price-support subsidies. I must say that I am heartily in favor of taking away all price supports.

Your plan on farm problem is the only one * * *. I wish commonsense would persuade enough other Congressmen to agree with you.

The Commonsense "Gap"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in an election year, it is always possible that intemperate statements can be made in the heat of campaigning. Yet even under such circumstances and much less when there is time for sober deliberation, it is not becoming to a man seeking office to jeopardize our great Nation in the eyes of the world.

This situation and this danger is recognized and discussed in the article by David Lawrence entitled "The Commonsense 'Gap'." He recognizes, I believe, as do we all, that our great Nation is unquestionably the leading military power in overall strength, and that it is this overall strength and not our excelling in every weapon, weapon by weapon, that counts in our defense ability. It is my hope that our citizens will not succumb to the defeatism and lack of judgment demonstrated by some who too quickly are selling short America's tremendous military might.

THE COMMONSENSE "GAP"

(By David Lawrence)

Judging by the sensational headlines and the political hysteria of the hour, America is in grave danger of being destroyed at any minute by 300 Soviet missiles.

We are supposed to be behind and cannot catch up for a couple of years or so—if then. This is called the missile "gap."

But what is even more serious is the credulity of many people who have been led by Democratic Party politicians to believe that we are in dire peril.

It may suit the ambitions of the candidates for political office to play politics with our national defense. But what possible good can it do the cause of peace and understanding in the world for Americans to present the spectacle of a nation divided, leaderless and shivering with apprehension?

Even though as strong as our potential enemies, we run the risk of conveying the impression that we really are weak and hence must submit to their demands. What a tragic way to portray the United States at a critical time, when the President

is about to go to a summit conference in Paris and then is to tour the Soviet Union.

Is Mr. Eisenhower to be presented before the world as the quivering messenger of a defeated people? Is this what the Democratic politicians want for their country?

None of the politicians, however extreme their statements, could really have been thinking of the impact of the recent barrage of criticism about our alleged weaknesses in defense. But it will be said that the politicians were, after all, just echoing the viewpoints of those generals who criticize the defense program on a professional basis, and that there could be no harm in bringing all this out into the open.

Nobody, of course, is objecting to discussion of our defense needs. We have had such debates since the founding of the Republic. But all of us will want to see some self-restraint imposed upon any public debate revealing vital facts about weapons of war, details of our military strength, and secret data gathered from abroad.

Commonsense tells us that if we are weak and are remedying the weaknesses, it is not wise from any standpoint to tell a potential enemy about it.

For the last 2 weeks there actually have been debates in Congress about our intelligence estimates. This is the most confidential of all categories of governmental information. Yet we actually see would-be candidates for the Presidency and Democratic leaders publicly interpreting such estimates to the detriment not merely of the administration, but of the position of their own country versus a potential enemy.

When General Power of the Strategic Air Command testified that the Soviets might, with 300 missiles, destroy our bases in this country, he was confining himself to a hypothetical situation that illustrated to him the importance of maintaining an airborne alert 24 hours a day, every day in the week. This would require a large and perhaps unnecessary expenditure. For when a crisis is on the horizon—and there are no signs of it in the immediate future—such an airborne alert can be ordered. The President has said that, the instant an airborne alert seems necessary, he will order it.

But is it true that 300 missiles could destroy America's retaliatory power just because bases in continental United States might be destroyed? First of all, those who know how far the development of rocketry has actually progressed say that it is impossible to fire a simultaneous salvo that would destroy all our bases at the same time. Since there necessarily would be a time lag between enemy firings, this would result in an opportunity for us to apply our retaliatory power.

Also, our Army has just revealed that, for the first time in history, a ballistic missile has been tracked down and destroyed in the air by another missile.

The Soviets, moreover, would have to do more than merely destroy our plane and missile bases in this country. There would have to be simultaneous destruction of all such bases in Britain and in southern Europe, and of all our aircraft carriers and their bombers. Likewise, every single one of our missile-carrying submarines cruising under the seas in different parts of the world would have to be demolished at the same moment.

Our Polaris missiles, which are to be fired from submarines, are to be operational soon, and within the next 2 years we shall be building many more of them. They can approach unobserved within a few miles of an enemy's coast and fire missiles 1,200 miles inland.

The key to the controversy over defense is not how many missiles the Soviets possess but what our overall power of massive retaliation happens to be.

There is need in America to apply common sense and close the "gap" between those who are engaging in flights of political fancy in an election year and the majority of the people, who believe the statements of the President of the United States—a military leader in his own right. He says unequivocally that we have the overall power to deter attack.

Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present herewith a copy of a resolution adopted by the Department of Louisiana, the American Legion, in convention assembled, in support of legislation to extend educational benefits to the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. This group represents a large and important segment of the people of Louisiana who are interested in the welfare of our veterans and our country, and I present it for consideration.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, expressing the will of the citizenry by the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), recognized the justice, equity, and the general value of a sound education and training program for the veterans of our country; and

Whereas, the legislation enacted to provide such education and training benefits was for the purpose of restoring lost educational opportunities to those men and women who served in the Armed Forces of our country and has accomplished this purpose and has been an immeasurable factor in contributing to the economic security of our veterans and their families, as well as to the security of the Nation as a result of the increase in the general education level and professional and technical skills of the veterans; and

Whereas the increased earning power of veterans directly attributable to the program is resulting in payment of increased income taxes which will more than repay the total cost of the program; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the continuing involuntary military service program, Public Law 7, 84th Congress, denies entitlement to education and training benefits to all veterans who first entered service after January 31, 1955, which is grossly inequitable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, in annual convention in Baton Rouge, La., July 23-26, 1959, strongly urges a continuation of an education and training program similar to that provided by Public Law 550, 82d Congress, to all veterans of our country who serve in any period in which involuntary military service is authorized, and urges the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to accomplish; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, all Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, and to the American Vocational Association.

The 42d Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, over this past weekend the spiritual directors of the two great Lithuanian parishes, in Worcester, Mass., St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, sponsored ceremonies commemorating the 42d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Joining with the parish directors were representatives of 67 organizations within the parishes including members from the Lithuanian Aid Association and the Worcester branch of the Lithuanian community of the United States in America.

The main exercise consisted of a radio program on the evening of February 13 over station WNEB, in Worcester, and a great mass meeting held on the afternoon of February 14 in St. Casimir's Parish Hall.

I had the special honor of taking part in both of these programs and have been requested to include, at this point, the address I delivered at St. Casimir's Parish Hall:

THE 42D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, WORCESTER, MASS., FEBRUARY 14, 1960

It is an honor for me to once again join with you patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent here in my area, as well as those throughout the country, in commemorating the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

It is nearly 20 years since the barbarian hordes of Soviet Russians overran Lithuania reducing your native land of freedom to a slave state incorporated in the Communist empire.

Today, however, we recall a happier occasion in the history of Lithuania. It was 42 years ago that Lithuania proclaimed her independence.

It is most fitting that we commemorate this event and recall Lithuania's former days of liberty. For the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, the conviction that Lithuania shall one day be again free, lives on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people today, just as it lived through more than a century of czarist oppression.

Let us remember that Lithuania became a free land four centuries before America was even discovered. That freedom was lost in 1795 only to be regained in 1918. The same Russian imperialism that enslaved Lithuania before holds her in chains again today. The name of this tyrannical government is different now but the oppression is just the same and even worse.

Through 123 years of czarist rule, enduring all sorts of cruel hardships the brave Lithuanian people passed on from generation to generation their national traditions, their love of liberty, their ideal of national freedom and independence. Today's generations are no less firm in their determination that Lithuania shall once again know freedom.

We realize, of course, that at this hour, unfortunately, the people of your homeland are living behind an iron curtain of fear and persecution. All of the extremes of brutality are being constantly visited upon

your people in a ceaseless attempt to destroy the national consciousness, religion and freedom of Lithuania.

Despite all cruelities your people have steadfastly maintained their religious faith, their national identity, and an unquenchable yearning for renewed independence that must surely be ultimately rewarded.

Through the terrible ordeals of seven centuries, the Lithuanians have given consistent testimony to the fundamental truth that man has an inborn desire for freedom which cannot be rooted out or destroyed by any tyrant. I believe that this fundamental truth will in the end spell defeat of the brutal Communist system, but we must persevere in our own efforts to assist Lithuania, and the other Communist enslaved nations.

The Kremlin leaders are now engaged in a great campaign to try to make us forget the Red atrocities of the past. Through cultural exchanges, good-will ambassadors, offers of trade, and soft words, they attempt to lull us to sleep, while they prepare for further aggressions.

The passing years have tended to dim the memories and still the consciousness of many in the free world. We must then strive with all our might to keep these memories alive and the conscolusness of free people alert.

This anniversary of Lithuanian independence should remind all Americans that we cannot close the door on Lithuania's just claims to independence without betraying our solemn obligations and denying our own heritage.

I do not believe that this country will ever abandon our moral commitment to strive for eventual freedom for Lithuania and all the other Communist enslaved nations, and I am very proud to add my voice to so many others today in pledging that we will keep the faith with the forces of freedom everywhere in the world.

We are inspired in our common task by the knowledge that the spirit of liberty still, and will forever, breathe in the hearts of all Lithuanians. The illustrious Lithuanian poet, Maironis—1862–1932—aroused the nation with his undying verses and instilled all Lithuanians with fervent love of their country, their language and their people. He preached, through verses, the gospel of national resurrection and even today his words continue to be a source of spiritual strength, a battle cry, and a promise of ultimate victory.

Although Lithuanians are forbidden on this 42d anniversary to sing their national anthem I am sure that Lithuanians everywhere will be repeating these words of consolation and strength written by Maironis:

"Protect, O Almighty, our beautiful homeland,
The soil where we labor, where our fathers rest.
Thy fatherly mercy is boundless and lasting;
Hear us, Thine own children, long ages oppressed.
Forsake not our land, All Highest, while the fury rages;
For Thou art our hope and vision, now and through the ages."

All Americans, not just the Lithuanian Americans, share, I am certain, these sentiments and look forward to the time when Lithuania will again take her rightful place with the free nations of the world. Let us pray together that the Almighty will speed that happy day.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include at this point a radio address given by Anthony J. Miller, Esq., a prominent Worcester attorney of Lithuanian descent:

I am very proud, as an American citizen of Lithuanian descent, to participate with our friend, Congressman HAROLD DONOHUE, in this ceremony marking the origin of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania 42 years ago.

We take this occasion, on behalf of our enslaved homeland of Lithuania, to reaffirm our pledge to work for self-determination and freedom for all people of all states.

It is idle to speak of peace when whole nations are ground under the heel of tyranny. It is a mockery to talk of negotiations looking to an equitable solution of the issues dividing the East and the West when valiant nations like our Lithuania are held in stern and brutal subjection.

It has been well said that foreign policy is forged on the anvil of public discussion, that public opinion is a determining factor in determining policy. Let all take note then that the rank and file of Americans, of all national origins, look with abhorrence on the enslavement of Lithuania.

Tonight we call upon liberty-loving people the world over to remember that the Red heel came down with crushing brutality and terrorism in 1944, that the brief flame of rewon Lithuanian independence was tragically snuffed out and Lithuania has been held a prisoner nation to this hour in defiance and violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

Above and beyond that, the enslavement of Lithuania is in violation of the spirit of equity among the community of nations, does great violence to international morality, and is a constant affront to the conscience of the world.

Just as the great Lincoln, whose memory we so reverently honor, said that a nation "cannot endure half free and half slave," so we say today in the name of Lithuania, as we address ourselves to the aggressors and tyrants: The world cannot endure half free and half slave.

To the Red tyrants who have forcibly impressed once-free Lithuania into the Soviet Imperialist Empire we say: Do not try to inveigle us to a so-called peace conference so long as you hold Lithuania and other once-free states in terroristic captivity.

America, the world, the conscience of mankind will never recognize Soviet supremacy over Lithuania. In the fervent prayer and belief that God is still in His heaven and will one day make all things right with the world, we confidently look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again take her place among the free nations of the world.

We can be sure that the anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be remembered in Lithuania. But there will be no festivities—no gay bunting, no unfurled flags; no music—to commemorate it. Rather, it will still be observed in mute if defiant silence, or perhaps in reconsecration to those ideals, to those ways of life which the Lithuanian people cherish.

In this country, on the contrary, the day will be openly celebrated by the nearly 1 million Lithuanian Americans who are scattered throughout the States of the Union. Here in this blessed land of freedom these, our fellow Americans, will, as they have in the past, take occasion to remember their oppressed kinsmen across the ocean and to solemnly pledge again their spiritual and moral support for their eventual liberation.

They well know of the painful tortuous years the people of our homeland have bravely endured. The deportations, the enslavements, the destruction of political freedom and economic initiative are facts which have leaked through to the free world despite the Iron Curtain of silence behind which the Communists try to hide the countries that they persecute.

We Lithuanian-Americans, especially, know that the people of our homeland are of stout heart. We know that faith and hope cannot be removed from the Lithuanian spirit. Inevitably the time will come when the tyrants grip will weaken, when freedom will win over enslavement and sorrow will be turned to joy.

The American people and Government have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. In many ways America is informing the world of Soviet misdeeds in Lithuania, and is mobilizing the moral forces of world opinion against the oppressors, in the hope that Lithuania's day of freedom will be hastened and that the Kremlin's rule of misery and hatred will be forever overturned.

While we wait for that fateful time, I ask you to join with me tonight in sending across the seas to our beloved people of Lithuania this message:

"Be not discouraged, be not downhearted. The night may be long and dark, but the sun of the morning is soon to break upon you, your homes, and your land. Each day that passes brings our blessed country closer to inevitable independence. We shall not fail you and will work and pray together with you until your liberty is finally accomplished."

College of the Pacific at Stockton, Calif., Achieves Growing Recognition in the Field of Scientific Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to take this opportunity to call your attention to an article in the January 1960 Pacific Review, alumni issue, published by the College of the Pacific at Stockton, Calif.

During the past few years the College of the Pacific has achieved growing recognition in the field of scientific research.

The article follows:

The college laboratory—a maze of tubing, chemicals and machinery. Into these scientific surroundings come eager—and sometimes not too eager—freshmen to struggle with the fundamentals of chemistry, physics, or pharmacy. Into these surroundings also come the advanced student and the professor to reach beyond the knowledge imparted in a textbook or lab manual into the unknown—to open new vistas through research.

Research has become an increasingly important part of the Pacific picture and has drawn nationwide attention to the projects and experiments conducted in College of the Pacific laboratories. The recognition of the vitality of these projects has encouraged financial support of the work by various national organizations through grants and contracts.

A search for an effective combatant to one of the Nation's leading killers, cancer, is being conducted in the College of the Pacific chemistry department, financed in part by grants from the American Cancer Society.

Working with an idea similar to an atom bomb reaction, Dr. Emerson Cobb, chairman of the College of the Pacific chemistry department; William Rhoads, graduate student; and Dr. John Phillips, Stockton surgeon, have been experimenting with two common substances, tetracycline and boron.

In the experiment, tetracycline, which has a great affinity for cancerous tissues but is expelled by normal tissues, is used as

a carrier to deliver a radioactive boron isotope to a cancerous cell. A nuclear reaction is then triggered and the cancer cell is destroyed. The neighboring cells are not greatly affected since the range of the explosion ends close to the walls of the cancer cell.

The College of the Pacific researchers are working in conjunction with a Stanford University team headed by Dr. Victor Richards. The boron-tetracycline compound is prepared in Stockton and sent to Stanford, where Dr. Richards and his associates inject it into cancer-stricken mice. The cancerous tissue is then sent back to Pacific for examination and study.

The conjunction of the tetracycline and boron was a "chemical pioneering job," according to Dr. Phillips.

"But our work is just beginning," Dr. Cobb remarks when asked about the progress of the cancer project. The chemistry department head predicts the team has 5 to 10 years more of pharmacological research ahead of it, including the solution to such problems as loading the bomb with different compounds for different jobs, simplifying the loading procedure, and using the process in treating brain tumors.

In another part of the chemistry department, a part of the search for solids that would be able to stand the friction and heat of a trip into outer space is in its beginning stages.

Working under a $1,000 grant-in-aid from the Research Corp. of New York, Dr. Jesse Binford, assistant professor of chemistry, and several graduate assistants are attempting to discover what materials can withstand heat up to 1,500° C. without disintegrating, changing their atomic makeup, or changing the presence of other substances with which they might react.

The chemistry professor said that one of the big problems in missile construction today is the discovery of a solid that will remain stable at high temperature. New compounds are being made to fill this need, he said, and he hopes to obtain samples of these for testing. Later, in the project, the team may make samples of their own for experimental purposes, he added.

The College of the Pacific researchers constructed the compact, but complicated, equipment that they are using in their experiments. One of about six such sets known to be in existence the testing unit consists of an electrically heated furnace a canister holding a cylindrical copper block, and a control panel for temperature regulation and measurement.

Each solid being tested is heated in the furnace to the desired temperature, then lowered by a wire from the furnace into a cup in the copper block below. By determining the temperature of the copper block, the investigators are able to measure the heat capacity of the substance.

"Measurement of the heat capacity, the step with which we are concerned, is but the first step in discovering what solids could be used successfully in outer space," Dr. Binford says.

Research for the pure joy of investigating the unknown is the purpose of the experiments being carried out by Dr. Herschel Frye of the chemistry department under the auspices of a $900 Penrose Grant from the American Philosophical Society. Dr. Frye and Constantin Vlassis, doctoral candidate, are conducting polarographic studies involving reduction of inorganic coordination compounds, a field in which there has been little investigation.

Chicken eggs are of great importance to the school of pharmacy's department of physiology and pharmacology which recently was awarded a $35,000 contract by the Office of Naval Research to develop methods of utilizing chick embryos to measure the effects of drugs and chemicals.

Dr. N. S. Van Matre, assistant professor in the department and chief investigator of the project, said they are trying to develop techniques of changing and regulating the chemical contents of egg yolks in order to use the chick embryos for controlled tests of many compounds. Completely artificial egg yolks can be substituted for the original in the laboratory method, according to Dr. Van Matre.

The new research method may add greatly to the knowledge of the actual cellular effects which many drugs and chemicals have on the human body and its various systems, according to Dr. Carl Riedesel, chairman of the department.

Although the project is directed in the school of pharmacy, Dr. Van Matre always emphasizes that all the science departments at Pacific are contributing to the research program. The physics department, for example, is investigating a delicate preamplifier for an electrocardiograph to record graphically the heartbeat of chick embryos.

The project, which has been going on for some time sustained entirely by the college, will continue for several years, according to Dr. Riedesel. A summary of the project and data assembled will be filed with over 27 agencies, including the Smithsonian Institution and the Biological Sciences Information Exchange.

A $1,200 grant from the American Philosophical Society is financing a study by Dr. Riedesel of the physiological effects of certain alkaloids found in varieties of narcissus bulbs grown in the Stockton region.

Although the poisonous effects of these bulks have been recognized for years and some of the alkaloids studied chemically, practically nothing has been done to evaluate the ways in which the bulbs can cause distressing symptoms when eaten by mistake, according to Dr. Riedesel.

Assisted by Mrs. Cisco Kihara of the school of pharmacy, Dr. Riedesel will try to develop efficient methods of extracting the alkaloids found in the bulbs, which have poisonous effects when eaten, and will investigate the effects of these alkaloids on the nervous system, blood pressure, and other body systems.

Thus, the research project goes on—quietly, but effectively. And thus Pacific expands in another facet of its "pursuit of excellence," growing not only intellectually but also making a vital contribution to the modern times.

Much of County Sewage Will Go to Sea in 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Tarrytown (N.Y.) News of January 12, 1960:

MUCH OF COUNTY SEWAGE WILL GO TO SEA IN 1960'S

The decade of the 1960's will see Westchester sewage go to sea in style—or at least a large part of it will.

While sewage is a problem for Westchester in the next 10 years, public officials don't think it will be a headache, at least for most of the county.

Westchester County has purchased a huge barge—*Westco I*—which will haul sludge from the joint Yonkers sewage treatment plant out to sea. The barge and the $15 million treatment plant itself, now nearing completion, are part of a county program to curtail pollution of the Hudson River.

The date for the opening of the plant, which will serve seven sewer districts, is late February. The districts are the Bronx Valley, Hutchinson Valley, North Yonkers, South Yonkers, Central Yonkers, Saw Mill, and Upper Bronx Valley.

BUILT UNDER ORDER

The county was under order of the Interstate Sanitation Commission to build the plant. A similar order is in effect for the Mamaroneck and Blind Brook (Rye) treatment plants. The county is preparing plants for modernization of those plants on the Long Island Sound side of the county.

Westchesterites will be called upon in the 1960's to approve the issuance of bonds for those two plants because the jobs are expected to cost several million each. County voters must approve any issuance of bonds over $2½ million. Only the persons actually served by the sewer districts have to pay the debt.

While southern and central Westchester with its network of sewers are in good condition, the outlook for the north-central part of the county is not as bright.

That area has been using backyard disposal all along but the area is being developed rapidly. Sewage will become a public problem in the next 10 years, if not already.

The problem is multiplied because the area is largely in the New York City watershed area. Fifty-eight percent of the water Westchester uses comes from New York City supplies so Westchester is very much concerned.

HUGE INVESTMENT

Since a sewer system in the north-central part of the county will have to start from scratch, a huge investment is seen. Recent limited commercial development of the area may help absorb the tax burden for sewers.

Outside aid is possible.

New York City might share the cost of developing sewers since it is interested in protecting its water supply. There have been precedents for New York City to act. The city, under an old agreement, now disposes of Mount Kisco's sewage.

The Federal Government might help. Right now, prospects for a sewer district for Yorktown seem brighter. Supervisor John Downing of Yorktown has reported that Federal Government money is now available for such work. The sewer district would be in the Yorktown Heights business district. The Federal Government would pay up to 30 percent of the costs and the town would also be eligible for State aid for costs of engineering work.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko: 1746–1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Friday last was the birth anniversary of Tadeusz Kosciuszko. This son of Poland was a great soldier of freedom, and he is best remembered in this country as a brave fighter in our War of Independence.

He was born into an impoverished family on February 12, 214 years ago. At the age of 13 he lost his father, but his yearn-

ing for education led him to the royal school at Warsaw in 1765. He was graduated with the rank of captain in 1769. Then, aided by a scholarship, he entered the famous military school at Mezieres in France, where he specialized in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he had already finished his studies when he heard of the American Revolution. At once he saw his chance for action in a good cause, and on borrowed money he sailed for America. Here he was admitted into the service, his qualities at once recognized, and he was charged with drawing up plans for fortifying the Delaware River. His success at this assignment earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army.

In the spring of the following year he joined the northern army at Ticonderoga. During the next 2 years he was in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. Subsequent he took part in many battles, distinguishing himself in all of them. On October 13, 1783, in recognition of his signal services, Congress made him a brigadier general.

Having served the noble cause of this country with distinction, in July of 1784, he returned to his native Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for her freedom. There for more than 20 years he continued his brave but unfortunately futile efforts, and was fated to die in exile on October 15, 1817. Today in commemorating the 214th anniversary of his birth we pay homage to his blessed memory.

U.S.S. "Oakland"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a gallant warship that saw service in the battles of Leyte Gulf, Bismark Sea, and Tokyo Bay, and that also saw action in the Marshall, Gilbert, and Mariana Islands, is shrinking away under the welders' cutting torches at the Todd Shipyards in Alameda, Calif.

The U.S.S. *Oakland*, built at Bethlehem Shipyards in San Francisco and commissioned on July 17, 1943, is being scrapped.

Her short life was filled with battles and alarms and she goes to her death within sight of the city of Oakland after whom the gallant lady was named.

Under leave granted I include the following article from the Alameda Times Star, Alameda, Calif., of January 27, 1960:

U.S.S. "OAKLAND" IN ALAMEDA TO DIE—TORCHES CUT CRUISER'S ARMOR

The 18-year-old cruiser U.S.S. *Oakland* was dying today at Alameda's Todd Shipyards.

After 11 years of retirement, the end had come for the 6,000-ton veteran of 10 World War II Pacific battles.

Welders' cutting torches cut through the inches-thick armor of the 541-foot-long light cruiser in the yard across the bay from where she was built during World War II.

The vessel was towed to the Todd yard late Monday night after spending over a decade in mothballs at the Navy's reserve fleet headquarters near Stockton.

The Lerner Co., of Oakland, bought the ship from the Navy for about $200,000. The vessel, which will be scrapped at the Todd yard, should be demolished by July 1, according to a Todd spokesman.

COMMISSIONED

The U.S.S. *Oakland* was commissioned on July 17, 1943. She was christened by the then president of Mills College, Aurelia H. Reinhardt, on October 23, 1942 at the San Francisco Bethlehem Shipyards.

The ship served in Task Force No. 38 which was under the command of Admiral "Bull" Halsey in the Pacific. The *Oakland* participated in the Battle of Leyte Gulf, the Battle of the Bismark Sea, and Battle of Tokyo Bay and saw action in the Marshall, Gilbert, and Mariana Islands.

Ironically, during the battle for Okinawa on April 11, 1945, the U.S.S. *Oakland* suffered its only casualties of the war. A sailor from Oakland—the only man among the ship's 700-member crew who was from the namesake city—was killed along with another sailor during a dive bomber attack.

TROOP CARRIER

Following the end of the war, the *Oakland* served in Operation Magic Carpet, making four trips across the Pacific bringing soldiers back to San Francisco from the Western theater of the war.

The vessel is of the Worcester class of light cruisers and had six sister ships of her class. She was armed with ten 5-inch cannons. The *Oakland* was inactivated in 1949 and put into mothballs near Stockton until her recent sale.

Human Background of the Civil Rights Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine section of the New York Times of Sunday, February 14, Mr. Anthony Lewis has written an article entitled "Human Background of the Civil Rights Issue." This is must reading for everyone concerned with this subject. The article is too lengthy for insertion in the RECORD, but I should like to draw my colleague's attention to it.

Mr. Lewis succinctly traces the development of civil rights in the United States, pointing out that areas of the North are just as guilty as areas of the South in giving concrete recognition to the inalienable rights stated in our Constitution. Mr. Lewis traces the progress that has been made both in the North and the South, but, he says, "The difficulty with this impressionistic sketch of improvements in the life of the Negro American is that it is too rosy. A closer examination shows what everyone knows—that life remains much harder for a Negro than for a white man of the same talents."

Mr. Lewis points to the voting problem, reminding us that only 25 percent of voting-age Negroes in the South are registered compared with 60 percent of the whites. The employment situation, he says, is probably worse.

Mr. Lewis concudes his article as follows:

Can the goals be reached? The mood of those concerned with Negro rights is optimistic.

A recent authoritative book, Jack Greenberg's "Race Relations and American Law," sees these factors pushing the end of racial discrimination in the South: industrialization; urbanization, bringing with it social anonymity and security; the homogenization of the South and the rest of the Nation through television and other mass media of communication; universal training in unsegregated Armed Forces; the stand of most churches against segregation, and the Negro's growing political and economic strength.

To these should be added the fact that racial discrimination conflicts with the American ideal. What Gunnar Myrdal said in 1944 is true today: "When we say that there is a Negro problem in America, what we mean is that the Americans are worried about it. It is on their minds and on their consciences."

The Economics of Fairplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times on February 9 carried a most interesting and enlightening editorial which I am including in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House and Senate:

THE ECONOMICS OF FAIRPLAY

Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell issued a bread-and-butter-type forecast over the weekend that should be of interest to every American. In his report, drawn from a Labor Department study titled "Manpower: Challenge of the 1960's," Mitchell talked about the number of jobs that will be available in the 10 years ahead and the type of workers that will be available to fill those jobs.

He had words of warning for employers, words of hope for workers who have been discriminated against (including Negroes, handicapped and older persons), and words of advice for youngsters undecided on careers.

To the employers, Mitchell aimed a warning that changes in the labor force "will require a major overhaul in the employment policies of many businesses." For example, Mitchell cautioned that there will be comparatively fewer workers available in the 25-to-45 age bracket—the so-called prime-of-life bracket. Reduced birth rates in the thirties and early forties account for this situation.

Mitchell said bluntly: "Employers who do not abandon policies against hiring workers because of their age or sex, or race, religion, or nationality, or because they may be handicapped in some way, may have real trouble finding enough workers in the decade ahead."

In the past, arguments against discrimination in employment have been based primarily on the moral premise that the No. 1 criterion for employment should be the employment seeker's ability to do the job—not the color of his skin, his religion, his age or the fact that he walks with a crutch. This remains the most valid argument against discrimination.

Mitchell's warning, however, adds a new weapon—economics—to the arsenal of fighters against discrimination. Mitchell points out that in the years ahead it will be a simple matter of good business to hire workers previously viewed as untouchable.

The labor secretary also had blunt advice for youngsters debating whether they should continue their education or go job hunting. His warning: Stay in the classroom. Once again it's a matter of simple economics. He said the biggest increase in jobs will come in fields requiring the most education, such as professional and technical occupations. These also are financially rewarding jobs. Mitchell suggests it will pay Johnnie to stay in school, and the dividends will increase as time goes on.

The Power Issue Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members a provocative speech and proposal made by Leland Olds, former member of the Federal Power Commission, at the Electric Consumers Information Committee workshop meeting, Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960:

THE POWER ISSUE TODAY

Today I want to deal briefly with the power issue in terms of some historical background. I think, as we enter a new legislative year, we need to make sure that we see the problem before us as a whole, in order that the separate legislative proposals may form a picture which the public can understand and make its own, in spite of the distorted image being offered by the electric companies advertising program.

After suggesting this perspective, I shall offer a few broad recommendations as a focus for our efforts.

As my text I can find no better statement than that of Presidential candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt, speaking in Portland, Oreg., in 1932. He said there was need for bringing the discussion back into simple, honest terms because, "there has been in the past few years, as the Federal Trade Commission has shown, a systematic, subtle, deliberate, and unprincipled campaign of misinformation, of propaganda, and, if I may use the words, of lies and falsehoods." He noted that "the spreading of this information has been bought and paid for by certain great private utility corporations."

That statement fits the situation today. We might only add that the great private utility companies are battling in the courts and elsewhere to regain their right to charge to the taxpayer and the consumer the costs of this lying misrepresentation of America's vital institutions.

I am convinced that we are at a turning point in the evolution of American power policy—and more broadly in the evolution of the management and financing of what must be a steadily expanding public sector of our economy. Our success as a nation in meeting the challenge of a world in revolution will depend in large measure on how we take the next step forward.

And let me say this without the slightest hesitation. We are entering an age of comprehensive planning and orderly public financing. And, whether the planning and public financing are in terms of multipurpose river-basin programs, or regional giant power, or ample supplies of water for all purposes, or broader opportunities for recreation, or highways, or schools, or cultural opportunities, or greater health and happiness at each stage of man's existence on earth, we must establish a goal which people will make their own, as well as the means to achieve it. In the words of Prof. Lawrence Krider, of American University, addressing a convention concerned with road construction, "the goal of our planning is some image of a future America."

We started reformulating our goal and testing the means of achieving that goal nearly 30 years ago in terms of what appeared a national economic emergency. But, after a pause of 8 years, we must go forward again with the obligation to present to the billions of underprivileged peoples in the world a workable system for providing under freedom the higher standards of living which the technological revolution applied to resources can make possible not for a privileged few, but for all.

And let me say that we cannot allow freedom to be interpreted in terms of the sacred rights of enthroned selfishness, because the underdeveloped parts of the world will see through that sham. In fact, they have experienced it as colonialism. My contact with some of their representatives over the years made it clear that they saw a wide range of New Deal activities, including the TVA, the REA, Government participation in the financing of public and other economic activities including use of resources, the Wagner Act as a charter of industrial democracy, the Social Security Act, and many other reforms, as roads to greater freedom under democratic government.

THE DEMOCRATIC APPROACH TO MODERNIZING INSTITUTIONS

In order to get the fundamentals of our approach squarely in mind let us go back to the basic thinking of the man who provided leadership 30 years ago. I have always felt that Franklin D. Roosevelt's broadest formulation of that approach is to be found in his address on receiving a degree at Oglethorpe University, May 22, 1932. His subject was: "The Country Needs, the Country Demands Bold, Persistent Experimentation." He was talking particularly to "my fellow members of the class of 1932."

After noting that some students of economics traced the country's difficulties to defects in the world's monetary systems, he said that, among other phases of the problem, "that which seems most important to me is the problem of controlling by adequate planning the creation and distribtuion of those products which our vast economic system is capable of yielding." In a previous reference to the need for a larger measure of social planning he had said:

"Such controlling and directive forces as have been developed in recent years reside to a dangerous degree in groups having special interests in our economic order, interests which do not coincide with the interests of the Nation as a whole."

He said that, "when the Nation becomes substantially united in favor of planning the broad objectives of civilization, then true leadership must unite thought behind definite methods." He concluded:

"The country needs and, unless I mistake its temper, the country demands bold, persistent experimentation. It is commonsense to take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all, try something. The millions who are in want will not stand by silently forever while the things to satisfy their needs are within easy reach."

This, it seems to me, could be recognized as keynoting the remaking of our society into a modern, up-to-date social order. It involves the application of the scientific method not only to the development of the machinery required for the release of atomic energy, or the automating of our industries and our lives in general, but also to invention directed at improvement in our social institutions, changes which would make technological invention the servant of a joyful life for all peoples.

And let me state, without equivocation, that we cannot as a people afford to leave the establishment of goals, the planning, the control of experimentation in developing the means of reaching those goals, the building of the image of a future America, to self-perpetuating financial "groups having special interests in our economic order, interests which do not coincide with the interests of the Nation as a whole," to borrow FDR's 1932 words.

With this brief general introduction, I will turn to the power issue interpreted in terms of modern experimental approach.

SOCIAL INVENTION IN THE FIELD OF POWER POLICY

FDR's 1932 campaign speech in Portland established the principle and pattern for experimentation in bringing American institutions in the field of electric power up to date. His title is still significant: "A National Yardstick To Prevent Extortion Against the Public and Encourage the Wider Use of That Servant of the People—Electric Power."

The yardstick function in the American power economy was not of itself a new experiment. It had been effectively performed by thousands of American municipal systems since the beginning of central station electricity. But the experimentation lay in adapting that democratic American institution to the age of giant power. This required that local yardstick operations be supplemented with national yardsticks in the field of bulk power supply. It lay also in providing public financing at low interest rates for the extension of electric service to all farms, including not only the distribution cooperatives but also combinations of these cooperatives for joint undertaking of the wholesale power supply function.

In his Portland address Governor Roosevelt made this clear. He laid it down as a basic principle "that where a community—a city or county or district—is not satisfied with the service rendered or the rates charged by the private utility, it has the undeniable basic right, as one of its functions of government, one of its functions of home rule, to set up, after a fair referendum to its voters, * * * its own governmentally owned and operated service." He added: "That is the principle which applies to communities and districts, and I would apply the same principles to the Federal and State Governments."

At the very start of his address he set forth his belief "that the question of power, of electrical development and distribution, is primarily a national problem." He took issue with the 1925 statement of former Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover that there has been outrageous exaggeration of the probable extent of interstate power."

In other words, F.D.R.'s experimentation in this field was based on a recognition of the fact that the electric power business had ceased, so far as power supply is concerned, to be essentially a local responsibility, power trust slogans mouthed by the present national administration to the contrary notwithstanding. In fact, the 1925 Hoover statement suggests that the "power is a local responsibility" hallucination may be deep-rooted in the Republican Party—hereditary perhaps.

The New Deal experimentation in this field gave new strength to the American public yardstick as a supplement to regulation. It proved a vastly important force in bringing low rates to consumers served by private power companies. It extended the benefits of the electrical age to the Nation's

farms, and produced a tremendously expanded market for electrical equipment and appliances. But, perhaps equally important in the long run, it showed the way to institutional progress through establishment of integrated hydrosteam generation and transmission systems with utility responsibility for ample supplies of the lowest cost power that modern technology can provide to all systems serving ultimate consumers.

Our legislative program must provide an orderly basis for the organization and financing of giant regional generation and transmission cooperatives democratically organized to provide low-cost bulk power supply to all electric systems serving ultimate consumers in every region.

FROM ROOSEVELT TO ROCKEFELLER

The recent report of Governor Rockefeller's Committee on Power Resources makes it perfectly clear that the country cannot depend on the private power companies to lead the way into giant power. The Electrical World news story, which is all I have to go on, tries to put the best face on it, emphasizing its recommendation of joint action by all New York utilities in planning and locating generation, increasing transmission capacity, and resolving financing, regulatory, and system organization problems. According to Electrical World, the seven utilities serving 98 percent of New York consumers promptly formed the Empire State Utilities Power Resources Associates to study ways of providing future power at the lowest possible cost, a worthy objective.

But a reading of the Electrical World article is enough to reveal the extent to which the recommendations fall short of offering the region the full advantages of giant power. All the New York companies want is a nice little giant that won't subject them either to Federal Power Commission or Securities and Exchange Commission control.

Thus, while the report recognizes that some form of joint ownership may be necessary to finance larger and more efficient generating stations, it rules out merger of the seven utilities as impractical, if desirable.

Just what this means in terms of unnecessarily increased cost of service to consumers can be shown by drawing a rough map based on the distribution of company franchise areas in New York State as reflected in the Federal Power Commission Typical Residential Electric Bills Report for 1959. The Rockefeller committee little giant power report reflects the inability or unwillingness of the private power companies to simplify the overlapping patchwork power system setup which now prevails in New York State. In a few minutes I will suggest the reason why.

Similarly, the report recognizes that large generating units and large capacity stations, pooled for integrated operation, would require heavy high-voltage transmission to permit economical loading, minimize reserve requirements, and support or firm up hydro capacity. But it backs away timorously from regional integration which would add further advantages in the way of lower fuel costs and time-diversity of peak loads.

I show you on this map symbolically the kind of regional giant power system which could bring 7.0 mill delivered bulk power costs to the entire Northeast region. Yet the Electrical World reproduction of a map from the Rockefeller committee report shows essentially an intrastate system. The New York Power Authority in its 1938 annual report showed a more up-to-date map of an integrated power supply system for New York. Surely the Rockefeller committee has labored and brought forth a mouse. The Electrical World summarizes the report's explanation for this basic deficiency as follows:

"Multiple regulation by State public service commissions and the Federal Power Commission do not appear to be necessary when companies exchanging power across State lines are seeking only engineering integration, economies of pooling, or emergency backup. Big integration has been hampered by utility reluctance to assume the burden of such multiple regulation. The committee believes a workable arrangement to facilitate interstate pooling can be worked out without impairing the Federal Power Commission's essential jurisdiction."

Watch out for an early effort of the power companies either to amend the Federal Power Act along the original Walker Cisler-Detroit Edison lines, or to gain a phony exemption under the emergency or defense provisions of the act so as to exempt interstate wholesale power pooling from effective Federal regulation.

The fundamental reason for this timorous approach and this failure of the Rockefeller committee to recommend a giant power corporation with power supply as its separate function is that this would simplify regulation and make it more effective in asserting the public interest in low-cost electric power supply. Due to the multiplicity of interchange contracts for all classes of power in the private company interconnected systems approach, the handling of the wholesale power cost factor in electric rates is already all too frequently permitting overallocation of costs to residential consumers as well as to municipal and rural electric systems obtaining their power supply from private companies.

As an example of private company scrambling tactics, let me go back to a 1927 directive from a holding company official to those engaged in reorganizing its Pennsylvania properties, involving a writeup of $36 million, or more than 100 percent. The New York holding company official, after making the point several times, wound up his memorandum thus:

"I again desire to impress upon you the importance, in my opinion, of scrambling all those reorganizations together so that the only thing the Pennsylvania commission will be able to understand will be the result and not how the result was obtained."

Actually, it was not until the Federal Power Commission, referrred to in the Rockefeller committee report as "the burden of multiple regulation," was brought into the picture that the writeup in this reorganization was eliminated from the Pennsylvania company's capital accounts. Throughout the history of regulation company efforts to befuddle regulation have included the concoction of complexities including reproduction cost valuation, observed depreciation, economic depreciation, and allocations of cost. If we can set regional wholesale power supply up as a separate function, delivering power to local distribution systems on a single rate schedule basis, we will have taken a big step toward ending some of this befuddlement.

The Rockefeller committee was heavily weighted with power company executives, and was headed by John E. Burton, Governor Dewey's chairman of the New York State Power Authority, who consistently played the power company game. Fortunately, however, one member was Dr. James C. Bonbright, member of the power authority from its beginning until Dewey made a clean sweep of survivors from the preceding Democratic regimes. Professor Bonbright had filed with the Governor a supplementary report which has not yet been released, except for a summary of points attached to the committee report. One of Bonbright's points, reflected in the Electrical World article, is significant. He suggests that the State power authority, responsible for generation and marketing of about 3 million kilowatts of Niagara and St. Lawrence power, should have had recognized status in the pooling of the State's power resources, as well as in the generation and sale of low-cost power. Apparently, even this State agency is being euchred out of the basic power setup. We shall await with interest release of the Bonbright comment.

FROM ROCKEFELLER TO RUSSIA

To get some idea of the technological backwardness of the Rockefeller little giant power approach and the reasons for the backwardness, let us return a moment to the Third World Power Conference and the report on "Electric Power Development in the U.S.S.R.," prepared by the Russian Academy of Science for that conference. That was back in the 1930's and reflects mainly principles and plans and experiments, but it seems to express the technological approach uninfluenced by ulterior considerations. And the recent Senate Interior Committee report on "Relative Power and Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A." suggests that we've got to reckon with that kind of planning being carried out in the Soviet Union.

The 1936 Russian report refers back to the Goelro plan submitted to the 8th All-Russian Congress of Soviets in December 1920. It sums up the essential features of the Soviet electrification program based on that 1920 plan as follows:

"(a) The centralization of electric power economy and the concentration of generating plant and regional electric stations, interconnected into electric systems by high-voltage networks, with interregional interconnection of the networks later on. * * *

"(b) The development of the centralized combined production of electrical and heat energy in heat-and-power (H. & P.) stations, as organic links in planned electric power systems.

"(c) The development of hydroelectric stations, based on the coordinated development of waterpower. Like the H. & P. stations, the hydroelectric stations are essential factors in the location and combination of productive forces.

"(d) Fullest utilization of low-grade local fuel (peat, culm, oil shales, local coal of low-heating value, etc.) for electrification * * *."

The Goelro plan was approved by the all-Russian congress of soviets 5 years before Governor Pinchot submitted his 1925 giant power report to the Pennsylvania Legislature; 13 years before the birth of TVA, and 30 years before McGraw-Hill published the "Integrated Power System," a book by Philip Sporn, president of what has become the American Electric Power Co. integrated power system. What has been holding up modern power planning in our technically advanced Nation?

The 1936 Russian report tries its hand at an answer. It refers to the retarded development of centralized electric power economy in other countries as attributable to monopoly capitalism, to the competitive struggle between various financial groups, and to the fear of a high level of centralization in the electric power economy. The report says:

"The competitive struggle between electric companies, the planless location and development of productive forces, subject only to profit interests, and the hunt for consumers to increase the plant factor of the power station—all these have resulted in the high-voltage networks in capitalist countries possessing a configuration and extent that are irrational from the standpoint of national economy."

It should be noted that Western Europe has taken steps to overcome this irrationality in power system organization.

NATION CANNOT AFFORD TIMID APPROACH

The Rockefeller committee report is just the latest in a series of programs reflecting the private power company approach to giant power.

Technologically, the American Electric Power Co. system, extending from the Chicago area to Roanoke, Va., probably leads the way. In the South, the Southern Co. system serving Georgia, Alabama, and part of Mississippi and the Middle South Utilities system in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas, are going forward on the interconnected systems principle with joint planning of generating capacity.

The five-company proposal to the Bureau of Reclamation for integration of their transmission systems in the Rocky Mountain area, among other things to wheel Colorado River storage project power to preference customers, has also recently come into the picture. And Pacific Gas & Electric's baby interconnection between California and the Pacific Northwest, recently found financially feasible by the Bonneville Power Administration for possible marketing of its surplus Columbia River Basin power, has all the appearance of a camel's nose poked under the tent. We should review these projects in terms of the Bureau of Reclamation 1952 "Study of Future Power Transmission for the West," which would link Colorado, Central Valley (Calif.), Columbia, and Missouri River hydro with giant steam located in regional fuel areas to assure low-cost power for the entire region.

Whatever their technological merits, all private plans are essentially following the interconnected systems approach. No plans call for development of giant regional wholesale power supply as a separate function with all the possibility it offers of reducing costs through a high percentage of bond financing and simplification of rate regulation.

I do not think our great Nation can afford to go forward on this piecemeal, patchwork basis in a period when we are going, in any case, to add tremendous blocks of generating capacity, combining steam and hydro in combinations which mark a new technological breakthrough. I do not think that we can afford, on the one hand, to leave our essential yardstick public and cooperative electric systems insecure as to future supplies of low-cost power and, on the other, to leave regulation to unscramble a scrambled multiplicity of wholesale power interchange contracts.

And, perhaps most important of all, I do not think that, in the competition of social systems, we can afford to have the leader of the democratic world come off a poor second or third best in the sound engineering organization of its vital power supply function because ulterior considerations block progress.

THE ENGINEER RATHER THAN THE FINANCIER MUST GUIDE

Whether we turn to the 1936 Russian report to the Third World Power Conference or to the more recent Senate committee report, which tells how rapidly the plans described in the earlier report are being carried out, we cannot get away from the contrast with our approach to giant power in this country. It is a contrast between the engineer's approach, where he is free to do his best unpressured by ulterior considerations, and the power company approach, in which enginering planning must adjust itself to possibly conflicting private financial interests.

Some years ago I talked with Ted Parker, chief engineer of the Tennessee Valley Authority during its first extraordinary construction period. Parker had previously worked for a great engineering firm which served the utility industry. But he told me that he had found in the TVA his greatest opportunity to perform the service an engineer always longs to perform, in complete accord with the ideals of the profession. Never before, he said, had he worked where everyone was working for a common objective, where no one was seeking a profit for himself, where love of job predominated, and where the only pressure was to do his best and be his best.

That engineering approach has continued to characterize the planning of TVA in building the biggest single power-supply system in the country. And it is that kind of engineering approach—unwarped by our present patchwork of power-system organizations and uninfluenced by the dislike of big finance for Federal regulation—which must lay out the plans for the Nation's power supply if it is to meet the challenge of the balance of the century.

Long-range planning for this immediate future means projecting power-supply systems which will meet our requirements when the population reaches a quarter of a billion, when the number of family units reaches 80 million, when worker productivity sustains a $10,000 average annual wage in today's dollars, and when the annual family use of electricity in the home and on the job reaches 80,000 kilowatt-hours, when each quarter of a cent saved in the per-kilowatt-hour cost of electricity will mean $200 to the family and more than $15 billion to the country as a whole.

Private power spokesmen have defined the basic outlines of the power-supply systems required to meet these demands as including (1) very large steam-generating units and stations, conventional and atomic; (2) hydro, including pumped storage projects, for peak loads and reserves; (3) integration of generating stations by high-capacity transmission; (4) joint ownership; and (5) possible high bond-ratio financing in order to bring power-supply costs down. But they show no present intention to provide the country with the full advantages of this approach.

In the light of the foregoing, and following F. D. R.'s diagnosis of what the country needs and demands, I conclude by proposing two bold experiments, as follows:

Proposal No. 1: That the country encourage and facilitate the establishment of giant regional generation and transmission cooperatives to meet the Nation's herculean power requirements in years ahead at the lowest possible cost. These giant power-supply cooperatives would be open to membership of all systems, however owned, on a democratic vote per member basis, except that provision might be made against preponderance of control by any single type of ownership. In connection with its river basin undertakings, the Federal Government could participate in such giant power-supply cooperatives to the extent of planning and operating hydroelectric projects and backbone transmission systems as integral parts of the regional power-supply programs. Otherwise, backbone transmission would be part of the giant power cooperative systems. Each giant G. & T. would be responsible for long-range planning of regional power supply, cooperating with Federal agencies in such planning, arranging for the financing of the necessary facilities, and their operation, to provide bulk power supply to all electric systems serving consumers in the region at the lowest possible cost without discrimination. There would be nominal investment of members in stock and patronage dividends, so that service would be rendered substantially at cost. The bulk of financing, however, would be provided by bonds sold to the agency provided in proposal No. 2. In general, this would follow the Swedish principle, in which all types of ownership work together for the common good.

Proposal No. 2: That the country establish a public and cooperative investment finance corporation to handle the long- and short-range financing of the public and nonprofit sector of our economy. This would be carefully planned on the basis of the experience of the several New Deal financial agencies, including the remodeled Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Public Works Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the REA, etc. The Federal Government would subscribe to the stock of this corporation, would vest in it ownership of all outstanding loans and advances on which repayments, in part or in whole, with or without interest, are required, including the reimbursable investment in river-basin projects and programs The agency would be authorized to advance money for all public and nonprofit purposes at varying interest rates, depending on the public purpose rather than the supply and demand for money theory. It would be operated increasingly on a revolving-fund basis, along somewhat the lines of private issuance of bank-made money for the conduct of business in the private sector of the economy, as some multiple of the institution's cash resources. From time to time, Congress could subscribe to more of its stock when desirable otherwise to expand its loan capability. Long-range investment planning would provide a safeguard against inflation.

In previous papers, copies of which are available, I have outlined the giant power problem and suggested alternative solutions. Recently, at a meeting in South Dakota of the Midwest Electric Consumers Association, representing the eight-State Upper Missouri Basin area, where 41 percent of all consumers of electricity are served by public or cooperative systems. I proposed the initiation of steps to create such a giant power supply cooperative as I have just outlined. A special committee has been set up to look into the matter.

There are many problems to be solved, but spokesmen for all groups in the power industry recognize that the country requires a new step forward in power organization. In view of its tremendous importance, in terms of the Nation's ultimate leadership in a world of change, Congress should give the matter consideration at the present session. Meanwhile, candidates for the highest office in the land could well make sound programs for the country's future power supply, and more generally for the financing of the public and cooperative sectors of our economy, leading issues. They would thus play their parts in creating the image of a future America, in which a modern society is scientifically evolved under procedures which we sum up as democracy.

A Tribute to Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following poetic tribute from one of my constituents in Cambridge that appeared on the editorial page of the Boston Herald on the 151st anniversary of the birth of the Great Emancipator. In these days of confusion, it is

well to have the words of Lincoln recalled to our minds:

LINCOLN

(By William H. McMasters)

How futile are the words of men to make
their heroes' deeds stand forth
Or bring to mind full measure of their
character!
So has it ever been with Lincoln.
He, of all our country's great, eludes the
tricks of rhetoric
And makes our efforts impotent, our studied
phrases trite and common.
As the pages of history turn and countless
yesterdays flow into the vast eternity
of time.
The best that we can do is mark the passage
of his tragic years
And breathe our heartful thanks that such
eternal grandeur
In one undaunted soul,
Belongs, in growing strength, to those who
live within the shadow
Of his stature.
On this anniversary of his birth, reverently
we pray;
That he look down from the serene and lonely heights of Mount Olympus,
And, once again, implore us:
"To do all which may achieve and cherish
a just and lasting peace
"Among ourselves, and with all nations."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	2030 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED — TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Congressman Lee Metcalf Speaks to School Administrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the leaders in the field of education in the House is, I am proud to say, my colleague, LEE METCALF, from Montana's First Congressional District. During his four terms as a Representative he has been a champion of improved education facilities and instruction in this country, a prerequisite to the maintenance of our world leadership.

Congressman METCALF is a cosponsor of the Murray-Metcalf legislation which would establish a program of Federal aid to education with the least possible Federal controls and would provide funds for construction of schools and teachers salaries. The proposal provided the basis for the action recently taken by the Senate in approving the Federal aid to education bill.

On Monday of this week my able colleague, LEE METCALF, spoke to the American Association of School Administrators at its annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAPPING NATIONAL RESOURCES FOR SCHOOL FINANCE, FEBRUARY 15, 1960

In 1954, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of which I was a member, in a Republican-controlled Congress, under a Republican chairman, made a brief report on Federal aid to education. The subcommittee said, "It is clear that Federal legislation is needed and that the legislation must be designed to encourage State and local efforts to meet the problem." The subcommittee recommended that "legislation be enacted to enable the States and local communities to expand their school construction programs."

In the years that have elapsed there have been weeks of hearings, dozens of hours of testimony and scores of recommendations for Federal assistance to States and local school districts. In the intervening years several independent agencies have also studied this problem and arrived at the same conclusion reached by our subcommittee in 1954—that if we are to maintain adequate educational opportunities in America, we must have substantial Federal assistance.

Yet today, the classroom shortage is more serious than ever before. The number of children enrolled in the public schools in excess of normal capacity has grown to the largest in history.

In the jargon of the bureaucrat, these are "surplus" children. I know very few parents who consider their children surplus. Last year, the number of surplus children was 1,850,000, this year, it is up to 1,883,000. But these surplus children are not the only ones who are being educationally short-changed. Because of the crowded, obsolete and substandard classrooms and the half shifts, the education of at least 10 million boys and girls is being impaired.

In addition to the nearly 2 million in excess of normal school capacity, there are at least 6 million in crowded urban elementary schools and more than another 2 million in obsolete or inadequate buildings. The 10 million figure is extremely conservative, because it does not include either urban high schools or rural schools.

In the opinion of some leading educators, the ideal class averages 27 youngsters in elementary and 20 in secondary schools.

If a class has 40 or 50 pupils, the education of every child in that room is being impaired, not just that of the additional pupils.

Even though the class size may be within the desirable limit, the youngsters are being short-changed if their teacher is substandard. And an even more serious crisis is developing in the shortage of trained teachers. Last year it was 135,000. When school opened in September it had grown to 195,000.

The only thing that has changed for the better is the fact that the States and local communities have made a tremendous effort, a magnificent effort, to meet the classroom and teacher shortage. They have made such an effort that they have physically exhausted their local resources. They have reached their statutory and constitutional debt limits, and they have reached a debt ceiling beyond which their tax system can no longer go without dire economic consequences. Evidence of this is the slackening of school construction and a downtrend in bond issues by school districts. During the first 11 months of 1959 voters of all States approved $1,230 million in school bonds as against $1,364 million in the same period in 1958. Last year, more than 70,000 new classrooms were built, a survey of future construction for next year revealed that 62,700 are planned, a decline of 10 percent.

The school population will increase by at least 1,200,000 next year. Just to take care of this increase, would require 43,255 classrooms. In addition, we will need replacements for the classrooms abandoned as obsolete. Exactly 16,400, the fewest in recent history, were so abandoned during the 1958–59 school year.

To house the increased enrollment and to replace obsolete classrooms, then, we need at least 64,655 more classrooms next year—or almost 2,000 more than the States report they are planning to build. As you can see, we won't even keep our heads above water next year—to say nothing of the backlog of needed classrooms.

Despite this gloomy picture it would not warrant the intervention of the Federal Government as recommended by the various groups that have studied the question unless there were a justification for Federal participation in the costs of education especially at the elementary and secondary level.

But it can no longer be denied that the national welfare depends upon the level of education. Our experience in two world wars concentrated our attention very forcibly upon the need for better educated soldiers. Indeed, the rejections in the draft of those disqualified by the mental test revealed great disparity among the States. For example, my own State of Montana led all the States of the Nation with only a 3.5 percent rejection while the two lowest ranking States had almost 50 percent rejection. That means that out of every 100 Montana boys called in a period of complete national emergency 96 would be sent into battle while another State with the same population could fill only half its quota. This fact and this alone has impressed Montana mothers with the importance of equalizing the required sacrifice by sending some of our tax money to help the States who cannot afford an adequate educational system.

The increasing mobility of our population means that a high percentage of tomorrow's adult citizens in almost every community will have been educated in some other community and some other State. Each year, one American out of every five changes his address. In many States only a fraction of those adults in penal institutions and of the youngsters in reform schools were educated in the States in which they are confined. The same is true of persons on the welfare rolls.

We pay for education whether we have it or not. And we pay more for it if we do not have it. We pay more in increased costs for penal and custodial institutions and for welfare. Today no State can escape its share of the high cost of inadequate education in any other State—nor can any State fail to share the benefits of good education.

In this age of missiles and satellites and cold war, the ultimate source of our security is the skill and technological competence and comprehension of our citizens. In the special field of missiles and space exploration the lead of the Soviet Union can only be overcome by accelerating research and technological advance, not only by highly trained specialists but by a greatly increased number of truly literate men and women at all levels. The Russian advances have only underscored our national shortage of developed brainpower. If the Soviet Union as a threat to our national security disappeared tomorrow, we would still be confronted by shortages of human resources in many fields which require high competence and extended training due to the ever-increasing technological complexities of our society.

Education is an investment in human resources from which we receive direct and positive gains in the form of higher productivity, more rapid gains in utilization of research, a better informed citizenry, as well as a stronger military. These are direct benefits that transcend State and local boundaries and involve our Nation's economic strength, our national growth, our prestige, as well as our national security and survival.

The mobility of our population, our dependence upon expanded education to maintain our economic growth are all items that prove a Federal responsibility for education.

Assuming a Federal responsibility, what is the role the Federal Government must play in a cooperative effort with the State and local governments to meet our educational crisis?

In the first place, a substantial increase in the Federal support for education is necessary. At the present time, less than 4 cents of each dollar expended for the

public schools comes from the Federal Government. I do not pretend to know what the exact proportion of the respective contributions of the Federal, State and local Governments should be—but I am convinced that at the present time, the Federal Government is shirking its responsibilities and not paying its just share. I am convinced that the Federal benefits are so great that the Federal Government should have stepped in and started greater participation in education before the States and local districts reached the point of exhaustion. But now that that point has been reached, it is imperative that the Federal resources be marshaled to assume an obligation that is overdue.

Actually this question of Federal aid resolves itself into a question of who shall pay for schools and what kind of tax shall be imposed to support them. Traditionally, on the local level, the schools have been supported by a property tax. In colonial times and pioneer days, this was an equitable tax on wealth. Today, when more and more wealth is in stocks and bonds and securities, and ability to pay is measured by income, a tax on property is neither equitable nor an accurate measure of ability to pay.

This is particularly true in suburban communities that have mushroomed around the cities. The residents of these communities are the young people with the most children to educate who live in homes that are heavily mortgaged. They educate their children in school districts that do not have the property tax base that is found in older communities where there are factories and transportation facilities and powerlines. This is one factor that has led to the development of foundation and State equalization programs. But even the States have to rely on sales and excise and consumption taxes, notoriously inequitable.

A whole different group of taxpayers contribute to the support of schools when that support comes from the income tax than contribute when the support comes from a sales tax or a tax on real property. This factor is an answer to those who contend that all money comes from the people and that the Federal Government must get the money from the people who live in the States, just as it is an answer to those who point out that certain States will pay in more Federal tax than they receive back in benefits. The tax burden in such States will be shifted so that those who have incomes of less than $10,000 per year in such States as Michigan and New York will pay much less tax for each dollar raised for schools than they would have paid if that dollar were raised locally. On the other hand, those with incomes of more than $10,000 per year in New York and Pennsylvania and other States that allegedly receive less than they contribute, will have to pay more in proportion and that is consistent with the basic principle of taxation on the basis of ability to pay.

An equally cogent argument for Federal support is that the tax base is national. States and local districts are haunted by threats that local industry will move if taxes are increased. Even if the local industry does not move, its competitive position relative to other States and localities is affected. In Montana, last year, the only national life insurance company located in that State announced that it was moving its headquarters from Helena, Mont., to St. Paul, Minn. And one of the reasons given was that the Montana Legislature had increased the gross premium tax. No such thing can occur, of course, when a life insurance company has to pay the same tax in St. Paul as it pays in Helena.

It has been suggested that local districts must bear at least half of the cost of education in order to maintain local interest and local control. At the present time, that ratio has not been maintained in many States. In Delaware, for example, 88.2 percent of the revenue for public elementary and secondary schools comes from the State government. In 20 States the local districts bear less than 50 percent of the burden. The experience in these States has not been that the additional State aid brought about any lessening of local interest or concern in the education of the children of the community. Likewise, a substantial aid program such as H.R. 22, which I have introduced, or the amended McNamara bill which passed the Senate the other day, would not upset the balance between the various levels of government. Even if the entire amount authorized were appropriated and expended, the Federal Government would be bearing less than 10 percent of the cost of elementary and primary education.

It may be that a just apportionment of the costs of education between the three levels of government would require that the Federal Government pay more than 10 percent. If we could put the present proposals into effect for 2 or more years, we could gain valuable experience that would help us ascertain the proper proportions. But in view of the need and the Federal interest, 10 percent of the cost is the least the Federal Government should bear.

At the same time that we are increasing the Federal share of the cost we should reappraise our position with respect to the question of Federal control.

After he had voted against the Clark amendment the other day, Vice President NIXON said, "In the field of education, we have two problems—attracting better teachers and raising their salaries and maintaining our traditional school system that operates without Federal control."

That statement is noteworthy because it completely disregards the problem of classroom shortages and because it brings up the tired old argument that Federal aid means Federal control in a context that has resulted in the most Federal control. The bill before the Senate was one for specialized aid, for construction. The Clark amendment would have added aid for teachers' salaries, so that the Federal support would have been general rather than specialized. This is the sort of traditional aid that operated without Federal control.

One of the current advertising campaigns of a machine tool company, a company that probably would not even be able to exist if it were not for Federal contracts and Federal subsidies, says that the Pilgrims didn't ask for Federal aid. Of course not, the small settlements established by the Pilgrims combined all branches of government as we know them today—Federal, State and local. And the Pilgrims marshaled all their resources to build churches and schools and homes for their families. They utilized to the fullest capacity every resource, public and private, to establish themselves in the new world and train future citizens to expand and develop their colony.

Probably here was born the unique American tradition of local autonomy in the management of schools. The conditions of pioneer and frontier life developed local responsibility and control. This has been taken as a matter of course and many people who are opposed to Federal support of education take the position that it is both unconstitutional and an innovation for the Federal Government to aid in education at any level.

As a matter of fact, the Federal Government has encouraged and aided education from pre-Revolutionary times. Prior to the Civil War, this aid took the form of general grants of land or money. There was no attempt to supervise teaching or regulate programs either directly or indirectly.

We are nearing the centennial of the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. At the present time in Congress, bills are pending to commemorate the passage of the Morrill Act and to make the Morrill homestead in Vermont a national shrine. And the significance of this legislation is great. The Morrill Act marked the change of the Federal policy toward education.

The Morrill Act provided a grant of 30,000 acres of public land for each Senator and Representative to be used by the States for the establishment of agricultural colleges. The act carefully prescribed certain fiscal and administrative regulations and the Congressmen of that time had no hesitancy in restricting curriculums. Section 4 of the act says, "The leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe."

Here was a grant of Federal land for the construction and establishment of colleges. In 1887, came the Hatch Act providing for agricultural experiment stations. This was a system of annual money payments instead of extending aid in lump sums of money and land. Indeed, the Hatch Act provided that only one-fifth of the first annual appropriation and only 5 percent of subsequent appropriations could be used for buildings.

In view of the interest in the so-called Powell amendment preventing the payment of Federal funds for segregated schools, the provision in the second Morrill Act in 1890 is of interest today. It declared, "No money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided."

In another area the Congress was busy making regulations specifically controlling the States' educational policies and restricting and regulating the State and local educational system. Between the end of the Civil War and the admission of Arizona to the Union in 1912, 12 States were admitted. In each case in the enabling acts, the Federal Government progressively required that certain provisions relating to education be incorporated into the State constitutions. Congress wrote 12 separate educational restrictions into the constitution of my own State, Montana. These conditions include stipulations as to the use of Federal land grants, the establishment of trust funds for the common schools, requirement that free common schools be maintained. And in order to gain statehood, the people of Montana gladly accepted these restrictions on local and State control of educational institutions.

The opposition of the senior Senator from Arizona to the acceptance of Federal funds provided by the National Defense Education Act and the refusal of the Governor of Arizona to request such funds make the provisions of the Arizona Enabling Act of 1910 of current interest. The act represents the extreme of Federal specifications as to use of Federal funds. It minutely provides for establishment of trust funds and subsidies and expressly sets forth not only the type of institution that is to be benefited, but the amount of benefit to be given each type of institution.

In other fields the extension of Federal aid departed from the historic pre-Civil War pattern of general aid without restriction

to aid for specific courses of instruction with complicated State plans requiring the approval of Federal officials before the money was granted. Such acts are still in existence and known to all of you, the Smith-Hughes Act, the Smith-Lever Act, the George-Barden Act, aid to impacted areas, and finally the National Defense Education Act passed last year.

Ten years of experience with Public Laws 815 and 874, which provide for support of schools in federally impacted areas, have demonstrated that Federal control need not be a consequence of Federal support. But nevertheless, inherent in Public Laws 815 and 874 are elements that might lead to Federal control of curriculums and textbooks and teachers. In both of these acts, the aid goes directly to the local school district without the intervening agency of the State school authority. In some districts, more than 50 percent of the support for operation and maintenance of the schools comes from the Federal Government. In fact, Uncle Sam is on that school board. An augmented Federal support program should avoid this by channeling Federal aid through the States so that the Federal money becomes intermingled with that of the State and local districts and there is never any direct connection between the Federal Government and the local school board.

Already, under the National Defense Act, we are seeing the dangers involved in specialized assistance. In order to encourage teaching of science and mathematics and foreign language, we have concentarted our Federal aid in those fields. A school that is badly in need of additions to the library and with funds to purchase books may decide to channel that same money into the purchase of scientific equipment because in the latter case the local tax dollar will be matched by Federal money. This is the case even though the need for the library is the greater.

In order to avoid this indirect control of curriculum, aid to education at the elementary and secondary levels should be by direct grants to the States, expendable as any other funds for any and all public educational purposes as the State itself may direct. Such grants will not interfere with our American method of keeping educational management close to the people and will return freedom of choice to the local school boards to decide under local conditions how best the Federal support can be utilized.

Now I use that word "grant" advisedly. Actually, it is not a grant at all—in the sense that a grant is a donation. When I use the word "grant" I mean Federal participation. I mean the assumption of the Federal Government's share of the responsibility for the education upon which a democracy rests.

I have been talking about direct Federal aid to education by an outright grant of tax money for support of specific educational programs or for specialized areas such as the help given in federally impacted districts. But there is another and equally important area of Federal aid. That is the indirect support given by our tax system. These include assistance to private educational and charitable institutions by means of deductions from the income tax for contributions, deductions to teachers for amounts spent in taking summer school courses in order to keep up with advancements in the subject matter and teaching methods, tax exemption on the income of State and local bonds for school construction and deductibility of State and local taxes.

Although these erosive concessions throw the entire income tax system out of balance, they continue to thrive and, indeed, to expand. The reason for their existence is a political one. It is frequently easier to go to the taxing committees of the Congress and get a back door subsidy labeled "tax relief" than go to the legislative committees, get authorizing legislation enacted, then go through the administrative agencies and the Budget Bureau to get budget recommendations and back to the Appropriations Committee and get a direct subsidy labeled "expenditures." The Eisenhower administration has this year come up with a third approach, that of the side door labeled "loans, guarantees, and insurance."

Involved here is a labyrinth of Federal benefits that are hidden from the public, that do not have the advantage of periodic review by congressional committees and administrative agencies. Such policies become fixed in the tax structure as vested rights impervious to change in economic conditions or tax policy.

I wonder if the time has not come for school administrators at the elementary and secondary level and for college presidents at the college level to reappraise and reevaluate some of these tax concessions and abandon the "back door" approach in favor of a frank and straightforward attempt at direct grants.

The Federal Government uses its taxing power to fix the income tax at a certain rate. The money raised from that tax is theoretically appropriated by the Congress on the basis of authorizing legislation regularly passed. If Congress recognizes that it is in the national interest to aid in the construction of school buildings, then a certain proportion of the national tax income is set aside for that purpose and allocated to the States on the basis established by statute. The tax deduction approach takes the decision as to where and how the money is to be spent away from the Congress and the administrative agencies and gives it to the individual who is taxed. This is not always in the public interest and is seldom in accordance with national policy laid down by the people through their elected representatives. It may be that educators of the Nation—or the admirals—have convinced the Congress that it is necessary to strengthen the science departments of the colleges and to train more doctors of philosophy in scientific fields. In order to do this, grants-in-aid are necessary to assist the colleges in establishing these expensive departments, and scholarships and fellowships are necessary to encourage students to continue their college work in order to obtain these advanced degrees. By a direct system of authorization and appropriation this policy can be carried out. But by a system of allowing deductions for contribution some of the tax money that would go to support this program is drained off. The person making a contribution to the college of his choice will prefer to endow a chair for history or build a chapel or plan for research into the tribal organization of the early American Indian, all commendable and worthwhile enterprises, but not in conformity with the national policy laid down by Congress.

A similar situation exists with tax-exempt bonds of school districts. The graduated income tax makes such bonds more valuable to those in the higher income brackets. So we have a regressive tax system for the construction of schools where those with the greatest income bear a lesser tax burden. This means not only inverted relief to the individual taxpayer, but it means that the Federal assistance goes to the school district that is in the best financial situation and those districts which have reached the limits of their bonding capacity cannot enjoy the benefits of the tax concession. There is mounting evidence that much of the benefit of the tax exemption accrues to the buyers of the bonds rather than to the local governments which issue the bonds. This would indicate that, at the same cost, the Federal Government could give more help to the State and local governments through direct grants.

Another proposal for Federal help is for the Federal Government to return a certain percentage of the income tax collected in each State to the State earmarked for educational purposes only. An example of this type of aprpoach is the Pelly bill which would return 2 percent of all Federal income taxes collected. There are serious administrative difficulties involved in such a proposal because large corporations pay withholding taxes on their employees at a central office, and the money collected in the State where the corporation had its headquarters would include income taxes earned in other States. But disregarding these difficulties, the bill has other disadvantages. It would provide for equalization in reverse. The bill would provide a return of about $1.1 billion each year. Under it, the State of New York would receive $71 per child while one of the neediest States would receive only $4 per child. My own bill, which provides for a flat grant of $25 per child, would have an equalizing effect. Instead of 2 percent as under the Pelly bill, the State of Alabama would receive 6.27 percent of the income tax collected in that State, Mississippi would receive 11½ percent, but in New York the return would be only 1.1 percent, in California 1¾ percent, in Pennsylvania 1.8 percent.

In addition to specialized assistance and Federal controls, the Eisenhower administration is insistent on State matching of Federal funds. If matching can come from either State or local sources and is for general educational purposes it is not very serious. The State and local communities will be spending far more money for education than the Federal Government anyway.

But matching of specialized funds distorts free and flexible management of State and local funds and when coupled with a requirement that matching be out of certain State or local funds then there is serious control and imbalance. Such a situation tends to create favoritism for certain types of education and forces States to alter their tax structures to conform with Federal requirements.

One other argument perennially used by opponents of Federal aid should be mentioned, that of the freight charge, the claim that somehow in the round trip to Washington and return, the tax dollar shrinks to 60 cents, or even less, due to Federal administrative costs.

A recent study of the functioning of 10 grant-in-aid programs by the House Committee on Government Operations has shown this is without foundation.

The 10 grant-in-aid programs analyzed by the House committee included the 4 largest and 6 smaller programs representing diverse administrative arrangements. For the 10 programs combined, the total of directly related Federal expenditures for administration, research and other associated activities was estimated to be 1.2 percent of the total grant payments to State and local governments in fiscal 1958. The addition of prorated indirect costs for other activities associated with these programs—costs including Federal tax collection and auditing—increased the total to 1.6 percent of the total grant payments. In other words, the total freight charge for the 10 programs accounting for four-fifths of all Federal grants is less than 2 cents on the dollar, even when we take into account what it costs to collect Federal taxes and audit agency books.

Now each of you has gone through special bond elections. You know the cost of raising this money on the local level. You know the cost of registration, of election judges and clerks, of the legal steps of clearing bond issues, the approval of forms. You know how expensive and time consuming the process is. Although no accurate figures are available, the best available estimate is that it costs somewhere between 5 and 10 cents per dollar to collect and administer a tax dollar at the local level. That, inci-

dentally, is the estimate of the American Association of School Administrators. In other words, collection and administration of a tax dollar on the local level costs 3 to 6 times as much as collection and administration of the same tax dollar on the Federal level.

The administration cost of such a proposal as the Murray-Metcalf bill would be infinitesimal. It requires only a simple mathematical calculation and notification of the allowance of the grants. If efficiency and economy in the administration of an educational program is what is desired this approach should appeal even to the chamber of commerce and the NAM.

Today there is pending in Congress legislation to accomplish the objectives of Federal aid within the framework of these principles. The bill that Senator MURRAY has introduced in the Senate and that I am sponsoring in the House is an example. The amended McNamara bill that passed the Senate last week is another.

More than any other group, yours is one that knows the problems of school financing. You know that the glib phrase, "Federal aid means Federal control" is a myth. You are the ones that meet with the taxpayers associations and the business community. You are the ones that belong to the luncheon clubs and the chambers of commerce. It is you that can bring the message of the need and justification for Federal support to the people of America more effectively than any other group. In doing so you will be performing a valued service for your profession. You will be helping your associates in the teaching profession to attain a higher standard of living and also a higher standard of professional capability. Even more important, you will be doing a great service to your Nation. It may well be that our national survival will depend upon the job you do in convincing your friends and neighbors of the need for better educational facilities. The passage of the pending legislation, as the result of the kind of popular demand your organization can generate, will help to do this important job.

OCAW-Sponsored Mental Health Center Will Stage Fund Drive During April

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert in the Appendix an article concerning a unique instance of a great labor union adopting a worthwhile public service institution and helping it with financial assistance.

The Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union is giving support to the Mental Health Center of America, in Denver, Colo., which provides treatment for mentally ill borderline cases as well as does research on the causes of mental illness.

In April the OCAW will solicit each of its members for 1 hour's pay as a contribution to the Mental Health Center.

Recently we have heard so much adverse criticism of unions that I believe this is a wonderful opportunity to remind ourselves of the overwhelming good that unions do. The article from the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Union News of February 8, 1960, outlines the campaign which this great union will conduct:

OCAW-SPONSORED MENTAL HEALTH CENTER WILL STAGE FUND DRIVE DURING APRIL

OCAW's support for the free, nonsectarian Mental Health Center of America will be put to the practical test during the month of April when the union's members will be asked to contribute 1 hour's pay each to this unique institution.

The 1959 convention unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the center and authorizing and instructing the union's officers to put into effect a formal fundraising campaign throughout the union.

OCAW President O. A. Knight emphasized that this drive will in no way conflict with united fund or other local federated campaigns. "The Mental Health Center of America is an institution that serves patients from all over America and Canada while United Fund institutions are local in character," Knight said.

"This was one of the facts we looked at when the OCAW executive board was first considering support for the center. As a result of this difference in service, and because the Mental Health Center of America does not seek support from local United Fund drives, we determined that no conflict exists."

Knight announced that the MHCA campaign will be spearheaded by Ben Bezoff and M. Phyl Poulson. Bezoff, who will be project director, has taken leave from the board of the center on which he has served for some 14 years to devote full time to the OCAW fundraising campaign. He is a well-known Denver public relations man. Poulson, who is international executive board member from district 2, is on leave from his job in the Utah Oil Co. refinery in Salt Lake City and is serving as associate project director. Most of his time will be spent in the field, working with OCAW local unions, helping them set up the committees and procedures for the April MHCA campaign.

Already underway with the assistance of OCAW district directors and representatives is the organization of campaign committees in every local union. Cards are being distributed to local unions through the staff of representatives on which the names of committee volunteers can be sent into headquarters.

Committee members will be furnished with solicitation kits including brochures explaining the work of the center and enough pledge cards to cover the membership of their local unions. Each contributor will receive a special card acknowledging his donation and thanking him for his support of the institution.

The Mental Health Center of America is located in Denver and is an institution with a long and proud record of national service. In its early history it served as a recuperation and rehabilitation center for people recovering from tuberculosis.

In 1957 the board of trustees decided that with tuberculosis on the wane they had to evolve a new medical program if they were to continue to be of service. A thorough study of health needs showed that intensive psychiatric care and research in the field of mental illness would be most useful. In America and Canada, the survey showed, there are almost 20 million people suffering from some form of mental illness.

In July 1958 the center opened its doors as the only institution of its kind of provide free privately financed treatment for the borderline mentally ill on a nonsectarian basis. These are the cases of people who cannot any longer function in normal daily life, but who are not yet stricken with irreversible mental illness.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Can Stop Inflation if We Have the Courage To Try," published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 20, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN STOP INFLATION IF WE HAVE THE COURAGE TO TRY

Inflation is commonly regarded as a sort of unavoidable disaster. Actually inflation is seldom accidental, but is the result of wrong decisions by governments which, in democracies at any rate, are made because pressure groups can outshout the rest of us. Everybody is against inflation, but everybody is for higher wages, more farm subsidies, and bigger welfare programs. In short, everybody wants to throw gasoline on the fire and rely on somebody else to put it out.

There are several devices which can be used to curb an inflationary boom in the early stages. Not necessarily in order of importance, these are: management of the national budget so that expenditures and income are in reasonable balance; sound monetary policies to prevent excessive credit expansion from causing inflation; and realistic management of the $290 billion public debt, including its reduction by any surplus which the Government is able to scrape together. To achieve these results the Treasury believes an increase of the interest rate on long-term borrowing is essential. This last item, which seems to generate more heat than light, is worthy of some analysis.

As of now the Government is required by a 40-year-old law to pay no more than 4¼ percent on all money borrowed for more than 5 years. This means that investors, able to get a better yield on their money in stocks, mortgages, and corporate bond issues, are unwilling to take the Government's long-term offerings. The Treasury has consequently been forced to get its money through short-term issues. In addition to piling up billions in debt which must be paid off during a brief period, too much short-term borrowing feeds the fires of inflation. This occurs because short-term securities are immediately salable, usually pretty close to the purchase price. A vaultful of short-term Treasury securities is the next thing to a vaultful of currency.

Actually the administration's proposal to remove the ceiling on long-term interest rates is not an effort to increase interest rates, as its critics have charged. As Secretary of the Treasury Anderson has pointed out, the effect could be just the opposite. "The rates we select," he said in a recent interview, "are determined * * * on the basis of what's been going on in the bond market. * * * Removing the ceiling would simply permit us to meet the market." By making long-term issues more popular, the average rate at which the Government could borrow money might actually be lowered instead of increased.

Of course, a technical device like an increase in long-term interest rates is not all that is needed to control inflation. Shortly after President Eisenhower's announcement, in his state of the Union address to Congress, that a $4,200 million surplus was anticipated

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the Treasury was able to float securities on better terms than have been possible for some time. This illustrates the importance of the Government's ability to keep its expenditures in balance. Tinkering with the mechanics of financing will avail little if Congress fritters away the prospective budget surplus by an unwarranted tax cut or unjustified spending.

The advocates of greater spending have developed what amounts to a theology of fiscal profligacy. For example, a group described as the Conference on Economic Progress has issued a report, written by economist Leon Keyserling, which deplores the grossly inadequate amounts of public spending in recent budgets, explaining that "every additional dollar of Federal outlays has a so-called multiplier effect, which results in 2 or two dollars of private consumer and investor outlay"—precisely the argument which those who fear inflation advance against unwarranted public spending. And some Members of Congress, eager for a torch to carry, denounce tight money as a scheme to enrich the bankers, despite the fact that any after-taxes profit the banks can realize from higher interest rates will be more than canceled out by the decline in the value of their present stock of lower yield Government securities.

Foreign holders of American dollar reserves are beginning to view the management of our finances—and particularly the refusal of Congress to remove the interest-rate ceiling—with some anxiety. This may partly explain the recent withdrawal of gold from this country. However, a too rapid or continuous gold loss might threaten the very existence of the international monetary system and the position of the United States as a world leader. The distress from a further decline in the value of the dollar among people who live on fixed incomes, retirement pensions, insurance policies, and so on, is easy to imagine. To a considerable extent it is being experienced already.

Even without unwise public spending, our gold reserve is under considerable pressure from an unfavorable balance of payments, arising from this country's international transactions, including investment of American dollars in overseas industry, foreign-aid advances, and money spent abroad by American tourists and servicemen. This problem can be taken care of, but if we insist on adding to the dollar's handicaps a loss of confidence in our financial commonsense, nothing but trouble should be expected.

What it comes down to is that inflation is inevitable unless there is patience and restraint on the part of the public. If every slight increase in prices is to mean a strike-enforced demand for higher wages, we might as well kiss stability goodby. L. Robert Driver, a statistician and tax expert who has been represented on this page in the past, has worked up some challenging figures on this matter.

"If the pay of all employed persons in the United States had been raised by 40 cents an hour, as the pay of the steelworkers was raised," says Mr. Driver, "the costs of goods and services in the country would rise by $45,800 million a year, or $270 for every one of our 170 million people." Leaving out the effect on our precarious competitive position vis-à-vis foreign producers, even a fiscal ignoramus can see the effect of such an addition to our already topheavy costs on the value of the dollar.

The essential element is what the first J. P. Morgan used to say he looked for in a man looking for a loan or a job: character. If we are really on a payola and tax-loophole economy, if we lack the guts to refrain from strikes and the intelligence to reject populist easy-money panaceas, then neither Congress nor the Treasury can do much for us.

If, on the other hand, the millions of Americans who know the score set themselves up as a sort of Inflationists Anonymous, pledged to resist the potions of the spendocracy, the news will get through to those who manage our affairs. They will know that the American people want their Government to protect the value of their money and their position in the world, and will accept short-term sacrifice for long-term security. On can bet on this possibility—either way.

Loyalty Oath Requirement of the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I found in my mail this morning a letter from a resident of Illinois, requesting me to explain to her why I allegedly do not intend to oppose the repeal of the loyalty oath requirement contained in the National Defense Education Act, which is Public Law 85–864.

This person attached to her letter a photostatic copy of a letter which she received from the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in which the Senator states that "Senator KENNEDY has introduced legislation to repeal the disclaimer section of the act and Congressman WALTER, author of the original requirement, has indicated that he will not oppose such action." I deem it necessary to correct two errors which have crept into Senator DOUGLAS' letters to his constituent.

I am not the author of the loyalty oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act although I am a strong supporter of the retention of this vital requirement. That requirement was not contained in the House bill. It was the Senate bill that did contain it and the managers on the part of the House agreed to the Senate version in conference. Of course, I was very happy to see that action taken. I am strongly opposed to the repeal of that requirement and my views have been clearly stated in a letter which I wrote on June 17, 1959, to Mr. A. H. Scouten, the secretary of the University of Pennsylvania.

My letter to Mr. Scouten reads as follows:

JUNE 17, 1959.

Mr. A. H. SCOUTEN,
University Secretary, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. SCOUTEN: I have your letter of June 15, and I am pleased to note that you appreciate my frankness in discussing with you the Penn faculty senate's objection to the "disclaimer affidavit" required under the National Defense Education Act. You have induced me to proceed in the same spirit.

Obviously, the purpose of the "disclaimer affidavit" is not to expose Communist infiltrators who have wormed their way into our intellectual circles. You are correct in stating that real subversives would "sign or swear to any statement if it suited their tactical purposes." The purpose of the affidavit is to ascertain that the beneficiary of a Federal educational grant is either a loyal citizen of the United States, or—if he swears falsely—a perjurer, subject to criminal prosecution. I am sure that you are familiar with the basic tenets of our law enforcement system, and that I therefore do not have to amplify that point.

Next, your statement as to the "disclaimer affidavit" impugning the loyalty of the academic community. I disagree with you emphatically. For the Government to ask a person to state affirmatively that he is not guilty of any wrongdoing, does not mean at all that the Government suspects him of misconduct. The purpose of the classic affirmation formula appearing on the income tax return is certainly not an implication that every taxpayer is a cheat; some are, and therefore the affirmation formula is necessary. The same rationale applies to the disclaimer affidavit. The same applies to the loyalty oath required of every employee of the Government. All of them are not thereby placed under suspicion of disloyalty.

It is more difficult to discuss the balance of your letter as it is always difficult to continue a discussion in the course of which one of the debaters retreats from argument to sophistry. Please don't mind my use of this word. But, how would you call an argument comparing the use of governmental funds for farm price support with the use of such funds for the purpose of promoting the education of selected future leaders of our scientific defense effort under the National Defense Education Act? In an effort to avoid insulting the intelligence of both of us, I shall rest there and not belabor the even more spacious nature of your coal miners and John L. Lewis inference, a truly prize equivocation.

The last paragraph of your letter disturbs me profoundly, as it again attests eloquently to the insufficient perception and comprehension of the very nature of communism by many of our leading intellectuals. Even in using a lighter note as you say, equations between totalitarian, terroristic communism and any, American or foreign, ideological movement are inexcusable. Hoping that I may remedy this situation, in my capacity as the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I am right now engaged in an attempt to publish certain materials which which might help to educate the educators.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Defense: A Need for Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the maintenance of an adequate defense system to deter aggression—now and in the future—is one of the major challenges confronting the Nation. Recently, we have been hearing testimony from our scientific and military experts on the adequacy of our defense program.

Even among experts, there are differing opinions on:

First, what is an adequate defense; and second, is the U.S. program sufficiently strong—particularly in relation to the Soviet Union.

We recognize that the Soviets have developed tremendous thrust for launching its intercontinental ballistic missiles. However, in this complex technological age, an effective defense cannot depend upon a single weapon—even the powerful ICBM.

The intercontinental missile will—in all likelihood—be the workhorse by and large, around which will be centered the defense of the future.

However, there are a wide variety of other weapons for defense systems: for detection of enemy approaches—and capable of retailiatory counterattack that must be kept at the ready—if we are to be adequately protected.

These include an up-to-date radar system for detection of approaching enemy planes or missiles; maintenance of a well-balanced striking power, including jetplanes, ICBM's, intermediate-range missiles, air-to-air, ground-to-air, and air-to-surface, and other missiles; submarines equipped with rocket launchers; adequate numbers of aircraft carriers for launching of jetplanes bristling with nuclear weapons and missiles; mobile, atomic firepower for all air, ground, and sea forces: These are only a few of the major facets of a complex, modern defense system.

In view of the conflicting opinions, the task before Congress is to determine, to the best of its judgment: (a) Is our defense adequate for present threats, and (b) are we moving forward fast enough to meet the threats of the future?

The people of the country, I believe, deserve a well-balanced evaluation by Congress, as well as by our experts in the various military and scientific fields, of the adequacy of our defense.

Recognizing that this is a political year, we can of course expect distortions by those who seek to gain political advantage, for example, in isolating what they feel are weak spots in our defenses without putting the whole picture in perspective.

In view of honest differences, as well as what appear to be deliberate distortions, I understand that President Eisenhower is considering taking the defense issue to the American people. The purpose would be to provide them with a realistic picture of the adequacy of our defenses. Frankly, I believe this would be a good idea.

The survival of our country, as well as freedom in the world, depends upon our deterrent power.

The maintenance of a strong, balanced defense force, too, will require the outlay of more than $40 billion of the taxpayers' money. In the light of these facts, every effort must be made, not only by Members of Congress, but by leaders in the various military and scientific fields, to provide the American people with the realistic picture of our defenses.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published a constructive editorial entitled "Defense: A Need for Perspective."

Reflecting the need for such perspective, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE: A NEED FOR PERSPECTIVE

If there is any subject on which people and statesmen should be able to take the long look rather than the narrow view, it would seem that it should be the subject of rockets in the verges of space.

Yet there is a persistent tendency, fostered by persons of great earnestness, to regard the missile race, and specifically the production of intercontinental ballistic missiles, as if this represented the whole or at least the crux of American defense.

Just as it takes more than one foot race to make a track meet, there is obviously more than one department of military defense and in fact more than a solely military aspect to national security.

This is what President Eisenhower seems to be trying to say in his press conference encounters against implications that the United States is being conditioned to a power position of second best.

Defense of the country is, as he has said, "a very wide and comprehensive problem." When he asserts that he knows more about it than any other one individual, this is not a claim of superior personal competence but a statement of the fact that the Chief Executive is at the focal point where data and recommendations from all the defense and diplomatic agencies come together.

The President more than anyone else is responsible for evaluating the needs of the various branches of the armed services, air, land, and sea, and for balancing them with civilian requirements and resources. Congress, to be sure, must have its coordinate part in providing financial sinews and directing the broad outlines of their use.

But it is doubtful whether any good purpose is served by the necessarily fragmentary leaks of material from congressional committee hearings which have heightened confusion as to whether America is beginning to close the missile gap or allowing it to be widened.

The people of the United States certainly do want to know that their Nation is gaining rather than losing in a competition which it has the wealth, skill and capacity to win for the deterrence of war. The administration should not underestimate either the Soviet ability to concentrate on specific accomplishments such as the ICBM or the moon rocket, nor dismiss the effect of these accomplishments in terms of world power.

But relative military strength should not be weighed solely in terms of ICBM's; for overseas bases and submarine rocket launchers enter into that equation, and the matter of mobility for brush-fire wars is of prime significance.

There are factors even outside the military which Premier Khrushchev fails to take into account when he boasts to Italian President Gronchi that a Soviet flag on the moon proves the superiority of communism over capitalism. The merits of a politicoeconomic system may reside not so much in whether it can put a tin spangle on the moon as in how often it puts meat on the kitchen table.

In short, the components of national security are so varied that they cannot be measured by one weapon system alone. Security depends upon a balanced defense establishment, on good international relations, and on a deeply based national morale.

Single Chief of the Military Would Imperil U.S. Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the perennial proposals that is just as regularly discredited is that of establishing a single Chief of Staff over the Armed Forces of the United States. Once again we are told that the panacea for virtually all problems connected with national security would be quickly solved if we could only junk our war-proven and demonstrably effective Joint Chiefs of Staff system and replace it with the alien single Chief of Staff and Supreme General Staff.

Some of the reasons why such a disastrous course of action should not be adopted by this country are contained in two editorials which I commend to the attention of the Members of this House. The first editorial, "Single Chief of the Military Would Imperil U.S. Defense," appeared in the San Diego Evening Tribune of February 4, and the second of the editorials, "Symington's Move—The Single Chief: No Bargain," appeared in the San Diego Union of February 5, 1960. These editorials discuss the dangers of one-man military control and the inherent deficiencies of the Supreme Staff system as compared with the repeatedly demonstrated strength and advantages of our Joint Chiefs of Staff system organization. As the second editorial so well points out, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, is a vigorous opponent of the rigid and autocratic Supreme Staff system.

I would like at this point to repeat the statement made by Chairman VINSON in the course of his speech before the guests at the Veterans of Foreign Wars dinner February 9, at which time he received the highest VFW citation for contribution to the strengthening of our Nation. On that occasion, Chairman VINSON warned against junking the Joint Chiefs of Staff and adopting the single chief—supreme general staff scheme, and said:

Every additional step we take toward a single general staff is a move closer to military and political disaster.

The two editorials follow:

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 5, 1960]

SYMINGTON'S MOVE—THE SINGLE CHIEF: NO BARGAIN

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, at last has made his move for more national attention to support his candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination. He has introduced a bill to set up a powerful single Chief of Staff in the Pentagon—a sort of supreme uniformed commander over all U.S. Armed Forces.

The fact that this proposal already has been discredited thoroughly by most responsible military authorities and many Members of Congress has failed to cool Mr. SYMINGTON'S ardor for the single Chief of Staff concept.

He claims his experience as Air Force Secretary during part of the Truman administration makes him an expert on such matters. The Senator thinks a single chief with the powers now wielded by the Joint Chiefs of Staff representing all the armed services would halt interservice rivalry, put an end to the cumbersome command structure now in force in the Pentagon and save the taxpayers money. The record shows that Nazi Germany and Japan fared poorly with a single chief system.

Yet men like former Assistant Defense Secretary Wilfred J. McNeil, who served as top Defense Department fiscal boss in the Truman and Eisenhower administrations until last year, say the single chief idea would produce no real economies.

Mr. SYMINGTON'S bill would retain all the services in their present status. A single chief would have no more authority to halt interservice disputes than the Joint Chiefs possess today. But he would be able to keep these arguments from the scrutiny of Congress and the American people. And his would be the only voice heard from the Pentagon on defense matters. This is not the way of a democracy.

Perhaps the greatest danger inherent in the single chief concept is the centering of too much authority and power in one man. At the same time it would abandon the Joint Chiefs in their present role and thereby rob the Nation of the wisdom and experience of men who have made a career of our country's defense.

Who is to say, under Mr. SYMINGTON'S proposal, that the single chief of staff always would be a wise man, one who sought no power beyond that which he needed to do the best possible job?

Under the Joint Chiefs concept, the unwise and the power hungry are outvoted and overbalanced by their colleagues.

Fortunately, there seems little possibility that the SYMINGTON proposal will get a green light from Congress this year. Even if it should be passed by the Senate, which is doubtful, Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee would place the measure in its proper pigeonhole. The venerable VINSON long has warned that no such single Chief of Staff idea would get the time of day before his committee.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Feb. 4, 1960]

SINGLE CHIEF OF THE MILITARY WOULD IMPERIL U.S. DEFENSE

It is discouraging to note that the tired, old idea of a single Chief of Staff for all of the Nation's Armed Forces has been dusted off again.

A bill to accomplish this dangerous change in the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system has been introduced in Congress by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri.

It deserves a quiet burial.

This idea has beguiled nations for a long time. Those who have succumbed to it have been defeated when the single chief concept had to meet the test of war.

The Prussian general staff was supreme when Germany was crushed in two World Wars.

Japan was led to war and defeat under a system of monolithic, centralized military control.

The Symington bill would clothe the proposed single Chief with enormous power of decision.

This awesome responsibility is now shared by the Chiefs of the various services, who can draw on wide experience and intimate knowledge of the capabilities of their respective branches.

The present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has no vote. His function is to win agreement of the heads of the services through his influence. The final decision is made by the service Chiefs, who can vote.

SYMINGTON would reverse this proven system. His bill would, in effect, make the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs the supreme authority as the single Chief of Staff for the Defense Department.

The service Chiefs, under the bill, would be relegated to the role of advisers to the lone man at the top.

This one man would have the final say on spending about one-half of the entire national budget.

This one man—and nobody is infallible—would have the final say on what this Nation would do in a military crisis.

If he guessed right—well and good.

If he guessed wrong? There is no consolation prize for second-placers in war.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is a workable system.

With its representation of the various services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps—it fits in with our tradition of checks and balances in the exercise of power.

It would be perilous to alter this system and substitute an alien concept that has demonstrated its fatal flaws.

This latest effort to undermine the Joint Chiefs would endanger our national defense at a time when we should be directing our energies toward strengthening it.

Congress can take the lead by shelving the Symington bill.

Opposition by Utah Wildlife Federation of Creation of a National Park in Area Known as Dinosaur National Monument

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by the secretary of the Utah Wildlife Federation explaining why the officers and members of that group do not feel it would be wise at this time to make the Dinosaur National Monument a national park.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
American Fork, Utah, February 12, 1960.

The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senior Senator from the State of Utah, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: The Utah Wildlife Federation, representing 29 sportsmen's clubs in the State, after due and timely consideration, offers the following protest:

We oppose the creation of a national park and the resultant closing of thousands of additional public lands to hunting in the area now known as Dinosaur National Monument.

We believe that until such time as the National Park Service can be composed of a more equitable representation of our sportsmen, and their policy changed regarding hunting within the boundaries of national parks, the area above mentioned should be left at its present status.

We are not opposed to the creation of national parks, as such, but we strongly feel that a more thorough investigation should be made of each proposed park to determine the effect on our wildlife and natural resources.

Respectfully submitted.

JACK ALLSHOUSE,
President.
EMERSON S. SMITH,
Executive Secretary.

The Uncertainty of World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress issued a report dealing with the international effects of our Nation's economic policy. Much of this document was devoted to expounding freer-trade dogma, while ignoring or misinterpreting numerous economic realities.

In one instance, however, the committee's report faced up to the hard facts of international competition in the 1960's. With admirable discretion, the Joint Economic Committee refuses to embrace the preferential trade concepts adopted by the two rival trading blocs in Western Europe.

This, of course, is what many Americans have been counseling for months. Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have noted the dangers to the United States that are implicit in the formation, objectives, and bylaws of the European Common Market and the Free Trade Association. Similar calls for caution have been sounded by certain business spokesmen, labor leaders, and organizations such as the Trade Relations Council of the United States.

So it is with a warm sense of gratification that I find these views now shared by the Joint Economic Committee, as evidenced by these excerpts from its report of January 25:

Six countries in Western Europe have now entered into an agreement to form a Common Market. Under this agreement, the participating countries will gradually reduce and ultimately eliminate tariff barriers against each other. They will, in time, have the same tariffs against all goods imported from outside the Common Market. In the meantime, seven other countries in Western Europe, having failed for the time being to reach agreement with the Common Market countries, have formed a Free Trade Association. Under the treaty, these seven countries would ultimately eliminate all tariffs on trade among themselves, but each country would retain its own tariffs against imports from outside the free trade area. In principle, these arrangements are a customs union authorized by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and toward which the traditional policy of the United States is not unfriendly. For political reasons, it would be regrettable if the OEEC countries divided into three exclusive

groups—those inside one customs union or another and those outside both. For economic reasons, it would be regrettable if these customs unions were operated in a manner that would stifle multilateral trade and result in harsh discrimination against other countries.

The problems created by the establishment of one or two large preferential trade areas are far more complex than those arising from the association of two or three countries in a customs union. The members of the Common Market and Free Trade Association, excluding overseas countries associated with them, account for 43 percent of total world imports. This is an enormous segment of the world economy to be set aside as one to which other countries could export only under serious handicaps. It would be tragic if after the heroic and largely successful efforts to expand world trade on a nondiscriminatory basis, these new and enormous customs unions were to become the instruments for legalizing and perpetuating onerous discriminations on the other half of the world economy, including primarily the United States, Canada, Latin America, and other countries in Asia and Africa.

There is a heavy responsibility on the Common Market and Free Trade Association to follow policies that will avoid serious harm to the world economy. A generally low level of tariffs within the customs unions will let these countries benefit from the heightened competition within wider trading areas without imposing too severe a handicap on the countries outside these areas. Furthermore, under the fund agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, there is a prior obligation to remove quantitative restrictions against imports from outside the customs unions before increasing the preferences that these countries extend to each other. Above all it will be difficult to safeguard the trading interests of other countries unless the members of the customs unions make their currencies convertible in accordance with the fund agreement. Convertibility would provide a minimum assurance that if quantiative restrictions become neecssary in one country they would not also be imposed by surplus countries in a customs union solely to facilitate the restoration of the balance of payments of a deficit country.

In the trade negotiations with the Western European countries, through the reciprocal trade agreements and through the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, the United States has granted valuable concessions in the form of easier (lower tariff) entry into the U.S. market. In turn, we have been granted valuable tariff concessions by these countries which were intended to give us easier entry into their markets. The value of the concessions we have given remain unchanged—in fact, they have grown more valuable as the U.S. economy has grown. The concessions we have received will become much less valuable through the formation of the new customs unions after our concessions were granted. A tariff reduction by Belgium, for example, which was valuable to the United States when German exports paid the same tariff, is much less valuable (or may be entirely without value) when German exports can enter the Belgian market at a lower tariff than the same U.S. exports and ultimately without any tariff. The United States and other countries that have given tariff concessions to Western Europe are entitled to know that the reciprocal concessions to them are not going to be negated in the new trade arrangements that are being made in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the uncertainty and doubt with which many observers regard the economic splitup in Western Europe was also underscored at a 2-day meeting of the Committee for a National Trade Policy only a few days after the Joint Economic Committee's report appeared.

The Journal of Commerce, describing the meeting, reported as follows:

Robert R. Bowie, Harvard economics professor who headed the European affairs round table, said the economist members indicated that it may be necessary for the United States to acquiesce in further trade disadvantages to help close the split between the six-nation Common Market and the Outer Seven of the Free Trade Association.

He said political considerations—interest in promoting free world unity—outweighed pure commercial factors in the opinion of the panelists.

This is disquieting news. The United States has been acquiescing, as Professor Bowie expressed it, to the demands of its trading partners for 25 years now, ever since the gradual surrender of foreign trade policies was launched by the Trade Agreements Act of the first New Deal administration.

Now the economists on the Committee for a National Trade Policy tell us we may have to start all over again or, at least, keep giving away trade concessions right and left, evidently with the hope that our country can make the best of a dangerous situation that developed in spite of our noble efforts of the past.

The fact is, however, that acquiescence—perhaps surrender or capitulation are better words—is the last thing we should do under the present circumstances. The situation calls for thoughtful, levelheaded study and careful observance on the part of this country.

We have been pushovers in the international tariff bargaining arena for a quarter of a century. It has not prevented our friends and allies in Western Europe, accounting for almost half of the total world trade, from breaking up into two economic camps, each of which is dedicated to advancing the interests of its own members at the expense of outsiders.

As one of these outsiders, the United States has much to gain from a policy which we should have been observing all along; namely, that of insisting that our trading partners comply in full with their trade commitments to the United States. We have much to lose from a policy of subservience and acquiescence. Further U.S. tariff concessions should not be granted until the air is cleared and we know for certain just where the rival camps in Western Europe are heading.

Red Party To Make Phony "Prosperity" Pitch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the Congress the observations contained in an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y. This excellent editorial follows:

RED PARTY TO MAKE PHONY "PROSPERITY" PITCH

Strange as seems the belief of the Russian Government that the American car-buying public can be sold on the Moskvich car, even stranger is the attitude of the Communist Party in the United States in expecting that American industry and the American people can be sold on Communist "peace and prosperity."

The party is expected to make a stronger pitch to big business representatives in the future, adding "prosperity" to its familiar "peace" theme of the past, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its annual report. Party workers are expected to show industrialists how peace could increase their profits, while the people at large will be told how peace and disarmament will make possible the spending of billions for schools, roads, hospitals, and housing, instead of defense.

Though at a low ebb numerically in this country, the party has great expectations of a soft sell of communism, assuming that the trusting American people, persuaded of Khrushchev's sincerity, are ready to take anyone—even a Communist—at his word. That is assuming a very great deal, indeed—even more than that the Moskvich is the American concept of what an automobile should be.

Currently the smartly taxed American people are being reminded that Russian power politics threatens to make life really tough for them in the sixities; but even the most trusting must become "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought" at the peril of Communist enslavement.

Greek Letters and Greek Press Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, His Eminence Iakovos, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Churches of North and South America, has proclaimed the week of January 24–31 as Greek Letters and Greek Press Week. We all aware of the great contributions to our civilization by the Greek language, philosophy, culture, and democracy of ancient times and the great sacrifices Greece has made in our modern times to the causes of freedom in her fight against facism, nazism, and communism.

The Greek language is being revived in several universities and placed on the curriculum in many State schools throughout the country.

I wish to pay tribute to Greek Letters and Greek Press Week. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an editorial from the National Herald, a nationwide Greek-American newspaper daily, which is widely read in my State, entitled "Press-Letters Week," and dated January 31, 1960.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS-LETTERS WEEK

In line with the standing policy of the archdiocese, His Eminence Iakovos, has proclaimed the Greek Press and Letters Week throughout his jurisdiction. Objective of this annual event is to impress upon our people the significance of the Greek-American press and Greek-American education in our development and progress as a cultural, racial, and religious group.

Our hope is that our people in every community will not pay lip service to the far-reaching objectives of this event, but utilize the opportunities it presents for some concrete action.

Governor Ribicoff Backs Programs To Help Commuters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut's great Governor, Abraham A. Ribicoff, has been working long and diligently toward a solution of the problem facing commuters living in Connecticut and other States. The Governor is at present in Washington discussing this and other problems with Members of Congress and officials of the administrative departments.

It appears that Federal action is necessary if the railroad puzzle is to be solved. However, on the State level Governor Ribicoff has been working closely with the Governors of our sister States of New York and New Jersey.

The Hartford Times for February 15, 1960, reports on two new moves which Governor Ribicoff, a former Member of this House, has endorsed.

Following is the article from the Hartford Times:

RIBICOFF SUPPORTS TWO MOVES TO AID RAIL COMMUTERS

Governor Ribicoff today pledged Connecticut's support to two interstate moves designed to alleviate the problems to commuters who use the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

They were:

Interstate audit of the railroad's commuter accounts.

Establishment of a tristate agency to preserve existing commuter services.

The Governor gave his support after meeting with two transportation committee members of the Metropolitan Regional Council, which is made up of top elected officials of cities and towns in the metropolitan area of Connecticut, New York and New Jersey. They were First Selectman Herbert Baldwin of Westport and Maxwell Lehman, executive secretary of the council.

"The council," said Governor Ribicoff, "is skeptical about New Haven Railroad figures as to losses attributable to commuter traffic.

"It asked if the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission would join the Public Service Commission of New York in auditing the figures.

"The answer for Connecticut is, 'Yes.'"

Governor Ribicoff said that if the tristate agency is carried out, he will be "more than willing to endorse such an agency if the other Governors go along."

The Governor added he would, in that case, designate somebody to handle the preliminary stages until such time as necessary legislative action had to be taken.

Death of Mr. Vasilios I. Chebithes, Past Supreme President of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, Mr. Vasilios I. Chebithes, past supreme president of the American Hellenic Educational Association (Ahepa) passed away on December 10, 1959. He had served as supreme president from 1924–27 and 1935–40. He was considered a great leader of the Ahepa and the first supreme president who undertook a nationwide building program. His name is known throughout the world by those of Hellenic descent. I offer my sincerest sympathies to his family and to his many friends through the country, many of whom come from my State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an editorial by the editor of the Ahepa magazine, Mr. Kimon A. Doukas, of New York, and an editorial by the editor of the English section of the National Herald, a Greek-American daily newspaper printed in New York with nationwide circulation.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VASILIOS ISIDOROS CHEBITHES, SUPREME VICE PRESIDENT

(By Kimon A. Doukas)

It was in the early hours of December 10, 1959, when Supreme President Loucas despatched the following brief message about one of his most illustrious predecessors:

V. I. Chebithes passed away early this morning. Services Monday, December 14, 12 noon, at Saints Constantine and Helen Church in Washington, burial at Arlington Cemetery.

V. I. Chebithes was no more. The man who led the Ahepa since 1924 on to glorious victories and suffered bitter defeats but never laid his convictions aside or let his fellow Ahepans down was gone.

He had passed into the Great Beyond. The eight-term Supreme President—a distinction and a privilege no one else has enjoyed and nobody will ever hope to attain—was only a memory. The stormy petrel of Ahepa politics, he who generated love and affection and thrived on criticism and hatred equally well, had departed quietly from the scenes of his most turbulent life. Ahepa was orphaned of one man it could or could not do without.

V. I. CHEBITHES—THE APOSTLE

(By James Karabatos)

In every movement, religious, social or otherwise, there is an apostle. He formalizes the basic concepts of his faith, interprets and reinterprets them seeking at the same time converts. He is a dedicated man and it is he who gives substance to a movement and makes it stick.

A dedicated man is a wanderer always on the go, always on the lookout for new faithfuls. Personal welfare takes a back seat. He is out of place, a fool; wasting his time and the money of others instead of holding a regular job at so much a year. Yet, when it's all over, it is the zealot rather than those enjoying the good things of life and the prestige that goes with them whose memory stays on. Such a zealot was V. I. Chebithes, the man who dedicated himself to the cause of the Order of Ahepa.

There are various kinds of yardsticks in measuring or evaluating a man's record. The impact of a man's personality on his fellowmen is certainly our safest guide. If the Order of Ahepa exercises an influence of such vast proportions in Greek-American life and Greek-American affairs and if the architect of the Order of Ahepa was V. I. Chebithes, as he certainly was, it follows that this man, the son of a priest and an immigrant boy, was destined to develop himself into a personality whose memory and influence shall remain long after his passing into the Great Beyond. He belonged to everybody except himself. That's the mark of a true apostle, of a true leader.

Why General X Isn't Writing a Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Charles Bartlett in the February 7 issue of the Chattanooga Times, gives refreshing perspective to the current "numbers game":

WHY GENERAL X ISN'T WRITING A BOOK

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—A press conference with a retiring general who may not even exist:

Question: "Are you resigning, General, because you can't accept the administration's defense policies?"

Answer: "No, I'm quitting simply because my time is up and I want to shoot some golf and catch some fish."

Question: "Aren't you even mad at the Budget Bureau?"

Answer: "I've had some budget problems in my day, but I am not mad at anyone."

Question: "But don't you intend to write a book and tell the Nation how you really feel about the adequacy of our defense?"

Answer: "I'm certainly not going to write a book and I have no intention to join those who are writing that we have become a second-rate military power."

Question: "But don't you feel that your service needs more men and equipment to stand up to the Russian threat?"

Answer: "I certainly do and I wouldn't be much of an officer if I didn't. Since the day when I had my first platoon, I have regarded it as my solemn duty to fight to get everything in the way of supplies and equipment for my men that could possibly be available. There is a pie to be divided at every level in the Military Establishment and those who make the most noise and fight the hardest always seem to get the largest slice. This is the system and the officer who does not play the system, whether he is running a platoon or an entire service, is not doing his job."

Question: "But if you feel your service needs more, shouldn't you take that message to the public?"

Answer: "Look here—it is the very essence of the military nature to need more. We could absorb 100 percent of the gross national product in our service alone and still point out areas in which we might be deficient when the attack came. There is no absolute point at which you can say we have enough and relax. The good commander is always thinking of new threats and vulnerabilities which may confront his service."

Question: "But now that you are retiring don't you owe it to the public to make known whatever doubts you may have?"

Answer: "What could the public do with that kind of information? The people who could use it best would be the Russians and I personally would take little pleasure in telling them my weak points. This is an area of government activity that is totally beyond public judgment and I simply cannot see how the politicians hope to justify their positions by taking their arguments to the newspapers. How can Joe Doakes in Chattanooga decide how many missiles we should have in 1963?"

Question: "But the military services have always been ready to use political pressure when they thought it might help them to get more money. Are you becoming virtuous just because you're retiring?"

Answer: "You're absolutely right. We have played the political game and we have played it rough. We have encouraged individual Senators like STUART SYMINGTON to take our causes to the Senate floor when we thought we might get public opinion rolling behind us. It is a rotten game and if the President had made one of our heads roll for playing it, we might have stopped. But the best jobs have gone to officers like Arleigh Burke, who have played the game the hardest and so most of us have come to assume that it's expected of us. It has become another part of the system."

Question: "But why is the game rotten?"

Answer: "Because it puts essentially military decisions in the political domain. Most of these are issues which should be decided in terms of the balance between the East and the West and not in terms of the balance between Republicans and Democrats. Neither the public nor the Senate Armed Services Committee have enough facts available to decide, for example, whether the Navy should have 12 or 40 Polaris submarines. This is a complex question involving a wide range of considerations, many of them necessarily top secret, and it cannot be wisely settled in the newspapers."

Question: "But doesn't the public deserve to be informed on the crucial question of its military strength?"

Answer: "The public can be informed in general terms but I am sure it is confusing to them when the Democrats maintain that the U.S. military posture is inadequate and then cut, as they did last year, the defense appropriations. I do not think a man can wisely or successfully run for President on the issue of an inadequate military force because he can only be proven right by an enemy attack. He runs the risk, by hammering on the charge that America is a second-rate military power, of persuading the people in the uncommitted nations who may not realize he is a candidate for office, before he persuades the people in his own country. I personally suspect it is not good politics and I know that it is not good national policy."

Question: "But how can voters make sure that we do not become a second-rate military power?"

Answer: "They have their opportunity at the ballot box. First-class leaders do not produce second-class countries. In military affairs it seems to me that the people have simply got to trust the men they elect to their top offices. The decision must be made behind closed doors and the President must inspire the kind of bipartisanship which will in turn inspire public confidence."

Question: "You realize of course you have given us no news?"

Answer: "Gentlemen at this stage of my career, you will make me happiest by forgetting me forever. I just want to fish and I think the opportunity is at hand."

International Development Association
Use of Counterpart Currencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the International Development Association, IDA, the charter of which is now being submitted to the World Bank for approval, provides another means of using judiciously the hundreds of millions of dollars in soft currencies we have accumulated through the sale of surplus foodstuffs and otherwise under Public Law 480 to many countries around the world. It also provides a vehicle for cooperative effort by the free world in extending economic assistance to the newly developing nations in whose future prosperity and viability we are deeply interested.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 13 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCING IDA

In a nation's banking and investment system there is need for several different kinds of financial institutions geared to various needs. The same sort of varied needs exist in the international community.

And a variety of international lending organizations are being developed to meet them. They include the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Development Loan Fund, Special United Nations Fund, and Inter-American Development Bank.

To these soon will be added, if plans mature, the International Development Association. Its charter is being submitted to members of the World Bank for approval. Originated by Senator MIKE MONRONEY, the IDA would be empowered to make low-interest loans to underdeveloped countries on long terms and/or repayable in "soft" (unconvertible) currencies of the borrowing countries.

While the United States would supply nearly one-third of the billion dollar capital, a larger proportion would be supplied by other industrial nations, and the United States would find a way to use millions of dollars in soft currencies it has accumulated through sale of surplus foodstuffs.

This arrangement promises to accomplish several desirable purposes which were beyond the scope of the World Bank, set up as it is to handle "hard" loans on a commercial basis. It enlists the assistance of Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, Japan, and other nations in an undertaking the United States should no longer carry alone.

Also it breaks away from the bilateral aid mechanism under which some Americans have been inclined to impose political conditions on recipient countries; yet, it does not go so far as the United Nations programs which, while desirable to a degree, permit Communist-bloc participation in planning and execution. The IDA offers a vehicle for characteristically free-world cooperation since the Soviet Union has not seen fit to join the World Bank.

International Financial Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, two announcements were made recently which emphasize this country's increasing involvement in efforts to improve the economic position of nations in underdeveloped areas of the world.

Two new international financial agencies, in which the United States will play a major role, have been launched. The Inter-American Development Fund, to which this country has pledged $500 million, will make loans in Latin America exclusively. The International Development Agency will confine its activities to other underdeveloped nations. We have guaranteed $800 million of the $1 billion capital.

I supported these two agencies, chiefly on the theory that soundly conceived loan programs would lessen the need for U.S. foreign aid.

Yet this year Congress has been asked to increase foreign aid appropriations to over $4 billion. I believe this amount should and will be substantially reduced.

The chief responsibility for conducting programs to encourage economic development in Asia and the emerging new nations of Africa should be shared by all nations of the world which now enjoy economic prosperity.

Our European allies and Japan have talked a great deal about assuming a share of the burden. The time has arrived for the United States to make it clear that these other nations must assume their fair share of the burden.

I can understand the clear need for outside assistance to help new nations gain a sound economic footing. But I can no longer see any need for the United States to carry this loan alone.

The inconsistencies of the administration's position on foreign aid and urgently needed programs at home are becoming harder for me to understand. For years we struggled to get a coal research program approved. The President vetoed a good bill last year, but at the same time foreign aid funds, appropriated by Congress, were being used to conduct the same kind of coal research work in a number of foreign nations.

We are desperately in need of economic development work in West Virginia. The President has vetoed legis-

lation of this kind for West Virginia and other States at the same time he makes a plea for larger foreign aid expenditures.

This just does not make sense to me.

The United States will have to continue programs of this type. But it cannot carry the burden alone nor on as large a scale as in recent years.

I do not believe Congress will vote $4 billion for foreign aid this year. Substantial reductions will be made. Perhaps if Congress makes it clear that it wants a new approach to foreign aid, the State Department will step up its efforts to have our allies assume a proportionate share of the burden.

Overall Land Use Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President in the light of far-reaching changes in our social and economic structure, the Nation needs farsighted planning, not only to properly utilize, but also conserve, our lands and other natural resources for the future.

Today the Nation is experiencing a population explosion.

In 16 years we will be a nation of 240 million, 60 million more than today.

The population explosion, together with expanded industrialization, homebuilding, and other types of construction, are creating ever-greater demands upon our land, soil, water, and other natural resources.

As a result, the question arises as to how we can best utilize such resources today, as well as to assure that there will be adequate resources for the future.

This is a local, State, and National challenge.

In an era when the tendency more and more is to look to Uncle Sam to resolve such problems, it is always gratifying to find realistic efforts to cope with such significant challenges at the local and State level.

Recently, Henry Ahlgren, associate director of agricultural extension at the University of Wisconsin, outlined some constructive recommendations for an overall land use policy at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin chapter of the Soil Conservation Society.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article reflecting creative thinking on a serious national challenge, printed in the Pure Milk Products Press, entitled "Overall Land Use Policy Is Ahlgren's Plan," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERALL LAND USE POLICY IS AHLGREN'S PLAN

A University of Wisconsin agricultural leader has called for an "overall land use policy, complete in all of its ramifications, for Wisconsin."

Henry Ahlgren, associate director of agricultural extension, said to members of the Wisconsin Chapter of the Soil Conservation Society at their annual meeting that in the past "we have selected the easier course by proceeding on a piecemeal rather than on an overall basis."

Ahlgren pointed out that our supply of natural resources is not inexhaustible. Many resources are not renewable. Needs and demands on water, soil, trees, and minerals are increasing daily. If the population experts are correct these demands will pyramid in the future.

He said "the time has come when we should begin to put the pieces together for a more orderly development of our land use program."

Of all our natural resources, water is fast becoming the most precious, Ahlgren said. Today we are using six times as much water as in 1900.

Ahlgren said conservation and wise use of natural resources do not mean the same thing to all people. Farmers think in terms of grassland farming and soil conservation. Foresters think of protecting and managing our timber resources on a sustained basis. Fishermen think in terms of an abundance of fish in clear, unpolluted waters. Industry and suburbanites have other ideas.

The situation he said, is still further complicated by the fact that at a given time and place one type of land use may be dominant. But for the best long range effect it should be put to another use.

Ahlgren said the problems of land use cannot be solved through a committee meeting a few times to try to hammer something out. It would require pooling of resources and involving the people through the democratic process.

He listed major objectives of a land use program as: (1) provide for best use of land, (2) promote economy and efficiency in government services, (3) eliminate waste, (4) protect property owners, (5) safeguard public health, (6) promote orderly community growth, and (7) promote safety.

Also, (8) insure efficient location of public buildings and public uses, (9) foster wholesome neighborhood spirit and civic pride, (10) reduce fire hazard, (11) promote a safe balance in the use of all land resources, and (12) give stability to property values and promote permanent homes, business and industry.

Ahlgren closed by saying "we must realize land use planning involves more than anything else the resolving of conflicts between people in what are the best uses of land."

In a panel discussion following Ahlgren's speech, Henry M. Ford, Wisconsin director of regional planning, pointed to the tremendous growth in residential types of land use. From 1950–59 new residential plats covered some 20,088 new acres including nearly 50,000 residential lots.

Ford pointed out that in the heavily populated areas of the State the land is moving rapidly from the town form of government to either the city or village form. This urbanizing process has now absorbed all of Milwaukee County and has spread into Ozaukee and Waukesha Counties.

In another panel speech, Walter Rowlands, specialist in land use planning at the university, pointed out that recreation is now the third largest business in Wisconsin. Recreation as an industry is growing so fast throughout the Nation that it may become the No. 1 industry in the Nation.

Rowlands said Wisconsin should reserve the lands and waters best suited for recreation to that use. Potential recreation lands should be protected so they are not destroyed in the meantime, he said. Some lands which have a high priority for agriculture, forestry and wildlife, may also be used for recreation.

Above all, Rowlands concluded, we need careful, and realistic planning and zoning.

Party Heads and the Public Compare Tenets of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Council Bluffs Iowa Nonpareil, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, February 14, 1960:

PARTY HEADS AND THE PUBLIC COMPARE TENETS OF POLITICS

(Two major political philosophies will again confront the voters this year. And, chances are, a lot of average men in the street would have to ponder a moment to describe them. The Nonpareil posed the question to three sources with a large stake in the answer: John Q. Public, Harold Beckman, and Emmet Tinley. Beckman is chairman of the Pottawattamie County Central Republican Committee.) Tinley heads the county Democratic central committee. Read their replies and judge for yourself.)

(By Harold Beckman)

The Republicans want:

1. A balanced budget. We believe the public household, like the private household, should meet its obligations currently and not burden the future generations of Americans with an impossible debt.

2. A sound and stable fiscal policy. We feel the financial needs of the individual, young or old, sick or healthy, employer or employee, or self-employed, can be more adequately provided for through preservation of the purchasing power of his income than it can through ever-expanding inflationary Federal programs.

3. More local, less Federal, responsibility. Americans are responsible people who can and will satisfy many needs of government on the State and local level if they understand the Federal Government will not take over. We do not subscribe to the theory that practically all governmental needs can only be provided by an overbearing central authority in Federal Government far beyond the control of the individual citizen.

4. Adequate, not excessive, defense coupled with a firm, not vacillating, foreign policy. We believe the maintenance of an adequate defense force coupled with a firm foreign policy is our best guarantee of peace and freedom. With such policies the Republican administration has given America 7 years of peace.

The opposition, which has controlled the purse strings of national defense and kept our military leaders in almost constant session with their congressional committees the last 6 years, suddenly, in election year 1960, is uncertain of our defense stature. Its similar uncertainty as to our defense stature and as to where our lines of defense should be drawn when it was in control of the na-

tional administration engaged us in two wars in this generation.

5. Progress, not panic. We recognize that unless we continue to expand our economy we cannot retain our position of world leadership. We have accomplished this in an atmosphere of peace and confidence, not war and political hysteria.

6. Preservation of rights of the individual. We believe government has the responsibility of maintaining equality under the law for all, providing help for all who cannot help themselves due to circumstances beyond their own control, and providing for all the maximum opportunity to help themselves, without threats of physical violence and economic reprisal by ruthless and misguided governments, employers, or labor union bosses.

7. Calm, confident, and competent leadership. We do not subscribe to the theory that the American people must be subjected to a war of nerves to respond to their governmental needs. We feel that they are intelligent, responsible people who will answer the call of duty when facts are properly placed before them by a principled, well-informed and intelligent media.

(By Emmet Tinley)

The Democrats believe:

In the individual's rights. The first and foremost principle of the Democratic Party is the recognition of the inherent dignity, equality and independence of each individual and of his right to enjoy the same political rights and to have the protection and benefits of the same laws as all other persons. The purpose of this principle is to provide equal opportunities for all citizens who may freely accept or reject them.

Separation of powers. A traditional tenet of the Democratic Party emphasizes the constitutional provisions reserving certain political powers to the several States and granting others to the National Government. The Democratic Party supports congressional legislation enacted within the framework of those provisions which affects the general welfare of the United States and all of its citizens in various economic, political and social matters.

On foreign relations. In the area of foreign relations, the Democratic Party has fostered a bipartisan approach to all principles concerning our peaceful relationships with other nations, encouraged the use of all diplomatic means for solving international disputes, and stimulated the development of mutual understanding among all nations in order to avoid costly and bloody wars.

On the closely allied and all important issue of national defense, the Democratic Party sponsors those measures providing maximum military strength on a sound economic basis, without needless waste, reduplication and petty intraservice rivalries and jealousies.

Guiding precept. A guiding Democratic precept is based upon the interdependence of all segments of the national economy, agricultural, industrial and commercial, management and labor, producer and consumer, and advocates that problems relating to any one be resolved only by measures which recognize this interdependence.

A balanced budget. On fiscal matters, the platform of the Democratic Party calls for a balanced budget, revision of our tax laws to provide a more equitable structure, and a sound economic policy based upon the vast resources and capabilities of the Nation.

Applying the principles. On specific issues, the Democratic Party applies these basic principles in such a manner that the rights of individuals are fostered and protected and the political, economic, and social segments of the country are strengthened.

INQUIRING REPORTER: HERE ARE THE VIEWS OF JOHN Q.

What is the difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties?

The Nonpareil's Inquiring Reporter asked this question in downtown Council Bluffs. Here were the answers:

E. L. Carris, Clarion, railroad engineer: "I wouldn't know what it would be. I've voted both ways * * * for the best man."

William Johnson, 1314 Avenue D, hospital attendant: "Republicans are a little more saving and not quite so wild to spend as the Democrats."

Mrs. Melvin Brown, 269 Morningside Avenue, housewife: "I've been a Democrat because I had a lot of confidence in Franklin Roosevelt. I think the party lacks leadership now."

T. K. Ahlroth, 219 Turley Avenue, retired printer: "The Democrats are a little more on the radical order, but for average people. The Republicans are conservative, I usually vote Republican."

Mrs. Richard Claar, Woodbine, farmwife: "I don't think the party principles differ enough to be too important. You have to decide on the man."

Robert Blosser, 335 Hyde Avenue, telephone company employee: "The Republican Party tends toward less restraint of free enterprise. This is an important basic difference."

Mrs. E. C. Berry, 2319 Avenue C, housewife: "I really can't see much difference. I think they are all in there for the good of the country."

Russell Shipley, 2825 Avenue D, custodian: "It's pretty well a tossup between the parties. Sometimes it looks like they're both just interested in getting in office."

Statement of Committee for Collective Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the request of the committee for collective security, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement signed by Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr., chairman of its policy committee, concerning certain basic foreign policy decisions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY,
New York, N.Y., January 12, 1960.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Before President Eisenhower goes to the summit conference and in view of the recent meetings between him and the heads of other states, the United States must reach certain basic policy decisions. Although we may hope that Soviet Russia is sincerely seeking world peace, it would be foolhardy to accept its declarations at face value unless translated into deeds. Until enforcible international agreements for universal disarmament are made, the free world must continue to build its strength. For Communist propaganda and the economic contest are an ever-present threat to the free world.

This country should pursue the following courses of action:

1. Maintain our defense program at not less than its current level.

2. Provide conventional forces sufficiently strong to deal with limited wars, and continue to develop missiles and other advanced weapons.

3. Prevent budgetary considerations from determining the effectiveness of our military power, even if it is necessary to increase taxes.

4. Develop the exploration of space so that we may exercise leadership in this field until it becomes a cooperative international venture.

5. Continue the temporary suspension of atomic tests while there is hope of achieving a plan for effective control and inspection in which all countries, including Communist China, participate.

6. Confirm and convince the world of our determination to cooperate in the defense of West Berlin, Formosa, South Korea, Laos, and other possible targets of Communist aggression.

7. Seek to strengthen the United Nations and the collective security of the free world by adding power to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other regional defense arrangements.

8. Expand our mutual security program for military and economic assistance, encouraging our prospering allies to participate.

9. Initiate proposals dealing with problems which divide the free world and the Communist bloc, such as Hungary, Tibet, the Indian border, and the divided states of Germany, China, Korea, and Vietnam.

10. Enlarge our program of cultural, scientific, and educational exchanges with the peoples under Communist domination.

Adoption of these measures will strengthen the collective security of the free world during negotiations for easing the tensions of the cold war and consideration of proposals for universal disarmament.

COMMITTEE FOR COLLECTIVE SECURITY,
GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Policy Committee.

Forty-second Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the people of the world in paying tribute to the brave Lithuanians in celebrating the 42d anniversary of the restoration of independence in Lithuania. I know that some of those, who are free, have the gravest concern over the fate of their kinfolk who cannot join them, but who are still struggling against complete enslavement.

I sincerely hope the time will come when they will be given an opportunity to celebrate their freedom, and to live together in a democratic world. My earnest wish is that the future years will be brighter for the Lithuanian people everywhere, who desire to live by the light of freedom.

The Splendid American in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, many complaints about U.S. technical assistance programs have been publicly aired, culminating, perhaps, in the recent best seller, "The Ugly American." In welcome contrast to these charges about the behavior of Americans on oversea assignments and the manner in which the American taxpayer's money is spent abroad, an article has recently appeared in the Newsletter of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

This article, "The Splendid American in Israel," describes the dedication and true value of a number of Americans charged with carrying out various technical assistance projects in the State of Israel. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Mr. Philip Gillon, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Hadassah Newsletter, January 1960]

THE SPLENDID AMERICAN IN ISRAEL—AN APPRECIATION OF U.S. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

(By Philip Gillon)

Hundreds of thousands of Americans have read a best-seller entitled "The Ugly American" and asked themselves anxiously whether their representatives abroad are really as obnoxious as the characters described by authors Lederer and Burdick. The book describes the imaginary land of Sarkham, somewhere near Laos and Vietnam, where, with notable exceptions, American diplomats and experts are foolish, fatuous, aggressive, opinionated, and arrogantly convinced that the American way is the only way and anything homegrown beneath contempt.

I cannot say anything about points east of Suez, but I have met and interviewed dozens of Embassy, U.S. Information Service and U.S. Operations Mission personnel in Israel, and have yet to meet an American who is not intelligent, unaggressive, and soft-spoken to a degree that makes an interview difficult. With their mild drawls, they are all almost excessively differential to the opinions of others and the view that the local man knows best is basic to their attitudes.

The International Cooperation Administration enlists personnel as "expert technicians" to serve with the U.S. Operations Missions as advisers to Israel. It is no exaggeration to say that Israel's rapid development over the last decade is in no small degree due to these mild-mannered men.

The opening of Israel's hinterland would have been impossible without a transformation of the existing means of communications. Road and rail transport were completely inadequate for the needs of an expanding economy. The railway system was obsolete, consisting of a small fleet of steam locomotives, the roads were built by methods which ignored the revolutionary techniques developed in the United States during the last 2 decades.

In 1954, Paul Oakes came from Lafayette, Ind., as adviser to the State of Israel Railways. Since finishing high school, Oakes had worked on railways for several decades: he served in Europe during World War II with the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Second Military Railway Service; afterwards he was railway chief mechanical officer in Japan and Korea. He advised Israeli railways throughout the 5 critical years during which the system was completely converted to diesels and the line stretched itself by 25 percent to reach down from Rehovot into the heart of the Negev. He helped with the building of new railway stations, sidings, workshops, repair shops, as well as advising on training techniques for personnel, on maintenance and management.

Paul Oakes minimizes his own contribution: "I'm well aware that the railways of Israel were running when I came and will be running when I leave." Moshe Savidor, general manager of Israel Railways, puts it quite differently. "All the credit," he says, "goes to Paul Oakes, whose valuable experience and wisdom in handling delicate personnel problems have contributed considerably to the achievements of Israeli railways. His guidance during the dieselization process, his advice and interest, coupled with the authority he commands and his balanced views on many complex subjects have greatly contributed to the progress of our system."

In the paving of roads there is a similar story to tell about modest, patient Harold Monson, who helped Israeli road engineers to revolutionize their techniques. "They were doing a very good job," he says, "but of course there are all sorts of modern methods they had to learn." In fact, Monson, who had worked on highways in South Dakta for 21 years, in his quiet and unobtrusive fashion changed Israel roadbuilding until today local road engineers are working with maximum efficiency. Fine new highways run from Beersheba to Dimona, near the Dead Sea; along the Mediterranean costline; down to Capernaum on the Sea of Galilee; up the Judaean hills to Jerusalem. All bear the imprint of Monson's advice.

Sam Barrash, adviser on automotive equipment and repairs, started working on automobiles as a mechanic in Baltimore in 1921: he rose steadily the hard way to become a service manager and afterwards ran his own repair business. During World War II he served in the U.S. Army at Fort Meade as principal automotive adviser and shop superinfendent, and later he joined the Department of Defense as an operations chief and shop superintendent.

Israel's vehicles come from the United States and every country in Western Europe; some of them have long since attained the age of man's legal majority. Keeping those wheels turning involves a nightmare of multiple languages, diverse systems of measurement, varied standards of training, every horror a mechanic can possibly conceive. One day Sam may advise the Government Department of Development on a giant automotive plant and equipment at the copper mines at Timna; the next day he will be asked to help a small repair shop for European midget cars. Trucks, buses, cars, whatever goes on wheels—it's all grist to Sam's mill.

One of Israel's proudest achievements has been the afforestation of hill-slopes eroded through 13 centuries of neglect. American experts advised on the planting program; today hundreds of thousands of trees are already yielding timber. One of the latest technicians to arrive, Roswell D. Carpenter, has been ranger logging superintendent, forest economist, and staff assistant in the U.S. Forest Service.

In the few months since he arrived in Israel, Carpenter has prepared forest management plans and logging projects. He devised a drum-type peeler for eucalyptus trunks from a secondhand cylinder two yards long which had been discarded as scrap. The peeler cost $1,000 to assemble and replaces machines operated by four men; it peels 40 trucks of different diameters in 9 minutes. As a token of gratitude, the Keren Kayemet honored him with a grove of 1,000 trees planted in his name in Israel.

In "The Ugly American" two bright free lance visitors suggest that the quality of cattle and chickens should be upgraded; their proposals are ignored. Israel's animal husbandry—indeed, all her agriculture—has been transformed with American help and advice. Take, for example Larry Short, an expert on range management with a background of years in the American prairie States, who looks rather like Hopalong Cassidy. Larry can claim a great deal of the credit for the success of "Operation Cowboy," by which the beef herds of Israel were increased several times and the type of animal upgraded through cross-breeding with Herefords, Brahmans and Santa Gertrudas.

One of the most picturesque of the American experts was John Stover Norris from Enid, Okla., who has just finished a 2-year term. When Israel turned to the Negev in search of valuable minerals, Norris went along as a drilling adviser at Sodom, on the Dead Sea; at King Solomon's Mines, near Eilat, on the Red Sea; at the Great Crater, that mighty cleft in the surface of the desert. Norris had cut his teeth on drilling machines; for 30 years he had worked with equipment in Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Both Norris and his wife loved Beersheba, the new boomtown in the heart of the desert. He trained Israelis in the use of the latest failing drills, which work on either water or air and make desert exploration possible. Today the local technicians are carrying on where Norris left off.

Another interesting adviser is Emile Charroppin Freeland, a member of the Explorers' Club in New York and author of "Tales of a Sugar Tramp." An expert on chemical engineering, Freeland has helped in his time to establish industries in Chile, Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Mexico—all kinds of industries, such as sugar, soap, vegetables, oils, paint, coffee, handling, alcohol distilling, sulfur processing, fertilizers. He is inspecting and advising Israeli plants at the rate of four a day; he responds happily to the rush tempo of a country in a hurry.

The latest field of American guidance in Israel is management. Most of Israel's managers came up the hard way from pick and shovel beginnings; many of them still think of themselves as laborers who have only temporarily abandoned overalls for white collars. The modern concept of management as a skilled occupation is only slowly taking shape.

Departments for providing graduate training for the country's future managers have been set up at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and in the Haifa Technion. Karl Ferderer, who directed the project, together with Raymond E. Hartstein, provided seminars and courses for those persons presently active in management. "Of course, the techniques of management which are ideal for General Motors are not necessarily suitable for Israel," Ferderer emphasizes.

It is indicative of the American fear of giving offense that when an article recently appeared in the Jerusalem Post describing the American contribution to the management project, an American professor promptly wrote a letter to the editor saying that the importance of the Americans had been overemphasized and the role of their Israeli counterparts understated. This supersensitivity pervades the thinking of all the American advisers. Far from any ar-

rogant emphasis on their knowing better than the locals (a feature of most of the advisers in "The Ugly American") they bend over backwards to minimize their own contributions to Israel's development.

An interesting USOM innovation is industrial design. An office was opened in Tel Aviv by the Government of Israel with the help of two American ICA advisers, Paul Karlan and Mort Rothenberg, partner and staff designer respectively in a prominent Pittsburgh firm. Karlan set up a seminar in order to convince dubious manufacturers that the attractive design and packaging of industrial products was essential in capturing new export markets, particularly the American one. Today, the office is firmly established and the American advisers will leave in a few months' time.

Many of Israel's farm women are new immigrants coming from 70 different countries, with a wide variety of cultural backgrounds, most of them changing from a known urban life to unfamiliar farms. Israelis know that the successful settlement of immigrant families depends on the housewives. Nellie Watts and Velma Huston, two remarkable experts on home economics who will be long remembered in this country, are building up home economics for farm women into a vital social factor in Israel life.

Thus the story of American technical aid in Israel comes close to being a catalog of all the State's activities. It is safe to sum up by saying that there is hardly an aspect of the national life—apart from defense—which has not been enriched by American technical advice.

Israeli journalists are grimly independent and loathe patronizing and sycophancy. The spokesman for both Embassy and USOM, Bill Anthony, is as different from the self-satisfied and insensitive public relations type described by Lederer and Burdick as it is possible to imagine. He is quiet, unassuming, and prefers to explain rather than use high pressure salesmanship. The result is that the press is not only highly cooperative and appreciative of the American program, but also understands its objectives.

George Leroy Peterson, from Minnesota, Chief of the Agriculture Division of USOM is an ideal type of the amiable American abroad. He has been engaged in helping countries to rehabilitate or to develop themselves ever since 1944. He has held many posts in many lands during the last 15 years. He holds M.S. and Ph. D. degrees both in agricultural economics and in general economics. Yet he prefers service abroad to a lucrative post at home.

"The underdeveloped countries want to share a better way of life and it is up to the United States to help them to get it," Peterson says. "It's the right thing for us to do, the moral thing, since we enjoy so much plenty ourselves; it's our duty to help others to attain higher living standards."

John J. Haggerty, Chief of USOM, defines the ultimate goal of the Americans very simply: "We are working ourselves out of our jobs as fast as we can."

Veterans' Administration Medical Care Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my Keenotes issued today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

WASHINGTON, *February 17, 1960.*

On Monday, the Hospitals Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, began a comprehensive series of hearings on all phases of the Veterans' Administration medical care program.

We have 171 veterans' hospitals and domiciliaries. It costs an estimated $931 million each year to finance this program. In addition, we will begin spending July 1 $75 million a year for the construction of new facilities to replace older ones.

No one, I am sure, begrudges veterans the very best of medical care. Congress has been generous in its appropriations for this program. But our desire to care adequately for our veterans does not blind us to the need to make sure that the program is operating as efficiently and economically as possible.

My subcommittee has called in several of the area medical supervisors and general medical directors in the larger centers.

We want to get their ideas on operation and maintenance of present facilities and types of new installations which might be needed.

Perhaps these gentlemen can come up with suggestions that will not only improve service but will also enable us to make substantial savings.

I am highly honored that our distinguished chairman, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE of Texas, has assigned such an important task to the subcommittee which I head.

Almost all congressional hearings are conducted away from the glaring lights of television. They seldom make headlines. But hearings such as our subcommittee will hold are indispensable to the effective operation of the legislative branch. We have to know how the various agencies of government for which we are responsible are operating.

It makes little difference what Congress does if the intent of Congress is not followed. It is only through periodic checkups that we can be assured our programs are being carried out as intended.

You possibly will not read about the hearings. But for five days we will be holding these sessions from which we hope can come constructive recommendations for further improvements in medical services available to our veterans.

At the same time, a number of other committees will also be holding public hearings. These hearings too, for the most part, will be unspectacular and will not make the headlines.

But from the standpoint of sound, efficient government, the information these hearings develop will be far more important than the sensational headlines produced by the investigation of payola among disc jockeys. I do not intend to discount the investigation of the Harris subcommittee one bit, but cite this only to show that other committees, operating quietly and in relative obscurity, also achieve valuable results.

The Discipline of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Discipline of Gold," published in the February 1960 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISCIPLINE OF GOLD

The loss of $3.3 billion of gold in 2 years has come as something of a shock to a people who for a quarter century have enjoyed the comfort of a more-than-ample gold reserve. But the shock can be a beneficial one. It already has done more to promote realistic thinking about currency soundness in the United States than years of theoretical discussion were able to do. The attrition of a nation's monetary treasure is a visible, measurable process which teaches its lessons in a practical way. Thus does gold continue to perform its historic disciplinary function, enforcing the rules of sound finance by imposing penalties and warnings when they are needed.

The concern aroused by the gold flow is not over the present size of the reserve. Even after the heavy drain of the past 2 years—representing an acceleration of a trend that has been going on for a decade, with a total net loss of $5.1 billion—the Nation's hoard is still very large. Some might even say too large, in terms of the optimum distribution to promote world economic health and growth. The $19.5 billion held by the United States is almost half the world's supply of monetary gold—exclusive of holdings of the Soviet Union, which are not reported.

The true significance of the gold outflow goes deeper, to the chronic deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments, and to the factors which cause that deficit: foreign-aid disbursements, maintenance of oversea military installations, American investment abroad, and—reflecting high domestic costs and prices as well as intensified foreign competition—the narrowing surplus of U.S. exports over imports.

By no means all of these factors are to be deplored. The great progress of foreign countries in rebuilding their economies and strengthening their currencies, for instance, is to be applauded; it has been an objective of official U.S. policy throughout the postwar era. But the harmful effect of the domestic wage-price spiral on U.S. exports—an effect accentuated by the foreign improvement—is to be deplored, and this is one of the lessons that the movement of gold is driving home.

During a long period, because of various circumstances, there was no apparent reason for this country to feel anything but complacent about its gold supply—the jokes about Fort Knox had connotation of smugness. Both before World War II and after it, the economic and political problems of other countries so greatly overshadowed ours that the United States was the natural repository for gold. The direction of flow was reversed temporarily during the years of our participation in the war, but by 1949 our holding was up to $24.6 billion, its alltime high. This compared with the $6.8 billion we had held just after devaluing the dollar by writing up the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 an ounce in 1934.

That such a great increase had occurred during a period when this country was almost continuously pursuing essentially inflationary monetary policies—first to fight a recession, then to fight a war, and finally to maintain artificially high prices for Government bonds—merely testifies to the even greater difficulties which were besetting the other principal countries of the world. Their currencies were under much stronger inflationary pressure and, in the years immedi-

ately after the war, their productive facilities were not yet able to offer strong competition in international markets.

RESERVES VS. CLAIMS

Back in the 1934–41 period, while our gold stock was increasing, our need for gold as statutory reserve against currency and central-bank deposits also was rising as recovery from recession brought expansion of the money supply. Our active entry into World War II accelerated the growth of the money supply, calling for more gold reserve at the very time gold was flowing out of the country. In 1945 Congress acted to widen the narrowing spread between gold on hand and the required domestic reserve. It reduced from 40 and 35 percent, respectively, to a uniform 25 percent the backing for Federal Reserve notes in circulation and deposits of the Federal Reserve banks. This move reduced from $15 billion to $10 billion the amount of gold tied up as required monetary reserve. In the intervening years this amount has increased only gradually, standing today at about $11.7 billion.

Since 1949, however, while our gold store has been declining, the claims against it from another direction have been rising sharply. Foreign holdings of short-term dollar assets—in a sense the demand deposits of an international banking system—have increased from $7.6 billion in 1949 to $19 billion at present. The increase in these dollar claims represents, for the most part, deferred settlement of the unfavorable U.S. balance of payments which has been cumulating over practically all of the last 10 years.

Theoretically, the entire amount of foreign short-term dollar holdings is presentable, directly or indirectly, for redemption in gold. Actually, a considerable part of the total—precisely how much can only be guessed—constitutes working balances which foreign individuals, banks, central banks and governments need to maintain here to facilitate day-to-day commercial dealings. The total also includes $3 billion of U.S. subscriptions to the capital of international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund. These are potential, but hardly imminent, demands.

Since domestically held Federal Reserve notes and deposits are not redeemable in gold, the statutory reserve requirement against them does not represent a potential drain. In fact, Congress could release part or even all of the $11.7 billion thus committed simply by reducing or eliminating the requirement, although the probable psychological effects of such action are open to debate.

The real exposure is in that part of the foreign holdings over and above needed working balances, the part that is at the optional disposal of the owners to place where they think it can be most safely and most profitably employed. Because investments earn money and gold does not, and because the dollar has held a preferred position among currencies, the preponderant share of the dollar balances gained by foreigners has been retained here in dollar form. Of $16.4 billion acquired in the past 10 years, only $5 billion has been taken in gold, with the rest allowed to remain in dollar assets.

RECENT TREND A WARNING

The figures for the last 2 years viewed by themselves, however, are less favorable. During 1958 and 1959 foreigners earned a net surplus of about $7.3 billion, took $3.3 billion in gold and left $4 billion in dollar assets. The payments disadvantage has been intensifying, and so has the inclination to withdraw gold. The latter development can be explained partially by the desire of other countries to rebuild their own gold supplies. But it must also be read as a warning that the balance-of-payments deficit has been going on too long, and that the dollar is now in competition with other strong currencies. What has happened thus far, in other words, is a hint of what may happen on a much more drastic scale unless certain actions are taken to correct the payments imbalance and affirm to the world our determination to prevent further erosion of the dollar.

The necessary steps are well known. They include the arresting of the wage-price spiral which has so badly hurt American exports, tighter control of government expenditures, legislation to permit sensible management of the Federal debt, and an unmistakable casting out of the soft-money bias which for a quarter century has haunted the U.S. economy like the mark of some unexpiated sin. There is nothing new about these requirements—advocates of monetary soundness have been urging them through the whole long period when outside circumstances masked the need to abide by them. Now gold, that ancient disciplinarian, is reasserting the lesson—in a way that can escape no one's attention.

Selling or Buying, SBA Offers Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. S. Oliver Goodman, financial editor of the Washington Post which appeared in the February 11 issue of the Post. This very informative article is under the heading "Selling or Buying, SBA Offers Help."

It is gratifying to note this cooperation being received from the press in notifying the financial world and the small business segment of the Nation that the Small Business Administration, established by the Congress, is in a position to aid small business not only in making loans but in the procurement and property disposal field. Appreciation should be extended to Mr. Goodman for this fine public service, and the Small Business Administration is also to be commended for making this information available to him and to the public.

It is hoped that this will establish a pattern which will be followed throughout the Nation in making small business firms aware of the services to small business available under the Small Business Act. It is felt particularly that a large segment of the small business concerns of the Nation is not fully aware of the Small Business Administration's procurement and technical assistance programs. In House Report No. 1252 of Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, there is a recommendation that special attention should be given by the SBA to publicizing their property disposal program in order that small business firms will be advised that set-asides are made in this property disposal field so that Government surplus property and merchandise are made available to small business. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee submitted this report—House Report No. 1252—to the Speaker and to the House on February 8, 1960 last. Copies are now available, upon request, to the Members and others.

The article by Mr. Goodman in this connection follows:

CAPITAL · COMMERCE—SELLING AND BUYING, SBA OFFERS HELP

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

Want to buy Government surplus property and merchandise? Want to sell your goods and services to Uncle Sam?

It's not as hard as you think. The Washington field office of the Small Business Administration in the Lafayette Building has a wealth of free services and information available.

Arthur H. Doll, manager of the local SBA office, yesterday announced that small business firms here received $235,517 in Government contracts during January.

These contracts, he explained, were made as a result of SBA's cooperative set-aside program with Government purchasing agencies. Under this program, civilian and defense agencies reserve proposed contracts for exclusive competitive award to small business firms.

During January, local firms getting contracts on low bids included Southern Oxygen Co., $81,191 for oxygen; G. & G. Co., Inc., two contracts totaling $34,041 for clothing; National Scientific Laboratories, Inc., $65,753 for engineering services, and Test Club Co., $28,209 for spare parts.

The local SBA office also is now providing help for small business firms in locating property available through Government surplus sales. Doll added that a want list has been established and business firms wishing to be listed may contact his office at room 438 in the Lafayette Building, 811 Vermont Avenue.

Catalogs of current sales at all major Government installations in this five-State area are available in the Richmond regional office of SBA. Firms that cannot conveniently visit the Richmond office may have this review made for them through the want-list procedure, Doll said.

The SBA also has prepared a "Sales Information Handbook," available upon request at the local office. This handbook lists all major Government selling installations in this area and provides the information needed to buy at Government sales.

Other SBA services include financing. Federal procurement, marketing, research, management, and technical assistance.

The first step is to contact Doll at the address mentioned above. Let him know you're alive and what you want to sell or buy.

Proposal To Remove Deterrent to U.S. Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the inability of the United States to bring cases before the World Court, involving the rights of American business in foreign countries, because some of these

countries make use of the same escape clause of the Connally reservation may well be a deterrent to the growth and expansion of American investment abroad at a crucial time in our history. This escape clause consists of a six-word amendment added to America's adherence to the World Court in 1946. These six words were added to an article of the resolution stating that the authority of the International Court did not apply to matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, "as determined by the United States."

President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, the Attorney General of the United States and the American Bar Association, support the repeal bill on our reservation to the World Court adherence statute which will withdraw the reservation I have quoted. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on February 12 and a dispatch to that newspaper from its Washington correspondent, Richard L. Stout, on February 11.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 12, 1960]

PROCRASTINATION ON WORLD COURT

The familiar sound of dragging feet is beginning again to be heard in the Senate when the subject of rescuing the World Court is brought up.

Apparently some Senators still are fearful of risking a vote on it.

The international tribunal at The Hague has remained in a state approaching suspended animation ever since the Senate attached the so-called Connally amendment to its ratification of Court use in 1946. This amendment left the United States free to determine whether or not it would allow its position to be litigated in any given case. Other nations followed suit. There was a general breakdown in use of the Court.

For years the American Bar Association has been pouring on the logic supporting participation in this system of international justice by law. Last year the movement to repeal the Connally amendment received high-level bipartisan backing—from Democratic leaders, the President, Vice President, and Republican Party planners.

This year President Eisenhower and his Attorney General both have again backed the movement, which centers on Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S repeal bill.

But despite this phalanx of supporters, some Senators reportedly wish to procrastinate. They say privately that to have to vote either way might hurt their election chances.

This kind of thinking is ostrich politics. The bar association, the President, and other leaders have handed these foot-dragging Senators, ready made, the best kind of practical arguments for turning a "yes" vote on the Humphrey bill into a campaign asset.

The case for an unleashed World Court is clear. It would be no immediate panacea, forcing Moscow to play by ground rules. But in time it would tend to build up such ground rules, and put more force behind treaties signed by Washington. As a nation dedicated to an orderly world, the United States would be profited more often than hampered.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 11, 1960]

WORLD COURT'S ROLE STRIKES U.S. SNAGS

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The move to extend jurisdiction of the World Court at The Hague is in trouble. A new chapter of the ancient American struggle between internationalism and isolationism is being written in the Senate.

In 13 years the World Court has had only 13 cases. In a world threatened by nuclear war, the tribunal that might apply the rule of law to international disputes is only a sideshow.

One reason for the Court's impotence is the six-word Connally amendment added to U.S. adherence to the Court in 1946. Under this amendment the United States declares what cases it will and will not allow to go before the Court affecting it. Other nations have written similar qualifications, and since each potential litigant is suspicious of the other, the lack of jurisdiction has reduced the court to a shadow.

AMENDMENT ATTACKED

The administration wants the Connally amendment repealed. Spokesmen of the American Bar Association urge it strongly. Twice President Eisenhower has asked repeal in state of the Union messages.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has made a practical case for repeal: How can U.S. investors hope to protect interests in foreign countries—Cuba, for example—if there is no international law worth the name to protect them?

Again, William P. Rogers, Attorney General, backs repeal, as do other top White House advisers.

The move has strong backing from Democrats, too.

After waiting for months for the administration to introduce its own motion, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, put in his version. The fight in the Senate today centers round the Humphrey motion, a motion which President Eisenhower supports.

In an election year to find Messrs. HUMPHREY and NIXON on the same side of an international issue would seem to be final evidence of its nonpartisan nature.

But there are powerful forces against action. More important, perhaps is simple inertia. The history of the United States is against yielding sovereignty except under pressure. The League of Nations was rejected, and only a Second World War brought the United States into the United Nations.

Theoretically, law instead of war sounds fine, but there is something ominous and sinister to many in letting an international court substitute for national decision.

Representatives from the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the State Bar of Texas, the Southern Industrial Council, and the like express opposition.

CAMPAIGN FIGHTS REPEAL

Only one hearing has been called by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Originally the administration proposed to send up second-string spokesmen, but ultimately Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, and Mr. Rogers came up to back the Humphrey resolution.

There is a tendency by Democratic Senate leaders to ask if the administration has thought through the significance of the step involved and the degree of leadership it must offer. They urge educational propaganda by President Eisenhower himself and a willingness to step into the fray.

Some skeptical Democrats attribute Mr. Eisenhower's popularity to his alleged unwillingness to write checks for unpopular causes against his enormous bank account of prestige.

Argument against the repealer is that it would let foreign judges decide domestic" matters.

Advocates of repeal point out that the Court is specifically prohibited from interfering in domestic matters. The question is: Who shall decide what is a domestic matter? The crucial six words added by former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, settled this question—"As determined by the United States."

ESCAPE CLAUSE NOTED

The United States is unable to bring cases before the World Court involving rights of American business in foreign countries because the latter use the same escape clause which Senator Connally invented.

Southern Democrats tend to oppose the repeal because they fear that foreign countries will bring cases involving treatment of Negroes in the United States. Thus, there is a tendency for Southerners and Old Guard isolationists to unite.

Some observers feel that isolationism is still latent in the United States, though it has been obscured during President Eisenhower's incumbency.

Some Observations on Current American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always an inspiration to read the words of Herbert Hoover and his address on February 13 to the National Council of United Presbyterian Men in the United States is no exception. If anything it is his best contribution to his high standard of thinking which he has displayed on many occasions. In his speech he reviews the achievements of our country during his long and eventful life, he warns us all about the perils that beset us, and he submits suggestions how we can overcome those forces in the world that would destroy us. In conclusion he emphasizes the fundamental strength of America and points out how this strength may be sustained and expanded "from growth of religious faith; from our devotion to freedom of men; and from a determined staunch stand against the evils which beset us," and he goes on to say "with these forces in motion, there can be no decline or fall in this Nation." There is the philosophy of a great and good American with a heart as big as the universe and a faith as mighty as truth itself.

The text of his address follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON CURRENT AMERICAN LIFE

(Address by Herbert Hoover to the National Council of United Presbyterian Men in the United States Saturday, February 13, 1960, New York, N.Y.)

The minds of thoughtful Americans today are greatly troubled. It ill befits these times,

or you and me, that I should try to entertain you with the usual afterlunch quips and humor. It is more fitting that I speak bluntly of our difficulties, and try to give you some assurance of the fundamental strengths of America.

We are in the midst of six dangerous crises.

We have in the Communist nations implacable enemies, whose determination—despite their disguises of peaceful cooperation—is to destroy and dominate the free world. And they are succeeding at our very doorstep.

We are not only plagued with their conspiracies but with the infection of Karl Marx in both the thinking of our people and the actions of our own governments.

We are in a crisis of inflation, which steadily saps the earnings and savings of our people.

We are in a crisis in our foreign trade—in which competition and an unfavorable trade balance cause the flight of our capital from fear of the stability of the dollar.

We are in a crisis of the domination of some labor unions by hoodlums; and the use of their gigantic funds to influence elections.

We are in the midst of an increasing moral slump as witness the increase in major known crimes. From 1946 to 1957 the increase in these crimes was three times greater than the increase in population, and in 1958 these crimes increased over 9 percent. In 1958 over 12 percent of those arrested for these crimes were under 18 years of age.

We can hardly believe that integrity and moral steadfastness are increasing when we witness the daily exposure of municipal corruption, the operation of some television and radio programs, and even the operation of meat, fuel oil, and retail shops.

I could dwell upon this half dozen tribulations at great length—but it is happier to convey some comfort to troubled minds by recalling some of the great strengths of America.

This Republic is now 184 years old. It is older than any other great representative government in history. We have gone through seven wars, with series of crises before and after each one. We have gone through three great inflations with crises before and after. We have gone through the inevitable depressions from these inflations, with accompanying crises. We have gone through a dozen crises of corruption in government.

Yet today we still possess most of the Bill of Rights, as handed down by the Founding Fathers 169 years ago. We are well fed, well clothed, fairly well housed; and we have the right to kick about any crisis.

This American way of life has proved to be pretty tough. But it needs to be even tougher right now.

THE GROWTH OF NATIONAL STRENGTH

I have lived a long life, and I have seen our Nation rally, exert its strengths to surmount dangers as great as those which beset us today.

Among the signs of our moral and spiritual strength, I have witnessed the outpouring of compassion which saved the world from two gigantic famines that followed the two great wars. During 45 years we provided the necessary margins of food, medical care and clothing to 1,400 million human beings—who would otherwise have perished. And included among them were millions of people in our implacable enemy—Communist Russia.

And in these efforts we have restored healthy minds and bodies to over 16 million children—who would have died from famine and disease—or would have become a danger to the world with their degenerate minds and dwarfed bodies.

Within my span of years, I have seen our voluntary organizations and institutions—devoted to religious service, charity, education, and community welfare—increase by tens of thousands in numbers and by billions of dollars in support.

I have witnessed elementary education expand to include practically all our children. Whatever complaints may be made about the system, it has practically abolished illiteracy; and it has embedded in children's minds the inspiring names and events of our history.

I have witnessed the growth of higher education until today our institutions of learning are turning out more instructed men and women each year than the rest of the world combined.

I have witnessed great discoveries from scientific research. With the advance of medical science, our youth are taller than their fathers, and the span of life has been greatly extended.

We can well respect the accomplishments of Russian technicians. But let us not forget that they obtained the telegraph, the telephone, the electric lamp, the speaking sound track, the radio broadcast tube, the airplane, atomic and nuclear power from us.

But with all these evidences of the future strength of America, I cannot say to you that we may be without fear.

A WORD TO THE CLERGY ON THE SLUMP OF NATIONAL MORALS

A major crisis I have mentioned is the slump in morals. From the pulpit you strive, hourly and daily, to mend these evils. But the Nation is in need of something more.

It needs to awaken from apathy. It needs a great stir of conscience, that certain evils be ended.

For instance I could prove to you by authorities and statistics that our law enforcement machinery has become deplorably weakened. Something is terrifyingly wrong in our law enforcement system when in 1958 there were 2,340,000 persons arrested for major crimes, and only 88,780 of them landed in State and Federal prisons. This number does not include our county and city jails which hold mostly pending cases and minor offenses.

I know of nothing in the teaching of the Scriptures which advocates the release of mad dogs onto the streets. In fact, I interpret Christ's words on "casting into outer darkness" to include effective sentences in prison.

The constant exposure and demands of the press for reforms in law enforcement needs the impassioned force of the pulpit.

TEENAGE DELINQUENCY

I will detain you with only one more example where there is urgent need for a stir of national conscience.

J. Edgar Hoover stated that in 1957 an estimated 740,000 youngsters under 18 years of age were arrested.

Those youngsters arrested in 1958 accounted for about 49 percent of all arrests for burglary and 64 percent of auto thefts. Their crime rolls include repeated murders, assaults, and rapes.

We are told that the remedy is the job of the parents, the schools, the press, a cessation of corruption through our mass communications and that it is the job of the religious denominations.

But we cannot ignore the fact that with the growth of slums and congested areas in our cities a new problem has arisen which cannot be reached by these remedies. These kids outside their school and waking hours are forced to the streets for air and play. It is here where teenage gangs and crimes are born.

The remedy is by prevention—not by a policeman. And prevention can only come from alternatives to life on the streets. The many agencies working to these ends are not simply alternatives to the street. They give the kids a chance in life. They build character. They awaken moral conscience, which is the sure guide in life. They need the organized support of the whole clergy of the United States.

A WORD TO THE CLERGY ON THE INFECTIONS FROM KARL MARX

Another crisis which haunts us justifies a further word to the clergy of America. This also is within your particular concern.

That is the spread of the Karl Marx virus. More leaders of the Christian faiths need realize the ultimate end of this infection among us. The real meaning and purpose of socialism is the governmental operation of all commerce and industry, and the reduction of life to pure materialism. This infection creeps through our Nation by deluded and misled men and by disguised organizations, fronts, and cults. These agents of infection are like hermit crabs which crawl into such terms as "liberal," "progressive," "public electric power," "managed economy," "the welfare state," and others.

Yet we have before our eyes, both in the preaching of Karl Marx and in the exhibits of government in one-third of the world, the fact that commerce and industry cannot be taken over from the people by the government without dictatorship and the destruction of all independent thought, including religions. They have ostentatiously proclaimed that "religion is the opiate of the people."

The clergy can perform a great spiritual service to the American people if they would tear away the disguises and expose the meaning, the ultimate consequences, and the destinations of this infection.

IN CONCLUSION

In conclusion, in looking over the current scene in our national life, if we take a worm's-eye view of the crises and forces which surround us, we may worry that we are approaching the decline and fall of the greatest Nation in history.

If we take a bird's-eye view, we see the fundamental strength of the American people.

And how can this strength be sustained and expanded?

It must come from growth of religious faith; from our devotion to freedom of men; and from a determined stanch stand against the evils which beset us. With these forces in motion, there can be no decline or fall in this Nation.

But we have need to exert all the strengths which God has given our Nation.

Coal Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express, on behalf of the people in my congressional district and in other coal areas, as well as for myself, our very deep and sincere appreciation of the action of the House on Monday in passing legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research. This legislation is of the utmost importance to coal-producing areas and to the hundreds of thousands of people dependent upon coal for a livelihood.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that coal has undergone a great technological revolution in the last decade. Machines

have replaced men. The result has been widespread and has created much unemployment in coal-producing areas.

Mr. Speaker, we hope, through this legislation, to insure that the Nation's great coal industry continues to progress. We did not ask for special treatment for coal. We were merely asking for an opportunity for this great industry to improve its efficiency and value to the Nation.

It is with truly grateful hearts that we say "Thank you" to all who helped in our longtime efforts to secure passage of this urgently needed legislation. While the bill does not go as far as we would like, it is certainly a wonderful start in the right direction.

The Late Honorable David McKee Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on this date the Committee on Science and Astronautics agreed to a resolution in memory of our departed colleague, David McKee Hall, a Member of the House of Representatives from the 12th District of the State of North Carolina.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following resolution:

RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF A CHARTER MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, THE HONORABLE DAVID MCKEE HALL, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. CONGRESS, FROM THE 12TH DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Whereas he was nominated to serve with the initial membership of the Committee on Sciene and Astronautics and was designated by his party as the ranking new member thereon; and

Whereas he fulfilled his mission on the committee with perception, diligence, force, understanding, and high integrity; and

Whereas he was able to convey, with dignity and simplicity, a unique wisdom to the affairs and proceedings of the committee; and

Whereas he represented the committee in important relations abroad with distinguished international figures of government and science; and

Whereas he accomplished the foregoing despite laboring under the most difficult and trying personal handicaps, yet did so with unfailing humor and humility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Science and Astronautics hereby expresses deep gratitude and thankfulness for its association with David M. Hall, and that the Committee on Science and Astronautics also expresses its profound sorrow and sense of irreplaceable loss at the passing of David M. Hall in his beloved native State, January 29, 1960; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution, signed by the members of the committee, be presented to the immediate family of David M. Hall; that a copy of this resolution be made a part of the permanent archives of the committee; and that this resolution further be placed in the RECORD of the Congress of the United States.

Distinguished Nevadan, Ty Cobb, Honored by B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Las Vegas Review-Journal issue of Tuesday, January 26, 1960, which relates to the honor conferred upon my fellow Nevadan Tyrus Cobb by the Sports Lodge of B'nai B'rith:

DISTINGUISHED NEVADAN HONORED BY B'NAI B'RITH

(By George King)

In case you didn't notice, one of Nevada's most distinguished residents was singularly honored Sunday night in New York by the Sports Lodge of B'nai B'rith, an organization of Israelites of German extraction founded in America in 1843 and dedicated to the moral elevation of its members.

There probably are many Nevadans who do not even realize that Tyrus Raymond Cobb is a bona fide citizen of this State, with a home in Glenbrook hard by the shores of Lake Tahoe, much less that he was named Man of the Age in baseball by the noted sports group.

But neither of these little details have been overlooked by George Maines, an authority on the life and accomplishments of the Georgia Peach. It should be mentioned here that Maines is also an authority on the life and accomplishments of one Gene Austin, a singer of songs.

Maines was elated to see his old friend Ty selected by B'nai B'rith as baseball's outstanding personality during this century over the likes of Babe Ruth, Frank Chance, Pop Anson, Home Run Baker, Honus Wagner, Nap Lajoie, George Sisler, Rogers Hornsby, Tris Speaker, Eddie Collins, and such modern upstarts as Johnny Mize, Joe DiMaggio, Hank Greenberg, Stan Musial, and Ted Williams, just to mention a few of the greatest.

Sharing the limelight with Cobb at Sunday night's B'nai B'rith banquet were eight other Men of the Age in sports—Jack Dempsey in boxing, Bobby Jones in golf, Red Grange in football, Bob Cousy in basketball, Maurice Richard in ice hockey, Jesse Owens, in track, and Eddie Arcaro in horse racing.

That's pretty fast company, but Maines insists our fellow-Nevadan is right in his proper element. And we might point out that George, a great booster for Nevada, brushes aside the fact that Ty also maintains residences in his hometown of Royston, Ga., and Atherton, Calif.

Maines recalls that during Austin's recent engagement at Harrah's Club in Reno—shortly before he took over the center of the stage at the Nevada Club here in Las Vegas—Ty and Gene were hashing over old times when Freddy Martin, the band leader, happened by with Nick Lucas, the old "gittar" man.

"Now there's two stars in different lines who hung up more records than any other two performers in history," Freddy admiringly remarked to Nick. Anyone who disputes this statement will get a powerful argument from Maines, who can quote chapter and verse on the achievements of both to back up such an accolade.

Cobb will be accorded a new honor on January 31 at the annual dinner of the New York chapter of the Baseball Writers' Association of America. He will belatedly receive the Player of the Year Award for 1911, no such awards having been made by the writers prior to 1924. Maines can quickly tell you why Ty is getting this award.

"In 1911, Ty batted .420 for Detroit, drove in 144 runs, collected 248 hits and stole 83 bases," quotes the encyclopedic-minded George. "And during his 24-year major league career, 22 of which were spent with Detroit, Ty compiled a batting average of .367 and stole 892 bases."

Maines spent some time with Cobb at both Glenbrook and Atherton recently and reports that Ty, now 73, has apparently licked the ill health that plagued him through much of last year.

"Ty was a very sick man and tortured by back and leg pains resulting from old baseball injuries. But he's recovered nicely and I'm glad to see he was able to make that New York banquet last Sunday," Maines said yesterday. "He richly deserves such honors, not only because of his great record as a ballplayer, but because of the unpublicized financial aid he has made to less fortunate oldtime athletes and needy present-day college students through the Ty Cobb Foundation."

Being familiar with these humanitarian activities of a great old warrior who has, on occasion, received the worst of it in the public prints, we heartily agree with Mr. Maines. Nevada may well be proud of Tyrus Raymond Cobb—a legend in his own lifetime.

Proof of Need for U.S. School Aid Collapses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount to refute arguments that there is need for a massive program of Federal aid to education. For example, I point with pride to the record in my State of Iowa, where citizens are meeting their responsibilities in this field with determination and success.

The record shows that Iowa school districts are spending more on school construction than the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said would be required during the 5-year period from 1956 through 1960.

As the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier points out in a recent editorial, this should collapse any argument that Federal aid is needed in order to meet the school building needs of the State. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the Courier editorial, which follows:

Back in 1955 the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared figures in showing the school construction needs for each State in the following 5 years. That report declared that Iowa should spend $113 million by 1960; and the advocates of Federal aid shouted that the money could not possibly be raised from local tax sources.

But the Iowa Taxpayers Association reports, with subdued and dignified glee, that Iowa school districts actually spent $114 million on school construction during the first 4 years of that 5-year period. If 1960 spending continues at the 1959 rate, the association declares, the total spending for the 5-year period will be at least $30 million

greater than the sum which the Federal Government said would be required.

This should collapse any argument that Federal aid is needed in order to meet the school-building needs of the State. Those who rate public issues on a selfish basis might be interested in whether Iowa would probably gain or lose from a Federal-aid program. Here are the figures:

	Iowa	U.S. average
School enrollment as percent of total population (1957)	19.5	19.8
Per pupil expenditure in average daily attendance (1958–59)	$346	$340
Per capita personal income (1957)	$1,896	$2,027
Personal income per child of school age (1957–58)	$7,707	$8,591
Percent change in school-age population (1950–57)	Up 22.3	Up 31.4

Thus, while Iowa has slightly less income than average to apply to educational needs, it also has had less of an increase in school-age population, thus reducing school-building needs. Depending upon what formula is used, it is unlikely that Iowa would either lose or benefit much from a Federal aid program. Iowa dollars would be taxed out of our pockets and returned in approximately the same number to our schools—minus, of course, the usual administrative deduction.

And let no one assume that Federal aid would reduce reliance on the property tax. The taxpayers association points out that generous Federal aid is already available in the welfare field. Yet, although the total Iowa increase in the property tax for all purposes last year was 8.5 percent, the increase for public welfare (despite the Federal aid) was 9.7 percent. By making spending seem easier and because of the strange illusion that Federal aid is free, Federal matching aid for local governmental purposes only increases local spending from local tax sources.

Any sensible and public-spirited citizen would energetically support Federal aid for education if it can be proved that States and local governments are unable to do the job. But no such proof has ever been offered.

The South and Its 1960 Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in the mad scramble for votes of certain minority groups in the November presidential election by both political parties, apparently the most powerful potential minority, the South, has been overlooked. No doubt this is because that section which has traditionally been solidly Democratic is considered to be in the bag.

For the past decade and a half the South has resented its unenviable position of this being taken for granted. With ever-increasing numbers our people, dedicated as they are to constitutional government, have begun to question the wisdom of supinely following the modern leadership of the party of its fathers where the NAACP, the ADA, and other left-wing groups call all the signals and even threaten to drive them out of the party.

Now, when the South is again threatened with punitive legislation reminiscent of the Reconstruction days of the War Between the States, there are potent omens that the traditional yoke of political serfdom may be thrown off.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an article from the pen of that mighty champion of conservative government, David Lawrence, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily Star. The article follows:

THE SOUTH AND ITS 1960 COURSE—SENATOR RUSSELL INDICATES PROTEST VOTE THROUGH STRICT STAND ON CONSTITUTION

(By David Lawrence)

The big political news of the coming months of 1960 is not just the struggle between the various aspirants for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency but what the South may be preparing to do at the polls next November.

The South has it in its power to take 128 electoral votes away from the Democratic Party and to refrain also from giving them to the Republican nominee. This means that, unless one nominee or the other got 269 of the remaining 409 votes, the House of Representatives would have to select the next President.

What will the South do? A hint has just come from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and one of the most outstanding men in Congress. He said something very significant on this issue a few days ago in addressing the Georgia Legislature, but somehow it wasn't noted in the press generally. He declared:

"I confess I do not know how much longer the South must serve as the doormat for the ambitious leaders of both national parties.

"Certainly, there is no comfort for us in the ranks of the Republican Party. The heir apparent to the GOP crown already has taken his stand with the NAACP. He is, in fact, one of their most prominent honorary members.

"Our own party has virtually deserted us. The proud democracy of Jefferson and Jackson has become the captive of a leftwing element that is barely Democratic even in name, but which is trying to recast the party in its image.

"Many of this gang of phony liberals and party wreckers have publicly advocated driving the South from the house of our fathers.

"The South is entitled to better treatment from the party that it has nurtured, supported, and revered for almost as long as it has the Constitution. We are entitled to the measure of respect and influence within the party that our years of loyalty have earned.

"No section of the country can rival the South's long record of Democratic loyalty. But party loyalty is a two-way street. Those who kick the South in the teeth at every opportunity must not expect us to keep turning the other cheek forever.

"The South has no intention of abandoning its loyalty to the democratic principles that it has ever held. But it owes no loyalty to self-styled Democrats who flout and despise the true Democratic faith.

"The patron saints of the democracy—giants like Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson—built the party upon the solid rock of the Constitution.

"That is where the South stands today. Others may seek to subvert that fundamental premise of the Democratic Party, but the South will keep the faith.

"We have taken our stand on the Constitution of the United States. And there we propose to remain."

The first test will come in the next 2 or 3 weeks. Upon Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, the Democratic leader, will fall the burden of getting some kind of civil rights bill through the Senate. To win support of northern Democrats at the nominating convention, he has to get a bill passed now that will make him appear at least as satisfactory on this issue as Senator KENNEDY or Senator SYMINGTON or Adlai Stevenson. If, on the other hand, the Texas Senator steers a compromise bill through that satisfies the South, he will, of course, retain the support of his fellow southerners, but doing this might cost him the support of northern Democrats.

There has been a tendency in the North to write off the Southern opposition as of no political consequence. The assumption has been that the people of the South will not vote for the Republican nominee and hence will be compelled to vote for the Democrat, no matter who he is. But the experience in 1948, when 39 electoral votes in the South were taken away from President Truman, indicates how the South operates when it wants to bolt the Democratic ticket. This wasn't quite enough to throw the election into the House of Representatives, but it would have taken only 38 more electoral votes from the South to have brought that about. For Mr. Truman got 303 electoral votes, and 266 was necessary for a majority. The agitation on civil rights and States rights had not been carried on at that time, however, to such an intensive degree as it has been since the 1954 Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the schools.

This year it would not be as difficult as it was in 1948 to mobilize the protest vote in the South. In fact, even if the professional politicians in each Southern State feel they have to stay "regular" and support the "regular" set of Democratic Party electors on the ballot, the write-in technique is still available. This was how South Carolina elected STROM THURMOND to the U.S. Senate in November 1954. The same thing can happen also in other Southern States in November of this year in support of an independent set of electors.

Pentagon Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern among responsible legislative leaders of both parties that the present organizational setup in the Pentagon is not adequate to meet the threat posed for this country by the revolutionary techniques in weapons and warfare.

Former Army Chief of Staff Taylor, a highly respected military leader, is the latest expert to call attention to this problem. He believes the division of our Defense Establishment into three separate services is outdated. He proposed a single service and a single uniform.

This is pretty much in line with the thinking of President Eisenhower when unification was first considered by Congress. At that time, Congress refused

to go as far as Mr. Eisenhower and other military leaders recommended.

What has prompted the latest discussion of our military organization is a continuation of bitter interservice rivalry, which has been intensified by the struggle over the development and control of missiles.

There can be little doubt that we have failed to make as much progress in the missile race as Congress and the people had hoped for. When our recent moon shot failed, the public was advised that a shortage of powerful Atlas missiles would probably delay another try at hitting the moon for a year.

Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in a race with the Russians on missiles. Every time they pull off some spectacular achievement in space it serves to dramatize for the rest of the world the amazing accomplishments of the Russians. This means that the rest of the world listens respectfully when the Russians brag of their great accomplishments and of their intention to overtake us economically and industrially within a few decades.

Management and control of our space program has been widely dispersed. We have had the three services engaged in duplicating and in many instances competitive work. The creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration last year should go a long way in putting the civilian phases of our space problem on the right track.

But the interservice rivalries still exist. Despite numerous administrative changes and the appointment of a succession of missile czars we do not seem to be able to narrow the lead which the Russians enjoy in the adaption of missiles and rockets for military purposes.

There is little doubt that interservice rivalry is costly in terms of money as well as time. How to achieve greater efficiency through further unification will be a major problem facing this Congress.

The American people and the Congress are fearful of creating a military Frankenstein. In this country, the military must be subordinate to elected civilian officials. Creation of an all-powerful military that could intrude itself into top policymaking decisions could change complete the basic concepts of our Government.

Yet, we must have a military that is capable of swiftly adapting itself with new weapons systems and the changes in strategy and tactics which these new weapons demand. The big question is this—How can we attain this needed organizational efficiency without creating a two powerful military?

It is a difficult problem. But it is one the American people and the Congress must face up to. During the coming months undoubtedly the question will be debated more and more in Washington by dedicated men and women whose only interest is the security of the United States of America.

Fear Destroys a City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the First Methodist Church in Shelbyville, Tenn., one of the fine towns I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is privileged to have as their minister one of the most able and distinguished ministers in the entire Methodist conference—the Reverend H. T. Tipps.

I have been provided with a copy of one of Dr. Tipps' truly great sermons by Attorney Edwin T. Nance, of Shelbyville. This sermon is so powerful and stirring as suggested by Mr. Nance that I wish to share it with my colleagues and others and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have this sermon reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The text of the sermon, entitled "The Death of a City," follows:

I want to take you back this morning to an old, old story, found in the Book of Joshua. It is the story of the siege and fall of the city of Jericho. Many of you are familiar with it from your childhood—you remember the old lithograph pictures of the march, with the priests blowing their long golden trumpets; but it has a mighty lesson for grownups today.

Moses had led the children of Israel to the border of the Promised Land when he was taken from them. Well before his going, however, he had bestowed upon Joshua the mantle of leadership. (You remember that Joshua was one of the two from among 12 who had been sent out to spy out the land, who believed that it could be taken. It is surprising that the writer to the Hebrews, although he mentions the incident never mentions Joshua by name in the roster of the great men of the race. It is, perhaps one of the ironies of history that few men who follow very closely upon the heels of a very great man come in for their true recognition. Small wonder it is that Joshua was overshadowed by Moses.)

Joshua was a past master in the role of taking over command of a people. He began early to make plans for taking possession of the land. One of the chief obstacles to any planning, however, was the strong city of Jericho, which was just inside the border. It had to be taken, albeit it was well fortified and surrounded by mud-baked walls. This fortress had to fall before looking to the land beyond. Joshua knew, moreover, that untrained warriors were no match in military strength for the enemy, so he devised an ingenious plan—one of the most amazing pieces of strategy imaginable. He devised a campaign of nerves—you of our day know what is meant by a war of nerves. Joshua used the tactic of wearing down the morale of the enemy.

His plan was unorthodox and unpredictable. He simply moved a small army up to within sight of the city walls, but out of arrow shot, and encamped. Then he began a routine. Each day the Hebrews deliberately had a religious ceremony, then lined up; marched so as to encircle the city, carrying their ark of the covenant, and having the priests blowing their trumpets—and after that, simply retiring to their camp. You know the progress and end of the story. For 6 days this identical performance took place; and then on the seventh a change: instead of encircling the city once they marched around it at faster pace seven times. On the seventh the priests blew the trumpets, and all the Hebrews, as previously instructed sent up a mighty shout of triumph—and with the blast and the shouting the walls of Jericho fell down.

(Now there is much that the architects tell us about the power of vibration; also there can be much speculation as to what may have been done secretively both inside and out—but the walls fell—and the faith of an ancient people in their God and their leadership was sustained. They gave the glory to God.)

What we have said is the actual Scriptural account of the happening—for the rest we have to depend upon our imagination. Yet it does not take too much, for the same thing is happening around us today. When the guards had caught sight of the Israelite Army of siege on the first day they no doubt reported immediately to their king; and the court was thrown into consternation and fear because of the tales of terror they had heard concerning the wars of the Israelites—their annihilation of the Amorites, and the like. The king ordered the gates bolted and forbade any person's coming in or going out. The defenses were mobilized; a state of emergency was declared, and the sharpest vigilance ordered. (You can imagine how everybody who could do so crowded the city wall to see what the enemy looked like.) No one slept much, what with the wild rumors circulating. Mornings came and went, finding the people of the city weary from loss of sleep and anxiety. In the nature of things the panic somewhat subsided, but the anxiety for fear of an outbreak persisted. The city waited, paralyzed with fear, watching every move of the Israelites. Always they were the same: a service of worship, a parade around the city with the ark of the covenant and the priests blowing the trumpets—no sign of preparation for hostilities for 6 days in a row. Then came the seventh day: the first activities were the same; but this time the Hebrews did not stop with circling the city one time, but quickened their pace, and began another and another until seven. Imagine the pandemonium that broke loose in the city when the pattern was broken. Panic brought acts of violence of all kinds. The garrison crowded the city wall for anything that might happen. Then the final stroke—in the seventh round, the blast of the trumpets and a prolonged shout—and Jericho fell, without as we should say, the sound of a shot. (Students of Tennessee history can point to an incident in the Civil War which shows how a city's population can be thrown into a frenzy: When it was reported at Nashville that Fort Donelson, at Dover, had fallen to the Federals all control was lost. The lawless ones among the people made a wild dash for supplies against a long siege. They seized meat supplies and other foods ruthlessly to prepare to save themselves from possible starvation. Probably old Nashville never suffered such a battle of nerves.)

The strange situation in the ancient city of Jericho is this, that at any moment during the week the army of the city could have opened the gates, challenged the Israelites to open combat, and, so far as military prowess was concerned, defeated them. The reason this was not done is obvious: Jericho was already defeated within before she was conquered from without. Did not

Joshua's spies who went in to seek out the city prior to operations have to consort with a harlot? Had she not already turned in treachery against her city? Arnold Toynbee, the great British historian of our day has said that there are on record the accounts of the rise and fall of 16 civilizations. "There is not one" says he "that perished from outside force until it had decayed within."

Internal decay alone can account for a war of nerves. A nation with moral and spiritual courage will have no part in such a war, yet we are seeing in our day at least the beginnings of wars of nerves. World War II began as a war of nerves. Adolph Hitler must have known the story of the fall of Jericho by heart, because his early victories were won by its tactic. Long before his armies crossed the borders of Poland, Belgium, France, and Norway he had sown seeds of fear and treachery and distrust in the hearts of certain of the people. And the same could happen again if there is not moral and spiritual preparation to forstall it.

Never was there such a challenge to positive thinking and acting as in our day—never such a time to demand people of moral and spiritual stamina. With so much that is controversial to hear, so much that is deluding to see, so many half-truths afloat, one wonders how his nation would stand up in a crisis. We know that it is important to keep abreast scientifically and militarily with our would-be enemies—but how to keep the heart of the nation pure and unassailable, that is essential, too. What puzzled Jericho was that there were no weapons. Have we too forgotten that the inner weapons are our stronghold. Do we remember that the outer without the inner are futile. Do we still remember that, "Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain who build it; except the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh in vain?" When we consider the corruption that infests so many areas of our political, industrial, social, and economic life, we could well take thought for the future of our Nation. We have recently brought to light a Harry Gold, a Greenleaf, the Rosenbergs. There are probably thousands more like them, who have no love nor devotion for God or country—people who would sell their birthright "for a mess of pottage." Yet we are a Christian Nation: and a Christian should be able to win those people who are beleaguered with problems they do not understand. It is a time for the individual Christian to take upon himself the yoke of his responsibility.

That is just where the Gospel of Christ comes in—at the point where weakness and healing are needed. This Gospel is penetrating—invigorating: "Whosoever heareth these words of mine and doeth them shall be likened unto a man who built his house on a rock. The rains descended, the floods came, the wind blew upon that house, and it fell not, for it was builded upon a rock," said He. Likewise He said, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me."

You should be saying in your heart now, if you are beleaguered, afraid, distraught, "Let me find my way to this Saviour." If you do not know the first step I will tell you—"It is prayer—the mightiest force in the world." You have opportunity to make yourself a channel through which God can send His strength and blessings into your life, and into the lives of those around you.

I witnessed an example of how men and women may save themselves and their land from the plight of Jericho. At the turn of the year 1959–60 there came together men and women from all over the United States in Knoxville to declare their stand for Christ, and await the power of God to be poured out upon them. Their intent was to meet a new era, not waiting for its portent, but rather launching a new one. The movement is called A Decade of Prayer. The plan is for Christians to take the initiative, not wait for defensive action. Testimonies of the power of prayer were given by Stanley Jones and other great spirits. At midnight the great delegation was upon its knees taking the Holy Sacrament as a pledge to launch a decade of prayer, rather than to meet a new era waiting to find what it would bring.

Where do you begin to fortify against a defeating situation? Answer: "Right where you are." Not after it breaks, but now. The habit of coming to God immediately when you feel uncertain will introduce you to the habit of coming to Him for everything. With God on your side you cannot know defeat. Even a war of nerves cannot assail your citadel.

Wait not for the enemy to come near—rather, have God with you first.

Commemoration of the Battle of Aiken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I salute a magnificent address made by the Honorable William D. Workman, Jr., author, news reporter, and columnist of Columbia, S.C. Mr. Workman is the author of the book "The Case for the South," and has a bright history of literary compositions and contribution. Recently, on the occasion of commemorating the Battle of Aiken, fought at Aiken, S.C., of February 11, 1865, he made a significant address which I include herewith. I preface his address with the introduction of Hon. John A. May, of Aiken, S.C., distinguished lawyer, historian, and legislator, and I include at the end of his remarks a poem by Hon. John A. May on the Battle of Aiken. I call attention to the significant remarks of Mr. Workman which I was not privileged to hear, but which I have read with great interest and appreciation and which I attach here so that his thoughts may be spread abroad:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN A. MAY, INTRODUCING WM. D. WORKMAN AS PRINCIPAL SPEAKER, BATTLE OF AIKEN MEMORIAL, FEBRUARY 13, 1960, AIKEN, S.C.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, to me this is a great day. For many years I have cherished the thought that some day the battle of Aiken would be given the recognition it so justly deserves. Today a dream of years has come true.

After Sherman's march to the sea, he crossed the Savannah River and headed toward Columbia. When he reached Blackville, he halted long enough to burn Barnwell and to continue to tear up the South Carolina railroad, as well as to pillage all the countryside. It was here that he ordered Maj. Gen. Hugh Judson Kilpatrick to destroy the Graniteville mill and the Augusta arsenal, both so essential to the Confederacy.

Kilpatrick camped at Johnson's Turnout, now known to us as Montmorenci. As he entered Aiken on his way to Graniteville and Augusta, he was surprised by his old West Point classmate, Maj. Gen. Joe Wheeler. It was a complete route. Kilpatrick was decisively defeated and forced to retreat to Montmorenci. Wheeler, himself, chased Kilpatrick and almost caught him. Kilpatrick rode so fast that he lost his hat in making his escape. Throughout the years there has been an effort on the part of Sherman and Kilpatrick—and other Union generals—to minimize the battle of Aiken. They prefer—if they mention it at all—to call it a skirmish and even today some of their admirers still try to belittle the battle by referring to it as a skirmish. This is not true. It was a full-scale battle. Thousands of men on both sides took part. Many brave men on both sides paid the supreme sacrifice. It is estimated that approximately 75 Union soldiers and 50 Confederates were killed. Some of them lie buried just across the street in the Baptist churchyard.

The Battle of Aiken was not only a great Confederate victory—probably the last or certainly one of the last Confederate victories—but it had a far-reaching effect.

Every place that Sherman and Kilpatrick had been before had been left in flames and ruin. Here a battle was fought which resulted in the saving of Augusta, the arsenal, the Graniteville Mill, and our own little town from complete destruction.

Yes, the man of vengeance, the man who made war on women and little children, was stopped right here where we stand today.

Today we are honored to have as our speaker a true son of the South, a man who recognizes our problems and one who has the ability to portray them truthfully and unbiased to the world. So I present to you a South Carolina boy who speaks to us today of our great birthright, and who has so nobly presented the "Case for the South." A man who fought for his country in time of war; a man who defends our principles in time of peace—W. D. "Bill" Workman.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM D. WORKMAN, JR., AT AIKEN, S.C., FEBRUARY 13, 1960, ON THE OCCASION OF COMMEMORATING THE BATTLE OF AIKEN

We are assembled here today to commemorate a time and place where southerners fought to defend themselves and their ideas against outside domination. They fought to safeguard what to them was a basic right—the right to form their own government. That fight was lost, and the Government of the United States triumphed over that of the Confederate States.

Today, southerners once more are fighting, this time in the realm of politics and law; but they are fighting now to defend the United States and those concepts of constitutional government for which this Nation stands. In the long roll of history, it may well turn out to be that the Supreme Court's desegregation decision of May 17, 1954, was every bit as dangerous a threat to the Union as was the firing on Fort Sumter 93 years earlier. In a very real sense, the southerner today is fighting not only for the South, but for America, when he rallies to defend the Constitution of the United States.

The southerner once more finds himself in what has been described, under other circumstances, as "a thoroughly orthodox English revolution, seeking to conserve rather than destroy."

A South Carolina historian, the late Dr. D. D. Wallace, used that description in portraying the attitude of the early colonists who rebelled against the inept and dictatorial rule of the lords proprietors. It could be as well used to describe the reaction against the British Crown as the War of the Revolution developed; and, later still, as the South rebelled against the northern aggression which provoked and sustained the War Between the States. And it can be used today, when southerners once more seek to conserve rather than to destroy a way of life

which they have evolved to their own satisfaction.

What basically is at stake here is the right of freemen to govern themselves—a right woven into the long tapestry of English history from which our own fabric of government has been cut. The threads go back to the meadow of Runnymede, where English demanded—and got—a royal acknowledgment of their rights and liberties. In that Magna Carta of 1215 they got no new system of government, no radical departure from accepted practices, but a detailed reaffirmation of what had long been the law of the land—yet a law which was beginning to erode under autocratic and despotic practices. And they also got in that great charter a pledge that the Crown would "only appoint such men to be justiciaries, constables, sheriffs, or bailiffs as know the law of the land and will keep it well." Note that language—"as know the law of the land and will keep it well"—a commitment of conservatism, not of radicalism; a pledge to preserve the law, not to change it.

And so it went through the years—down through the Petition of Right, the English Bill of Rights, and into our own Declaration of Independence, wherein was set forth the American proposition that governments among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. But even here, the struggle was, to use Wallace's phrase again, "a thoroughly orthodox English revolution, seeking to conserve rather than destroy." Had the colonists of 1776 had the same rights and privileges accorded to their contemporaries in England, it is doubtful that there would have been an American Revolution. But they were being deprived of those rights—as the Declaration of Independence documents in considerable detail—and they reached the point where they could and would fight for their liberties.

Thereafter came open warfare—which ended in a peace treaty wherein "His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia to be free, sovereign, and independent States."

And then came the drafting of a constitution of the United States to replace the old Articles of Confederation. It sought to weld the new States into an entity which could "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty." Yet even as the States agreed to join hands for those and other specified purposes, they insisted that they be safeguarded in other rights retained by the States. Too few of us realize that 7 of the Original 13 States—more than half—refused to ratify that constitution until they were assured that the rights of States would be safeguarded in all areas except those granted to the Central Government. And these were not all Southern States, for they included New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island—in addition to the Carolinas and Virginia. Here, for example, is what the people of the State of New Hampshire proposed should be put first among the "alterations and provisions" to be embodied in the new constitution:

"That it be Explicity declared that all Powers not expressly and particularly Delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several States to be by them Exercised."

That concept—or precept, if you prefer—represents one of America's distinctive contributions to political science, and it embodies in itself a safeguard for the perpetuation of liberty. It grew out of observation of the abuses which had continually crept into the government of other nations, even including that of Great Britain, and it was written into the American Constitution as the 10th amendment of the Bill of Rights. And—mark this well—it undergirds southern political thinking today as it once undergirded that of this fledgling nation of ours.

The South holds, with Francis Lieber, that "the more a constitution partakes of the character of a solemn compact, the closer its construction must be." It holds, with that great Michigan jurist of a later year, Judge Thomas Cooley, that: "A cardinal rule in dealing with written instruments is that they are to receive an unvarying interpretation, and that their practical construction is to be uniform. A constitution is not to be made to mean one thing at one time, and another at some subsequent time when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable."

The point to be made here is that the position of the South with respect to States rights is not peculiarly southern, but is peculiarly American—and that only in the South has that concept been nourished, cherished, and preserved. Elsewhere in the Nation, the principle of States rights has degenerated into a nerve-sapping willingness to submit to the ever-present eagerness of the Central Government to grow larger by the cannibalistic practice of feeding on its lesser parts. And in this process of governmental degeneration there has come about a distortion, a perversion, of political values. Today we are rapidly approaching, and may well have reached, the point where political control of the Nation lies in the hands of what might be called the concurrent minority—the opposite extreme of that state of political tranquility envisioned by John C. Calhoun as a natural consequence of rule by his concurrent majority.

Instead of having the various elements of the American community united in a common undertaking to promote the welfare and progress of the whole, with each of its individual parts assured of protection against oppression or maltreatment at the hands of the others, we have achieved a state of balance between the two major political parties wherein an imbalance can be effected by a numerically insignificant portion of the populace. Thus, what Calhoun feared as the tyranny of the numerical majority actually has evolved into an even more distressing tyranny of the numerical minority.

This state of affairs has developed, perhaps inevitably, from a combination of circumstances which characterizes the American Government. The emergence of the two-party system had its inception in an understandable difference of policy and governmental philosophy between segments of the population which gravitated together out of political like-mindedness. Then followed a consolidation of power in the hands of the relative few who came to control the machinery of the respective parties, whether overtly or covertly. Simultaneously, out of the natural propensity of American citizens to choose up sides, a situation developed wherein each of the two major political groupings achieved a virtual parity of strength in many areas of the Nation. One exception was the South, where the regional heritages tended to bind the people together in a common bond of sympathy with one party and of hostility to the other.

But, with the achieving of comparable political strength between Republicans and Democrats elsewhere in the Nation, and more especially in the big States with many electoral votes, self-serving politicians realized that those electoral votes could be tipped into one party basket or the other by the simple expedient of maneuvering the uncommitted minorities which were chiefly concerned with their own special interests.

Out of this realization on the parts of both the politicians and the leaders of the minority groups came this control by the concurrent minority. In city after city, and State after State, there gradually were developed combinations of racial, religious, and occupational minorities which together provided political schemers with the means of influencing the outcome of elections on local, State, and National levels. And since the consuming interests of these minority groups transcend (in their minds) the broader considerations of the general public welfare, it became a simple function to manipulate such groups as voting blocs. Appeals to their minority consciousness and promises to serve their minority interests did the trick. And just so long as the major parties remain in positions of relative political balance, the minority combinations can be employed as the balance of power to tip the scales—and the votes—to whichever of the major parties caters most abjectly to the minority demands.

The concurrent minority, therefore, thrives upon discord and disunion. Instead of promoting a harmony which would bind together diverse elements of the majority in the joint and amicable exercise of political control, the militant minority bloc—in order to preserve its own influence—seeks to pit one faction of the majority against the other. Only thus can the minority retain its status as the balance of power, and exercise its disproportionate power to bargain and to intimidate. It naturally follows that the concurrent majority and the concurrent minority are in fundamental and continual opposition to each other—the first seeking peaceful coordination of effort with the aim of political tranquility, the second thriving on incessant agitation with the view of forestalling and thwarting any likelihood of agreement between the majorities.

A corollary of the brazen maneuvering which has accrued from this set of circumstances is the evolution of the white South as the target for abuse from both national parties. The South, less the carefully distinguished and constantly seduced Negro population, can be safely attacked without risk of offending any of the minority groups which exert such tremendous influence in the critical cities and States of the non-South. Consequently, there is ever-increasing exasperation in the South with both major parties, but with it is a sense of frustration stemming from the South's inability to adequately defend itself against such politically motivated attacks.

Nevertheless, there remain hosts of southerners who feel earnestly, if none too optimistically, that the States of the South have more in common with each other than with either national party. Bound together by their joint adherence to State rights, constitutional government, and racial integrity, these southerners reason that only by collective political action can they protect themselves against exploitation by both Democrats and Republicans. Thus arises the recurring consideration of third party movements.

This third-party talk in the South is not born of any desire to break up the traditional two-party pattern of American politics. It stems, rather, from a sense of political desperation on the part of southerners who find no haven in either national party. The Democratic Party has long since abandoned the fiction of championship States rights (the fact fled during the thirties). The Republican Party's lip service to the cause of State sovereignty, voiced overmuch in 1952, stands exposed as political hypocrisy of the worst sort. And, in between this disillusionment with the Democrats and this disenchantment with the Republicans, stands the southerner—beleaguered and belligerent.

He is beleaguered because the odds seem against him in this midcentury alinement of leftwing liberals and pseudoprogressives who sneer at the legacy left by the framers of our Constitution. He is beleaguered, too, because he finds a paucity of regional political leadership. True enough, there are

spokesmen of and for the South, but too many of them suffer from national political aspirations. Then there are others who speak for the South, but whose influence barely reaches beyond the borders of their home States. And always there is the political jealousy which constrains and restrains public officials in cooperative undertakings which involve areas where they cannot hope for votes. Indeed—and I hate to make this acknowledgement—the South suffers somewhat from its very excess of States rights. In today's political battles, as in yesterday's conflict during what we choose to call the War of Northern Aggression, the States of the South find it difficult to achieve coordination on a policymaking level, despite the community of interest of the rank and file on the lower levels. Yet as we look about at the crop of new young governors on the southern scene, there is hope that mutual trust and mutual interests will bring about greather southern cohesion than we have witnessed in recent years.

The South is a sleeping political giant, possessed of untold and well-nigh unlimited potentiality, awaiting the day when a leader—or group of leaders—will emerge with a plan of action and a sacrifice of self which will fuse southerners into an amalgam of resurgent Americanism. Those things to which the southerner clings—love of the land, pride of family, resistance to tyranny, insistence upon self-government—all these are things which Americans everywhere can cherish. When the southerner extols the constitution of Washington, Madison, Franklin and company in preference to that of Earl Warren and associates, he does so not just for the South, but for America. In all conviction, and in all truth, the southerner looks upon the South as the homeguard of the Nation.

THE BATTLE OF AIKEN, FEBRUARY 11, 1865

(These words are contributed by John A. May, Aiken County legislator and chairman of the South Carolina Confederate Centennial Commission to commemorate the Battle of Aiken. On February 13, 1960, the Aiken County Historical Commission unveiled a monument where the greater part of the famous battle was fought.)

Fresh from the sea march and Savannah's surrender
Sherman pressed on, the South to dismember.
On his way to Columbia, the proud capital to destroy
He stopped a moment for Kilpatrick's deploy
To complete the pillage, more people to kill
To destroy the arsenal and the Graniteville Mill.
He began his mission entering Aiken town
Not expecting to find any rebels around,
But he soon discovered to his sad dismay
Joe Wheeler's cavalry were here that day.
Able and strong that Confederate band
All willing to die to save their land.
Kilpatrick halted near the east of town
When Wheeler's men began to bear down.
Up Richland Avenue he began his search
And found his foe near the Baptist Church.
And all that day they fought and died
And neither stopped 'til eveningtide.
And then at last, the Federal blue
Fired a few wild shots and then withdrew.
Kilpatrick left in such a hurry
He lost his hat amid the flurry.
Joe picked it up and smiled with glee,
"That's one Yankee hat, that Columbia won't see."
And so the Battle of Aiken ended
And now, Thank God, all scars are mended.

—JOHN A. MAY.

(Dedicated to my grandfather, John Salles Randall, who as a boy of 16 served under General Wheeler at the Battle of Aiken.)

Johnson Alone Fits All Demo Leadership Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON would make a great President of the United States.

In an editorial appearing in the American Statesman, of Austin, Tex., one of the important daily newspapers of our Nation, on Sunday, February 14, 1960, these reasons are presented ably and brilliantly.

I ask that the editorial be included in the RECORD. It is as follows:

JOHNSON ALONE FITS ALL DEMO LEADERSHIP NEEDS

Repeatedly we have heard and read, during the current nationwide speculation on Democratic Party presidential nomination possibilities, something to this effect:

"Of course, the ablest man in the Democratic Party this year is Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, but because he is from Texas he won't stand a chance to be nominated for President."

If this attitude is to prevail when the national Democratic convention meets in Los Angeles this summer, then it is safe to predict that the Democrats will lose another national election this fall. For this attitude reflects to a large extent a parochial frame of mind, an outlook based on the sectionalism and factionalism that has riddled the ranks of the Democratic Party in recent years.

The fact is that LYNDON B. JOHNSON has demonstrated his national stature repeatedly under the most trying circumstances ever since he became Democratic leader of the U.S. Senate in 1953. His remarkable skill in holding together in the national interest an extremely diversified group of U.S. Senators has prevented what otherwise would have been a deadly stalemate of the kind that brought the government of France to its knees 2 years ago.

Most of the comment on JOHNSON's performance as Senate Democratic leader has centered on his personal talents in human relations. We think the really important fact aspect of what he has done is the broad-gaged vision it revealed in LYNDON B. JOHNSON. He has been a man of destiny for the United States and the free world.

In more than an academic sense, LYNDON JOHNSON has been a man of destiny also for the Democratic Party in Texas.

Consider for a moment the history of this majority group of Texans over the past 8 years. In two presidential elections, Texas voted strongly for a Republican President, which means that Texas Democrats jumped the party fence in large numbers.

Without LYNDON JOHNSON as a rallying point, the effect of these consecutive defeats for the party might well have been by this time chaos and confusion in Texas political ranks.

The strong figure of LYNDON JOHNSON has made it possible, instead, for the State organization to hold itself together in respectable strength and thus to serve the people of Texas.

The point is that LYNDON JOHNSON already is approaching this lodestone role in the national party. If the Los Angeles convention wants to perfect an organization that has a chance to win the Presidency, LYNDON JOHNSON is the only man who has demonstrated at all political levels the capacities to head it up as nominee.

LYNDON JOHNSON has imagination, perceptiveness and a tireless zeal to serve the United States and the cause of liberty. His outlook on the national and international scene is one of sound, practical, courageous vision. He would be a powerful Democratic candidate if nominated, and a great President if elected.

People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, all of us know that the months ahead promise to be crucial ones for the United States and the American people.

We should discover before the end of the year whether the Russians are really sincere in their professed desire to ease tensions in the cold war and arrive at some understanding whereby the threat of war will be eased.

If there is one thing which unites the American people it is the desire for peace. That is why everyone, regardless of political affiliation, approves the President's good will visits to other countries of the world.

The summit conference this spring will pose the first test. Mr. Khrushchev will have an opportunity to prove that he is sincerely interested in easing the cold war. He can do this by relaxing some of the rigid demands of the Russians, especially as applied to Berlin.

Also, Mr. Khrushchev, if he is really sincere in his desire for peace, can restrain the Chinese Communists. The Chinese appear on the surface to be much more aggressive at this point than do the Russians.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that foreign policy will not become a political issue during this session of Congress. This does not mean there will not be disagreements. There will be, but the arguments will come over emphasis and direction, rather than the policy itself.

We know that foreign aid will be argued at length. Some Members will want to downgrade military aid and emphasize economic assistance to nations such as India. Others will want to abolish foreign aid and concentrate on military assistance.

Our defense program, which cannot be separated from foreign policy, will also be widely debated. Some Members of Congress, with considerable background information at their disposal, will want to step up the missile program. They fear we are allowing the Russians to widen the present gap. Others will insist upon more emphasis on conventional arms, arguing that if we depend entirely upon atomic weapons it will be an invitation to the Russians to start small-scale local engagements which cannot be met with the hydrogen bomb.

Arguments over defense will not be partisan bickering. Sincere, dedicated and patriotic men will take issue with the President's position that our defense setup is adequate.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy was never intended to stifle debate. We need to discuss issues of such importance as foreign policy and defense. It would be tragic if the people, because of their great confidence in Mr. Eisenhower, resented legitimate debate of these issues and branded everyone who asks pertinent questions a political opportunist. I am sure Mr. Eisenhower would be among the first to insist upon the right of anyone to debate these questions in a logical, dispassionate manner.

But after all the debate is over and the policy on both foreign affairs and defense is agreed upon, the country will remain unified.

The people want peace. But they do not want peace at any price. That is why our people will continue to insist upon a strong defense, backed by the latest in new weapons, until the Russians prove by deeds, and not words, that they are ready to make fundamental changes in their policy.

America's New Frontier of the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1960, in an address at the Mississippi Valley Association meeting in St. Louis, Mo., our colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable ED EDMONDSON, of Muskogee, did himself proud with a message on the development of the Arkansas River Basin. He deals realistically with this great project and I wish to commend him for it. It is my great hope that we can move forward rapidly on this project and that planning funds for Ozark Dam and others of the great project can be secured this year.

It would take much time and space to give credit to all those, living and dead, who have done so much to make the dream of the Arkansas Valley a reality in the near future. At this point I wish to insert the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], in which I concur completely:

AMERICA'S NEW FRONTIER OF THE SIXTIES

Four years and four months ago a man who was then a stranger to many in the Arkansas Valley stood before a large number of Oklahomans and Arkansans in the Sky Room of the LaFayette Hotel in Little Rock, and said:

"The improvement of the Arkansas River for navigation was authorized by Congress in 1938. Since then there have been other authorizations for some of the flood-control reservoirs which will contribute to navigation. I submit to you it is time something happened to bring this authorization to reality. I can promise you the wholehearted support of the Mississippi Valley Association, which I represent."

The speaker was Everett Winter, executive vice president of your great association.

The time was October 28, 1955, a few short months after the great breakthrough on the floor of Congress in 1955.

In the session of Congress which had just concluded at that time, we had succeeded in securing appropriations to begin construction on three major dams of the Arkansas Basin program—Oelogah and Eufaula in Oklahoma, and Dardanelle in Arkansas.

The amount of money appropriated was not large—less than $2 million of construction money in all—but the mandate of the Congress was clear and decisive.

In that mandate, in both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, the support and help of legislators from the Mississippi Valley States had supplied the vital difference between defeat and victory.

The helping hand of 1955 was followed by further strong support in 1956, when supporters of Arkansas River navigation won for the first time the official backing and sponsorship of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Among my treasured souvenirs of the 1956 battle is a resolution adopted here in St. Louis at a most opportune time by the Mississippi Valley Association, which reads as follows:

"We recommend that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to expedite the authorized program for the Arkansas River Basin for flood control, bank stabilization, navigation, and incidental hydroelectric power.

"The Keystone, Eufaula, and Oelogah Dams in Oklahoma, and the Dardanelle and Ozark Dams in Arkansas, are key installations for this program, and we recommend that funds be especially provided for these installations. * * * We urge that construction funds be appropriated to continue the Toronto Dam on the Verdigris and for the planning of the Elk City on the Verdigris, and the Twin Dam on the Neosho.

"We recommend that the Corps of Engineers provide the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget with data showing as nearly as possible a specified period of years for the completion of the entire program, and the annual amount of appropriations necessary for such completion; and upon receipt of this data, the Bureau of the Budget include the funds for each year indicated in the data, but in any event, Congress provide the funds necessary to so progress the program."

Those were welcome words, my friends, in 1956—the words of a friend indeed, for a friend in need.

With your splendid and tremendous help, the battle was won again in 1956, and we have seen the banners of progress steadily go forward in 1957, 1958, and 1959.

Last year, of course, we fought a new battle on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate.

It was the battle of "No New Starts," and for a few uneasy weeks in Washington, water resource development hung in the balance while Senators and Congressmen debated the vital issue of "Procrastination Versus Progress."

The enemies of progress insisted that our great Nation could not afford any further new starts in navigation, flood control, and reclamation. Because of inflation, we were told, provision for future water supply would have to be delayed.

There was even unfriendly talk, in high places, about "raids on the public treasury" and the "pork barrel" character of water legislation.

On the other side of the question, the opponents of procrastination reminded the Congress that even President Coolidge had defended the basic soundness of water development projects, pointing out that such projects "do not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be productive."

An even more famous quotation on this subject—appreciated by Democrats as well as Republicans—is the well-known statement of former President Herbert Hoover, made while Secretary of Commerce in 1925:

"We have learned that expenditures on great reproductive works are neither a waste nor a burden upon the community. They bring a rich harvest in increasing wealth and greater happiness. They tend directly to strengthen the foundations of agriculture and industry. Even from the narrower view of taxation, they are an economy, for it is by such works that we increase the income available to taxation and thus reduce individual burdens."

In the final showdown of 1959, the weight of your progressive association was once again felt on the floor of the Congress. Once again, it was on the side of progress, and we won the battle for new starts in water development.

While the final appropriation bill adopted for civil works in 1959 contained a total figure slightly below the Presidential request, it also contained the money for an important series of new starts in navigation, flood control, water supply, and reclamation projects.

An inspiring feature of this victory was the willingness of water project sponsors all over the United States, voluntarily to accept reductions in the money provided for their projects, in order to continue the forward march of water development through the funding of new starts.

It was this spirit, my friends—the spirit of cooperation for mutual objectives, the spirit of willing sacrifice to advance common goals—which made possible the victory for new starts in 1959.

And it is this spirit, ladies and gentlemen—vitalized and personified by your great association—which will be needed to continue our progress in the years ahead.

Today, in 1960, we in the Arkansas Valley are both proud and humble in the knowledge that our river—so long neglected and forgotten on the American continent—is now the location of one of the greatest multipurpose development programs under way on any continent.

A few short years ago, we were fighting hard to secure our first million dollars for navigation construction. Our first construction amendment, in fact, provided the total sum of $900,000, to be divided equally between two great dams—one in Arkansas and one in Oklahoma.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, the President's budget calls for $20,700,000 on Eufaula, $17,400,000 on Keystone, $6,100,000 on Dardanelle, $3,700,000 on Oologah, $3,800,000 on John Redmond, and $2 million on Council Grove. In addition, the sum of $5 million is recommended for bank stabilization.

This total, of more than $58 million will make it possible to continue orderly progress toward completion of these major dams on schedule, and some of the largest construction contracts in the history of our valley are now being negotiated by the Army Engineers.

The Toronto Reservoir is scheduled for completion this year; final completion of Oologah will follow in the summer of 1962; Keystone, Eufaula and John Redmond will be completed in 1965, if orderly appropriations continue during the next 5 years.

In addition, my friends, the need will soon be upon us for further new starts in the Arkansas Valley. Studies are now underway on the Bird, Caney, and Verdigris Rivers, on other Oklahoma and Kansas tributaries of the Arkansas, and along the navi-

gation channel in Oklahoma and Arkansas.

New techniques in construction, and improved engineering methods, have resulted in substantial reductions in Army Engineer estimates for two of these major dams—and additional millions may well be saved if the permanent bank stabilization program can be initiated at once along the river.

The inauguration of the permanent bank stabilization program, to take the place of emergency measure now underway and provided for in the budget, will be a major objective of the Arkansas and Oklahoma delegations in this session of Congress.

In that effort, which we believe will not only save millions of dollars but also advance the completion date of the navigation project by many months, we are once again counting upon the stalwart help of the Mississippi Valley Association.

If the sustained effort and cooperation of the last 5 years can be continued for the next 10—I strongly believe that navigation can be underway along the Arkansas, from the Mississippi River to Catoosa on the Verdigris, before the autumn leaves are falling in 1970.

Navigation on the Arkansas River.

The constant goal and objective of Arkansas and Oklahoma legislators, for more than half a century, is now within the sight of all of us. For these two States, and their economic future, it means the rising of a new sun, the dawning of a new day, the bright and glorious beginning of a new and better tomorrow.

For all of you who have helped to bring that dream within sight, I want to express the profound and heartfelt thanks of nearly 4 million people who live in the Arkansas Basin.

We thank you for what you have already helped to accomplish—and for what you stand ready to help us accomplish in the future.

By your efforts, America is a stronger Nation today than it was in 1955—a stronger Nation, and a better place in which to live.

And by your continued efforts, along America's new frontier of water development in the 1960's, a great dream of our Nation's landlocked Southwest is now approaching reality.

My hope and prayer for that dream, as we move forward toward that new frontier, can best be expressed in the words of Edwin Markham:

"Ah, great it is to believe the dream
As we stand in youth by the starry stream;
But a greater thing is to fight life through
And say at the end, 'The dream is true.'"

Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the February 15, 1960, issue of the Roanoke World-News, the editor addressed an open letter to Dr. Fidel Castro which, under permission to extend my remarks, I quote herewith in full:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER CASTRO

DR. FIDEL CASTRO,
Premier, Republic de Cuba,
La Habana, Cuba.

DEAR MR. PREMIER: Today is an important anniversary to both Cuba and the United States and thus provides us with appropriate opportunity to make some observations and to ask some questions.

It was 62 years ago today, February 15, 1898, that somebody—we never learned who for sure—blew up the U.S. battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, killing or drowning 266 Americans.

For us this meant war with Spain as our country moved quickly from mere sympathy for the downtrodden Cuban people to active conflict against the oppressor.

In the swift succession of events which followed, the American Navy struck hard on two sides of the world to annihilate the Spanish Navy. U.S. ground forces linked with Cuban patriots to complete the victory in a matter of months.

In that war for Cuba's freedom, 274,717 Americans rallied to the colors and of these 290 perished in battle and 2,365 died of disease while preparing to fight.

True to the principle that it did not covet territory, the United States gave full freedom to the Cuban people within 2 years—as soon as they could be prepared for it.

Ever since then, American might and prestige have stood between Cuba and possible foreign interference just as that strength has guaranteed the freedom of all South American and Caribbean countries from aggression.

Americans and their Government have not always liked the regimes which came into control of Cuba, but they have refrained meticulously from interference as, indeed, you are certain to be aware.

Now, Mr. Premier, we might explain that Roanoke is an average medium sized city and is, we like to think, rather representative of American communities. Our beliefs, our aspirations, our sympathies and our loyalties are about the same as those you would find in any city or town of the United States.

Among the men who hastened to volunteer in the war which brought Cuba freedom was a company from Roanoke, some of whom did not get back. Since then our people always had a warm spot in their hearts for Cuba. Our city has attracted Cuban students for many years.

Together with the overwhelming majority of 180 million citizens of this country, Roanokers despised the Batista regime. There was joy here, as everywhere else in America, when he was overthrown and you were welcomed to power. Seldom has any man or movement enjoyed the vast reservoir of good will that you had a year ago.

Today that reservoir has dried up. Rather, it was destroyed when you removed the dam that held it there in store.

Why?

Frankly, we are mystified why anyone would want to do that.

Today all of us are terribly offended when you denounce our country, vilify our President and attack our Congress.

Perhaps you do not understand although you should. We American people are the Government of the United States. When you attack it you attack each and every one of us.

Under trade agreements, as you know, our Government has given preference to Cuba in the purchase of sugar. The price of that commodity is subsidized by each American taxpayer.

There is some talk that because you have denounced our country so much and for no justifiable reason we should retaliate by cutting the sugar quota. Most Americans do not feel that way because they are tolerant and because they continue to hope that you will relent.

Perhaps you wonder, although it should be perfectly clear, why Americans—Roanoke people included—are no longer in sympathy with you. Here are just a few of the reasons:

Our people, who were so outspoken in their approval of your revolution at first, were alienated immediately by the wholesale executions which gave your suffering country a blood bath more like those of Nazi and Communist triumphs.

Americans will never be convinced that it was necessary to condemn and execute hundreds simply because they might have supported another regime or differed with you in thought.

Americans know that the hated Batista spared your life when your previous revolt failed. They think you have much to learn about the quality and practice of mercy and the magnanimity a principled victor should possess.

Americans cannot understand why you imprison men who have been your friends and comrades in arms because they differ with you on policy and have the courage to speak their minds. This is tyranny rather than patriotism in our lexicon.

Americans cannot understand how anyone who based his revolution upon a demand for freedom of expression can turn about and seize or suppress newspapers, drive their editors out or permit workmen to nullify editorial opinions of their employers. That means the press is no longer free.

Americans are unable to justify your seizure of property without legal process or true payment. Many citizens of Roanoke, for example, own stock in companies which established and ran industries in Cuba. They are not capitalists. This is money taken from their life savings. Expropriation and seizure are two different things and they believe you should learn the difference.

All of us are aware that your revolution could not have succeeded without some of the clandestine and even open operations of sympathizers in this country. You sponsored and encouraged it. Yet, now that the shoe is on the other foot, you have cried with rage about our "lack of neutrality." Our Government, as you are aware, is trying hard to block every leak of arms, ammunition, supplies, and men that might be used against you.

Americans remember, even if you do not, that when you took over the Government you promised without reservations that there would be free elections within the year. The elections have not been held. Is not this dictatorship and the denial of democracy—the same thing against which you inveighed before Batista was overthrown?

Americans are especially offended because, in your seemingly endless harangues, you encourage the Cuban people to believe we Americans and our Government are their enemies.

Most of all, Mr. Premier, Americans are shocked and injured of spirit because you and those about you are consorting with, even encouraging, the Communists who are sworn enemies of the United States and of true freedom wherever it exists. They are not your friends any more than they are our friends. They are using you and unless you awaken to the danger they will dispose of you when their evil purpose is served.

These are things we think each American would tell you if he could, Mr. Premier. They are things he would say because he is still a friend of Cuba and of the Cuban people even though he is disillusioned with you and your revolution which went astray.

Do not underestimate us, sir. Because the United States is a great nation and is accustomed to being kicked in the shins and spat upon by upstarts and minors does not mean that it will permit this to continue indefinitely. There comes a time when patience ends.

If there is any one thought we should like to convey to you, it is this: please halt the excess of language and action, sit down and take stock of where you are leading the Cuban people—our friends—and try to get back on course.

That great reservoir of good will which we mentioned in the beginning can be refilled to overflowing.

But you, Dr. Castro, are the only one who can do that.

We invite a reply and will be happy to print it on this page for wide circulation.

THE EDITOR.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that this letter will never see the light of day in the Cuban press. Castro would not permit it. Will Castro extend the courtesy of a reply? Castro would not dare.

Evidence Grows of Support for H.R. 10350 To Abolish Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, each day since I introduced H.R. 10350 I receive more evidence that the majority of American people favor ending the farm price support program which has reduced the income of farmers and increased the amount of Government surplus agricultural commodities.

My daily mail overwhelmingly expresses support for my proposal to cancel the present outmoded laws which have proved such a costly failure.

A typical letter from a constituent reads as follows:

I want you to know how much we approve of your action in your proposal to repeal the price support farm subsidies.

We are well aware that you will meet with much opposition. There are more fringe beneficiaries who wish to see the farce of farm support program continue than there are full-time farmers who support it. There are many also who feel the political gains may be had by supporting the farm support program. You may be bucking a stone wall presently, but you are taking a step toward sound government.

We have one small example of an acquaintance who lives on acreage in the Arlington-Darrington area who makes no bones about receiving $600 a year under the soil bank plan. This is for acreage that he says never was under cultivation. He has always been too busy logging, commercial fishing, and so forth to have time to farm.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I might cite a rancher in eastern Washington who telegraphed me:

Congratulations on your stand on farm subsidies according to today's AP release. No contracts, no supports for 1961 wheat crop. Remove present surplus from domestic market.

The president of Independent Farmers of Indiana, Inc., from Albion, Ind., wrote:

Yesterday's Indianapolis Star ran a UPI article about congressional proposals to solve the farm problem. The only hopeful bit in the rather lengthy story was the mention that you had introduced a bill to repeal the entire farm support program and restore a free economy for farmers.

Would you please send us a copy of your bill? Rest assured that the Independent Farmers of Indiana, as well as independent farm organizations of other States will support any bill that will get the Government off the backs of the farmers and make them freemen again.

Here are excerpts from other opinions which I have received:

This program has long ago served its usefulness and has been one of the most abused programs and it should definitely be discontinued at once and not permitted to continue.

Why should the farmers be paid for not producing? Why single them out? Why should we be paying millions a day for storage and the foods rotting in warehouses. They should give this surplus if surplus it is to these so-called friendly nations.

You will have the Nation's support in any action or law to abolish the farmers racket.

The small farmers are getting the short end of the stick.

Would rather see some of our staple goods, such as surplus wheat, for example, be given to some of the starving peoples of the world rather than see it in storage at a very high cost to the taxpayer and not helping anyone.

I think that if price supports were reduced and the regulations on the farmers were relaxed that it would be a big help to them.

There must be a sound farm program passed through Congress.

I would abolish all price supports.

Agricultural price supports are wrong.

I get mad.

Price supports should be done away with entirely.

We are vitally concerned.

These supports should be discontinued.

Let's stop buying the farmer's vote and let him stand on his own feet, the same as the rest of us.

I am in favor of reduced agricultural price supports.

We need a new farm program.

They have never helped the vast majority of real farmers one iota, as far as I have been able to learn.

I strongly favor your stand on reduction of agriculture price supports.

A poor price-support program, which encourages crop surplus, which benefits the larger farmer.

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Hartford Times is conducting a vital campaign in the interest of highway safety. I have been happy to support that campaign and have forwarded the following remarks for publication:

Motor vehicle traffic accidents now rank among the leading causes of death in the United States, but we pay far less attention to them than we do to such factors as heart disease, cancer, and other illnesses. A major effort of research is needed if we are going to meet the issue posed by a rising population, more and faster cars, increased highway mileage and our standard of living. I do not think we should ever accept the death toll as a blood sacrifice in return for greater convenience and comfort.

I am happy to see the Hartford Times stimulating citizen research into means of fighting the accident problem. We have been making progress in highway safety ever since the record year of 1941, when the national toll of 39,969 deaths set an alltime high. Under the vigorous leadership of Governor Ribicoff, Connecticut has been in the forefront of recent efforts to control the pattern of highway fatalities.

We need, however, to bring to bear upon this issue the brains and talent of all our people. Whatever the practical output of suggestions, the increase in public consciousness of the importance of highway safety and how to secure it would represent a major gain. It has been my feeling that periodical re-examinations of all licensed drivers would be a great step toward safety. Such examinations, if given every 10 years and if set up in an efficient manner, would be of no burden to either the State or to the licensees.

Highway safety begins at home. It begins with the driver and the pedestrian. From the proper maintenance and upkeep of today's powerful automobiles to the observance of weather and driving conditions, the human factors in the accident record are statistically provable. Youth and advancing age both affect the rates of accidents. The courts, the police, the governmental agencies can do their part, but safety is everyone's business, and it deserves the resourceful thought of all our people. I wish the Times campaign the best of fortune.

One Thousand Dollars a Minute—$1,500,000 Every Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, "$1,000 a Minute—$1,500,000 Every Day" is the caption of a leading editorial appearing in the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News on Tuesday, February 16, in support of President Eisenhower's request that Congress enact a constructive and sensible farm program.

Passaic County, N.J., farmers whom I am proud to number among my constituency have never asked me to support the crazy-quilt farm programs which are so costly to our taxpaying public, programs which have never had my support. I hope all my colleagues will read this editorial, especially those who serve on the House Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations. The editorial follows:

President Eisenhower is making another attempt to persuade the Congress to end the incredible follies of the farm price support program. All who live in Metropolitan North Jersey have a personal stake in his effort.

The program, by holding up the price the producer receives for certain basic crops, also holds up food prices that the consumer must pay. In addition, we are taxed to pay for the farm program. The annual cost is so

high that the figures have virtually no meaning for the average person. President Eisenhower, in an effort to illustrate part of the cost in comprehensible terms, put it this way:

"The Government sustains a net cost of more than $1,000 a minute—$1,500,000 every day—the year around, to stabilize wheat prices and income."

Please note, this is for wheat only:

Even worse than the cost is the effect the support program has in Mr. Eisenhower's words again: "Inexorably it generates even larger surpluses which must be expensively stored."

We cannot even give away the surplus to less fortunate people, because that would wreck the world wheat market, bring ruin to farmers in friendly countries, and create grave political unrest.

The most galling part is that the little American farmer is not the largest beneficiary of the program. Big farming corporations are the ones who do real well. In 1958, for example, one cotton producing corporation, English-owned, received $1,442,595 in price-support loans. Another received $1,216,669. A total of 250 cotton producers received $100,000 or more each.

Mr. Eisenhower says he will approve any constructive program that Congress offers him. "The important thing for farmers, and for all Americans, is for us to act sensibly and to act swiftly," he says. Tell your Representatives in Congress that you want them to support Mr. Eisenhower's efforts and come up with a workable solution to the problem.

Worldwide Story—Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in the magazine section of the New York Times, February 14, there appeared a well-written article by Gertrude Samuels entitled, "Worldwide Story—Juvenile Delinquency." The article described the problem which countries all over the world are facing, increasingly, in the area of juvenile delinquency.

The writer points out that not only has infection spread throughout the prospering, industrialized countries of the Western World, but also to less developed countries where urban growth has accelerated since the war. The article is too long for insertion in the RECORD, but I thought it important to draw attention to it, and also to state in full Miss Samuels' conclusion, which appears as follows:

The diagnosis of delinquency is difficult, they say, let alone the cure. At one time people thought only poverty was to blame; at another time, war. But today we see that the more advanced a nation becomes—such as the United States, Britain, West Germany—the more delinquent the children may become.

The technical answers usually are: establish schools, provide jobs, provide playgrounds, get parents to behave. But, while all this is important, it does not go to the root of the disease. At the root is the disregard for the eternal values of life: truth, honesty, and integrity, the love (or fear) of God. Many believe these values are leaving the modern age.

Corruption in high places, materialism, the aggressive striving for success—all must naturally have an influence on children.

In the less advanced countries, urbanization, industrialization, and social change are inevitable. What U.N. experts think is not necessarily inevitable is the social disorder which has been identified with change in the past.

Their task, as they see it, is to focus on the forces in the old order which prevented delinquency. These were the social control of the family which, in Asia, has always been paramount; a single code of morality, honoring everyone's property as being sacred; fealty to law and order; and the desire to maintain one's dignity. They want, in short, to devise ways of preserving traditions while progress is brought within reach.

One official summed up the problem—and its solution—in this way:

"Of course, juvenile delinquency is a symptom of our times—but that does not mean that we have to sit back passively and wait for the epidemic to pass.

"We have gone through many years of pouncing on the individual delinquent as being maladjusted to his society and putting the microscope on him. But many youths are having normal reactions to a total social setting that is delinquency-breeding in its selfishness, materialism, petty prejudices, and animosities. Delinquency results not only from the absence of social control, but also from exposure to organized adult delinquency and crime.

"What we need," he went on, "is a sense of public morality to permeate all of our ways of life. It may sound a little ridiculous and puritanical, but it is not really. The cult of the rugged self-centered individual—a man responsible only to himself and perhaps to his own immediate family—doesn't necessarily engender any great spirit of group responsibility.

"Somehow, there has to be a renaissance of public and private morality. If we want a solution, somehow we have to strengthen the social responsibility of the whole people. Only then is there hope for a solution to the children's problem."

Supplemental Congressional District Population, Etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, and, Mr. Speaker, because I received recently from the Library of Congress in answer to my inquiry certain congressional reapportionment and population figures which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1960, I wish to state that I have now received from the U.S. Department of Commerce, population estimates for March 26, 1959, dealing with the reapportionment of the number of Congressmen by States, together with the accompanying letter dated February 10, 1960. I respectfully submit, therefore, that this supplemental information will be found very valuable and pertinent to the subject matter:

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: I have just seen the material concerning congressional reapportionment which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4.

The material includes a table showing the States "which will lose seats in the House of Representatives after the 1960 census has been taken." While this list is based on a projection which was made by the Bureau of the Census and issued in March 1959, I think it necessary to emphasize that the apportionment as based on the official census returns may be different from that shown in the Census Bureau projections. The projections were based in part on conjecture as to future population changes and, as was pointed out in our release, "* * * it is not unlikely that several of the congressional delegations may prove to differ by one member from those shown in the table." For example, another computation that has been made using slightly different assumptions on population growth of individual States finds that on that basis California would gain only six instead of seven seats.

I am enclosing a copy of the Census Bureau release to which reference has been made.

If we can be of any assistance to you in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

PROJECTED REAPPORTIONMENT OF NUMBER OF CONGRESSMEN BY STATES

(This report, which supersedes series P–25, No. 180, reflects the effects of the imminent admission of Hawaii as a State and a revision of the projections of the population of the States to April 1, 1960.)

Under present law a reapportionment of the House of Representatives will be made by means of a stipulated computational procedure based on the population of each State as it will be found by the population count of the 1960 census. Since this reapportionment will become effective unless Congress takes specific action to change it within 15 days of the date the figures are passed along by the President, it is of interest to compute the apportionment based on the projected population by States for April 1, 1960. This projected apportionment is shown in the following table. It is emphasized that this apportionment is based in part on conjecture as to future population changes and that it is not unlikely that several of the congressional delegations may prove to differ by one member from those shown in the table.

In view of the admission of Alaska to the Union and the imminent admission of Hawaii, the computation for the apportionment for 1960 includes the Members allocated to these States within the present limitation of the size of the House of Representatives to 435 Members.

If population developments follow the course outlined in the projections of the State populations to April 1, 1960, Hawaii will receive 2 seats, Alaska 1, and 18 States will have a change in the number of Representatives to which they will be entitled. Of the 18 States with changes in the number of Representatives, 5 will gain and 13 will lose. The 1950 census returns led to losses in 9 States and gains in 6. The largest gain between 1950 and 1960 would be that of California, with 7 seats, the same as the gain for the preceding decade. Other States with gains of more than 1 Representative would be Florida 4, Michigan 2, and Texas 2. Arizona would also gain a seat. The largest losses would be suffered by New York and Pennsylvania, which would each lose 3 seats. Massachusetts and Arkansas would each lose 2 Representatives. Nine States would suffer a loss of a single Representative.

The West will be the only region to have an increase in the number of Representatives. It would have 65 seats in contrast to the present 57. The Northeast would lose 9 seats, and both the North Central region and the South would lose a seat. Alaska and Hawaii have not yet been allocated to any region.

The figures for 1960 are based on the estimated population of the States shown in Current Population Reports, Series P–25, No. 189, "Provisional Estimates of the Population of States and Selected Outlying Areas of the United States: July 1, 1958," as projected to April 1, 1960.

In addition to the uncertainties connected with the projections of the population by States, is should be noted that a shift of a relatively small number of persons between two States competing for the 435th Representative may result in a change in the number of seats assigned to each. In the apportionment based on the 1960 projections, for example, a shift of 1,000 people in the estimated population of the State assigned the 435th Representative to that of its closest competitor would have resulted in the loss of a Representative to this competitor.

Legislative procedure of apportionment: The 1960 census of population will be taken as of April 1, 1960. The Bureau of the Census has 8 months from the start of enumeration to determine the total population of the States. Upon completion of this tabulation, the Bureau will transmit these totals and an apportionment of the present number of Representatives (435) by the method of "equal proportions" to the President of the United States. The President in turn will transmit this information to the Congress within the first week of the first regular session in January 1961. Within 15 days of the receipt of the message from the President, the Clerk of the House of Representatives will inform the executives of each of the States of the number of Members of the House of Representatives to which his State is entitled in the following Congress. Thus, the reapportionment of seats among the States made as a result of the 1960 census will become effective in the elections for the 88th Congress in November 1962.

Membership in the House of Representatives as based on the 1950 census, and hypothetical membership as based on projections of the populations of the States for 1960

Region, division, and State	1960	1950	Changes	
			Gains[1]	Losses
United States	435	435	19	19
Regions:				
Northeast	106	115		9
North Central	128	129	2	3
South	133	134	6	7
West	65	57	8	
Divisions:				
New England	25	28		3
Middle Atlantic	81	87		6
East North Central	89	87	2	
West North Central	39	42		3
South Atlantic	61	60	4	3
East South Central	30	32		2
West South Central	42	42	2	2
Mountain	17	16	1	
Pacific	48	41	7	
New England:				
Maine	2	3		1
New Hampshire	2	2		
Vermont	1	1		
Massachusetts	12	14		2
Rhode Island	2	2		
Connecticut	6	6		
Middle Atlantic:				
New York	40	43		3
New Jersey	14	14		
Pennsylvania	27	30		3
East North Central:				
Ohio	23	23		
Indiana	11	11		
Illinois	25	25		
Michigan	20	18	2	
Wisconsin	10	10		

Membership in the House of Representatives as based on the 1950 census, and hypothetical membership as based on projections of the populations of the States for 1960—Continued

Region, division, and State	1960	1950	Changes	
			Gains[1]	Losses
West North Central:				
Minnesota	8	9		1
Iowa	7	8		1
Missouri	11	11		
North Dakota	2	2		
South Dakota	2	2		
Nebraska	4	4		
Kansas	5	6		1
South Atlantic:				
Delaware	1	1		
Maryland	7	7		
Virginia	10	10		
West Virginia	5	6		1
North Carolina	11	12		1
South Carolina	6	6		
Georgia	9	10		1
Florida	12	8	4	
East South Central:				
Kentucky	8	8		
Tennessee	9	9		
Alabama	8	9		1
Mississippi	5	6		1
West South Central:				
Arkansas	4	6		2
Louisiana	8	8		
Oklahoma	6	6		
Texas	24	22	2	
Mountain:				
Montana	2	2		
Idaho	2	2		
Wyoming	1	1		
Colorado	4	4		
New Mexico	2	2		
Arizona	3	2	1	
Utah	2	2		
Nevada	1	1		
Pacific:				
Washington	7	7		
Oregon	4	4		
California	37	30	7	
Alaska	1		1	
Hawaii	2		2	

[1] Alaska and Hawaii have not been allocated to any division or region.

On Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article written by Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann of the Congregation Zuchron Moshe in my district.

The article follows:

ON LAW AND ORDER

(By Julius G. Neumann)

It was first on Christmas Day, 1959 that the world learned of the reappearance of the vile form of the swastika on the walls of the rebuilt synagogue of Cologne, Germany. A few days later news of desecrated houses of worship came from many parts of the world. In no time the plague spread to our own backyard.

Are these the deeds of juveniles who know not what they do, or is it the fruit of a concerted effort highly organized? Over a month has passed since we learned of the desecrations and the news remains continuous with policemen posted at our doorsteps. The latest, painted swastikas over 70 tombstones in a Staten Island Jewish Cemetery.

It is well that all these be seen in proper perspective, that the wall scrawls of a backward child not be viewed as comparable to the recurrence of the Nazi disease in Germany. But it is also important that both children and adults learn that there is nothing funny about such behavior, that the community has no patience with those who play with racial or religious fire, that out of small prankish prejudice larger flames can be ignited.

We cannot know at once—and for some time it will remain speculation—whether the act was perpetrated by a Nazi or a nitwit or both, but it is a reminder that the plague of intolerance still haunts every land, not excluding our own.

For a few days I myself was of the opinion that space given these outrages in the press may well help induce other new outbreaks. But this very same thought, I reminded myself, was advanced when Hitler first sought power in Germany and those who then advocated the silent treatment have since had mortal cause to rue their advice.

While I concede that newspaper reports of the incident in Germany had something to do with triggering outbreaks elsewhere, it has been also found to be true that hate groups have an active, though informal communication system of their own. It would be wrong for editors to decide that outbreaks of this sort were not of great enough concern to merit larger space. The press must reflect conditions as they appear, and if it fails to do this, freedom will not have long to endure. When such acts of desecration are fully publicized, the public is informed that an evil virus is afoot and has a chance to react against it. When we keep such events secret, we allow the cancer to grow.

Who is using the weapon of these passions and why? Hitler used it with success as a black magic to swell his power as does Nasser today. The little imitators to be found in America use it as a small-time racket. Their acts have the reverse effect of that intended, and will only impress upon our people the necessity of cherishing the precious heritage they have in freedom of worship. They find it a weapon neither for conquest nor massive resistance. It represents a feeble scattered terrorism of despair. The majority of humanity rejects it. Even German leaders abhor it.

The question is, as far as our own America is concerned, what legal means will be taken to make these swastika outrages too perilous to repeat. Even a racist fanatic will hesitate, when there is considerable risk. We need stronger laws here against defacing places of worship, not as offenses against property but as outrages against religious liberty. In speaking with Assemblyman Joseph J. Weiser, I was gratified to learn that he was ready to introduce such bill in the now opening legislative session, only to be told that such bill had been introduced already. On the national scene we find our Representatives FARBSTEIN and LINDSAY studying the matter thoroughly and advising the use of existing statutes to avoid repetition of such terroristic acts. It should compel the Attorney General of the United States to recognize the growing menace of hate mongering and use the powers of his office to deal with it.

Anti-Semitism is not a Jewish problem, it is primarily a Christian problem, and as far as my Jewish brethren and I are concerned, I would like to quote: "Don't ask the Jews what they are going to do," said Rabbi Asaria of Cologne's desecrated synagogue, "go to the Christians and ask them what they are going to do."

I still hope and pray that Christmas will be known by its eternal prayer of peace on Earth and good will toward all men, that the words of the Prophet Micah (IV: 3–4) will yet come to be,

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-

hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore. And they shall sit every man under his vine and under his figtree; and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken."

Boland Favors Early Civil Rights Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights issue was presented before the Senate this week and I certainly hope that this legislation will soon be brought onto the floor of the House. In view of this, I recommended to my colleagues that they read the following editorial from the Boston Herald on February 11, 1960, entitled "Enforcing a Right":

ENFORCING A RIGHT

The 15th amendment is one of the shortest and clearest articles in the Constitution. Its first section provides:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The second says simply:

The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Yet in the 90 years since its adoption the article has never been obeyed in the section of the country to which it was particularly addressed, the 11 States of the southern confederacy, and Congress has been unable to devise appropriate legislation to enforce it.

In 1871 the national lawmakers tried. In one of the "force bills" (based technically on another section of the Constitution) they authorized the appointment of "election supervisors" by the Federal courts in districts where two or more citizens requested Federal oversight of the registration of voters for congressional elections.

But political administration of the law resulted in so many abuses and so little improvement in Negro registration that the whole scheme was dropped in 1894.

Now, with civil rights again a major political issue and with the Civil Rights Commission reporting flagrant interference with Negro voting in several Southern States, new efforts are being made to carry out the mandate of the 15th amendment. But the going is still sticky.

The problem at the moment is to get the proponents of civil rights legislation to agree on a bill.

The Civil Rights Commission proposes that the Federal Government appoint its own registrars in areas where Negroes are denied the vote. But this, being a purely administrative process, would apply only to Federal elections.

The administration supports a plan under which the courts would appoint referees to investigate registration holdups in both State and Federal elections and order individuals to be placed on the rolls in appropriate cases.

Others are agitating for still more sweeping and effective enforcement.

It is far from certain now whether the various civil rights group can get together on a bill and pass it over the bitter-end objections of the southern bloc in Congress. It is even less certain whether such a bill, if passed, will prove more effective than the old "force bill." Custom is strong and apathy is even stronger.

Yet the times call for a determined effort to meet the problem. Voting discrimination violates a basic principle of our democracy. And in a world where democracy itself is fighting for survival we cannot let this flaw in our own system go unchallenged.

The spirit of the 15th amendment will prevail in the long run because the country as a whole is determined that it shall. But education may have to play a greater role than force in bringing it about.

Capitol Hill's Robin Hoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the February 11 issue of Suburban Life, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on the subject of Federal aid to education, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House and Senate:

CAPITOL HILL'S ROBIN HOODS

Federal aid to education proposals are flooding Congress once more with most of them ranging from the impractical to the ridiculous.

A notable exception is President Eisenhower's recommendation that funds be made available for school-building purposes where the need is evident. Matching funds should be provided by the benefiting districts, as the financial responsibility is primarily theirs.

Because of its comparatively high per capita income, Illinois stands to give far more than it receives in many of the Federal aid to education plans under discussion. These range from programs to help only the neediest States to those calling for National Government subsidies on a per pupil basis.

The great weakness in such schemes is the refusal of these spenders to go below the State level in their analyses. Illinois, for example, rates among the States in least need of Federal assistance on a State basis. Yet there are many Illinois school districts that are strapped for funds and many property owners being taxed to the hilt for educational purposes.

The same shallow thinking prevails when comparisons are made between the amount of money spent annually for liquor and tobacco and the amount spent for educational purposes. These scattershot statistics make it look like the average American puts out more for alcoholic beverages and smokes than he does for schools.

If they were collected on a local basis here, however, the picture would be far different. The average family here contributes far more for education than it spends for the other items.

Furthermore, these deceptive national figures fail to take into account the great personal sacrifices many families make in order to enable the children to obtain college educations or special training.

It takes a minimum of $6,500 to send a youngster to college for 4 years. The average family doesn't spend this much on liquor in 30 years.

Also ignored are huge sums spent for the operation of parochial and private schools.

Catholic schools in Chicago have invested $3 million in sprinkler systems as a fire safety measure in the last 12 months, and another $5 million must be spent for that measure in 1960. Suburban parishes have been given individual assessments ranging as high as $25,000 this year for an archdiocesan high school expansion program.

Lutheran, Seventh-day Adventist, Christian Reform, and other denominations which prefer their own school systems also spend millions of dollars annually for their operation.

No matter what the Federal aid to education program, there is one inescapable fact: it must be financed by the taxpayers. Furthermore, such national programs are a bureaucrat's dream; they take men and money for administrative purposes.

There is no such thing as free Federal money, whether it be for schools or other purposes. The Federal funds that may dribble back to school districts here would be substantially less than the amount sweated out of local taxpayers by the Government in Washington.

We have no Santa Claus on Capitol Hill. Instead we have many Robin Hoods with a common psychosis; they would take from all the people to give to some of them. Chicago's western suburbs could lose plenty under such an arrangement.

We would be far better off with a reduction in colossal Federal expenditures on all fronts and a realistic increase in school taxes where necessary on a local basis. In that way we would get 100-percent return for our educational investment.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a letter has just come to me from an old and valued friend, Mr. Ralph E. Randel of Panhandle, Tex. The contents of Mr. Randel's letter is similar to many which come to me from others in the 18th Congressional District of Texas which I have the honor to represent. Mr. Randel's communication expresses simply and succinctly the thinking which is prevalent in homes all over our great country. His letter reflects a situation which has been echoed by me for several years in this august body, and I commend the studied comments of Mr. Randel to the Members of the Congress:

RANDEL MOTOR CO.,
Panhandle, Tex., February 1, 1960.

Mr. WALTER ROGERS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: At breakfast this morning my wife and I read that we were contemplating a $40 million loan to Poland. The paper said that this would be the third one of a similar size in the past year. I don't believe this needs any comment. It is so small in proportion to the billions we have loaned and have given outright that it is hardly worth of notice. The reason why it hit us wrong was that we had just decided that we would have to wait until later to paint our house because we had to borrow money to pay our income tax. Our house needs painting but we can't paint it. We are thrifty people and do not throw money away. We have a daughter in college and she gets by on a minimum we feel. The sad economic fact is that we cannot quite keep

even with the board and pay the very high cost of living today. We don't, then, feel very good when we see that we are giving money away all over the world and at the same time raising our national debt as well.

The American taxpayer cannot continue to work long hours and pay high taxes to subsidize people of the world that make fun of us for being money grabbers or money mad. It seems to me that the Congress must establish a program for "relief" of the taxpayer. We are bankrupting ourselves by playing like there is no end to what we can spend and give away. We are there now, Walter, and God help us if we don't realize it before it's too late.

Very truly yours,

RALPH E. RANDEL.

Sewer System Seen Most Urgent South Kingstown Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Westerly (R.I.) Sun of January 7, 1960:

SEWER SYSTEM SEEN MOST URGENT SOUTH KINGSTOWN NEED

The construction of a sewage disposal system is South Kingstown's most urgent need and the conditions which it would alleviate become worse yearly, the South Kingstown Sewer Study Committee said today.

The statement was made in a letter to the Municipal Planning Board which replied to several comments made by the board in a review of the sewer committee's report on the proposed Wakefield-Peace Dale disposal system.

At the request of the town council the planning board reviewed the report of the sewer study committee. Its comments were contained in a letter sent to councilmen December 31.

Points made by the planning board in its review of the sewer report were:

1. The sewer system is one of many needed projects which should be ranked on a priority basis.

2. If the system is to be constructed, the initial stage should serve only the critical areas.

3. The board is concerned with the assessments and rates proposed by the study committee. These should be considered in the light of the ability of the residents of the community to pay and the value of the property connected to the sewage system.

The sewer study committee letter, signed by Donald A. Campbell, chairman, says the committee agrees with the planning board on the need for a plan for meeting long-range community needs.

But it adds, "we firmly believe that a sewage disposal system is our most immediate need, since it has been under consideration for 65 years and conditions which it would alleviate become worse yearly.

"Any new municipal improvements in this proposed area, such as a consolidated elementary school, a police station and jail, should be serviced by adequate sewage facilities," the letter continues.

In its opening statement the committee says the sewage system is an important step and merits "a full and frank discussion of all questions raised by such a project."

"The assessments and rates as proposed in our report are the result of several months' study, during which other means of financing a sewage system were given careful consideration," the committee says.

The committee attempted to tailor a flexible system suited to the needs of the town. "Methods of financing sewer systems vary greatly and there appears to be no standard method. We firmly believe that we have presented the most equitable and feasible plan for South Kingstown," the committee says.

"Other sewer systems in Rhode Island were studied and Walter Shea, chief sanitary engineer for the State, and Carleton Maine, the senior sanitary engineer, were consulted," the committee says.

"The size of the proposed system was carefully considered by your board (the planning board), the town council, and Metcalf and Eddy before this committee began to study the financial aspects. This recurrent question of the possibility of a reduction in the size of the project was discussed again in our committee's ocnference with C. G. Hammann of the engineering firm. At that time he reiterated their firm conviction that attempting to reduce the proposed works in any significant manner would be impractical and uneconomical," the committee says.

"We hope that our report will be studied further by the community as a whole, so that the town can make a decision before construction costs become even higher," the committee concludes.

A public hearing on the sewer proposal is scheduled for Monday night at 8 at the town hall.

Aid, an Arm of American Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, 1959, the Honorable William E. Warne, former aid mission chief in Iran, Brazil, and Korea, described for the third annual World Affairs Institute at the University of Oregon in Eugene, the U.S. foreign-aid programs as an arm of America diplomacy.

Mr. Warne will be remembered as a longtime employee of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior, he having completed his 16 years of service there with 4 years as Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development. After more than 7 years abroad for the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies, Mr. Warne returned to California, his home, at Gov. Pat Brown's call to become director of the department of Fish and Game on April 1, 1959. On January 4, 1960, Governor Brown moved him to the State department of agriculture, where he now serves as director.

This background will give additional weight to the very thoughtful discussion that Mr. Warne has presented on one of the most important problems before the American people.

The address follows:

AID, AN ARM OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

(By William E. Warne, director, California Department of Fish and Game, formerly Director of Foreign Aid programs in Iran, Brazil, and Korea [1])

Since World War II, the United States has developed as an arm of her diplomacy a group of programs commonly called foreign aid. This is without previous parallel in history.

Conquest, colonial envelopment, and subversion have given way before this new instrument, well designed to support the traditional foreign policy of the U.S. Government. The old programs have as their objectives, though the various authorization acts state them in different terms, the assistance of friendly and cooperating nations to realize their own aspirations. The technical cooperation program, for example, is designed to assist friendly peoples to do for themselves the things that are needed to advance them toward their own personal and national goals. Aid provided under this banner, seeking no short-term political ends, and given without strings attached, is an embodiment of the longstanding policy of the United States to refrain from interfering in internal affairs of her friends and neighbors, to help nations to remain independent and self-determinant.

There is considerable confusion in the public mind with regard to American foreign aid programs. Much of this confusion grows out of the constantly changing nomenclature, organization, and legislative enactments that have prevented the development of any easily recognizable image of foreign aid. In one 6 months' period, with exactly the same organization, doing exactly the same thing abroad, I had three titles, my staff had three designations, and the organization three letterheads in quick succession. If this had been the only instance of rapid reorganization, the resulting confusion would not have been so deep. Unfortunately, almost every year, there has been a major element added, a major element dropped, a new name given, or a new agency created.

If you can, I will ask you today to consider our foreign aid programs as a single and undivided effort, the exertion of the energy of a new arm of American diplomacy. If you will, please consider with me the generous rehabilitation of Italy, West Germany, and Japan, the Marshall plan, the aid to Greece and Turkey under the Truman doctrine, the technical cooperation programs organized under the spur of point 4 of the President's inauguration address in January of 1949, the programs for distribution abroad of surplus agricultural commodities, special economic assistance programs, economic programs in defense support, military assistance, the development loan funds, President Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace, and additional miscellaneous projects and programs—such as the Fulbright scholarships—as constituting a single program of foreign aid.

These different and sometimes disparate programs have all been parts of one effort, although it at times has been inadequately coordinated, to support American diplomacy. As time has run on, a strong tendency has developed to bring all of these programs together at a single point abroad. A pattern has developed in the field of a country team, of which the Ambassador is captain, of which the Aid Mission Chief, the Military Adviser, and other representatives of Washington agencies with programs in the field, are members. The country team seeks field coordination of all efforts for maximum effectiveness. This pattern is almost universally applied at this time, although the facility of the country team is still in the

[1] Presented at the University of Oregon, Eugene, "World Affairs Week," Thursday noon, Nov. 12, 1959.

process of development, and has some remaining weaknesses.

The act of placing the Ambassador in the position of captain of the county team, has done more than almost any other event to crystallize an understanding of the fact that aid is in support of diplomacy.

While the foreign aid program is brought together at a single point of application in the field, there is no unity among the agencies which administer the separate programs in Washington. Efforts have been made to equip, through organizational processes, the State Department to direct and coordinate these programs in Washington, but these efforts have been fitful and largely ineffective. Paralleling them in time have been other movements that have resulted in additional fractionalization and division. The Foreign Operations Administration was renamed by the Congress the International Cooperation Administration and placed in the State Department as a semi-independent agency. At almost the same time, however, administration of the surplus agriculture commodities used in foreign aid was returned to the Agriculture Department. When the Development Loan Fund was created a short time ago, it was made separate both from the ICA and the State Department. Efforts have been made to centralize policy direction in the State Department, but this has suffered the fate of all attempts to gain unity of policy at the hands of multiple agencies with dispersed authority and operational control. It has worked poorly.

Those of us who spent many of these difficult years working abroad in the program, frequently felt such frustration growing out of this changing background as to question whether in fact progress was being made toward a solution. The remarkable vitality of the foreign aid program is demonstrated by its survival and continuing effectiveness under all handicaps.

I, personally, was in Iran from November 1951 to March 1955, in Brazil from May 1955 to June 1956, and in Korea from July, 1956 until March 1959 as the head of aid missions. Despite all, I assure you that the sometimes hectic things that we were doing were beneficial, effective and appreciated. Now that I have been home long enough to observe the forest without bumping into all of the rough-barked trees, I see that the foreign aid program generally has been successful in supporting American diplomacy.

What have been the results? Western Europe has political stability and economic revival and growth. Greece and Turkey, once under savage attack through subversion, have recovered clearly independent status and have grown in strength and determination to adhere to compatible free world principles. Iran, dragged to the brink of destruction, has been enabled to resume her traditional independent position, and has restored her economy and national integrity. South Korea and South Vietnam have been reconstructed and stabilized. The free Asiatic nations remain free, and while constantly threatened have made some advances toward security. In Africa and Latin America relatively modest programs have underscored the insistence of our Government that our neighbors and friends be permitted to work out their own destinies.

Trouble spots have developed and do exist. It might be concluded without close examination that the new arm of American diplomacy did not have strength to support the American position in these instances. Syria, which became a part of the Arab Republic with Egypt, never received American aid. Iraq, which was the scene of disquieting political changes, was organized typically from the point of view of the American aid program. Efforts to extend effective assistance in Egypt early encountered the obstacle of rampant Arab nationalism. The foreign aid program has difficulty or cannot operate effectively in possessions of colonial powers such as some notably disturbed ones in Africa. In some areas at the periphery of the Iron Curtain, the contest has been indecisive with the U.S.S.R. adding a facsimile of our own aid program to others of her own in order to gain ascendency, which, as yet, she has not been able to achieve.

American diplomacy, even with the added strength of its new arm, cannot be expected to prevent political eruption. What is hoped of it is that it will prevent such eruptions from becoming conflagrations. This, of course, has been achieved.

Critics of the foreign aid program attack it as being more than we can afford, wasteful, unrealistic, gratuitous, and ineffective.

"This foreign aid is bleeding us white," an acquaintance said to me as I helped him hitch his boat trailer on the back of his station wagon.

There has been no time in our history when the standard of living in the United States has risen so high as that since the Second World War, the identical period during which the foreign aid program has developed. I think in the light of this we can dismiss allegations that our aid is more than we can afford. If the disparity between the level of living in the United States and that of other countries, now friendly to us, continues unameliorated or deepens, I think it will only be a question of time until we suffer the fate of Imperial Rome.

Charges that the program is wastefully administered have discomposed me most. Most of the aid programs are carried out by the host government or an agency within the host nation. The projects are not the work of the American technician and administrator who is sent abroad. These well-qualified Americans work with and through host nationals in effecting the projects. Usually the influence of the Americans is not in depth. In such circumstances, obviously, the projects will be shaped by the local customs, methods, and practices. Each aid administrator abroad endeavors to assist his counterparts to improve methods of operation. Nevertheless, the fact that the work is done by the local national means often that it is not done as efficiently as it might have been done in the United States. In Korea, each of the 300 Americans on my staff when I was the economic coordinator, including stenographers and the mission director, on the average had supervision over the expenditure of $1 million a year of American aid funds. At the same time, an average of program expenditures divided among total staff available to supervise those expenditures in the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency which I once knew intimately, gave a factor of only $17,500. In which agency is it reasonable to expect the closer supervision and the more efficient operation? I certainly never would condone waste of public funds. My own experience abroad convinced me that the aid funds were being used as carefully as possible under the circumstances.

Another one of my friends said to me, "They are just making suckers out of us; taking our aid we thrust upon them and doing as they please." This gentleman was reflecting a reaction that frequently develops when the leader of a friendly nation does something that might be described as plucking a feather out of the tail of the American eagle, or as tweaking the beard of Uncle Sam. Our policy is one of encouraging self-determination. We are not being naive when we assist a country, the leader of which from time to time takes an action which affronts us. We must try to understand that such actions may have different aspects half a world away. Also, the cultural and political background against which the act was taken might give it quite a different interpretation in the country in question. We must also realize that some things that we do, completely understanding them here within the borders of our own country, seem utterly inexplicable and highly offensive to some people abroad. The foreign aid program should not be used at any time for short range political purposes. In other words, American aid should not be a reward for some immediate act on the part of a friendly government. Likewise aid should not be diminished as punishment for isolated unfriendly actions, which affront our pride. Aid programs are long term. The execution of projects requires much time. Just as our foreign policy is long range and unchanging, just as it is held above partisan strife, so its new arm, foreign aid, must be long range in its objectives. It must be supported by a constancy of purpose. The annual uncertainty of authorization and appropriation mitigates against its full success.

Still another friend of mine said to me, "I was abroad, and, from what I saw, I thought that they did not appreciate at all the sacrifices we make to give them foreign aid." In most of the countries where our aid is being given, making a living, keeping body and soul together, is a real and earnest job. Likewise, the preservation of internal security and the maintenance of peace are serious assignments for the governments. Our aid frequently contributes to the success of the efforts of the population and the government to achieve these immediate goals. This contribution, however, does not lift their burdens, but at best only eases them. The tasks at hand still require all of the energies of the people and their officials. We should not continuously seek expressions of gratitude and appreciation. It seems so unbecoming of a great people. Even with our massive assistance, the Korean gross national product still is less than $150 per capita as compared to about $2,400 in the United States. Our reward for our aid should be taken in the mutual respect and friendship between our nations and our peoples.

"You have been giving Korea about $300 million a year for 5 years," one of my friends said to me. "Why isn't the job done?"

Long-range jobs cannot be completed in a short time. The fact that aid, even of substantial amounts, does not cure all of the recognizable ills immediately, should not be a reason to call it ineffective. Many have been most unrealistic in their appraisal of the need. The Communist war in Korea destroyed more than $3 billion of property in South Korea. Our aid in Korea since the war ended, has enabled a resumption of orderly functioning of the Government and a restoration of the level of living of the people. Reconstruction has been completed and a development era is being entered. With the military commitments that Korea has in behalf of herself, the United States, and the whole of the free world, it is not likely that viability can be achieved in her economy without long continuation of outside assistance. It would be most unreasonable to expect anything other than this. Our aid to Korea has been phenomenally successful. It has not, however, resolved the problems of Korea. These problems are coextensive with the problems of the free world. The country is divided as the world is divided and for the same reasons. Only when it will be possible to lift some of the restrictions placed on Korea by the cold war can final solutions of the problems of Korea be found.

The richest experience of my life has been to have participated in this unique experiment in international relations that is represented by the foreign aid program. Those who would really like to know what some of our aid activities mean to the people

abroad should have been with me on occasions that moved me deeply. I believe they would have felt more than satisfied with what their tax dollars were buying.

In Iran in 1952, at a village called Khoshkrood, virulent typhoid fever broke out. Twenty-three of the few hundred residents had died by the time the messenger reached our headquarters in Teheran, some 50 miles away. A mobile health unit was dispatched. I went with the Minister of Health, Dr. Ali Maliki, to visit the unit a few days later. It was dark when we came to the turnoff in the desert that led to the town. It was bitterly cold as we more or less felt our way along the trail toward the village gate. We were met by what seemed to be the whole of the population of the village. There in the dark, men and boys, women and girls, were drawn up on either side of the road, lit by a few dim lanterns.

"There have been no more deaths," one reported.

Another said, "When, in the eternal night that soon will follow this one, you reach the bridge before the gate of heaven, we will testify for you and let no one turn you aside."

Far up the Amazon at a health center set up by a cooperative project under the direction of the Brazilian Government and our foreign aid, one may see any day mothers with their babies brought for inoculation. Since this program began, 10 years have been added to the expectancy of life for those who live in the Amazon Basin.

In Korea, along almost any road, if the word got out that an American was coming, boys and girls of the 4–H Clubs probably would appear, wave Korean and American flags made with crayons on scratch paper and hold up their chickens or rabbits, or now and then a young pig to be seen.

"Hello," they would shout, grinning and frantically waving, "OK, Miguk"—(OK, America).

How much is it worth to you as an individual to have these boys and girls around the world excitedly yelling "OK, America"? It is costing you less than 5 cents of your Federal tax dollar today to support the whole structure of foreign aid and all of its components, including military aid, plus contributions to multilateral programs, to boot.

If this new arm of our foreign policy continues to help underpin peace and to make the world a safer place in which to live, it will be worth whatever it costs. The foreign aid program deserves our earnest study and support. It is a bold, an American, a Christian experiment in strengthening diplomacy. In my view, despite all, it has succeeded.

Protection of Vanishing Wildlife in Illinois, a Vital Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as one who is vitally interested in the conservation and the preservation of wildlife, I present for the consideration of the House, an article reprinted from "Illinois Wildlife," which I believe has great significance. I feel sure that every Illinois Member of Congress shares my concern in perpetuating the life of the Illinois prairie chicken which may well become extinct on the American scene.

Certainly there are other Members of this body who have a genuine interest in the preservation of wildlife in other areas of the country and who may find this article of particular interest, too.

The article follows:

ILLINOIS PRAIRIE CHICKENS NEED YOUR HELP

"Old soldiers never die, they just fade away." These words from any old Army song later made famous by General MacArthur can well be applied to our Illinois prairie chickens.

Since settlement of Illinois began a century and a half ago, these magnificent birds have tried to hold their ancestral booming and nesting grounds. In the 1850's, after the settlers had cleared much forest land and when they had begun to plow down the prairie sod, prairie chicken populations reached a peak. Waste grain and weed seeds provided a new, more plentiful supply of food and there were still large acreages of wild grassland for nesting and rearing young. Today, the native grassland has long since been plowed under, but prairie chickens have held on in some less intensively cultivated parts of the priarie region and, at times, have been very numerous there. Since World War II, however, mechanized agriculture and new farming practices have weakened the last strongholds of the prairie chicken. The resonant booming of the male prairie chickens is gradually being lost in the drone of tractors.

Only 1,000 to 3,000 prairie chickens can now be found in the State. Yet field studies conducted by the Illinois natural history survey during the past 25 years have given evidence that if permanent grassland refuges are provided for them in a few strategic places, there is a good chance that colonies of these birds can be preserved indefinitely for future generations to enjoy.

An example of an effective man-made environment can be found near at hand. About 1875, farmers in a dozen south-central Illinois counties began to raise seed crops of domestic grasses, redtop and timothy, and until World War II, such grass seed was the principal cash crop of this region. The cultivated grasses were harvested late in the season and thus they provided relatively safe places for prairie chickens to nest and rear their young. They effectively took the place of the native prairie vegetation. Sporting journals published in the 1880's pointed out that although prairie chickens were very scarce in central and northern Illinois they were still numerous in the south-central counties. Until recently, prairie chickens continued to thrive in that region. Often the birds ranged over ground frequented by domestic poultry and livestock, and often they lived in small colonies on isolated prairies for many years.

It is evident that wild prairie chickens in good environment have the capacity to produce large enough numbers of young to compensate for losses caused by hunters, predators, and many other decimating factors. However, prairie chickens have a relatively short breeding period, chiefly from April to mid-June. They are not well equipped to withstand severe nesting losses such as occur in grain farming districts where hay is harvested in late May or early June. Thus, when farmers of the redtop region, about 15 years ago, found it was more profitable to lime and fertilize their land for grain crops than to produce redtop and timothy seed, the nesting cover almost disappeared and the prairie chicken population began to decline sharply.

In 1953, the National Wildlife Federation recognized the prairie chicken as a threatened species and was instrumental in establishing a national committee on the prairie chicken. This committee is now engaged in setting up a national prairie chicken refuge in the Flint Hills region of Kansas. It also has attempted to stimulate interest in the conservation of prairie chickens in the States where they are still present.

Although a few of the Plains States still have prairie grouse in large enough numbers to permit limited hunting, in most cases, conservation measures are based on the esthetic appeal of the prairie chicken. The first report of the National Committee on the Prairie Chicken stated, "The prairie chicken is not only a magnificent bird, a prime example of native wildlife, it is an inseparable part of American tradition. Its colorful courtship antics on the booming grounds were adapted in the dances and pageantry of the American Indian. It flushed in whirring flocks ahead of the covered wagons as the pioneers pushed from Ohio toward the Rockies. It provided food for the pioneers and its friendly booming dispelled the solitude of the lonely prairies. It must not be permitted to pass from the American scene."

Friends of the prairie chicken in Illinois for several years have attempted to alert the public to its alarming decrease since World War II. These warnings led to the establishment in July 1959 of the Prairie Chicken Foundation of Illinois. The Prairie Chicken Foundation is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the task of preserving for future generations some representative colonies of Illinois prairie chickens. Parent organizations of this foundation were the Illinois Audubon Society, the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, the Illinois Division of Izaak Walton League of America, and the Illinois Chapter of Nature Conservancy, Inc. The officers of the new foundation are J. W. Galbreath, chairman, of East St. Louis; Ralph Smith, vice chairman, of Chicago; Mrs. Madeline Dorosheff, secretary, of Springfield; and George B. Fell, treasurer, of Rockford.

The Illinois Natural History Survey, Illinois Department of Conservation, and the Prairie Chicken Foundation of Illinois are cooperating in an effort to locate the remaining colonies of prairie chickens and to find areas that promise to be most effective as prairie chicken refuges. The accompanying map summarizes the reports of prairie chicken colonies received as a result of questionnaires sent in 1957 to about 1,000 rural mail carriers throughout the Illinois prairie chicken range. Prairie chickens were reported to be still present in slightly more than 100 localities in 24 counties. Although these colonies were widely distributed in south-central Illinois and a few other places, in almost every case the birds were reported to be decreasing steadily.

One reason for the remarkable tenacity shown by Illinois prairie chickens in their present unfavorable environment is the fact that since ancient times they have undergone natural selection which gave them a high adaptability to this region. Prairie chickens, probably indistinguishable from those of today, roamed the grasslands of the Mississippi Valley during the Ice Age. They were able to cope with climatic changes, natural enemies, and in later centuries, with human hunters. Dr. Paul Parmalee of the Illinois State Museum has identified the bones of prairie chickens from Indian midden heaps at the Modoc site in Randolph County which date back as far as 4000–3000 B.C., and many more prairie chicken bones from the Cahokia site in Madison County which were left there by Indian hunters probably during the period A.D. 1200–1550.

To establish adequate grassland refuge areas in one or more places within the remaining range of prairie chickens in Illinois will require much work by interested individuals, as well as many financial contributions toward a fund for purchasing or leasing refuge land.

The Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich. I feel that this is an excellent article on the President's recent farm message and one which merits the attention of the entire membership of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

THE FARM MESSAGE

President Eisenhower's 1960 farm message was clear as to the need for changes in the system under which the country is continuing to pile up crop surpluses which must be stored at a staggering cost to the taxpayers.

There is no difficulty in pinpointing the need for changes in a system under which the Government, as Mr. Eisenhower said in his message, is spending $1,500,000 each day—$1,000 a minute—in an effort to stabilize wheat prices alone.

The President warned that unless constructive action is taken promptly "the danger is very real that this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation."

In stressing need for elimination of the obvious evils of the farm program, Mr. Eisenhower said that "it defies common sense to continue to encourage, at the cost of many millions of tax dollars, the building of ever larger excess supplies of products that, as they accumulate, depress farm prices and endanger the future of our farmers."

It also might have been said that the farmers are not the only ones whose future is involved but that all taxpayers have a vital stake in action based on economic soundness rather than political advantage.

But while the President found it easy to emphasize the need for changes he did not attempt to lay down a specific program for Congress to enact.

Instead, the whole tone of the election-year message was to put it squarely up to the Democratic-controlled Congress to do something about solving the problems the President outlined.

Mr. Eisenhower said he would approve legislation that "will eliminate production controls or make them really effective or allow the farmers themselves to choose between realistic alternatives." He also said he is willing to gear supports to market prices of previous years or to establish supports in accordance with provisions of law or to relate price supports to parity.

The President repeated his recommendation for a wheat program which would eliminate acreage allotments and marketing quotas beginning with the 1961 crop.

This raises the question, however, of whether the farmers should expect any form of payment from public funds without subjecting themselves to controls needed to keep the present situation from becoming much worse than it is.

This question seems to have been recognized by the President when he said elsewhere in his message that it must be recognized that the higher the support the more the farmer must be regimented. It would seem to follow that when there is any Government support there must be some control.

Among Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations was a proposal for a three-year extension of the soil bank land retirement program and an expansion from the present 28 million acres to 60 million acres. The President proposed that the Government be permitted to make rental payments on retired land in the form of crop surpluses as well as cash.

The Agriculture Department has estimated ultimate cost of the expanded soil bank program at $875 million a year compared with the present spending level of $375 million.

If there were assurance that such increased soil bank spending would result in commensurate curtailment of overproduction the President's recommendation would appear to be sound. But there has been criticism of the soil bank operations by those who charge that much of the land placed in the soil bank and rented by the Government with tax money had not been used regularly for crop production and therefore did not serve the proper purpose of the soil bank.

The President has called on Congress to overhaul the farm program and make it "sensible and economically sound." Such an overhaul is long overdue. There is a serious question, however, as to whether the overhaul will come in an election year in which both parties will be bidding for the farm vote.

Congress has the duty of enacting a sensible and sound program. But until it does so, the executive branch of the Government has the duty of exerting every effort to see to it that all operations under the present program are managed in a way that will prevent any unnecessary drain on the public purse.

Report by Hon. Malcolm Wilson on Progress Made Under Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual 1960 dinner of the Westchester County Republican Committee, which was recently held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, we were privileged to have as main speaker, Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, a distinguished son of Westchester County, N.Y.

It was with intense pride that I listened to the report by the Honorable Malcolm Wilson on the great progress that has been made by the Republican administration of the Empire State, under the combined leadership of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller and the Lieutenant Governor.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include in the RECORD Lieutenant Governor Wilson's presentation which outlines the significant achievements that have been attained during the past year.

Every American who is interested in a sound, orderly and efficient government that has the heart and soul of the people's welfare as its foremost concern, will be greatly impressed by Lieutenant Governor Wilson's excellent documentation of the progress made by a new Republican team in the initial year of the Rockefeller administration.

The report follows:

Since we last met on a similar occasion almost a year ago to the day, much has happened of interest to all of us. In our local elections—despite a vigorous campaign by our political opponents—and although in several areas of the State our party did not fare as well as formerly, it is a source of gratification that the government of Westchester County remained firmly in Republican hands—and that among other gains in local government we recaptured the mayoralty of one of our six cities.

Our victories reflect credit not only on our candidates who waged such effective campaigns, but also—and even more importantly—on the men and women who as district leaders, canvassers, fund-raisers, envelope-stuffers, doorbell-ringers and in myriad other ways performed the drudging and often thankless tasks which are indispensable to success in any campaign. You who are here tonight—and the thousands of other loyal Republicans of our county whom you represent—are the muscle and sinew of our organization—and I want to pay deserved tribute to you and to them for the characteristic dedication and devotion which brought victory to our Republican standard once again.

Since a year ago, much has happened in your State government too. Then, our Republican State administration was only three weeks old—and there was relatively little to report on a stewardship so newly begun—except that we had made a good start in coping with the dubious legacy of vexatious problems which we had inherited from the late but unlamented administration of Averell Harriman. Within the narrow compass of the few moments of your time I propose to occupy, I will not undertake to recite the litany of accomplishment of our administration—but I should like briefly to touch upon something which is especially significant to all of us here who share a common interest in the growth and future of our State—a common interest in the responsibility of the Republican Party in terms of serving the welfare of our fellow citizens—and a common interest in the continued success of our party.

Surely it is needless for me to remind you that when Governor Rockefeller took office he found that during the recent years of Democratic administration the State was living well beyond its means—spending much more than it collected in revenues and covering up its deficit by dipping into reserve funds and selling bonds. Now actually this practice could have been continued for a few years more but, at the end of that time, would come a frightful moment of reckoning—our State plunged so deeply into debt that at the very least it would take years of stifling austerity to climb back to solid ground. And in the meantime, while the State would be continuing its headlong plunge into the abyss of virtual bankruptcy—we would be guilty of perpetuating the same pattern of Harriman fiscal irresponsibility which cost us so dearly in terms of loss of job opportunities for our growing population.

Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, this is no mere exercise in semantics. The fact of the matter is that fiscal integrity in State government is an indispensable ingredient in the formula by which good economic climate—and the jobs which it produces—is compounded.

The irresponsible thing—the essentially cowardly thing—and yet, many counseled, the politically expedient thing to do would have been to continue in the same way and let others worry about the future. The alternative was to take the politically precarious course of reducing expenditures, minimizing borrowing and raising taxes to produce more revenue. This was the tough choice, the

courageous choice, the honorable choice, our Governor's choice. Despite the uproar raised in many quarters by the Governor's decision, he adhered to principle—and we in Westchester can be especially proud that every member of our delegation to the legislature—our six assemblymen and our three senators—stood shoulder to shoulder with Governor Rockefeller in his fight for fiscal integrity—and the battle was won.

Through this combination of additional revenues and strict economy, the Governor expects to restore the State budget to a truly balanced basis beginning with the new fiscal year—without any new taxes or tax increases. This in itself is a monumental achievement in so limited a time. But the very determination by your administration to restore fiscal integrity has contributed substantially to increased jobs and economic growth through restoration of business confidence.

Now, ladies and gentlemen—I'm not complaining, mind you—I really enjoy the opportunity for service which you have provided me in the office of Lieutenant Governor—but frankly, after 20 years in the assembly, I cannot help but bridle occasionally at the constitutional curb on the tongue of the presiding officer of the Senate, especially when I have an almost irresistible urge to join my Republican colleagues in responding to the Democratic opposition in the legislature. I hope you will indulge me, then, if I avail myself of the opportunity of making some observations here.

To put it as charitably as I can, the Democrats have engaged in the worst sort of flagrant demagoguery and political fakery. Singing the siren song of the something-for-nothing line, they not alone opposed the tax program which was needed to produce our revenue, but at the same time have urged vastly increased expenditures. All of us here know that government does not spend a dollar which it does not first either get in taxes or bond for future payment in taxes collected from the people. This basic fact is not exclusively the knowledge of Republicans—and yet our Democratic friends—possessed of the same knowledge—simultaneously advocate a reduction in taxes and a multimillion-dollar increase in State aid of virtually every form.

Of course, I suppose we should not be too surprised—because the Democrats are old hands at the something-for-nothing line. I recall that during a recent session, for example, we added up their various bills and found that they proposed to cut taxes by $252 million and, at the same time, increase spending by $1,300 million.

Just as the leopard does not change its spots neither does the tiger change its stripes because the same pattern continues. "Responsibility" is a word and a concept with which our Democratic opposition appears to have not even a nodding acquaintance. In their frantic effort to be all things to all men, it seems to me as though they go dashing hither and yon all over the New York landscape with political geiger counters. Every time they get a bleep, even a little one, they shift position. They stand up in the legislature and declare themselves for thrift and economy in government, yet they virtually break their necks rushing into print to oppose every economy move announced by the Governor. In their 1958 platform the Democrats pledged a balanced budget. Yet they persist in advocating tax reduction while at the same time opposing economies and demanding higher spending.

Their latest line is the one which involves the greatest peril for our State and its future, because the Democrats now urge, with renewed vigor, that we issue hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds and run the State on borrowed money.

To run on borrowed money, ladies and gentlemen, is to operate on borrowed time. You can't solve State problems with a credit card. The Democrats with their so-called pay-as-you-use policy, as distinguished from our pay-as-you-go policy, would have our State resume the Harriman pattern and follow the Tammany example of the city of New York, where the annual debt-service item alone is about $350 million. To give you some idea as to what sort of things are included in this item—unless it was recently discharged—taxpayers in the city of New York are still paying interest at 7 percent and amortization on bonds issued in Boss Tweed's day—about 1870—for the purpose of building a plank road in the Bronx.

You cannot build a sound government—city or State—on a foundation composed of the quicksand of debt. It is our responsibility today to meet the problems of today and not to shift them to future generations. All of us love babies—including our Democratic friends—but you don't do baby any favor when you chuck him under the chin with one hand and toss a mortgage into his bassinet with the other—and yet that is what we do every time we issue a bond. A dollar spent from the avails of a bond issue costs almost $2 by the time it, and the interest on it, is repaid.

The real question is—shall we follow our sound Republican policy of "pay-as-you-go" or the Democratic policy of "pay-twice-as-you-go."

Unfortunately, the concept of enjoying governmental services presently—with payment deferred to the future—appeals to some people who don't think things through. And the Democratic leadership—knowing its fundamental unsoundness—urges the course, callously disregarding its obligation of responsibility and refusing to raise its sights from the next election to the horizon of the next generation. I am confident that the vast majority of the people of our State will not be fooled. But because some of them may be, it is up to all of us as responsible citizens to expose these tactics and combat this Democratic demagoguery wherever it may take root.

We are progressing on many fronts with exciting, imaginative, sound programs in all proper areas of State concern, each of which alone would be worthy of more time than either your patience or any reasonable respect for your tolerance on this occasion would permit. I bespeak your earnest interest and active support of those programs as they unfold and develop—for most of them will meet the same type of irresponsible opposition.

There is just one more observation I should like to make and then I am done. At the outset of my remarks I mentioned the strength of our Republican Party in our county. It is so because the voters of Westchester know that the Republican record of good government both assures a secure present and presages a bright future.

I hope that all of you, as I did, read the excellent and complete business review section recently distributed with all their papers by Westchester County publishers, with its impressive forecast of our county's future in the decade immediately ahead. I need not tell you that growth and change of this magnitude will require government of vision and flexibility and that our Republican Party cannot remain static but must measure up constantly to its greater responsibility in the face of this growth. No matter how securely we seem to rest in the public favor, we cannot actually rest—for we can never afford complacency.

This was brought forcibly to my mind recently when I glanced over some figures showing graphically the relative strength of the Republican Party in various States of our Nation now as against the strength in those States 4 years ago. In State after State, once considered strongholds of Republicanism, Republicans lost governorships, Senate seats, congressional seats, and one or both houses of the legislature formerly held by our party. Except for an isolated gain here or there, the dreary pattern of loss was relieved only by the result in New York, where during the same period we regained both the governorship and a Senate seat from the Democrats and, at the same time, held the other Senate seat, both houses of the legislature, and a majority of our delegation to Congress.

Ours is the most Republican State in the Nation today—and not by accident—for in this State—and our own Westchester County is a prime example—Republican officeholders have been alert to the wants of the people and—by and large—Republican leaders have presented to the electorate men and women who are sensitive to the needs of our time and the bright promise of our future. Our party must remain vibrant and responsive here—and must become vibrant and responsive elsewhere—if it is to continue to meet the challenge of responsibility. We must constantly strive to keep and to place in positions of political leadership men and women who are dedicated to the principles of our party and the success of its candidates—men and women who constantly encourage new people to become active in our Republican organization—rather than men and women whose prime interest is their own perpetuation in party office for selfish reasons, while our party fortunes decline in their areas of responsibility.

In short, wherever they may be we must rid our party ranks of the honorary pallbearers.

For in this critical time—as our country increasingly bears unique responsibility for the final fate of freedom everywhere in the world—I am persuaded that our party, too, must bear increasingly heavy responsibility. With this awareness—and with each of us recognizing his individual obligation—pray God we will prove worthy of this challenge and of this opportunity.

Labor Looks at Current Developments in Atomic Energy Commission's Regulatory Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Mr. Leo Goodman, secretary of the Atomic Energy Technical Committee, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, delivered to the Atomic Energy Committee of the Federal Bar Association at their annual convention in Washington, D.C., on September 26, 1959. Mr. Goodman's remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF LEO GOODMAN, SECRETARY, ATOMIC ENERGY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE, INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE, FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONVENTION, SEPTEMBER 26, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, fellow panel members, and friends, I would suppose my inclusion on this panel is due to the fact that certain organizations with which I am associated have been carrying on proceedings under the Administrative Procedures Act before the Atomic Energy Commission and now an ap-

peal from the decision of the Commission is pending in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Unlike some members of this panel, I am not prepared to discuss the full benefits which have accrued from this case. It is still pending before the proper tribunal and those of us associated with it as petitioners will discuss our views regarding merits of our position before that tribunal. Here I will confine myself to a few quotes of statements made by others regarding that case and a review of the present regulatory functions of the Commission as they appear to us who are associated with organized labor.

Our concern about regulation is not exclusively that of a party of interest. If it were, I believe the facts, in many cases, would justify extensive challenge of a number of the activities of the Commission. We do not ever associate ourselves with the extreme position taken by Dean Spilhaus. You will recall in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he said:

"The overall consideration is whether the Atomic Energy Commission has outgrown its usefulness."

In that speech he made the recommendation that:

"Congress move(s) positively to apportion out the operational and fiscal control of the AEC functions to the several appropriate permanent agencies of the Government."

He continued:

"And that, if this is done, the tremendous impact of nuclear energy on our whole society would not be subject to the inevitable hazards that accompany over-centralized control, over-centralized control which otherwise may have adverse effects on education, based on free, flexible and varied patterns, economy based on fair imaginative competition and government based on an informed public."

While the situation upon which Dean Spilhaus based his conclusions has changed in some regards, the central thesis, I believe, continues to prevail today and would justify serious consideration for some aspects of his recommendations. This central thesis, I will repeat from his statement and adopt it as my own. He said:

"The trouble comes I think from the Atomic Energy Commission having too many functions under one head, a centralization of authority which is contrary to the principle as demonstrated in the separation of judicial and executive powers in government."

Illustrating this central thesis and indicating concern by others regarding it, is the quotation from the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists which said in connection with the proceedings in the PRDC case:

"This case brings to light the multiple role played by the five-member AEC in the development of atomic power. The AEC has been a promoter of the project; it has financed the bulk of the research and development work on the fast breeder reactor; it will become a partner in the project when the contract is signed by waiving the fuel lease charge for 5 years and providing about $4 million for further specific research and development. It is also the agency which licenses the project and regulates it, and is now performing a judging role upon its own actions. It has become a party to the proceeding by setting up a 'separated staff' of attorneys to participate in the hearings with freedom to take positions note binding on the Commission. If the project proceeds, the AEC will be the fuel supplier and will buy the plutonium produced, and may also have to reprocess the spent fuel at a price to be negotiated."

One student of administrative law, after a review of the hodge-podge which this situation presented, concluded in an article in the Georgetown Law Journal (vol. 47, p. 87):

"It becomes apparent that the crux of the matter lies in the body of law that governed the conduct of the hearing in the PRDC case—the Commission's rules and regulations. These obviously were drawn with great care and with meticulous attention to preserve the unfettered freedom of action so uniquely an attribute of the Atomic Energy Commission since its birth. It is as though they constitute a protective shield surrounding the actions of the Commission, making them almost as impervious to attack as are the various containments that shield the reactor itself. But this armor is not impenetrable. Rules and regulations promulgated in furtherance of the national desire to forge ahead in the development of nuclear power through private enterprise may not take precedence over the need for caution in matters involving atomic energy, and over the paramount duty of the Commission to protect the health and safety of the public."

The failure of the AEC to separate its promotion functions from its regulatory functions has caused many knowledgeable authorities to question the continuance of the existing procedures. One such group, the National Advisory Committee on Radiation appointed by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, after extensive discussion, adopted a draft report entitled, "The Regulation of Radiation Safety in the United States" which contained the following language:

"The dual role of the Atomic Energy Commission in the promotion and development of atomic energy on the one hand and its regulation of radiation safety on the other is an interesting one. Generally, the vesting of both promotional and regulatory functions in the same agency is unwise and may be expected to present a number of serious difficulties. Foremost among these is the possibility that the agency in its zeal to carry out its promotional activity may lose sight of its responsibilities in operational safety.

"During its lifetime, the Atomic Energy Commission on a number of occasions has indeed been accused of subordinating radiation safety to economic advantage when several of its nuclear reactor installations have been planned."

Subsequently this language was softened because of the embarrassment it might cause to the Atomic Energy Commission. Nevertheless, the National Advisory Committee on Radiation recommended a change in responsibility for radiation protection and thereby started a chain of events which, in my opinion, will bring about a fundamental revision of AEC's regulatory powers in at least one aspect of its activities in the direction of the changes recommended by Dean Spilhaus.

On March 25, 1959, Dr. Russell H. Morgan, Chairman of the Surgeon General's National Advisory Committee on Radiation released the Committee's report to the press. The Committee's recommendation No. 1 said that:

"Primary responsibility for the Nation's protection from radiation hazards be established in a single agency of the Federal Government. The Committee believes that this agency should logically be the U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and urges immediate legislation to achieve this objective."

On April 4, 1959, the White House issued a press release which stated:

"In view of the considerable public attention which has been focused recently on radiological health studies of the Federal Government, the President has asked that current plans of the executive branch be made clear."

On August 14, 1959, the President issued a statement which announced:

"Organizational arrangements aimed at centralizing responsibility for providing general standards and guidance to executive agencies for their use in developing operating rules and regulations for radiological health protection. In order to obtain assistance in the discharge of this function the President has issued an Executive order establishing a Federal Radiation Council."

Thus, for the first time since enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the absolute jurisdiction of the AEC to provide for the health and safety of the public from atomic radiation was superceded. The Chief Executive of the United States took complete power unto himself to establish standards of radiation protection and subordinated the AEC into membership on a new Federal Radiation Council. The members of the Council included the Chairman of the AEC, but also included three Cabinet officers—the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Congress subsequently added the Secretary of Labor. The President has appointed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as Chairman of the new Federal Radiation Council.

This is only a first step in the transition of responsibility from the AEC to other branches of Government. Thus we see the separation of the promotion functions and the regulatory functions into different arms of Government. It is interesting to note that the President designated his own special assistant for science and technology as primary adviser to the Council rather than relying exclusively on existing staff, either of the Bureau of Standards or of the AEC. The Federal Radiation Council was instructed to take steps designated to further the interagency coordination of measures for protecting humans against ionizing radiation, and to that end will consult with all Federal agencies which have radiological health responsibilities.

Meanwhile, on the same day, the Congress took steps to provide the necessary funds to implement this transfer of responsibility. Appropriations for radiological health activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were increased from approximately $500,000 to $2,500,000.

On August 21, 1959, the Bureau of the Budget submitted its recommendations in behalf of the administration to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. I do not believe that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget have yet been made public. I would like to read the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Budget to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"(1) The President provide general standards and guidance to executive agencies for their use in developing operating rules and regulations for radiological health protection.

"(2) The President be advised by a Federal Radiation Council, established by the President to advise him regarding the general standards and guidance to be issued by the President, as well as other matters pertinent to radiological health, the council to be composed of the heads of the agencies principally affected—AEC, HEW, Defense and Commerce; and that the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology serve as an adviser to the council.

"(3) The Department of Health, Education and Welfare intensify its radiological health efforts and have primary responsibility within the executive branch for the collation, analysis, and interpretation of data on environmental radiation levels such as natural background, radiography, medical and industrial use of isotopes, and X-rays and fallout, so that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, may advise the President and the general public.

"(4) The Atomic Energy Commission have the principal Federal responsibility for preparing the States for the proposed transfer of certain of its regulatory responsibilities.

"(5) The training programs necessary for such transfer be financed and planned by the Commission, and, in order to make maximum use of existing facilities and competence, such programs be conducted under cooperative arrangements between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(6) At the termination of this special training program, any training of State personnel be conducted within the continuing programs of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and other Federal agencies.

"(7) The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, continue as the Federal focus point for guidance and assistance to the States with respect to radiation sources not now under control of the Commission."

It is clear that the President's Executive order of August 14, 1959, implemented the first three points of this recommendation while the latter four points were the subject of legislative activity by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The following day, the President designated the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council and, directed that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare intensify its radiological health efforts and have primary responsibility within the executive branch for the collation, analysis and interpretation of data on environmental radiation levels such as natural background, radiography, medical and industrial use of isotopes and X-rays, and fallout so that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may advise the President and the general public.

On August 26, 1959, the Joint Committee held executive hearings for the AEC on the proposed legislation. The Bureau of the Budget made its position strong in an additional communication to the chairman of the Joint Committee and on September 1, 1959, the Joint Committee reported the AEC and administration's bill implementing the four latter points of the Bureau of the Budget's recommendations while giving legislative sanction to the establishment of the Federal Radiation Council.

Labor strongly disagrees with the efforts to assign responsibility for protection from radiation hazards of isotopes, or any other part of this science to the States at this time. They are simply not prepared to assume this burden. It is clear that this aspect of the bill also runs directly counter to the recommendations of the knowledgeable members of the Surgeon General's National Advisory Committee on Radiation. The AEC has long sought to divest itself from this responsibility. Under the impetus of the administration's action, the Joint Committee finally bestirred itself and paid the price exacted by the AEC to bring about legislation in the 1959 session.

During the course of floor action on the bill, Senator ANDERSON approved the need for action at this time because it would take the AEC 6 to 8 months to draft the regulations to implement the section making possible transfer of responsibility to the States.

We of organized labor shall participate in this process to assure maximum protection of health and safety of the workers employed in the presence of radiation sources.

Only Federal Aid Can Strengthen Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has already been legislative action taken, in another body, on legislation regarding school aid through the use of Federal funds. It is strongly hoped that the Education and Labor Committee of this body will soon report another school aid bill to the House. In the expected debate surrounding that issue, no doubt the old dusty arguments against such aid will be dragged out, polished a little by adding the Presidential blessing to them, and used to persuade some of our colleagues that school aid is unnecessary.

But, Mr. Speaker, educators are by no means the only people interested in such legislation. Organizations which have long fought for the public interest in every kind of legislation are adding their voices to the demands for action in this field—action before it is too late. To this chorus is now added the words of Mr. Peter Schoemann, president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices, or the Plumber's Union, to make a long title short.

Mr. Schoemann, in a very few words, sets forth the issue plainly. That issue is, Are we, or are we not, going to provide adequate funds to do this vitally needed job? Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ONLY FEDERAL AID CAN STRENGTHEN SCHOOLS
(By Peter T. Schoemann, general president, United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters)

We all know the United States gives billions to foreign countries each year to strengthen them in their fight against communism. But did you know that last year we agreed to pay $237,000 to improve teaching in Philippine schools?

Did you know we earmarked over $1.18 million that same year for better schools and vocational training for youngsters in Thailand, which is the modern name for Siam? And that the little country of Korea was slated to get more than $2.1 million to improve its educational system?

In varying amounts, every year we've assured Federal aid to education in Burma, Cambodia, Free China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and a host of other countries in Asia and Europe and Africa and South America. We even allotted $112,000 to Yugoslavia, an admitted Communist but anti-Russian nation, to boost vocational training and teach English.

Year in and year out, we are tabbing between $30 and $53 million for educating young people in nations throughout the world. For health, sanitation, and social welfare we are yearly devoting even much greater amounts.

This aid is well worth it. This is a vital part of our continuing struggle. Every dollar we spend to educate and train and help our neighbors to stand on their own feet is a dollar well spent.

But what about education right here at home? Granted we're in a race with Russia, in which knowledge and know-how may be vital to our existence, what are we doing nationally to improve grade and high schools locally?

The answer is almost nothing.

For 15 years since the end of World War II we've done practically nothing nationally to aid our local grade and high schools, except where the Federal Government itself created overcrowding by new or enlarged military posts or Government agencies. Yet the need for Federal aid is overwhelming.

Take classrooms alone.

Every year the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare dismally announces the continuing classroom shortage. This past year HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming sent his usual Christmas message to the school children of America. He said loftily:

"I can come to only one conclusion. The Nation is not moving fast enough to reduce the classroom shortage."

Then Secretary Flemming added a few facts:

Last year the number of classrooms needed for pupils rose again. We now need 66,400 classrooms where we needed 65,800 a year ago.

Number of pupils above normal size classes also rose. We now have almost 2 million children who can't fit into our classrooms.

At the same time, the number of classrooms built fell for the second straight year. We fell more than 10 percent behind the previous year and built less than we did in the school year 1955–56.

Bond issues for new classrooms dropped. Most bond issues were limited to seven States.

"In short," he concluded, "we have made very little progress over the year in dealing with the huge backlog of need for classrooms which developed during the war years, when school construction was virtually at a standstill."

But what did Secretary Flemming's Christmas message propose?

Nothing.

He said nothing about what to do on this shortage. He left this matter open until after Christmas for President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to Congress.

This brings us to the second scene of this little act in our current national tragedy. President Eisenhower went up to address the Congress. He took a very high level approach to Federal action helping our schools. In fact he left them high and dry:

"We cannot be complacent about educating our youth," he announced. "But," he carefully added, "* * * the educational process, essentially a local and personal responsibility, cannot be made to leap ahead by crash centralized Government action."

The President then proposed "to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts." In other words, he proposed that Uncle Sam should guarantee payment of local bond issues where local tax efforts fail.

There is only one thing wrong with this proposal. It won't work.

Last year I took the time to apply the Eisenhower proposal to my own home city of Milwaukee where I served on the school board for more than 20 years.

In Milwaukee, we would first have to get the State agency to submit to the Federal Government a plan for our local bond issue. Then we would have to convince the Federal Government we were making "a reasonable tax effort" to support our schools and pay off our debts. New taxes, if needed, would require new taxing authority from the State legislature.

Next, Milwaukee has just about reached its present debt limit. For a new bond issue the board of education would have to get the approval of the common council and then go to the legislature to raise our debt limit by the amount of the new issue. The next regular session of the legislature does not occur until 1961.

Having obtained authority for further indebtedness and a guarantee from the State that it would stand behind one-half of the new issue, then Milwaukee would have to conduct a popular referendum to approve the bonds.

Anyone can see that, at this rate, it would take 2 or 3 years to get even a promise by the Federal Government to pick up the tab on a local bond issue just in case the city of Milwaukee defaults. It doesn't take a financial wizard to figure we can't build badly needed classrooms this way.

This is the story in Milwaukee and it is the same story in one community after another across the Nation. Underwriting local bond issues simply won't meet the classroom shortage. And the Eisenhower program proposes absolutely nothing to overcome the steadily growing shortage of teachers, as well.

Local financing can't do the job. Right now we need to invest several billions of dollars for school construction and teachers' salaries, leaving the problems of how and what to build and teach strictly up to local control. Yet bills in Congress authorizing adequate Federal aid along these lines (without Federal control) have got nowhere.

In the Senate, the Murray bill, S. 2, quietly lies before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Metcalf bill, H.R. 22, is doing the same thing in the House of Representatives. I testified for both bills at hearings last year.

If history repeats itself, however, these bills will be defeated as in the past. The White House, the special interests and the false cry that Federal aid means Federal control kill these bills every time they come up.

To show how mistaken is this fear of Federal control, let's just take a look at history. We've been aiding higher education with Federal funds ever since the Civil War. Land-grant colleges—State owned and operated—have, thanks to Federal aid, provided higher public education for almost a hundred years. Yet no one has said a word about Federal control and, in fact, there has no Federal control at all.

During the past 10 years, Congress has appropriated about $1.5 billion to build, maintain and operate grade and high schools where increased Federal activities, like Navy bases, or defense plants, have created a local burden on the schools. This includes teachers' salaries.

Yet no one has even hinted that these federally aided schools or teachers might or should be subject to Federal dictation or control. What they teach and how they teach is strictly a local affair. The same goes for longstanding Federal aid to vocational training under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts and for new aid to higher education under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Federal control is to me a poltergeist—a ghost dreamed up to throw a monkey wrench into the works. For when we get down to facts, we have, in every school board and in every educational institution and organization, a sleepless watchdog over the U.S. Office of Education and the Congress. One move to dictate how or what to teach and some of the most politically effective forces in this country will be up in arms. Federal control is a political impossibility.

Despite this fact, the future of Federal aid to education remains dim. Unless those in the administration who really see the classroom and teacher shortage really want to do something, we won't have much chance to put through an adequate program.

But this is an election year. We might get a piece of this program, such as the modest bill, confined to building classrooms, known as S. 8, introduced by my fellow member of the United Association, and good friend, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan. This bill would make $500 million available this year and the same amount next year to build schools. Even this much at this late date would be a very substantial accomplishment indeed.

Frankly, I'm tired of defeat after defeat on this very important issue. We need Federal aid for construction on School Street as well as on the Burma Road. Let's take our own children and their teacher out of the furnace room and put them in the classroom where they belong. And let's do it this year.

Noise—A Threat to Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, a major problem in our country today is the increasing air traffic with the accompanying noise nuisance, as well as danger from low-flying airplanes.

This problem is especially important at the major airports in the United States. I would like to point out that while it is not a new problem, it has become more acute with the advent of the commercial jet airliners.

Aircraft noise obviously is annoying. We know of people living in the vicinity of large airports whose night's sleep is broken time and again throughout the night by planes passing closely over their dwellings. The noise from planes disrupts classroom work in some localities. We all realize, of course, that there is no total solution for the noise problem, but there are steps that can and should be taken to lessen its effect.

With this in mind, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which was published in the February 1960 issue of Business/Commercial Aviation, a Conover-Mast publication. This excellent editorial entitled "Rx for Noise Control—Put Up or Shut Up" describes very clearly how aircraft noise has become not only a nuisance for the community, but a detriment to aviation progress as well. In a special report in the same issue of Business/Commercial Aviation, Editor William B. Osmun and the staff analyze the noise problem and suggest a sound course of action which in my opinion, if adopted, would go a long way toward solving the problem.

The material follows:

RX FOR NOISE CONTROL—PUT UP OR SHUT UP

It's about time we recognized the noise problem for what it is—a major threat to all aviation.

We can protest all we want—point out that a lot has been done already to reduce aircraft noise, that it's costing us in payload, in performance, in operating efficiency, and that our willingness to shoulder this burden should be proof enough of our good faith. Every one of these claims is true. But that's the point. The point is that our claims won't make the noise problem go away—for the simple reason that the public protesting against noise doesn't believe them.

Right now, the people suffering from aircraft noise don't believe anything we say. They are convinced the airlines are trying to evade the issue, and that the airport operators and FAA are in cahoots with the airlines. Communities that have long complained about aircraft noise are proceeding on the assumption that the aviation industry has no intention of making any serious efforts to cope with the problem. For their residents, they see no relief other than by political pressure, legislation, or court action.

We ourselves are to blame for much of the public attitude about aircraft noise. The antinoise procedures were forced on us by public pressure or the threat of it. Not surprisingly, we got little credit for something we did only grudgingly. In any case, what with bigger planes, more powerful engines, and steadily increasing air traffic, there hasn't been so much progress on noise, no matter how you look at it.

Naturally, we can go on waiting for antinoise pressure to build up before we move. The pressure will build up all right, and the longer we wait, the stronger the pressure will be. There's always the grim chance that a large transport will plunge into a heavily populated area near one of New York's airports. Of course, such a crash objectively would have nothing to do with noise. But tell that to the people who wake up at night to hear the roar of jet engines and immediately think of several thousand tons of metal that might drop down on them out of the sky. If there ever is such a crash, the noise problem will be solved right away—and we'll have precious little to say about how it's solved.

Let's tackle noise reduction boldly. Let's look at every possible way to relieve the nuisance. We cannot give up so much that aviation is hopelessly crippled. But neither can we hold back from a solution just because it will cost money. Conversely, the communities cannot sit back and look on while we try to do the impossible.

What we need is leadership—of a kind that neither the airport operators nor the airlines can give. Only the FAA can give it (with something better than local rules).

Let the FAA move on noise reduction as vigorously as it moved on air traffic control. Make noise-control regulations where they are needed. Get research projects going on ways to cut noise—from suppressors to high-lift wings. Look into the possibilities of making "noiseworthiness" a part of airworthiness. Promote runway construction and airport design for minimum noise. Push for enforceable national standards of land-use control to keep the communities from encroaching on airports.

If all this takes new legislation, ask for it. If it takes more money—as it surely will—say so. Then we'll see who's really in favor of noise reduction.

Above all, let's seize the initiative. If we keep dragging our feet, waiting until we're forced to move, then we'll deserve the pushing around we're sure to get.

THE WAY OUT

We are deadlocked on airport noise because no party to the conflict can resolve it going it alone. Neither the airlines, nor

the airport operators, nor local civic and political units have the authority or the technical competence to solve the problem. Only the Federal Government has anything approaching the necessary competence and authority needed. And even FAA may need more authority from Congress before an all-out attack on noise can be launched.

Fundamentally, there are three ways to reduce noise: by muffling or suppressing it at the source; by muffling it at the receiving point; by making use of the fact that sound pressure falls off rapidly with distance.

Everyone of these approaches offers a number of possibilities, every one has advantages and disadvantages.

For noise that is generated on the ground, suppression techniques are fairly well advanced. Engine test cell design now includes adequate sound suppression as a matter of course. For engine runups during maintenance checks, noise can be baffled by fences, by doing the runup in a place where buildings will baffle the sound before it reaches airport neighbors, or by the use of portable sound suppressors. Engine runups also can be limited—or prohibited—during the night hours. But this procedure would run counter to the current trend of doing most maintenance at night, when planes are least needed for scheduled service.

Los Angeles International Airport has made what is probably the strongest attack on jet ground noise. Airport general manager Francis T. Fox has barred jet engine runups in the airline maintenance areas between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. unless a suitable suppressor is used—one that will reduce the noise to about 60 PNdb at the airport boundary. Fox admits the 60 PNdb figure is a "stiff requirement;" but likens it to "what the human ear registers from average daytime background noise levels in residential areas." The big question is whether this much suppression can be achieved with portable suppressors, the only ones that the airlines can use economically.

Intelligent planning and effective use of known techniques are probably all that is needed to keep ground noise within acceptable limits. For flight noise, the solution is neither so easy nor the technique so well advanced.

The noise of turbojet engines is suppressed by breaking up the flow of exhaust gases. This reduces the shear between the gases and the surrounding atmosphere. The shear is what makes the noise, while the gas flow is what gives the engine its thrust. So the principle of noise suppression works against the very purpose for which the engine was designed. Besides this direct assault on engine performance, suppressors further lower jet performance by adding both drag and weight. The J57's 21-tube suppressor adds 420 pounds weight and loses 700 pounds thrust. Suppressors and thrust reversers cut the 707–120's range by 5.5 percent and the speed 6.7 percent.

The J57 suppressor is effective: Bolt, Beranek & Newman, in their report for the New York Port Authority compared the noise of a 707–120 with that of a KC–135 using the same, but unsuppressed, engines. Their measurements showed "that the overall sound pressure level (at maximum dry thrust for each airplane) is reduced by 10 decibels. We calculate that the perceived noise level is reduced by 5 or 6 PNdecibels * * * This is highly significant * ** Without the suppressor the noisiness of the 707–120 would be about 50 percent greater."

Work continues on refinements in suppressor design. Some may be possible, but engineers and FAA officials see little hope for much drastic improvement. The limiting factor will aways be that noise suppression also means thrust reduction and loss of performance.

There is another design approach which promises noise reduction without loss of thrust. It is represented by the "fan" and "bypass" engines (See B/CA, December 1959, p. 36). Both are variants of the same principle: air entering the engine is separated into two flows, one that passes through the combustion chamber and one that does not. The latter flow is compressed before being expelled from the engine, increasing the mass flow of air without a corresponding increase in speed. The lower the speed of the airflow through a turbojet, the less shear there is. This design principle gives less exhaust noise for a given amount of thrust. Its drawback is that designers must be very careful they don't end up with a noisy, whiny compressor instead.

Suppression of sound at the listening point cannot be overlooked. It is a well-known fact that the greatest incidence of noise complaints is in the summer when house windows are open. Some residents have already cut down summertime noise by air conditioning their homes, keeping windows shut all the time. Part of Los Angeles attack on the noise problem includes research into the effect of home attic and roof insulation on noise reduction.

Increasing the distance between noise source and listener is the oldest and still the most promising method of noise suppression. It is the basis of the system of preferential runways, routings, and altitude restrictions that has been the most common method of noise abatement used until now. The possibilities of this method are by no means exhausted, but all the easy and quick cures have been pretty well used up.

For instance it is possible to put more vertical distance between aircraft taking off and communities under their path by steepening the takeoff path. An increase of thrust, such as that promised by the retrofitting of "fans" to the J57 would make such steepening possible. Historically, increases in power have gone into upping takeoff gross weight, giving greater range and payload. The Airport Operator's Council has asked the airlines and manufacturers to use some of the extra thrust provided by fan engines for noise abatement, rather than putting it all into gross weight increases. FAA has made it clear that it likes this idea.

Other possibilities for steepening the takeoff path include aerodynamic refinements in wing design. Just how much these can do and how soon is hard to say. Undoubtedly, research in this field would be pushed harder if steeper takeoffs became a requirement for the airworthiness certification of new aircraft. But whether this would be a step in the right direction and, if so, whether FAA has the authority to take it without a clear congressional mandate, remains to be seen.

Steepening the approach path is even more difficult. Many industry observers question the wisdom of raising the glide slope at Los Angeles from 2¾° to 3°. They claim this is just about the upper limit for a safe approach angle for large, sweptwing jets.

AIRCRAFT DESIGN IS A LIMITING FACTOR

Making the takeoff or the approach steeper are solutions that are limited by modern aircraft design. Progress can be made, but it is likely to be slow and modest. Therefore, whatever we do about noise control for many years to come, people who live under approach or takeoff paths, or within 2 to 4 miles of the end of the active runway will continue to hear noise.

There are two answers to this problem: use runways that don't take aircraft over nearby residences, keep houses from being built that close to the runway. To be effective, both of these methods must be considered at the time airports or runways are planned.

We are making progress in building noise reduction into airport design. Washington's Dulles International Airport has a 4-mile buffer zone between residences and runway end. The New York Port Authority, in its planning for the New York area's fifth major airport near Morristown, N.J., suggests that 5 miles is a better figure.

Idlewild's new runway 4R–22L, is oriented so approaching aircraft pass over a park instead of residences. Runway 31L is being lengthened to 3,000 feet more than is needed for full-gross-weight takeoffs just to make it possible for departing jets to be higher by the time they are over Howard Beach at the airport's edge. Runway extension for similar purposes is also underway at Los Angeles.

Cross-wind landing gear has been mentioned as a possible help, since they would allow the use of preferential runways at higher cross-winds. Some airline engineers feel the jets' tolerance for cross-wind would be increased just as much by improvements in aircraft handling characteristics.

One of the most obvious, and most neglected, methods of noise control by distance is to control the use of the land nearest the end of the runway. This land can be controlled by zoning, purchase of easements, or air rights, or outright purchase.

Zoning has limitations. If land is zoned to a less lucrative potential use, there's a legal issue to resolve—you might be taking away property without adequate compensation. Also, zoning is a function reserved to local governments, this makes for untold complications. Easements, by which rights to some of the airspace over a property are acquired, probably offer the best answer when outright purchase is too expensive. Possibly they could be used in combination with zoning.

Whatever steps are taken to insulate airports from communities by control of the use of land near runways, they will be effective only to the extent that runway lengths are kept reasonably constant. If land purchased for noise control is used for runway extension to accommodate new, more powerful transports, little progress will have been made. The age-old battle between airport operators and the airlines over making the airport fit the plane or vice versa hasn't yet been fully resolved. There are signs, though, that FAA is edging towards giving more weight to making the plane fit the runway.

Discussions of land use control as a noise abatement technique have a way of degenerating into an argument about "Which came first, the airport, or the community?" It is true that airports like Idlewild were largely superimposed on an already existing neighborhood. And at places like Los Angeles, the community's encroachment upon the airport is of such long standing that the question of who got there first is now purely academic.

Still, there are undeveloped areas near today's airports where houses, schools, and even hospitals, are going up with complete disregard of the nearness of the airport and the paths flown by aircraft using it. For example, a church and new houses are going up right now within sight of the approach lights to LaGuardia's runway 4—a scant two-thirds of a mile from the runway's end.

This sort of thing should never have been permitted to happen. It cannot continue, or it will make a mockery of even the best noise abatement efforts. Here is an area where constructive help from the community and local governments is greatly needed.

Technically speaking, it shouldn't be any more difficult to whittle the noise problem down to size than to solve the air traffic control problem. All that is needed is the will to tame aircraft noise—and the time, manpower, and money to do it.

Money is the biggest hurdle of all. Each party to the noise problem—airlines, airports, local communities, Federal Govern-

ment, and the public—will have to contribute before the problem is really licked. Yet no one wants to be the first to make the effort. This is understandable. As long as there's no clear-cut fixing of responsibilities in the noise abatement effort, to volunteer is dangerous. For the volunteer is likely to be considered to have tacitly admitted that he's at fault. He risks being saddled with the lion's share of the responsibility for curing the problem.

Leadership, therefore, is essential. Every possible approach to noise reduction must be explored. Every proposed solution must be weighed in the balance to see that no party to the problem pays an unfair share of the price. But each party must take some part of the responsibility and bear some share of the cost.

Progress in reducing the annoyance caused by aircraft noise is possible. But it can only come as the result of a comprehensive, vigorous, all-out attack on the problem. This calls for leadership such as only FAA is competent to give. Whether FAA will move far enough and fast enough and whether the public, through Congress, will back FAA sufficiently with money to pay for the effort, are the big questions of airport noise control.

The Question of the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on December 22, 1959, Dr. Nuci Kotta delivered a splendid address to the Kiwanis Club of Savannah, Ga., on the subject of "The Question of the Captive Nations."

Arrangements for this address by Dr. Kotta were made by Hon. Hugh G. Grant, of Augusta, Ga., a former U.S. Minister to Albania.

Dr. Kotta is a young man, of exceptional ability and knowledge of European affairs, especially the Communist activities in the nine nations under the Iron Curtain. Dr. Kotta is a lawyer, a graduate of the University of Paris, and in his official capacity as Deputy Secretary General of the so-called captive nations has a wide knowledge of the European situation. He is a son of the late Prime Minister of Albania.

I have obtained permission from Dr. Kotta to insert his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and pursuant to unanimous consent previously obtained, I insert the address herewith:

THE QUESTION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I wish to begin by thanking you, Mr. Chairman, and the Savannah Kiwanis Club, for the honor you have done me in inviting me to address you today on the question of the captive European nations. I wish also to express my gratitude to my respected friend, Mr. Hugh G. Grant, former U.S. Minister to Albania, and great friend of my country, for having suggested that you invite me.

I will divide my talk in three parts. In a first part, I will speak briefly about the exiles from central-eastern Europe and their main organization, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, which is the spokesman in the free world of the Soviet-enslaved peoples of central-eastern Europe. Secondly, I will try to give you a picture of the true situation in our captive countries. Thirdly, I will endeavor to project the question of the captive European nations in the broader framework of the present international situation. Afterward, if you wish to ask me any questions, I will try to answer them to the best of my knowledge.

During the last stages of World War II and in its wake, through aggression and subversion, or both, the Soviet Union enslaved 100 million people in eastern Europe and imposed upon them Communist regimes completely subservient to Moscow. As a result, there were other dreadful results which we will examine later—a number of patriots escaped to the free world where they joined the ranks of the older exiles who had been forced to leave their countries following the Fascist and Nazi aggressions.

There exiles organized themselves in national committees or councils and undertook to work for the restoration of freedom and independence to their homelands. Several years ago, these committees and councils joined their efforts and created the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations is composed of the democratic representatives in exile of the following nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania and acts as the spokesman in the free world, of our silenced peoples. Our assembly gives voice to their aspirations to freedom and independence and defends their inalienable right to live under governments of their own choosing, through free and unfettered elections under international control. In other words, the main goal of the assembly is to work for the liberation of our peoples from Soviet domination and Communist dictatorship. The assembly also considers it as its duty to warn the free world of the danger of Soviet imperialism.

In order to keep alive interest in the fate of our enslaved peoples, the Assembly of Captive European Nations endeavors to inform the free world on the true situation prevailing in the capitive countries. This brings me to the second part of my talk.

It is, of course, impossible, in the course of a short speech, to give a comprehensive picture of the situation of the Central-Eastern European countries under Soviet rule. I will, therefore, limit myself to a panoramic view which I will, here and there, illustrate with examples taken from my own country, Albania, whose situation I know a little better. I wish to make it clear, however, that the situation is basically the same in all the Soviet-dominated countries, independently of their geographic position or the degree of economic development.

After the Soviets gained control over our countries, they reduced them, for all practical purposes, to the status of colonial possessions although, with the exception of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which have been annexed by the Soviet Union, our nations have retained nominal independence.

The Soviet political and economic structure has been imposed to our countries. Their constitutions are patterned upon those of the federated republics of the Soviet Union. The ordinary laws are the replicas of those of the Soviet Union, but, because of the resistance of the peoples, criminal legislation is often harsher than in the Soviet Union.

What characterizes the Communist regimes in our countries—and in the Soviet Union as well—is the total suppression of political, religious, and economic freedom; the violation of all human rights and a ruthless economic exploitation. What makes communism even more unbearable in the captive countries, is the fact that this inhuman, abnormal system has been imposed by a foreign power: Russia.

The Communist constitutions pay lip service to democracy, although they establish discriminatory privileges for the Communist Parties. In fact, however, all parties, other than the Communist Party, have been suppressed and, with the exception of those who have escaped to the free world, their leaders have been killed or imprisoned. Thousands upon thousands of average citizens have also been murdered, imprisoned or deported.

Religious persecutions have been characterized by an extreme brutality and ruthleasness. A great number of the clergy have been murdered or sent in concentration camps. In Albania, for instance, one-third of the Catholic clergy, regular or secular, have been shot and another third have been imprisoned. The head of the church, Archbishop Prennushi, died in prison. Most of the churches have been closed. Although perhaps not as totally suppressed, the Moslem and orthodox churches have not fared much better. Their rightful leaders have been replaced by subservient tools of the regime. I met the other day an American of Albanian descent who has visited Albania recently. He told me that only old people dare go to church. The younger do not lest they be fired from their jobs and when one is fired for such a reason, in a Communist-dominated country, he not only loses his job but the right to work as well.

The economic exploitation of the population would be unbelievable to free people, like you. All means of production are owned by the state which in turn is owned by the party that is in fact by the Soviet Union. The former owners were expropriated without any compensation and, quite often, they were killed or sent to concentration camps. As for the land—and you must keep in mind that, with the exception of Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany, Eastern Europe is basically agricultural—after a fake agrarian reform which took place in the beginning, it is now being collectivized against the will of the peasants.

Soviet Russia exploits the captive nations as never a colonial power in the past has exploited its colonial possessions.

In the beginning of her rule the Soviet Union took from our countries whatever she needed, giving little if any compensation in return. As a result, the standard of living of our peoples fell well below that of any previous period, even periods of war or natural disasters. Now, the Soviets are proceeding to the economic integration of the captive countries which may not appear to be as crude an exploitation as that of the first period of plain plunder but which, nevertheless, is just as ruthless and even more dangerous.

However, the most horrible aspect of the tyrannical system imposed to the captive countries by the Soviets, is undoubtedly the perversion of justice. The aim and purpose of Communist justice is, as stated by the Communists themselves, to protect the political and economic structure of the regime and not to serve what they call the bourgeois ideas of justice. Everything that serves the state is good and permissible. You all have read, I am sure, about showcase trials at which the accused have confessed to anything their torturers wanted them to confess to. You remember, for instance, that Cardinal Mindszenty was forced to confess that he had indulged in blackmarket operations.

I said a moment ago that criminal legislation in the captive countries is often even harsher than in the Soviet Union. Let me mention only one example: the penal code in Albania. An article of this code, promulgated in 1952, stated that penal responsbility for political crimes begins at 12. A boy or a girl, a child of 12, could have been sen-

tenced to prison in Albania for crimes against the state, until December 1958, when the age was changed to 14.

You may ask what are the crimes against the state which could justify the imprisonment of a child. Anything practically. The judges, the people's judges as they are called, are not professional judges. They are party men; they do whatever the party tells them to do. The lawyers, themselves, who by the way are collectivized, are forced to be accessories of the Communist justice. They must assist the prosecution. They must inform the prosecutor of whatever secrets they have learned from the accused they are supposed to defend. As a result of such justice, only in my country, in Albania, according to conservative estimates based on reports by escapees—the Communists, of course, do not publish statistics of their crimes—about 10,000 people have been killed with or without trial while approximately the double of this number are in prisons or in concentration camps. For the United States this would mean over 1 million killed and over 2 million imprisoned. This is the face of communism. This is what communism has done to our countries. This is what it plans to do to the countries of the free world.

I wish now to try to expose a fallacy that is spreading in the free world since Khrushchev started in his dove-calls for relaxation of tension and peaceful coexistence. Some well intentioned but naive westerners have been misled by a skillful propaganda and made to believe that, since Khrushchev took power in the Kremlin, a liberalization of the regimes has taken place in all the captive countries. These and others also contend that the economic policy of the Soviet Union towards the captive nations has changed and that the captive countries have now become economic liabilities for the Soviet Union.

I wish I could devote more time to this. Since I cannot, however, I will explain briefly why both above mentioned assertions do not correspond to the true situation.

I believe that the affirmation that there has been no liberalization in Hungary after the repression of the Hungarian Revolution needs not to be demonstrated. The United Nations has established that fact and condemned the new wave of Communist terror.

It is true that in Poland the people succeeded, 3 years ago, at a difficult time for the Soviets and the Polish Communists, in imposing some restrictions to the tryranny of the regime. But Gomulka is now bringing back the Stalinists and tightening again the screws. As for the other countries, the very fact that the terror-backed drive for collectivization of the land has been accelerated during this so-called period of liberalization shows that it exists only in the Communist propaganda and in the credulous, optimistic imagination of some well-intentioned wishful thinkers.

I have no time to deal with the assertion that the captive nations have become economic liabilities to the Soviet Union. I wish, however, to point out that the integration of the economies of the captive nations into that of the Soviet Union with a view to their ultimate absorption, represents nearly a 40-percent addition to the economy of the Soviet Union and thus serves the Soviet plans for world conquest.

This brings me to the third and last part of this lecture, namely to the importance of the captive European nations in the present East-West conflict.

The Soviets have made no mystery of their determination to conquer and communize the world. Lenin has said it, Stalin has said it after him and many lesser Communist leaders as well. Not so long ago, Khrushchev stated that the Communists will abandon their goal when shrimps will whistle on a mountain top.

The free world did not in the beginning take these threats seriously. However, when, after World War II, Soviet-led international communism enslaved in a few short years 700 millions of people, the free world was forced to take such defensive measures as could contain communism and NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact—whose name was changed recently after Iraq abandoned the Western camp—were set up. Later, the successes of the Soviet Union in the field of modern weapons, and particularly in rocketry, convinced the free world that the Soviets were indeed to be taken seriously. Unfortunately, while making efforts to strengthen its defenses in the eventuality of a hot war, the free world did not fight the political and ideological struggle which the Soviets had forced upon it. In the political field the West has only reacted to Soviet moves without taking initiatives of its own. It has accepted to be placed on the defensive and has never undertaken to exploit the weaknesses of the enemy. True enough a policy of liberation of the captive nations has been proclaimed, but nothing has been done to implement it.

Yet, the Soviet Union has far greater difficulties and weaknesses than the free world. One of these weaknesses is the resistance of the enslaved peoples—and even the hostility of the Russian people themselves—to a regime which rules by theft, terror, and murder.

The Soviet leaders are very much aware of the importance of the hostility of the captive peoples. They know it to be one of the major obstacles to further expansion in Europe. This is why, ever since they took control over our countries, the Soviets have endeavored to convince our peoples that their only hope to improve their wretched condition is to resign themselves to their fate or better to become active partners in the Communist drive for world conquest. It is in order to convince our peoples that no alternative is left to them, that the Soviets have pressed the free world to establish diplomatic relations with the Communist regimes of the captive countries, that they asked, and unfortunately obtained, the admission of these regimes in the United Nations—a fine organization in many respects, but an organization that needs to realize one day that she must either abide by its present charter or change it for, as things stand now, with the foreign-imposed regimes of our countries in its midst, the United Nations violates its own Charter every day of the year.

The captive peoples have so far refused to let themselves be deceived by the Communists. Their hatred of communism and their will to resist are as strong as ever, but their confidence in the free world has been shaken. Now that, with its ultimatum over Berlin, the Kremlin has succeeded in resuming its dialog with the free world and is making another bid to obtain from the free world the recognition of the status quo in Eastern Europe, our peoples are seriously disturbed. They cannot fail to see that the new Soviet tactics of alternated threats and sweet talk about relaaxtion of tension and peaceful coexistence are making inroads in certain circles in the free world.

It is worthwhile, therefore, to try to see what the Soviets offer in exchange for the renunciation by the great Western Powers of their right and their obligations, deriving from wartime and postwar agreements, to concern themselves with the fate of the captive nations.

The Soviets say that they offer a relaxation of the international tension. This is fine, but how could international tension be relaxed if the causes of that tension, i.e., the subjugation of the captive nations and of Eastern Germany and, above all, the determination of the Soviets to conquer the world, are not removed? Tension is not a phenomenon in itself. It is only the consequence of a certain situation. It is like fever—the symptom of deeper trouble.

The Soviets say also that they offer peaceful coexistence. What is peaceful coexistence? No lesser authority than Mr. Khrushchev himself, at Novosibirsk on October 10, shortly after his visit to the United States, thus defined peaceful coexistence: "Coexistence means continuation of the struggle between the two social systems—but by peaceful means, without war, without interference by one state in the internal affairs of another. * * * We consider it to be an economic, political, and ideological struggle, but not military."

This is Mr. Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence. Thanks to a clever Soviet propaganda, the very words "cold war" have become anathema in many circles in the free world. Yet, what Khrushchev defines as peaceful coexistence is a declaration of war by all means short of military action or, if you prefer, cold war whether some wishful thinkers want to admit it or not. If the free world were to buy this Soviet brand of peaceful coexistence, it would buy, in fact, surrender by installments or war when it is at its weakest.

Until now, despite many serious concessions such as the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Communist regimes of the captive countries or their admission in the United Nations, the West has refused to recognize the status quo, as a matter of principle and of moral obligation. The great democracies were not convinced in the beginning that their interests were at stake in this question. This is why their stand was moral, honest but passive. Too many people believed that the Soviet Union had enslaved Eastern Europe to provide for her security and not to use it as an advanced base for further expansion. Now, however, many western leaders recognize that the occupation of the captive countries and the exploitation of their economies to the benefit of the Soviet's economic machine is both a tragedy and a danger to the free world. This was stated in the clearest terms in the political resolution adopted last month in Washington by the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference.

The important question is now whether the free world will translate this awareness of the importance of the captive nations to its own security into practical policy. Personally, I do not believe that the great Western Powers will recognize the status quo at the coming summit conference. I know that they do not want to do this and that they cannot afford to do it. The question, however, is whether they will raise the problem of the captive nations at the summit conference and press for a speedy solution in conformity with the principle of self-determination.

In the past, the Western Powers have been particularly timid when negotiating with the Soviets. While the latter have always insisted on negotiating only a question affecting the interests and rights of the West, the great Western Powers have reluctantly agreed, but agreed nevertheless, not to initiate or press negotiations on all the unlawful gains of past Soviet aggressions. It is, therefore, imperative that, in any future negotiations, the great democratic nations do not accept that the discussion be limited to specific crisis artificially created by the Soviet Union, such as the Soviet-engineered Berlin crisis for instance, but raise the question of the captive European nations and insist that it receives a speedy and equitable solution.

Based on a firm policy, such new western approach to negotiations could produce results which might remove the danger of war with which the world is faced today. A constant western pressure thus put into ac-

tion, added to the resistance of the captive European peoples—not to speak of the resistance of the Chinese people, which, if assisted, could also produce tremendous and perhaps even greater results—might force the Soviet Union to give up its goal of world conquest and, thus, might spare the free world of the dreadful alternative of nuclear war or surrender.

For what is in stake in the present struggle is not only the physical survival of humanity, but also the survival of freedom and western civilization. On one side we have a world which has inherited and developed a civilization that goes back over 2,000 years. A world immensely enriched in spiritual values by the ideas of the philosophers of the 18th century among whom the Founding Fathers of your country were not the least distinguished. A world based on freedom for man and on the corollary principle of the right of self-determination for peoples which we owe to the most authentic statesman of the 20th century, President Woodrow Wilson. On the other side we have a world in which the mass of the people is subjected to a cruel and arbitrary tyranny and to a ruthless economic exploitation by a small minority of privileged individuals who have thrown overboard whatever idealism their abnormal unnatural ideology may have contained in its beginnings to keep only its slogans of world revolution and its apocalyptic formulas of universal panacea.

The Western World has every advantage in this struggle. It enjoys economic superiority. Because of its superior justice it can count on the support of the great majority of the people. Most of all, it enjoys freedom which, if it dares make use of it, could become a Trojan horse of irresistible and devastating effectiveness in the enemy camp.

What the West needs in order to survive and to win is a renewed confidence in its spiritual values and the political determination to translate it into action.

Should the democratic powers fail to show the necessary resolution, they might lose. They could be defeated with or without war and over the rubble of our civilization, our enemies would build a new world from which freedom and human rights would be banished, a world in which there would be no room for any of us.

Indeed so much is at stake that one cannot but hope that those who are entrusted with the defense of democracy must not and will not fail to save it.

Summerfield Hits Dems on Postal Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than 2½ years since I nominated for permanent appointment the acting postmaster at Flint, Mich. This gentleman has been a leader in the civic life of that community and has an excellent administrative and governmental background in city and county government as well as experience in private industry. He is a veteran of World War I and has been awarded the Purple Heart.

He has passed all the civil service requirements, been carefully investigated by the Post Office Department and nominated by the President of the United States for this responsible position.

I am aware of no reason whatsoever in his background, reputation or present service which should cause the Senate to withhold confirmation of his appointment. In my opinion, the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield has ably summarized the Michigan postmaster situation in an article which appeared in the Flint Journal of February 12, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SUMMERFIELD HITS DEMS ON POSTAL APPOINTMENTS

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield blasted Michigan's two Democratic Senators today for blocking Senate confirmation of 38 postmasters in Michigan.

Summerfield, in Flint for tonight's Republican Lincoln Day program, took the recent resignation of Robert C. Miller, acting postmaster at Pontiac, as a springboard for his new attack on the policies of Senators PAT MCNAMARA and PHILIP A. HART.

"The news (of the prospective resignation) is a truly sad commentary on the extent to which Senator MCNAMARA will play politics irrespective of its damaging effects on the postal service for the people of Michigan," Summerfield said.

He praised Miller, and explained that the resignation comes because Miller is tired of waiting for Senate action. The nomination was left pending in the Senate last year and was sent back last January 11.

"On both occasions, the nomination of this able man was blocked for purely political reasons by Senator MCNAMARA, who refused to give any explanation for his actions," Summerfield continued.

"Senator MCNAMARA's position, aided and abetted by the concurrence of Senator PHILIP A. HART, who takes his cue from Senator MCNAMARA, does great damage to the postal service. It impairs the effectiveness of its operation, causes lack of confidence in men appointed to serve as postmasters and makes it very difficult to get competent men to accept these important appointments.

"It is extremely unfair, and not in accord with our best American traditions, to permit this great misuse of senatorial power. This is particularly true since Mr. Miller and others like him already have demonstrated their unusual abilities to capably serve in the position of postmaster for which they were nominated."

He cited action by the Michigan chapter of the National Association of Postmasters last June calling on the Senators to approve appointment of deserving postmaster candidates.

"Unfortunately, this appeal to reason has had no effect upon Senators MCNAMARA and HART," he concluded. "There are currently pending before the Senate the nominations of 38 postmasters for Michigan, several of which go back to 1955.

"Almost without exception these men are war veterans, and a number of them are also experienced classified postal employees with long years of postal service. All have satisfactorily passed civil service examinations for these jobs, and all have been carefully evaluated by the Post Office Department and nominated by President Eisenhower."

Summerfield attached to his statement a list of the 38 nominees, including Flint's Charles H. Pratt, who became acting postmaster in 1956 and was nominated for the permanent appointment in 1957.

Senator MCNAMARA has been holding up nominations since he took office in 1955, allowing a few to trickle through each year after his office has spent months investigating them.

HART has said he will follow MCNAMARA's lead on the appointments. One Democratic Senator is enough to block confirmation, as the Senate is organized by the majority Democrats.

Summerfield will speak tonight at the IMA Annex at Genesee County's Lincoln Day dinner. Principal speaker will be Frederick H. Mueller, Secretary of Commerce in President Eisenhower's Cabinet. Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN will introduce the Washington guests. The program begins at 6:15 with a reception in the lobby.

Is Space a Way to Peace or War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address I delivered before the National Secretaries Association, Presidential Chapter, at their "Boss Night" dinner at the Broadmoor here in Washington on Tuesday evening, February 16, 1960:

IS SPACE A WAY TO PEACE OR WAR?

(By the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York, at the National Secretaries Association, Washington, D.C., February 16, 1960)

It is a pleasure for me to talk to you today about the prospects for cooperation in international relations and the dangers of unbridled competition among nations in the new realm of outer space.

As you know, the leaders in space research and exploration are the United States and the Soviet Union. Last year a deadlock arose between these two countries, both in the United Nations and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU) on the issue of representation on space committees. This deadlock seemed to result from long-standing cold war antagonisms without any particular relation to science or the exploration of outer space. I am happy that agreement had now been reached and the Soviet Union has expressed its willingness to join the space committees of both ICSU and the United Nations.

But the fear still exists: Will outer space be used for war or peaceful purposes only? Satellites and space probes have already become major factors in the cold war. Hot war, if it ever comes, is likely to be decided by a space weapon—a truly fantastic and terrible weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), with a nuclear warhead.

Since outer space seems bound up with our future as a nation and as individuals for good or for ill—in peaceful pursuits, cold war or hot war—I should like to discuss its implications in all three respects.

Nuclear missiles have brought about a complete revolution in warfare. For most of us, the nature and extent of this change have simply not "sunk in." Are people in Cleveland or St. Louis, for example, concerned today about attack from submarines? Hardly, I think. Yet attack from submarine-launched missiles on most inland cities is technically possible. Perhaps you're thinking that there will be no great cause for concern as long as the policy of deterrence continues to work and we have enough power to retaliate. Quite true, but some pretty big "ifs" are involved. Just the other day, General Power, who heads the Strategic

Air Command, stated in public that some 300 ballistic missiles, half of them of only intermediate range, could knock out our nuclear striking force in a matter of 30 minutes. Now, I don't know how many long-range ballistic missiles the Soviet Union will have in, say, another 3 years. If I had any secret information on that subject, I would not let it out in public. But I do know that some very well known columnists, including the Alsops, Hanson Baldwin and Roscoe Drummond, have been guessing that by 1963 the number of Soviet ICBM's could be about a thousand. Let's hope their estimates are too high.

In any case, it is indisputable that the United States no longer has the military superiority over the U.S.S.R. that it enjoyed during the late 1940's. What is less often understood is that the U.S.S.R. has not acquired such a superiority either. The situation is correctly described as an uneasy balance or stalemate. In the calculations of theorists, at any rate, each side can maintain equality by being able to strike back so hard that the other side's decision to attack in the first place would be irrational. This kind of equality is well within the reach of both the United States and the Soviet Union. Some observers even argue that it would be wasteful to build up our striking power beyond a relatively low point. If our retaliatory forces are invulnerable, they need not be large.

It seems to me, though, that the conclusions I have just described, while valid for war games and strategic theory, ignore the significance of the cold war. Since the theorists themselves believe that no thermonuclear hot war will occur, if both sides keep their guard up, the cold war is likely to be decisive. It is a war of science, economics, espionage and subversion, politics and diplomacy—above all, a struggle for men's minds. To the average person, talk of thermonuclear parity seems unreal. The nation that can strike the hardest, or that leads in some significant and representative activity, is regarded as superior.

It makes no difference that superiority is meaningless in terms of deterrence, or that neither side aspires to rule a world in ashes. The average person still jumps to the conclusion that one side or the other is superior—not on the basis of analysis, but from what are taken to be symbols of superiority. This very belief, regardless of its foundations, becomes a potent factor in the cold war.

I frankly believe that the Russians see no advantage to themselves in a full-scale war. They feel that they can eventually conquer the United States and the rest of the world with the minimum of risk by tying in political objectives to scientific objectives. The more spectacular they make their scientific achievements, the greater propaganda effect they will have of the rest of the world.

While on this point, may I say that I cannot understand why this great country of ours which got to its present position of leadership by pioneering, must follow the Russians now. Why can't it do something spectacular on its own and have Russia and the rest of the world follow America for a change? Surely we have the resources and the brains to do it with.

From my personal observation on the tour that I took last fall—through the British Isles, Ireland, Scandinavia, the Soviet Union, Poland, West Germany, Austria, France, and Italy—I got the feeling that other countries see the U.S.S.R. as eventually overtaking the United States in all fields, unless something is done now to stop her.

To return for a moment to the ever existing possibility of a hot war, Soviet space achievements and particularly the power of Soviet rockets have given rise to some interest and concern.

On January 7, 1960, the Soviet Government announced that it would test fire a new rocket into the mid-Pacific, between January 15 and February 15, and for that purpose would reserve a large impact area of nearly 45,000 square miles, lying approximately 1,100 miles southwest of Hawaii. Then on January 20, according to our own Defense Department, "an object which had certain characteristics of a ballistic missile" landed in the sea area reserved by the Soviet Union.

If this Soviet missile was launched from a known base, such as Kapustin Yar or Tyuratam, it must have traveled about 8,000 miles. This is a sobering fact. The Soviet Union announced that the missile had gone 7,766 miles to within 2 kilometers (1.24 miles) of its target.

As you know, two requirements for a good military missile are guidance and propulsion. On the matter of guidance, the recent Soviet sharpshooting exhibition in the Pacific should settle any doubts. Soviet guidance is good enough. While it may not be quite so good as ours, the difference seems more academic than practical. As for propulsion, Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of the National Space Agency, has testified that the Soviet space lead "is based principally on the possession by the Soviets of one or more reliable launch vehicle systems having perhaps twice the thrust of our own first-stage booster rockets." The weight of informed opinion accepts the fact that the Soviet tests in the central Pacific are being made with an even more powerful rocket booster than the one that launched the sputniks and luniks.

Wu Yu-Hsun, vice president of the Communist Chinese Academy of Sciences, has said that "the propulsive force of the rocket (launched by the Soviet Union into the mid-Pacific) reached about 1 million pounds." Compare with this the 360,000-pound thrust of our own Atlas. Our Saturn rocket, which is expected to produce a thrust of 1½ million pounds, will not be available until 1964. It seems a safe prediction that by 1964 the Russians will have developed a superrocket of their own, even more powerful than Saturn.

The acknowledged superiority of the Soviet Union in rocket thrust is no minor matter. It makes possible the accomplishment of missions in outer space that we cannot even hope to emulate today. It shortens the lead time in vehicle development from concept to launching. It increases the reliability of Soviet rockets and missiles.

From a military point of view, greater rocket thrust brings all the advantages just enumerated plus several more. Rockets of greater thrust can carry heavier and hence more powerful warheads, delivered as accurately (if Soviet announcements on this point are believed) as our own Atlas.

More than a year ago, Khrushchev said that the Soviet Union had an 8,700-mile missile with a 5-megaton warhead. At the time, President Eisenhower expressed his disbelief. I wonder if he has since been convinced. Suppose the new Soviet rocket can hurl such warheads a distance of 8,000 miles or more. We would then be outgunned, outranged—as the Allies in World War I were outgunned for a time by "Big Bertha", exposed to its fire but helpless to strike back. Could we have prevented Russia from obtaining this gigantic lead? The answer is: "Yes."

At this point, I wish to be fair to both the administration and Congress which is probing this entire defense program. Some say that the apparent feud between the President and the Congress is confirming weaknesses in our Government structure and giving the Communists another propaganda victory which they can exploit to strengthen their allies, weaken ours, and convert undecided peoples.

Let us first admit that we have no choice under a democracy. We cannot live in a vacuum and we cannot function in secrecy, unless we change our form of government. For my part, I think the debate is good. It is healthy. I have the greatest amount of confidence in the American people. I believe that they, like a jury, if given all the facts will arrive at the right decision. The question is when to alert the American people—after the fire starts or before? Congress, I think, is doing a tremendous service by trying to stir up the American people now, before it is too late.

You, the jury, may want to consider whether it is wise to have the leadership in the White House different than that in the Congress. Perhaps a government should stand or fall on its record, without being able to pass the bucket to this or that branch. But that is an election campaign issue and unnecessary for me to go into now. It is food for thought, though, is it not?

Now enough on this somber side of the picture. Let us look at the other side where its brilliancy holds a hope and a promise that space research will transform our daily lives and our patterns of cooperation with other countries, bringing peace and abundance to everyone on earth.

It seems almost certain, as Dr. James Van Allen has said, that the progress of space science and technology will bring "• • • a large and continuing harvest of important practical application." Many specific practical uses of outer space have not only been predicted but are actually planned or under development. They include weather forecasting and control, television, and radio relays, navigation, and geodetic measurement, and even mail service. As you may remember, in June of last year mail was delivered from a submarine at sea to a city on the Florida coast. The Navy is also developing a navigation system using an artificial satellite. Information provided by the satellite is expected to be made available for unrestricted civilian use, so that ships and travelers everywhere can quickly find their exact positions on the earth's surface. Communication and weather satellites, too, are currently undergoing development and testing by the U.S. Government.

Satellites and other space systems should not belong to any particular country. They are worldwide by nature. Certainly, nonmilitary space systems will be far less effective without international, and in some cases universal, cooperation. For example, a communication satellite can hardly provide the worldwide radio and television coverage of which it is capable unless other countries cooperate. A single uncooperative government, in fact, might even deprive other countries of its benefits by disabling the satellite or jamming its equipment by radio.

The international character of outer space holds out the promise of bringing all countries closer together in their peaceful pursuits. Can there be any doubt that one result will be to change our attitudes toward other countries? Think for a moment about worldwide radio and television. National television has created new ties and greater understanding among people in different parts of our own country. If Ivan and Sonya could watch the same program as Johnny and Susan, this would be a different world, would it not? The chances are that it would be a better and safer place to live.

Ever since I became a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I have personally advocated greater international cooperation in space research. To that end I have labored as diligently as I knew how to do, visiting a number of foreign countries, communicating with the President and other officials in this country, and talking and conducting correspondence on the subject with Khrushchev himself.

There are signs that my efforts and those of others, both in the Government and in private life, are beginning to bear fruit. Russia, which had refused to join the temporary committee on the peaceful uses of outer space, has now joined the permanent committee recently formed.

Beyond the immediate practical uses already described, the exploration of outer space will add to our knowledge of the earth and its environment. Space research has led to the discovery of the Van Allen radiation belts and to new knowledge about such matters as the shape of the earth, high-energy particles and cosmic rays, the proper use of which they say some day can prolong your life a couple of hundred years. Sooner or later, the scientific knowledge derived from space research is bound to prove useful in our daily lives, even if we don't get to live to 200 years or more. We know that this has been the result of every systematic line of scientific inquiry in history. Some applications are already apparent. For example, our growing knowledge about high-energy particles in outer space will improve our radio communications here on earth. Research on materials for the nose cones of military missiles has led to the development of a plastic which is now used in home refrigerators.

My remarks would not be complete without a reference to the influence of space exploration on the human mind and spirit. It is plain that the challenge of outer space appeals to man's curiosity and thirst for adventure. I believe it will also stimulate our moral sense, our capacity for wonder, our faith in God and reverence. In the realm of the stars, I hope we may at last lose our selfish interests and petty bickering (political and otherwise), refine our sympathies, strengthen our moral fiber, expand our spiritual understanding, and lift up our eyes to higher and eternal goals.

If a Roman Catholic Were Elected President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1960, a sermon entitled "If a Roman Catholic Were Elected President" was delivered by a distinguished clergyman in my district, Dr. Irwin M. Blank, rabbi of Temple Sinai, at Tenafly, N.J.

As we all know, much has been written and spoken in public and in private over the years for and against the desirability of a Roman Catholic as President of the United States. Many of the points expressed in Dr. Blank's sermon, however, are original and thought provoking.

While I do not necessarily agree with all of the statements Rabbi Blank makes in his sermon, I am in hearty and complete agreement with his final conclusion, which is:

Every citizen of this country, if he is eligible under our Constitution, has the right to run for, and to be elected to, any public office and to be judged on his record and on his stated policies and attitudes.

In my judgment, to hold otherwise would not be in accord with the Declaration of Indepedence or the Constitution of the United States.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that in November of 1960 and at every future election throughout the land the voters of America will vote for the candidates best qualified for office on the basis of their merit and their policies. The electorate should never be influenced by the race, religion, creed, or color of any candidate for any public office in our great Republic.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Blank's interesting sermon in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IF A ROMAN CATHOLIC WERE ELECTED PRESIDENT

(Sermon by Dr. Irwin M. Blank)

One of the oft-repeated incidents concerning the history of the Jewish community in America revolves around the actions of one Asser Levy. It was in July 1655 that the question arose in New Amsterdam as to the right of the Jews to defend the community. In August of that year the council ruled that "owing to the disgust and unwillingness of the train bands to be fellow soldiers with the said nation and to be on guard with the same at the guardhouse * * * Jews cannot be permitted to serve as soldiers, but should be exempt. For such exemption each male person should pay a monthly contribution of 65 stivers."

It was Asser Levy who fought this ruling and won for the Jewish community of his day the right to serve in the military of New Amsterdam and freedom from special taxation. Had it not been for the heroism and courageousness of Asser Levy, who knows but that the United States today, as many countries in Europe, would have a concept of second-class citizenship which limits the ability of a segment of the population to participate fully in the affairs of government.

Certainly we know that even at this late date our Government is not free from such restrictions, either in law or in fact. If this were not so we would not require the establishment of Government agencies whose function it is to guard against discrimination. We would not still be concerned about poll taxes and Sunday laws if we had arrived at the utopian state in which all citizens were treated fairly and equally under the law.

Of immediate concern and interest to us is the discussion and reaction which has been generated by the possibility of an American citizen of the Roman Catholic faith running as a candidate for the highest elected office of our land, the Presidency.

First, a word to those members of the Jewish community who harbor the illusion that we are living in a Christian nation. Apart from what Christians mean when they speak of our country as Christian, when most Jews use the term they seem to mean that it is a sort of "we against they" situation in which Jews are the underdog. If any issue should disabuse Jews of this impression it is certainly the one of the likelihood of a Roman Catholic citizen serving as President.

The recent statement by a minister of a local Unitarian church to the effect that under no circumstances would he consider voting for a candidate of the Roman Catholic faith coupled with the results of a survey of Presbyterian ministers, recently published in the New York Times indicating that there is a similar feeling held amongst members of this group as well, should serve to underline the thought that there are many issues on which the Christian community is not united. To succumb to the belief in the myth that this is a Christian nation is to weaken the fabric of democratic life.

If we agree that neither in law nor in fact is this a Christian nation then within the framework of our consideration of the problems, imagined or real, concerning the likelihood of electing a citizen of the Roman Catholic faith as President, we must ask ourselves whether this is a Protestant nation, whose highest office is to be restricted to a Protestant and whether this is a country whose pattern is to be limited to that of the Protestant ethic.

Here again history and the theory of democratic society will not permit us to answer in the affirmative. A democracy depends for its very survival upon its ability to keep its policies and its laws free from the domination of any one sectarian influence.

Perhaps more than any other religion, Roman Catholicism's doctrines seem to be clear cut and unequivocal. Most citizens would find themselves hard put to cite what this or that Protestant denomination believes with reference to specific questions or for that matter what this or that Jewish group believes. Yet, with reference to Roman Catholics we seem to be able, in most situations, to indicate what the nature of the Roman Catholic commitment is.

This is largely because of the clear cut hierarchy which exists within the Roman Catholic Church which restricts the issuing of policy to specific officials within the church. Thus, the situation is quite unlike the Protestant Church in which it is virtually every denomination for itself, or within the Jewish community where it is virtually every Jew for himself.

The principles and practices of the Roman Catholic Church are proclaimed by the Pope or an authorized official. Therefore, theoretically, the principle and the practice are clear and binding upon every Catholic who wishes to remain within the good graces of the church.

But, the truth of the matter is that these principles are not necessarily crystal clear nor is the practice binding under every and all circumstances.

A few illustrations will suffice to demonstrate this point.

With reference to the schooling of the young, some time ago the principle was established that only in a church school could the young receive that kind of education which could be sanctioned by the church. Now, the truth of the matter is that not every Roman Catholic child is being educated in a Roman Catholic parochial school even where such schools are available and to the best of my knowledge although there may be pressure exerted on the parents of these children they are still considered to be within the good graces of the church.

It is also well known that despite the church's stated position against divorce that divorces have been granted by permission of the church, even if we say after great effort, nevertheless granted they have been.

The Roman Catholic Church, as is true of most individuals, will avoid a display of overt hostility against it if it can avoid it and will not be rigid in its attitude unless the issue is joined. It seems to be that when the Roman Catholics' position on a specific matter has prevailed it is because the rest of the community is divided in its attitude.

This has certainly been true in the case of the constant attempt to revise the divorce laws of New York State. Repeatedly Jewish and Protestant legislators have voted in accordance with the Roman Catholic position. The same would hold true on the issue of Federal aid to church schools. Many Protestant Churches have pressed for

such aid along with the Roman Catholic Church. The same would hold true for Sunday laws. I am certain that not every car that had a sticker on it urging that one vote for the Sunday law was driven by a Roman Catholic.

The truth of the matter is that any religious group if it finds itself in the majority is sorely tempted to play fast and loose with the democratic structure. The question was once put to me by a Protestant minister as to what I thought would happen in a community where there was a Jewish majority. I could not be as reassuring as I would like to have been, because I suspect that we would be guilty of the same errors.

Those who fear that a Roman Catholic would be too bound to his sectarian doctrines are really expressing their doubts concerning the strengths of a democratic system. They are fearful because they know how large a percentage of our citizenry are ill informed concerning public issues. So much so that many citizens would not even know whether a public official was following a sectarian doctrine or not. They are fearful of putting into high office a man who is committed to the principles of a religion whose adherents are in a numerical minority because they know that it places great responsibility on the adherents of a faith whose members are in the majority to keep sufficiently well informed to know when their own doctrines are being challenged. The truth of the matter seems to be that all too many of our citizens do not care to be well informed.

It is clear that whoever assumes public office must swear loyalty to the Constitution of the United States. It is also clear that the Pope or perhaps one should say the Roman Catholic Church does not exert any temporal power. It is not likely that a President of the Roman Catholic faith would consult the church with reference to the signing of treaties, trade agreements, or what have you. And even if he did we still have a Congress, a free press, and an articulate citizenry. And if, in the final analysis, adequate safeguards are absent for the protection of the democratic process then, by all means, let us have those safeguards.

Our Constitution clearly bars the possibility of using any kind of religious test for those desiring public office. As Jews we know the nature of these religious tests and surely we should be amongst the first to exert every effort so that this principle is observed in practice.

It is legitimate to require that any candidate state himself clearly on the vital issues of the day. It is also known that only the very few ever do. Some of our ablest statesmen and politicians are also our ablest evaders of the direct answer.

If this is so then we shall have to try to evaluate the nature of the evasion. If a man expects to hold public office then his views cannot be kept secret.

In any event we do not have the right to prejudge any candidate because of his religious commitment. We do have the right to judge him on his record and on his convictions vis-a-vis the issues of the day.

It is for him to square his answers with his religious convictions not for us to reject him without knowing what those answers are.

Surely, no one will understand me as insisting that we must have a President who is of the Roman Catholic faith. But, it is my hope that everyone will accept the thought that every citizen of this country, if he has the qualifications as stated by our Constitution, has the right to run for and to be elected to office and to be judged on his record and on his stated policies and attitudes.

U.S. Nuclear Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I recently received from a distinguished surgeon in my district, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Jr., of Gallipolis, Ohio. Dr. Holzer describes what I consider to be one of the gravest threats ever to confront our Nation. I urge my colleagues to give this matter their full consideration. I firmly support the proposals advanced by Dr. Holzer and I have called them to the attention of the President:

THE HOLZER CLINIC,
Gallipolis, Ohio, February 13, 1960.

The Honorable WALTER H. MOELLER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MOELLER: I write to urge and plead that you immediately and emphatically declare your support to the following:

(1) A continuation of our policy that nuclear weapons not be distributed to our allies.

(2) A declaration by the United States of our intention to permanently abstain from testing nuclear weapons.

Wider distribution of nuclear weapons should be opposed because:

(1) It is a truism that the probability of the use of these weapons increases in direct proportion or perhaps even in geometric proportion to the number of nations possessing them and the number of persons responsible for their handling.

(2) Distribution of nuclear weapons to our allies destroys any moral argument available to us in protesting the furnishing by the U.S.S.R. of such weapons to her allies and satellites.

(3) Fear and distrust of us by the U.S.S.R. her satellites, and the uncommitted nations can be only greatly enhanced.

(4) No possible purpose can be served by a reversal of our policy in this regard.

(5) Wider distribution of these absolute weapons belies our posture of peace-making in the world.

(6) The possession of nuclear weapons by any smaller, potentially unstable government could in the rapidly changing world cause such a nation to assume a course which would be irreversible and lead to total thermonuclear disaster for the whole world.

Testing of nuclear weapons should be banned unilaterally by the United States because:

(1) Such a declaration would help to convince the world that we mean business when we talk about peace-making. I fail to see, looking at us through the eyes of a foreign nation, how we could be regarded with any great amount of trust at the present time. By now we must have in our possession many times the thermonuclear power required to kill all the people in the world. If we never intend to use it why try to improve on it?

(2) Despite the assurances of Edward Teller and the like, the contamination of our atmosphere and the resultant radioactive fallout cannot be anything but harmful.

(3) Our stalling on agreements at Geneva, because of the statements by Teller and others that underground explosions cannot be monitored, can only be regarded as evidence of insincerity about genuine approaches to peace and disarmament. A declaration of a unilateral ban would help to mend the damage done by such stalling and would put the U.S.S.R. in the position of having to take the next step to show that she really wants peace.

Sometime—by somebody—something must be done to stop this mad competition between the nations of the world. Step by step—block by block—a structure of relationship is being built in the form of an inverted pyramid, becoming less and less stable with each added block. To any rational person who can look at the situation in perspective it appears certain that there can be but one outcome. One of us will add just one more block and then—mutual suicide. May we remove at least a few of the blocks and render the structure just a bit more stable.

I do not accept the dictum that only a few informed people at the top are in a position to make decisions. In these unprecedented times we are engaged in the "politics of eternity." There is no experience or principle on which to rely except the fundamental moral principles on which all relationships of men to each other should depend. Therefore, I submit that any of us who are concerned and who will attempt to be informed may have an opinion as valid as any "expert" or "high authority."

I quote from an article, "The Anatomy of Deterrence," by Bernard Brodie, published in World Politics in January 1959. Mr. Brodie, no pacifist, but a Rand expert concludes his technical article in which he analyzes the psychology and mechanics of deterrence as follows:

"Technological progress is pushing us rapidly and inexorably toward a position of almost intolerable mutual menace. Unless something is done politically to alter the environment, both sides will before many years have numerous missiles accurately pointed at each other's hearts and ready to be fired literally at a moment's notice. Nothing which has any promise of obviating or alleviating the tensions of such situations should be overlooked."

Respectfully,
CHARLES E. HOLZER, Jr., M.D.

Senior Citizens Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the excellent sermon delivered by Rabbi Arthur Schneier, spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jacob in Brooklyn, N.Y., on Saturday, February 13, 1960, set forth the needs of senior citizens. Since he felt that a Senior Citizens' Week would help call attention to their problems and, in turn, lead to their solution, I have introduced a resolution to authorize the President to set aside such a week each year. The President, as you know, has called a White House Conference on Aging to be held in Washington in January 1961, and I think it entirely fitting and proper that the interest of the Nation be focused on this subject.

I believe Rabbi Schneier's words should be read by all, and I include them herewith:

"Cast me not off in time of old age, when my strength faileth, forsake me not"—resounds throughout the length and breadth of our land. Strangely, this plea by the psalmist is now uttered by men and by women whose earthly pilgrimage has been prolonged by scientific and medical research. It would seem that this miraculous achievement instead of assuring the rich harvest of a lifetime has given them futility, remorse, and despair. The overemphasis on youth, and the social ostracism of the aged have done much to deprive our elders of dignity and self-respect. They are but the unfortunate victims of society in which there is little cultural valuing of old people.

Regrettably, our values of the aged is determined in part by the ever-increasing fiber of materialism prevalent in our society. Productivity has become a prerequisite for status and self-respect. A lifetime of toil and hard labor is forgotten like a passing wind. Past performance is not relevant unless it has resulted in a continued state of productivity, marked by an accumulation of wealth. The damaging effects of a youth-oriented society seem to offset the advances of geriatrics and gerontology. The discriminating employment practices against persons above the age of 45, the magic qualities attributed to the aggressive young executive and professional, the concerted effort by our advertising media in suggesting ways and means to stay young are indicative of the cult of youth that America has embraced. One does not grow old gracefully in our country. Even our churches and synagogues have primarily become youth oriented. This manifests itself in the concentration on the building of youth centers and religious schools, the liberal budget for youth activities as against the limited number of golden age clubs and the almost complete void in congregational programing for the aged.

Our total commitment to the Moloch of wealth and plenty has translated itself into a drive for new things; we tire easily of clothes, household appliances, and automobiles. Yearning for the new is not only limited to consumer goods; it is quite apparent in our family and social life. The high rate of divorce may be attributed to a feeling of obsolescence that overcomes the marriage partner. They just seem to get tired of each other. "Obsolescence" well describes our impatient and discriminating attitude toward our aged population. In a society that places much stress on material wealth, man and his creators are easily discarded as obsolete. We seem to forget their experience and maturity are inherent qualities of the hoary head and not the young. It may be judicious to replace old machinery but it is not wise to dispense with experienced manpower at a time when the preservation of our American heritage requires the mobilization of all our resources.

Our society has lost the Judeo-Christian reverence and respect for elders. At present, the burden of adjustment is placed upon the old person. He is expected to accept social conditions as he finds them. Although the individual must prepare himself for the process of aging, it is society which must adjust its social norms, standards, and institutions to changed conditions in such a way that they would provide more fully for the satisfaction of the needs of the old. An adjustment to ease the economic plight of our aged has seen the introduction of social security by our Federal Government. Special housing, city and State support of needy oldsters in nursing homes, retirement benefits by industry and labor, the communal effort or golden age recreation centers, all represent a further accommodation to the needs of our aged, we must admit that these undertakings have met only with limited success in guaranteeing a respected role for our senior citizens. The problem as it confronts our Nation today is precipitated by the negative attitude of our culture and can only be remedied by a process of reeducation the clear responsibility of government, our school system and religion. We must embark upon a course of action that will assure love and recognition for our aged so that their autumn years of life may become golden days of self-fulfillment. Selfish motives require our close examination of this problem, for any improved social climate will primarily benefit us in our latter years.

The first White House Conference on the Aging is a good beginning in the establishment of an awareness of this social challenge. It requires the prestige of the President and Congress to stimulate a bold and imaginative program that will capture the hearts of the American people. We have set aside various days in our calendar to remind us of the noble principles and ideals of our heritage. We have designated Brotherhood Week to foster the spirit of brotherhood among people, we remember the men and women who gave their lives for the prescrvation of democracy on Veterans Day, and we pay homage to our teachers on Teachers Day.

It would serve as a source of motivation to designate a week or a day in honor of our senior citizens, when all the spiritual and educational forces could be marshalled to restore the Judeo-Christian reverence for our aged.

The problem of the aging is primarily an American one, achieved by the ingenious advances of medicine and the prosperity of our Nation. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa where the average life span is about 35 compared to 68 in the United States. The problem of aging is relegated to wishful thinking. We are indeed fortunate to be confronted with the challenge. The Almighty has shown his loving kindness and mercy to our Nation. He has truly blessed us with long life and prosperity. It remains our pleasant task to transform this gift into a blessing for our aged.

What About Underground Detection?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speakef, within the present general agreement that an international ban on nuclear testing is imperative, there are two distinct points of view developing, differing largely in their responses to the problem of detecting certain underground explosions.

The arguments of that group which holds that this problem should not be regarded as too strong a reason for holding up a testing ban are pointedly stated in the following article by Columnist Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post, February 16, 1960.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit Mr. Lippmann's article which follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—NUCLEAR TESTING
(By Walter Lippmann)

The explosion in the Sahara Desert, which shows that French science and technology are as good as anyone else's, is notice to all of us that there is no monopoly and not much mystery about nuclear weapons. What France can do today, China will be able to do tomorrow, not to speak of Germany and Japan. This would not necessarily mean the end of the world. But it will certainly mean that as the test explosions are multiplied, the air will become polluted, and the consequences to future generations are horrible to contemplate.

For 14 months the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States have been negotiating a treaty designed to put an end to test explosions. These negotiations have progressed marvelously, and they represent something quite new and unexpected in the relations between the Soviet Union and the Western World.

To be sure the three of us, who now have nuclear weapons, cannot impose our treaty, even if we reach final agreement, on the rest of the world. But if we are agreed on a treaty, we shall set an example, we shall create the machinery, around which world opinion will surely rally. There is little reason to doubt that France, for example, if her rights are respected, would join in and contribute valuable help in making the test ban workable.

Yet for the time being the negotiations are stalled. The issue arises out of experiments conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission in a salt mine in Louisiana. These experiments showed our experts that relatively small underground explosions cannot be detected by the existing instruments. They cannot surely be distinguished from earthquakes. Our difference with the Soviet Union is over the size of the underground explosions which can be detected. Our experts say that the underground explosion can be nine times as big, and still go undetected, as the Soviet experts say it can be.

The administration has taken the position that we will not agree to abandon underground explosions if our experts say they are too small to be detected. We propose, therefore, to authorize such small nuclear testing. As it happens, these authorized explosions would be just the ones which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon regard as desirable in order to perfect a number of weapons they are working on. The Soviet position, on the other hand, is that all tests must be banned, even those which cannot be detected.

The abstract logic of our position—ban only what surely can be detected—is perfect in itself. But there is a very good reason to think that it is unrealistic and that, if we hold to it inflexibly, refusing to work out any one of the many compromises which are quite conceivable, it will prove to be an unwise position. For it is based on the assumption that no treaty is better than an imperfect treaty.

I think this assumption is miscalculated. The miscalculation is a failure to realize the significance of the concessions which have been made by the Soviet Union in agreeing to an elaborate worldwide inspection system, of which a large number of stations, manned by foreigners, would be on Soviet territory. In the perspective of Russian, not to speak of Communist, suspicion, and dislike of foreigners, the Soviet concessions promise a political breakthrough of historic significance.

Our policymakers have not, it seems to me, taken into account the full consequence of the Soviet concessions. It is that the Soviet Union is by way of convincing most of the world outside this country that it is sincere about ending nuclear testing. We have been told by the experts of the Atomic Energy Commisison not to worry about fallout. But mankind is terrified by it, and the Soviet Union is buying world support by agreeing to be inspected by foreigners in order to end the testing.

The President and his advisers should bear this in mind when they talk about resuming

our own testing. The President has said that "we consider ourselves free to resume nuclear testing" but that we shall not resume it without announcing our intention to do so.

What does the President think would happen if he did announce such an intention? There would be an uproar around the world. Quite competent and cool observers believe that the uproar would bring about a special meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to protest against our action, and that if the question were put to a vote, we should be lucky to get 10 votes out of 80.

In any event the damage to our influence and our prestige would be enormous.

Moreover, and this is the point that the administration should not overlook, if the treaty fails because it is not totally perfect, the Soviet Union will have won a sweeping diplomatic victory. The Soviet Union will not have to admit foreigners to carry out inspection on her territory. At the same time the United States will not really be free to continue testing. For the more we test, the more we shall be denounced and opposed as having failed to show a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

When these negotiations started, the Russians wanted to ban testing without any inspection. If we hold inflexibly to our present position, there is likely to be no treaty, and the Russians will get for nothing most of what they wanted in the first place. They will have no inspection and they will have made it almost impossible for us to do much testing.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

In Defense of State Colleges and Universities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's greatest universities is Rutgers University, New Jersey's State university, located in the friendly and hospitable town of New Brunswick. Rutgers University's greatness is due both to the support given to it by the education-minded people of New Jersey and, equal in importance, the distinguished Americans who have served as its presidents. This post has been held in recent years by Dr. Robert Clothier, Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, and Dr. Mason W. Gross in that order.

Those familiar with State colleges and universities know that the charges leveled at them by their critics, that they have become too swamped with students to pay proper attention to quality, are simply not true. Another charge, equally fallacious, is that such State institutions are on the verge of becoming trade schools, not really educating, but offering easily available training in skills which could be acquired in 6 months of hard work in the world outside the campus.

As a member of the New Jersey State Legislature's education committee I had a close and intimate relationship with Rutgers University over a period of some years, and my experience at that time, and before and since, has convinced me that these great colleges and universities are making a unique and vital contribution both to our own country and to the world.

I am pleased to include here, as part of my remarks, an excerpt from an article from the Saturday Evening Post of February 13, 1960, written by Dr. Paul Engle of the State University of Iowa, which is one of the most informed statements I have seen and which sets forth the high purposes and great contributions which these State-supported institutions are making to our time and to our leadership of the free world.

An outstanding American editor, author and poet, Dr. Engle studied at Oxford University as a Rhodes scholar, and in more recent years won a Guggenheim fellowship. Dr. Engle has taught English at the State University of Iowa since 1937.

The excerpt follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY

(By Paul Engle)

For the last few years I have read with increasing alarm many gloomy articles about American education and its pitiful condition. In particular, the charges being made against our State colleges and universities are both impressive and depressing. State schools, critics assert, have become too swamped with quantity of students to pay proper attention to quality. Our tax-supported colleges have become playgrounds and marriage mills, more devoted to athletic spectacles, beauty queens, fraternity high-jinks, and other immature horseplay than to the dedicated pursuit of the scientific knowledge that is vital to our survival—such is the accusation. Or perhaps even more damning to the whole idea of the State university is the allegation that such institutions teeter on the edge of turning themselves into trade schools, not really educating, but offering easily available training in skills which could be acquired in 6 months of hard work in the world outside the campus.

Many of these accusations have some truth in them, and I—a college professor with my whole life invested in education—have shed as many tears as anyone over that portion which is true. But then one day the first American satellite soared into space. When the steady beat of its signals came back to earth, I was excited to read that the first communications this country had received from outer space came from miniature instruments designed and built for the most part in small rooms at the State University of Iowa, rooms which I pass almost every day. The instruments were the work of Dr. James Van Allen and his assistants—many of whom were still students working for degrees. Later the great belts of intense radiation which circle the earth were revealed by his instruments, were interpreted by him and his assistants, and were named the Van Allen belts, in his honor.

Not long after this I read a book on stuttering, edited by Wendell Johnson, a fellow faculty member who had been a next-door neighbor of mine for a year. And I learned that our university was the world's center for study of that shattering handicap in communication endured by more than 1 million people in the United States. At about this time I visited New York and went to see the new play Sweet Bird of Youth, written by Tennessee Williams and I remembered well the poetry Williams had written as a student on our campus poetry as intense as the plays he later wrote.

It become obvious to me that the university where I teach simply was not a hall of horrors, proving the decay of State education. I began to look around me. Over the next year or so I visited many State universities, talked with scores of faculty members and students. I collected and read about 800,000 words of reports. And from all this emerged an exciting composite of the State university, like American society itself, fumbling its way toward new greatness in an organized but sometimes loose-jointed way.

In brief, the amazing contributions of our universities in the arts, in science and in social thinking are so vital that it seems likely that our country's future security, as well as its future greatness, is bound up with them. In the ideological jungle of the twentieth century we have an absolute dependence on that unique combination of practicality and vision—and yes, even some of the supposed foolishness—which the State university has brought together in a single institution. This country will survive its passage through this perilous century because of its brains, and the State university is our most important mechanism by which that essential intelligence—scattered everywhere among our people—is given a chance to develop in every corner of the United States.

The campus of a typical State university sprawls over a lot of land in a curious collection of buildings from Victorian vile to modern capsules of aluminum and glass. Some are small cities to themselves—the University of Minnesota counts 26,500, for example. Money in astonishing amounts is needed to keep such institutions running—the University of Illinois budget runs more than $79 million, of which two-thirds comes from tax revenues. Thus has grown one of the extraordinary ideas invented by the American people, the notion that they should tax themselves in every State to provide the facilities for giving their children a look at the total knowledge of the world. This is in exact opposition to the view expressed in so charmingly an unpleasant way by the Oxford man who believe in education for only the so-called elite:

"We are the chosen few—
All others will be damn'd.
There is no room in heaven for you;
We can't have heaven crammed."

The view of the State university is: expand heaven. Bring the people into a larger room. These institutions as we know them in their astonishing range today are largely the result of their growth and development over the last 75 years. A few can claim that they began life in the 18th century—Rutgers of New Jersey dates from 1766; the University of Georgia goes back to 1785; the University of North Carolina to 1789. But in the beginning these were schools with primitive facilities, not fully developed universities. The concept of tax-supported State schools was given its most powerful impetus by the Morrill Act, which set aside Federal lands for school development. Timid President Buchanan vetoed the measure when it was first proposed, but in 1862 Congress passed it and President Abraham Lincoln put his name on it—one of our country's great acts of courage and vision in a year when the Civil War had powerfully shaken the unity and security of the Nation. Thus from the start of their major growth our universities had their roots quite literally in native American soil—in 17,430,000 acres of public lands that were given to various States for a State educational system.

The State university is a powerful cement in American society. Proportionately 10 times as many boys and girls go to college in the United States as do in the United Kingdom. The appalling catastrophes of European nations in this century surely have been due in part to the wide separation between the elite—a tiny educated group—and society at large. Such a sharp break does not occur in our country because of that additional nine-tenths who go to college—and a large number of them go only because the State schools offer them the opportunity close at hand.

The State university is the most massive attempt in the world's history to make higher education available to any qualified young person who wants it. As a result some shocking things happen. In a single year Ohio State University flunks out 2,000 students, many of whom never should have been allowed to enter. Yet look at the progress there. When Dr. T. C. Mendenhall lectured on physics at Ohio State in 1873, his only laboratory apparatus was his own lunch pail suspended by a rope from the ceiling—the

pail presumably swung in an arc which varied according to whether or not the professor had eaten his lunch. Today Ohio State's radiotelescope records the collision of galaxies of stars 200 million light-years away.

One of the best defenses of the State university has come, properly enough, from the Ivy League with its largely private schools. When he was president of Harvard, James B. Conant, speaking at the inauguration of a new president of Ohio State, said that the State university had been added to the medieval and Renaissance universities as "the new comprehensive American type." He felt that the tax-supported universities, as they grew toward maturity, had become the dominant theme of education in this country in this century. "This growth," he argued, "will be recorded by historians as clear evidence that the optimistic intellectual courage born of the 15th century Renaissance was, 5 centuries later, still driving westward with undiminished vigor."

Some critics, hearing the immense football stadiums howl on a Saturday afternoon as if Christians had suddenly attacked lions with their bare hands, cannot believe that the intellectual vigor is still on the campus. However, the one great, provable and proud fact about State universities is this: excellence is everywhere. It may exist in the midst of superb foolishness. But the excellence is there, standing clean and solid in the honest daylight, and it is expanding.

For years Yale and Harvard graduates led all others in numbers included in Who's Who in America. But in recent decades more graduates from the University of Michigan have been listed in this volume than those from any other school, public or private. The University of California leads all others in number of Guggenheim Fellowships awarded its faculty. From the years 1906 to 1932, 15 Nobel prizes were awarded to American citizens—2 of these had their education entirely in Europe, and one had no college education at all. Of 12 who were native American citizens, 10 were from private institutions of higher learning and 2 from public institutions. Now, observe this excellence: from 1933 to 1958, 46 Nobel awards were given to American citizens. (This excludes from the total six who had their entire education in Europe and two who attended no college.) Thirty-two out of the 46 received degrees from, or taught at, public institutions and 14 were affiliated with private institutions.

With almost savage zeal the State universities have taken up the ambition of Ezra Cornell when he founded the great university in New York that bears his name. He wanted a truly universal university, where any student could find instruction in any subject. Thus it was natural that in the early days of what is now Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Prof. Isaac Roberts, instructor in agriculture, should dig up buried horses, keeping the head and any diseased parts for instructional purposes, thoughtfully placing his students to the windward. There must have been learning at its ripest. Now the University of Indiana each year presents the opera "Parsifal," and undertaking musically far beyond the resources of most, if not all, private universities. The University of Arkansas has built a $1 million art center, designed by Edward Stone, architect of the American Exposition building at the Brussels World's Fair. The University of Nebraska not only has one of the finest living American poets, Karl Shapiro, on its staff but also has an outstanding museum of prehistoric life in that part of America.

It is easy to be misled at a State university basketball game, where students display poor sportsmanship—a world which offers some startling examples—by shrieking their doubts of the referee's ancestry. But think of the plaintive remark of an Oxford University physicist: "When Oxford finally gets its own electronic computer, we won't have to send certain kinds of data to California for processing." The development of the cyclotron on the Berkeley campus of the University of California by Prof. E. O. Lawrence, Nobel prize winner in physics, made that school one of the world centers for nuclear study. It led to the discovery of 11 of the 13 synthetic elements made in atomic reactors or atom smashers, including the atomic energy fuel, plutonium. If you have read about missile development, you know the initials BOMARC. The last four letters stand for Michigan Aeronautical Research Center, where the land-based guidance system for the missile was developed. Or consider that the midwestern universities are getting together to build, in a fine joint effort the largest high-energy particle accelerator in the world—and it will be built on some campus where it is no interference at all to have high-energy girls twirling their batons and accelerating their particles at football games.

Some of our State universities do look like warehouses and tend to regard students as objects to be stored there for a few years in a grand total that will impress legislators into voting larger appropriations. As any professor knows, there are classes in which the student's mind is scratched much less than his head. There will be young men and women writing the expressive English language with less grace than a child finger painting on a wall. There will be some male graduate students whose most enthusiastic research concerns the courtship habits of female undergraduates. But if you think such things are the heart of State university education, you are heartlessly wrong.

The fact is that our great State-supported universities and colleges support our society. They teach it, reflect its varied needs, refresh it, help it solve its problems. The University of Minnesota, for example, came to the rescue of the great Mesabi Iron Range when the rich ores were becoming depleted. By developing a process by which low-grade iron ores could be converted into concentrated pellets of taconite, vast, previously uneconomical iron resources were made economical.

That same university produced what is believed to be the largest audience ever to bear a poet when T. S. Eliot spoke there. At that university the American Legion of Minnesota has endowed a research professorship; show-business money has built the Variety Club Heart Hospital; the Veterans of Foreign Wars has given a cancer research center, and the Masons have contributed the Masonic Memorial Hospital. Banks and labor unions offer scholarships. Here are splendid examples of the mutual relationship between our State universities and the good human society in which they live.

Another ambition of the State university is the creation—coast-to-coast—of those practical and indispensable professional colleges without which our society could not long endure. The graduates of State colleges of law, medicine, nursing, commerce, engineering, dentistry, architecture, and education build our homes, heal our bodies, teach our kids, take us to court and get us out, design our highways and bridges, give us injections with the caressing needle when pain shakes us, fill holes in our teeth, and examine the holes in our head.

Our country's geography is vast and varied. It is crucial to our cultural development that in every State there should exist large and rapidly growing libraries, symphony orchestras which sustain the musical imagination, exhibits of paintings, visiting lecturers, many plays performed by university casts, regional magazines, and university presses. Year after year, in every State, universities bring into contact with the gracious world of pure knowledge hundreds of thousands of students who otherwise would never recognize it.

Then there are the service aspects of State education—a fertile source of good for all. An early supporter of State education and research asked, "Of what use is it when a man can say 'I am hungry' in six or seven languages, but cannot earn his own bread and butter?" Largely through agricultural research and education offered by these institutions, hunger has disappeared from our lives and we now are learning to say "I have a surplus—would you want some?" in most of the world's languages.

Michigan State University has come a long way from the time when lady students refused to hoe in the same row with male students who used tobacco. America's first State agricultural college, it now is turning itself into one of the country's first universities in total service to the world and in pursuit of total knowledge. Its Kellogg Center for Continuing Education is the finest building of its kind at any university, bringing to the campus more than 500,000 persons a year for over 500 conferences. It offers courses in Arabic, Hindi, Chinese, and Japanese by day, and by night provides a rich sequence of visiting ballet companies, orchestras, and its own theater. It is inconceivable that any alert human being could not find his interest at this university where one can study anything from artificial insemination of cattle to astrophysics.

Investment Guarantee Agreement Between United States and India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a signifiant event occurred recently in Washington, involving the United States and the Republic of India, which passed almost unnoticed, coming as it did at the time President Eisenhower was in India and attention was focused there. This was the signing of the Investment Guarantee Agreement between the United States and India and the reaffirmation of India's attitude toward private capital made at the time by the Honorable D. N. Chatterjee, Indian Chargé d'Affaires.

Many persons have thought of India only in terms of a recipient of American aid. They are perhaps not aware that India has taken many positive steps to encourage private investors to cooperate in the development of the Indian economy.

An editorial published in the Erie (Pa.) News shortly after the signing of the agreement summed up forcefully the significance of this development. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA WANTS U.S. CAPITAL; PEACE IS KEY TO DEVELOPMENT

While most of last week's international news centered around President Eisenhower's peace mission, particularly in India, an item concerning India and the United States passed almost unnoticed.

This was the signing last week of the Investment Guarantee Program between the U.S. Government and the government of India.

Under provisions of this agreement, our Government joins with India in assuring the safety of American private capital investments in India.

India's Chargé d'Affaires D. N. Chatterjee made this statement following signing of the agreement in Washington:

"We regard this agreement as another affirmation of our longstanding policy of encouraging private initiative at home and attracting private investment from abroad to assist in the development of our economy.

" • • • further, may I point out that it was because we have always welcomed such investment from the United States that we signed in 1957 the United States-India Currency Convertibility Agreement. That guarantees the American investor full convertibility into dollars of his investment and income from this investment."

Other features of India-United States investment agreements signed previously include elimination of double income taxation by the United States and India.

Among investment incentives are tax holidays up to 5 years on investments not returning more than 6 percent income.

To further show that India is taking steps to encourage investment are plans to establish an investment center to bring together facilities for locating and attracting foreign capital.

Most foreign capital invested in India is from the United Kingdom. Of the $1.2 billion in foreign capital invested in India, U.S. capital since 1957 has been relatively small—it totals about $120 million.

India's Chatterjee concluded his statement last week by saying: "It is our hope that with increasing contacts between India and the United States and the various measures which we have taken, including the agreement we are signing today, there would be a considerable increase in the flow of private capital from the United States into India."

From this it seems clear there is a growing bond between India and the United States. While present U.S. investments in India are small, taken on a broad scale, it is obvious India hopes to obtain much additional financial aid from private American capital.

From Chatterjee's statements, it is obvious India is attempting to attract investments which will boost her economy—to give the Indian population something above the present extremely low living standard.

To attract investments, India must have peace.

It is certain this new agreement, which received little notice last week, was a topic of conversation between the President and Nehru.

Bureaucratic Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Land Management—BLM—under the Department of the Interior—Interior—has charge of the management and disposal of 481 million acres of Federal land.

Recently, complaint, principally by realtors, was made to Chariman Dawson of the House Committee on Government Operations, which has jurisdiction over the spending activities of the executive departments, that BLM's appraisal of Federal lands was subject to criticism.

realtors, was made to Chairman Dawson wrote Interior that preliminary studies indicated that in a number of instances appraisals by BLM may be highly questionable, and that it would be advisable to suspend action on all cases involving land appraisals by BLM for a period of 60 days.

Complying, BLM suspended action in more than 3,000 cases then pending, though the subcommittee was investigating some 13 cases. Other applicants protested the delay.

As one of a special subcommittee of three—two Democrats and one Republican—it was my privilege to attend hearings in Arizona—where but 15 percent of the land is privately owned—where testimony involving three cases was heard—only witnesses approved by the subcommittee's investigators were heard—others denied a hearing. That procedure was in conflict with proper committee procedure. A report will later be made, giving Interior's centention.

A WORD TO CONSTITUENTS

Returning from the hearing, opportunity was given to stop off at Benton Harbor to have dinner with—I had assumed—2 or 3 friends. Much to my surprise, 60-odd were present and, after a little conversation about national affairs, it was suggested that, inasmuch as Berrien County cast more than a third of the total vote of the district, it was only fair that Berrien be advised as to when, if ever, I would not be a candidate for Congress.

My reply was that I knew of no reason why anyone should not be a candidate if he desired. Inasmuch as one or two of my Republican colleagues, who lack seniority; who, it may be, do less work than falls to my lot, and one or two State politicians whose pointed suggestions I have failed to follow, subtly indicated that I was getting too old to serve, it became my purpose to learn whether there was any substantial support to such an opinion.

An extensive inquiry was made through third persons and, in a roundabout way, to get an expression of opinion. It was extremely gratifying to learn that, while some might and some did question my political views, all expressed the opinion that there was no reason why I should not again be their candidate.

Many added that, because of my experience, I was in a position to better serve the district than would a newcomer. That, if last year's policy is followed, some 40 Members, mostly conservatives, will retire, it might be well to have me continued in office. Then, too, some economy-minded individuals suggested that, as long as I had, generally speaking, represented the sentiment of the district, there would be no particular advantage in retiring me on the pension which I had earned and helped pay for, while at the same time paying a new succeeding Congressman.

Much to my gratification, representatives of a rather large group, which has never before enthusiastically supported me, assured me of vigorous support.

Those of you who have seen or heard me recently are fully capable of forming your own opinions as to my ability to serve. So far, no one to my knowledge has arrived at the conclusion that I am not physically and mentally able to understandingly and vigorously express the views of the people of the district or perform my work.

It naturally follows that, inasmuch as I enjoy the work, having nothing else to do except fish or hunt—and of both I tire in a week or two—I know of no reason why I should buy a pipe, tobacco, a rocking chair, sit on a porch and rust out. Many have suggested that I submit my candidacy for your consideration. Never a shrinking violet, that is just what I am now doing.

Papers write I was 83, 84, 85, my last birthday. Even the most liberal Congress does not approve of three celebrations for one birthday. The record shows I was born September 10, 1875. How old am I?

Allies in Brotherhood of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an interesting and heartwarming aspect of the Boy Scout movement in this country has been its close bonds of friendship and cooperation with groups of all faiths which are working for common goals. A case in point is the manner in which Jewish Community Centers, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and the Boy Scouts of America have worked closely together over the years as allies in brotherhood.

Mr. Bernard Postal, director of public information of the National Jewish Welfare Board recently wrote a very interesting article on the manner in which these fine groups have promoted their mutual ideals. The article points out that as part of their activities nonsectarian Boy Scout programs are promoted to serve the needs of all youths, regardless of religious affiliation.

Mr. Postal's article also pays tribute to the great figures in this field who have given so selflessly of themselves and their talents for this great cause. Their example could well serve as an example for other organizations interested in promoting the spirit of brotherhood and interfaith understanding. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this interesting piece printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIES IN BROTHERHOOD OF YOUTH—JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS, JEWISH WELFARE BOARD, AND THE BOY SCOUTS

(By Bernard Postal, director of public information, National Jewish Welfare Board)

During Brotherhood Week in 1941, the Jewish Community Center of York, Pa., organized a Boy Scout troop and invited Rabbi Alexander Goode to be its scoutmaster. He accepted on one condition: "I will serve only if the troop is open at all times to boys of all faiths."

In 1952 this troop set a unique record: its Scouts of various faiths won awards from all the major religious groupings in the United States—the Ner Tamid Award of Judaism, the Pro Deo et Patria Award of the Lutherans, the Ad Altare Dei Award of the Catholics, and the God and Country Award of the Protestants.

This Scout troop, sponsored by a Jewish community center and meeting in the center building, reflected something of the profound faith of the late Rabbi Goode, now immortalized as one of the four chaplains of World War II who sacrificed their lives on a sinking troopship during World War II so that other men of all faiths might live.

This Scout troop also epitomizes the unique relationship that has existed between the Boy Scouts of America, now celebrating its golden jubilee, and the Jewish community center movement and the National Jewish Welfare Board from the very beginnings of Scouting in this country.

In June 1910, when a number of leaders of youth activities met in New York to launch the Boy Scouts among those present were William Mitchell, executive director of New York's 92d Street YM-YWHA, the oldest existing center in the country, Mortimer H. Schiff. Later in the year Oscar S. Straus, former Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and one of the founders of the 92d Street YM-YWHA, was added to the first national council of the Boy Scouts.

When scouting was born in this country half a century ago, there were already more than 100 Jewish community centers and YM-YWHA's. Regional associations of Y's existed in Pennsylvania, New England, and Greater New York.

Three years before the Boy Scouts was founded, Jacob H. Schiff, Mortimer Schiff's father, who had given the 92d Street Y its first two buildings, proposed the establishment of a national league of YWHA's. In response to this suggestion, Felix M. Warburg, Schiff's son-in-law, who was president of the 92d Street Y took the initiative in convening a series of conferences out of which there developed in 1913 the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations.

This council—the first permanent national association of YMHA's and Jewish community centers—became part of the National Jewish Welfare Board in 1922. From its very first days this counsil became active in scouting. In 1913 the 92d Street YM-YWHA founded the first Scout troop in a YMHA.

The late Frank L. Weil, for a decade president of the Jewish Welfare Board and a longtime leader in the Boy Scouts and chairman of the National Jewish Committee on Scouting, was an assistant scoutmaster of this troop. The first New York City Boy Scout to win the coveted Eagle badge was Milton D. Lowenstein, of the YMHA troop, who received it in 1917.

In 1915 the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations created a scouting committee whose aim was to encourage Y's to organize Scout troops. This committee published a manual on the Boy Scout movement and the YMHA, written by Samuel J. Blout, who was the first scoutmaster of the 92d Street Y's troop.

As a result of these efforts the Boy Scouts reported in 1917 that slightly more than 1 percent of the 7,319 Scout troops were sponsored by YMHA's. By 1936 the number of Jewish-sponsored troops, including those related to Jewish community centers and YMHA's, had risen to 3 percent of the total of 15,599.

The kinship between scouting and Jewish Welfare Board and its affiliated Jewish community centers and YMHA's was zealously encouraged by a unique group of personalities active in the leadership of all three groups. The first of these was Mortimer Schiff, who was both a founder of the Boy Scouts of America and of the Jewish Welfare Board. During World War I he headed Jewish Welfare Boards Army and Navy work which provided religious, recreational, and morale services for Jewish military personnel. It was he who took the lead in sponsoring scouting among churches, synagogues, and Jewish community centers.

Schiff served on the executive board of the Boy Scouts from 1910 until his death in 1931. Shortly before he died he had been elected president. Some years later he was succeeded by his son, John, who had also headed the Jewish Welfare Board's Armed Services Division in the early days of World War II.

It was Mortimer Schiff who helped develop scouting's field and training programs, promoted the local council systems and encouraged the growth of scouting's international work. In his memory, his mother, the late Mrs. Jacob Schiff, gave the Boy Scouts the Mortimer L. Schiff Scout Reservation in New Jersey, a 480-acre reservation where Scout executives and volunteer leaders from all parts of the country come for advanced training. Mortimer Schiff's name is on the charter granted the Boy Scouts by Congress in 1916.

In 1926, Schiff, the late Dr. Cyrus Adler, who had succeeded Schiff as head of Jewish Welfare Board's military welfare and religious program, and the late Harry L. Glucksman, then Jewish Welfare Board's executive director, took the initiative in organizing the National Jewish Committee on Scouting. The first executive of this committee, Philip W. Russ, now a member of the Jewish Welfare Board professional staff, prepared a brochure entitled "Scouting and the Jewish Boy." There was also a brief Yiddish version of this publication.

Dr. Adler was the first chairman of this committee, which embarked on a nationwide campaign to encourage Jewish groups to organize Scout troops. Although handicapped by lack of funds for many years, this committee not only stimulated the growth of scouting in centers, YM-YWHA's, synagogues, and other Jewish groups but aided in the establishment of kosher kitchens at Scout camps and in obtaining rabbis to serve as Scout chaplains. In 1935 Frank L. Weil succeeded Dr. Adler as chairman of the National Jewish Committee on Scouting.

In 1947 the committee established the Ner Tamid Award for Scouts who continue their Jewish studies after Bar Mitzvah. Since then 4,125 boys have earned this award which recognizes knowledge of Jewish festivals, attendance at synogogue, familiarity with Jewish life, service to the Jewish community and attendance at a Hebrew school or study of Hebrew at a public high school for 1 year after Bar Mitzvah.

In 1949 Jewish Welfare Board expanded its efforts on behalf of scouting by creating a National Committee on Scouting headed by Isidor Schifrin of Cincinnati. A survey by the committee in 1950 revealed that 79 percent of Jewish Welfare Board's affiliated centers and Y's sponsored Boy Scout troops and that 76 percent of these were supervised by center professional staff. This study showed that scouting was well integrated with the total center program, with 479 Scout troops sponsored by 176 centers.

At the end of 1958 there were 871 Boy Scout units sponsored by all kinds of Jewish groups, and nearly half of these were sponsored by centers. Jeffery L. Lazarus, Frank Weil's successor as chairman of the Jewish Committee on Scouting, has said that the Jewish community centers are among the best sponsors of scouting.

Scouting's 50th year finds Jewish groups of various kinds—centers, synagogues, B'nai B'rith, and others sponsoring 1,300 Scout troops with a combined enrollment of nearly 100,000 boys.

The 50-year-old tradition of Jewish community center and Jewish Welfare Board leaders assuming active roles in scouting has never been broken. The work of the Schiffs, Adler, Glucksman, and Weil has been continued by Irving Edison, Charles Aaron, Walter E. Heller, Solomon Litt, Louis Kraft, and Samuel D. Gershovitz through active participation in scouting programs and in the National Jewish Committee on Scouting. Before his death, the late Lloyd W. Dinkelspiel was also active in scouting.

Since 1947, Jewish Welfare Board has also played an important role in scouting's international jamborees and in scouting's camp chaplaincy program. At the sixth jamboree in Paris Jewish Scouts from the United States were able to obtain kosher food through the efforts of Jewish Welfare Board. At the seventh jamboree in Vienna in 1951 Jewish Welfare Board again arranged to provide kosher foods for American Scouts who wanted it and also furnished Jewish songbooks and prayer articles.

Since World War II, Jewish Welfare Board has been actively participating in all national Boy Scout jamborees. It has made available the services of Rabbi Aryeh Lev, director of its Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy, to help the National Jewish Committee on Scouting and its executive, Rabbi Harry Lasker, organize religious programs at the jamborees. Rabbi Lev, who has served as Jewish chaplain general at every national jamboree since 1950, has been responsible for recruiting Jewish chaplains in various Scout regions so that religious services and counseling could be provided to Jewish Scouts from the time they left home until they returned.

Jewish Welfare Board also handled the orientation of the Jewish chaplains, patterning it after the kind of guidance given rabbis who enter the military chaplaincy. Jewish Welfare Board efforts were also instrumental in getting the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide ecclesiastical appointments such as altars, arks, candlesticks, etc., which are used for the large open-air Sabbath services at the Scout jamborees. From Jewish Welfare Board, too, came prayer books, prayer shawls, and kosher food for distribution to the chaplains who in turn made them available to Scouts who observed the dietary laws.

Throughout its 50 years then, the Boy Scouts of America, a unique brotherhood of youth, has had active allies in the Jewish community center movement and Jewish Welfare Board because each sentiment and injunction expressed or implied in the Scout oath and law finds its sanction in Jewish tradition, the perpetuation of which is at the core of the purpose and program of Jewish community centers and Jewish Welfare Board.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I am very pleased to submit the views of one of my constituents, an educator by profession, and one who seems to reflect the majority opinion on the problem of farm legislation. While I am not in complete agreement with him as to the replacement of the small farmer, many will subscribe to his views on the general situation.

Congressman J. ERNEST WHARTON,
Member of Congress, 29th District, New York, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHARTON: I think this type of questionnaire is an excellent idea. I think you, as a Representative of this area, should find out what we want, rather than be guided by the newspapers, or by Gallup polls, etc. (the validity of which I question).

On the subject of farm subsidies, I would like to expatiate on this more than your questionnaire permits. When the Federal Government collects taxes from people to provide military defense, to provide necessary services, etc., that is fair and moral. When the Federal Government collects some of my precious dollars (I have a wife and five children to support) to give to a farmer to raise food that neither he nor I nor the U.S. Government want, that is grossly immoral. I spent the first 15 years of my life in a small farming community in Wisconsin, and I have worked on farms occasionally, so I know the farmer has problems, but so does everybody else. When the small businessman can't make ends meet, he goes out of business. I hate to see this happen, but if the man's services aren't sufficiently in demand, I don't think we should subsidize him to build things we don't want. The farmers would raise a howl if their local board of education hired 10 extra teachers, to sit in 10 empty classrooms, "because these poor teachers couldn't find a different job." Or if Federal Government laid out a highway half a mile wide from New York to California, the farmer would shout that this is unnecessary. It is just as unnecessary that we have mountains of food piled all over the country, much of it to be wasted and spoiled, all of it expensive to store, all of it to be sold at a loss or given away.

Many many farmers overinvest in machinery, like combines, which they cannot afford to buy in the first place and which they cannot afford to maintain in the second place. Is it wise to spend $5,000 to $6,000 for a machine that will be used perhaps 20 days a year. If five or six farmers went into company on one that would be a different story.

Perhaps it is just as well that many of the small farmers be allowed to go out of business, to be replaced by bigger, more efficient units. Or if it is felt that our country needs these little farms badly enough, I believe it would be economically sounder to give each owner of a small farm an annual subsidy—let's say $500. Then let the law of supply and demand operate. Those who have to go out of business then would prove themselves not worth retaining as farmers.

Yours truly,

CLETUS SCHILLER.

World Peace by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am sure all my colleagues will receive a great volume of mail in regard to Senate Resolution 94, which in effect would destroy the Connally reservation as it applies to the World Court. Many good editorials and columns have been written in support of the Connally reservation, but I came across one this morning in this week's Newsweek which I think is particularly applicable. It is entitled "World Peace by Law," written by Raymond Moley. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Feb. 22, 1960]

WORLD PEACE BY LAW

(By Raymond Moley)

As an ideal, "world peace through law" has moved enlightened minds over many centuries. There were many prophets even before Dante wrote his De Monarchia in the 14th century. Three hundred years later, Hugo Grotius became the founder of modern international law. There have also been many judicial bodies of an international nature, the latest of which is the United Nations' International Court of Justice. The U.S. Senate by resolution in 1946 recognized its jurisdiction.

At that time, however, wise people recognized that under modern conditions many domestic concerns might be construed to be international and that we would need some protection against having our internal affairs dragged before a tribunal dominated by other nations. Senator Tom Connally then succeeded in having added to our recognition of the court's jurisdiction the words, "as determined by the United States." That was the Connally reservation. We were not alone in specifying a reservation. Twenty-two other nations have made such limitations of their own.

CONNALLY RESERVATION

But now the effervescent Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has before the Senate a resolution to repeal the Connally reservation. This idea, born of a current flush of optimism, holds that since we are strong—which HUMPHREY frequently denies—we can attain peace by unilaterally submitting our domestic affairs to the caprice of others. An unusual group of bedfellows supports the Humphrey proposal. There are, of course, his fellow "liberals" in the Senate, also many global societies, and, strangely enough, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. The State Department in an official policy statement has stated that "there is no longer any distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs." This doctrine would apply to such subjects as immigration, tariffs, and the Panama Canal, which we have regarded as vital to our internal affairs.

The court to which we would assign such interests under the Humphrey self-denying act is composed of 15 judges selected by the United Nations. We, as well as other countries, have one judge. The U.S.S.R. and Poland have one each. Several small countries are also represented.

But while the Communist bloc thus outnumbers us in the court, no Iron Curtain country has agreed to submit to the compulsory jurisdiction of the court. This is indeed a strange situation, in which people sit on the court to administer law which they themselves refuse to recognize as binding.

CONSENT, KEY WORD

In their zeal for an ideal, those who propose unilateral legal disarmament forget the true nature of law and its capacity to command obedience. Woodrow Wilson sacrificed popularity, health, and life itself for the ideal. But he understood the reality of civil obedience and the substance of courts and judges. In his four-point speech on July 4, 1918, he summed up the matter in a sentence:

"What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

"Consent" has a long history and deep meaning. It is real only when those involved freely, knowingly, willingly, and with a part in creating the situation, enter into the benefits and responsibilities of the decision. It is not present when a virile and sizable minority disagrees. "Opinion" is not created by law. Opinion creates law. Opinion, not a mere majority in the U.N. or in a township. We learned that when we tried to enforce sumptuary laws here. The overwhelming majority must see law as the embodiment of what it deems just. After law, there must be courts.

There is no such world law now, with great Communist nations in defiance of what other nations believe to be justice and sacred obligation. We should, however, seek for such consent and the law that defines it. The International Court of Justice is useful to remind us of the ideal and to adjudicate what minor matters come before it. But we must not alienate our responsibility to stay strong and thus through weakness dissipate our moral influence in the world. Legal disarmament would be as disastrous as military disarmament.

Our State Colleges and Universities Are Rich in Scientific Curiosity—Their Motto Is "The State Is Our Campus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our State universities are rich in scientific curiosity and are dedicated to the total life of man. We all benefit from the results.

It was while studying the science of soils at Rutgers, the State university of New Jersey, that Dr. Selman A. Waksman discovered streptomycin which is so effective in the treatment of tuberculosis and some other infectious diseases.

I include here the second part of an article in defense of State colleges and universities written by Dr. Paul Engle of the State University of Iowa. The article appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of February 13, 1960:

Our State universities are rich in scientific curiosity and we all benefit from the results—sometimes from those unpredictable ricochets of that curiosity which lead to amazingly valuable targets. It was while studying the science of soils at Rutgers, State University of New Jersey, that Dr. Selman A. Waksman (born in a thatched hut near Kiev, Russia) noticed that while many groups of microbes lived in harmony with other groups, certain microbes destroyed others. This led to his search for a made-by-microbe enzyme or antibiotic that would attack disease germs, and to the discovery of streptomycin with its effective treatment of tuberculosis and some other infectious diseases.

The motto of these schools has been: "The State Is Our Campus." State extension pro-

grams—extending education beyond the campus itself by means of county agents, traveling specialists and correspondence courses—reach every county; they bring hundreds of thousands of people to the college every year for short courses; they immensely affect the lives of the people. This is unheard of in Europe, and too often in America the extension system is derided as not being "true education" in the traditional sense. This it certainly is not, but it gives our society a coherence and a steady, practical progress—the best possible basis for any sort of education.

For some years the University of Wisconsin has given more Ph.D.'s in science than any other school. When we hear so much about the pressure to turn out scientists, let this State university's remarkable contribution be praised. Or, if you have ever poisoned a rat with a substance called Warfarin, so deadly and subtle that the Medici would have rejoiced in its use, recall that the first four letters of that name stand for Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, which holds the basic patents. The same substance, processed as a drug called Dicumarol, saves human lives as a blood-thinner, useful in preventing or treating embolisms. When Wisconsin's Dr. Harry Steenbock discovered a process for irradiating food to increase its vitamin-D content, he not only helped banish rickets among children but also helped devise a mechanism, through the research foundation, by which some of the financial proceeds from such discoveries could be fed back into more research. The fellowships and facilities which this State university offers make it one of the world's great research centers.

In brief, the State university is dedicated to the total life of man, not only to his mind or his knowledge of classical culture. These latter are of constant importanc, but there is no inconsistency in a university's offering every subject which provides a heightened understanding of man or at least adds to his comfort and security. The same school can teach the blinding Greek tragedy of Oedipus, of that doomed king's punishment for his pride and his violation of his mother, and at the same time can offer a psychiatric recognition of the emotional complex to which Oedipus has given his name. It can also offer courses on marriage, on the family, on every aspect of human relationships, normal and abnormal. The State university holds that it is important to read the text of the classical tragedy, but that it is also proper to help the child with vitamins, the right psychological atmosphere and the appropriate preschool chances to grow. This surely is the whole sort of place which Dr. Conant meant when he spoke of the new comprehensive American type of university.

There are still some problems, of course. The heavy practical emphasis of the State universities was anticipated long ago by one of the first fighters for such schools, Jonathan Baldwin of Illinois: "When I have taught a boy merely to hold a plow," he said, "I have only taught him to be a two-legged jackass, twin brother to the four-legged team in front of him. But when I have taught him, truly and scientifically, the mighty mysteries of the seas, stars, oceans, lands and ages that are concerned in the act of plowing, I have made a man of him—had we not better say an angel?" Such reminders are needed; the State university all too often teaches the boy his basic skill and neglects the angel in him. Of Greece's magnificent culture, for example, all that our boy may know after 4 years of college is an invaluable collection of telephone numbers of the Greek-letter sorority houses.

Still, some of the foolishness on the campus will fool you. Look at a street in Bloomington, Ind., some afternoon and you may be shocked to see girls racing bicycles or even tricycles. What nonsense. Not so, however, for this performance is the Little 500—a takeoff on the Indianapolis auto races—a competition put on by the Indiana University students to raise money for scholarships, a total of 426 such grants of $100 each in the last 5 years. At the same university Nobel Prize Winner Dr. Hermann Muller makes studies in genetics which argue for greater care in creating new life for this lively globe, whether animal or human. His efforts would produce girls with legs far better adapted for riding in the Little 500.

The really serious problem of the State university is not the natural tendency of young folks to have fun, but rather it is a mysticism of mediocrity that has resulted in some unrealistic policies. Counting enrollments without regard to quality of the individuals is a deceptive occupation—and it could be a disastrous one. For the rest of this wicked century, only supreme intelligence will save us. One Einstein probing the essential order of matter, which we must understand, is more necessary than 10,000 minds devoted to probing the best way to slip brand names into the TV viewer's unsuspecting consciousness.

There is an absurd suspicion of the word "elite" in many State universities, as though it were proper to praise outstanding talent and guts in football but wrong to praise the same level of talent in activities of the brain. The University of California admits roughly the top 15 percent of the State's high-school classes, and Michigan's average is the top 40 percent. These are unique exceptions, however, to the general level of admissions. Not only do State universities tend to admit the incompetent student and go to the wasteful necessity of giving him housing, food and wasted instruction, they also tend to demand too little of him. Too often the result is a neutral person, with no richness of cultural experiences to sustain him after he leaves the university—a bland product which had attended elementary classes and advanced parties without coming into contact with the greatness inhabiting the same campus.

Because of their flexibility and their size, both of which allow some appalling things to be done in the name of education, State universities can also do some very original things. The new America operas "Susannah" and "Wuthering Heights" were composed by Carlisle Floyd at Florida University. He says: "This university afforded me an invaluable laboratory for learning whatever I know about the art of music and also the opportunity of hearing what I have written in performance." This notion of the university actively encouraging both the creation and the presentation of all the arts is a brandnew invention, native to this country. The University of Illinois has developed the first combination of sound with sight on film, improved railroad rails, corn, and soybeans—and it also produced Kurt Weill's "Threepenny Opera" before its successful New York run. It regularly offers work in the arts which would amaze a European: a large exhibit of contemporary American paintings and sculpture, new music in premiere performances, a string quartet performing difficult music by such modern composers as Alban Berg, an exhibit by students of city planning of a whole town ordered and landscaped. Such breadth of activities is new to the educational scene.

On balance, the State universities are cause of hope, not despair. The fact is that these schools—a unique American invention—have become distinguished institutions faster than any group of educational places ever has before. After all, most of them are only 50 to 75 years old in terms of being major universities. Remember what the poet Holmes wrote about Harvard:

"And who was on the catalogue
When college was begun?
Two nephews of the President
And the professor's son."

In many ways the State university now has taken the entire world for its campus. It is the sustainer of the Western tradition of free inquiry. Only at the University of Michigan Press is Boris Pasternak's novel, "Doctor Zhivago," published in its original Russian. That noble press is helping to keep Russian literary tradition alive by printing a selection from every worthwhile Russian writer who has been silenced in the past 30 years. Two-thirds of the personnel recruited for technical assistance abroad has come from the land-grant institutions. Michigan State has the only dean of international programs in the world. Its faculty members go out to Brazil, Okinawa, Vietnam, Pakistan. When Michigan State started, more than 100 years ago, its first students attended chapel at 5:30 a.m. and spent 3 hours after breakfast logging land to build a place to study. Now the Michigan State faculty is clearing the corners of the earth for a more abundant and democratic development. Tides of foreign students are coming to our campuses from all over the world, and not just to study our practical sciences. To the University of Iowa come poets from Japan, Formosa, Ireland, England, fiction writers from South Korea, the Philippines, Sweden. At the same time tides of university-trained specialists are flowing out, carrying to emerging nations all around the world the modern techniques of agriculture, health, education, industrial development. The all-American idea of extension has become global.

The pay of a full professor in the United States is one and a half times as much as the wage of the average factory worker. In Russia, it is eight times as much. This is a comment not only on the miserable pay scale of the Russian worker but also on the importance Russia's rulers attach to education. Agreed, that Soviet intelligence is not a free one by our standards, but we must not overlook the essential challenge of that intelligence, free or not. Our State universities are making a great effort to attract and keep distinguished minds—and they must succeed if our society is to meet the competition it surely faces.

Society has shaped these universities, and now the universities will increasingly shape society. They must bring to their campus that 47 percent of high school seniors with a high IQ who do not get to college—any college—and they must search for them as hard as they search for quarterbacks who can handle the pass-run option. This terrible erosion of our brainpower must be stopped for our very survival, and the State universities can stop it. These universities will enchant you and disappoint you. They will offer the mediocre and the marvelous on the same campus, in the same buildings, in the same hour. But their virtue will triumph, because they exist in a free country, reflect its freedom and will be great instruments for keeping it free.

Korea's Misfortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Korea's Misfortune," published in the Washington Post of February 16, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S MISFORTUNE

Twice in 4 years fate has intervened to deprive Korea of effective opposition in a presidential election. The sudden death at Walter Reed Hospital of Chough Pyong-ok leaves the Democratic Party, which is vying with the Liberal Party of President Syngman Rhee, without a candidate for the top office in the election on March 15. There is a sad and remarkable parallel between Dr. Chough's death and the death just before the 1956 election of another Democratic presidential nominee, P. H. Shinicky, for whom nearly 2 million votes nonetheless were cast.

An equally odd coincidence is that when President Rhee took advantage of Dr. Chough's illness and trip to this country for medical treatment to advance the election from the usual May 15 date, the filing deadline was set for February 13. Thus Vice President John M. Chang, who contested the Democratic nomination with Dr. Chough, presumably cannot replace him on the ticket. Dr. Chang, who has been almost totally isolated by the Rhee government, remains the vice presidential nominee against the Liberal he defeated in 1956, Lee Ki-poong.

Dr. Chough, a graduate of Columbia University, was Dr. Rhee's personal emissary to the United States at the time the Republic was established in 1948. Like so many other Korean leaders who had once associated with Dr. Rhee in the independence movement, however, Dr. Chough broke with the aged President over his arbitrary and authoritarian qualities. Even though the Rhee government had stacked the cards heavily against the Democrats in the forthcoming election, the tough-minded Dr. Chough had been expected to make a good race.

What makes the death so poignant is that Dr. Rhee and his colleagues had been using every device to disadvantage the opposition, from intimidating voters in byelections and suppressing critical newspapers to misusing the national security law. The outlook for a fair election was dismal enough before Dr. Chough's death; now that the case of the Democrats is hopeless, perhaps Dr. Rhee can afford to moderate his dictatorial tactics.

Editorial Response to a Suggestion by Senator Hennings for a "War on Hunger"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the senior U.S. Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS HENNINGS, has long been in the forefront of those in Congress who believe that our great abundance of food is a blessing enjoyed by America rather than the headache and curse so many people associated with farm policy seem to regard it. Senator HENNINGS is an advocate of the food-for-peace proposal to use our abundance of food to help the less fortunate people of other countries to achieve a decent minimum diet.

He has also always been one of the strongest supporters of the food-stamp plan for assuring a more adequate diet for the millions of our own citizens here in the United States who now are forced by economic necessity to live on less than a decent minimum diet. I appreciate the support Senator HENNINGS gave me in the long fight to have the food-stamp plan enacted last year after 5 years of effort. I know he joins me now in hoping that the President will finally agree to utilize the authority now provided under the food-stamp law for putting the plan into operation.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think there will be general interest in an editorial which recently appeared in the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, discussing Senator HENNINGS' views on food for peace, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times, Feb. 8, 1960]

THE WAR ON HUNGER

Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, produces some food facts. He points out that when all the wheat harvested last fall is finally totaled up, the United States "will find that it has produced just over a billion bushels." He figures that 500 million bushels would be ample for the needs of the 170 million Americans.

By way of contrast, says Senator HENNINGS, India's entire food grain production (wheat, corn, millet, rice, etc.) will total about 273 million bushels. And with these 273 million bushels India must try to feed 400 million persons.

The Missouri Senator was writing in favor of the food-for-peace bill which was prepared and introduced in Congress last year.

In 1954, Congress came up with Public Law 480, under which we have managed to increase our distribution of surplus food in various parts of the world. We have certainly helped India in that direction.

We have managed to get around some of the complex problems involved in the war on hunger, such as problems of international trade, transportation, currency, and politics.

We have gotten rid of some $7 billion worth of surplus food through surplus disposal programs which sell excess food for foreign currencies, barter food or strategic materials and donate food to meet emergency needs. Even so, our surpluses mount. And humanity demands that the program be augmented.

President Eisenhower has asked the world to join in an all-out "war on hunger." There are some objections to the new food-for-peace bill, and these are admitted by Senator HENNINGS. For one thing it sets up a 10-year program "under which the United States would contract to supply surplus foods to hungry nations." Many are not willing to face the prospect of surpluses on a permanent basis in American agriculture.

But surely we will continue to have an abundance, though the cost of that abundance in storage, farm subsidies, etc., to the American taxpayer, in one of the fantastic postwar episodes and awaits courageous approaches.

The cold war has put tangles into the world trade problem. Certainly not the least valid reason for seeking peace in our time is the fact that world trade would be stimulated so that it would be possible to win a world war on hunger.

Real Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Adrian Daily Telegram of Adrian, Mich., in its editorial of February 8, 1960, comments on testimony which I submitted to the Senate Interior Committee in support of S. 2549, the Resources and Conservation Act of 1960. The last paragraph of this editorial states the matter far more persuasively and eloquently than I was able to do, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial on Senator MURRAY'S bill be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL CONSERVATION

Michigan's junior Senator, PHILIP A. HART, gave eloquent and persuasive testimony for wise management of the Nation's natural resources in a recent appearance before a Senate committee. It was considering a bill, which he supports, calling for a council of resources and conservation advisers in the White House and a parallel joint committee in Congress.

These two bodies, Senator HART pointed out, "will enable all sections of the country to have their developmental needs placed in national focus alongside those of all other sections." The bill, he said, "permits us to look at all resources needs of all parts of the country and formulate programs in the light of this knowledge." As things are now, there is a multiplicity of Federal, State, and local agencies operating in a spasmodic fashion with overlapping and sometimes with conflicting purposes.

Senator HART emphasized particularly the need to preserve recreational resources, declaring that with the Nation's population growing so rapidly, recreational areas are taking on prime importance. Means of controlling stream pollution have been devised and are increasingly being applied; scientists are developing feasible ways to salvage brackish and saline water for drinking and other municipal purposes; there are hints of wondrous new potentials for power. But there are no known or foreseeable substitutes for hiking and camping, hunting and fishing, mountain climbing and skiing and these require lands and waters reasonably close to expanding industrial areas.

"At the very time when there are more and more people, and more of them than ever before wanting to refresh themselves from the strains and fatigues of daily living," said Senator HART, "we are bulldozing miles of trees and meadows for highways and housing developments, we are building factories on our remaining shorelines, we are polluting our streams and our beaches."

We must have sites for new factories and for new towns and more highways essential. But factory lots cannot be used for picnics; polluted water destroys fishing, highway rights of way often spoil spots of natural beauty. Yet we can have all these essentials to a rapidly growing population, including recreational areas as well, by intelligent overall planning. That is conservation at its best. And that is what the resources bill is aimed at getting.

Security Intelligence Leaks Harmful to U.S. Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial and resolution:

[From the Ledger Star, Feb. 11, 1960]

MILITARY REPORT—SECURITY INTELLIGENCE LEAKS HARMFUL TO U.S. SECURITY

(By James Elliott)

NORFOLK.—One of the most touchy questions in Washington these days involves the recent leak of testimony before a congressional committee of Central Intelligence Agency head, Allen W. Dulles.

Already Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois has suggested that a probe might be in order. And there have been accusations that presidential hopefuls are more interested in making headlines than headway.

The controversy centers around a column written earlier this month by Joseph Alsop in which he related how Dulles had told the committee that Russia would have 35 intercontinental ballistic missiles in launchers by the end of June and between 140 and 200 by mid-1961.

Congressional and military circles in Washington are upset not only by the leak from the committee, but also by the fact that the information was made public.

"This is one of the most serious things to happen here in a long time," emphasized one responsible Pentagon officer.

In the past, there have been a number of leaks from congressional committees. Heretofore, however, there have been few, if any, which have involved facts that clearly are a matter of security intelligence.

Regrettably, a leak of this nature raises the question of trust imposed on a congressional committee. For if the men elected to these responsible positions evade that trust, many feel, they are not upholding the responsibility that goes with the post they are holding.

The press, too, must share a certain responsibility in matters like this, many agree.

The whole question of security leaks very likely will be discussed by President Eisenhower at his press conference today. He is known to be disturbed by the matter.

The real tragedies of this particular leak, many feel, fall into two particular areas. In one, the trust one government agency has in another becomes jeopardized. Central Intelligence quite likely can be expected to be more guarded than ever even in closed-door sessions in the future.

The other is that the information leaked gives an insight into CIA's operations. The enemy always knows what he's doing. But when he finds out what information the United States knows about him, he begins to learn more about where the United States is getting that information.

And the cold recital of CIA's information in a most sensitive area like ICBM capabilities undoubtedly will cast a deep shadow over that agency's operations in the future. It could well be extremely detrimental to the security of the United States.

VFW NATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE—DEPLORING THE PRACTICE OF LEAKING CLASSIFIED INFORMATION TO THE PRESS AND PUBLIC WHICH HAS BEEN OBTAINED IN CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Be it resolved by the VFW National Security Committee meeting in Washington, D.C., February 7, 1960, That we recommended to the VFW commander in chief that the Veterans of Foreign Wars deplores the practice of leaking strategic military information obtained in congressional hearings on military matters to the press and the public.

A Plea for Political Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on January 27 of this year, 84 "dinners with Ike" were held across the Nation. Fourteen of them were given in the State of Arizona, one in each county, an accomplishment of which no other State can boast. In addition to hearing the remarks of our President and Vice President and the other party dignitaries who appeared on the national scene, the participants in each of Arizona's 14 dinners were able to hear the remarks of distinguished members of the Republican Party of that State as they spoke following the closed television portion of the program. One of those speeches, delivered by Mr. Denison Kitchel, at Morenci, Ariz., carried such a challenge to the voters and the candidates that I believe that colleagues of mine will find food for thought in his remarks. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the speech entitled "A Plea for Political Integrity" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA FOR POLITICAL INTEGRITY

(By Denison Kitchel, "dinner with Ike" program, Morenci, Ariz., January 27, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, to have such a fine gathering as this under the auspices of the Greenlee County Republican Committee, is, I hope, an indication of the dawn of a new era in Greenlee County politics. To be frank with you, when I was first asked to come here and address a Republican meeting, I laughed at the idea. I suggested that since I knew both of the Republicans in Greenlee County, I might just call them on the telephone and let it go at that.

When I was told that quite a gathering was anticipated, I began to wonder why I, a political nobobdy, was being asked to go. I said to myself "With Goldwater speaking in Phoenix, Fannin in Tucson, and Rhodes in Yuma, why am I being sent to Morenci?" Then I looked at the Greenlee County registration, almost 19 registered Democrats for each registered Republican, and, harking back to my college days, I thought I saw the answer to my question.

Many, many years ago when I was in Yale, I had a roommate who was on the football squad. Like Hester of earlier times, he was very anxious to win his letter. But for 3 long years he warmed the bench and never got into a game. When we came to the last game of our senior year, the annual tilt with Harvard, it was his last chance. The day was a bad one for dear old Yale from the very start. Harvard scored one touchdown after another. Fred Jones, my roommate, sat on the bench in utter gloom. It was the last minute of play and the score was Harvard 60, Yale 0. The coach suddenly turned to Fred. "Go on in, Jones," he said, "you can't possibly do any harm now."

Looking at that 19 to 1 registration, I thought maybe I had found the reason why I was being sent to Greenlee County.

But seriously, I consider being here both a privilege and a challenge. I am convinced that if this great Republic of ours is to be preserved, it will come about only by overcoming such odds as these, by fighting unremittingly against entrenched irresponsibility and grave political amorality.

In the few minutes I have in which to talk with you tonight, I want to ask you to join with me and with millions of others, Republicans and Democrats alike, in a crusade to restore integrity to American politics. Somewhere along the road that integrity which was the key to the founding of our Nation and which is so essential to its preservation has fallen by the wayside. By integrity I mean adherence to principle and rejection of expediency. In connection with this subject, it can best be described as political "guts"—the political "guts" to fight for a principle and the political "guts" to lose, if necessary, rather than to compromise with what is wrong. I am convinced in my own mind that the American people will choose political integrity as the best means of self-government whenever they are given the opportunity to make that coice—unfortunately, in these days of political amorality, of "me-tooism," they seldom get that chance.

It is my guess that most of you would classify yourselves as conservatives. But it would also be my guess that many of you are not quite sure what a conservative is—except that a conservative is usually against what is going on in government these days. Further, I would guess that some of you are even a bit ashamed of being a conservative.

For some strange reason, the word "conservative" has come, in the minds of many, to have derogatory connotations. (A conservative is said to be a reactionary, a person who resists change unreasonably, a selfish person who has no interest in the welfare of his fellow men. These are utterly false assertions. The true conservative is one who seeks to conserve those institutions and principles which, on the basis of knowledge and experience, he has found to be good. The true conservative is not opposed to change. On the contrary, he welcomes constructive and well-considered change which makes even more effective and more desirable those things which the tests of time have proved to be fundamentally sound. The conservative is not willing to exchange a pig-in-a-poke or a pie-in-the-sky for something of known value. He is not willing to throw away his heritage for the sake of political power.

Of the two words which are nowadays so constantly used as opposites, i.e., the words conservative and liberal, the latter is probably the more misleading of the two. In fact, the word liberal as used today is a complete misnomer. Originally, the word was applied to one who was particularly zealous of individual liberty, one who resisted to the utmost the encroachment of government on personal freedom. Today, it is the conservative who occupies that role—he is convinced that the principle of maximum freedom of the individual and minimum interference by government is one which has stood the test of Time and which must be conserved. The liberal of today stands for just the opposite. He is concerned with the governing of all forms of individual endeavor and conduct by some sort of self-appointed group, of which he is a member, having a special aptitude for determining what is best for everyone else. He is only liberal in the sense that he gives freely of what is not his. This he does

through the media of high taxation and profligate governmental expenditure. Wittingly or unwittingly, socialism in the guise of the welfare state is his goal.

So the first thing of which I would persuade you tonight is that if you have the beliefs of a true conservative, if you feel, as I do, that the things of proven value to this Nation, such as individual freedom, economy in government, self-reliance and human dignity, should be conserved, then be proud of those beliefs and shout them from the housetops. Be an active, effective, affirmative conservative—not one who sits meekly by and criticizes, who does nothing overt to conserve the principles and institutions in which he believes.

There is no doubt that the conservative is constantly placed on the defensive by the so-called liberal. The liberal promises everything in the name of humanity and the general good. This is the trick of his trade. He is careless with the truth. He seeks ever to sway people by appealing to their self-interest. Therefore, to be active, to be effective and to be affirmative, the conservative must, first, know clearly what it is he believes in and cherishes and, secondly, find ways to express those beliefs simply and persuasively. In this connection I suggest to you the necessity for study. I can tell you from my own experience in recent years that you will find great pleasure and interest in going back and learning again what you may have learned as a youngster, but have since forgotten. What will surprise you most of all, I think, will be to find that there is nothing new at all in these schemes of the so-called liberals. Social security, unemployment compensation, Government subsidies, socialized medicine, farm price supports, pump priming—you will find them all, in some form or other, in various stages of the history of civilization and invariably playing an active part in the ultimate downfall of the society which succumbed to them. You can go back to Aristotle, Plato, Gibbons, Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Hamilton, Madison, Adam Smith, and many others for this purpose. Or, if you choose, there are some able contemporary writers in this field, such as Chamberlin, Hazlitt, Von Mises, Kirk, Burnham, and Buckley. In this latter connection, you will be amazed to see how much fine material is being produced today in explanation of the conservative viewpoint. At any rate, I can promise you a fascinating and entertaining experience if you will undertake some study of this sort. And I cannot emphasize enough the thought that if we intend to do something to stem the tide—and God knows we must—we must know what we are talking about and become articulate in the truth.

Well—to all this high-sounding talk you may be saying to yourself "Why should I concern myself with all this? Politics is not my business and, besides, here in Greenlee County the voice of a conservative is about as effective as a drop in the ocean." Don't say that. Don't take that defeatist attitude. Politics is the business of every citizen. Every one of us who loves his country has a duty to himself and to his children to engage in politics. I don't mean by that that each of us must go out and run for public office or run around making speeches. I mean merely that we should talk politics, talk to our friends, talk to our neighbors—put across in every little way we can the ideas in which we believe. We should do party work designed to inform the voters and get out the vote. When possible we should make financial contributions.

I don't care whether the registration shows 19 Democrats for every Republican or 100 Democrats for every Republican. The party labels don't mean anything any more. The two-party system in this country has become a farce. The two major political parties stand for just about the same things. Both have shelved integrity and chosen, in greater or lesser degree, to seek votes at any cost. The result, in effect, is a one-party system under two meaningless labels. This sad situation can never be remedied until there is a return to political integrity by at least one party, by the citizens who support that party, and by the candidates who seek to represent it in public office.

I submit to you that if you are a true conservative, and if you demand political integrity of yourself and of your public officials, the time has come for you to mold a political party in the image of your beliefs and standards. And I submit to you that the Republican Party is the one which offers to you the best chances of success in such a project. At least, here in Arizona we have the makings of a party of which every true conservative, every believer in political integrity, can be justly proud.

Before each one of you is a copy of the 1958 platform of the Arizona Republican Party. When you go home tonight, I urge you to read it. It is a revolutionary platform. It does not attempt to promise everything to everybody, like most platforms do. In fact, it doesn't promise anything to anybody. Instead, in brief and clear language, it states the fundamental principles for which the party and its candidates stand. And it was men like Barry Goldwater, Paul Fannin, and John Rhodes, men with political guts, who, pledged to this revolutionary platform, persuaded the voters of Arizona, predominantly Democrat by registration, to elect them to public office.

I am convinced that what has been accomplished by conservatives in Arizona through this forthright approach can be accomplished with equal success nationally. There is nothing peculiar about the Arizona voter. With the tremendous influx of population from all sections of the country, it is obvious that Arizona voters are perhaps the most accurate cross section of voting America to be found anywhere. And that cross section, faced with a clear-cut choice between the political integrity of conservatism and the appeal to self-interest of so-called liberalism, gave a clear-cut answer. I am convinced that the same answer would be given nationally if the American voter could be offered that same clear-cut choice.

With the retirement of President Eisenhower from the political scene the element of immense personal popularity will be absent from the forthcoming presidential election. The chances of winning an election with conservative overtones through "me-tooism" and general pettifogging of the issues—to be perfectly blunt about it, through modern Republicanism—will thus, in my opinion, be virtually eliminated.

Now has come the time when conservatism in any true sense of the world can only survive by a return of political integrity. Now has come the time when people who have a vital community of interest in less wasteful government, in better schools supported and controlled locally, in economic freedom, in the right to work, in individual liberty, in equality of opportunity, in all of the great principles upon which this Nation was founded and has prospered, must work actively and intelligently for the conservation of those principles.

Our best chance is to make the Republican Party our vehicle in this crusade and to mold the Republican Party in the image of the political integrity for which we stand. To this end we must require of ourselves and of those who seek to represent us in public office faithful adherence to the precept voiced by Shakespeare:

"This above all: to thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Nationwide Interest Is Mounting for the Enactment of an Adequate and Deserving Pension for the Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the veteran of the First World War has been accurately described as the forgotten veteran, because it is nearly 42 years since Armistice Day 1918, heralding the end of what was termed "a war to end all wars," and yet the veteran of that bloody conflict continues to be subjected to inequitable treatment in the field of veterans' pensions.

Instead of being accorded proper treatment, the World War I veteran has been sandwiched in with the veterans of other wars under the veterans' benefits program. The khaki-clad American doughboy of 1917–18 never received so-called fringe benefits awarded to those who served their country in later conflicts. The result is that the World War I veteran has been the victim of gross discrimination.

In order to correct the glaring inequities they have suffered, World War I veterans have begun a drive to garner support for a World War I pension bill, several of which are pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I am proud to be the sponsor of H.R. 10130 which is a revised version of my bill, H.R. 1181, which, despite nationwide support last year, failed to be considered by Congress. H.R. 10130 is a companion to the Lane bill, H.R. 9336, which has been selected this year by World War I veterans in their efforts to secure approval of a World War I pension bill.

It is a pleasure to join in the drive launched by World War I veterans throughout the Nation to develop support for H.R. 9336. Although I have similar bills pending, my sole concern is to aid in securing passage of a World War I pension bill and, therefore, I have no pride of authorship.

It is my sincere hope that World War I veterans will be encouraged in their effort to emphasize to Congress the need for approval of World War I pension legislation.

As an example of the enthusiasm being generated for H.R. 9336, I am pleased to include in my remarks at this point the following resolution adopted February 8, 1960 by American Legion Post No. 281, Tyrone, Pa., one of the large and active posts in the central Pennsylvania area. The resolution follows:

PENSION RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of this session that, meeting in regular session as of Monday, February 8, 1960, 8 p.m., we place ourselves on record as favoring the enactment by Congress of H.R. 9336 which, among other things, favors a pension for those of the First World War; and be it further

Resolved, That we direct that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and the Honorables JOSEPH CLARK and HUGH SCOTT, Members of the U.S. Senate from the State of Pennsylvania; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask of the three to use their good offices to have H.R. 9336 cleared from the House Veterans Affairs Committee and placed upon the floor of the House so the Members may vote upon it; and be it further

Resolved, That we ask our Congressional Representatives, Messrs. VAN ZANDT, CLARK, and SCOTT to favor, by their vote, enactment of H.R. 9336; and, moreover, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Department of the American Legion of Pennsylvania and the national commander of the American Legion, the Department located in Harrisburg, Pa., National at Indianapolis, Ind.

WARREN E. GETZ, Sr.,
Commander.

Attest:

FORREST M. LUCAS, Jr.,
Adjutant.

Defense Procurement Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Robert E. Wood, former chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., appeared before the Joint Economic Committee during the hearings on "Impact of Defense Procurement on the Economy." Because of his former connections, namely: Director of Panama Railway and chief quartermaster general of the Army in construction of the Panama Canal; acting quartermaster general, U.S. Army, during World War I; consultant, World War II, to Chief of the Air Force, General Arnold, on questions of procurement and supply; member, Task Force on National Security Organization, first Hoover Commission; chairman, Task Force on Use and Disposal of Surplus Property, second Hoover Commission; member, Committee on Business Organization of the Department of Defense, second Hoover Commission, I value his views on the matter of integration of supply systems by the Department of Defense.

The Washington Star on February 14 carried a portion of General Wood's statement and I wish to take this opportunity to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

WATCHDOG REQUIRED

It is evident from the lack of enthusiasm at the Pentagon over proposals for consolidating procurement and supply services that something more than authority to eliminate duplication and other waste is necessary to get results. Recent hearings before a Joint Economic Committee subcommittee revealed that progress has been very slow in carrying out recommendations of Congress and of the Hoover Commission. There is a good deal of merit, therefore, in the suggestion that the joint subcommittee on defense procurement be made a "watchdog" group, ready to prod the armed services if they continue to lag in logistical teamwork.

Retired Gen. Robert E. Wood, board chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co., was one of several Hoover "task force" members who testified at the hearings in favor of the standby plan. Several subcommittee members have expressed interest in the idea. Here is an opportunity for Congress to follow through on an economy program that promises substantial defense savings without any reduction of military strength.

Interest Ceiling Has Opposite Effect From What Was Desired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, in recent times, U.S. money policy has been the focal point for discussion—in fact, has become a real issue.

What we need, of course, are the facts, not fiction, on the situation.

Repeatedly, President Eisenhower has urged the lifting of the 4¼-percent interest rate on long-term issues of bonds. The Congress, I believe, should give early, sympathetic consideration to these recommendations of the President.

Why?

Because at the 4¼-percent level, it is difficult to sell the long-term securities—particularly in view of the tremendous competition for the available money on the market.

According to experts, also, the net effect—despite statements, perhaps politically motivated, to the contrary—a 4¼-percent ceiling actually costs Uncle Sam more, rather than less, in borrowing money to meet financially obligations.

Why?

In 1960, it is estimated that the Treasury will need to borrow $80 billion. If forced to purchase the money on short-term securities, at interest rates up to 5¼ percent, the costs to the American taxpayers may be substantially higher—than if there were a moderate increase in the 4¼ ceiling on longer-term borrowing.

Until now, there has been too much heat, and too little light shed, on this vital issue.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a constructive editorial simplifying the factors involved in this interest rate controversy.

Reflecting a situation that needs clarification, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Milwaukee Journal printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST CEILING HAS OPPOSITE EFFECT FROM WHAT IS DESIRED

An argument that seems to have got twisted around quite backward is the one between the Eisenhower administration and Congress over the 42-year-old legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates at which long-term securities, 5 years or more, may be issued.

In refusing, so far, to lift the artificial ceiling, Congress strikes what it hopes is a popular pose, defending the people from soaring interest rates and accusing the administration of wanting to make tight money even tighter. Actually, Congress seems to be effecting just what it professes to oppose.

In such a respected Bible of economic thought as Barron's Financial Weekly, the conclusion is that the ceiling on long-term rates has merely pushed short-term rates through the roof. Since long-term issues won't sell at 4¼ percent today, the Treasury has been forced to borrow an additional $36 billion using short-term securities, at rates up to 5¼ percent, in order to get the money at all. And $80 billion more refinancing must be done this year.

Much of the money thus invested, says Barron's, has been in lieu of corporate bank deposits or has been withdrawn from savings banks and savings and loan associations. What Congress has really achieved, therefore, is to reduce bank liquidity and thus, by its own action, make tight money tighter. It also has hurt housing prospects by reducing the supply of home financing.

To be sure, with the ceiling off, the Treasury would need to be cautious not to get stuck with too much long-term debt paying high rates at some future time when the money market is looser again. But that should be fairly elementary in debt management, and certainly the kind of safeguard Congress imposes is all too amateurish.

Actually, in his repeated, urgent pleas for repeal, the President is not seeking authority to increase the total cost of Federal debt. Rather he is asking for a chance to manage the debt more soundly, perhaps even saving some interest. Excessive borrowing in the short end of the market, as he says, is expensive and inefficient.

He is too polite to say to Congress in so many words that its stubborn stand is a silly affair. But Barron's says it, and it seems to fit.

A Potential Poet Laureate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 13, 1960, the New York State Democratic Committee tendered a dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City. Democratic presidential contender, Senator JACK KENNEDY, pleased the gathering with his humor and his message criticizing the present administration in its handling of our defenses and our economy was enthusiastically received. Gov. Robert Meyner, former Gov. Averell Harriman, Mayor Robert Wagner, New York State Comptroller Arthur Levitt, Michael Prendergast, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, and Carmine G. DeSapio, national Democratic committeeman and potential poet laureate, contributed to the oratorical evening. The speech of Carmine DeSapio captured the spirit of the crowd and reflected their sentiments. This speech displayed the poetic talents of the remarkable Carmine DeSapio. I suspect that a reading of the speech will give Democrats as much pleasure as it will give Republicans displeasure. In any event, I am sure that impartial readers

will find delight in this parody of a popular Christmas poem, which Carmine DeSapio authored.

His speech and poem follow:

My good friends, my fellow Democrats, this is an inspiring demonstration of our party's strength, our party's unity, and our party's determination to elect a Democratic President next November.

It is a very moving experience for me—as I am sure it must be for all of you—to witness and participate in the friendship and good will which are manifest here tonight.

And, underlying the gaiety and the camaraderie with which we gather, is the strong bond of common dedication which we share.

Governor Meyner and Senator KENNEDY, distinguished and informed, will spell out, I am sure, the issues which confront the people in the forthcoming election. I would, therefore, like to take advantage of the warm spirit prevailing, and satisfy a yearning I have long nurtured. Here is what I mean—with profound apologies to Clement Clarke Moore:

'Twas mid-July and all through Chicago
Not a delegate was stirring; on thought an embargo.
The weather was warm; the Republicans cool,
They had it all set the people to fool.
They had it worked out with effort and care
From the American voters the White House to snare.
With wit and with whimsy and slogans galore,
Everything was settled; Bring DICK to the fore.
They sang of peace and prosperity, too,
And scoffed at the chaos which "brinkism" grew.
Derided the danger of our missiles lag;
With truth and with fact played hilarious tag.
The high cost of living just didn't exist
And the farmers' dilemma lightly dismissed.
An unbalanced budget and taxes sky high?
Let Madison Avenue give it a try.
The moment grew near and a hush filled the hall—
DICK NIXON was ready to heed the great call.
Hear, Thruston, Dirksen, and Dewey so dear,
You scuttled Rocky and the road is all clear;
Delivered the nomination on a platter of gold
And taken me into your hallowed fold.
For this I promise continued control
Of our Nation's resources and our party's soul.
I'll wage a campaign that's hard and tough
As only DICK NIXON can really get rough.
I'll smear and slander; vilify; attack,
For of guts and spirit I sure have no lack.
I'll take them on—whomever they name
And brother you just watch me defame.
Hear, Thruston, Dirksen, and Dewey so strong,
With me at the helm you'll never go wrong.
But, alas, my friends, their plans went astray
'Cause a Democrat won on election day.

Arizona: Thriving Oasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is always a thrilling experience to discover that people, other than one's self and one's neighbors, share the confidence and pride that are ours in the State of Arizona. Just a short while ago it was my pleasure to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in Newsweek magazine; and today, only a few days after the 48th birthday of Arizona as a State, which was February 14, I discover that another outstanding periodical is paying tribute to the healthy, rapid, and successful growth of Arizona. I wish it were possible to have the RECORD display the outstanding color pictures that accompany this article; but, in their absence, I am certain that the words will convey the full meaning of the story. So I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Arizona: Thriving Oasis," appearing in Time magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA: THRIVING OASIS—ENERGY FILLS THE OPEN SPACES

"The region is altogether valueless. After entering it, there is nothing to do but leave." (Report to Congress, 1858.)

Heading eastward over the Arizona desert, high-flying transport pilots can pick up the urban glow of Phoenix from 70 miles out, as the city lies like a blue-white solitaire upon limitless black velvet. Though Phoenix expanded its limits from 17.1 square miles in 1950 to its present 110-square-mile area to make room for a tripled population (373,000), it remains no more than a brightly lit patch upon a landscape characterized by vastness.

Today Phoenix is leading Arizona into a boom which, if measured by statistics, skyline and traffic, seems much like the growth pattern that created such major cities as Detroit and sprawling Los Angeles. In fact the boom takes on a difference in quality and character from the backdrop of open land, air and sky that once made up the wildest Old West.

GUNS AND WATER

From the Grand Canyon in the north, where the Colorado River cuts the most spectacular incision anywhere in earth's surface, the Arizona landscape sweeps eastward to the gaudy Painted Desert, takes in the stone trees of Petrified Forest, the cinder mountains piled up by a geological era of active volcanoes. Southward lies the butte-strewn sands where Apache Chief Geronimo waged the last Indian wars upon whites, the rich, old copper mines producing one-half of U.S. needs, such legendary towns as Tombstone, where gunslingers Wyatt Earp & Co. built the legends that feed today's TV. Along the Mexican border, the rambling ranches still raise cattle, which for the first time in 1953 outnumbered the State's people population.

As Phoenix and Tucson (population 182,500) reach out into the open spaces with acres of factories, airports, suburbs, housing devolpments and tourist havens, the open spaces give back an atmosphere that makes this a boom with a difference. Uniquely, the movers and shakers share a sense of self-sufficiency (though they live at the mercy of transcontinental railroads and highways), of well-being (though summer temperatures rise to 120° in the shade), of boundless confidence that if the desert can be turned into a thriving oasis nothing in the world is impossible (though they are still pressed by the desert's ancient problem: water).

COOL MONUMENT

It was mastery of the water problem that first made Arizona a place to live instead of a place to leave. In 1867 an Indian fighter named Jack Swilling began to investigate the ruins of some ancient canals (believed to have been built in the 10th century by the Hohokam people). Swilling decided to set up an irrigation company, succeeded in starting a new town. One literate resident proposed that they call their town Phoenix because, he said, "they would raise a new civilization upon the ruins of the old." The new civilization did not win a real chance of success until after President Theodore Roosevelt pushed through his Reclamation Act of 1902. His first major project: Roosevelt Dam, northeast of Phoenix, which backed up enough water to support a citrus and truck-garden industry in Phoenix' sun-drenched Salt River Valley.

Phoenix cherishes another unique monument to desert progress: the downtown Fox Theater, in 1931 the first building in town to install an air-conditioning system. As mechanical air conditioners became cheaper, they eventually became a necessity for every business, standard equipment in homes. This simple piece of technology, now installed in automobiles, made the desert endurable year round, made the vast reaches of Arizona a promising center for easy living.

RICH AND MANY

Hungry men tend to start most migrations, but the new westward stream, especially to the resort area just east of Phoenix, was started in the thirties by rich men. Among them: Cleveland Inventor John C. Lincoln, who built the now-famous Camelback Inn on the lower slopes of Camelback Mountain; Chicago Chewing Gum Magnate William Wrigley, who founded the fabulous Arizona Biltmore and started a golf course colony nearby; International Harvester Heir Fowler McCormick, who went a little farther east into Paradise Valley to start what is now the richest winter residential area in the State.

It took World War II, with its influx of dispersed war plants and military bases, to give thousands of nonmillionaires an incurable taste for desert living. By some estimates, half of the Army Air Corps pilots trained at Williams and Luke Airbases worked their way back to the Phoenix area after the war. Companies, too, returned. Goodyear Aircraft Corp., which modified patrol bombers htere during the war, migrated back to produce missile components. Hughes Aircraft Co. set up Falcon missile production at Tucson. Word of the easy life spread through family and community grapevines. Chicago's Paul V. Galvin, then president of Motorola, Inc., cagily realized that Phoenix would be a good place for luring the scientists and engineers needed to pioneer the electronic age's transistor production, founded an industry that is still doubling and redoubling production and employment.

Today 16 major firms, engaged mainly in electronics, have built plants in the Phoenix area; the State's total manufacturing income rose 12 percent last year, to $550 million. Attracting still more industry is a basic fact of the labor market—the cheaper, easier living lures some 2,500 migrants into Phoenix each month; keeps pay scales 10 to 25 percent below the average of older industrial areas.

BOOM AND BUILD

The tourist trade grew faster than factories. At least 6 million people now tour Arizona each year, inspire gaudier and gaudier strips of motels and roadside restaurants on roads leading out of Tucson and Phoenix. The unchallenged center of tourist trade has risen just across the irrigation ditch from the Paradise Valley area, where the early-bird millionaires first set the style for desert life and leisure. Its name, Scottsdale, which as recently as 1949 was a sleepy farm town of 1,700. It has now become the

shopping center for a population of about 50,000. Desperately hanging on to its best tourist lure, Scottsdale, billing itself as "The West's Most Western Town," last week held its annual Parada del Sol Rodeo. But money has turned Scottsdale into a form of effete West, a place of fabulously expensive watering spots (suites up to $120 a day) and chichi stores, such as a custom perfume shop, which composes a unique aroma for each lady customer.

The influx of money and people put new strains on Arizona's business and political leadership. First to rise to the challenge were the bankers. In the late forties, Walter Bimson, then president of Valley National Bank, bet more heavily than any other man upon the State's future, extended credit to a handful of ex-carpenters who proposed to build new homes, motels, and office buildings for the new Phoenix. One result: Valley National, which had only 15,000 depositors and $8 million in deposits when Bimson took over in 1933, today has 350,000 depositors (total population: 1.3 million) and $567 million in deposits.

Another result of the openhanded type of leadership was a new crop of young millionaires. Samples:

David Murdock, 36, ex-riveter who arrived from Michigan in a house trailer in 1947, has since built $30 million worth of commercial buildings.

John Long, 39, who teamed with wife Mary to build their first home in 1947, developed methods of year-round construction and prefabrication into the best housing buy (say U.S. building experts) in the United States. Example: a 3-bedroom house with swimming pool for $11,600. Long's Maryvale development in northwest Phoenix now holds 11,000 new homes, a bigger population than Yuma, plus a shopping city, will soon include a hospital and golf course.

Lee Ackerman, 39, Missouri-born ex-pilot, who got a cub reporter's job on the Arizona Republic in 1946, started an advertising agency, then an investment company to take advantage of the fantastic boom in land values across the State, now also owns a savings and loan association. Democrat Ackerman intends to run for Governor this year.

The new Arizonans set a dizzy pace in Phoenix's business life. At a cocktail party 14 months ago, builder Murdock told friends about the 20-story office building he wanted to put up, said idly, "I wish I had a bank in my building." The idea struck some listener's fancy, started serious talk, and 30 minutes later the cocktail-party group had pledged $960,000 toward the new bank. Today, the handsome, blue porcelain Guaranty Bank Building is just about complete, and the new bank, actually capitalized at an unusually high $2,750,000, will open with the building next month.

VOTES AND HOPES

The yeasty growth penetrated Arizona politics, once 3 to 1 registered Democratic (because Arizona's first settlers mostly came from the South). U.S. Senator CARL HAYDEN, 82, has been in Congress since Arizona became a State in 1912. Tucson's STEWART UDALL, 40, an able liberal Democrat, who benefits from a well-respected political name, preserves his party's label in the part-Mormon Second Congressional District, which encompasses all the State outside Phoenix. But the Democratic grip began to slip in Phoenix in 1949.

Ideological leader of the new Republican group was popular department store owner, BARRY GOLDWATER, a 40-year-old in 1949 when he led a good government reform slate to take over a rickety Phoenix city government. Three years later he upset Senate Majority Leader Ernest McFarland in a Senate race, beat him again in 1958. Kansas-born JOHN RHODES, who learned about Phoenix as a World War II pilot, became in 1952 the first Republican to win an Arizona seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. By 1958, Republican Paul Fannin, backed by such businesslike young Republicans as Dave Murdock, took over the governorship.

The hard-driving young leaders have rushed Phoenix and Arizona into a glittering new era, but they well know that they have not licked all its serious problems. For one thing, the sense of unlimited expansion space is deceptive: the United States and the State government own an amazing 86 percent of it. In the limited area left, fast and loose land speculators have driven up prices; some desolate North Arizona acres shot up from $150 to $1,000 in the last year.

Such prices might make sense if the State had water enough to turn its acres of desert into residential lots of sunshine. But the Phoenix area alone is already using more water than its reservoirs collect, has to mine 1,300,000 acre feet of water annually out of its lowered underground water table. Though the new residential areas use only one-third as much water as the crops they replace, the further spread of homes into the desert will leave a water problem that can be solved only by wresting more of the Colorado River away from California (which also has a water problem) or by man's long-term dream of making fresh water out of the sea.

Making no litle plans, Phoenix's movers and shakers count on atomic energy to provide some day the vast power needed to bring salty Pacific seawater fresh into the desert.

The Federal Retiree Health Benefit Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution which was adopted by the Detroit Chapter 89, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, on the Federal retiree health benefit program:

FEDERAL RETIREE HEALTH BENEFIT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress has voted to establish a system of prepaid health benefits for Federal employees on a payroll deduction basis with a substantial Federal Government contribution to the cost; and

Whereas the new program provides benefits for retirees who retire subsequent to the first effective date of coverage but makes no provision for retirees who retired prior to such first effective date; and

Whereas this omission appears to be discriminatory and should be corrected; and

Whereas the practice among other large employers is increasingly tending toward making available to retirees the same group health benefits at the same group rates charged for active employees; and

Whereas it is in the public interest to provide for the health care of our older citizens through prepayment and at a rate they can afford to pay out of their limited resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NARCE hereby directs its officers and representatives through all appropriate means to promote the passage of Federal legislation which will make available to all eligible Federal retirees the same health benefits which will soon be available to future retirees under S. 2162 and at the same rates.

Can We Do Business With Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Soviet Union appears anxious to resume trade with the United States, but not without a price. Chairman Khrushchev has forecast that trade between the two countries may rise from $21 million in 1958 to $3 billion, although it would be difficult to find many in the United States to agree with him. A shrewd analysis of what such trade would mean in terms of the Battle Act of 1951, and the Trade Agreements Extension Act, governing the export of strategic materials, in the Reporter magazine for January 7, 1960, reveals what political rather than economic motives are the driving force behind Khrushchev's efforts at restoring United States-Russian trade. Trade may well come in this volume and be very welcome but we must understand clearly all the elements involved so that our public policy may reflect the situation accurately. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the consideration of Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH BUSINESS CAN WE DO WITH THE RUSSIANS?

(Howard S. Piquet and Leon M. Herman)

According to Premier Khrushchev, trade between the Soviet Union and the United States "over the next few years" may shoot up from the 1958 figure of $21 million to as much as $3 billion. Most competent American experts, on the other hand, take a dim view of this rosy prospect.

Notwithstanding a substantial increase in U.S. exports to the Soviet Union during the first 9 months of 1959, exceeding somewhat the total for all of 1958, United States-Soviet trade is and always has been very small relative to the total trade of either country. In 1940 the Soviet Union accounted for only 1 percent of the total foreign trade of the United States. By 1947, after the termination of lend-lease, it fell back to the same level. With the introduction of U.S. export controls in March 1948, shipments to the Soviet Union came to an almost complete halt and continued to hover below $1 million annually for 6 years.

Exports have risen slightly since 1956 but still remain small. In 1958 they totaled only $3.5 million whereas our imports from the Soviet Union amounted to $17.5 million. Exports and imports together are infinitesimal compared with the total foreign trade of the United States, which amounts to $29 billion. The United States now exports to the Soviet Union about as much as it exports to Barbados and imports about as much as it imports from Afghanistan.

To the Soviet Union, foreign trade serves primarily as a means of coordinating the

various national economies of the Communist bloc. Three-fourths of its $8 billion annual total of foreign trade—divided about evenly between exports and imports—involves the other Communist countries, headed by East Germany and Red China. Soviet trade with non-Communist countries also virtually balances out, with exports and imports each valued at $1.2 billion. The total volume of Soviet trade with non-Communist nations is roughly comparable to that of Switzerland. From all non-Communist Europe, Soviet imports in 1958 amounted to only $600 million.

POLICY AND FACTS

As Khrushchev sees it, only the artificial barriers erected by the United States since 1948 prevent an almost limitless expansion of Soviet-American trade. The Battle Act, enacted in 1951, prohibited U.S. foreign aid to countries that export strategic materials to Communist nations; and the Trade-Agreements Extension Act of 1951 withdrew unconditional most-favored-nation treatment from all products imported from the Soviet Union. Under the Johnson Act of 1934, private long-term credits may not be extended to countries that are in default to the United States, and the failure of the Soviet Union to settle its lend-lease accounts automatically places it in this category.

But even if all these legislative barriers were eliminated, it is far from likely that Soviet-American trade would thereupon immediately begin to flourish.

At best, trade between a free-enterprise economy and a state-controlled economy is beset by many difficulties. Under a state-controlled system, foreign trade is inevitably tailored to meet the requirements of an all-pervasive economic plan. External purchases are limited mostly to goods necessary to break domestic bottlenecks and to enhance self-sufficiency. Such trade therefore tends to be sporadic and unpredictable.

By the same token, buyers in the United States can have no assurance that there will be a continuous supply of needed imports, or that they will be free from the hazard of periodic flooding in a particular market. If the Soviet planners discover an unforeseen need for foreign exchange to purchase some capital equipment, they may flood the market with, say, tin or crude oil, regardless of cost and price.

To the British market, for example, the Soviets sent only 500 tons of tin in 1956, then suddenly raised it to 8,700 tons in 1957. France received 80,000 tons of diesel oil in 1957 from the Soviet Union; the next year it got 263,000 tons, three times as much.

When the Soviet Union has been faced by the need to score a point in the political arena, it has not always been meticulous in fulfilling its contractual obligations. A recent case in point is the scrapping of a contract to deliver oil to Israel. Trade disputes are usually adjudicated before a Soviet arbitration body in which the state is both defendant and judge. It would be surprising if the decisions of such a court were not heavily influenced by the wishes of the Soviet Government.

To the American businessman the Soviet market is, therefore, not a normal trading area. Although he does not exclude it altogether, he regards it as a market of last resort. He has learned to be wary of the bureaucratic procedures under which it operates and of the slow and tedious "negotiations" that are inevitably involved. The Soviet negotiator, who is frequently replaced, is a firm believer in haggling. He neither knows nor accepts the judgment of the market concerning any commodity, and the American trader soon becomes acutely aware of the hazards he must face should a commercial dispute arise.

The Soviet market has the added disadvantage of not affording U.S. exporters any protection for patent rights to the innovations embodied in exported equipment. The Soviet Union is not a party to the international convention on patents and does not hesitate to pirate the designs of patents issued by other countries. Soviet purchasing agents insist on the latest version of any machine that they procure, and they purchase only one or two models at a time. Their prime interest is in developing the internal self-sufficiency of the Soviet bloc, not in the international exchange of goods.

If he is an importer, the U.S. trader must face the fact that changes in the diplomatic climate can easily damage him financially. Anyone engaged in trading with a ministry of the Soviet Government must work on the assumption that his rating as a customer depends more on the friendliness of the foreign policy pursued by his government than on his own performance. His claim on the Soviet product that he customarily receives can suddenly be erased by the appearance of a more highly valued customer in a country that pursues a friendlier policy toward the Soviet Union.

Of course there is risk in all international trade. And the trader must evaluate the opportunities that a given market seems to offer. By this test the Soviet market can have a strong attraction for a few enterprising U.S. exporters. Although the Soviet Union is an unpredictable customer, it is a large one. It would not be realistic for an entire industry to expand its plant capacity on the basis of a spate of Soviet orders, but a Russian order can be quite attractive to an individual producer, particularly as a means of tiding him over a stagnant period.

TOWARD THE FUTURE

Trade between the United States and the Soviet Union would be both cumbersome and hazardous even if there were no international tension, no record of defaults on indebtedness, and no uncertainty over the aggressive intentions of Russia's restless rulers.

If, however, the intensity of some of the grave and irritating issues now separating the two countries could be reduced by negotiation within the near future, the chances for increased trade between the two countries would obviously brighten. The question is, to what extent?

On this score some recent statements by Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon suggest what we may expect. While careful not to arouse false hopes for a change in the nature of the Russian market, he envisions a gradual expansion in the volume of trade with the Soviet Union. Generally speaking, he expects it to come about through a slow improvement in mutual confidence. More specifically, he implies that the United States might be willing to consider the removal of the barriers against Soviet trade, provided the Russians are willing to enter into a substantial agreement regarding their lend-lease indebtedness.

Such action on their part might be a reason for asking Congress to lift the embargo on furs and to restore unconditional most-favored nation treatment of all goods imported from the Soviet Union. At the same time, it is generally agreed that U.S. control over the exportation of strategic materials will not be abandoned until some of the deeper problems of the East-West conflict have been resolved.

In the meantime, the most important hindrance to trade continues to be the nature of the Russian market, which is not likely to undergo radical change in the foreseeable future. By their own standards, the Soviet trading agencies are now enjoying a high level of trade with Western Europe. They have ready access to the markets and resources of most industrial nations more or less on their own terms. To them the United States is just another Western market. It is the largest, to be sure, and at times it is unique with respect to certain goods. But there is no great need for the Soviet Union to make substantial concessions to obtain freer access to this market.

THE LONG VIEW

The Soviet leaders would like to induce the United States to abandon its official safeguards over strategic exports, because success in this area would constitute a political accomplishment of the first magnitude. But they are not prepared to pay a price for it, certainly not to the extent of altering their state trading system.

Because the United States is only one of several major industrial markets, the scale of future United States-Soviet trade is limited by the need of the Soviet trade monopoly to maintain contact with the group as a whole. For the time being, Soviet trade with the West is expanding slowly. The big percentage upswing, from a low base, came 5 years ago. At present the peak in Soviet purchases from any Western trading partner amounts to $150 million a year, and this figure is reached only in countries that can absorb an equal volume of goods from the Soviet Union.

By comparison, the U.S. demand for typical Soviet export products is limited, although it could in time be raised several notches above the present level. Under more favorable trading conditions, such purchases could conceivably expand to $75 million a year, a fivefold increase over 1958. Given the known Soviet interest in our industrial equipment, it would not take very long to bring up the volume of U.S. exports to that figure. Beyond that, however, any increase could be attained only through the granting of long-term credits to the Soviet Union, a development that must be viewed as improbable until the general climate of relations between the two countries improves markedly.

Milwaukie Needs Its Own Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Monroe Sweetland in the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review regarding the need for an independent post office at that city. I agree thoroughly with the editors contention:

[From the Milwaukie Review, Feb. 11, 1960]

MILWAUKIE NEEDS ITS OWN POST OFFICE

What happened at 4:55 one afternoon last week should perhaps be reported as a page 1 news item. Instead we are putting it in the editorial column because its obvious moral makes an argument for a change of policy. We couldn't even report this incident at our post office without adding another to the long list of reasons for a change.

Theron Sedgwick, who had rushed to the post office after returning from work, was burdened with two big packages to be shipped overseas. He arrived at about 4:45, secured his tags for the customs declaration at the counter, and proceeded to fill them out on the nearby tables. At 5 o'clock, straight up, the clerks locked the outside door as they finished the short line of patrons at the counter.

As the clerk on duty finished with the editor's mail, he called to Mr. Sedgwick, who was half through the detail on the tags,

"It's 5 o'clock. The office is closed. You'll have to bring those packages back tomorrow."

It was an outrageous discourtesy, as we observed it, and an inconvenience expensive in time and effort for Mr. Sedgwick. In our opinion it would not happen if the clerks and administration did not treat Milwaukie as a colonial outpost. The interest of the majority of the staff is not in this community, and they know that they will be transferred sooner or later to some other branch of Portland's farflung postal empire.

If we had our own post office, the postmaster and most of his crew would live here. They would have some feeling for Milwaukie. In addition to all the other points being made by the North Clackamas Chamber, we consider the object lesson of the Theron Sedgwick incident last week to be highly pertinent. It is not only the incivility of one tired clerk at 5 p.m., it is the whole policy which must change. 1960 is the year to restore the independent status of Milwaukie Post Office.

Three Latin American Presidents Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Frederick (Md.) News, relating to an address made before the Newman Club of Hood College, Frederick, by the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor of the St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and an expert on Latin American affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE LATIN AMERICAN PRESIDENTS COMMENDED

Addressing the Newman Club of Hood College at the invitation of Rev. Herbert R. Jordan, moderator, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and a specialist on inter-American affairs, declared that three South American presidents, Dr. Jorge Alessandri of Chile, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia, and Dr. Camilo Ponce Enriquez of Ecuador, were displaying superb leadership, despite gigantic economic and political problems.

Dr. Thorning added:

"Chilean President Alessandri, who has just completed his first term, has succeeded to a marked degree, by frequent trips into the interior.

"Dr. Lleras has familiarized himself with local needs and then provided new clinics, hospitals, roads, and schools. Most Colombians agree that the former dictator, Gen. Gustavo Rojas Pinillas, was accorded a fair trial. In like manner, justice was meted out to the tyrant's former henchmen without any semblance of the lynch law which disgraced the Castro regime in nearby Cuba. Delicate questions of religious peace were also handled in a tactful, equitable style. North American observers have paid tribute to this new approach to an old problem.

"In Ecuador, President Ponce has insisted upon honest public administration. Dr. Ponce may join the ranks of the few Ecuadorean presidents who, in recent years, have completed their full term of office."

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman SCHERER, of Ohio, two articles concerning the International Labor Organization. One is by William L. McGrath and the other by Don Knowlton. When these statements are viewed in the light of the record developed by the Congress during the years in which it has studied the activities of the ILO, their lack of objectivity becomes obvious.

The February 2 statements raise general questions concerning first, the monetary contribution of the United States to the ILO; second, alleged socialistic orientation of ILO conventions and recommendations; third, the extent and nature of participation in the work of the ILO by the Soviets and their satellites; and fourth, the objectives of the International Labor Organization.

The International Labor Organization is a specialized agency now associated with the United Nations. It was created in 1919 as a part of the peace settlement. Samuel Gompers, then the president of the American Federation of Labor, played a prominent role in its creation. The International Labor Organization is unique in that representatives of employers and workers as well as governments have a voice in its work. It is truly a democratic organization and the fact that the United States and 79 other nations are members testifies to its worldwide importance.

When the United States became a member of the ILO in 1934, we formally accepted the obligations of its constitution which sets forth, among other things, financial and budgetary arrangements. Thus, article 13, 2(c), of the ILO constitution provides:

The arrangements for the approval, allocation and collection of the budget of the International Labor Organization shall be determined by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the delegates present, and shall provide for the approval of the budget and of the arrangements for the allocation of expenses among the members of the organization by a committee of government representatives.

The United States is a member of this committee of governments and has always played a decisive role in determining the percentage scale for the allocation of contributions among member nations of the ILO. The contribution of the United States has been fixed at 25 percent since 1951 with our full agreement and the Congress each year has reviewed the activities of the ILO in conjunction with the annual request of the Department of State for an appropriation to meet our contribution of 25 percent of the ILO budget.

The U.S. contribution to the ILO for the calendar year 1959 was $2,132,464; for calendar year 1960 our assessment will be $1,975,364. These amounts appear to the Congress and to many responsible people to be a small price to pay for keeping the voice of this Government and our belief in the free enterprise system, in free collective bargaining and in the basic dignity of the individual before an international forum in which 79 other nations participate.

In 1956 the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, chaired by the Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Representative from Missouri, carefully examined the question of U.S. participation in the ILO. This examination included allegations pertaining to Soviet domination and control of the ILO and inherent implications that the objectives of the ILO were inconsistent with continued U.S. participation therein. Mr. William L. McGrath was a principal witness and at that time placed before the committee at great length the substance of all these matters which are the subject of his present article. In rejecting these allegations, the committee concluded in its report of July 1, 1957 that:

(a) The ILO has a history of solid accomplishments in helping to raise labor standards and in assisting in the industrialization of underdeveloped countries. Both are broad objectives of U.S. foreign policy. By and large the ILO program is strengthening the social fabric of newly developing countries along lines designed to protect the freedom and well-being of the worker.

(b) The presence of Communist representatives should not drive the United States out of the ILO, even though it raises serious questions as to the basis of representation in the Organization. In the main, their presence serves to emphasize the importance of the ILO forum for presenting the American viewpoint. It is in this forum that the major Communist arguments on bettering living and working conditions can be fought and revealed for what they are, that is, deceitful inducements toward total tyranny. The Communist practice of forced labor has already been exposed in a study which has had a tremendous impact.

(c) The essential ILO orientation is toward developing free institutions in the field of its special concern. Even among the free nations of the world there may be disagreements over the means of furthering this objective. However, it is the subcommittee's opinion that, taken as a whole, the work of the ILO lessens the opportunity for Communist propaganda to take root in non-Communist member countries.

(d) The subcommittee is convinced that the procedures established under the U.S. Constitution are entirely adequate for the proper consideration and disposition of conventions approved by the ILO. Only 7 of the 104 ILO conventions have been adopted by the United States, and these dealt with matters of lesser importance. Other countries, particularly some of the newly developing countries, however, find the ILO con-

vention method helpful in improving working conditions.

The subcommittee's report is based upon hearings held between February 20 and July 2, 1956, during which it heard a large number of witnesses, representing labor, management, and government, as well as other American interests, and developed a voluminous record of testimony and statistical data. The report pointed out—and this is still the case—that the U.S.S.R. and its satellite nations control 36 out of a total of 320 votes which can be cast in the annual ILO Conference, and only 2 of the 40 votes which can be cast in the governing body. As for the 10 industrial and analogous committees of the ILO which ordinarily meet once each 2 or 3 years to discuss the problems of particular industries—textile, petroleum, chemical and others—and whose opinions are advisory to the governing body, the Soviet Union, and satellites hold only some 17 of the 223 seats distributed among the committees.

The importance of the ILO was emphasized by President Eisenhower in his statement to the most recent International Labor Conference, in June 1959, which reads in part:

The ILO is a vital forum for the exchange of information and opinions by representatives of governments, employers and working men and women. It has adapted itself ably to changing conditions and developed new techniques to meet new problems. It has grown strong in service to the people of the world.

Over the years, from its rich store of experience, the Organization haes shared its wisdom with newly developing countries through technical assistance and educational programs and advisory and information services • • •.

The United States is proud of its membership in the International Labor Organization. We are glad that so many of our citizens have been able to serve the cause of world peace through participation in its work.

I should like at this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the electrical contractors magazine, Qualified Contractor, for December 1959, which clearly establishes the point that not all employers agree with the views expressed by Messrs. McGrath and Knowlton. I also invite your considered attention to a recent speech by the Honorable George C. Lodge, Assistant Secretary of Labor, International Affairs, delivered at Rutgers University on the ILO on January 28, 1960, in which Mr. Lodge highlights some of the constructive work the ILO has done and is doing, and sets forth the vital interests of the United States in the International Labor Organization. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the speech of the Honorable George C. Lodge. I also include the editorial written by Oliver F. Burnett, president of the National Electrical Contractors Association:

THE VITAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

(Address by George C. Lodge, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, at the ILO Conference of Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, N.J., January 28, 1960)

Few initials have caused more consistent confusion in the United States than ILO. It has been misunderstood and misconstrued by many ever since the United States joined it in 1934. Some think of it as an organization of trade unions, others as a world parliament and still others as a leftist operation with dark and dangerous objectives. It is none of these.

Actually it is an eminently practical, 40-year-old specialized agency of the United Nations, strongly committed to democratic ideals and posing no threat to any nation's sovereignty. Surprisingly unpublicized, it has accomplished some of the most remarkable feats of international diplomacy in recent years. In addition, it has brought help and hope to many millions of people throughout the vitally important less developed areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America; and it has done so effectively and economically.

I

In 1948 the ILO made a significant contribution toward averting a serious international crisis. The International Transport Workers Federation (ITF), composed of virtually all the transportation unions of the free world, announced that it was going to boycott all ships flying the Panamanian flag, a threat which the ITF was perfectly capable of enforcing. The ITF alleged that many of the ships flying the Panamanian flag had been transferred from other flags so that employers would be able to avoid having to pay decent wages, observe adequate safety standards and to evade taxation. The federation charged that deplorable living and working conditions existed aboard these ships. An ITF boycott would have meant a serious stoppage of much of the world's maritime transportation.

The Government of Panama rejected the allegations of the ITF and requested the ILO governing body to conduct an official inquiry into the charges. The ILO went to work and the threat of international boycott passed. A tripartite—employer, worker, and government—commission of inquiry was appointed and in November of 1949 the ILO noted that Panama has "made an earnest endeavor to improve conditions in its merchant marine," and that many brandnew ships were being registered under the Panamanian flag.

Of course, since that time there has been increasing international attention to the problem of "flags of convenience." The widespread and important implications of the growing use of this device have been considered at length by a number of international bodies, most recently the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference and the ILO Maritime Conference.

Another example of success in ILO solving troublesome situations was its solution of a crippling railroad strike in Peru in July of 1957. The railway of southern Peru, the longest and most important in the country, climbs by a hazardous mountain route from the Pacific coast 14,000 feet to the Andean High Plateau. It is the principal method for transporting food, cattle, sheep and minerals in southern Peru. Work on the line is particularly strenuous owing to the high altitudes, and in April 1957 some 3,500 railway workers struck for wage increases, overtime pay, increased family allowances and a number of improvements in the conditions of their employment. All efforts to solve the strike failed and the situation was getting more serious by the day with hardship and starvation resulting because of the lack of transportation. Finally, on July 16 the Peruvian Minister of Labor transmitted to Mr. MORSE the request of a number of leading citizens of southern Peru for assistance from the ILO in settling the dispute. Six days later Pier Paolo Fano, chief of the ILO's International Organizations Division, was on his way.

Three weeks later, after making a careful study of the situation, Mr. Fano presented a proposed settlement to the mediation committee. The committee adopted them unanimously with the concurrence of representatives of the railroad labor and management and the strike was settled.

II

Created in 1919 at the Versailles Peace Conference as part of the League of Nations, the ILO brings together employer, worker and government representatives from 80 nations in an effort to improve the welfare of workers throughout the world and to assist in the development of those institutions which will ensure the free and just development of societies.

Operating on a current budget of slightly more than $9 million, the ILO holds an annual conference each June in Geneva where its permanent office is located. It has a governing body, composed of 20 governments, 10 employers and 10 workers, which supervises the International Labor Office, determines conference agendas and formulates the budget on the basis of recommendations made to it by the director general of the organization.

Delegations to ILO annual conferences are made up of one employer representative, who in the United States is nominated jointly by the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce, and currently is Cola G. Parker, director of Kimberly-Clark Corp.; one worker delegate nominated by the AFL-CIO, currently Rudolph Faupl, international representative of the International Association of Machinists and two government delegates, one from the Department of Labor and one from the Department of State. Last June the conference had nearly 1,000 delegates and advisers in attendance.

The ILO is of very special and unique importance to the United States and to the free world. It is the only organization created to deal with the problems which are so real to most people in the world—problems of work, wages, security and the right of all human beings to freedom and dignity. Even though U.S. objections to the League of Nations prevented our joining the ILO officially until 1934, 15 years after it was founded, this country has always played an important role with respect to the organization. Its first meeting was in Washington in 1919 and among its moving figures was Samuel Gompers, first president of the American Federation of Labor.

III

It was no accident that the ILO was founded when it was. Its founders in addition to reflecting the sharp increase in the social conscience of governments following World War I felt an urgent need to create an international organization which would refute the Marxist theory of the inevitability of class warfare. And the ILO has indeed

shown that workers and employers can meet together peacefully and reconcile their differences for the promotion of the welfare of workers the world over.

Using Lenin's phraseology, the ILO is truly a counterrevolutionary organization. It was created deliberately to give an outlet and a hope to working people whose lives, values, and systems had been shattered by the First World War. For in those days many European workers were being beguiled by the promises of a new and better life which came to them from the Red Revolution in Russia.

At the very moment that title XIII of the Treaty of Versailles was being drafted to include an International Labor Organization, French Premier Clemenceau had 30,000 troops mobilized in Paris to put down a general strike. Defeated Germany was in despair, hopelessly viewing her shattered structure, and the Communists were threatening to gain control in 1919 through their utopian appeals to humiliated war veterans, much as a slightly different sort of dictatorial ideology did take control of Germany 13 years later. All over the world workers were seeking urgent solutions for their postwar problems.

The ILO was launched to offer workers a chance to sit down with employers and governments and attempt solutions to their problems without recourse to revolutionary violence; and in its very conception it offered to working people the promise that employers and governments of the nations of the world were prepared to deal with their problems fairly, democratically, and seriously.

Thus, from the very beginning the ILO has been an important anti-Communist influence. And from the beginning doctrinaire Communists have found the ILO a very uncomfortable place indeed, since they are forced to negotiate problems which their faith decrees are soluble only by warfare and revolution. The Communists do not recognize employers and workers in the same sense as does the rest of the world. A free trade union has no role at all in a totalitarian state; nor does a free employer. Conscious of this, employer and worker delegates at the ILO have never been wholeheartedly willing to accept Communist representatives. Quite rightly, they consider them no different from government representatives. This basic difference between free and totalitarian countries is a point of continuing strife in the ILO, and while efforts have been made to compromise the difference it is doubtful whether the followers of Marx and Lenin can ever feel at home in the ILO.

IV

The ILO was the first international organization ever to seek to make social justice the basis of permanent peace. In 1954, in a special audience with members of the Governing Body in Rome, Pope Pius XII said:

"Over the past 30 years and more you have patiently and untiringly built up an achievement of which you can justly be proud.

"Not only have you contributed to the progress of social legislation in different countries but, above all, you have united governments, employers and workers in courageous and successful collaboration.

"You have led them to master every passion, all bitterness in their demands, and every obstinate refusal to face inevitable developments; they have learned to listen to each other's arguments, calmly weigh the facts of an extremely complex problem and jointly propose the necessary improvements.

"You have thus created a kind of international forum, a clearinghouse where essential information and useful ideas are collected, tested, and published."

The ILO's work covers a wide range of subjects, including: problems of employment, improved living standards, equal opportunity, sound labor-management practices, the development of skills, protection for the life and health of workers and adequate provisions for child welfare.

It seeks to accomplish its tasks in three ways:

First, the ILO brings together labor, management, and government representatives to formulate international standards in the labor field covering such things as wages, hours, working conditions, and social legislation. There are now more than 220 such instruments which cover nearly every conceivable type of labor conditions. These are not binding in any way except to the extent that they may be accepted by individual national governments; so the ILO is in no sense a world parliament. This phase of the organization's work is regarded by many nations, including the United States and many of the less developed countries, as having been largely accomplished for the present. The great need now is for guidance and assistance to the nations of the world, particularly those in early stages of development, to give practical effect to the standards which have been set forth.

A second major activity of the ILO is the collection and analysis of facts and figures about labor throughout the world. The ILO is without doubt the most important single source of such information.

Finally, the ILO's newest and fastest growing activity is its assistance to many nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to help their people develop better methods of production, free and peaceful labor relations, more efficient training institutions, and many other necessities for the successful and democratic evolution of an industrially underdeveloped society. Increasingly the ILO is changing its emphasis in order to meet the urgent needs of the more than 20 new nations, containing more than one-third of the world's people, which have achieved independent status since World War II. The primary concern of these nations, David Morse points out, "is not so much with additional legislative standards as with creating the institutions needed to give a practical content and effect to legislation." These "institutions" are in such fields as vocational training, collective bargaining, employment policy, and social security.

V

What does the ILO mean for Americans? Why did President Eisenhower in June call it a "vital forum" and reaffirm U.S. support of it?

First, I think, because it gives all free nations a unique opportunity to prove their devotion to the high ideals of social justice upon which the organization was founded. It gives us an opportunity to heed seriously and act on the admonition contained in the ILO constitution that "conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship, and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled." No one can see the ILO at work without being impressed by its capability to improve these conditions.

High in the Andes of Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia are some 7 million human beings who eke out their short lives at a bare subsistence level, ridden with tuberculosis and other diseases, outside the stream of their nation's life and yet desperately needed to assist in the development of their underpopulated countries. At its field bases in the Andes the ILO in cooperation with other U.N. agencies is raising the living standards of these people, teaching them to increase the yield of their crops and training them in carpentry, mechanics, and other skills so that they will be able to contribute to their country's urgent need for skilled manpower.

In Haiti, ILO experts taught mechanics how to construct simple windmills, increasing many times the irrigation and power available. They have taught artisans how to make cane knives, introduced the wheelwright's trade, and, by improving tanning methods, revolutionized the leather industry in the whole country.

On the great rivers of Asia, Burma's mighty Irawaddy, India's holy Ganges, and the ageold Indus of Pakistan, brown-sailed sampans and picturesque paddlewheelers are being steadily replaced by diesel-driven craft. This is largely due to the work of a handful of ILO technicians who have taught mechanics in this Asian region the skills necessary to maintain and repair diesel engines.

On an island in the Nile, near Cairo, the ILO has helped to establish a workshop and training center for the blind, the first of its kind in the country; and in Ceylon, Brazil, Guatemala, and Indonesia assistance is being given for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

Following the disastrous methane gas explosions in the coal mines of Zonguldak, Turkey, miners and safety engineers visited France, Great Britain, and Germany under ILO worker training programs to find out how to prevent such disasters from recurring.

India's capital city, New Delhi, plagued by breakdowns in the public transportation system called upon the ILO for help. A productivity expert showed the Indians how to expedite repair and maintenance procedures which solved the problem. ILO productivity teams have helped repeatedly to increase productivity in India, Pakistan, and a score of other countries around the world.

These are just a few examples of hundreds of ILO technical assistance projects being carried out around the world under both the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance and the ILO regular program activities. The ILO does not undertake elaborate projects costing a lot of money. Many ILO programs consist of single experts working often under extremely difficult conditions, teaching new skills in isolated communities. Its funds are very limited and it uses them carefully where they will have the greatest impact in supporting, not substituting for, going programs. As quickly as it can, the ILO tries to get out of any given project and leave it to the people themselves to carry it on.

Obviously the importance of such work to the development of free, vigorous economics is beyond measure. It is hard to conceive of any more effective way in which to discourage in a thoroughly constructive fashion the subversion of democracy by dictatorship.

Second, the ILO is important to the United States and the free world because it is implanting in the newly devoloping countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America the free institutions of collective bargaining and labor relations which are so important for the successful development of these countries within a context of democracy. It also is having an important effect on the development of free trade unions in those areas.

Worker organizations in the newly developing countries are of the utmost political, social, and economic importance. Although they bear little resemblance to the labor unions of Europe and the United States, the trade unions of these areas have a power and a significance which is often misunderstood or unseen. Most of these unions evolved from a basically rural society for political or ideologocal reasons. They have developed largely as rural cooperatives, political parties, independence organizations, semifraternal groups and in a few instances rudimentary industrial unions. And in many of the developing countries the most important influence on the people are these organizations of the workers. One only has to look at such leaders as President Bourguiba in

Tunisia; President Nkrumah, of Ghana; Sekou Toure, President of Guinea; Tom Mboya, of Kenya, and President Lopez Mateos, of Mexico. All of these men and a score of others in Asia, Africa, and Latin America owe their rise to power largely to the support which they received from organizations of workers. Several started themselves as labor leaders.

International communism quickly sought to use these organizations as instruments for subversion and the seizure of power. In a significant number of countries, however, for example, Malaya and India, the strongest anti-Communist elements are the free trade unions. Often they haev been the first organized force to realize that with communism comes not utopia but a more dreadful form of colonial exploitation than the world has even seen.

The ILO through its field offices and its countless contacts with trade unionists throughout the world can have a very important influence on these workers' organizations. Through workers' education programs the ILO teaches the basic elements of collective bargaining, the responsibilities of a trade union, the methods of negotiation, and provides the basic for the development of peaceful understanding between employer and employee. It is plain that nothing could be more important in the establishment of democratic societies than this.

In addition the annual conference of the ILO provides a unique meeting place for the leaders of labor from all over the world. For many it is the only opportunity they have to travel from their country and be posed to government, employer, and worker representatives from other countries. The conference thus provides an extremely important opportunity for the exchange of views and the promotion of understanding between various sections of the world.

The presence of these workers' leaders at the conference is also important because they can see first hand the hyprocrisy of the Communist claims and preachments. For example in 1956 and 1957 the annual conference considered the problem of forced labor and adopted a standard in the form of a convention condemning the practice and calling for the elimination of it wherever it existed. The Soviet Union quite naturally was peculiarily sensitive on this subject, since several years earlier the U.N. and the ILO had found forced labor to exist on a very wide scale in the U.S.S.R. and other Communist bloc countries. This was something which was not particularly harmonious with the Communist claims to a worker's paradise.

The falsity of the Communist claims is effectively exposed in the ILO by workers themselves; not by governmental representatives alone, but by those who are supposed to be the luckiest of all in Moscow's utopia.

For example, during the discussion on forced labor the Soviet delegate referred to the Taft-Hartley Act as "a slave labor act" and denied the existence of forced labor in the U.S.S.R. The then American worker delegate, Mr. George P. Delaney, rose from his seat flushed with anger, and in a way a governmental spokesman could hardly have managed, castigated the Russian. He said American labor objected to certain portions of the Taft-Hartley Act and hoped to get it changed, but he forcefully denied that it had anything to do with "slave labor." He then proceeded to list in great detail the embarrassing evidence of real slave labor which existed behind the Iron Curtain. This struck far deeper in the minds of many at the conference than had the only response to the Soviet Government been governmental.

Similarly, last June, Rudolph Faupl, the present American workers delegate, urged with particular authority, the rejection of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation. Faupl, a native born Hungarian who came to this country as a young boy, is a machinist by trade and is widely respected by his fellow workers around the world. With stirring emotion he spoke of the ruthless suppression of the workers of Hungary and this year as last the entire Hungarian delegation was refused admission.

Last June at the annual meeting in Geneva I had the honor to sponsor a resolution with the Minister of Labor of India, Gulzarilal Nanda, calling upon the ILO to increase its operational and technical assistance activities in a number of fields. The resolution was adopted unanimously with the exception of the Soviet bloc. Their objections to it were difficult to understand but undoubtedly they found it impossible to endorse the expansion of ILO's activities in the promotion of free, democratic institutions of labor relations. It was perplexing for many of those from the newer countries, who have taken seriously the Communist line, to learn that they were opposed to expanding programs which are of such vital and immediate importance to the newly developing countries.

The third reason why the ILO is important to the United States is domestic in nature, and divides itself into several parts:

(a) Increasing the purchasing power of the vast majority of the world's population would increase the potential market for American exports.

(b) Improved standards of living abroad would tend to reduce the disparity of foreign labor costs with those of the United States, thereby improving the competitive position of American goods on world markets.

(c) Unless progress is made in raising standards of labor abroad, particularly in countries with extremely depressed standards, improving those of American workers, who must compete on the world market, will become increasingly difficult.

Mr Morse puts this aspect of the ILO's contribution as follows:

"An implicit purpose of the early ILO was to prevent any country and particularly the less industrialized countries, from entering into international trade competition on the basis of cheap labor standards. * * * Now, by contrast, a very great part of our effort is directed towards enabling countries to develop their industries and particularly toward promoting economic expansion and social growth in the less developed countries. * * * Our main emphasis today is on improving working and living conditions by helping the less advanced countries to develop their economic potential and to raise their productivity and by helping the more advanced countries to lay the social basis for greater economic cooperation."

The ILO after 40 years stands today at the threshold of vast opportunity and represents a bright hope to many millions of people throughout the world. It has come a long way since that day in 1919 when representatives from 40 nations met in Washington at the first conference. It has shown itself adjustable to change and sensitive to the new needs which confront it. "The ILO," as Mr. Morse put it last June, "is an organization of people, a human organization working through and amongst people for the attainment of certain human goals. It is neither the embodiment of an absolute moral law revealed 40 years ago and enshrined in the Constitution, nor is it a supranational judicial authority empowered to enforce certain defined standards. It works in the world as it finds it and it works in the world for the attainment of its purpose. The purpose * * * is the improvement of conditions of men and women throughout the world."

I have pointed out several reasons why the ILO is today important to the United States, and I must say that there is very good cause to believe that it will be even more important in the years ahead.

The outcome of the enormous struggle of hundreds of millions of people in the newly developing areas of the world for economic improvement and freedom from foreign domination will undoubtedly determine the course of the world in years to come. There has probably never been such a huge and important mass emotion as the determined desire of the people of the developing nations for an improvement in their way of life, for a square meal where there has been starvation, for a hospital bed where there have been death and disease, for a decent house where there have been filth and squalor, for freedom and dignity where there have been domination and servility. The International Labor Organization is looked to as a principal contributor to the fulfillment of these needs. If these desires are not going to be frustrated and if the world is going to avoid the terrible consequences of such frustration—the bitter resentment of the poor toward the rich, of the have-nots toward the haves, of the downtrodden toward the exalted—then we must strengthen the ILO in every possible way. If we do, it will continue its admirable efforts to meet today's problems, human dignity will be enhanced, the cause of freedom will prosper and the world will be a little closer to everlasting peace.

THE ILO WEAPON

(By Oliver F. Burnett)

The International Labor Organization offers America a great opportunity to preserve not only our free competitive private enterprise system but also our high standard of living.

This may sound strange to American businessmen, who have been suspicious of the ILO. Organized business has taken part in the ILO with tongue in cheek because they had an uneasy feeling that the Communists and Socialists would use it against us. Some of that feeling comes from a lack of understanding of the ILO and its aims. Some comes from the defeatist attitude that the U.S. businessman is no match for the Communists and Socialists at the conference table.

I had the privilege of representing the United States as an employer delegate to the 6th session of the ILO at Geneva. As a result I believe that the ILO affords America a fine contact with the 79 other participating nations, including the U.S.S.R. I know that the U.S. businessman can handle himself well against the "pros" on the other side, and that his views are respected and eagerly sought by those who can gain the most from them.

The ILO was established under the Treaty of Versailles to promote peace by exchange of information among the nations and give weight to recommendations of these nations in the field of social and economic justice for the workingman. The idea was that harmonious international relations would be advanced by raising the standard of all the people who produce goods and services.

What America has to sell is freedom of the individual. The Communists can produce exceedingly well. But they achieve production by command. Slavery is inherent in that system. In America we produce for profit. The only way we can make a profit is through the workers. We must make sure that we satisfy the needs of our workers if they are to produce so we can make a profit. Our system has greater built-in security for the worker than any socialist scheme. But it depends on the profit motive, and here at home we had better give serious attention to make sure the climate permits profits.

The statement of this American social and economic philosophy, bluntly put by a businessman, startled other delegates, most of

whom had Socialist leanings. They look to government for both opportunity and protection, and they are disillusioned. When they grasped the meaning of our way, they became excited and eager to know more. The ILO gives us an opportunity to tell them more. They are receptive to our ideas so long as we do not try to force our views on them. What we have is nothing more than an extension of the concept of individual freedom that sparked the Renaissance. We have tried it and like it. We think that if others try it they, too, might like it.

The ILO is developing such practical steps to equalize working standards throughout the world such as building skill. They avidly sought information on our apprenticeship and training methods. They want to know how to attract young men into construction. We tell them that they must increase the incentives. Here is a practical answer to the concern of American business with unfair foreign competition based on low wages. If the ILO can cause the wage of a Japanese construction worker to rise from 25 cents an hour to something like the level in the United States, the Japanese manufacturer will lose some of the advantage he has over the U.S. manufacturer because he will not be able to build new facilities so cheaply.

It seems the time has passed when we can build a tariff or protection fence around our high living standard while the rest of the world goes hungry. The ILO points to another and, surely, better way—raise the worker standards of the world to approximate ours so we can have an opportunity to compete for the benefit of all.

Lincoln's Birthday Commentary by Edward P. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most cogent and nourishing Lincoln's Birthday commentaries that I have heard was given by the eminent American Broadcasting Co. commentator, Edward P. Morgan. Mr. Morgan is particularly gifted at relating Lincoln to contemporary times. I want to quote one brief section:

He would have been deeply troubled, surely, at the spectacle of a great country shrinking from adventure, sliding into a secondary place with a misguided if somewhat guilty satisfaction. A century and a quarter ago, at the ripe age of 29—a little younger than the mature years of the current payola witnesses—Lincoln told a Young Men's Lyceum in Springfield, Ill., "towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored."

I ask unanimous consent that the February 12 commentary of Edward P. Morgan over ABC be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS,
FEBRUARY 12, 1960

Yesterday, I went over to the Lincoln Memorial to think me some thoughts. They had a formal little program there at noon today in observance of Lincoln's Birthday but I preferred the relative privacy of an unscheduled visit so I went in advance. There was a soft hint of spring in the air. The sky was filled with the fresh petticoats of pearl-gray clouds, showing here and there a flash of blue. The trees were a blur of bare brown branches and on the winter-faded, yellow-green grass beneath them starlings scratched and squawked. The clean white spike of the Washington Monument was a wavering watercolor in the long, breeze-flecked Reflecting Pool. And there, behind, just inland from the left bank of th Potomac, rose in rhythmic Doric columns that harmonious mass of marble, a sort of American Parthenon, the country's tribute to its homely 16th President.

There weren't many visitors. A young man with a camera. Two Government girls. A bespectacled Air Force tech sergeant with a baby in his arms, his wife and two other children, a boy and a girl, bringing up the rear. While his blanketed armful squirmed, the airman stood at the base of Daniel Chester French's statute and stared up into Lincoln's sad, strong face. Then he gazed reverently around the temple. "It's fabulous," he murmured to his wife, in a Carolina drawl. She nodded and took the baby from him as if fearful he might drop it in absent-minded inspiration.

Fabulous was not an adjective that I had associated with Lincoln before. But as I contemplated it I realized it was just the word to describe the impact of his character on the current American scene. Here indeed was a fabled figure, gauntly, grotesquely unbelievable in the easy ooze of the opulent sixties. He was a bumpkin whose awkward dress would be as anachronistic as his honesty. He was only 56 when Booth's bullet killed him but the tragic responsibilities of the war had long since lined his face with the saber scars of pain and sacrifice—burdens which successful men unload nowadays on the analyst's couch and in the steam bath at the club.

Very likely it is easier to rise to greatness in the hoist of historic cataclysm. From the memorial's wall inscriptions carrying the awful weight of Lincoln's days bore down on you with an almost palpable crush. From the "Second Inaugural Address" at the height of the war came the words of heartbreak, determination and hope: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right let us strive on to finish the work we are in * * *." And from those scribbled comments at Gettysburg "It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to that unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced."

The work they died for is still unfinished and other tasks command our dedicated attention too but it is very hard now for us to sense the terms of our emergency with the sacrificial urgency that war can bring. So it was that day before yesterday a disc jockey defined the "wonderful, romantic" American way of life with the motto: "I'll do for you. What will you do for me?" And so it was too that by far the longest dispatch on the news wires today chronicled the crisis between a television comedian and his network over a censored joke about a water closet.

Mr. Lincoln would have chuckled over that; not the joke, the situation. But he would have been deeply troubled, surely, at the spectacle of a great country shrinking from adventure, sliding into a secondary place with a misguided if somewhat guilty satisfaction. A century and a quarter ago, at the ripe old age of 29—a little younger than the mature years of current payola witnesses—Lincoln told a young men's lyceum in Springfield, Ill., "towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored."

I asked the handsome National Park Service guide at the memorial, a Negro and native of Jefferson's Charlottesville, he happened to be, if visitors asked him questions. "Yes," he said, "they keep asking how tall the statue is."

At Your Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 10362, the bill which I and several of my colleagues recently introduced, that we have called the Family Farm Income Act of 1960, accomplishes nothing more than the solution of the government surplus storage problem, which we earnestly believe it will do, it certainly should merit the serious consideration of every member of the House. It is a shocking indictment of the existing farm program under which storage costs alone for a period of 20 months amount to more than the cost of the entire farm program for all commodities during the past 20 years of its existence.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include an editorial from the Mansfield News Journal for February 11, 1960, which poignantly treats the matter of current storage:

AT YOUR EXPENSE

The ordinary citizen cringes a little—and perhaps feels just a touch of envy—when he reads of someone doing well at Federal expense. The House subcommittee investigating grain storage has turned up a number of pertinent cases.

One that makes gloomy reading for taxpayers concerns a Kansas firm which rented a military warehouse for $28,000 over the course of several years, spent $40,000 fixing it up for grain storage, and then collected storage fees from Uncle Sam totaling $1,838,000. This is what is known as a handsome profit. Legal, too.

Two things about it are of particular concern to citizens as taxpayers, however.

The Government's left hand—in this case the Commodity Stabilization Service—apparently didn't know what its right hand—the Army, which rented an old warehouse at a very low figure—was doing. The second point is that the Government's payments for grain storage are unrealistically high and thus permit unconscionable profits, under some circumstances, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Another flaw in the present grain storage system is that the policy of using all "usual and customary" facilities of the commercial grain industry before turning to Government storage is badly stretched. Coal bunkers, tents, an old railroad roundhouse, a brewery, an antiquated bank building—all have been accepted as "usual and customary" facilities, at the same rates paid for top-notch warehousing.

If the idiotic subsidy and price support program is to be continued, at least Federal payments for storage should bear some reasonable relationship to actual storage costs.

Goals for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem of projecting into our country's future in order to analyze the directions of our development, the needs we must anticipate and the objectives we want to reach has been engaging the best minds in our land. President Eisenhower has wisely recognized the need to appraise, coordinate, and guide the many efforts now underway by universities and organizations to study various aspects of this overall problem. Our leadership of the free world has imposed enormous responsibilities upon us which we can ignore only at our peril.

In the appointment of a Commission on National Goals, made up of some of our leading citizens, the purpose of which is to develop an outline of objectives and programs for the next several decades, the President has taken an important step forward.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject entitled, "Large Minds and Great Issues," from the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LARGE MINDS AND GREAT ISSUES

There seems to have been a plethora lately of studies by boards, foundations, committees, and what have you, of where the Nation is or should be headed. One result has been that the President's proposal to establish an extragovernmental Commission on National Goals was greeted with some sketpticism and not a few yawns.

There also, however, has been a widespread sense of uncertainty, of apprehension, as to what the future might hold and of our national readiness to meet it.

Setting up the 11-member Commission was not an empty gesture. Its composition, now announced, is impressive: chairman, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of the American Assembly; vice chairman, Frank Pace Jr.; plus Erwin D. Canham, James B. Conant, Colgate W. Darden Jr., Crawford H. Greenewalt, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Learned Hand, Clark Kerr, James R. Killian, Jr., and George Meany. This adds up to a formidable array both of talent and experience, well seasoned both in and out of Government yet unburdened by obstructive political partisanship.

The President has identified the Commission's job as being, in part, to "identify the great issues of our generation and describe our objectives in these various areas," and he has expressed his hope that it would "develop a broad outline of coordinated national programs for the next decade and longer."

This is a tall order. It would be both unrealistic and inappropriate to expect any detailed legislative blueprint. But it would be equally unrealistic not to expect from a group of such caliber, so instructed, a fresh and stimulating appraisal of the challenges posed by a climactic decade ahead.

That we need such appraisal, and constant reappraisal, is inescapably a concomitant of the galloping pace of current history.

The Commission has, in President Eisenhower's words, "the opportunity to sound a call for greatness to a resolute people, in the best tradition of our Founding Fathers." Let's hope it makes the most of that opportunity. For clearly the age we are entering cries out for greatness.

Maintenance of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address given by my colleague, the Honorable EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, at the 63d annual banquet of the Catholic Club in Darien, Conn., on February 11, 1960, and an address given at the same time and place by the Reverend Thurston N. Davis, editor of America magazine, which was published in the New Republic on February 15, 1960. In both of these addresses we are given a clear picture of dangers which surround us at this time and we are admonished to reexamine our course lest it bear us to the point of no return. The urgency of the situation makes it imperative that we accept such advice. The addresses:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, FIRST DISTRICT, CONNECTICUT, AT THE 63D ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY BANQUET OF THE CATHOLIC CLUB, WEE BURN COUNTRY CLUB, DARIEN, CONN., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1960

The number of words filling the air this weekend about Abraham Lincoln must be legion. It is characteristic in the life of a very great man—and there can be no question that Lincoln was one of the greatest of our world—that there is much to be considered edifying in his every action and thought.

Thus I am sure that those who wish to draw on Lincoln as a source of inspiration in remarking upon today's events will be adequately furnished with quotations. If they want to discuss anticolonialism and American attitudes, they have only to remember that Lincoln said in 1854: "No man is good enough to govern another man, without that other's consent." If they would bring his wisdom to bear on the subject of civil rights, they may quote what he said in 1859: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

As for myself, I thought it might be interesting to consider what Lincoln might have said about rockets and missiles, or the fields of science and astronautics. This is a little more difficult. Yet, in view of the assertions and denials that have flown in Washington, the charges and countercharges, I think I may have found an apt quotation. It comes from remarks Lincoln made at dinner on the train moving to Gettysburg in 1863, where he was to deliver a few remarks on the dedication of the battlefield. The train ride had been noisy and the use of tunnels and cuts had dimmed the light from time to time.

Lincoln, at table, took occasion to comment: "This situation," he said, "reminds me of a friend of mine in southern Illinois, who, riding over a corduroy road, where the logs were not sufficiently close together, was frightened by a thunderstorm. In the glimpse of light afforded by the lightning, his horse would endeavor to reach another log, but too frequently missed it and fell with his rider. As a result of several such mishaps, the traveler, although not accustomed to prayer, thought that the time had come to address his Maker, and said: 'Oh Lord, if it would suit You equally well, it would suit me better if I had a little more light and a little less noise'."

Those of us who have been closest to the testimony on our missiles and satellites as it unfolds daily in Washington, sometimes wish that there were a little more light and a little less noise.

Research and development has become an important part of both our governmental and industrial activities. In Lincoln's day, however, Robert V. Bruce said, "During the Civil War the nearest thing to a research and development agency was the President himself."

President Lincoln became interested in and is responsible for the introduction of machineguns, rifled cannon and other weapons of war. In the course of these developments we find that he narrowly escaped death when an experimental rocket exploded in its launcher as he stood watching nearby. He also bypassed the War and Navy Departments to set up a secret project to develop a new explosive using chlorate as a base. It is interesting to note that chlorates are now being tested in the field of solid rocket propellents.

In a lecture entitled, "Discoveries and Inventions," Lincoln said: "Just now in civilization and the arts the people of Asia are entirely behind those of Europe; those of the east of Europe behind those of the west of it; while we, here, in America, think we discover, and invent, and improve faster than any of them."

This is a statement which fits exactly into the conflict which now exists as to the technical and productive ability of the United States, the countries of the free world, and the Communist bloc. We can most certainly conclude that no nation or groups of nations has such a superior ability or capacity that it can maintain secrets within itself to the denial of others. We have already seen this myth exploded in the atomic and hydrogen fields. We know, too, that in the missile and space field we can have no monopoly. We have the capacity to set such a stirring pace in the field of space as to be far in front of all others.

We can maintain our position as the leadership nation in the free world forever—provided we have the desire to do so.

It has already been shown that our ability to negotiate with other countries has become more difficult because of the progress now being made in the exploration and use of outer space. There is no question but that the Soviet Union has enhanced its prestige by achieving the first success in space flight. Its continuing achievements in this area after the first sputnik have allowed the Russians to exploit this prestige throughout the world. Unfortunately, many of the peoples of the world have concluded that this progress means that the Russians have also achieved technical superiority in the military area.

As of today, this is not true.

The United States maintains itself as the strongest military power with a tremendous retaliatory capability. Yet, George Allen of the U.S. Information Agency has submitted the results of a poll taken in Europe, and these show that in answer to a question involving whether the United States or the Soviet Union had the greatest total military

strength, the people of West Germany decided against the United States by 1 percent, the people of France by 10 percent, and the people of Great Britain by 15 percent.

The psychological aspects being so important in this complex struggle, it is necessary that we accomplish sufficient achievements so that the results be reversed.

The peoples of these countries would better support us if they are convinced of our ability to protect them and to achieve final victory.

Dr. von Braun has stated before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics that he believes that the Russians had the capacity this year to orbit a vehicle around the moon and to effect a soft landing on it. He believes that we will not have this capacity until 1963.

On the surface this is a frightening situation.

We have, however, taken an important step that is sure to pay great dividends. The President has decreed that the von Braun team will be transferred from the Army to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. The House has recently passed a resolution supporting this and expediting the progress of this transfer.

There is also being requested, this year, an additional appropriation of $100 million for the SATURN project which falls under Dr. von Braun. This will allow us to develop a space vehicle with a million and a half-pound thrust capacity which will have not only the moon within its range, but also Mars and Venus. This tremendous thrust will have the ability to hurtle 15 tons of payload into outer space.

We are, however, 3 years behind in this particular area.

I am convinced that the difference between us and the Russians is not so large in those fields of knowledge which are less susceptible to propoganda. This is in the ability to overcome the dangers which will affect men in outer space. The final achievement will be the ability to develop a manned-space vehicle which will have maneuverability in outer space together with the ability to return to earth at will. Here we must overcome the problems in radiation, metallurgy and in outer space environment for man—to name just three.

There is no way of keeping a tally sheet in these fields, but it is my own belief that it will be here that our achievements will be outstanding.

Let me close with a paragraph of Lincoln's speech at New Haven in 1860, a paragraph written about another subject, but one that well deserves recalling:

"I think that one of the causes of these repeated failures is that our best and greatest men have greatly under estimated the size of this question. They have constantly brought forward small cures for great sores—plasters too small to cover the wound. That is one reason that all settlements have proved so temporary, so evanescent."

If we apply these sentiments to many of the problems that are so large today, we must recognize the grain of truth. And we must redouble our efforts to secure true national unity while we seek a more powerful position of defense. It would be well if, as we did, we kept in mind these words of Lincoln:

"You cannot fail, if you resolutely determine that you will not."

HAVE WE GONE SOFT?

(By Thurston N. Davis)

Like a strong and vigorous person suddenly stricken in middle life, we appear obsessed with a fateful diagnosis which tells us we are sick and will surely die unless we somehow change the habitual pattern of our lives. And, as diseased people often do, we talk at great length about the latest chance remark dropped by the doctor. The malady is variously described. Columbia President Grayson Kirk's verdict is "spiritual flabbiness." Alan Drury, in "Advise and Consent," writes of our time as the age of the shrug and stresses the "dry rot" every perceptive American senses in the air around him. Prof. Charles A. Siepmann, who heads the New York City branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, declared only the other day: "We're breeding a new type of human being—a guy with a full belly, an empty mind, and a hollow heart. I see them walking about, and I don't like them one bit."

All this gives added point to John Steinbeck's letter to Governor Stevenson. To "dear Adlai," Steinbeck transmits his two first impressions of the United States of America of 1959–60: First, "a creeping, all-pervading nerve gas of immorality"; second, "a nervous restlessness—a hunger, a thirst, a yearning for something unknown, perhaps morality." Then, as afterthoughts, two further impressions: "The violence, cruelty, and hypocrisy symptomatic of a people which has too much"; and "the surly ill temper" that afflicts "humans when they are frightened." "Mainly, Adlai, I am troubled by the cynical immorality of my country. I don't think it can survive on this basis."

Where do we go to gather evidence on our alleged decadence, immorality, and materialism? We might pick up the travel supplement in our Sunday New York Times and glance at the midwinter ads for hotels and motels along the neon-bright strip of Miami Beach. Here, in one concentrated spree of vulgarity, we move from star-studded offers of fun, fun, fun, at low, low rates—with "authentic Polynesian Luaus" thrown in free at one address—all the way to siren assurances that if we reserve now (at $16 daily per person) then Paradise (double occupancy) is so near at hand.

This sort of thing, I suppose, is materialism, though it is somewhat too obvious to be named decadence. But it isn't merely the Miamis of the world that are issue. If Steinbeck, and all the other critics are to be credited, this moral miasma which afflicts us is well-nigh universal. It is the fly-now-pay-later urge. It's the itch for the fast buck, for the irresponsible pleasure, for the short cut to power or payola or prideful status. It's the clever dodge, the inside track, the deal, the gimmick, the angle, the guy we know who'll "fix" it. It is the "filter" mentality: have the fun, but avoid the lung cancer or the pregnancy. It is the omnipresent yen to push somebody else out of the way and become the fellow who's got everything. To quote Professor Siepmann again: "This amorality is endemic. Society is shot through with it. You'd be amazed at how many students said Charles Van Doren was right. Anything for No. 1."

How does one go about computing the moral strength or weakness of an entire society? Crime and delinquency statistics, the divorce rate, the blight of pornography, the rising rate of illegitimate births, the high incidence of broken homes, the surge of mental illness, the percentage of youth rejected by the armed services, phenomena like the current practice of cheating in college examinations— these and other data and studies give some sort of an idex. What else is needed?

Eugene Kinkead, an editor of the New Yorker, has written a book entitled "In Every War But One" (Norton). It attempts to analyze the hundreds of cubic yards of documents that the Department of the Army assembled in its deadly serious effort to find out what went wrong with American prisoners-of-war in Korea. Kinkead reveals, amid much other data, that the 229 Turks who were captured and interned in Korea all managed to survive their imprisonment, and not a single one became a collaborator. One-third of our boys, on the other hand, became collaborators; and 38 percent of them died. The Army found that GI's often abandoned fellow Americans who were wounded; they cursed their officers; the strong took food from the weak; in certain cases Americans sick with dysentery were rolled out into the cold to die; and this was done, not by their Chinese captors, but by fellow GI's. Turks, however, kept a high morale, shared food and nursed their sick back to health.

Heaven knows, the image of America that is refracted through these and other available statistics is enough to shake the most complacent of us. Nevertheless, the picture is incomplete. The big, bold headlines—ah, dear, freedom of the press—tell us about the mad bombers, arsonists, sex maniacs, kidnapers, juvenile murderers, junkies, and extortionists among us. They rarely highlight the millions of hard-working and dedicated people still in the land: surgeons, nurses, nuns, civil servants, artists, social workers, public school teachers, clergymen, firemen, policemen, truckdrivers, scholars—and plain, everyday, indispensable fathers and mothers of growing families.

Then, too, a certain aroma of phoniness creeps at times into these discussions, making it all the more difficult to assess our true moral stature. We could well have done without the tears and congratulatory salvos that greeted young Van Doren's public confession, which to many, by the way, was the most meretricious incident in the entire quiz show mess. John Cogley, in the Commonweal, said Van Doren "did his greatest mischief and was guilty of the most shameful abuse of public confidence, not when he accepted money under false pretenses, but when he made his belated confession," which, he went on, while "humble" in the approved TV and Madison Avenue manner, "reeked with pride."

And, frankly, are we doing any better at genuinely unburdening our consciences than Van Doren did? We feel clean and noble when we excoriate the materialism around us. We manage to pin the blame on some scapegoat—working wives, or the New Deal, or high taxes, or John Dewey and the teachers colleges—leaving very little responsibility at our own doorsteps. Our excoriations would be far more convincing if we were readier with tax dollars for defense and for economic aid to less materialistic peoples; if we fought harder for the Negro; if our consciences were a bit more troubled over irrationalities in our immigration laws; if we worried a little more about the lot of the Puerto Ricans in our cities; if, having done our excoriating, we were prepared to sacrifice a slice of our time or a touch of our comfort to the common good of the free world and the righting of injustices and inequities here at home.

A false note is sounded, too, by the realization that in large part our concern originates in fear that we may soon be overtaken, economically, by the purposeful Soviet Union. Can we honestly say our fear is the trepidation of God-fearing men—fear for ourselves and our souls and our fate, for the harvest of our sins and our wretched confusions? Or is it nothing but a camouflaged lust to cling on to the very possessions we protest are our undoing? There is reason to suspect that it may be the latter, that what we are really worried about is that the whole kit and caboodle of our American way of life—missiles and credit cards, Cadillacs and pop-up toasters, our freedoms, fun, filters and foolishness—is about to go down the drain. If so, then we do have reason to be concerned for ourselves and our future.

Our trouble is not simply that some Americans have air conditioners in their cars, or that an increasing number of our citizens are making downpayments on cabin cruisers. Their number is and will remain limited: even in our affluent society there is still plenty of personal poverty. The obli-

gation of transcending and mastering material possessions presses harder on the few than on the many. The crasser brand of materialism, therefore, can be discounted as a real problem for the vast majority.

There is, however, a subtler problem which does touch us all. It goes by various names and is all the following things at once: a loss of faith, an obfuscation of reason, a failure of nerve, a loss of confidence, an intellectual and moral vacuum, a failure to maintain our grip on the big idea about ourselves and the world we inhabit.

What is really wrong, it seems to me, has to do with our loss of the big idea, by which I mean our loosening grasp on the meaning and purpose of human life in relation to a real order of objective and transcendent being. Our problem is that we no longer know who or what we are. We no longer collectively see ourselves as a people bound together by common affirmations, common assumptions, common loyalties to a commonly shared universe of values. For years we have viewed this American pluralism as a product of our freedom and as a source of immense strength. Now it is slowly dawning upon us that it can become a debilitating disease. This malady, which is now epidemic, affects rich and poor, young and old. It is as though all at once we had lost our identification papers. To make matters worse, we have not only let the big idea slip away, but it is no longer polite or even permissible to raise any of the big questions men have always asked about the big idea.

What are these big questions which, in the contemporary atmosphere of our official agnosticism, may be asked and answered only behind the doors of the home, church and synagogue? To paraphrase a list of such questions prepared by Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., for "Religion and the State University" (University of Michigan Press, 1958): Where does man rank in the order of being, if there is an order of being? What is the nature of man? Is it of a piece with the nature of the cosmic universe? Is it to be understood in terms of the laws of the universe, whatever they may be? Or is there a difference between man and the rest of nature? Is the nature of man spiritual in a unique sense? What is man's destiny? Is it to be found and fulfilled beyond time in another world? What is the sense of history? Does history have some kind of finality? Or is the notion of finality meaningless? What can a man know? What do you mean when you say, "I know"? Are there varying degrees of knowledge and certitude? Can man's knowledge and love reach realities that are transcendent to the world of matter, space and time? Is there a God? What is God? Does God have a care for man? Has God entered the world of human history to accomplish a redemption? What is meant by "salvation"? What is meant by freedom, justice, order, law, authority, power, peace, virtue, sin, morality, religion?

Just now, in the United States and throughout the West, there is obviously no consensus as to how these and similar questions are to be answered. There is not even a shared language of words and concepts with which the separated components of our society might begin to be able to discuss them. Yet, as recently as 75 years ago, in the academic world as well as in the realm of public affairs, the ancient heritage of such words and concepts, products of the scholastic tradition, was still in uneasy but de facto possession. Today, except in some of our colleges, the lines that once bound us to that heritage have been broken.

Once the ancient words and ideas had been widely discredited, a new lexicon of discourse took their place. It was a tongue which had been coming into more and more common usage since the 18th century, the language of modernity—of science, experimentalism and positivism. Until almost yesterday, who would have dreamed of disputing modernity? And yet, though it was so firmly in control just a little while back, today, in Father Murray's phrase, modernity is dissolving in disenchantment. The disenthronement has created a strange new situation, a sort of ideological interregnum. The seals of legitimacy, so to speak, have disappeared from its head and tongue. Though it still exercises a kind of caretaker government in our universities and elsewhere, the modern idiom of positivism is reenacting the old story of the emperor's clothes.

It is this sudden turn of events in the world of ideas, this breakdown of the flimsy consensus of modernity, that has brought us to that condition of moral vacuum which John Steinbeck and others perceive and deplore. More or less clearly we today realize that a postmodern era has commenced and that we are entering it in a state of intellectual nakedness. The pressing need for some sort of revival of the public philosophy of the West has come home to us. This, it would seem, is what these gathering storms of protest and criticism are all about.

Half a dozen years ago, in his essay on "The Public Philosophy," Walter Lippmann insisted that in our "pluralized and fragmenting society a public philosophy with common and binding principles" must somehow be salvaged and reinstated. If we fail to revive and restore the consensus we once possessed, Lippmann warned, "* * * then the free and democratic nations face the totalitarian challenge without a public philosophy which freemen believe in and cherish, with no public faith beyond a mere official agnosticism, neutrality, and indifference. There is not much doubt how the struggle is likely to end if it lies between those who, believing, care very much—and those who, lacking belief, cannot care very much."

We know from the chapter he contributed to "Walter Lippmann and His Times" (Harcourt, Brace), a volume published last year to honor Mr. Lippmann on his 70th birthday, that Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., was more than a little scandalized by the stress the veteran columnist placed on the necessity of shoring up the public philosophy as a condition of the survival of our society. Mr. Lippmann had written: "I do not contend, though I hope, that the decline of Western society will be arrested if the teachers in our schools and universities come back to the great tradition of the public philosophy. But I do contend that the decline, which is already far advanced, cannot be arrested if the prevailing philosophers oppose this restoration and revival * * *."

However, as Schlesinger's reaction demonstrates—and he is not alone in his appraisal of Lippmann's thesis—the academic world is not as yet in the mood to accept responsibility for the difficult but still feasible task of restoring what Lippmann calls a common conception of law and order which possesses a universal validity.

Meantime, each fresh week and month of our now lengthening postmodern experience serves to sharpen the issue and drive home its urgency. If we are really determined to fill the present void, we shall rediscover the words and begin to conceive the ideas with which to ask once again the big questions that every generation must answer. Thus, conceivably, if time is given us, we may even reclaim the big idea. If war is too important to be left to the generals, this present dilemma of ours is too terrible to be entrusted to the professors.

Needed: Reinstatement of Funds for Tornado Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the advances in science and technology are enabling mankind to learn more of—and, to an ever larger degree, control—the forces of nature.

We realize, of course, that there are still a great many unknowns in the field.

Nevertheless, the eternal quest of man for ways and means to control the elements is essential—if these forces are to be harnessed to serve humanity, or at least to protect the human race from being unwarrantedly damaged by such forces.

At this time, I refer particularly to the elements of weather.

Over the years, our Nation has suffered tremendous losses in deaths, as well as property damage, from hurricanes, tornadoes, and other types of storms or atmospheric disturbances. During the past 5 years, for example, 3,343 tornadoes occurred, causing 523 fatalities, and an inestimable amount of property damage. During the period 1916–51 there was an average of 222 deaths each year caused by tornadoes.

In Wisconsin alone, the property damage from a single tornado in 1958 resulted in an estimated $17 million.

Although we are still a long way from controlling such forces, we nevertheless are progressing toward learning more of them, as well as establishing forewarning systems to enable people to protect themselves from hurricanes, tornadoes, and other such storms.

Currently, the Congress is considering appropriations for carrying on expanded programs of research for weather control.

During its consideration of funds for projects in this field, the House of Representatives cut—and unwisely, I believe—$775,000 from the President's recommendations for funds to expand weather research and control projects.

Today, the Senate Appropriations Committee is considering the matter.

Fundamentally, I believe, there is a real need for an expanded weather research program.

I would sincerely hope, therefore, that the Appropriations Committee would reinstate the funds cut from the weather research budget by the House of Representatives. In addition, I respectfully urge the Members of this body to approve such funds when it comes up for consideration in the Senate.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter which I have written to Chairman HOLLAND of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD—emphasiz-

ing the need for reinstatement of the funds for the weather research programs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1960.

Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Commerce Department and Related Agencies Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPESSARD: I am writing to respectfully urge reinstatement of the $775,000 cut from the Weather Bureau research program by the House of Representatives.

During recent years, your committee has made a constructive contribution to improved weather research, aimed at protecting people and property from the ravages of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other atmospheric disturbances.

In view of the tremendous damage, as well as loss of life and loss of property resulting from such storms, I'm sure you agree that there is a real need for carrying on effective research programs.

Recently, I was gratified by the recommendations of the President and the Bureau of the Budget for including in the 1961 budget funds for improving weather research.

As you know, hundreds of tornadoes—the most violent of all atmospheric disturbances—occur each year. In the past 5 years, for example, 3,343 tornadoes occurred, causing 523 fatalities, and an inestimable amount of property damage.

During the period 1916 to 1951 there were an average of 222 deaths each year caused by tornadoes. With the beginning of the modern tornado warning service in 1952 the average number of deaths caused by tornadoes for the period 1952 through 1959 has been reduced to only 163. I am confident, as are prominent meterologists in the Government and in universities, that an expanded program of tornado research such as is proposed by the President, will permit a drastic further reduction in the annual toll of lives brought on by destructive tornadoes striking without warning. Experience has proved that many lives can be saved when advance warnings of a tornado's approach are provided to communities in the path of the storm.

Unfortunately, the House of Representatives made what I believe are some unwise cuts in the budget of the Weather Bureau.

I am well aware—as I know you are—that in these times of great demands for Federal funds, there is a real need for a priority system for appropriation of Federal money.

In view of the fact that such funds were deemed essential by the administration—which, as you well appreciate, has made an effort to keep spending down to essentials—I believe this should be considered, along with the overriding merits of the need for greater research itself.

Consequently, I would hope that your committee would find it possible to reinstate the $775,000 for research relating to tornadoes in the 1961 appropriation.

As you know, the purpose of the funds is to permit an expanded program of hurricane research and the inauguration of a similar program for studying tornadoes.

This is a particularly opportune time to launch a Midwest tornado research project, since—I am informed—within the next month, the Weather Bureau will have available three specially instrumented aircraft. These aircraft—a B-57, for very high altitude investigations, and two DC-6's for middle and low flying—have been undergoing modification and installation of the most complex meteorological research equipment available anywhere in the world.

As I understand it, money—up to this time—has been only provided to fly these planes during the summer months in investigating tropical storms and hurricanes.

With an increase in appropriations, however, the Weather Bureau would be enabled to operate these flying laboratories on tornado research projects during the spring months also before hurricanes normally develop.

The tornado research plans of the Weather Bureau for fiscal year 1961 include, in addition to the use of flying laboratories, the following:

1. Utilization of existing upper-air sounding stations for maximum soundings of upper atmosphere every 2 hours during selected severe tornado outbreaks in order to gather the required data for research on these storms;

2. Extension of the small, intensive surface research observing network to obtain greatly increased density of reports during the spring and summer months;

3. An expansion in the program of research contracts with universities directed toward the study of tornadoes.

In view of the great improvement in hurricane warnings brought about by the intensive hurricane research project, I strongly urge Mr. Chairman, that your committee give full consideration and approval to the Weather Bureau's request for the additional $775,000 to permit inauguration of a similar program of tornado research in the midwestern area.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Two Hundred and Fifty-six Thousand Dollar Salt Pollution Suit Settled for $25,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal of December 6, 1959:

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX THOUSAND DOLLAR SALT POLLUTION SUIT SETTLED FOR $25,000—AGAINST 11 COMPANIES

DENVER CITY.—Suit for $256,000 filed in January by Gordon Woods, Cisco, against 11 oil companies for alleged pollution of underground water has been settled out of court for $25,000.

Announcement of the settlement was made by Attorney Paul New, Denver City, attorney for Woods.

Woods brought suit against the companies on grounds that they were using open salt water or slush pits for disposal of salt water and failed to reinject the salt water into abandoned wells or through reinjection wells.

Owner of four sections in the Waples Platter area of Yoakum County, Woods contended that the salt water had polluted 14 irrigation wells he has drilled since owning the land. He also contended that the entire four sections, with the exception of a minor portion, is under irrigation and pollution of the water permanently destroyed the usefulness of the land and the irrigation wells.

Of the original 11 defendants named in the suit, Attorney New said, only 7 were named in the settlement reached with Woods. The other four were dismissed from the action several weeks ago.

Defendants against whom the settlement was reached included Shell Oil Co., Davidson Drilling Co., Inc., Great Western Drilling Co., Drilling and Exploration Co., Inc., Plymouth Oil Co. Tidewater Associated Oil Co. and Texaco Seaboard, Inc.

Woods' original suit asked for $100 damages for each of the 2,560 acres in the four sections he alleged had been harmed.

Arms Contracts Found Lagging in Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there has been brought to my attention the lag in arms contract settlements in the Defense Establishment.

According to a story published recently in the press, the Navy has issued a report which sets forth the status of its negotiated contracts.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Allen M. Smythe, reputable financial writer, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, January 31, 1960, which covers this problem, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS CONTRACTS FOUND LAGGING IN SETTLEMENTS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Military airframes, aircraft engines, and their avionic equipment take plenty of the taxpayers' dollars. Year-end reports just being released by the Pentagon confirm this. Also, final price determination is not yet completed on defense contracts totaling billions of dollars.

The Navy states that January 1 they had outstanding 277 contracts of the incentive and price redetermination type that had a value of $6,599,351,000, and which were overdue or had not yet reached their target date for final settlement.

Of these, 156, valued at $3,575,051,000, were listed as awaiting settlement. The Bureau of Naval Weapons accepted the responsibility for delay of 23 incentive contracts with an average value of $30 million. Contractors were reported responsible for delayed settlement on 37 incentive contracts with an average value of $48 million.

The Bureau of Naval Weapons was formed December 1, 1959, by the consolidation of the Bureau of Acronautics and the Bureau of Ordnance. The new Bureau contracts for all naval aircraft and their electronic and other airborne equipment.

The total of all Navy contracts awaiting settlement is nearly $2 billion less than the amount 2 years ago. The bulk of the unsettled contracts are with Pratt & Whitney, jet engine builder, and with large airframe firms.

The Navy lists all contracts that have based their target dates for price settlement by more than 3 months under contractor or bureau responsibility. Exact prices or number of contracts are not given for individual contractors.

The Navy lists responsibility for delinquent settlement with Lockheed and Sperry Rand for contracts totaling between $50 million and $100 million. Also in this category are Martin and McDonnell of approximately $150 million each. Douglas is listed around $175 million.

Grumman, builder of supersonic fighters for aircraft carriers, has contracts to the value of approximately $400 million awaiting settlement. These also are termed contractor responsibility.

Chance Vought, which is another builder of supersonic naval aircraft, recently had its submarine air-breathing missile, Regulus, canceled. The company's naval contracts to the value of $500 million are listed under "contractor responsibility" as delinquent.

The Navy accepts responsibility for delayed settlement of contracts between $50 million and $100 million for Goodyear and Philco. Douglas is listed with around $125 million. Westinghouse and Grumman totals are each $150 million. The Lockheed total is under $250 million.

Navy delays are also holding up settlement of $350 million in incentive contracts for North American, which builds the twin-engined attack bomber for aircraft carriers.

Pratt & Whitney has five contracts totaling $600 million awaiting settlement.

Mr. President, I am glad to have this matter clarified by the Navy in a prompt manner. It is assumed that the Air Force will disclose its contractual status in the near future.

A Bill To Correct Certain Inequities in Public Law 68, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Postal Field Compensation Act of 1955 to correct certain inequities with respect to supervisory and other postal field service employees.

Section 1 of the bill would eliminate the restrictions on the number of employees who can be assigned in levels 17, 18, 19, and 20. At present, although Public Law 68 is designed on the basis of equal pay for equal work or responsibilities, some of the offices have grown so that the postmasters should be in one of the restricted levels. On account of that restriction, they cannot be promoted with the result that supervisors do not receive promotions on the basis of equal pay for equal work or responsibilities.

With respect to section 2, the Post Office Department has interpreted the phrase "supervises approximately 20 or more employees" to mean that the "or more" could be any number more than 20, while on the other hand "approximately 20," when the number of employees supervised is below 20, is interpreted to mean no fewer than about 16. Many supervisors supervise 40, 50, or more employees for more than half their tour of duty, or all of their tour of duty, and still are placed in level 7 since the 40 or 50 employees are considered as "approximately 20 or more." Since the Department has decided that they will go approximately 4 below 20 for "approximately 20" they should not go more than 4 above 20 for the "or more." Those supervising more should be in level 8 by establishing a standard position for that level.

Since an employee can qualify by working 30 days in the beginning of a calendar year in the higher level for higher level pay and, under the law, it is possible for him not to be assigned to higher level pay until December and then receive the higher level pay, it does not seem logical that if he is placed in the higher level position 1 month later—in another calendar year—his value is suddenly lost. After he has once qualified for higher level pay, he should not need a requalifying period merely because it is another calendar year. Also, the qualifying period should be reduced from 30 days to 20 days since 20 working days constitute a working month which was the intent of the originally established period. Section 3 would accomplish these purposes.

Many clerks and carriers who are promoted from level 4 to a supervisory position lose a longevity grade of $100, due to the fact that the grade was established under the alternate method of receiving the longevity or "meritorious" grades by being at the top step of the level for 3, 5, and 7 years instead of the newer standard of 13, 18, and 25 years in the postal service. This means that many level 4 employees who receive only $285 per month upon promotion to level 7 have $100 of that amount taken away and receive only $185 upon such promotion. Section 4 would correct that inequity.

Section 5 would provide a fair increase in salary for a three-level promotion. Supervisors are generally promoted from level 4 employees—clerks and carriers. Most of them have had enough seniority to be working preferred tours of duty—with carriers having steady day work—and when they become supervisors they ordinarily go to the less preferred tours, usually to night work. For making this basic change in their way of living and for assuming additional responsibilities and duties, they are compensated for the first year by the small increase in salary of about $5 per week or possibly only slightly more than $3 per week. Section 5 would give them a salary increase of $625, or about $50 a month, for assuming this additional responsibility. Under the present promotion method, many able clerks and carriers refuse promotion. This section does not entail any retroactive pay, but places those already promoted in the salary step and level they would have been in if this section had been in effect when Public Law 68 was originally enacted.

Section 6 would continue the present appeal procedure.

Excerpts of Testimony of Dr. Thomas Carney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding interesting hearings on a subject of great importance to farmers and to consumers all across the country. These hearings involve the application of the so-called cancer clause, or Delaney amendment, to the use of chemicals in agriculture, and the use of chemicals, colors, and other additives in processing foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

This is a very complex problem. All of us want to foster public health without unnecessarily crippling technological progress in agriculture or in the other industries upon which we depend for a safe and adequate supply of foods and drugs.

A very informative statement was presented during the committee hearings by an eminent scientist, Dr. Thomas P. Carney of Indianapolis, who has devoted his life to fighting disease and promoting health. Dr. Carney is a vice president and research director of Eli Lilly & Co. and is chairman of the Committee for the Study of Carcinogenic Substances of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. Following is a summary of his statement, presented on behalf of the association, which I believe Members of the House will find helpful and interesting:

SUMMARY OF A STATEMENT BY THOMAS P. CARNEY ON H.R. 7624 AND S. 2197 BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, FEBRUARY 11, 1960

My statement will be confined to a discussion of the implications of the so-called cancer clause, or Delaney amendment, of H.R. 7624 and the Food Additives Act of 1958. The Senate did not include this clause in similar color additives legislation which passed there (S. 2197).

The Delaney amendment imposes a flat prohibition on the use of any substance which can be made to produce cancer when ingested by animals, even if the dosage is a million times that for intended use in man or if experimental conditions are totally unrelated to actual use. We will demonstrate that such a clause is unscientific and works against the broad public interest. We will show the restrictions it imposes on agricultural progress through limitations of research and will suggest a slight modification in its wording which will protect the public health but permit the public to benefit from technological advances.

The essential purpose of color additives legislation now before this committee is to provide for the use of certain substances known to be safe as colors but which would be banned under the inflexible provisions of the present color laws. Yet in its own field the proposed cancer clause imposes precisely the same absolute or per se doctrine which the legislation before you is designed to correct.

Let me demonstrate the dangers of such a clause using as an example the substance diethylstilbestrol. This chemical has been safely used in both human beings and animals for years. Yet, under the Delaney amendment, its present use cannot be extended and new uses are prohibited.

It is especially significant, then, that the Food and Drug Administration has examined scientific information about stilbestrol on six occasions and declared this chemical safe for six different uses. In 1941, the FDA, after examining clinical results with stilbestrol in 8,000 women, cleared this chemical as safe. It sanctioned the uses of stilbestrol in animals in 1947, 1954, 1955, 1957, and 1959.

Stilbestrol is now administered to an estimated 300,000 women and 50,000 men per year in the United States. In addition, it is fed to some 75 percent of all beef cattle on feed in this country.

Many publications of outstanding authorities in the field of endocrinology have demonstrated that stilbestrol is safe as administered to human beings. Within the past 3 months, articles have appeared in the Western Journal of Surgery and two issues of the Journal of the American Medical Association pointing out that there is no danger of cancer production from estrogen treatment.

With respect to the use of stilbestrol in animal feeds, many scientists have reported on the lack of residue in meats produced. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Eudcation, and Welfare has also stated that no detectable residue remains in beef and sheep fed stilbestrol.

Stilbestrol faces a continuing problem under the Delaney amendment because it can be made to produce cancer under certain conditions in guinea pigs, Syrian hamsters, and in a few strains of mice and rats. Most work has been done with mice specially bred to develop spontaneous cancers.

It is very important to note that no cancers have ever been produced with stilbestrol—even when efforts were made to do so—in most strains of mice and rats, nor in any monkeys, dogs, cats, goats, rabbits, pigs, many breeds of chickens, turkeys, and pheasants. Neither has cancer been reported in the millions of cattle and sheep to which stilbestrol has been fed.

We have here, then, a product known to be safe on the basis of long and widespread experience with both man and animals. And yet this very valuable product could never have been developed if a clause like the Delaney amendment had been in effect; adidtional uses of the product are prohibited even now.

Another example of problems arising when the Delaney amendment is applied can be seen in the case of arsenicals. Several of these chemicals are used in poultry and swine.

Delaney amendment provisions have prevented the further clearances or arsenicals in feeds, even though it has never been demonstrated that the organic forms cause cancer. Like stilbestrol, the arsenicals had received prior sanction by the FDA.

In considering the safe use of substances that cause cancer in animals, a point of disagreement has been whether or not threshold levels exist. A threshold level is one below which an animal does not get cancer but above which an animal does.

Many references in the scientific literature indicate that at low levels many chemicals do not produce cancer, but at higher levels they do. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has accepted safe levels for radiation even though higher levels can be harmful or fatal, thus employing scientific judgment in determining safe limits of a known hazard.

The danger in a rigid and sweeping clause such as the Delaney amendment, which permits no scientific judgment as to safety of specific substances, is that it can prohibit the use of very valuable chemicals which are known to be safe. We should recognize that chemicals have had a dramatic impact upon our agricultural economy and its ability to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population.

One hundred years ago a farmer in this country produced enough food for himself and three others. Today he produces enough for 25 besides himself. Farm production has increased 33 percent, with 33 percent fewer farmers, in the past 20 years.

Our record of improvement in agricultural production is due to (1) mechanization, (2) better strains, and (3) chemicals. Representative DIXON, Republican of Utah, estimates that 40 to 50 percent of farm productivity improvement since World War II resulted from agricultural chemicals.

It would be disastrous to remove any one of these methods to boost farm production at the same time that our population is increasing at its present rate. If, for instance, stilbestrol had not been on the market, the farmers of this country would have had to produce 360,000 more beef animals in 1959 to supply the amount of beef possible with stilbestrol. This is enough beef to feed 2½ million people for 1 year.

The Food Protection Board of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council said in 1956:

"No one knows exactly what would happen if the use of pesticidal chemicals on the farm should be abandoned, but it is safe to say that we could not commercially produce apples, peaches, potatoes, citrus, and tomatoes, to mention only a few crops; and yields of others would be drastically reduced."

In the same report this board pointed out that in dealing with chemicals the distinction between toxicity and hazard should be recognized. Toxicity is the capacity of a substance to produce injury; hazard is the probability that injury will result from its proper use. A compound might be highly toxic, but used properly it would not be hazardous.

It should be obvious from previous discussion that a restriction such as the cancer clause affects the entire economy. It prevents the use of agricultural chemicals that have been highly important in improving both quantity and quality of food.

To use an example, stilbestrol is estimated to have saved the farmers of Iowa $15 million in 1959. Without stilbestrol, it either would have cost the farmers more to produce the beef or cost the consumer more to buy this beef. Multiply this example by the thousands of useful chemicals involved and you arrive at the billions of dollars saved the economy yearly.

The Delaney amendment also curtails progress in another way. From 2 to 5 years and $750,000 to several million dollars are needed to develop a new product in the pharmaceutical industry today. If there is a possibility that a useful new chemical might be kept off the market because of the inflexible cancer clause, then research on this chemical must be dropped.

We have stopped work on items of this kind in our company. I can tell you, too, that one major industrial company has discontinued operations at its agricultural research farm because of the uncertainty of the future in this field.

We believe that in enacting the Delaney amendment Congress made a sincere effort to write a law to protect the general health and welfare. But we do not feel that it was the intent of Congress to prevent uses of substances safe for their intended purposes.

We have no objection to retaining the Delaney amendment if the right of scientific judgment is returned in its administration. To accomplish this, we propose a change in the wording of this cancer clause to read in part:

"A color additive shall be deemed unsafe * * * if the additive is found in amounts and under conditions reasonably related to the intended use to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal."

We also believe that a similar change should be made in the Food Additives Act.

This leaves some element of scientific judgment in the hands of the FDA—the agency well qualified to exercise its discretion in the best interests of the public.

The Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles, Calif., on February 17, on the subject of the Connally amendment:

THE TIME IS NOT YET

In 1946 the United States made itself subject to the International Court of Justice by a resolution of the Senate. But the resolution did not pass before Senator Connally added an amendment exempting this country from the court's jurisdiction in cases which we ourselves might regard as essentially domestic. Other nations took the same line, and as a result, according to those who do not like the Connally amendment, the court has not had much business, about two cases a year.

HUMPHREY RESOLUTION

About a year ago Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally amendment and make the United States accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the international court "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now holding hearings on this matter.

This is not a party issue. President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, Secretary of State Herter, Attorney General Rogers, all support repeal of the Connally amendment, and so does the American Bar Association.

But we are unabashed before all this eminence; we do not want the Connally amendment repealed—not yet.

Our reasons can be found in a quotation from the late Senator Robert A. Taft, a quotation used, curiously enough, by Vice President NIXON last year in an address advocating repeal of the amendment. Senator Taft said:

"I do not see how we can hope to secure permanent peace in the world except by established law between nations and equal justice under law. It may be a long, hard course, but I believe that the public opinion of the world can be led along that course, so that the time will come when that public opinion will support the decision of any reasonable impartial tribunal based on justice."

SENATOR TAFT'S POSITION

Senator Taft believed "the time will come" and life would hardly seem worth living if we too could not believe this. But there are no shortcuts to the millennium; the United States cannot bring it closer by leaping into the pit like the Roman knight, expecting the chasm to close over us and thus improve the world by our self-destruction.

Most of the advocates of our full submission to the International Court of Justice are lawyers, and this is no accident. For the lawyers, despite the many mischiefs they have done through the ages, have cherished a noble dream of a world ruled by law. The Greeks had it and got so far with it when Rhodes was a merchant power as to enforce a universal commercial law in the eastern Mediterranean—with the aid of the best fleet on the seas. The Romans dreamed, too, and there are passages in Justinian's code books which show he believed the law of his lawyers was the law of the world. Dante wrote about such law and a Dutchman named Grotius (1583–1645) devoted his life to finding a code to which all nations would subscribe.

The difficulty implied in the quotation from Senator Taft has always interposed: public opinion is various, and until there is one public opinion in the world there can be no world law to which everyone will submit.

Who would have the nerve to tell us, the American people, that our system of laws is not the best for us? And who would tell the Russians, or the subjects of any other Communist state, that their laws are not suitable or on the whole are not satisfactory? And what about some of the new African countries whose body of laws is still in its infancy? Or the Moslem countries where "civil" law and religious law are interchangeable, and the people like it that way?

How, out of this welter of law, custom and superstitution can a viable international code, an equity of the world, be formulated and enforced? Where is the universal public opinion upon which it would have to rely for enforcement?

TRIBUNAL OF NATIONS

The World Court has 15 judges under the U.N. constitution. The present 14 (one died in 1958) were appointed from Norway, Pakistan, Uruguay, the United Arab Republic, France, Mexico, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Australia, Greece, Free China, Poland. Of the 14 judges, perhaps 5 of them, consulting their homeland constitutions, might agree on a doctrine of liberty and individual rights roughly approximating the first 10 amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Several could not rise above the religio-legal prejudices of their native lands; others would not dare. In short, this court could not have any common denominator of international law, even a low one.

The advocates of repeal of the Connally amendment assure us that the Court would not really interfere in our "domestic" affairs—in such matters as desegregation, for instance. Perhaps not. But there are matters to which our malicious friends would draw the Court, by bringing actions against us if we submitted, that would seem very domestic to many Americans. Panama undoubtedly would start litigation about the canal, and others would sue with vindictive delight for rulings on our nuclear tests, our tariffs, offshore oil, foreign bases, etc.

SPECIOUS ARGUMENT

Walter Lippmann, an advocate of repeal, writes temptingly that full adherence to the World Court would provide private Americans with some security for their foreign investments. But under what rule of equity and what force of international opinion? What could a World Court do at this moment to abate the economic and other obscenities of the utterly irresponsible and defiant Castro regime in Cuba, particularly when, as Mr. Lippmann said 10 days ago, the public opinion which counts in this case, that of Latin America, is mostly on Castro's side, whatever he does.

The time will come, as Senator Taft said, but the time to repeal the Connally amendment is not yet.

Grain Traders Worry That U.S. Crop Props Are Killing Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal:

FADING FUTURES: GRAIN TRADERS WORRY THAT U.S. CROP PROPS ARE KILLING MARKETS—WHEAT, CORN ACTIVITY DROPS ON BOARD OF TRADE; SOME DEALERS LEAVE THE FIELD—PILLSBURY SEEKS SPECULATORS

(By Richard F. Janssen)

CHICAGO.—In the vaulted amphitheater of the Chicago Board of Trade the gray-coated grain traders still carry on their supercharged daily commerce, a noisy melee from 9:30 to 1:15 that resembles nothing quite so much as a food riot in Calcutta or the final, frenzied moments of an overtime basketball game.

But something has gone out of the game these days—much of the stimulating uncertainty of former years, and with it, much of the money.

In 5 or 10 years this place will be dead, one veteran floor trader remarks dolorously.

Though this prediction probably is overly pessimistic, there's no question but that futures trading—the purchase and sale of commodities for future delivery—has been going down hill steadily, and that in the last couple of years the descent has been especially precipitous. Volume of futures trading for all commodities on 15 major U.S. exchanges last year sagged to the lowest point since World War II. At that time many exchanges were either closed or almost completely inactive. For grain trading alone, the 1959 figures were barely a third of those in the mid-1920's.

SLIMMER TRADE, CHEAPER SEATS

Board of Trade officials estimate that their trade in wheat futures last year was off 27.6 percent from 1958 and that corn trading dropped 11.2 percent from the prior year. Memberships on the exchange, reflecting the diminished activity, have slumped to a seat price of $5,000, close to a record low, compared to $62,500 in the 1920's.

The decline, traders say, can largely be traced back to one source—Uncle Sam and his various farm price support programs. Designed in part to stabilize the prices farmers receive, the U.S. price-propping efforts have succeeded entirely too well in the eyes of the traders. Wheat futures prices, which used to soar and dip like a runaway kite, now ooze up and down in minute fractions of a cent. And corn, which in particularly volatile years has seen prices triple, last year fluctuated within a relatively narrow range, between a high of $1.40 a bushel and a low point of 99 cents.

This relative leveling off of futures prices is a body blow to the speculator. By narrowing the possibilities for big profits, the Government programs naturally lessen his incentive to take a chance. Food processors, too, no longer go into the futures markets as actively as they used to. Commodities they buy for processing into food aren't going to change in value very much during the manufacturing and storage cycle, which may take several months, so there isn't quite the need there used to be for protective futures market "hedging" operations.

It might be asked: "Isn't this all to the good? Certainly it must be a desirable social end to eliminate the peaks and valleys of farm prices, to smooth out farm income so that everybody makes a living. So the speculator gets hurt. Who cares?"

A LOAD FOR TAXPAYERS

The grain traders' reply is that the gradual substitution of artificially high Government prices for prices established by free markets is not only expensive for consumers but is costing taxpayers nearly $1 billion a year in losses that the Government sustains in its price-propping endeavors. In the last 16 months, Uncle Sam's Commodity Credit Corp. has recovered only 70 cents of each dollar it spent on commodities finally moving out of its surplus hoard.

Farmers, who might be expected to benefit from Government guarantees of high prices, eventually will suffer, too, say the grain men, as the buildup of surpluses becomes too huge for even the Government to support. At last count, Uncle Sam had accumulated more than $9 billion worth of commodities in his stockpiles. And the total is growing.

So far, cotton provides the most striking example of how a price support program can wreck a futures market. Last August 1, the Government turned to a new plan to help cotton farmers; if they comply with acreage allotments, it will purchase the cotton they offer at a price well over production costs. Currently, the program is taking about 70 percent of the total U.S. crop. This, of course, makes the Government the biggest cotton dealer and helps stabilize the price.

UNCLE SAM TAKES OVER

The result: "In 1959, only about 1.9 million bales of cotton were traded on the New York Cotton Exchange after August 1, down 69 percent from 1958," reports the exchange's president, William K. Love, Jr. Indignantly he declares the program is "leading the entire cotton industry to complete socialization." Textile mills now can buy their needs from Uncle Sam at an average of $156 a bale, $14 less than the Government pays the farmer for the same bale.

Already two important cotton trading firms have closed their doors: The 69-year-old Cone, Schwarz & Co. and Alvin Wachsman & Co., whose principals were members of a family that has been in the cotton business for four generations. Other firms, more diversified in commodities or securities, are attempting to hold on in hopes that trade will pick up.

But unless the Government program is changed, "I don't see any future for the Cotton Exchange," says Ceaser Cone, president of Cone Mills Corp. of Greensboro, N.C.

Grain traders, obviously frightened by the crisis in cotton, are worried that the same fate is creeping up on them. "Even though my father was in this business, I certainly wouldn't let my son enter it," says one veteran Board of Trade member. "The way things are going we'd better get out completely and let the politicians run the food business."

A survey last October 1 showed the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation owned 96 percent of all corn in off-farm storage. On the same date, about 75 percent of the 1.7 billion bushels of wheat in elevators and other nonfarm storage places was either owned directly by the U.S. or held as security for price support loans.

CLAMPING ON A CEILING

The Government's domination of supplies "tends to set a ceiling as well as a floor on prices," says an official of a big Minneapolis-based grain firm. This means the "extreme risk" of price changes no longer exists, so firms such as his find much less reason to enter the futures market and "hedge" against price variations.

"Hedging" is the main raison d'etre of a commodity market. To understand its importance take a highly simplified look at how it works:

A flour mill buys a carload of grain at $2 a bushel. Since it won't make all the grain into flour right away, it might be able to buy the grain later at a lower price. To offset this risk, it contracts to sell an identical quantity on the futures market at $2.05 for delivery next March.

In a month or so, when the company is selling its flour, the "cash"—immediate delivery—price of grain may have fallen to $1.95. The company thus has "lost" five cents by buying at the earlier $2 price. But the March futures price also has dropped, to $2, so the firm buys back its futures contract for that amount, five cents less than it had sold it for. Thus, by balancing a loss with a gain, it has protected its inventory investment.

To work, the system requires that a speculator buy any contract that a hedger wishes to sell. The speculator, in fact, is an indispensable part of the market mechanism. Now, both parties are drifting away.

"You know wheat is never going to be much above or much below the Government support price," says one large miller. For example, the July 1959 wheat contract never got outside a $1.79 to $1.90 range; in contrast the July contract in 1953 went from a low of $1.87 to $2.48 a bushel. Because of this greater price assurance, "there are many more instances now where we buy grain for cash and don't bother to hedge in the futures market," the miller says.

SMALLER INVENTORIES

Some millers, moreover, are carrying smaller inventories of grain now that they can rely on the Government stockpile at any time. This, in turn, further cuts the need to hedge on the futures market.

Nowadays, some food processors that want to hedge almost have to go out on a search to find a speculator to handle their business. A. C. Owens, director of mill grain procurement for Pillsbury Co., says in prewar days the Minneapolis Grain Exchange was swarming with speculators. "But now, there's only one speculator left there who will buy the futures contracts we sell. When he goes to Florida on his three-week vacation, we have to trade on the Chicago market."

This thinness in the market has brought some changes in the way a big company like Pillsbury must operate. A trade of 200,000 bushels of wheat some 25 years ago would probably have provoked only a one-eighth-cent-a-bushel movement in the price; "now it could mean running the market up or down one-half cent," says Mr. Owens. While seemingly a small faction to worry about, it means that a trade could now cause four times as great a price movement as previously. For a company such as Pillsbury, buying 58 million bushels of wheat a year, a difference of half a cent a bushel means $290,000, Mr. Owens comments.

To adjust to this condition, companies now frequently place a "limit order" to the broker so that the trade is made only within certain price limits. This in itself tends to minimize market movements.

Several brokerage firms which maintained commodity departments along with their securities business have dropped out. One such is Hornblower & Weeks, which about 6 years ago set up a commodities trading department in Chicago. "We started in small and we stayed small," complains Charles Perrigo, the firm's senior partner in Chicago.

Mr. Perrigo says his firm thought some of its "more speculative" stock customers might be interested in a crack at such things as wheat or soybeans. "Almost the reverse was true," he says. "We found brokers on the Board of Trade speculating in stocks." Hornblower & Weeks dropped out of cotton about a year ago and brought the remainder of its commodity activities to a close last September 30. Declares Mr. Perrigo: "Government supports don't permit a free market in which there can be a speculative interest."

TWO CARLOADS OF BUTTER

Grain men shudder when they take a look at trading in foodstuffs more severely affected by price supports. At Chicago's Mercantile Exchange, an official has no trouble at all computing the butter futures volume for 1959: Only two carloads. In 1958 three carloads were traded. This compares with 35,000 carloads a year before World War II.

"We could trade butter futures, but there is no incentive any more," says Glenn Andersen, butter merchandiser and broker for Berkshire Foods, Inc., Chicago. Now, the Government stabilizes the price by buying all that is offered to it at the support rate, revised only once a year. The Government currently buys butter in Chicago at about 58 cents a pound and sells it to distributors at slightly more.

"During a few weeks in the year when supply is short and the price is a few cents above the support, we'd dearly like to hedge," says one distributor, "but there aren't any speculators left to take the opposite position." Most of the time, however, his firm has no need to hedge, he says, "since butter rarely goes more than 5 cents above the support any more."

The decline in futures trading has been on a broad front. The Commodity Exchange Authority, the Government's regulatory agency, says that such trading in the fiscal year ended June 30 declined in 15 commodities, disappeared in four and rose only in five. In calendar 1959, of the Nation's 15 major exchanges, only the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange and the Commodity Exchange showed gains over 1958.

The outlook is not completely without cheer, of course. Even a price supported crop like soybeans can become the object of keen speculative activity, as happened last fall when supply appeared in very close balance with demand. Prices ranged over a comparatively wide spread, well above the support price. Soybean trading on the Board of Trade in 1959 increased 42.7 percent from 1958 and soybean meal futures gained 87 percent. Practically the only other major commodities to score substantial futures trading gains last year were copper, lead, hides, and sugar, all in worldwide production and thus not subject to price controls by any single nation.

Other factors than Government controls, such as a marked overproduction of a commodity in relation to consumer's demand for it, can temporarily depress activity on a futures market. With falling prices, speculators are less apt to purchase contracts for future delivery, when prices may be lower yet. Cocoa futures trading, for example, dropped last year after vigorous trading sessions in 1958, largely because worldwide production increased sharply. But, unlike their counterparts on the Board of Trade, traders on the New York Cocoa Exchange show little apprehension about future volume and seats on the exchange are now close to a record high.

The Old Guard of the City of New York Speaks Out Against Hatemongers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a recent meeting in New York City of the Old Guard of the City of New York, which is not what what we ordinarily think is meant by this term, a resolution dealing with the recent outbreaks of hatemongering was adopted. It was prepared and read by Col. William H. McIntyre.

At the request of this organization, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It seems to me that this is as emphatic and eloquent a condemnation of some of the things we have seen happening, and as eloquent a statement of true Americanism as has come to my attention recently.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have read in the press of the diabolical actions of vicious persons who have marred or destroyed houses of worship.

In the Gospel of St. John, it is written, "In my Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so, I would have told you."

There is anger and shame all over our great land, when we read of such happenings. Who is responsible? Do these attacks on persons and property emanate from abroad?

Life, at best, is but a short time, therefore, we should spend these precious years with a high purpose in mind to do good works.

Let us remember, that the spiritual values mean most, reach highest, last longest, and in the end, make life most memorable.

Where did the Unknown Soldier worship?

Water Resources Called Vital to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald of October 13, 1959:

WATER RESOURCES CALLED VITAL TO ALL

Industry and the public have a vital stake in the Nation's water resources, say three experts attending the annual meeting of the Federation of Sewage and Industrial Wastes Associations in Dallas.

The experts who addressed the federation's Monday afternoon session at Dallas Memorial Auditorium are Mark D. Hollis, assistant U.S. Surgeon General and newly elected federation president; N. D. Griswold, assistant general manager of the Dow Chemical Co., Texas division; and Milton P. Adams, executive secretary of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

Each speaker stressed the importance of sound future planning in the handling of U.S. water resources.

STREAM POLLUTION

Mr. Hollis warned that rivers, streams, and lakes can no longer be treated as freeways to transport all the industrial and municipal pollution that will be dumped into them.

"Ways must be found," he said, "to keep pollution out of the waterways and to purify the waste matter that may have to be thrown into the water."

"Such a nationwide program will cost at the start about $10 million a year," he said.

CONSERVATION

Mr. Griswold said that conservation of the Nation's supply of water is vitally important to industry and agriculture and to the Nation as a whole.

He said it is estimated that the United States already has invested nearly $179 billion in water development. He added that "an expenditure on the order of $171 billion over the next 15 years must be paid out of taxes, and industry's share of the tax bill is and will be substantial."

"Industry," he said, "has a vital stake in the efficient use of the water resources to minimize future expenditures as much as possible."

GOVERNMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. Adams said that the Federal Government, State governments, and industry must each have a different viewpoint toward water resources.

He said that sewage and waste treatment as it is now known will not be sufficient in some locations to recreate an adequate water resources reserve. And presently known treatment methods will have to give way to superior methods when they are devised, he said.

"More and better water conservation by all, particularly by industry, will aid in solving water resources problems of the future," he said.

More than 1,500 persons—a record in the 32-year history of the federation—are attending the Dallas meeting. It will continue through Thursday.

Freedom Versus Coercion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "Freedom Versus Coercion" from the December 17, 1959, Chicago Daily News just crossed my desk, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FREEDOM VERSUS COERCION—FARM GROUP BUCKS SUBSIDIES

The constitutional provision that each State should have two Senators stacked the congressional cards in favor of farmers. It gave sparse rural populations far more voting strength per capita than the populous cities.

Congress continues to pander to agriculture above all other pursuits. It erects several screens around its purpose. One of them is that the small farm must be preserved because it is the ideal way of life. It is ideal not only because it is healthful, but because it presumably develops the qualities of self-reliance and independence.

This article of faith has suffered somewhat in recent years with the clamor for Federal subsidies, when dependence on the taxpayers did not seem to square with the cultivation of self-reliance.

There is one great farm organization, we are happy to say, that fully appreciates this irony. The American Farm Bureau Federation, now holding its 41st annual session in Chicago, stands squarely for junking these Government farm programs.

It recognizes them for what they are: political schemes with power as their real objective.

We particularly admire the insight of Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the AFBF, who said: "We will never have the opportunity to vote on the simple issue of capitalism versus socialism—or, stated more simply, freedom versus coercion.

"Instead, the citizens of our Republic will continue to decide each day whether we want to move little step by little step in one direction or the other."

It would be foolish to predict the trend from a single straw, but it is worth noting that the voters of Iowa's 4th Congressional District elected Republican JOHN KYL over an opponent who campaigned on an anti-Benson platform.

Agriculture Secretary Benson, of course, is only a symbol. Congress, not Benson, has written the farm laws.

But Mr. Benson symbolizes the principle of nondependence on the Government, which is what the glorifiers of the ideal farm life profess to admire.

Professor Richardson Discusses Trujillo and Castro After Personal Visit to the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger, Sunday, January 31, 1960. Prof. Gilbert P. Richardson is professor of history and political science at Florida Southern College, and is a specialist on Latin American affairs. He recently visited the Dominican Republic where he studied governmental affairs, and this report of his trip will be of interest to Members of the House, I am sure. The article follows:

(By Ed McNeely)

The assassination plot against Gen. Rafael L. Trujillo, strongman leader of the Dominican Republic, Thursday involved the wealthy class and did not have the sympathy of the workingman, according to Gilbert P. Richardson, professor of history and political science at Florida Southern College.

"It was a revolt against the personal rule of the Trujillo family rather than a mass revolution against the Dominican's system of government," Richardson said.

STUDIED AFFAIRS OF GOVERNMENT

The Florida Southern professor, a specialist on Latin American affairs, recently returned from the Dominican Republic, where he studied governmental affairs.

Richardson termed the uprising as the work of the wealthy—a forerunner to the "desertion of the intellectuals. It lacked the social aspects of a revolution," he added.

Trujillo, who has imposed a tightfisted reign over the island republic for 30 years, is still the champion of the working class, the professor said.

"The Dominicans do not always agree with Trujillo or his younger brother, President Hector Trujillo, but they do respect him for what he has done for them," Richardson observed.

ASSUMED POWER 30 YEARS AGO

Rafael Trujillo came to power 30 years ago at the end of the United States' occupation of the island, the historian pointed out, and since then has led the country to a fairly stable economy—a contrast to the past history of the republic.

The older Trujillo was trained by the U.S. Marines during the occupation from 1916 until 1924, Richardson said, and was commander of Dominican forces when the Marines left.

During his 30-year administration, Trujillo has made the Dominican Republic one of the more progressive Latin countries, the professor stated.

"He has built hospitals, housing developments, roads, and communication systems, as well as attracting new industry to the island," Richardson said.

Also, Trujillo has made education compulsory for everyone under 60 years of age, in a determined effort to stamp out illiteracy, Richardson said. Strides have been made toward stamping out tropical diseases which menace many of the Caribbean Islands, he added.

"When the Salk antipolio vaccine was introduced, Trujillo immediately renamed a Ciudad Trujillo (the capital city) thoroughfare Avenida Jonas Salk," the historian said.

Without the support of the masses, a revolt stands little chance of being successful, Richardson said, because the Trujillo brothers enjoy total control of the Government "and have no compunction over getting rid of opposition."

Rafael Trujillo commands an apparently loyal army of 12,000, an air force of 2,400 and a navy of 2,000. He also surrounds the capital with a 6,800-man national constabulary or secret policy which can be mobilized on a moment's notice, Richardson pointed out.

CITIZENS RALLY BEHIND BROTHERS

Since the attempted invasion by 200 Cubans, under a Panamanian flag last July the small island republic's population has rallied quite strongly behind the Trujillo brothers, the Florida southern political scientist said.

"The Dominicans also are studying with interest Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's anti-American campaign, and are taking advantage of it to make a bid for a larger sugar quota for Dominican Republic," Richardson said.

Richardson predicts that Dominican Republic, Cuba's island neighbor, may attempt to lure American sugar interests from Cuba if Castro tries to nationalize them as it has been rumored.

"But," he added, "there is a general fear among the Caribbean islands that Castro will flood the world market with Cuban sugar if the United States cuts Cuba's sugar quota."

Richardson said that such an act by Cuba would "knock the bottom out of the world sugar market, dropping the price from 5 to 5½ cents to, possibly, 2 to 2½ cents."

To the average American, the professor added, this does not seem too grave a problem, but to the Caribbean countries it is. "It's a bread and butter problem with them," Richardson said, "because the price of sugar determines their national prosperity."

DOMINICANS TO EXPAND

Richardson said the Dominicans are eager to expand their sugar production, but are nervously watching Castro's anti-American campaign.

"The average Dominican hates Castro and actually lives in fear of a Cuban invasion," Richardson said, adding that friction between Dominican Republic and Cuba is based on a multitude of reasons, ranging from politics and today's economic battle to the burial place of Christopher Columbus.

Columbus Day is a big holiday in both Cuba and Dominican Republic, Richardson said, and both countries claim to have the remains of Columbus. A big part of the Columbus Day celebration in the Dominican Republic is centered around the Cathedral in Ciudad Trujillo, the capital, when the bishop, mayor, and secretary of interior open Columbus' tomb for public viewing.

Speaking on the possible effects of Castro's anti-American campaign, Richardson said, "The Dominicans feel it is Castro's way of taking his own failures out of the spotlight. He is taking advantage of the Latin countries' general attitude toward the United States.

"Most of the Latin Americans call us Gringos, meaning 'stuck up,' and 'haughty,' " the historian said, explaining, "It is a picture they get from tourists who show little or no respect for the Latins and their problems."

Richardson noted that if Cuba does nationalize the 39 American sugar companies he does not see any military action by the United States, because, "The whole world is watching and remembering Hungary."

He pointed out several economic measures which could be taken by this country, including freezing of Cuban assets here to cover the losses of American investors in Cuba.

Other possibilities, according to Richardson, are restrictions on tourist travel to Cuba—"The $50 million tourist trade has already dwindled to less than $25 million each year, an embargo on spare parts for Cuba's industrial machines and autos, granting political asylum to all Cubans who wish to flee because of the absence of free elections."

Displaced Cubans here already are proposing the establishment of a Radio Free Cuba in south Florida, Richardson said.

Richardson, a specialist on Latin American affairs, recently returned from the Dominican Republic where he studied the sugar situation, because, he said, "It is feared Castro will quietly nationalize the American sugar companies just after cane harvest time.

"At the present time," he said, "only 3,700 square miles of the Dominican Republic's 9,900 square miles of tillable soil are under cultivation.

"The Republic in the midst of an economic expansion campaign and possibly may attempt to attract these 39 companies through favorable land leases," Richardson observed.

"There are now 15 sugar mills operating in Dominican Republic, 6 of which are American controlled," the historian said, "pointing out that two of these mills produce four-fifths of the Republic's sugar."

Tailored in Four Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which was featured in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of February 14, 1960, written by Mr. Lou Rauscher, a staff writer of the Independent. The subject of the article is Mr. Felix Olszewski, a well-known Wilkes-Barre tailor for many years.

The article follows:

TAILORED IN FOUR COUNTRIES—FELIX THE TAILOR ONCE OUTFITTED KAISER WILHELM

(By Lou Rauscher)

Felix the Tailor's story is made to order. He fits the pattern of a modestly successful man, with experiences ranging from an early apprenticeship in Europe where he once had occasion to work on a uniform for Kaiser Wilhelm to proprietorship of his own shop, located in the same block on East Northampton Street, city, for the last 52 years.

"Suits me," was his reaction to our request for an interview. "I've been in this business since the turn of the century and this is the first time anyone's made a fuss about it."

Felix Olszewski, whose pleasant disposition belies his 74 years, was born in Suwalki, Poland, one of eight children (he still has a sister living there).

His early life was interwoven with the usual vagaries of childhood before he took apprentice flings at carpentry and several other native trades.

None suited him and he felt stagnate until his introduction to tailoring. This, he recalls without hesitation, measured up to what he was looking for.

KAISER REGULAR CUSTOMER

Felix ironed out the kinks during an apprentice period in shops in Poland, Lithuania, and Germany. It was during an attachment to a shop in Berlin that he helped turn out some military duds for Kaiser Wilhelm. Felix notes that the Kaiser was a regular customer at the establishment.

Mr. Olszewski landed in the Heights section of the city in 1904. Not too long thereafter he took a fancy to a Georgetown belle by the name of Jennie Simoncavage.

They got their marriage license at the old Courthouse on the Square and subsequently became the parents of eight children. His Jennie died 2 years ago shortly after they observed their 51st wedding anniversary.

Felix today still puts in a full day's work in surroundings that have been bypassed by the march of new methods in tailoring. A potbellied stove replete with the old trademark, the goose iron, occupies a place of prominence in his shop as it has for the last half-century.

STILL USES GOOSE IRONS

His goose irons are among the few left locally in the trade today. He still uses them for pressing work, and there's a horseshoe used for underlaying the irons that has been in his shop since it was given him by a Stegmaier Brewery employee in 1909. The shoe came from one of the brewery's delivery horses.

Felix, who once pressed 48 suits by hand in a single day for what he considers some sort of record, estimates that he's worked on enough garments during his time to stretch to Europe and back.

Prior to opening his own business Felix worked for Simon Long as a coatmaker. He set out on his own in July of 1907 in a shop on Lincoln Street, where he stayed for 1 year before moving to his present location.

He still has the first entry he ever made in his ledger and to this day has never gone in for the modern stamp method of cutting cloth.

Although he's tapered off from his earlier pace, he still designs his own patterns on occasion and prides himself on his custom work.

"I don't know if I'd be as lucky these days as I was shortly after World War I," he mused in obvious reference to the slackening demand for tailormade clothes.

A GRATEFUL MAN

"At one time it was the thing to have your suit made to order. They've gotten away from that now. I only thank the Lord I was able to do as well as I did."

Felix, who now has 16 grandchildren, earned enough to send 3 of his 8 children through college. Two of his sons are engineers today, while a daughter is a teacher. A son, Anthony, is the only child living locally.

HE'S OWNED SHOP ON THE HEIGHTS FOR LAST 52 YEARS

Our subject is one man who hasn't fallen prey to the pushbutton era. He loves to hike and during good weather thinks nothing of walking to the Polish cemetery in Wyoming, where his wife is buried, and back in a single afternoon. He makes this trip once a week in the summer.

Last year he took several jaunts to points such as Five-Mile Mountain, the Triangle at Mountaintop, Stink Pond in the Glen Summit area, and in his younger years has walked to White Haven and back in the same day.

He recalls that it was on one of his White Haven safaris that his oldest son, Walter, tired out on him.

LOVES TO WALK

Nary a day goes by that Felix doesn't take his constitutional. He politely turns down a lift when he's out walking and a friend happens by in a mechanized chariot.

"I don't believe in riding," he says, "and as long as I have two good legs I'll use them."

The tailor shop is located directly across from Hose House No. 4. Felix vividly recalls the days of the horse-drawn fire trucks, the barn, and how the firemen maneuvered over the cobblestones on Northampton Street in response to a call.

Felix the tailor remains one of the few Heights residents to speak, read, and write five languages fluently—Polish, Lithuanian, German, Russian, and English.

He is content now to fill out his days with a slower pace, having reared his family, earned his friends, and served as a useful citizen of the community.

In the light of how tailoring has so completely dominated Felix's life, it probably wouldn't be pressing a point to add here that clothes really made this man.

Inflation and When It Occurred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the February 16, 1960, edition of the Washington Post constitutes an interesting analysis of inflation. The rate of increase by individual years since the close of World War II is particularly significant:

THE TOPIC THAT VIES WITH SEX—LIVING COST AND HOW IT'S MEASURED

Cost of living's gone so high
That it's cheaper now to die;
Absolutely, Mr. Gallagher?
Positively, Mr. Shean.

(By Frank C. Porter)

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Shean could probably draw as hearty a laugh today with this fragment from their famed vaudeville act as they did in the early 1920's. For although the upward march of prices has slowed noticeably in the past few years, cost of living still vies with sex as topic A in most urban conversations.

David L. Babson & Co. devotes its current staff letter to the subject, shows that the 1947-49 dollar has shrunk to 80 cents and observes that Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index "is not only the most widely known of the Nation's statistical series but probably has the greatest impact on the economy."

This index, the Babson letter points out, governs pay increases for millions of workers through cost-of-living escalator clauses. It sways the purchase decisions of millions of consumers. The Federal Reserve Board

watches it like a hawk. And it influences the policies of investors and business planners.

Many newspaper readers now follow the month-to-month changes in the BLS index as conscientiously as they do the adventures of Little Orphan Annie, the misadventures of the Washington Senators, and the stock prices of Ampex or Thiokol. But if most everyone talks about the index, very few really know what it is. So the Babson firm obliges with a brief description.

Its complete title, "Index of Change in Prices of Goods and Services Purchased by City Wage Earner and Clerical Worker Families" indicates it is based mainly on middle-income buying habits. Changes are measured in percentages from the 1947–49 average. Thus the December 1959 reading of 125.5 percent means a 25.5 percent increase from the base period.

Some 298 items, each weighted according to its importance in a typical family budget, are priced monthly in 46 localities. The major component groups are given the following weights: Food, 30.1 percent; housing and household operation, 20; transportation, 11; apparel, 9.7; medical care, 4.7; personal care, 2.1; reading and recreation, 5.4; other goods and services, 5.

Babson notes that the service categories have been responsible for the largest portion of the increase in living costs the past 5 years (medical care rose 22 percent, more than any other group).

But it also finds that living cost increases have been much more moderate of late. Translating the index into terms of the shrinking dollar, Babson puts the decline in purchasing power at an average 1.2 cents over the past 5 years. This compares to drops of 10 cents in 1946, 15 in 1947, 8 in 1948, and 7 in 1951. The record of purchasing power in terms of 1947–49 dollars since World War II:

Year	Purchase power	Percent change
1946	$1.20	−7.7
1947	1.05	−12.5
1948	.97	−7.6
1949	.98	+1.5
1950	.97	−1.0
1951	.90	−7.2
1952	.88	−2.2
1953	.87	−1.1
1954	.87	----------
1955	.87	----------
1956	.86	−1.1
1957	.83	−3.5
1958	.81	−2.4
1959	.80	−1.2

Tips and Cash Gratuities To Be Included for Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will provide that tips and gratuities shall be included as wages under the old-age, survivors', and disability program. This bill will correct an injustice, produce additional revenues, and will make realistic the social security benefits for service workers.

This bill will consider tips as wages for the purposes of social security. Service workers pay income taxes on their tips but their tips are not considered in computing their social security benefits. The provisions of my bill will increase social security revenues by collections on income which has never been subject to the payment of social security taxes. It will result in a reporting of realistic wages, thus increasing the social security benefits for service workers when they become eligible.

I introduced a similar bill in the 85th Congress and in the early part of the 86th Congress. During the consideration of the omnibus social security bill in 1958, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee indicated that while the committee favored the principle of my bill, the subject required further study. Two years have passed and further study has been made. This bill which I am introducing today improves upon the previous bill and seeks to meet the objections which have been raised. The features in this bill which were not present in the previous bill are as follows:

First. This bill requires the employer instead of the employee to report where the employee has not declared the amount of tips which he has earned during the month and file such information with his employer within 10 days from the close of the month.

Second. This bill grants the employer the right to review the amount which the employee has reported to him as his actual tips.

Third. This bill in one of the alternative computations of mandatory reporting by the employer estimates the tips to be the difference between $1.25 an hour and the base hourly wage where the salary of the service employee is less than $1.25 per hour.

Fourth. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules to carry out the provisions of the bill and to review the amounts reported.

The only reason that tips were excluded originally in computing social security benefits is that it was thought that to include them would be impracticable and there was a desire not to encumber the social security system with difficult administrative problems. Experience and time have demonstrated that those deficiencies and difficulties no longer obtain. Experience shows that a workable plan of computing tips is not only possible, but also administratively practicable. My bill offers that plan.

Eight States and the District of Columbia require that tips and gratuities be treated as wages received from the employing unit. Unemployment compensation regulations in 14 other States under certain conditions recognize tips as wages, such as where an employee gives an accounting to his employer of his tips or where tips contribute more than 50 percent of the employee's base earnings. In the State of New York, in an analogous situations, namely, the computation of taxes on board and lodging, tips and gratuities for unemployment insurance purposes, the New York State Industrial Commission has issued rules which solve the problem inherent in the situation.

Under the provisions of my bill, the employee will inform his employer of the amount of tips received during a given month within 10 days after the close of the month and turn over to the employer the amount necessary to pay the employee's share of the social security tax on the tips. The employer also has the right to withhold the estimated social security taxes from the base wage of the employee. Where the employee fails to inform his employer of the amount of tips or other cash gratuities, the employer must report in either of two ways. The first alternative method which the employer may use in the reporting of tips is the reporting of an amount equal to the difference between the employee's average hourly pay for employment performed for such employer during such month and $1.25 multiplied by the total number of hours of employment performed by such employee for such employer during such month. In other words, the employer reports as total wages for the month an amount equal to $1.25 multiplied by the number of hours worked by the employee during such month. If the employee does not file his report to his employer within 10 days of the close of the month, the employer may use a second alternative. This alternative provides that the employer must file as employee's wages the employee's base salary plus tips which are set forth in a schedule. The employer shall collect from the employee or deduct from the employee's base wages 2½ percent of the employee's wages or such percentage as is provided for by the Internal Revenue Code.

In any event, where the employee fails to report his tips to the employer within 10 days of the close of the month, the employer must report as tips the sum provided for in either of the two alternative methods.

My bill is divided into four sections. Section 1 of the bill adds a new paragraph to section 209 of the social security law and provides that tips and other cash gratuities received by an employee in the course of employment from persons other than his employer shall be considered remuneration for purposes of payment of social security taxes as provided for under chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 2 of the bill adds another paragraph to section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and provides that tips and cash gratuities customarily received by an employee in the course of employment from other than the employer shall be considered remuneration for purposes of social security.

Section 3 adds a subsection (p) to section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and this subsection (p) is divided into six parts. Each of the first three parts sets forth a method of computation of tips and cash gratuities for purposes of social security. The amount of tips is either the actual amount received by the employee, or an estimated amount representing the difference between $1.25 per hour and the actual hourly base wage, or an estimated amount based on experience and set forth in a schedule.

The fourth part of section 3 sets forth the conditions which must exist in order for tips not to be included as remuneration for purposes of social security. The fifth part of this section provides for the withholding by the employer of the social security tax on tips and cash gratuities from the base wage. The sixth part of this section 3 requires the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to promulgate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the subsection and requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the review of the amount reported.

Subsection (p), subdivision (1) of section 3 of the bill provides that where an employee within 10 days after the close of any month reports to his employer the amount of tips which he received during the month and pays to his employer the required rate of social security taxes, then the total amount which the employee reported shall be considered remuneration paid to him by the employer and the sum so paid shall be treated by the employer as though it had been deducted from wages.

Subsection (p), subdivision 2 of section 3 provides for mandatory reporting by the employer where the employee does not report actual tips and his hourly wage is less than $1.25 per hour. Under such conditions the employer must report as tips the difference between $1.25 per hour and actual base wage per hour multiplied by the number of hours which the employee worked during a month for such employer, or the employer, at his election, must report as tips the amounts provided for in a schedule set forth in section 3, subsection (p), subdivision (3).

Subdivision (2) of this subsection provides that the employer shall collect from the employee or deduct from the employee's wages the 2½ percent or the appropriate percentage of tax which the employee must pay.

Subsection (p)(3) provides for alternative computation for mandatory reporting by the employer. This method computes tips as wages for each designated group of employees. This part of the bill provides that where the employee has not reported his actual tips and where the employer does not elect to report as tips the difference between $1.25 per hour and hourly base wage where the employee's base wage is less than $1.25 per hour, the employer shall report an amount which experience shows service groups on the average receive. The nine service groups and the amounts which they have deemed to have received from the point of view of experience as tips and cash gratuities are as follows:

(a) Beauty parlor operators: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a beauty parlor operator during any month shall be deemed to be equal to 10 percent of the wages (determined without regard to this subsection or the last sentence of subsection (a)) paid to such operator by his or her employer.

(b) Service employees in restaurants: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a service employee in a restaurant during any month shall be deemed to be equal to 7½ percent of the amount charged for food and beverages served by (or attributable to service by) such employee during such month, except that the amount of such tips and other cash gratuities shall be 5 percent of the amount charged for food and beverages served by (or attributable to service by) such employee during such month if he is employed at a counter or in a drugstore.

(c) Dining room employees in American plan hotels and in eating clubs: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a dining room employee in an American plan hotel or an eating club shall be deemed to be $2 per day of full-time employment for waiters and waitresses and $1 per day of full-time employment for busboys.

(d) Hotel service employees: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a bellhop, porter, baggage porter, or doorman employed by a hotel shall be deemed to be $2 per day of full-time employment.

(e) Taxicab drivers: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a taxicab driver shall be deemed to be equal to 12½ percent of his total bookings if he operates his cab in a city having a population of 100,000 or more, or $9 per week in any other case.

(f) Employees in barbershops: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by an employee of a barbershop during any month shall be deemed to be equal to (i) 15 percent of the wages (determined without regard to this subsection or the last sentence of subsection (a)) received during such month in the case of a barber, (ii) 25 percent of the wages (as so determined) received during such month in the case of a manicurist, or (iii) 5 cents for each customer of the barbershop in the case of an employee shining shoes or brushing and otherwise attending to customers' clothes.

(g) Baggage porters in bus and airline terminals: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a baggage porter at a bus or airline terminal shall be deemed to be $2 on any day on which he worked at least 7 hours, and 30 cents per hour of employment actually performed on any day on which he did not work for at least 7 hours.

(h) Pinboys at bowling alleys: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a pinboy at a bowling alley shall be deemed to be equal to 2 cents for each game for which he sets up pins.

(i) Maritime service employees: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a maritime service employee shall be deemed to be equal to whichever of the following amounts per day is applicable for each day of full-time employment: bartender, $1.70; bellboy, $1.80; deck steward, $2; headwaiter, $3.35; night steward, $1; room steward, $2.90; salon steward, $1.75; stewardess, $1.65; waiter, $2.50."

Subsection (p) subdivision (4) provides that under certain conditions, no tips shall be included as remuneration for social security purposes. Tips or cash gratuities shall not be included where (a) acceptance of tips or gratuities is not allowed; (b) notice is displayed that tips are not allowed; (c) employer adopts reasonable means to insure that tips or cash gratuities are not received; (d) employer submits to the Secretary a statement setting forth that tips are not allowed and methods to obtain compliance by customers and employees.

Subsection (p) subdivision (5) provides that an employer at his own option or upon the request by the employee may withhold from the employee's base wages the social security taxes due on the actual tips reported or on the estimated tips collected during the month.

Subsection (p) subdivision (6) provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of the bill and to prescribe rules for the review of the amount reported.

Section 4 of the bill deals with the effective date of the law and provides that the amendments shall apply only to tips received on and after the first day of the second month which begins more than 10 days after the enactment into law.

The custom of rewarding a person for satisfactory services rendered is an ancient one. This custom has become highly formalized with the development of our social habits. Considerable discussion is devoted to it in our best etiquette books. It has also become a fixed part of our economic system and, as a result, millions, of our workers today depend upon the receipt of gratuities or tips in order to earn a living.

We are all aware of this. Each time we eat in a restaurant, get a shoeshine, have our luggage handled, we know that the person serving us must depend upon our tipping him for a substantial portion of his or her daily wages. It is now part of the system governing the relations of these persons with their employers.

As I understand, a great many of these personal service personnel would like to see the system changed. They would prefer to have an assured weekly wage and have the cost of their services taken up in the bill presented by the employer to the customer. This, of course, is a subject which is beyond the power of a legislature to handle.

During my travels throughout Europe, I noted that the employer includes the amount of the employee's tips as part of the bill. The practice is to allocate a percentage of the total bill as tips. The percentage which was most frequently used was 13 percent.

Service employees, however, have another problem, one for which the Congress, and the Committee on Ways and Means in particular, should take responsibility. They are denied the benefit of social security coverage of that portion of their income which comes directly from the customers they serve. Only the low basic wage, which they receive from their employer, may be credited as wages under the present law, except in a small percentage of cases where the employer requires the employee to account to him the amount of tips. The injustice of this treatment is manifest. When these people become eligible to receive their social security benefits, they find themselves entitled to payments which fail to reflect their true earnings histories. This is because the wages which have been credited to them in many cases make up as little as one-half or one-third of their total earnings, counting their tips.

My proposals and proposals similar to mine have met with opposition from only one quarter—the associations of employers of personal service personnel, the restaurant and hotel operators. The reason they have advanced for their position is difficulty of administration—although, one cannot help but recognize that if the proposal were adopted their employer's taxes would be increased.

The difficulty, they claim, arises in ascertaining the sums involved in the tips received by their employees.

If difficulty of administration were allowed to prevent the adoption of worthwhile legislation, most of the activities of the Federal Government would never have been undertaken. In this instance, the administration of the bill, while intricate, is not impracticable. The people affected by my bill are entitled to consistent treatment by the Government. We have found ways to collect income taxes based upon their tips. There is no reason why we should deny them social security protection on an equal basis. Simple justice requires that Congress treat service employees fairly and grant these worthy citizens the protection intended for all workers by the Social Security Act.

Who Would Really Benefit From Federally Controlled Elections?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the Federal Government were to take over the ballot box? Would it really be to the benefit of southern colored citizens?

These are valid questions. They are raised in an interesting editorial which appeared recently in the Talladega Daily Home, a daily newspaper published in the Fourth Alabama District.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial, at the same time commending it to the reading of Members.

The editorial follows:

A DIRE FUTURE FOR MILLIONS IN THE SOUTH

If the Federal Government is allowed to take charge of the southern ballot box, will this give any assurance to the Negro in the South that his future will be improved?

This is a question, which when applied to the masses of southern colored population, deserves some real study by the ardent race fanatics in Washington.

If it is the southern Negro who is being considered, then there must be one answer.

If the vote of northern Negroes is the only consideration than there is entirely a different answer.

Is the overeager Attorney General Rogers at this time thinking about the vote in the northern Negro ghettos, or is he thinking about assistance for the millions of colored people throughout Dixie?

From all the loud sounding action in Washington, there is pretty clear evidence that Mr. Rogers and his ilk care little or nothing for the best interest of the southern Negro.

They appear to be actors on a stage. They do not seem to understand the roles they play. And apparently they care not one tiny mite about the ones they propose to bring a strange new way of life.

The southern population is approximately one-third colored. In all but a very few densely Negro populated areas, the issues when drawn on racial lines will solidify the anti-Negro vote.

As it is many whites exert great effort to aid his colored neighbors. The rapid advances of the ex-slave population proves this. This can come to a fatal end.

If the restrictions are all discarded, there will be heavy increases in Negro voters, but also heavy increases in white voting strength. The increased white voting strength will be largely in a group easily swayed to be anti-colored. The Negro will again gain little or nothing.

In the heavily colored population areas like some of Alabama's black belt counties, most if not all economic power is held closely in white hands. These whites will be forced to close down securely the economic barriers. This they will do, or they will move away like the white inhabitants of the Nation's Capital.

We do not believe the whites will choose to move. Therefore the masses of Negroes will be forced to seek residence elsewhere. The flood tide into Chicago, Philadelphia and other northern areas will really begin to flow. It could become a giant exodus of great import to national affairs.

The great masses of colored people who have a home and a place in these deep South areas, will be forced by the racists, like Rogers, to seek strange and foreign abode. They will be forced by these into northern areas where they are bitterly unwanted.

Who will gain by all this forced civil rights and forced legal action on the South, its registrars, its schools, its courts and its way of life? We can see no one except the selfish politicians, and their gains must be for a fleeting moment.

The great loser and deep sufferer will be the masses of fine colored people who have a place in Dixie and are a vital part of this southern empire.

There can be no other results, not in the lifetime of most of us who are now living and have some close association with the ill-fated controversy.

The Mississippi Valley Association Resolutions Chart a Course of Real Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Valley Association has just completed its annual convention in St. Louis, Mo., and has endorsed a comprehensive program for waterways development that can mean a great deal to America if it is carried out. Among other important projects endorsed by this association is the Cross Florida Barge Canal concerning which its resolutions state is "for the best interest of not only the midcontinent area and the State of Florida, but for the entire country." They urge that the construction be started at the earliest possible date. I sincerely hope that this session of Congress may make funds available for this project, which will not only be a great economic asset to the country but will provide a safe route for war materials—not vulnerable to submarine attack—and thus greatly contribute to the security of our country. The resolutions of this association are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER SYSTEM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

We recommend appropriations for the resumption of advanced planning of Millers Ferry multiple-purpose dam; the initial project in the plan of development of the Alabama River for navigation, flood control, and limited hydroelectric power. The comprehensive plan of development of the Alabama-Coosa River system was authorized in 1945.

We call the attention of Congress to the development of the Coosa River and tributaries for the generation of hydroelectric power by private capital; six dams having been constructed prior to 1929 and in continuous operation since that date. Also, that the 83d Congress suspended authorization of the Coosa River for development of hydroelectric power to permit development by a private utility under a license later issued for the construction of four additional dams and the modification of one existing dam. The license required that all construction be accomplished within a 10-year period from date of start of construction of the first dam which began in July 1958.

We also call the attention of Congress to appropriations heretofore made for planning of the initial project, Millers Ferry Dam, Alabama River; the plans are approximately 38 percent complete. The development of the Alabama River section of the waterway is of such size and complexity that the construction of the three dams on this section of the river will have to be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers. A recent report by the engineers continues to indicate the economic feasibility of both the Alabama and Coosa Rivers for navigation for a distance of approximately 525 river-miles.

We urge Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to resume planning of the initial project in order that the entire plan of development and of the Alabama-Coosa River System can be accomplished without further delay.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

We commend the 86th Congress for appropriating funds to continue construction of major features of this important comprehensive project in Arkansas, Kansas, and Oklahoma.

1. We commend the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army for its success in maintaining the prescribed schedule of work which sometimes was carried on in the face of many difficulties.

2. We commend the Bureau of the Budget for recommending funds for fiscal year 1961 to continue the authorized program in the Arkansas River Basin for flood control, bank stabilization, navigation, water supply, and incidental hydroelectric power.

3. We call to the attention of Congress the importance of starting the final planning of main-stem dams in Oklahoma at Webbers Falls and Short Mountain, and at Ozark in Arkansas, and the need for early construction of these projects.

4. We urge that new construction starts include the Elk City (Table Mound) Dam on the Elk River in Kansas, and that sufficient construction funds be appropriated to get this project under way. Floods in 1959 clearly demonstrated the serious deficiency of flood control storage on this stream.

5. We urge early authorization of the Cheney Division (Ninnescah River) of the Wichita multiple-purpose project. This development is badly needed and the city of Wichita has already voted bonds for the pipeline and agreed to pay its share of the reservoir construction.

6. We urge study of a canal which will provide a connection between the Arkansas-Verdigris navigation channel and the Eufaula Reservoir. It should be less expen-

sive to build this canal now rather than after the locks are built on the Arkansas and after the Eufaula Reservoir has been filled. This could open low cost water transportation to the high quality coal reserves in this area and to its pioneer glass industries.

7. We also urge that funds for bank stabilization be removed from the emergency category and put on a permanent basis, so that the river can help clear the navigation channel of sediment before the upstream reservoirs are closed, thereby reducing the cost of the work materially.

8. It is essential that work on the bank stabilization and navigation features from Fort Smith, Ark., downstream, beginning at the mouth of the Arkansas River, be prosecuted simultaneously with work on the upper reaches as rapidly as possible, to secure the earliest possible return of benefits. It is highly desirable that all bank stabilization work be completed by 1964.

9. We emphasize that the Arkansas River is the only major river in the Nation undeveloped for navigation. We therefore urge Congress to provide adequate funds to continue planning of badly needed authorized projects in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas so that the benefits may be made available at the earliest possible time.

SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY

We urge that the Corps of Engineers continue to expedite the survey now under way, on the engineering and economic feasibility of combining the movement of large volumes of surplus water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural uses from southeastern Oklahoma into central Oklahoma with an extension of the authorized navigation project on the Arkansas River.

CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

We believe that the early completion of the Cross Florida Barge Canal is for the best interest of not only the midcontinent area and the State of Florida, but for the entire country. Planning funds should be immediately appropriated for this project, so that construction can be started at the earliest possible date.

Lithuania's Fortitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include an editorial appearing in the Evening Herald, of Shenandoah, Pa., on February 16, as follows:

LITHUANIA'S FORTITUDE

Today, as a good many millions of Americans of Lithuanian extraction know, marks the 42d anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. It is a national holiday comparable to America's Independence Day.

Tragically, what should be a day of unrestained joy in Lithuania, is totally impossible because of the cruel and ruthless heel of the Russian oppressor. Lithuania like her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, has been in a state of subjugation since 1940.

That year marked the beginning of the modern-day ensiavement of the gallant Lithuanians when the Russians literally confiscated the whole country. Through the medium of military force, the Kremlin heartlessly wiped out Lithuania's independent political status, brazenly announcing to the rest of the world that the people had "voted" to become the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic State.

The Soviet Union's action, a foul stab in the back, made a worthless scrap of paper out of the treaty of 1926, which guaranteed Lithuania's sovereignty.

Then and there ended, for the time being, the freedom and liberty enjoyed since February 16, 1918, when Lithuania was recognized by the world as Free State.

The callous Soviet domination was interrupted during World War II when Hitler's murderous Nazis occupied the stricken land. But when the tides of war reversed, the Red tyrants returned. They remain in power today. This is why Lithuanians are unable to celebrate their independence day; to do so would mean instant punitive measures.

In contrast to the most harsh measures endured during Josef Stalin's regime, conditions these days have eased to a considerable degree in Lithuania. Certain types of mail are now processed although the ban remains on religious articles of any description. Packages of food and clothing may be sent into the country. However, the wily Communists impose near-prohibitive duty costs. Imposts on such packages sent to those in need are almost twice the actual value of the contents.

Garrisons throughout Lithuania are maintained at full strength by the Soviet military. Any open display of patriotism brings immediate punishment. Even the brave underground resistance no longer can strike back because the patriots lack access to arms and ammunition.

The puppet government officials, mostly Russian-born, do exactly what they are told by the Kremlin. And the substitution of Lithuanian family groups by Russian citizens has not ceased. The loyal Lithuanians are sent to Siberia; the Russian substitutes move into the empty homes and assume legitimate Lithuanian identities.

Many of the numerous and historic churches have long since been confiscated by the Reds and turned into theatres of warehouses. Where once there were 15 churches in Kaunas, there now remains one. Worship is permitted but the Reds intensify brainwashing of the younger Lithuanians.

There is no formal religious training or instruction whatsoever. Under its national government, Lithuania had three seminaries with close to 1,000 studying for the priesthood. Today, there is only one; enrollment dare not exceed 170 at any given time.

The evil inconsistency of all this is readily apparent in the Soviet Union's international policies. Freedom for colonies in Asia and Africa, shoults the Kremlin. But not a word about the slave status of Lithuania and her neighbors.

So Lithuania's 42d independence day necessarily must be celebrated in such freedom-blessed nations as these United States. Here at home and in communities adjacent to Shenandoah, those of Lithuanian descent are joined by fellow citizens in extending a heartfelt salute to the people of Lithuania for their remarkable fortitude.

That history shall again repeat by confirming the reality of Lithuania's independence through restoration of the Republic of Lithuania is the wish of those who cherish liberty across the face of the globe.

Missile Gap Controversy—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD two articles from a series by Ray Cromley which appeared in the issues of February 8 and 9, 1960, of the New York World-Telegram and Sun.

These articles are most timely, since they deal with the current controversy over the missile gap in our defenses. They are written by a veteran Pentagon reporter in an unbiased manner and in the national interest. I commend them to the attention of all my colleagues:

[From the New York World Telegram & Sun, Feb. 8, 1960]

COULD REDS DEFEAT UNITED STATES?

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—This is how not to be confused as we go into month of political battling over U.S. defense:

First, tell yourself the United States does not have the small war deterrent power to prevent Nikita Khrushchev from expanding in such areas as the Middle East.

Then admit that U.S. strategists haven't figured out how to keep Russia from devastating a great portion of the United States if she wants to try a sneak first blow.

Note that in overall strategic kill power the United States overshadows Soviet Russia in 1960.

Finally, concede that in 2 to 4 years there will be a disparity between our strength and Russia's which may or may not be critical, depending upon how fast Russia manufactures intercontinental ballistic missiles and how fast America's countermeasures come along.

TWENTY-ONE INTERVIEWS

These statements are made on the basis of discussion with 21 men in Washington who are in positions to know the state of U.S. defense.

Some of these men vote Democratic, some Republican. None is a politician. None wants to be quoted. Most are key military research or technical men in the Department of Defense and key foreign affairs agencies. Some are in key defense companies.

They differ on details of what should be done—and on what the Russians might do next. But on the key questions of balance of power there is very little disagreement.

They agree that the Soviet Union cannot knock out the United States, nor destroy our power to devastate the U.S.S.R. in a retaliatory blow.

They agree that speeding production on current U.S. missiles is not the answer to the possible serious danger in the missile gap period of 1962–64.

RUSSIANS AHEAD

They agree that the Russians are furthest ahead of the United States in their numbers of modernly equipped and mobile ground forces.

"Khrushchev keeps talking big about ICBM's," says one Pentagon planner, "but he keeps putting huge amounts of funds into modernizing his ground armies."

The United States is woefully weak on land.

U.S. armies are also limping along for want of air transport.

If United States and Soviet troops had to race for a trouble zone, the battle might be lost before American troops arrived.

On the seas, the United States far outclasses the Soviet in aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and troop transports. But there's reason to fear that 300 Soviet subs, capable of operating on the high seas, could devastate U.S. troop and cargo convoys and raise havoc with carrier task forces.

But for combined air-missile strategic power it's a different story.

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED BOMBERS

The United States has 1,600 intercontinental jet bombers scattered on 70 bases. It's believed over half could survive a sneak

Russian attack in 1960. Around 500 are on permanent 15-minute alert. U.S. defense men estimate three-fourths of those left could get through Soviet aid defense and bomb Russia.

The Soviet Union has 250 to 500 usable intercontinental bombers, but with no overseas refueling basis. U.S. defense men think the bulk would be lost in a sneak attack on the United States, unless U.S. fighter and missile defenses were asleep.

The United States could mount a carrier bomber force of 125 planes capable of hitting Russia with nuclear bombs.

There are about 60 Thor intermediate range missiles in England and something over 150 Air Force fighter bombers on bases close enough to bomb Red-held territory.

NO DEFENSE

The Soviet now has about 10 intercontinental ballistic missiles. They could probably knock out three major U.S. targets, four if the Reds were lucky. There is no defense against them in 1960.

Russia also has a few submarines with short-range missiles—capable of hitting U.S. coasts.

The United States has seven or eight ICBM's, no operating missile subs yet.

The military estimate based on this strength picture is that:

Russia will keep attempting in the immediate future to whittle way at the frontiers. Khrushchev will not attempt world war III.

The United States will continue trying to convince Russia that whittling might lead to world war III. Therefore Russia had better not take chances.

EXPERTS ON DEFENSE OUTLINE THE FACTS

Ray Cromley talked to 21 men in key civilian and military jobs in Washington to gather the facts for this series. Here are some of the questions he asked them, and the almost unanimous answers they gave him.

"Question. Can the Soviet Union knock out the United States?

"Answer. No, but the Reds could do a terrifying amount of damage.

"Question. Could the Reds knock out our power to retaliate and devastate the Soviet Union in return?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Is there a possible serious danger in the much talked about missile gap period of 1962–64?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Should we speed production and close the missile gap now?

"Answer. No, that would be even more dangerous. Today's missiles are too vulnerable to sneak attack.

"Question. Is the United States strong enough to deter the Soviet from deliberately starting World War III?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Are the Reds ahead of the United States in intercontinental ballistic missiles in quality and numbers?

"Answer. Yes, in both.

"Question. Are the Russians ahead of the United States in overall strategic military strength?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Where are the Russians furthest ahead of the United States?

"Answer. In superbly equipped and mobile ground armies.

"Question. Is the Soviet Union moving ahead in military strength faster than the United States?

"Answer. Probably.

"Question. Is this because they're spending more money?

"Answer. No, the best estimate is that the Soviet Union and the United States are spending approximately the same amount on arms.

"Question. Is the United States spending enough money on national security?

"Answer. Probably.

"Question. Is the United States spending its defense dollars wisely?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Where is the Soviet Union spending more of its funds?

"Answer. On research.

"Question. Where is the United States overspending?

"Answer. First, on producing obsolescent missiles; second, on fixed maginot-line type defenses against bombers."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Feb. 9, 1960]

UNITED STATES BETTING ON SUPER BOMBERS, POLARIS-FIRING SUBS FOR DEFENSE

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The United States is staking its future on the gamble that in the crucial years 1962–64 the supersonic bomber and the Polaris-firing submarine are more vital to national defense than the international ballistic missile.

By 1963, the midpoint of this period, the United States will have:

Two hundred and forty Polaris 1,500-mile-range ballistic missiles aboard 15 atomic-powered submarines.

About 500 B–52 bombers, many able to stand 500 miles off Russian targets and lob in Hound Dog missiles.

One hundred and sixteen 1,500-mile-an-hour B–58 bombers. Eight hundred B–47's.

About 250 Titan and Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles, most on hard and semihard sites. (A "hard" site is one which could only be knocked out by a direct hit. It's difficult to "harden" a site for liquid fueled rockets.)

Twelve aircraft carriers—each with atom-carrying bombers.

Against this, the Russians in 1963 presumably will have:

Some 650 ICBM's.

Less than 175 operational intercontinental bombers. Some may carry Hound Dog-type missiles.

Probably a half-dozen or less Polaris-type nuclear submarines. But several dozen or more submarines capable of firing 300-mile missiles.

Since Russia would hit first in any future war, all Red planes and missiles would be available for the first attack.

As for the United States, a fourth of the intercontinental bombers will be kept in the air at all times in periods of extreme emergency. These should escape destruction in a sneak attack. A fourth of those on 15-minute alert might escape destruction if U.S. defenses are not caught napping.

A third to a fourth of the U.S. ICBMs should escape destruction.

Presumably three-fourths of the Polaris-firing submarines will be hidden and therefore could come through the first blow unscathed.

This Soviet first blow destruction would leave the United States a combined striking force of ICBMs, Polaris-firing submarines and missile-firing intercontinental bombers able to wreak terrible destruction on the Soviet Union.

ONE SHOT DEALS

If the American strategic planners, whose consensus I am reporting, have things figured right, the United States—even after absorbing the initial blow—should be able to hit the Soviet with more destruction than was thrown at us.

Further, most of the Russian attack force would be one-shot deals—ICBM's shoot just once.

But missile-firing Polaris submarines and long-range missile-firing planes would be able to reload and go back for repeated attacks upon a partially disarmed enemy.

Now for the nonstrategic forces.

By 1962–64 the U.S. surface Navy will be in pretty bad shape. There will be a small nucleus of modern and modernized ships. But many of the carriers and other vessels will be overage.

IN BETTER SHAPE

The U.S. Army will be in better shape than it is now. But it will be worse off compared to the Russian Army. The Army modernization plan was to have begun in 1959 and be completed by 1963 or 1964.

But the plan hasn't gone through. Instead there's a stretch-out modernization plan which at present rates will mean a modernized American Army sometime around 1972.

Meanwhile, the Russians continue to pour modern equipment into their armies.

Invoke the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, here in Washington there are many viewpoints on whether we should do this or that and of course, conservative Americans have this viewpoint expressed in the editorial that appeared in the Lebanon Daily News for February 15, 1960.

It also brings to my mind the old adage—lend a friend money and make an enemy.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to is as follows, together with a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Sheldon John Shale of Cornwall, Pa., praising the Lebanon Daily News for their forthright presentation:

FEBRUARY 16, 1960.

Mr. HENRY L. WILDER,
Publisher,
Lebanon Daily News,
Lebanon, Pa.

DEAR MR. WILDER: The editorial "Invoke the Monroe Doctrine" printed in your last night's issue of the Lebanon Daily News is an excellent presentation. I trust that everyone of your readers took the time to read it and that they will want to express their convictions about the serious Cuban situation.

Too often local newspapers tend to portray a narrow or bigoted point of view, as well as involving personalities. In this instance your editorial staff is to be commended for reminding us of the Monroe Doctrine and its ramifications. I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of the editorial to Congressman MUMMA with a copy of this letter in the hope that he, too, will begin to encourage the State Department to stiffen its attitude. What better definition for "colonization" is there than the constant influx of Communist agents and their increasing activities?

Sincerely,

SHELDON J. SHALE.

INVOKE THE MONROE DOCTRINE

In 1823, the young United States of America could hardly be considered as strong as a third-rate power. But the American Government in those days had guts. It stood up for its rights as a Nation and for the rights of its citizens.

Russia, Austria and Prussia formed into what they termed the "Holy Alliance," the main objective of which was to end the system of representative government in the former provinces of Spain in the Western Hemisphere.

All three were powerful countries. But that didn't deter the United States. Our President then was James Monroe. He issued a proclamation warning foreign countries that the Western Hemisphere was "henceforth not to be considered as subject for colonization." By colonization, internal penetration and subversion was also meant.

That pronouncement by President Monroe became the cornerstone of American foreign policy. And so it has remained—that is, until Fidel Castro took over in Cuba.

Castro is an agent of Russia, one of the three nations at which the original Monroe Doctrine was aimed. The Castro regime is nothing but an extension of Russian communism, a mere 90 miles from Miami, Fla.

But do we hear our State Department talking about the Monroe doctrine now? For some reason, known only to themselves, the men directing our foreign policy have conveniently forgotten that the Monroe Doctrine exists.

So what do we find? We find Cuba crawling with agents representing the Russian and the Chinese versions of world communism.

And do we invoke the Monroe Doctrine and give Fidel Castro and his Communist agents 24 hours to get out.

Up until now we haven't. We have followed a pink-laced, pantywaist policy of appeasing Castro with a few weak protests which Fidel probably looks at for his daily laugh.

And we continue to subsidize sugar exports from Cuba.

Meanwhile weak-kneed Uncle Sam is becoming the laughing stock of Latin America.

It is time for the United States to stop this nonsense.

It is time we invoke the Monroe Doctrine, just like we did in 1823.

It is time we issue an ultimatum to Castro.

And if Castro ignores it, then we must embargo all Cuban exports to this country. If that doesn't force him into line, we must declare a naval blockade and starve him into submission.

To land the Marines will hardly be necessary. Cuba needs exports and imports for survival.

Americans with the red blood of patriotism running through their veins are asking, "When will the United States begin acting like the United States and remove this cancerous growth of Castro communism, which is now entrenched 90 miles from our shores?"

The New Sugar Daddy From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, traditional and longstanding friendship of the American and Cuban peoples requires that we take under serious consideration any step that might change those relationships. The recent contract concluded at a favorable price for the Soviet Union, in contrast to existing market obligations in contracts with this country, raise an issue. How long should we go on turning the other cheek?

The attached article, written in Havana by James Reston, appeared in the New York Times of February 14, 1960. It merits attention and reflection. Cuba's new sugar market in Russia of a million tons a year raises serious questions for both the Department of State and the Congress. How much longer can we continue, for instance, to deny friendly countries such as Brazil, Mexico, and Peru a reasonable share of our sugar market?

I respect the troubled considerations expressed by the Secretary of State in discussing these issues. I believe they should be posed, however, for the reflection of all.

The article follows:

HAVANA—THE NEW "SUGAR DADDY" FROM MOSCOW

(By James Reston)

HAVANA, February 13.—Cuba has a new "sugar daddy" today, the Soviet Union's top traveling salesman, Mr. Anastas I. Mikoyan, and the question now is whether she can also keep old Uncle Sam on the string.

If she can, she'll be doing fine, but as every woman knows, two "sugar daddies" at once are an extremely complicated operation.

Mr. Mikoyan has made clear here that there is a limit to Moscow's generosity. This is no grant-in-aid or nest egg he is making to Cuba: it is a $100 million loan at 2½ percent interest: it is very largely a buy-Russian loan, which would make Cuba at least partly dependent on Soviet machinery parts and technicians, and that is not all.

Mainly, Cuba would sell her sugar to the Soviet Union at the world price of around 3 cents a pound. Earlier in the week, Mikoyan bought 345,000 tons here at 2.78 cents a pound. This is not only less than the world price, but is less than the 4 cents a pound it costs Cuba to produce the sugar, and is almost half of the subsidized price of 5.25 cents a pound paid by old Uncle Sugar.

So Cuba is taking quite a gamble. She is betting that she can play footsie with Mikoyan, expropriate U.S. property in Cuba, and still retain a U.S. sugar subsidy of more than $100 million a year above the world price.

WHO'LL PERSUADE CONGRESS?

This raises an interesting political question in Washington. How, for example, would you like to go to Capitol Hill and argue on behalf of an economy-minded administration that the Appropriations Committee should vote to continue paying $100 million-a-year subsidy to Cuba, whose officials and press are vilifying the United States and moving closer economically and politically to the Soviet Union?

Fidel Castro, whose experience with any Congress is strictly limited, has started more political hares running with this deal than he apparently realizes. Washington is full of lobbyists arguing against the Cuban subsidy, demanding more sugar production in the United States, and urging a larger share of the U.S. sugar market for Mexico, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Nicaragua.

Even before today's Soviet-Cuban deal was made, U.S. officials here were having trouble holding the line against those in Washington who thought the U.S. subsidy to Castro's government should be cut or eliminated.

The argument of U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal was that the Cuban people should not be punished for the follies of their government.

It was also part of his argument that if the United States continued the sugar subsidy in spite of the anti-American attitude of the Castro regime, the other Latin American governments would take this as final proof that the United States would not use its economic power against them, even when provoked.

SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Now, however, even those officials here who were making these arguments to the State Department are on the defensive. For they now have to explain what will happen in the rest of Latin America if Cuba can benefit from Soviet trade, expropriate U.S. property, and still be subsidized by the United States to the tune of over $100 million a year.

Finally there is the Soviet aspect of the deal. U.S. officials here frankly felt that Moscow would not risk a deterioration of relations with the United States just before a summit meeting in order to improve Soviet relations with Cuba.

The Russians have now done so, however, and there was considerable spectulation here tonight that they were trying to demonstrate that, if Washington refused to recognize Moscow's sphere of influence in Eastern Europe and on the southern borders of the Soviet Union, or Peking's sphere of influence in the Formosa Straits, the Soviet Union would not continue to recognize our sphere of influence even in the islands off our shores.

Where Marx Went Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently an outstanding member of the administration, Mr. George C. Lodge, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs, gave an address under the following title: "Where Marx Went Wrong—An Analysis of the Economic System of the United States." It is an excellent presentation. Mr. Lodge wrote it in order to provide a brief interpretation of our system for the use of others abroad and to dispel some of the misunderstanding that people abroad have about our economic life. Such misunderstanding particularly exists among peoples in less developed countries.

Mr. Lodge has been a fine representative of the United States in a series of international conferences. He has the high respect of management and labor alike and is one of the ablest public servants that we have in Washington. Space does not permit me to insert in the RECORD the full text of Mr. Lodge's paper but, with unanimous consent, I am appending hereto a much edited version:

WHERE MARX WENT WRONG—AN ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

(By George C. Lodge, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs)

While we ourselves use the word capitalism in describing our economic order, it bears little or no resemblance to the monopoly-capitalism of the 18th and 19th centuries. Contrary to the teachings of Marx, our economic system has in fact proven to be a spectacularly effective means for the creation and just distribution of wealth. Aris-

ing from free business competition, among people enjoying political democracy, the American way has been and is more revolutionary than the state capitalism practiced today by the followers of Marxism-Leninism. In fact, it renders the Marxian view of capitalism, socialism and communism obsolete. Soviet Communists today are fighting a ghost. The monopoly-capitalism that Mr. Khrushchev boasts he will bury has long since died in the United States—if it ever existed. It has been converted into the most effective and egalitarian social system the world has yet known.

But we have difficulty communicating our experience to others. As Jacques Maritain has told us:

"You are advancing in the night, bearing torches toward which mankind would be glad to turn; but you leave them enveloped in the fog of a merely experiential approach and mere practical conceptualization, with no universal idea to communicate. For back of adequate ideology, your lights cannot be seen."

THE PROBLEM

Our wealth does not dazzle the foreigner with the virtues of America. The people of less developed countries are not particularly affected by statistics on how many cars are in American garages or television sets in American living rooms or bathrooms in American homes. After all, dictatorships are often efficient producers of goods. They see little relationship between our horn of plenty and their problems. The system by which our horn has been filled is simply known to them as capitalism, without qualification, and this word arouses almost unanimous animosity because it embodies attitudes and images of Dickensian exploitation which have been overcome in the United States for some years. In many foreign countries a capitalist is thought of as the economic descendant of the feudal lords who once were their rulers; as the representative of monopoly business, depositing his profits in foreign countries, with little sense of social justice or community responsibility. Capitalism is also a word associated with colonialism and exploitative land tenure, with the man who takes everything and gives nothing.

There is little understanding abroad of the role the U.S. Government plays in protecting the public aganist abuses of economic power and thus leaders of developing countries often find it difficult to see why our economic system should not follow the course laid down by Marx, the rich getting richer, the poor, poorer and the robber baron increasingly rapacious.

To the average man in most of the developing countries of the world, whose chief economic concern is keeping body and soul together, a capitalist is the curse of the poor, the villain in the Communist morality play, the local money lender, the black marketeer. Unfortunately, most entrepreneurs in these countries do little to change the image. Many of them look upon a 40 percent profit from investments and 60 percent from the yield of rented land as being a normal annual reward, while wages in these same countries are often below the subsistence level.

Often leaders of less developed countries have turned to socialism and socialist practices not so much to place the means of production in the hands of government as to assure that production facilities will be used with some measure of social justice. Very often these leaders fail to see that we have produced in our free, competitive system forms of social justice not generally associated with capitalism.

It is not realistic to expect other countries, particularly those of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, to adopt our system as it is. The most we can hope for is that through a proper understanding of our economic order the peoples of foreign countries may know and understand us better and may possibly find portions of our experience which may be helpful.

The American system is evolving fast. There has been no time to articulate for it a proper classical philosophical base. Its essential characteristic is efficient, competitive production causing economic progress through social justice by democratic means. It is a creature of our political system—pragmatic, responsive to the will of the people and subject to countless checks and balances imposed internally by labor, management and competition, and externally by government In contrast to Marxian socialism, communism or exploitative capitalism, economic decisions in our system are the sum of countless individual decisions rather than edicts handed down either by a handful of robber barons or by the State. The public consensus is the final arbiter of power in the American economy. If the public consensus is not recognized, the State intervenes. Basic to the success of the American businessman is his own realization that he must serve before he gets.

THREE NEW ELEMENTS

Laissez-faire capitalism was, as Adolph Berle has noted, transformed in America by three elements, all of which are revolutionary in character, but none of which ever contemplated blowing up the whole system.

1. The first was the development of the professionally managed American corporation which replaced individual or family owners and tycoons and moguls, interested only in building personal fortunes. Two-thirds of American industry is today carried on by about 500 corporations. Were these the possession of 500 families or individuals we would probably be suffering from exploitative capitalism. But they are not. The economic power of the corporations is widely distributed and becoming steadily more the possession of the many rather than the few. Actually our corporations have about 12,500,000 direct stockholders. Even more important a large and growing amount of their stock is held by institutions, pension trusts, insurance companies, mutual funds, etc. Probably 50 million Americans receive a share of the profits of the 500 corporations through investment in these institutions

Thus corporations have become in a very real sense public, rather than private, enterprises, serving a large and growing body of stockholders, offering jobs to millions, as well as supplying an enormous consumer population. They are public and yet they are not of the State.

The managers of these corporations are not owners; they have been called nonstatist civil servants. The corporate system at present is thus operating to "socialize" or "peopleize" American industry but without the intervention of the political state.

2. Secondly, organized labor has become a permanent and powerful element in the American economic system. The American worker has never thought of himself as a member of the oppressed proletariat. Through his union he has become an equal partner in the labor-management relationship and bargains collectively normally without the intervention of Government to secure a just share of the fruits of his labor. Instead of the American worker in a capitalist society becoming progressively poorer, he has become progressively richer. During the past 30 years real wages of workers have risen about 3 percent annually, or 30 percent in each decade, helping the American worker to achieve the highest living standards of any worker in the world. A coal miner, for example, gets between $25 and $28 a day. Real family income, adjusted for change in the value of the dollar, has risen 50 percent in 10 years.

3. Perhaps most important, public concensus has persistently refused to permit the American Government to become an expression of the ownership class as Marx predicted.

We live under what in fact many would describe as a welfare state which seeks to put a floor below which no one can sink but builds no ceiling to prevent a man from rising.

In the less developed areas of the world and even in Western Europe there is little awareness that Government expenditures for various social insurance programs in the United States are around $12.5 billion annually; that another $25 billion or more is expended each year by Federal, State and local governments under various other social welfare programs, such as public welfare, public health and medical care, child welfare, aid to veterans, public housing and education; that in addition, contributions to private health and welfare funds are currently being made at a rate of $8 billion a year; and that the total of $46 billion amounts to roughly a tenth of the current gross national product.

Few Asians and Africans have any idea that the United States has an elaborate unemployment compensation system and few realize the extent of our agricultural programs and Federal power establishments. It has been estimated that in the United States 20 percent of the gross national product is disposed of by the various levels of Government; in India the figure is only 10 percent. Such figures point to the difficulty of using the words capitalism and socialism with respect to the United States and countries like India today.

In our country, all corporations except the smallest must pay 52 percent of their profit to the Federal Government, in addition to many other taxes. We have a steeply graduated income tax which at the upper levels rises above 80 percent. Eleven percent of the American taxpayers that is, those earning over $8,000 a year—pay 51 percent of the personal income taxes.

The Government regularly invades what might be regarded as the normal sphere of private enterprise to do what it cannot do or do so well, whether it be build a Tennessee Valley Authority, provide electric service to rural communities or advise, regulate and assist the farmer. It is important to note that this sort of governmental activity is not a matter of doctrine or ideology. It is rather the pragmatic voice of the people speaking through the State to get some particular thing accomplished that needs doing.

In the last century when free competition was threatened by abuses, concentrating too much power in the hands of a few to the detriment of the many, Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, curbing monopolies and establishing the principle in law that everyone has a right to become a capitalist.

When unscrupulous businessmen sought to palm off on the public dangerous medicine and adulterated foods, Congress passed the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1905, regulating producers. Times have changed since then and today the majority of goods and services are guaranteed to satisfy the customer, the trademark has become a valued and trusted mark of confidence.

ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS AND COOPERATIVES

While there is, to be sure, great concentration of power in the corporations of America, the role of small business should not be underestimated. Despite the giant corporations, there is room and need for the small family enterprises similar to those which exist throughout the world.

Of all retail establishments in the United States, over one-third are run by the proprietor, with no paid employees. Over an-

other third have five or fewer employees. Together their sales volume is over one-third of all retail sales, including those of the large retail chainstores.

Raymond W. Miller has estimated that there are more than 100,000 manufacturing enterprises in the United States—nearly 40 percent of all manufacturers—with fewer than five workers. Some 240,000, or over 80 percent of all manufacturers, employ fewer than 50.

Mr. Miller writes:

"The nonprofit cooperative enterprise is a fundamental part of the American business scene, recognized and respected throughout the Nation.

"To quote the National Association of Manufacturers:

" 'A "cooperative" is a form of business enterprise that enables a group of individuals, partnerships, or corporations to combine together for the purpose of producing or buying or selling a commodity or service. City consumers have gotten together to buy goods and sell them. Businessmen have formed mutual fire insurance companies. Individuals join together to buy life insurance through a mutual insurance company or merchandise through a mutual wholesale purchasing association. People who save money put their funds in a mutual savings bank. Farmers join together to buy goods they use in production or to sell the things they grow. All of these are "cooperatives." They are also legitimate forms of private enterprise.' "

Grapefruit-Sized "Brain" Beats Computers in Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story written by Mr. Roger Stuart which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on February 1, 1960; a press release by the Republic Aviation Corp. dated Saturday, January 30, 1960; and a statement by Mr. Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic Aviation Corp., at an American Legion panel on manned aircraft held on Saturday, January 30, 1960, at American Legion headquarters in Washington:

GRAPEFRUIT BRAIN BEATS COMPUTERS IN OUTER SPACE

(By Roger Stuart)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—An American Legion panel on manned aircraft here was told today about a small, grapefruit-sized computer of marvelous achievements, which requires only a tenth of a volt of electricity, yet can digest incoming data and transmit answers in fractions of a second.

Information concerning the computer, it was explained, had been given to Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic Aviation Corp., in a memorandum prepared by a member of the company's engineering department.

Mr. Peale, scheduled to address the meeting, was ill. So Kenneth Ellington, Republic vice president, was assigned to read the text of his speech, including details of the memorandum—which Mr. Peale had planned to give at the outset of his remarks.

The computer's repaid digestion of incoming data and transmission of answers, it was noted, is done by some 15 million tiny, individual message relay centers all linked together. This marvelous little machine is reported to have 10,000 times the memory storage capacity of the best of today's giant brain, and they estimate it can store information for as long as 60 to 90 years.

The memo concluded that, from the point of view of development and production costs * * * the basic unit can be built for well under $100 and by reasonably unskilled labor.

Suggesting that a device like this could some day obsolete the human brain, the Peale speech text added:

"But have no fear of this, for what I have been describing—as I'm sure some of you have already guessed—is the human brain!"

The aviation executive said he hoped you will pardon my deception, but in my opinion this little homemade story puts a finger on what is really the nub of this question about the future of manned aircraft.

For the "simple facts of the matter," according to Mr. Peale, "are, we haven't yet learned how to make or build any black box that can outperform or outthink the human brain—or, more specifically, possess the vison, the judgment, or the reasoning power of a skilled pilot."

A truly effective weapons system, he declared, must have the flexibility and capability which only a skilled man can give it.

Suggesting that he qualified as something of an expert concerning missiles as well as manned aircraft, since his company has manufactured both for years, Mr. Peale gave it as his conviction that aircraft and missiles "complement one another"—and that both will continue in use.

As wars are fought nowadays, whether of the brush type or general warfare, he said, "low-level-flying supersonic aircraft are a means of supporting ground forces and will continue to play a critical role."

And when, he continued, the state of missile art reaches the degree of development now enjoyed by manned aircraft, "they will still not fully take over our defensive burdens because in that time—or perhaps even before then—we will have new generations of aircraft tailored to a number of missions. * * *"

Beyond the vertical-takeoff aircraft, according to Mr. Peale, will be "still other variations—and generations—of aircraft. * * * Some, obviously, will take us into the outer space regions, and they will be different in design and appearance from aircraft as we know them today.

"But, and this is a key to the situation, they will be manned."

AF PILOT'S ROLE SECURE, EXPERT SAYS

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 30.—The day of the manned aircraft in military combat is far from over, an aircraft industry expert declared here today.

"We haven't yet learned how to make or build any black box that can outperform or outthink the human brain, or which possesses the vision or the judgment of a skilled pilot," said Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic Aviation Corp.

Peale told an American Legion panel studying the question of the future of manned aircraft as a weapon system that "manned aircraft have the ability to evade radar detection by treetop approach or electronic countermeasure" they are capable of defending themselves en route; they can change course without previous planning and, at the business end of the mission, are still the most accurate and reliable means for delivering bombs."

He pointed out that the same electronic devices that have made missiles possible have also increased the usefulness and extended the life of manned aircraft.

"The nuclear weapons, which give military meaning to missiles, have also augmented the striking power of any given manned aircraft. A single fighter with this capability has a thousand times more the striking power than that of a World War II B-17. In fact, a manned aircraft can today carry a greater load than any known ballistic missile, he added.

Peale, whose Long Island aircraft firm has built some $4 billion worth of military aircraft, said that in either a limited war or in a general war situation the tactical role served by manned aircraft is critical and will continue in importance for years to come.

As examples of jobs still performed best by a plane with a pilot, Peale cited such missions as the support of ground troops, the attacks on "targets or opportunity," those that arise suddenly, and the destruction of relatively small targets such as a bridge or missile launching site.

At the same time, he said, manned aircraft have the dual capability of handling general war missions where either long-range targets are involved or the requirements are fro massive retaliation.

Beyond those generations of military aircraft now flying, Peale said he saw families of vertical takeoff aircraft (VTOL) such as supersonic fighter-bombers. These, he said, would have the capability of rising or landing vertically so that historic dependence upon formal bases, facilities and runways would be eliminated.

"A VTOL weapons system," he added, "capable of operating from unprepared fields or roads, adds tremendous flexibility to our deterrent forces—flexibility and capability difficult, if not impossible, to match with anything but a manned weapons system."

REMARKS OF MUNDY I. PEALE, PRESIDENT OF REPUBLIC AVIATION CORP., AT AMERICAN LEGION PANEL ON MANNED AIRCRAFT, WASHINGTON, D.C., SATURDAY, JANUARY 30, 1960

Dr. Danforth, Congressman Brooks, Mr. Newlon, Mr. Abbott, gentlemen, before I begin my formal comments, I'd like to take a moment to tell you about a memorandum I received the other day from one of the people in our engineering department. It has a bearing on our discussion this morning.

Actually, this memo tells about a small, grapefruit-sized computer. It requires only a tenth of a volt of electricity—as you probably know even a flashlight needs 20 to 40 times that much—yet it can digest incoming data and transmit the answers in fractions of a second. The memo goes on to point out that this is done by some 15 million tiny, individual message relay centers all linked together. This marvelous little machine is reported to have 10,000 times the memory storage capacity of the best of today's giant "brain," and they estimate it can store information for as long as 60 to 90 years.

From the point of view of development and production costs—and this caught my eye—the basic unit can be built for well under $100 and by reasonably unskilled labor.

Now, if what they claim here is true, a device like this could someday obsolete the human brain—and we'd have no need of discussions such as today's.

But have no fear of this, for what I have been describing—as I'm sure some of you have already guessed—is the human brain.

Now, I hope you will pardon my deception, but in my opinion this little homemade story puts a finger on what is really the nub of this question about the future of manned aircraft.

The simple facts of the matter are, we haven't yet learned how to make or build any black box that can outperform or outthink the human brain * * * or, more specifically, possess the vision, the judgment, or the reasoning power of a skilled pilot.

Nor do I anticipate that we will learn how to design such units within our lifetimes.

A truly effective weapons system must have the flexibility and capability which only a skilled trained man can give it.

I am in both the airplane and the missile business. Our firm has built some $4 billion worth of military aircraft during its nearly 30 years of aircraft production. Through 2 major wars and in 17 limited wars I've seen what aircraft and men can do as a team.

At the same time, I'm no stranger to missiles either. Few people realize it, but Republic held the first missile production contract ever let—that was back in 1944 when the Government asked us to analyze and duplicate the V–1 rockets * * * and we produced nearly 1,400 of them. Today, we have a missiles systems division which just marked one of its best years since it was formed in 1952.

This may not qualify me as an expert, but at least I belong to both lodges.

But let's get back to the subject at hand.

I believe I know my field—and as far as missiles are concerned—I am willing to accept the claims of their most ardent supporters. There is no point in getting sidetracked by technical arguments over the respective capabilities of hardware. In my opinion, the entire picture can be brought into proper focus by looking directly at some of the broader noncontroversial areas. Some of these are so obvious that they are almost always overlooked.

First, let me say this: No responsible military authority that I've ever talked to thinks solely in terms of missiles replacing aircraft. They think entirely in terms of the job to be done and the most effective way to do it. In many instances missiles of a variety of sizes and complexities constitute the best tool for the job, so they are selected.

In still other areas—perhaps fewer, it is true, than in previous years—manned aircraft will be required. As weapons systems, aircraft and missiles complement one another.

Air supremacy, according to every Air Force report I've ever read, depends upon the ability to penetrate all targets no matter how well they are defended. Manned aircraft possess the ability to evade radar detection by tree-top approach or electronic countermeasures; they are capable of defending themselves en route; they can change or alter course without previous planning and, at the business end of the mission, they still are the most accurate reliable means for delivering bombs.

Manned weapons systems also provide the most positive means of identifying other manned bombers so that the latter can be stopped before they penetrate the defense zone, or before they can drop their bombs or launch air-to-surface missiles.

Reconnaissance satellites or missiles with automatic equipment will not be accurate enough or reliable enough to be considered for this vital mission for at least another 10 years, most experts say.

These then, are the general qualifications for the continued importance upon manned aircraft or weapons systems. They are clear-cut and I think logical to anyone who looks at the picture clearly.

And, as it is with anything in the defense picture, cost enters the discussion.

Initially, if you but compare unit costs, missiles would seem to have the edge. A recent report I read priced a squadron of Thors—that is about 15 missiles—at $15 million, whereas an equal number of high-speed interceptors or fighterbombers would probably cost about $20 million, give and take a few million, depending upon what figures you use (and there are enough of them around these days, I might add).

But, we must remember that a missile is a one-shot affair—a manned aircraft can be used hundreds of times.

In a very real sense a modern, all-automatic aircraft like our own F–105D is a missile with return capability.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the very electronic devices that have made missiles possible have also increased the usefulness and extended the life of manned aircraft.

The nuclear weapons—which give the military meaning to missiles—have augmented the striking power of any given manned aircraft. A single fighter with this capability has a thousand times more striking power than that of a B–17 in World War II. In fact, a manned aircraft can today carry a greater load than any known ballistic missile.

And, finally, you get down to the mission to be performed. Will it be an all-out nuclear war? We all certainly pray that it won't come to this. What is more likely to happen—most experts agree—is that we will continue to have the series of cold or limited war situations like those we've experienced since 1945.

If you accept this, we should then look at the role of a weapons system in light of both the very special needs of a regional or limited-area war, as well as, the requirements demanded by a general war.

Manned aircraft can alone offer this dual capability. Let's consider the first situation—limited war.

Here, the targets will be relatively small—targets like airfields and towns instead of huge industrial complexes and large cities. Pinpoint, precision bombing is demanded. It would be very difficult to destroy a long bridge without destroying the town, with anything but a manned aircraft. They are also the only safe way of limiting destruction to strictly military targets.

Basic military strategy in coping with a limited war situation is first to have a mobile force ready for a show of strength at any point in the world to prevent the outbreak of a shooting war and, failing that, to swiftly perform armed missions to aid friendly forces.

In a general war, as well as local conflicts, low-level flying supersonic aircraft are a means of supporting ground forces which in any war situation will continue to play a critical role.

And when the state of missile art reaches the degree of development we now enjoy with manned aircraft, they still will not fully take over our defensive burdens because in that time—or perhaps, even before then—we will have new generations of aircraft tailored to a number of missions in either a general or a limited war.

I'm referring to vertical take-off (VTOL) aircraft. * * * Supersonic fighterbomber capable of rising or landing vertically so that the historic dependence upon formal bases, facilities and runways is eliminated.

A VTOL weapons system, capable of operating from unprepared fields or roads, adds tremendous flexibility to our deterrent forces—flexibility and capability difficult, if not impossible, to match with anything but a manned aircraft.

And beyond this there are still other variations—and generations—of aircraft, many on our own drawing boards back at Republic. Some, obviously, will take us into the outer space regions, and they'll be different in design and appearance from aircraft as we know them today.

But, and this is a key to the situation, they will be manned:

You don't have to take my word for it—there are any number of experts who have said this time and time again.

Early this month, for instance, General Schriever's assistant, Col. Norman Appold said he saw "the moving of man into space as only a continuation of existing Air Force missions." He pointed out that there is no clear-cut line of demarcation between air and space.

Some of you perhaps heard the talk by Gen. Tommy White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, when he addressed the National Press Club here early in January.

During the discussion period he was asked if he saw any mission for manned combat aircraft during the next 5 years.

General White repeated what he has said on many occasions * * * that in every field of aeronautical combat he saw a requirement for manned aircraft for another 10 years and maybe more.

The predominant requirement for the indefinite future, according to General White, will be in the tactical field where the Air Force works closely with the Army, where the targets are ones of opportunity, not fixed targets.

He also pointed out that there isn't as yet an antiaircraft or an antiairspace weapon which is effective against both missiles and manned aircraft, nor do we have missiles with the range and accuracy of a missile launched from a long-range aircraft.

And, finally, he commented on the psychological implications which have all but been ignored.

General White said:

"I simply can't imagine resting our entire or the preponderant part of our offensive capability on a static system such as a missile stuck in the ground or sitting on a railroad, or even in a submarine.

"The enemy, and your friends, can't see this thing. It is not good enough to say, 'Oh, you should see the submarines we have under the sea and the missiles we have in these holes all over the United States.' They are going to have to see something flying at very high speeds over great distances."

And that, gentlemen, sums up my views, too.

I thank you.

Drop Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written concerning what we are to do in the Congress with respect to interest rates on Government bonds. Initially, without a complete study of this problem, I was not sure what my attitude would be; however, I have now had a full and complete opportunity to study the legislation which has been proposed by the administration to raise the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. I have come to the conclusion that this is "must" legislation in order that the Secretary of the Treasury be permitted to handle the huge debt of the country in a more orderly fashion. I am convinced that failure to do this will result in a great penalty being assessed against "Mr. Average American" who pays the greater percentage of the taxes that are collected today, for the reason that failure to adopt this legislation will mean more of his tax dollars being channeled into payment of higher rates of interest for short-term obligations of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read an editorial in the Wheeling News Register, an independent Democratic news-

paper in my district, for which editorial I want to congratulate the author and to respectfully call it to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent I include it as a part of my remarks.

On this grave issue of handling the finances of our Nation, I concur with this editorial that this is no time and no place to play politics—Democratic or Republican.

DROP POLITICS

For the sake of public peace of mind it is to be hoped Congress arrives at an early decision on what to do about interest rates on Government bonds.

The administration wants Congress to remove the ceiling of 4¼ percent on long-term bonds. The argument is that because money commands more in private financing there is little market for such obligations, so the Government has been forced to resort more and more to short term issues, where the ceiling does not apply, in managing the big public debt. Removal of the ceiling, it is represented, would make long-term Governments more attractive, thus actually lowering the overall interest burden while exerting an anti-inflationary influence.

Opponents of the proposal, chiefly Democrats, argue that the effect would be precisely the opposite, not merely increasing the interest rate on long-term bonds but encouraging private financing to follow suit. Nobody but bankers, it is held by some, would benefit.

Yesterday the House Ways and Means Committee went into closed-door conferences with Treasury Secretary Anderson with the hope in mind of working out agreement on a modification of the administration plan advanced by Democratic leaders. Other Democrats, however, who have taken an uncompromising stand on the issue, hope to get a majority of Democratic Senators on record against any change at a caucus today.

In a situation such as this the ordinary citizen is peculiarly at the mercy of his elected representatives. He lacks sufficient knowledge of the subject to form an independent opinion and advise those who speak for him. To his way of thinking, men skilled in the intricacies of money management should be in the best position to make an intelligent decision. In any event, he feels that on a matter such as this he has the right to demand of everybody in position of authority that in resolving the controversy consideration of partisan advantage be discarded altogether. This is no time and no place to place politics, Democrats or Republicans.

Sparks of Freedom Undying in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, for over 20 years, the people of Poland have lived in bondage, and, yet, the spark for freedom has not been extinguished in the minds and hearts of her people. Both behind the Iron Curtain and in the free world, her sons and daughters are still resolute in their determination that Poland shall again be free and be a symbol of liberty for the world to witness.

I am incorporating below a memorial by the Z.P.W.P. Inc., an anti-Communist confederation of Polish freedom fighters headed by Jozef Mlot-Mroz, president, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. L. A. Sikora, honorary president:

MEMORIAL

The members of the anticommunistic confederation, also known as the Freedom Fighters for the Independence of Poland, and the representatives of many enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain, met on January 16, 1960 at the International Institute in Boston, and agreed that all the results of and resolutions adopted at the meeting be written in the form of a memorial and sent to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington.

As political emigrants from behind the Iron Curtain and as victims of Hitler's tyranny and later on of communistic tyranny, we appeal to the highest governing body in the United States to support our anticommunistic action and our struggle for the freedom and independence of the enslaved nations.

From past experience we know communism with its horrible means and methods of terror through which communistic dictatorship plans to rule the world and so, we hereby declare that:

1. Communistic dictatorship and nihilism is based on the rule of bayonets and abounds in the blood of subdued and captive peoples. These terrible Red prodigies are a disgrace to the 20th century.

2. Communism is a sworn enemy of God and the church. One who does not believe in God and disobeys His commandments is also our enemy.

3. Godless communism undermines Christian civilization and under the pretext of world peace, with an abjectness equal to Hitler's, penetrates everywhere, becoming the greatest hindrance to western civilization today.

4. Communism is a festering abscess on the healthy body of the world today.

5. Between communism and democracy there lies a great abyss, at the bottom of which, in torture and convulsive agony lie enslaved nations who have faith in the United States and look hopefully to her for deliverance.

6. The world today is deluded by the opinion that political coexistence with communism is possible through appeasement. If this opinion is permitted to continue, the spirit of resistance among the enslaved nations will die out and America will lose her real allies and friends.

7. Stalin's successor, Khrushchev, in a cynical manner, mockingly stated many times that "he will bury America", and "that our children and grandchildren will live in a communistic atmosphere". Is this not enough evidence of Khrushchev's arrogance and a testimony that the Red incendiary has made his plans to conquer our country?

8. Moscow wants to lull to sleep the vigilance of the Western World. She is now using a psychological approach and at the present time she seems to be successful. The West sleeps on, silently resting on the laurels of 1945.

9. Khrushchev is endeavoring to force communism on the free world, promising paradise here on earth. All those who think or feel that the visits, travels, and speeches of Khrushchev foretell peace are gravely mistaken. In the Kremlin there is a hearth which spews sparks, ready to bring a new conflagration to the entire world. The only way to save the world from this dangerous devourment is to extinguish the source of the flames.

Although we, the most wronged political emigrants, do not call upon the West to begin a political struggle, we hereby propose that:

(a) It is necessary to work out a constructive program for the West in regard to the political action. The forgotten Hungarian tragedy forces the free world to act, by stressing the means by which the Communists would be turned back. Action must take place of words.

(b) Communism today is like a volcano, which at any moment may erupt, destroying communistic Pompei. We must act intelligently so that the lava of this volcano will not reach the West, but rather destroy the Kremlin itself.

(c) It is not permissible for the West to sell the independence of other countries in exchange for material advantages. Defending its own independence, the West must demand a specific day on which enslaved nations will be granted their freedom. It is impossible to separate the peace and security of the free world from the freedom and independence of the enslaved nations under communism.

(d) We strongly protest against the economic exploitation of enslaved countries by communism. We strongly protest against enslaved labor and the violation of human social principles under communism.

In conclusion, the members of the protesting committee, all representatives of the enslaved countries from behind the Iron Curtain, salute Poland as she observes the anniversary of her entrance into the family of Christian nations 1,000 years ago. Under the motto "One Thousand Years of Poland" we state that:

Poland in the course of her history passed through many a transition period. She was once at the height of her power, becoming the bulwark of Christianity, shielding Europe against the onslaughts of the Tartars, Turks, and Communists. During World War II she floated in a stream of her own blood. Lost 6 millions of her citizens. Today she suffers under the despotic rule of communism which deprived her and other countries of their freedom and independence. Communism hideously deprives these nations of their faith in God. Tomorrow this same treacherous communistic strength may likewise engulf America. That is why today America, stretching out a helping hand to the enslaved nations and trying to obtain for them the most cherished freedom she enjoys, is protecting her own freedom and existence.

The Polish emigrants, living outside the borders of their nation manifest their strong ties to the thousand-year culture of Poland, and live in the hope that the day of freedom will soon come, as it must.

Thus, appealing to the leaders of the United States and begging their intercession for us on our way back to freedom, we hereby declare that: Whoever fights for freedom, fights in defense of America, peace, and justice.

H.R. 7015

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I do not need to remind my honored colleagues that the more than 2,000 colleges and universities of the United States are struggling with a multitude of problems of increasing severity and ex-

treme complexity. More than ever in the past, our Nation needs larger and larger numbers of educated citizens trained both to meet the demands of specialized professional and scientific endeavor and to provide the solid leadership core of an enlightened citizenry. The problems of this age call for effort on behalf of education on a greater and wider scale than at any time in the past. Thus, many of us have been trying to find ways to aid and assist the colleges and universities. These institutions need help, and help for them is forthcoming; not only through the Federal Government's provision for relief at strategic points through the National Defense Education Act and the college housing loan program, but through a growing disposition on the part of the States to expand their programs of higher education, and through increased private and corporate gifts for higher education. Business and industry, private organizations, church groups, public officials at the local, State, and national level—all have engaged in the study of the needs and problems of the Nation's colleges, and all are contributing to efforts to meet them.

The cost of attending college is increasing rapidly, and all signs point to continuation of this increase. A U.S. Office of Education study of tuition and fees in 196 representative institutions of higher education, accounting for 55 percent of the Nation's total undergraduate enrollment, indicates that these charges increased 32.6 percent between 1954 and 1958 in public institutions and 39 percent in private institutions. In the same period the cost of living index, which has a direct bearing on room, board, and other costs borne by college students and their families, increased by some 8 percent. The average cost of sending a student to college has now risen to $1,500 annually in our public institutions of higher education and $2,000 in private institutions. Since increases in college enrollments are coming more and more in families of modest means this increase in costs constitutes a serious burden for many of our citizens.

It is with this thought in mind that I have taken this time to again urge support for my bill, H.R. 7015. This proposed legislation, which I first introduced early in 1953, would permit a taxpayer to deduct from his gross income expenditures for tuition and other educational expenses. There is a limit set in the bill that such deduction shall not exceed $1,500 for any one individual in any one taxable year. The taxpayer could make the deduction for his own expenses for education or for those of his spouse or any of his dependents. In addition to tuition charges, other deductible expenses could be for books, fees and charges, uniforms, board, lodging, and other expenses necessarily incurred in or incident to the effective pursuit of an education.

My bill will undoubtedly benefit the colleges and universities. Its primary objective, however, it to provide assistance at the point of most critical importance, that of the individual family that is endeavoring to provide higher education for its members. What is needed most in this day is Federal action that will encourage more parents to make it possible for their children to attend college, that will make it easier to go to college. Higher education has become a necessity, not a luxury, and the simplest, most effective way to give it a boost is to lighten the tax burden on money spent for higher education. Our Government encourages religion, without favoring any one religion, by lightening the tax load on contributions to religious organizations. My bill would encourage higher education in the same way—by lightening the tax load on the man who wants to give his children the advantages of higher education. It provides help for those who are willing to help themselves.

In accord with the American tradition of equal opportunity, we should encourage opportunity for every individual who has a reasonable chance of succeeding, and let his success speak for itself. Recent studies have shown that a high percentage of persons completing the Ph. D. degree in certain scientific fields have IQ's below 120. All the ability tests there are will not suffice to predict accurately the performance of an individual who is actually willing to do his very best. My bill does not require that a boy or girl have an IQ of 130 in order to qualify for assistance; it rewards the effort of all in a way that is psychologically sound, simple to administer, and direct in application.

At almost every point the Government's efforts to provide assistance to higher education have encountered the complicated problem of the relationship of church and state. My bill would avoid this problem entirely by supplying assistance to every American family, without any requirement as to eligibility beyond the willingness to invest its own resources in the education of its members.

Most efforts made thus far to provide assistance to the families and individuals most directly concerned with the cost of higher education can be applied on a large scale only by the setting up of complicated policies and procedures for administration. May I point out that my bill requires no complicated set of provisions for regulation and control, no costly process of administration, no haggling over questions of eligibility. Most of the educational expenses reported for deduction can be checked for reasonableness with published data on estimated costs of attendance at specific institutions, and can be verified in detail, when necessary, by references to institutional records.

Do not overlook the indirect benefits my bill will bring to the institutions themselves, which face a long period of extreme financial difficulty occasioned by rising costs of operation and the necessity to expand. By increasing the ability of students and their families to continue to pay a reasonable share of the increasing cost of education, this bill will help the institutions maintain a desirable balance of tuition and fee income with income from other sources. This is particularly important to the private and church-related colleges, which enroll about 42 percent of all students in the United States, because they derive about half their total operating income from tuition and fees. Unless these institutions can expand their enrollments as rapidly as do the public institutions, our dual system of higher education, which we believe essential to the Nation's interests, will be threatened. My bill will help these institutions substantially but, because the assistance is supplied indirectly, will avoid the complications attending most proposals to extend assistance to private colleges.

May I summarize briefly. My bill first, provides help at the point of most critical importance, second, is psychologically sound because it lightens the tax load of those who are willing to make a worthy effort, third, is democratic in that it plays no favorites, fourth, creates no complications regarding church and State relations or public versus private institutions, fifth, is uncomplicated and easy to administer, and sixth, will benefit both public and private institutions. I solicit for it your careful attention and thoughtful support.

Mike Coll of Hazleton, Pa., Retiring After Nearly Half Century on Newspaper Staffs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story that was featured in the Plain Speaker of Hazleton on Saturday, February 13, 1960, announcing the retirement of Michael V. Coll after nearly 50 years' service with the Plain Speaker—Standard-Sentinel. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to warmly congratulate Mike Coll for his many outstanding contributions to the betterment of Hazleton and the Greater Hazleton area in his capacity as a columnist, editorialist, and sportswriter as well as in his present position as Hazleton's city controller. I wish Mike Coll a long and happy retirement.

The story follows:

"MIKE" COLL IS RETIRING AFTER NEARLY HALF CENTURY ON NEWSPAPER STAFFS

After almost 49 years service with the Plain Speaker—Standard-Sentinel, Michael V. Coll, 219 East Beech Street, has retired due to illness.

Mr. Coll, who is Hazleton city controller, resides with his son-in-law and daughter, Attorney and Mrs. Frank Gormley.

He was born in Jeanesville on March 18, 1887, a son of the late Dominic and Bridget Coll.

As a youth he entered the employ of the J. C. Hayden Store and within a few years became manager.

REPORTER SINCE 1911

He began his newspaper service as the Hazleton Sentinel south side correspondent in 1911, joining the city news staff in August

1913. He served as reporter and sports editor, continuing in this dual capacity when the Sentinel merged with the Daily Standard to become the morning Standard-Sentinel.

For many years he wrote a popular daily column, "Wise and Otherwise," for the Standard-Sentinel.

Coll transferred in 1946 to the staff of the Plain Speaker as a reporter and editorial writer. Until stricken ill several years ago he had continued to write the "Wise and Otherwise" feature for the Standard-Sentinel.

A list of major news events Coll covered during his period of service would read like a history of this region, among these being the Tomhicken mine disaster in 1926 and the Kelayres political shootings of 1934.

MANAGED THEATER

During the early years of his newspaper service, he was manager of the Campbell Theater, West Broad Street, when motion pictures were coming into their full popularity.

His bookings brought to Hazleton the outstanding film features of those days and the theater ranked with the leading motion picture houses of the East.

FOUR TERMS AS CONTROLLER

Coll is serving his fourth term as city controller, a post to which he was first elected in 1945.

He has been active in politics for many years and on numerous occasions was asked to be a candidate for mayor or council but declined, preferring to retain the controller post.

In 1951 he served on the board of governors of the Pennsylvania League of Third Class Cities.

PROMINENT IN KIWANIS CLUB

A charter member of the Hazleton Kiwanis Club, he was its secretary for 25 years until 1951 when he was named president. After completion of his term as president he was made an honorary life member.

OTHER AFFILIATIONS

He is a member of St. Gabriel's Church and the parish Holy Name Society and of the Knights of Columbus Council 442.

He served three terms on the Catholic Charities board of directors and three times on the Salvation Army Advisory Board.

In recognition of many years' service in publicizing its affairs, he was made a privileged life member of the Men's League of the First Presbyterian Church.

In 1957 he was honored by the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick by being named Hazleton's leading citizen of Irish descent.

For many years he was one of the leaders of the Old Timers Association which sponsored annual Memorial Day ceremonies in Jeanesville.

PROMINENT IN SPORTS WORLD

Of his many activities, sports was the field in which he became most widely known.

His engaging personality won him an ever-widening circule of friends which includes many of the Nation's most prominent sports figures.

Numerous young athletes had his help in securing athletic scholarships in leading universities of the Nation and his list of house guests read like a "who's who" in sports.

Those who came here to visit him included such outstanding personalities as Coach Ralph Sasse of West Point and Coach Rip Miller of the U.S. Naval Academy.

HIGH SCHOOL BOOSTER

High school sports were practically on an intramural basis in this area until Coll turned the spotlight of publicity on Hazleton High School's activities in the late 1920's.

His coverage was not only largely responsible for the tremendous interest generated here but other cities followed his example as high school sports won new stature throughout the State.

Coll followed the path of Hazleton High School to its State basketball championships in 1928 and 1929 and again a decade later.

He supported the moves which brought Hazleton High its present gymnasium and its spacious football stadium, even today one of the State's finest.

HEADED PROFESSIONAL LEAGUES

His interest covered not only scholastic sports but professional as well.

Prior to World War I he was secretary of the Penn State Basketball League, at that time probably the Nation's fastest circuit.

He served many years as president of the Tri-County and Anthracite baseball leagues when these regional circuits operated on a scale equal to the fastest minor leagues. He was president of the Twin-County Football League in the early 1930's and president of the Eastern Professional Football League which brought bigtime football to this area in 1939.

He played an important role in bringing the New York-Pennsylvania League franchise to Hazleton and helped this league to advance in stature to become the Class A Eastern League later on.

Address by Martin B. McKneally, National Commander, the American Legion, at Dinner Honoring Members of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, last evening the American Legion held its annual dinner in honor of Members of the Congress.

On this occasion my very distinguished friend and constituent, the national commander, Martin M. McKneally, made the following address.

This excellent speech, short, sincere, and constructive, certainly belongs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is a very great pleasure and honor for me to be able to ask that it be included in the Appendix.

We are fortunate indeed to have one of our great patriotic organizations, in these troubled times, select as national commander a man of such vision and courage.

The speech follows:

Members of Congress, I am delighted to bid you welcome to this dinner of the American Legion honoring the Congress of the United States. These annual festivities are a means by which we can express gratitude to you for the support given by you to the legislative objectives of our organization. And they do more. They grant to us the opportunity to pay tribute to the system of representation by which our Nation is governed. It is proper that this be done by a group of war veterans who are joined together to promote the ideals of our country. This Congress of the United States is the perfect embodiment of men's will to enjoy, to maintain and control his freedom. By your legislative enactments, you keep freedom broad and at the same time protect it from deteriorating into license.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, you better than anyone, know and must know that it is in our day that freedom is suffering the hour of its darkest peril. Shall we here lose it in a great power struggle in which our country is vanquished? Or shall we lose it because we really don't understand the nature of it? Shall its loss be the result of an adoption of a false set of values that places the emphasis on material comfort and prosperity instead of moral and spiritual fiber? Have we not a tendency to measure the success of our policies by whether or not they work to our advantage in a material way rather than to measure the success of them by the test of rightness and wrongness? No one will argue against material comfort or security except insofar as a reliance upon them is destructive of personal liberty. Americans have come to believe that communism thrives on human misery, poverty, and degradation, and that democracy grows with an expanding production of motor cars, television, and refrigerators. And because they believe this, they sometimes follow policies, both abroad and at home, that ignore the fact that man does not live by bread alone. The greatest men our country can boast of were men of profound spiritual conviction, who suffered immensely within themselves for spiritual ideals. The two men whose birthdays we honor in February conducted the affairs of this Nation in time of war and in time of peace toward one end—the preservation of human freedom. The times in which each lived were different, but the challenge the same and the challenge is the same today. Evil forces and evil men would rest in the name of comfort—freedom from mankind. This mistake was made once in our generation by the German people who gambled away their freedom to gain security and they woke amidst rubble and ruin to find they had lost both. Freedom is the most easily lost of men's possessions and it will be lost here unless it is rooted in a deeply spiritual belief in God and the divinely created nature of man. It is to promote this doctrine of belief that the American Legion was called into being. It is in exaltation to the concept of God and country that the American Legion will work without wavering and it shall not be dissuaded by unrealistic arguments by vile cartoons or by mendatious reporting. It shall proceed to promote its doctrine of belief, with high regard for all constitutional legalities and amenities. It shall never be un-American. It shall not play the role of either naiveté or of friend to men whose avowed purpose it is to destroy what the soldiers of three wars fought to preserve.

For your kind attention, we express our great gratitude. For the cooperation extended to the American Legion in the area of veterans affairs in the House of Representatives, we give our thanks—for the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate, we express our most ardent hope.

And now to conclude. There is an interesting definition given by a recently naturalized citizen, a man who has known as you and I have not known, the tortures of the concentration camp. He proclaims:

"I am an American citizen—a member of the greatest fraternity on earth—the brotherhood of free men because a million American citizens had died and millions have suffered in the wars of our Republic. I have greater freedom than any other citizen of any other nation in any other period of mankind. I have greater freedom to work, to worship, to love, to learn, and to play. Mine is the freedom to compete, to invent, to save, to invest, to create, to promote, to own. I have freedom to choose, to join, to vote, to speak, to travel, and to walk erect with head high. I am free to be my own self as an individual human soul. I am free to glorify God."

NAACP's Thurgood Marshall Meddling in British Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is astounding to learn that one of the NAACP's professional agitators, Thurgood Marshall, is meddling in the relationship between Great Britain and its colony, Kenya.

Robert C. Ruark, a nationally syndicated columnist, has focused attention on the manner Marshall is injecting himself into the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. Ruark also points out the nefarious scheme of Mboya, and other African dictators, to capture political control of Africa and thus enslave a great majority of its inhabitants.

The State Department should look into the connection between this representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Mau Mau terrorists, who are supporting Mboya's and Marshall's position at the London Conference.

Mr. Ruark's article follows:

THURGOOD MARSHALL NOW "SPOKESMAN FOR AFRICA"

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NAIROBI.—The intrusion of Dr. Thurgood Marshall, the chief counsel for our National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, into the muddled mess between Great Britain and its colony, Kenya, seems to me to be meddling of the highest order.

What happens between Kenya and England at the current constitutional conferences in London is none of America's official business, and it certainly is none of Dr. Marshall's business. But, nevertheless, he is an official adviser to the African group, thus lumping himself with Peter Koinange, an avowed pro-Mau Mau and outcast from his own country.

The situation is ridiculous. Marshall was out here for only a couple of days. He is not an African. He is an American, and a mostly white one, at that. If he knows anything about Africa or Africans he read it somewhere.

SOUNDS FUNNY

But here is this American Negro saying out loud that somebody else's government may be subject to revolt if his pressure group of irresponsibles doesn't get what it wants in the way of complete control of the country. I can understand the bellwether, Tom Mboya, saying that in one of his usual threatening moods, but it sounds funny coming from a sophisticated American lawyer who wouldn't know a Galla herdsman from a whistling thorn.

"The new group in Africa know exactly what they want," Marshall is quoted as saying in London. "They want independence now—tomorrow is too late."

This "new group" Marshall mentions is composed of Marshall, Mboya, and a handful of other self-seeking politicians, plus their captive voters in a few cities. They compose a fraction of the 6 million African population. A good two-thirds of this population never heard of Tom Mboya or "uhuru"—freedom—let alone Marshall or the NAACP.

I have just finished a back breaking 2,500-mile round trip by jeep to Mogadishu in Somalia, up via Garissa in the northern frontier of Kenya, and I daresay I saw more actual Africans on that one trip than the glib Mr. Mboya has seen since he became a politician instead of a sewerage inspector.

It is almost laughable, if it weren't so pathetic. Here we have this semiwhite American, Marshall, saying for publication that the Europeans "had made little effort to learn the Swahili language or otherwise adapt themselves to the culture of their adopted country."

I would point out the African himself, outside of the cities, has made little or no effort to learn Swahili, which is not really a language anyhow, but a kind of "me Tarzan-you Jane" trade language compounded of Arabic, pidgin English, and some native dialects.

BLOODY CULTURE

There is no broad culture in this country. A Boran herdsman is as different from a Masai as a Suk differs from a coastal Swahili, who is more Arab than Negro. The Nilotics do not agree among their varying tribes on God, diet, or ceremony, and any Wakamba will eat a Kikuyu raw.

The only common culture of Africa before the white man and the Arab came to bring it alive and make it politically conscious was one thing—blood. In some ways that is still the common culture—blood, or the threat of blood to spill.

I do not quarrel with the right of the African to try to overthrow the vested interests of the European, to quarrel and fight and kill and steal among themselves, or to attempt to enslave a majority by a political minority. It's their property.

But it jolly well is not Dr. Thurgood Marshall's land, and, in effect, he is breaching a law which says that Americans are not supposed to get mixed up in other people's revolutions as an active participant. This is one time when I would like to see Mboya's "scram out of Africa" slogan apply to one meddlesome American whose name is Marshall and whose career has been founded on color.

Education Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today, I received a well-thought-out and well-written letter from a schoolteacher in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, which I wish to share with all my colleagues.

This letter, which Mr. John A. Scott wrote, expresses very well the reasons which every Congressman must consider if he is to help our great Nation overcome our educational gap, and if he is to help it prepare for our future educational needs.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1960.

Hon. LEONARD G. WOLF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I am writing to urge you above all else to vote for and work for the passage of the Federal school aid bill that is now before the House.

From the bottom of my heart I am asking that you and all other representatives rise above the political shenanigans as reported in the Kiplinger Washington letter dated February 13, 1960, and do something for the sake of aiding the people, and that alone. I again urge passing of the above-mentioned bill for the following reasons, along with many others that need not be listed.

1. There is a trend in the tax pattern which is operating against our obsolete method of school support. Not too many years ago State and local government took about 75 percent of our tax dollar; the Federal Government took about 25 percent. The situation now is just the reverse.

2. The coming shortage of teachers confronts us with a grim prospect indeed. One million five hundred thousand new teachers, more than the total number now in service, must be recruited in the next 10 years if the present ratio of teachers to pupils is to be maintained. Our needs, let us not forget, are not only quantitative, but qualitative.

3. It is authoritatively estimated that in order to maintain the present student-teacher ratio, between one-third and one-half of all 4-year-college graduates would have to enter schoolteaching in the next decade. Now only one in five enter teaching, and the reasons most often given is that the pay is just not good enough or will it ever be.

4. Business, industry, and government are outbidding the teaching profession for talents of many of its best qualified and most able men and women.

5. The teacher shortage at the beginning of this year, according to Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick, was 195,000. This is up from 182,000 the year before.

6. Teacher's salaries are on the bottom rung of the pay ladder of virtually all professions. It is an indictment of our society when we oblige the teachers of our children to go around in shiny clothes, their minds preoccupied with bills rather than ideas and ideals.

7. Much of the wealth produced in Iowa is not taxable by the local or State authorities, but the profits of corporations are distributed to stockholders of other States. Furthermore, the profits of these companies are taxed by the Federal Government, and it is the Federal Government which should contribute a fair share of this wealth back to the States.

8. The assessed valuation of property no longer reflects an accurate measure of the taxpaying ability.

9. Between 1940 and 1956 the national income increased 321 percent. Between the same years the assessed valuation subject to the property tax has increased in value by only 88 percent. Hence, it is quite apparent that the assessed valuation failed to grow at the rate needed to support the services dependent on it.

10. There is something drastically wrong with our sense of values in this country when people spend more money on tobacco, alcohol, and cosmetics, than they do on education.

11. When thousands of communities have taxed themselves as high as they can in the form of sales taxes, real estate taxes, and personal property taxes, and are still able to pay their teachers only about half of what others are earning in other positions which require less training, we cannot hope to attract the bright, inquisitive, inquiring top people into the teaching profession.

12. Reports indicate that the Soviet Union is channeling between 10 and 15 percent of its national income into education, as compared to 5 percent in the United States.

13. It is admitted that there is a present classroom shortage of 132,000 classrooms. Think what it will be in 10 years. The local taxing authority cannot in any manner or means take care of it.

14. In the programs which the President has sent down to the Congress in recent years, and which he has sent again this year, there are hundreds of items for education

in foreign countries, which include payments to teachers. There is a strange contrast between what we do for foreign countries and what is denied to our own people.

15. If the President of the United States wishes to veto the bill, that is his responsibility. We need a bill designed to meet with the needs of the country, rather than designed to please the President or to fill the needs of any political party or political group.

I have done all I can do. The rest is up to you. You and your fellow representatives must go on from here. Yours is a great responsibility, for you and you alone can solve to a great degree the problems and troubles that now face and will continue to face our public schools.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SCOTT.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

Growth of Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 22, 1960, as follows:

THE GROWTH OF CO-OPS

The Nation's co-ops are under heavy attack in Congress right now—and properly so—on the ground that they don't pay their fair share of taxes. They have spread into manufacturing and processing—in direct competition with business that must pay the corporate tax rate ranging up to 52 percent.

They weren't always like that. When the co-ops first started, they were usually small groups of farmers who got together to buy equipment that one farmer alone couldn't afford. Or they bought big amounts of seed and fertilizer and so got a bigger discount than one farmer alone could get.

But it wasn't long before they began to branch out into other businesses besides farming. The way it worked was this: The co-ops avoided taxes on their earnings by issuing periodic certificates stating the individual's share of the earnings. The courts held these certificates were not taxable to the members since they had no determinable market value. So the profits made by the co-ops were reinvested in other enterprises. And the members received ever larger notices of their earnings—taxable only when they were cashed in.

Good deal, no doubt. But not a very good deal for all the other taxpayers, including the companies the co-ops were in competition with. So Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee is going to work on a plan to force the co-ops to pay more taxes.

But what the growth of the co-ops also reveals, it seems to us, is man's ingenuity. They didn't really begin to grow into combines of all sorts of businesses until somebody discovered there was a legal tax dodge attached to the deal. They're certainly not alone in this; a great many other facets of the economy have their own built-in tax avoidance schemes. The co-ops, to that extent, are only a manifestation of one of the things that's wrong with the country today.

And what's plainly wrong is that the Government takes so much of the average man's earnings away from him that any man in his right senses is going to try legally to beat the tax collector.

We hope this study of co-ops will reveal that eternal truth to Congress. Maybe then they'll decide that patching up the tax structure won't do nearly as much to end tax avoidance and tax evasion as less Government spending and lower taxes.

The Development of Public Economic Awareness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Junior Chamber of Commerce, through its State committee on governmental affairs has launched a well-thought-out and constructive campaign for a balanced budget and sound fiscal policies at all levels of government—local, State and Federal.

It is a Jaycee creed that "economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise" and that the free enterprise system can only be preserved and made more effective by sound fiscal policies.

The Washington State Junior Chamber of Commerce members hope that others will join them in this crusade for a balanced budget and lowering of tax structures to the end that free enterprise, which has made the United States the strongest and most prosperous Nation in the world, will continue progressing to ever greater achievements in the future than already have been attained.

The program of the Washington State Junior Chamber of Commerce appealed to me as so impressively constructive, that I asked E. Woodford Wayland, chairman of the Jaycee's State committee on governmental affairs to write a paper for me on this Jaycee program so that I might have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My hope is that other organizations throughout the Nation will join the Washington Jaycees in their patriotic crusade to balance the budget and promote sound fiscal policies at all levels of government—local, State, and National.

Mr. Wayland's paper on the Washington State Jaycee program follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC ECONOMIC AWARENESS

(By E. Woodford Wayland, State chairman, project governmental affairs, Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce, Longview, Wash.)

In the State of Washington, an impact has been made on the public's awareness of the national economic plight in the short span of a few months. The publicity received from a planned program on public awareness and its effects has resulted in various favorable comments as well as the suggestion by the Honorable RUSSELL V. MACK, Member of Congress, that the program be outlined so that other areas and communities might be inspired to do likewise.

The response obtained has been achieved through the efforts of the young men of the Junior Chamber of Commerce and in Washington State, as part of the National Jaycee governmental affairs project. Such a project is open for any organization to develop and is one in which any individual may participate. The success of any organization with this type of project is dependent upon its members' ability to face the issue and see its quiet but damaging approach and presence. In the Washington State Junior Chamber of Commerce, more and more young men are accepting their responsibility to safeguard the Nation's economic welfare with the same determination that they used during the past hostilities to safeguard our Nation's physical existence. These same men realize that they have more at stake than any other age group. They are extremely interested in the perpetuation of the free enterprise system and they do not wish to see the economic growth of the Nation stunted by unnecessary tax burdens or detrimental fiscal decisions. It is for these reasons that considerable effort has been expended by the Jaycees in a short period to create awareness among its membership and the public of the urgent need for economic counterweapons such as a balanced budget, a sound fiscal policy for our economy, and a fair, equitable method of taxation.

The method followed by the Jaycees in presenting the program to the State up to the present time has been through the use of resolutions, proclamations, mailings, and direct contact. First, a resolution was introduced to and passed by the Longview, Wash., Junior Chamber of Commerce in December 1959. A copy of the resolution was mailed to the more than 90 Junior Chamber of Commerce chapters in the State of Washington with the notification that the resolution would be submitted to the State organization at their April 1960 convention meeting and that each chapter would have to vote on the submitted resolutions. This action obligated every club to give thought to the facts contained in the resolution. The resolution is as follows:

"Whereas the Jaycee creed contains the statement 'That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;' and

"Whereas the greatness of the United States of America is a direct result of the free enterprise system and the basic American idea of freedom of opportunity; and

"Whereas an integral part of the free enterprise system is the incentive provided by the opportunity afforded to every individual to make of himself what he will, and to prosper in proportion to his success in taking advantage of the economic opportunities which are available to everyone in our American way of life; and

"Whereas the present income tax laws of the Federal Government tend to stifle economic progress under the free enterprise system, to discourage individuals from putting forth maximum effort, investors from continuing to provide the capital necessary to the development and growth of private business and to thereby stunt the economic growth of our country: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the Longview, Wash., Junior Chamber of Commerce at Longview, Wash., this 3d day of December 1959, That the said member organization go on record in favor of Federal legislation to reduce the basic income tax rate from 20 to 15 percent and to correct the inequities of the present income surtax rates in such a manner that the right to healthy economic growth is preserved for the present and future generations of American citizens; be it further

"Resolved, That the said member organization urges the balancing of the Federal budget and the adoption of all possible practices which will tend to make the operation

of government on every level more efficient and economical."

This resolution was followed up by a statewide mailing to local chapters, the receipt of requested informative literature from the Jaycee national headquarters, publicity in the State Jaycee newspaper, and the personal encouragement of Jaycee officers.

The next task was to convey thoughts concerning the national fiscal policy to the public. A visit with our State Governor, the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, revealed to us his interest in our project and our concern for the national fiscal policy. In helpful cooperation with our organization the Governor declared the week of January 24 through 30, 1960, as Jaycee National Balanced Budget Week throughout the State of Washington and issued a public statement:

"A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR

"Inflation is a result of our Nation spending more than its revenue. A balanced budget is important because if the Government does not live within its means, every American suffers.

"Our public debt has increased to $285 billion at the start of fiscal 1960 in comparison with the total smaller debt of $237 billion of 67 free world countries including England, Japan, Canada, and Australia, and 7 Soviet bloc nations.

"It is important not to stunt the future economic growth of this country and the actions, opinions, and desires emanating from each State of these United States has a pronounced effect upon the determination of the national fiscal policy.

"Now, therefore, I, Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby call to the attention of the people of this State the week of January 24 through 30, 1960, as Jaycee National Balanced Budget Week in the State of Washington and further call upon the people to encourage Congress to effect a program of efficiency in Government and to operate within the national budget for the purpose of limiting and reducing the national debt."

Publicity was then released throughout the State to newspapers, radio stations, and television stations on the Balanced Budget Week and a second and separate proclamation was issued to all Junior Chamber of Commerce chapters for local use. Each chapter was urged to have the Mayor of its community to proclaim a local Balanced Budget Week, using the second proclamation. This proclamation read as follows:

"Whereas a dire need presently exists in our National Government for a return to a sound and practical economy; and

"Whereas one of the most rational means to achieve this worthwhile goal is to balance expenditures with revenue; and

"Whereas the Junior Chamber of Commerce of this city recognizes action must be taken to alleviate the economic threat to the welfare of our democracy; and

"Whereas it is the responsibility of each citizen to inform his elected representatives of his views on matters involving public finances.

"I, _____ _____, do hereby proclaim January 24–30 as Jaycee National Balanced Budget Week in the city of _____ and urge all citizens to take an active interest in the economics of their State and Nation."

The issuance of the State and local proclamations occurred at a time when they could be most effective. Congress had just convened and public thinking was directed towards the Federal Budget.

In reviewing the project to date, the largest single problem has been the complacency of the average citizen towards our economic health. A second problem is that a silent, camouflaged enemy is difficult to fight. Its presence is much like a cloud saturated with inflationary dollars, located above an already drenched area, waiting only to be mistakenly seeded with further deficit spending and unnecessary public expenditures before doing permanent and unestimateable damage.

The assistance of Governor Rosellini, Representative Mack, the mayors, the news outlets, and National Jaycee Chairman Carman E. Kipp, and others has been most helpful to the Washington State Junior Chamber of Commerce in creating public awareness. The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, since its founding, has been instrumental in preserving and promoting our inherited way of life and is privileged, once again, to stand up and be counted, this time in a vital role of restoring our Nation's high standards of economy, the heart of our American heritage.

Return the Farmers to a Free Supply and Demand System Without Disrupting Normal Marketings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving the answers to questionnaires I sent out to a cross section of the people of my congressional district. I felt it incumbent on me to find out their opinions on a number of issues that may well be considered this session of the Congress.

As yet, I have not had a tabulation made, but on the farm subsidy question I did get a count on the first thousand returns which came back to my office.

The question asked was: "Do you favor reduction of agriculture price supports?"

This sample count of the 1,000 returns resulted as follows: 907 replied yes that they were favorable to a reduction in our farm support programs; 93 replied no they were against such a reduction. So the ratio is about 9 to 1 in favor of reduction in agriculture price supports.

In a conversation with our colleague from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] he furnished me with the percentage of his constituents who expressed their views on this same subject of farm price controls in a recent poll he conducted. Since his congressional district is more rural than mine I would expect a variation in viewpoint. However, Mr. Speaker, the tabulation of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] showed 75 percent of those responding to his questionnaire as opposed to farm controls with 20 percent being favorable to price supports and 5 percent undecided or not taking any position.

An interesting feature of this Oregon poll was that of those who marked their questionnaires saying they were farmers more than a majority said they were against the price-support program.

Speaking of polls, Mr. Speaker, the April 1959 issue of Farm Journal contained the results of their readers' vote. A majority of these farmers voted for the complete elimination of all support prices and controls. An overwhelming majority voted for a reduction of present high support programs. I understand the Farm Journal's circulation of more than 3 million covers all parts of the country.

Another periodical, the Farm and Ranch Magazine published in Nashville, Tenn., in its July 1958 issue gave its readers' views based on a survey. Eighty-seven and one-half percent were in favor of farming being returned to a free supply-and-demand system as soon as possible with minimum Government control. Twelve and one-half percent were against return to a free supply-and-demand system.

I might mention the Farm Journal once more. Earlier this year there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the Journal by John Strohm. He had sent questions to agricultural economists at every one of 49 land grant colleges.

What did these experts say in their replies to Mr. Strohm?

According to him 4 out of 5 economists said:

Any laws further hamstringing the free market will hurt the farmer, the consumer and the Nation.

Another of their conclusions was:

The law of supply and demand is not out of date—there is no substitute for the free markets.

Since introducing H.R. 10350 to repeal price-support subsidies and to provide for the disposition of the Commodity Credit inventory without disrupting normal marketings, I have received much and widespread support.

Hereafter are three letters, one from the East, one from the Middle West, and one from the South, which speak for themselves:

WM. CALHOUN HOPE,
PUBLIC RELATIONS,
New York, N.Y., February 16, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Old House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I wish to take this means of congratulating you upon the introduction of your bill H.R. 10350, which calls for the abolition of price supports and the disposition of the CCC's surplus agricultural commodities through donations to nations friendly to the United States, etc.

To my way of thinking, this is the most sensible farm bill that has been introduced in Congress during the current session, and I certainly do hope that you will be successful enough to steer it through to a point where you can force the House Agriculture Committee to hold hearings on it. I am confident that, once you can get it to the hearing stage, you will find many people that will come forward to testify in favor of it.

I greatly enjoyed reading the grassroots opinion concerning your bill which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A1227.

Sincerely,

WM. C. HOPE.

FEBRUARY 13, 1960.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN PELLY,
U.S. House of Representative,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN PELLY: It was interesting to read your discussion of the farm program in the February 10 issue of the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD. Without question, your bill is the answer to the present farm plight, but the big problem would be in convincing other Congressmen. We have a small group in our county and they are deeply interested in supporting you on this program. If there would be anyway in which we can assist in this matter, we will certainly do what we can. We hope you are able to get this before the people and Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES L. TAYLOR.

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
February 14, 1960.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: I commend you for your recent action with regard to farm price supports. It seems to me that legislative action such as you have proposed is long overdue.

Certainly, the farm subsidy program must be termed, by any reasonable standard of judgment a fiasco. It is a fiasco not only from the point of view of folly compounding folly, but also from the point of view of a culture which has not yet attained maturity in its judgment. How else can one interpret the stubborn persevering in obeisance to a pressure group? I suppose this perseverance reflects the awareness of a specter from the past—namely, a declining agricultural system which directly affected the economy of the Nation. Can it be said with any truth, however, that the health of the agricultural system now has direct and large correlation with the health of the economy as a whole? What has been written and said about the industrial complex and the rapid improvements in technology belies such an idea.

One of the things that disturbes me most, however, about the continuance of the price support system which obviously offers so many opportunities for abuse, is the implication of governmental duty that it seems to carry with it. This is a moral question, it seems to me. When one segment of the population has managed to maneuver itself into a position where it regards itself as indispensable, the next step seems to be the attitude that governmental beneficence should shine brighly and unceasingly. There should be no element of risk involved or any intermission in continuously high profits—so it is implied. This, I think it can be shown, often leads to individual and cultural deterioration of the worst and most destructive order. I do not mean to say that obstacles, per se, produce progress and positive advantages; the removal of all obstacles and the shifting of responsibility to a collective and financially bottomless "they" are certainly deplorable, however.

I shall follow congressional reaction to your bill with interest. I think it deserves applause and active support.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE H. SMITH.

The U.S. Missile Miracle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the pleasure to be a guest at the third Dr. Robert A. Goddard Memorial Dinner, which is held annually in connection with the National Missile/Space Conference in Washington, D.C.

The conference is sponsored by the National Rocket Club and companies in the missile space business, and has as its objective the promotion of policies, programs and legislation to keep the United States in high position in science, research, and development, as well as operational aeronautics, missiles, and space fields.

In the 2-day conference this year there were four panel presentations on the space challenge—its philosophy, legislative aspects, outlook, and a final one regarding space products. I was privileged to participate in the panel on space philosophy, and would have participated in the one on legislation, but duty kept me at hearings of our Science and Astronautics Committee.

As a member of this committee, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues and fellow Americans, the fine address by one of our top military-spale men, Lt. Gen. Bernard Schriever, at the Goddard Memorial Dinner of the Conference.

A LESSON IN DEMOCRACY

(By Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Research and Development Command to the National Rocket Club Goddard Memorial Dinner, Washington, D.C., February 17, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rocket Club, ladies and gentlemen, one associated with research and development usually speaks to the future and I have always attempted to put into practice the policy never to look back. On the other hand, honors are usually based on past accomplishments and tonight is honors night. Only a few are publicly honored, and for that matter, even recognized. This is doubly true when there exists a popular image of a "missile mess" and interservice rivalry. I hope, therefore, in some small way this evening, to dispel these misconceptions. If I can bring a little more recognition and appreciation to the many thousands of men and women who have labored so hard in the arena of our national missile program—then I will feel well rewarded for my effort tonight.

I am grateful for your invitation to be with you this evening. I am grateful because it affords me a most welcome and timely opportunity to report to you—and through you, to the American people—on a few thoughts—backed by a few simple facts—about our missile program—and what these facts mean to me.

U.S. AIR FORCE—AEROSPACE POWER FOR PEACE

It is most appropriate that I report these facts to the membership of the National Rocket Club. Your members are in the forefront of our Nation's effort to probe the frontiers of space. We share the same deep sense of inner satisfaction and accomplishment now that we are seeing yesterday's space flights of fancy become today's space flights of fact.

I would hope that the facts that I present this evening—and their meaning—will give renewed strength and courage to any of our citizens who may have grown doubting and faint-hearted about our Nation's ability to compete with Communist Russia. The confusion resulting from the claims and counterclaims concerning our intercontinental ballistic missile program, could have a disturbing effect.

In setting forth my thoughts, and the facts, I will not belabor you with the uninteresting—and well known—details of recent ancient history. Rather, I will tell you of "The Missile Miracle" which has occurred in this country in the past 5½ years. It is a miracle wrought by tens of thousands of dedicated men and women—throughout the length and breadth of the Nation—who have labored round-the-clock to "beat-the-clock." Theirs has been an all-out effort in the Nation's interest. Many of these men and women are in this audience tonight. It is to you and to your colleagues—in science, in industry, and in the military services—to whom high praise and great credit must go for having been the principal architects and builders of this "Missile Miracle." The miracle could not have taken place, if it had not been for the imaginative and daring work done by Dr. Robert H. Goddard and his inspired followers.

You are all well aware of the so-called thermonuclear breakthrough of 1953, which resulted in our scientists telling us that it would soon be possible to carry thermonuclear warheads of very high yield in relatively small packages. This breakthrough made the intercontinental ballistic missile both feasible and a mandatory weapon for our deterrent force structure.

You are also well aware of the fact that in February 1954, Dr. John von Neumann and his colleagues—representing the best scientific and technical brains in America—told the Air Force that an operational intercontinental ballistic missile could be achieved by this country in from 6 to 9 years, provided that an all-out development effort—with the highest national priority was initiated immediately.

Acting boldly and decisively on the recommendations of the Von Neumann Committee, the Air Force immeditely embarked on an all-out development effort to give this Nation an operational intercontinental ballistic missile in the shortest possible time that technology would permit.

On September 1, 1959, the Department of Defense announced to the American people that the Atlas ICBM had become operational. This was just a little over 5 years from the time that the accelerated ICBM program had gotten underway and beat the most optimistic forecasts of the Von Neumann Committee.

On September 9, 1959, a completely operational ICBM was launched by an Air Force Strategic Air Command crew from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. Lifting from its launch pad, this missile flew its planned trajectory over the full intercontinental distance and struck its intended target with pinpoint accuracy.

In addition to beating the schedule, I can tell you tonight that the achievement of our Atlas missile in reliability, range, accuracy, and destructive power far exceeds the most optimistic estimates laid down by the Von Neumann Committee in 1954 and 1955. At that time it was the consensus of the scientific community that—if all went well—the first operational ICBM's might have a reliability of 50 percent. The Atlas missile today has a reliability very much greater.

Likewise, at that time the most optimistic range hoped for by our scientists was 5,500 nautical miles. The actual range of the Atlas ICBM today is in excess of 7,000 miles.

Last but not least, in 1954 the attainment of a 5-mile accuracy was considered a very logical goal. The accuracy of the Atlas missile today is within 2 miles of the target. I wish to point out in this connection that the accuracy I am citing is not that of a single fortuitous shot. Rather, and significantly so, it is the statistical average achieved by 15 consecutive launches of the Atlas missile. In these launches accuracy and reliability were the primary objectives.

Those of you who have participated in rifle-match competition can appreciate the full significance of this accuracy when I say to you that it is comparable to that of the expert marksman who places 15 consecutive

shots in a 4-inch bull's-eye at a range of 300 yards.

To understand what all this really means in our competition with Communist Russia, we need to consider where we stood in the development of long-range missiles in 1954. At that time our ICBM program was still primarily a research and study effort. It employed only about 300 people on a full-time basis. Long-range test facilities and the necessary missile industry were virtually nonexistent. This was largely due to two reasons. First, a practical demonstration of the thermonuclear principle did not occur until November 1952, when there was detonated a hydrogen device, which, together with the equipment necessary to insure its explosion, weighed many tons. Second, even with intensive and continuing research and development by the AEC, the practicability of packaging a nuclear device of high enough yield and low enough weight to make the ICBM a feasible and militarily useful weapon system, was not established until the winter of 1953–54.

To come from these meager beginnings to where we are today, the Nation had literally to lift itself by its bootstraps. A "business-as-usual" approach would not have brought us even within striking distance of our goals. Unprecedented actions had to be taken—and were taken.

In less than 5½ years, a multimillion-dollar nationwide missile and space-vehicle industry has been created. Today, over 100,000 people are working full time, to bring into the operational inventory our Atlas, Titan, Thor, and Minuteman missiles. Tens of thousands of people also are working on the U.S. Navy's Polaris missile, together with its nuclear-powered submarine base, and on the Jupiter missile developed under the stewardship of the Army. Countless thousands of other American citizens are supporting this nucleus of full-time workers. Moreover, the missile industry rests on a solid foundation. More than a billion dollars worth of vast and complex test facilities, production plants, and fully instrumented missile and space-vehicle test ranges, extending thousands of miles across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, have been brought into being.

As the ICBM development program has progressed, the Air Force at every step of the way has had the continuing advice and counsel of the most eminent scientists and engineers in the country. Their guidance has insured the soundness of the technical and management judgments and decisions which were made.

Here indeed is a demonstration of democracy at its best—of democracy recognizing what had to be done in the face of the Communist challenge, and acting forthrightly and decisively to do it.

In this connection, we should bear in mind that the Soviets are an internal power and, as such, had a very important requirement for short-range missiles. Immediately after World War II the Soviets confiscated the German V-2 missile plants. These plants were moved to Russia, where ballistic missile development was immediately begun with the assistance of German nationals who were dragooned into the Soviet service. Since that time starting with short-range missiles the Soviets have been engaged on a high-priority ballistic missile design, development, and production program of ever-increasing scope and magnitude.

As a consequence, at the time of our thermonuclear breakthrough, the Soviets already had a vast development, test, and production base in being, and a significant lead in the field of missilery.

Therefore, when we initiated our own accelerated ballistic missile development programs in 1954, we established the tightest possible time schedules.

These schedules laid down for the Atlas program in 1954 and for the Thor and Jupiter programs in 1955, have been exceeded. The Navy's Polaris missile program, which was the outgrowth of a joint Army-Navy effort on the Jupiter in 1955, is making excellent progress. The Air Force Atlas and Thor missiles and the Army-developed Jupiter missile are in production. The Navy's Polaris is expected to become a part of the deterrent power of the United States later this year. The Air Force Minuteman missile is scheduled to be in the force in significant numbers around mid-1963.

As this great scientific—industrial—military team has grown, and as it traveled the historic and difficult road which has led this Nation to the point where it is today—in terms of operational strategic ballistic missiles and a going scientific and production base—the successes and triumphs have been generously mingled with frustrations and failures. These mixed ingredients are common to any great human endeavor. We just happen to publicize our failures. But who among us would want to exchange our free press for the selective editing that goes on behind the Iron Curtain?

Speaking of failures, as you will recall, less than a year ago there were five consecutive Atlas failures. At the same time, though small attention was given to the fact, we also had our four consecutive successful Titan launches. There was much debate then as to the wisdom of continuing with the Atlas development. The panic button pushers were out in full cry, calling for the cancellation of the Atlas program in favor of Titan.

Today, in contrast, we have had 19 consecutive successful Atlas launchings and the Titan has been having some difficulty. So now the shoe is on the other foot. I have not the slightest doubt about the soundness of the Titan program. I have complete confidence that we will meet our operational date. With the recent successful flight of the complete Titan as well as previous flight tests, all its systems, including the nose cone, guidance and control, structure and propulsion, have been proved to be of sound technical design.

Our job now, as in all development programs, is to establish reliability.

I would therefore, sound a note of caution to those who have doubts and concerns as to the Titan program. Any disruption or degradation of the Titan development program, at this stage, could well have adverse consequences for our national security. I say this because the Titan ICBM has for over 3 years been programed to fill a vital role as an integral part of our deterrent force structure in the critical time period—1962 and 1963. Therefore our national security demands that we press forward with the greatest urgency on both the Atlas and Titan programs.

In looking back over the past few years I have made many strong and fast associations with my fellow workers in our great missile endeavor. The glue which binds these associations has been adversity—more so than success. The explosion of a missile on the stand, or shortly after lift-off, is a bit of death in the life of all those participating. Since I have had the opportunity to meet so very few, I would like to take this opportunity to pay public tribute to the many men and women who, with the high motivation and selfless devotion to the principles which have made this Nation great, have indeed wrought a missile miracle. In so doing, they have demonstrated to the world that our democracy, with its private enterprise system and a free people, is equal to any challenge which the Communists may pose.

What I am trying to say to the many who have met the challenge when the going was toughest has been stated most eloquently by a great American and a great competitor, President Theodore Roosevelt, who said:

"It is not the critic who counts—not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled—or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes short again and again, who knows the great enthusiasm, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause, who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

Missile Gap Controversy—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the concluding two articles of the series written by Ray Cromley on the current discussion over our defense position. These two articles appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun on February 10 and 11, 1960:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Feb. 10, 1960]

BUILDING '60 ROCKETS CALLED DANGER TO U.S. DEFENSES

WASHINGTON, February 10.—Jumping in now to close the possible missile gap of 1962–64 would seriously endanger the security of the United States.

Likewise, if the Russians built all the 1960-type ballistic missiles in 1960–63 that U.S. estimators think they're capable of, Nikita Khrushchev would be endangering his own defense position.

This is the startling private thinking of some of the top U.S. defense men. It is the reason why current U.S. missile production will be relatively small in 1960–62, until new type missiles are ready.

This is the reason why there are some men in the Pentagon who now think that a real missile gap may never develop.

LOOKING BACK

To understand this reasoning we have to go back a few years.

Take the air war in Korea. The Russians had concentrated on jets. The United States was far behind. The Red Mig was so good that they mass produced it. There was a "plane gap." The Russians had a lot of these modern planes. The United States didn't. But by leapfrogging the Mig-15 type plane the United States produced smaller numbers of a better plane, and the air battle in Korea was lopsided in our favor.

U.S. military men believe this lesson was not lost on the Russians.

Again look back several years. There was great furor in the United States that Russians were producing a huge intercontinental bomber fleet. The men who now forecast a missile gap, were forecasting a bomber gap with thousands of superior Russian bombers ready in a few years.

The United States tried to meet that gap, and built a large number of intercontinental bombers, hurried continental defenses at great expense.

NEVER DEVELOPED

But the Russian threat never developed. The Reds decided to leapfrog into missiles. The United States ended up with a considerable supply of intercontinental bombers which quickly were obsolescent.

In top U.S. military circles this Russian bomber red herring is now regarded as one of the major Russian victories—wasting U.S. production and effort in a blind alley.

Now these defense planners see the same pattern developing. They see Khrushchev speaking loudly about how many missiles he is producing.

But while Mr. K. talks, they notice two things:

He is improving his conventional army, navy, and air force in quality. He is producing more conventional weapons, not fewer.

He is not—so far at least—stepping up his missile production sharply. Nor is there evidence that he is planning to do so.

NO EVIDENCE

If Khrushchev were going to produce a great quantity of 1960-type missiles, he'd have to already have started a vast program of missile bases. So far there has been no evidence of this.

But whatever Khrushchev does, U.S. planners think they've learned the lesson of the Korean air battle and intercontinental bomber race.

So, U.S. strategists want to leapfrog today's old-fashioned intercontinental ballistic missiles. They want to turn out only as many liquid-fueled Atlases and Titans as they must in order to get by.

For these missiles with their fixed and well-advertised locations will soon be sitting ducks for Red sneak attacks. They're cumbersome and expensive. They're not versatile. They tie the United States to a vast network of expensive soon-to-be-obsolete type of missile bases.

If turned out in large quantities, they would tie up a great portion of U.S. military effort and organization on weapons and base capable of doing only one job in one way.

The strategists instead aim at jumping right to a new generation of superior ballistic missiles—the solid-fueled Sky Bolt, Minuteman and the advanced Polaris.

These are highly mobile. They get away from the fixed maginot line type of defense. The 5,000-mile-plus Minuteman can be put on railway cars. The 1,500-mile Polaris fits on subs. The 1,000-mile Sky Bolt will nest neatly on B–52's and B–58's.

These new missiles can't be zeroed in by Soviet intelligence men and knocked out on the first lick. They are relatively cheap and can be produced quickly in large numbers. They can do a variety of jobs.

As one defense man puts it:

"If we concentrated on the Atlas and Titan closing the gap now, we'd be condemning ourselves to certain inferiority later. This we can't afford.

"It's not just expense. Once you get a big program like that in motion—bases, men, weapons, electronics—it's hard to turn the juggernaut around. And you find yourself committed to a defense that just isn't quite good enough."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Feb. 11, 1960]

REDS' FUTURE PLANS KEEP UNITED STATES WORRIED

(By Ray Cromley)

WASHINGTON, February 11.—Regardless of what they might say in public, the top Defense Department strategists are mightily worried that th Soviet Union may overtake the United States in military strength.

But the periods that worry them most are not the ones now being spotlighted. They are the years right after the so-called "missile gap years" are past—1966–67–68–69.

It's not the number of Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles that concerns the military men in looking ahead to these critical years. It's the expected quality of the nextgeneration Red ICBM's.

NOT THE SIZE

And it's not the size of the Soviet Army. It's new Soviet weapons not yet developed for the infantry, for space operations, for the Red navy.

All signs point to whole families of radically different Russian weapons that may come to fruition in another 6 to 9 years.

These will include some of the following weapons projects now under forced draft research by Khrushchev's orders:

A fantastic piloted boostglide bomber that would escape U.S. radar. It would maneuver so adroitly that electronic spy satellites would be hard put to chart its course in advance. This eventually would develop into a space bomber.

A maneuverable intercontinental missile—already theoretically possible—in 6 to 8 years.

New lightweight infantry weapons that would give the individual Russian GI an astounding amount of fire power. A whole series of new missiles for the infantryman.

A new family of highly mobile artillery for the front line troops which would give Soviet Army divisions several times the useful fire power and mobility of American divisions. These projected advances are over and above the current "more artillery" and "more mobility" drives.

Unconventional ammunition—for the infantrymen and for artillery—that would damage wider areas more severely than conventional ammunition.

A widespread underwater surveillance network comprised of a radically new type of detection equipment. It would enable the Russians to pinpoint the locations of U.S. Polaris-firing submarines and other warships and to track them underwater from extremely long distances.

A method of using electromagnetic waves to destroy the effective use of U.S. communications, navigation, reconnaissance and early-warning satellites in operation.

A new series of nerve, disease and psychological gases and fine dusts that could be effectively sprayed by Red planes sweeping at high altitudes across great sections of the United States or fired in by ballistic missiles based in Russia or on submarines.

Long-distance methods for disrupting conventional U.S. radio communications in order to confuse American defenses as a preclude to Soviet attack.

PUSH OBJECTIVES

Not all these projects will be operational in the 6 to 9 years. But some will. The Russians have concentrated heavy teams of scientists to push these particular objectives in an attempt to beat the United States to the punch with new weapons.

The Russians are reorganizing sections of their industry. Crash teams of scientists and engineers quickly exploit breakthroughs when they appear and seek to translate them quickly into actual weapons.

U.S. teams are working on most of these same projects. But there is evidence the Russians are putting in more concentrated effort. Russia is not spending more on research and development than is the United States. But too much of the U.S. effort is devoted to refinements. A great deal of the Russian research is devoted to attempting radical new approaches to defense weapons.

"Something startling and unpredicted could come out of this type of research at any time," says one Pentagon technical man wryly.

Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the column "Capitol Hill" from the much respected publication Navy—the Magazine of Sea Power for February 1960.

This article is, I believe, of very timely significance, as it discusses the importance of Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates' memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff of December 29, 1959. As the article points out, the Gates Joint Chiefs of Staff memorandum is of historic importance in the history of defense organization in this country. By that memorandum, Secretary Gates announced his policy of personally sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff during consideration of any matter in disagreement.

This action by the present Secretary of Defense has received widespread acclaim within Congress and in the press. Also, it was the subject of a resolution by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States commending Secretary Gates for his leadership in strengthening the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the principle of civilian control.

This article contains the most thorough analysis that has come to my attention concerning the contents and meaning of Secretary Gates' memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think that after Members have read this article, they will realize that strong enlightened leadership such as that provided by the present Secretary of Defense can make far greater contributions to defense efficiency and organization improvement than is possible by mere changes in organization charts. I commend the article to the attention of Members of the House.

Also, I am including a copy of Secretary Gates' memorandum of December 29, 1959:

CAPITOL HILL

On December 29, 1959 Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., in his typical businesslike fashion, signed a memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This memorandum, issued without the publicity buildup and fanfare which has so often accompanied Pentagon pronouncements, is already being hailed as perhaps the most important step taken with respect to defense organization since the Department of Defense was established in 1947.

The Gates JCS memorandum was a relatively short and very understandable document. In it Secretary Gates notified the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that he desired to be informed when disagreements begin to develop on an issue in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Upon being informed, he told them, he and/or the Deputy Secretary of Defense would then thereafter sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff when the issue in disagreement was under consideration by them.

By so doing, Secretary Gates went directly to the heart of some of the most important problems affecting national security and the survival of this Nation. By his action he did the following:

(a) Asserted in a meaningful manner civilian control over military policy.

(b) Contributed to increased efficiency, effectiveness and promptness of JCS planning, deliberations and policy formulation.

(c) By strengthening the JCS system, cut much of the ground out from under the complaining critics whose only solution to everything they don't like in U.S. defense matters is the establishment of the defeated, disproven, discredited and alien single chief of staff system.

(d) Demonstrated what sound defense thinkers on Capital Hill have long contended—that strong, intelligent leadership in the Defense Department can do many constructive things to improve defense organization within the statutory framework of existing defense laws.

Congressional reaction to the Gates JCS memorandum has been unprecedentedly favorable. In private and public statements, Secretary Gates' action has been lauded by both Democrats and Republicans. One of the most highly respected authorities on defense matters in Congress is reported to have expressed the following opinion of the Gates JCS memorandum: "I consider Secretary Gates' action to be the most far-reaching, fundamental, overdue, and constructive step taken by a Secretary of Defense since the establishment of the Department."

By his JCS memorandum Secretary Gates makes what could be a contribution of historic importance, not only to the Department of Defense but to our form of government itself. The constitutional principal of civilian control of the military is something with which everyone agrees but about which many disagree when it comes to the practical application of these principles. Perhaps the greatest danger to the continuing and meaningful existence of civilian control of the military has been the lack of a simple and effective organizational device for keeping the civilian Secretary informed and in contact with top military policymaking. Until issuance of the Gates JCS memorandum the Secretary of Defense normally was not a participant of the policymaking procedure in the JCS. He waited until either the JCS forwarded an agreed position or the members became irretrievably frozen in disagreement. However, under the new Gates procedure, the Secretary of Defense henceforwurd will not be remote and isolated from the most vital military planning matters. By sitting with the JCS members during consideration of a problem on which there is some disagreement among them, the Secretary of Defense avails himself of the means to be informed as to the background and can gain a firm feel of the problem in disagreement. Thus, any future Secretary of Defense—and it must be assumed that rarely again will there be one who has served such a long apprenticeship as has Secretary Gates at various levels of the Defense Department—will be the beneficiary of a system by which he is immediately brought into intimate association with the information concerning the matters he must decide. It will keep the civilian authority from being remote and isolated. It will assure effective civilian control because it will make the civilian authority knowledgeable.

There are also two other important points covered by the Gates JCS memorandum. For some time defense observers on the Hill have felt that the JCS was under too much Pentagon pressure to agree and avoid presenting split papers to the Secretary of Defense for decision. This process of unanimity for the sake of unanimity was recognized on the Hill as a weakening feature of policymaking. Secretary Gates, in his JCS memorandum, recognized forthrightly that the very nature of matters before the JCS makes it reasonable and understandable that occasional differences of opinion will exist. There is no doubt but what this attitude by the Secretary of Defense will go far toward giving the Nation better defense plans. Also, in keeping with principles of strong and enlightening leadership, Secretary Gates stated in the JCS memorandum that he would make himself available to the chiefs of services individually for consultation and that such consultations would take top priority in his schedule.

Thus civilian and military authority and ability are both enhanced by bringing them closer together at the proper point in the formulation of defense policy.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., December 29, 1959.

Memorandum for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Subject: Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Relationships with the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Reference: (a) Department of Defense Directive No. 5158.1.

You will recall that reference (a) assigns the responsibility to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for "Keeping the Secretary of Defense informed on issues upon which agreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff has not been reached, and forwarding to the Secretary of Defense the recommendations, advice, and views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including any divergencies."

It is logical to assume that occasional divergencies in views will continue to be experienced within the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In view of the fundamental nature of matters which come before the Joint Chiefs of Staff for study, such divergencies are understandable. It is important, however, that such problems be resolved promptly in order that orderly planning may proceed and, where required, prompt action taken.

It is requested that I be promptly informed regarding any issue on which a difference of opinion is developing within the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I intend that either the Secretary of Defense and/or the Deputy Secretary of Defense will promptly meet with the Joint Chiefs at such times as they consider the issue in question. This procedure will insure that I am fully informed on the problems involved with a view to effecting their resolution in the most expeditious manner possible, and, where necessary, bringing the matter to the attention of the President for his decision.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the above procedure should not be interpreted as precluding any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from bringing to my personal attention any matter affecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff or an individual service. I look upon such discussions as matters of the highest priority within the Department of Defense and will gladly make time available in my schedule for such meetings regardless of any other schedule I may have.

THOMAS S. GATES.

Education Aid Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the February 11 issue of the La Grange Citizen, a community newspaper in my district is, I believe, a most thought-provoking commentary on the subject of Federal aid to education, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

EDUCATION AID DILEMMA

How do you compromise your worries regarding Federal aid to schools, with your recognition that only through Federal aid is there assurance that all children in the United States will have at least a sound basic education?

A national committee of economists and businessmen has made the compromise by recommending Federal aid only where States are not financially able to provide facilities needed for adequate education.

Throughout America we have worked ourselves into this educational support dilemma by adhering to the original theory that each community provide the educational facilities for its children. Until the tax burden on real estate property reached the "straw on the camel's back" stage we did little to shift the financing to a broader basis.

During the past several decades there has been increasing admission that the State should supply the education fundamentals. Now there is admission that States, at least some States, will not be able to provide the necessary school facilities unless Uncle Sam helps out.

This trend toward broader base financing of education is recognition that no community can escape the evils arising from poor or mediocre education in any other community. U.S. population is so fluid there no longer is immunization through isolation.

The fear that Federal aid might mean Federal control of education is well founded. The distribution of funds from Washington could very easily be determined to favor those communities that comply easiest and with least resistance to Federal dictates.

A Bill To Provide Pay Increases for Postal Workers and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in behalf of our postal workers and our other Federal employees, who are seeking an increase in salary to offset the increasing cost of living.

I have supported legislation in the past which has given these public servants well-deserved pay increases, and shall support legislation to that effect at the present time. Several bills have been introduced on this subject, and I am introducing a companion bill today, which carries the same provisions as the Morrison bill.

In addition to providing for an upward adjustment in the compensation of our postal employees, the bill will also apply to other employees of the Federal Government.

Much has been said in the past, and will be said in the future, of the need for passage of such legislation. The de-

valuation of the dollar, the continuing spiral of living costs—these are some of the fundamental reasons for supporting legislation of this nature. Over the years the salary level of Federal employees has not kept pace with the increases granted those in private industry. Many workers have been forced to take on extra jobs in order to make ends meet. In so many instances wives of Federal employees have had to seek work to supplement the family income in an effort to provide the bare essentials.

I hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will see fit to approve this legislation without any undue delay, and I urge my colleagues to support it when it reaches the House floor for consideration.

Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of statement made by Hon. W. C. "Dan" Daniel, member of the House of Delegates of Virginia, from the city of Danville, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Wednesday, February 17, 1960. Mr. Daniel is a distinguished Virginian and American and is an authority on sound constitutional government. He is serving at present as a member of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government and is past national commander of the American Legion. Commander Daniel's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. C. "DAN" DANIEL, MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1960

The United Nations Charter provided for the establishment of an International Court of Justice of 15 judges to be employed in the settlement of international disputes. To make the United States subject to this Court, the now senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, introduced a resolution declaring that these United States would be bound by the Court's jurisdiction in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning (a) The interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation, provided, that such a declaration shall not apply to (a) disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; (b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Although domestic matters were ostensibly excluded from the Court's jurisdiction, no guide or line of demarcation was established for determining which matters were international and which were domestic. This would have left it for the Court to decide its own jurisdiction. To blunt this sword pointed at the very heart of our Nation, the Connally amendment was adopted, adding six words "as determined by the United States" to section (b) of the proviso. It meant simply that we reserved the right to say whether a matter involving our Nation was one of international or domestic concern. This is such an obviously sensible limitation that argument in support or defense of it would seem superfluous were it not for the fact that a number of persons of considerable public prominence urge its repeal.

Briefly, their arguments in favor of abridging this safeguard to our national sovereignty seem to be that the nations of the world are not using this International Court as a means of settling their differences (I understand the Court has had fewer than a dozen cases since it was created) and that this situation is attributable to the fact that other nations have followed the example set by us in the Connally amendment. These exponents of "one worldism" take the position that the United States cannot be trusted to decide the question of jurisdiction fairly, but that we can trust the World Court to make the proper decision for us—that is, that we can rely with confidence upon the World Court not to infringe on our domestic concerns. Also, we are told that if we make this basic, possibly fatal, cession of sovereignty, others, including the Communist countries, will be shamed into doing the same, and then we will have a world ruled by law instead of by force.

This latter is, of course, utter nonsense. I doubt if anyone in this room really believes that a dedicated Communist can be shamed into anything, certainly not into giving up any position of strength he may occupy. A Communist has no conscience in the sense we know it; his only shame comes in failing the Communist cause of world domination. But it seems hardly necessary to argue this particular point. If the administration or the Congress had any real confidence in the effect of moral or legal suasion or of world opinion on the aggressive aims of communism, I doubt if the arguments being made in these very halls on virtually every major issue—defense, education, welfare, budget, etc.—would be so intimately and repeatedly tied into the strength of our national posture in relation to Russia and China. No, gentlemen, you know that until God puts love and charity foremost in every heart, the safety of the world is more dependent on the strength and freedom of the United States than on anything else. The difficulty seems to be that apparently some have been misled as to the extent of the risk involved in repeal of the Connally amendment.

For a court decree to have any binding or peacemaking effect, it must be accepted by the parties affected. Acceptance comes in only two ways, either voluntarily because the parties, particularly the unsuccessful ones, feel that the preservation of law and order is more important than their own selfish desires; or else, because the court has the power necessary to force acceptance. Little need be said concerning the futility of placing our hopes for world peace on the first of these. For those nations which are willing to subordinate selfish aims for the peace of society as a whole, the world does not need a court; diplomacy will suffice. For the others, well, I am sure you can imagine just how far Messrs. Khrushchev, Mao Tze-tung, or even Castro would go in voluntarily acceding to a distasteful court decree.

This brings up the matter of the establishment of an international military force of sufficient strength to enforce decrees of this Court against any party. The ultimate necessity for this is so obvious that the groundwork has already been laid within the United Nations.

Here, then, is the question: Are the Senators willing now to agree that we will either voluntarily obey—or that international troops may enter these United States to enforce—decrees of this Court concerning our labor, racial, financial, and who knows what other domestic problems? I think not. "But," say the "One Worlders," "this is an unfair question; the Court's jurisdiction extends only to international matters—domestic matters are excluded." How weak must be their perception, how short their memories.

Whether these problems would come within the jurisdiction of the Court, once the Connally amendment were repealed, would depend on nothing more than the Court's own interpretation of such words as "essentially," "domestic," "international," "any," and "obligation.". Quite obviously, the judges' respective interpretations would be colored by their background, purposes and ideology. Many things that we think of as being of strictly domestic concern might well be of international concern to a majority of the members of the Court whose political views are entirely different from ours. Indeed, would it be reasonable to expect such a Court—being the creature of the United Nations—not to give a broad interpretation to those international obligations—that is the word used in clause (c) of the World Court resolution—set forth in that biggest of all treaties, the United Nations Charter. For example, subsection (a) of article 55 makes it an obligation of member nations to promote: "higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development."

After all, judges, like other men, have a natural tendency to aggrandize those institutions with which they are connected.

This is nothing new. For example, you will search in vain for any provision in the U.S. Constitution granting the Federal Government the right of eminent domain. Except for the fifth amendment, the only provision on this subject is found in section 8, article I, which reads in part as follows: "* * * and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings * * *."

For a number of years, the Federal Government observed this apparent limitation and the States condemned the land for it. Being federally minded, however, the Supreme Court had decided by 1875 that this was not a good limitation on the Federal Government and so simply held that any government as big as the Federal Government naturally had its own right of eminent domain. The constitutional phrase dealing with the consent of the State bothered it not at all—the court merely moved it over to modify the phrase "exercise like authority" instead of the word "purchased."

Regardless of whether we think it was right or wrong, it is common knowledge that the meaning and scope of the "general welfare," the "interstate commerce," and the "necessary and proper" clauses, among others, have been stretched beyond all possibility of recognition by those who adopted them. And you have seen matters of purely State concern at the time the 14th amendment was adopted—and so pronounced repeatedly for some 70 years by the highest courts in the land—changed overnight into matters of Federal concern. The wording of the Constitution remained the same. Later members of the Supreme Court simply decided that they did not like its initial meaning and so changed it. Indeed, the members

of our highest Court have substituted their own notions of right and wrong in place of once plain constitutional provisions to such an extent that the chief justices of the several States, in conference assembled, felt compelled to censure them in unprecedented fashion.

The point is this. If interpretations can expand and change so with judges of the same nationality and with a common legal and political heritage, how much stability and respect can we expect a polyglot international court to exhibit with regard to the scope and meaning of such words as "domestic concern" and "international concern"? And need I remind you again that the United Nations Charter was adopted as a treaty. Under article VI of our national Constitution a treaty "shall be the supreme Law of the Land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby."

One of the principal reasons this great legislative body was created was to act as a special guardian for the basic rights of this country, its individual States, and the people therein, and to guard against precipitate or emotional legislative action. It is my sincere hope that you will live up to that purpose in this connection and kill any attempt to repeal the Connally amendment.

Address of Hon. Harold W. Prehn, Assistant Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of former Assistant Federal Housing Administration Commissioner Harold W. Prehn made to the members of the National Committee of Section 608 Owners at its last annual meeting in New York City.

As a member of the subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee of this body, I have a continuing interest in the economic soundness of the apartment houses built under section 608 of the National Housing Act during the emergency veterans' housing program.

I am pleased to note that in the Federal Housing Administration's latest annual report, FHA multifamily housing losses are about six one-hundredths of 1 percent, which is truly an excellent record. This certainly indicates that FHA is carrying out the purposes of the National Housing Act with success.

On the other hand, I am advised by Carl L. Shipley, general counsel for the National Committee of Section 608 Owners, that members of that trade association are becoming concerned about increasing competition from single family dwellings insured under section 203 of the National Housing Act, and from other FHA programs.

In the National Housing Act, Congress has sought to meet the reasonable housing needs of the Nation. I believe we are succeeding. However, the basic standard in the National Housing Act is economic soundness.

The Commissioner of FHA is not permitted under the law to insure mortgages or multifamily dwellings which are not economically sound.

In my opinion it would not be in keeping with the spirit of the law to overbuild or create destructible competition among FHA insured projects. As a Member of Congress, I cannot imagine that the American taxpayer would approve of any such program.

I believe the speech of former Assistant Commissioner Harold W. Prehn is worthy of serious study by other Members of Congress and interested persons in the industry and in other agencies of the Government. His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HON. HAROLD W. PREHN, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF SECTION 608 OWNERS, OCTOBER 1, 1959, AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Shipley, distinguished guests, members of the National Committee of Section 608 Owners, I am pleased and honored to have been invited to make a few brief remarks to you today. The past 2 years I have come to know your chairman, James Blanchard, and your general counsel, Carl Shipley, very well. They are in constant touch with me and members of my staff on management of section 608 projects, as well as 207's and other multifamily housing built with mortgages insured by the FHA. While I cannot always agree with their recommendations, I can assure you they are strong advocates in behalf of the members of this trade association.

Before talking about some of the industry finance operations in the early years I want to say a word about the FHA.

You will recall that the FHA was established in 1934. It was originally financed with funds advanced by the Government. Since 1940 all FHA operating expenses have been paid from its insurance funds, and all the capital advanced by the Government to finance operations in the early years has been repaid to the U.S. Treasury. At the present time our capital and statutory reserves amount to $551.5 million, all of which has been built up from income.

As of our last annual report, the FHA had written an aggregate sum of $45 billion of insurance, of which $5.4 billion was written on multifamily housing projects with some 711,000 living units. Our losses on the total amount of all mortgage insurance have amounted to less than twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent. We think this is an extraordinary record showing the basic soundness of all of the FHA programs. As you know, under the law, the FHA will not insure a mortgage unless it is convinced of the economic soundness of the proposed project, except where FHA has no choice in the matter as in certain urban renewal areas or on military housing. (Some war housing.)

Now let me turn to the section 608 program. During the period of 1942-50, when the program expired, more than 7,000 apartment houses with over 465,000 dwelling units were built. Although most of these projects were a part of the veterans emergency housing program, they were well built with many garden-type projects and most of them were located on land which has appreciated in value over the years as building sites in urban areas have become harder to find. Not long ago I was interested to read that the inventory of rental housing is little changed in number from 1950. A census in that year showed 19.7 million rental occupied dwelling units. Reports from an updated inventory indicated rental occupancy to be a little more than 20 million. Thus, while over 9 million owner-occupied dwelling units came into the market between 1950 and 1958, the rental component of the market remained almost unchanged. Thus, the competitive position of 608's with comparatively low construction costs and low interest rate loans, is improving monthly.

Of course I know you have problems and if I didn't Jim Blanchard and Carl Shipley would soon make me aware of them. For example, some 608 projects are growing older and mortgagor-owners fear that they are confronted with a serious obsolescence problem. We are giving serious consideration to this problem. We have directed all of our field offices to broaden the base for determining the eligibility for refinancing existing section 608 and section 908 mortgages under the provisions of section 207, to restore projects to a competitive position by eliminating obsolescence or by adding new equipment and betterments. We realize only too well that the competitive position of some rental housing projects may become impaired through obsolescence of their design, functional plan, or equipment. In these circumstances, we have advised our directors that it will be prudent to give consideration to well conceived plans for capital improvements including the installation of updated equipment such as air conditioning, designed to restore a project to a more favorable position in the rental market. To be eligible for such refinancing, proposals must involve a substantial alteration or betterment of buildings or equipment calculated to restore the income potential of the property. We cannot refinance, pursuant to section 223, simply to defray the cost of a deferred maintenance program or to meet a deficiency in the reserve for replacements fund.

Another problem with which we are grappling is the handling of replacement reserves. Some mortgagees are reluctant to invest these funds, despite the fact that the mortgagee certificates provide either that the mortgagor-owner can deposit cash or bonds, which the mortgagee must accept, or that the mortgagee must invest the funds at the request of the 608 owner. Whenever this matter is brought to our attention, we try to correct it.

Some 608 and 207 owners feel that the FHA policy on withdrawals from the replacement reserve is much too restrictive. I have not reached any conclusions on this point. Obviously, the replacement reserve fund is necessary to build up a capital reserve with which to replace stoves, refrigerators, and other items which are wasting assets and become exhausted or worn out with the passage of time. On the other hand, it may be that in some instances our policy is too rigid. At the present time consideration is being given to the advisability of suspending the reserve payments where the amount on deposit is substantially equal to an accumulation of 144 monthly deposits and the fund is maintained at a prescribed minimum level.

Recently, some of you have become greatly concerned about vacancies in 608 projects which allegedly are caused by competition from FHA insured, single family dwellings. We are concerned about the vacancy rate in the Midwest and Southwest. One of our reports in June indicated that the national vacancy rate in FHA insured rental properties has increased from 3 to 5.4 percent in the past year. As you know, 608 projects were processed on the basis of 93 percent occupancy and a 6½-percent return. Therefore, the overall picture is better than we anticipated when these projects were built. However, I know there are individual vacancy problems which are very serious. These are of great concern to us. However, we do not have enough information at this time to tell whether or not these vacancies are caused by competition from other FHA projects.

I want to assure you that I have the greatest possible concern with maintaining the economic health of 608 projects. This means that we must have an effective maintenance program, and our rent ceilings must be reasonable so that a fair return can be earned by the owners. Our replacement reserve policy must be reasonable, and we certainly would not want to insure elderly housing, relocation housing, 207 apartment housing, military housing, or single family dwellings in any area where they must draw their occupants from 608 projects or other FHA-insured projects. I cannot conceive of any of our underwriters approving new housing in areas suffering a high vacancy ratio where the effect of new construction would be to create vacancies in existing FHA-insured residential property. We still have almost $3 billion of contingent liabilities in the 608 program, and all we can do is lose money if these projects suffer vacancies because we overbuild with single family dwellings or rental properties in the same market. We are looking into this problem and if any of you have any information corroborated by facts and other reliable evidence, I will certainly be happy to receive it. Even under the new housing law just passed by Congress, a $15,000 home requires at least a $600 downpayment and the monthly payments on the mortgage will amount to approximately $86. When you add in telephone, utilities, and the other monthly expenses, you can see that even this modest single family dwelling will cost $125–$150 a month. Further, you must bear in mind that many families who once occupies 608's have children, need more space, and must move into suburban areas in single family dwellings. However, we will not depart from our basic standard that every 207 project mortgage insured by the FHA must be on a property which is economically sound, and to me that means a property which fills a need in the market and does not simply transfer tenants from one FHA project to another. We do not intend to insure project mortgages if the result is to overbuild.

In closing, let me say I am glad to have the opportunity to be here with you. I think the National Committee of Section 608 Owners is making a valuable contribution as a trade association. I congratulate you, mortgagor-owners of 608 projects, for your serious and continued interest in the properties you own. We at FHA are always available to discuss any problem which has as its purpose strengthening the 608 program. Thank you.

Acts of Desecration of Synagogues and Other Places of Worship

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply gratified that on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives unanimously passed, by a vote of 392 to 0, a resolution expressing the profound sense of indignation and shock felt by Congress at the recent acts of desecration of synagogues and other places of worship.

I am proud to have joined with a number of my colleagues in the introduction of this resolution. On February 1, 1960, I expressed the reasons for my strong support of action by Congress to condemn these ugly acts of desecration.

We in America must demonstrate to the peoples of the world by word and deed our profound belief in religious liberty and our profound hostility to religious bigotry.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Sam E. Lesher, of Colorado.
Melvin H. Levine, of Massachusetts.
Wingate Lloyd, of Pennsylvania.
Roger S. Lowen, of New York.
George Q. Lumsden, Jr., of New Jersey.
Edward J. Maguire, Jr., of California.
Edward J. Malonis, of Massachusetts.
Wade H. B. Matthews, of North Carolina.
Henry Ellis Mattox, of Mississippi.
James A. Mattson, of Minnesota.
W. Douglas McLain, Jr., of Illinois.
Noble M. Melencamp, of Kansas.
Stanley R. Miller, Jr., of Florida.
Herbert T. Mitchell, Jr., of North Carolina.
John C. Monjo, of Connecticut.
John T. Morgan, of Illinois.
Gottfried W. Moser, of New York.
Robert B. Oakley, of Louisiana.
Oscar J. Olson, Jr., of Texas.
Ronald D. Palmer, of Michigan.
Thomas J. Pape, of Texas.
Sydney E. Paulson, of Michigan.
George A. Pavlik, of Iowa.
John A. Perkins, of California.
Miss Emily Perreault, of Illinois.
Lawrence Pezzullo, of New York.
Homer R. Phelps, Jr., of New York.
Martin Polstein, of New York.
Dale M. Povenmire, of Ohio.
Frederick D. Purdy, of Pennsylvania.
Walter G. Ramsay, of Virginia.
William E. Rau, of Missouri.
Miss Rozanne L. Ridgway, of Minnesota.
George B. Roberts, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John T. Rogerson, Jr., of Florida.
George M. Scanlan, of New York.
Orville H. Schmidt, of Minnesota.
Roger C. Schrader, of Missouri.
Glenn E. Schweitzer, of California.
Leslie Andrew Scott, of New York.
Arthur P. Shankle, Jr., of Texas.
David D. Shobe, of Illinois.
Robert Lee Shuler, of Virginia.
John P. Shumate, Jr., of California.
William L. Simmons, of Mississippi.
Clint E. Smith, of New Mexico.
Joseph L. Smith, of Indiana.
Walter Burges Smith II, of New York.
Wayne S. Smith, of California.
C. Richard Spurgin, of Illinois.
Linwood R. Starbird, of Maine.
Andrew L. Steigman, of New York.
Gerald M. Sutton, of California.
John J. Taylor, of Tennessee.
James M. Thomson, of Minnesota.
Thomas A. Thoreson, of Illinois.
Donald C. Tice, of Kansas.
Blaine C. Tueller, of Utah.
John T. Vanderveen, of California.
Leonard A. Warren, of California.
Ronald A. Webb, of California.
Benjamin Weiner, of New York.
Alfred J. White, of the District of Columbia.
Albert W. Whiting, of Kansas.
James P. Willis, Jr., of California.
Dawson S. Wilson, of Florida.
Herbert Gilman Wing, of Pennsylvania.
Edward C. Woltman, Jr., of Indiana.
Brooks Wrampelmeier, of Ohio.
Edward E. Wright, of Louisiana.

George Dolgin, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Merrill M. Bievins, of Kentucky.
Horace F. Byrne, of New York.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of New York.
Thomas H. Englesby, of the District of Columbia.
Elmer M. Falk, of Virginia.
Jorma L. Kaukonen, of California.
James F. Magdanz, of Virginia.
William J. Tonesk, of Alabama.
Paul A. Toussaint, of New Hampshire.
Mrs. Virginia C. Westfall, of Virginia.
Mrs. Doris S. Whitnack, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John Royle Baxter, of Maryland.
George M. Bennsky, of Virginia.
Irving G. Cheslaw, of Maryland.
David S. Ennis, of Florida.
Edzard S. Hermberg, of California.
Murray E. Jackson, of Illinois.
John Church Renner, of Ohio.
W. John Wilson, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lawrence H. Harris, of California.
Harry V. Ryder, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Elizabeth B. Tolman, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Bernice M. Kelly, of Texas.
Elwood J. McGuire, of Connecticut.
William G. Murphy, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Burton M. Chadbourne, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Rose M. Dickson, of New York.
Lyman W. Priest, of Arkansas.
Miss Marjorie A. Sutton, of Colorado.
James A. Verreos, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Morton I. Abramowitz, of Massachusetts.
Francesco J. Alberti, Jr., of California.
Scott I. Amour, of California.
Carl A. Bastiani, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Lyndall G. Beamer, of Illinois.
Calvin C. Berlin, of Ohio.
David E. Biltchik, of New York.
John A. Bushnell, of California.
David W. Carr, of Massachusetts.
Anthony S. Dalsimer, of New York.
V. Raymond Dickey, of South Dakota.
Richard A. Dugstad, of Virginia.
Jay P. Freres, of Illinois.
Miss Marlene W. Futterman, of New York.
George G. B. Griffin, of South Carolina.
Miss Lois Haase, of Missouri.
Gabriel C. Hanson, of Illinois.
Pierre M. Hartman, of Colorado.
Martin G. Heflin, of Florida.
David C. Holton, of Virginia.
Richard F. King, of Louisiana.
Anthony S. Kochanek, Jr., of New Jersey.
William E. Landfair, of Ohio.
Paul A. London, of New York.
David W. McClintock, of California.
Harry Macy, Jr., of Florida.
Miss Priscilla E. Mitchell, of Indiana.
Miss Sandra A. Nelson, of New Jersey.
Donathon C. Olliff, of Alabama.
Gerald G. Oplinger, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alison Palmer, of New York.
Frederick J. Plotrow, of New York.
Allen Van Potts, of Utah.
Anthony C. E. Quainton, of Washington.
Thomas J. Roesch, of Ohio.
David Rowe, of Maryland.
Thomas J. Scanlon, of California.
Miss Marilyn M. Shepherd, of North Carolina.
Richard W. Smith, of New York.
Roger A. Sorenson, of Utah.
Frederic N. Spotts, of Massachusetts.
Dirck Teller, of Maryland.
Richard S. Thompson, of Washington.
George R. Trolles, of Ohio.
Gary L. Vyne, of Arizona.
Raymond J. Wach, of Ohio.
John D. Whiting, of Wisconsin.
William B. Whitman, Jr., of Illinois.
Roderick M. Wright, of California.

Arthur J. Laemmerzahl, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 8, a vice consul of career and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on August 4, 1959, and confirmed by the Senate on August 12, 1959.)

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Martin H. Armstrong, of Washington.
Willard B. Devlin, of Pennsylvania.
John A. Noon, of Maryland.
Edward Stansbury, of Connecticut.

Richard P. Mitchell, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Maurice J. Gremillion, of Texas.
Russell S. Hibbs, of Missouri.
F. Raymond Senden, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Richard T. Akins, of California.
Edwin U. C. Bohlen, of Maine.
G. Stanley Brown, of Oklahoma.
James P. Burke, of Maryland.
William A. Campbell, of California.
Harold C. Champeau, of Maryland.
Thomas J. Flores, Jr., of New York.
Joseph E. Lazarsky, of Virginia.
Robert D. Murphy, of Maryland.
Oliver M. Silsby, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Roger K. Ackley, of Maryland.
Arthur C. Bartlett, of Connecticut.
William L. Green, Jr., of North Carolina.
Preston Valien, of Tennessee.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Appendix

Big Bend National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for several years the eyes of vacationing Americans have been turning toward Big Bend National Park, in southwest Texas. Now the New York Times has devoted a special feature article to this vast and intriguing land which promises to become a mecca for travelers who respond to the call of the great outdoors. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the February 14, 1960, issue of the New York Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE WEST IS STILL UNTAMED—BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK ON RIO GRANDE IS FOR THE HARDY VACATIONIST

(By Henry N. Ferguson)

BROWNSVILLE, TEX.—Tucked away in a remote corner of Brewster County in southwest Texas is Big Bend National Park. This 700,000-acre wonderland of great gorges, mountain peaks and broad mesas is approximately the size of Rhode Island. Lying at the bottom of the huge pocket formed where the Rio Grande dips deep into Mexico, this region is in a more nearly primeval state than perhaps any area of similar size in the entire country.

Through its passes Comanches and Apaches used to travel on their way to raid Mexican settlements. Cattle rustlers, smugglers, fugitives from justice, early Spanish explorers, and modern treasure seekers have probed its ancient secrets.

On November 21, 1955, Douglas McKay, who was then Secretary of the Interior, spoke eloquently of this scrambled region when he dedicated it as a national park. "The Big Bend country has a record of violence dating back hundreds of millions of years," he said. "These very mountains are products of the time when the earth twisted in an agony of upheaval and volcanic explosions."

The marvelously carved straight walls of the flame-colored canyons in the Big Bend country had their beginning back in the shadowy past, when the sea that had covered the central section of western America was beginning to dry up. As the Rocky Mountains started their slow push toward the sky, a thin trickle of water emerged from the ancient ocean of mud.

For millions of years, the slender stream that would one day be known as the Rio Grande flowed toward the sea. It worked unhurriedly at its task of cutting chasms 2,000 feet deep through this area. Today Boquillas, Mariscal, and Santa Elena canyons offer some of the most superb scenery in the United States.

LAND IS FORBIDDING

This is a wild, mysterious and forbidding land. As one native caustically remarked: "It is a country that promises more and gives less than any place I ever saw. There is nothing in these mountains that does not have claws or thorns or a sting to it."

And it is true. The creamy white blooms of the flowering sotol and the gorgeous coloring of the blossoming lechuguilla are eye-catching in their beauty. But the precipitous slopes and wide mesas are also clothed with masses of prickly pear and cacti that seem to take a sadistic delight in stabbing the unwary tenderfoot.

Marathon, on U.S. 90 about midway between San Antonio and El Paso, is the eastern gateway to the park. The first thing the traveler must remember, as he turns south from Marathon on U.S. 385 toward the park, is that he is in big country. It is still 40 miles to the park boundary, 69 to the next station, 79 to his destination in the basin of the Chisos.

He enters the park at Persimmon Gap, in the Santiago Mountains. The road at this point follows the old Comanche Trail into Mexico. The visitor is already more than 1,000 feet lower than at Marathon.

At this point it is well to recall that the Chisos and other mountains in the park, while having a stark beauty all their own, are not the same type as found in Colorado and other States. This is desert country where animals and plants must literally fight for their livelihood and very existence. The traveler must seek his green forests and cold mountain streams elsewhere.

As he drives toward the Chisos, the motorist will pass a sign pointing to Dagger Flat, an area of giant yuccas several miles off the main road. Farther down the highway is the fossil bone exhibit at Tornillo Creek. The exhibit shows the fossils exactly as they were found; one of the animals was an ancestor of the horse family.

FANTASTIC FOSSILS

Harold Broderick, park naturalist, points out that Tornillo Creek, a rampaging devil in this land of flash floods, contains many fossils of fantastic size. Archeologists plan to make a thorough study of the area soon.

"It would not surprise me at all," says Mr. Broderick, "if fossils in Big Bend did not outdinosaur Dinosaur." His reference is to Dinosaur National Monument in Utah-Colorado, considered the finest example of fossils in the national park system.

At Panther Junction, at the foot of the Chisos, are park headquarters, and the traveler could hardly do better than meet the park rangers who can do an excellent job of explaining park features.

Three miles ahead is Basin Junction, where the tourist turns for his drive to the basin through Green Gulch and over Panther Pass. The last 7 miles provide a drive that has no equal in Texas, and over terrain that oldtimers said no highway could ever traverse.

Switchbacks take the motorist up to 5,800 feet at Panther Pass, then drop him 400 fee into Basin itself. A peculiar feature of the road is that the visitor gets no view of the Basin lodges until he fairly bursts upon the scene.

The mile-high basin nestles in the shadow of its guardian, 7,300-foot-high Casa Grande, whose color changes each hour of the day as the sun changes. It is not, however, the highest point in Big Bend; Emory Peak is 7,835 feet.

It is because of its attitude that the park makes such a fine summer vacationland. July-August temperatures average a minimum 60 degrees and a maximum 85. It is dry, invigorating air. The park is open all year, camping grounds are free and trailers are welcome. Lowest temperatures are in January and February with minimums of 40 and maximums of 60.

Possibly the strangest phenomenon of all in this arid wilderness of painted rocks and jagged fissures is the presence of an evergreen forest, the habitat of the white-tail deer.

It is understandable that few visitors to Big Bend ever thrill to the soft tuch of pine needles beneath their feet, or even to the distant sight of tall trees. For it is a grueling 8-mile hike up a rock-strewn path that crosses the shoulder of Emory Peak, highest point in the park.

LOAM REPLACES ROCKS

Only after crossing this soaring barrier is the cactus left behind, and one's footsteps pad on soft loam instead of rocks. Then a look toward the heavens reveals a stretch of giant Douglas-fir trees, gathered here to form a lost forest in the midst of a desert.

Good paved roads now carry the visitor to most points of interest in the park. Excellent hiking and riding trails radiate out in all directions from the basin. One of the most popular of these leads up to Lost Mine Peak. There probably has never been a hiker on this trail who did not secretly hope that he might be fortunate enough to stumble onto the lost mine. It has been sought after for the last 150 years.

The window, at one side of the basin, also provides an interesting hike or horseback ride. For those with limited time, there is one trip that is a must. It is to the south rim of the Chisos, an 8-hour round trip on foot or by horseback.

Called the Roof of Texas, the rim is 1½ miles high. Far below, the sinuous Rio Grande threads its way eastward. Beyond the river is a veritable ocean of mountain ranges in Mexico. Most spectacular is the Sierra del Carmen range; at sunset it looks like hundreds of serrated miles of blazing, golden ingots.

BATHED IN SUNLIGHT

Santa Elena Canyon, on the Rio Grande at the western side, is best visited in early morning when sunlight bathes the canyon, making an ideal setting for good color pictures. Canyon walls rise more than 1,500 feet above the river for a scene that many visitors, upon seeing it for the first time, find hard to believe is in Texas.

A side road from Santa Elena leads to Castolon, a small community that was the scene of some action during the troubles with Pancho Villa in 1916–17. While still resembling a private community, Castolon was acquired 2 years ago by the National Park Service, but will not be taken over until 1961. This area is earmarked for future development as a major tourist center.

It was at Castolon that a Houston couple left the main roads in June 1957, to seek adventure in an area where tourists are warned not to enter. After their car became mired in the sand the man died from ex-

haustion and heat; his wife was rescued a few days later from a small cave in which she had found water.

Hot Springs, down in the southeast corner of the park, was visited by the Indians long before the white man came. They knew of the curative powers of the springs and chiseled a giant bathtub out of solid rock, to make it easier to bathe in the healing water.

The thing that will make Big Bend unusually different and attractive for the future visitor is a project to get the Mexican Government to allocate about 1 million acres of equally scenic beauty bordering our park.

Tourist accommodations, operated by National Park Concessions, Inc., range from plain to fancy. The park's cabins are simple but clean, without bath, but adjacent to central shower and toilet buildings. Rates are $5 per night for two, $5.50 for three, $6 for four.

Attractive stone cottages with small patios and featuring wall-to-wall carpets, all-electric heat, and private baths are $8.50 for two, $12.50 for four, $16.50 for six.

John Llewellyn Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once again America has honored the memory of Abraham Lincoln, an exemplary man of God, and an outstanding President. February 12 marked the 151st anniversary of his birth and, as is customary, millions of words have been written and spoken of his life, his deeds, his philosophy, and his speeches, conversations, and letters. While paying tribute to his name on this occasion, we at the same time encourage today's generations to emulate Lincoln's love of his Creator, love of his country, and love of his fellow men. Through the years I have found each February 12 a more enriching and more inspiring experience.

This years I should like to call attention to the anniversary of another great man who has made numerous lasting contributions to the Nation's social and economic welfare. He came into this world on February 12, 1880, a year of many remarkable developments. Charles Francis Brush brought arc lights to Broadway. Thomas Edison invented the incandescent lamp, and George Eastman founded a business of boundless possibilities with his invention of photographic equipment. James A. Garfield was reelected to the House of Representatives, then elected to the Senate, and finally to the White House—all in the same year.

Though the townsfolk hardly realized the significance of the event, the new son who came to the Thomas H. Lewis household in Lucas, Iowa, would someday take his place among the exclusive set of the Nation's immortal citizens. Like Lincoln, John Llewellyn Lewis had to do it the hard way.

As one of eight children, John had little opportunity for formal schooling. He went to work at the age of 12, yet his driving spirit and thirst for knowledge, blended with sound native intelligence, have made him one of the most learned men of our time. His courage, vision, determination, sincerity of purpose, and leadership elevated John L. Lewis to the presidency of the United Mine Workers within two score years of that memorable event back in Lucas, Iowa, in 1880. Then his struggles in behalf of the workers he represented were only beginning, and in the past 40 years he has carried on a relentless crusade that long ago had won for him the acclamation of management and labor alike, that distinguished him as the most remarkable and most respected individual in the history of the labor movement.

Let me read a passage from a famous address:

> Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights.

No, that quotation did not come from an oration by John L. Lewis. That paragraph was the product of Abraham Lincoln in his first annual message to Congress. But the spirit of these lasting words has been exemplified in the career of Mr. Lewis.

My home is in the center of a very important mining district. From the time of my childhood I have associated with mine owners and mine workers and their families. For as long as I can remember, the workers and their wives and children spoke of John L. Lewis as they would speak of their own fathers because they had complete confidence in what he said and what he did. And well they might have, for he never made false promises nor relaxed in his life's mission.

And the other workers—I use the word advisedly, because operating a mine requires work and more work, year in and year out, if any degree of success is to be attained in this highly competitive business—those workers called capital were not always so kind and gracious when they spoke of John L. I have heard him cussed up and down, but I never heard anyone ever say, at any time, that John L. Lewis was not sincere and integrious. Get mine owners alone and you would hear Mr. Lewis praised for his brilliance, his straightforwardness, and his determination.

Then the struggle reached its crescendo, and suddenly there was peace and amity. Mine management and John L. Lewis sat down and agreed upon a principle that could and should set a pattern in the other great industries of our Nation. Both houses now sup together as one happy family, with the result that the coal industry is unified in its efforts to go forward with general industrial progress, to share mutually in the products of mechanization, and to demand revision of governmental policies that place coal at an unfair disadvantage in fields of competition.

John L. Lewis has often been called a capitalist, and there is little question that he would have been a most successful and prosperous businessman had he chosen that side of the coal industry, or of any other industry. Without his cooperative attitude toward automation of mining processes, the American mining industry could not have approached the degree of efficiency which has placed it far and above every other mining system in the world. His insistence on making mines safer has had spectacular results, and today and every day the UMWA and coal operators work together in search of continued progress in this area.

At the risk of redundancy, I cannot help but mention the oratorical genius of this outstanding American who will celebrate his 80th birthday on February 12. Demosthenes and Cicero are names synonymous with rhetorical perfection. "On the Crown," a product of the third century before Christ, has endured the test of time, as has Cicero's "I Am a Citizen of Rome," which is of almost the same vintage.

We are to presume that every century had its great speakers—some evangelists, some statesmen, some lecturers, some teachers—and in divers tongues. But the list of outstanding American orators is not extensive. And for this reason John L. Lewis has captured still another niche in the halls of famous men. His capacity, backed by a fabulous vocabulary and a powerful and persuading voice, for drama, humor, and acrimony rank him with such famous names as Patrick Henry, Henry Clay, James Gillespie Blaine, Abraham Lincoln, Robert G. Ingersoll, Henry Ward Beecher, and William Jennings Bryan.

America is proud of John L. Lewis. We wish him many more happy and fruitful years as president emeritus of the United Mine Workers of America.

University of Hartford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared, for the information of the Congress and other readers of the RECORD.

We in Connecticut are proud of the rapid development and growth of the University of Hartford.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

The growth and development of the University of Hartford, in Connecticut, is a noteworthy example of the effectiveness of private initiative in alleviating the shortage of facilities in the field of higher education.

The University of Hartford was formed in 1957 through a combination of three well-established institutions—Hartford Art School, Hartt College of Music, and Hillyer College, including its technical institute—the Ward School of Electronics.

Over 10,000 students are now enrolled at the University of Hartford, Connecticut's largest nontax supported educational institution, advancing their education in the fields of engineering, education, business administration, liberal arts, music, fine arts, and other fields.

Classes at the university are now being held in owned or leased facilities which are widely scattered, principally in the city of Hartford. Through private initiative and private fundraising efforts, 250 acres of land have been acquired on which a modern, fully integrated university campus will be built.

In the 1960 "Report to the People of Connecticut From the Founders of the University of Hartford" there is comment that will interest the American people and point the way toward the solution of one of our most urgent problems.

Alan Tompkins, Dr. Moshe Paranov and Dr. Alan S. Wilson, the administrators of these three colleges respectively, have this to say: "In many parts of the country the great increase expected in college enrollments in the next few years is being viewed with a pessimistic alarm which is certainly not justified. In Connecticut these increasing numbers of young men and women, eager for advanced education, are welcomed joyously for the strength they represent in our State and for the challenge presented by their need for education."

I commend to the Senate the University of Hartford for its forward-looking attitude. Thanks to the leadership of men such as Alfred C. Fuller, head of the Fuller Brush Co., more than $3 million has been raised toward creating a new university campus. A general classroom building and central heating plant are now under construction and another building started by the end of the year is a possibility, according to Austin D. Barney, chairman, university building and development committees.

There are no dormitories in the building plans of the University of Hartford. All money contributed goes into classrooms, laboratory, and other instructional facilities. Students attending its classes commute. They live at home and by so doing they save about 50 percent of the cost of a college education.

In the American tradition is the fact that 70 percent of these students hold jobs in addition to their studies.

To the people of this Nation, the University of Hartford can be cited as an example of America's ability to solve its problems—in this instance the tremendous wave of college enrollments due to our population explosion. At the same time the university stands as a tribute to your young people who, by their own efforts, are determined to secure the benefits of a college education.

In this same founders report, University Chancellor Vincent Brown Coffin states that building a new campus goes hand-in-hand with the educational program. "The second is the more important," Chancellor Coffin said, "but it cannot function without the first."

The University of Hartford, as pointed out by Chancellor Coffin, has 230 founders who are men of leadership within the State. In the Chancellor's words: "They have dedicated themselves to the deep concern shared by most of our citizens that Connecticut shall become an even better place to live." As one of the founders of the university I heartily associate myself with his statement.

It should be of interest to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that such a significant accomplishment has come about in the field of education through private initiative.

Perhaps it can serve as a model for the establishment of other community colleges and universities throughout the land. In this way we may alleviate the critical shortage of facilities for higher education, simultaneously preserving the historic tradition of education free from Government control.

This is America as we all like to think of it: people, young and old, joined in a voluntary effort for the common good.

More Comment on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with President Eisenhower when he expressed the view in his recent farm message that the present farm mess is in no way the fault of the farmers. Likewise, I agree with him when he voiced his opinion that present farm policies hurt farmers rather than help them. And especially I agree with him in believing that present farm policies hurt city dwellers, who pay a heavy share of the costs and gain no benefits.

Speaking of the costs, in 1959, as I understand, the Government expenditure for price support programs was $2,850 million and the Commodity Credit Corporation expenditure of $1,537 million should be added to this.

Even more serious than the cost, however, is the dangerous situation which substitutes Federal control over the farmer and political regulation and management for individual enterprise and freedom in the open market.

In introducing H.R. 10350 which would repeal price supports without disrupting normal marketings, I have followed the objectives, at least, as he has stated them, of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. He has continually asked Congress, without success, to legislate a farm program to move away from acreage and price controls. Frankly, I think I should have talked to the Secretary before my bill went in, but the President's farm message was coming up and it seemed to me timely to get my bill into the hopper. But I am sure even if my bill were amended to only cover wheat it would solve part of the farm surplus problem in an area where no one else has had the answer.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I listened to an explanation by 1 of the 16 sponsors of a plan calling for direct compensatory payments to producers.

Whether such a proposal is called socialistic or a Brannan plan, I can only shake my head and say that to me this type of legislation goes completely in the wrong direction.

In this connection, I offer a view of William Calhoun Hope, of New York, which came in this morning's mail in a sheet entitled "Cotton Comments" issued by Robert Moore & Co.:

Although these identical bills, in their preamble, purport to show that the sponsors are fighting for the farmer by an excessive exhibition of patriotic but unorthodox flagwaving which is carried to an extreme, and declare that "It is the policy of Congress to promote, foster, and perpetuate the family system of agriculture against all forms of collectivization," practically the entire context that follows is built around a pattern of socialistic thinking.

Advocates of a compensatory payments plan, geared more intelligently to a domestic allotments plan for the basics only, will do well to steer clear of embracing such an approach to obtain their objectives. Certainly, if passed, such legislation would be voted by the President but it is highly unlikely that sound-thinking Democrats will allow it to pass.

Furthermore, its complicated language leads one to believe that it is permeated with "legislative sleepers." One such example is that section specifying that its implementation would cost only one-half billion dollars yearly. This cost could easily soar to billions of dollars due to the fact that supports would be mandatory for a myriad of perishables. Inasmuch as it takes 101,139 employees in the USDA to handle the work of that Department—which is primarily concerned with administering support programs on the six basics—imagine the extra number that would be necessary to handle the work that would be entailed for the implementation of this proposed "legislative monstrosity." It would defy the knowledge of the best legal brains.

Returning to the subject of my own proposal to eliminate the farm subsidy programs, I still am receiving every indication that my bill meets with strong popular approval. Here are some grassroots unsolicited comments along this line which I received from various people:

There never has been nor will be a medium to handle surplus other than supply and demand. This political horseplay is leading to a heavier bump day by day. Take it now and get it over with.

A change is needed.

I am worried about what seems to put Big Business into farming and crowd small land owners to the wall.

Did you hear ever of free enterprise? I can't see why I should pay taxes so some farmers can go to Florida in the winter and I can't even take a vacation digging in my garden.

Why not put the farmer back on his own—say where he was prior to World War II. It might be a little tough for a while, but he would eventually make it, and I don't think the banks and insurance companies who hold the mortgages would be too badly hurt. It would create competition, also supply and demand, and would tend to lower living costs, especially foods, and would give the consumer a break. When a working man buys a home to house his family, the U.S. Government doesn't subsidize his job, so why should he be taxed to carry the farmer?

Give American people back the initiative they should have.

Why should we pay twice for the groceries? Let's let the law of supply and demand take over.

An entirely new farm program is needed, one suitable to the 1960's—not the 1930's or the 1880's.

As a war measure it was necessary, but now, I believe the farmer should take his chances just the same as I or anyone else does that risks his capital and time.

It is high time that we let the farmers do the farming. Wo ever heard of paying someone for not producing.

I think all price supports should be removed from the farmers; there is no sense in paying money for surplus production that we cannot get rid of. You seldom see a farmer in the field; many moved to town and a hired man attends to the farm. You see many in California and Arizona in winter, particularly wheat farmers.

A new farm program is badly needed.

I am opposed to any form of subsidy.

Cut out soil conservation programs. Why subsidize anybody that does not take care of their property.

Take them off and let competition decide.

We understand the Representatives are responsible for this incredible farm scandal, subsidies, soil bank, farm support. Put an end to this senseless program. Wish we had more in Washintgon like you.

I've heard of your plan to reduce wheat surplus, and put this wheat farming back on a business basis. We are behind you in this effort.

Clarification of Federal Tax Liens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of transmittal and resolution adopted by the Conference on Taxation, National Tax Association, Houston, Tex., on October 28, 1959, favoring the enactment of legislation which would eliminate the uncertainties and confusion relating to Federal tax liens.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., February 16, 1960.

Re Resolution covering the enactment of legislation to clear up the present confusion with respect to Federal tax liens.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with the directive of the 52d National Tax Conference held under the auspices of the National Tax Association in the city of Houston, Tex., on the 28th day of October, 1959, I am pleased to forward the enclosed resolution relating to the above-captioned subject matter.

Most respectfully yours,
WALTER W. WALSH,
President.

RESOLUTION, CONFERENCE ON TAXATION, NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION, HOUSTON, TEX., OCTOBER 28 1959

Whereas the scope of the Federal tax lien has been substantially broadened by court decisions in recent years consequent uncertainty as to the extent to which the claims of private creditors and State and local governments may be subordinated to those of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the recent situation adversely affects the revenue of States and local governments and innumerable business transactions; and

Whereas the American Bar Association has recommended to the Congress the enactment of remedial legislation; and

Whereas the National Association of Tax Administrators submitted to the Congress in 1957 proposals for achieving greater equity for State and local governments in cases where their claims were in conflict with those of the Federal Government:

Resolved, That the 52d Annual Conference, sponsored by the National Tax Association, urges the Congress to promptly enact legislation which will eliminate the uncertainties and inequities which now arise when there is conflict as to the priority of tax claims of the United States and of claims asserted by State or local governments or private citizens; and

Resolved, That the president of the National Tax Association be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to all Members of Congress of the United States, to the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Dr. Jerome Kerwin's Address on Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an address at the 11th annual convention of the Christian Family Movement by Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, internationally renowned and beloved dean of the Department of Political Science of the University of Chicago. The address follows:

PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT
(By Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin)

Politics is an interesting occupation. It is interesting to those of us who have devoted our lives to the study of it and who, after many years, particularly during a presidential campaign, can observe and not feel that we'll die if one or the other wins or loses. Too, it has its amusing side because we always hear the same things in different words. We hear the same warnings and the same accusations; we see the same number of threats to sue for libel—no one of these suits has ever been carried out; we see these things happening throughout the campaign and it becomes very absorbing. It's phenomenal when you realize that in a presidential campaign, millions of people, perhaps somewhere up around 3 to 5 million, are engaged in activity. They are purely amateurs and yet they are just as intense as if they were being paid a fortune for their services. Any of you who have had any contact with political headquarters during one of these campaigns, realized the very amateur nature of the performance. You are not surprised when you get three directives in 1 day telling you to be at three different places at the same time. You are not surprised when you go down to headquarters to find several people in hysterics, 3 threatening to leave, 3 already having left and 3 proclaiming victory for their particular faction.

There is no place in the world where people are called upon to act as parts of the Government enterprise more than in the United States of America. Political scientists believe we're called upon too much. They believe we have too many elections; that we could get along with fewer and perhaps more concentrated elections, with a shorter ballot, resulting in a more intelligent choice by the voter. Gradually we are coming around to that kind of reform.

We know that the Government as the agent of the larger unit, the State, has one supreme purpose and that is the promotion of the common good. That common good is not the greatest good of the greatest number; it is the good of all because there is a good that is common to all people and this the political order must promote.

One can think of the Government functions as protective; those functions protect us from outside enemies or inside disorder. One can think of the function of the Government as educative through the law and other means by which it promotes the education of the populace. One can think of the Government as a promoter of morals through maintenance of the natural law. The State is a moral unit and it has a very high purpose as a perfect society. And we can add to the functions of government that which St. Thomas calls making for progress.

So according to the outlook which we have received in our tradition, we cannot say that government is a necessary evil. We cannot agree with those who put that forward as an acceptable proposition. We cannot say otherwise than that government is a positive good for man. You may not like this particular government or that particular government, but we are talking about government in general which is necessary for all men. And as Aristole said "to live without it, one has to be either a beast or a good."

If one considers this high purpose of government as a positive good, one must remember another important fact about it. Trace your history back as far as Roman law. You will note a theory which comes down to us today; government stems from the people. The famous sign that preceded the Roman armies—Senatus Populusque Romanus, "the senate and the Roman people"—indicates the theory of the popular origin of government. From that time on down, the theory was never lost. Government stems from the people.

"I do not mean to say there is not another source as it comes to the people. It is true, as Christianity taught, that all authority comes from God. But at least on the natural level, it comes through the populace. This was understood even in the times of the most absolute monarchies. The monarch simply symbolized the people in their activities. In our own time, with the greater education of the people and the greater the possibilities of making their wills felt, more power has come into the people's hands. Thus in a very definite sense, it can be said that in the democratic order sovereignty inheres in the people. What is this Government supposed to do? Certainly in a general way it is supposed to encourage the people to do what they can by themselves; but what they cannot do for themselves, the Government must do. This means a great deal more in our time than it meant years ago. Those people who think of government functions in the terms of the 18th century are far wide of the mark. Because of our greatly complicated economic and social life, the Government has become a very active, a very large institution; no larger institution exists. This is not owing to any kind of conspiracy. This is a normal development. It is so throughout the whole world.

* * * * *

Whatever the government does—local, State, or Federal—our very lives, our very health, often depend upon this activity. The primary thing is not a manner of taxation; it's not a matter of budget. The government is a spending unit and not a money-making enterprise. We have only one thing to ask—that when money is given, we get a dollar's worth in return for the dollar that is spent. We cannot ask that service of government be deflated to the point where it simply represents the necessities of the 19th century. * * * The services that are given by the government are there by reason of demand.

Take our cities—they maintain educational institutions, social service enterprises, parks, and playgrounds. They are important social service institutions. How did our political machines grow in our cities? By being the great social service institutions that in that day didn't exist. What was the great strength of Tammany Hall? Tammany Hall took care of the poor and those in distress? It took care of the sick. It did many things for people that no one else did. The well-to-do had their means. The middle class had their means. But the vast teaming thousands of the East Side of New York did not.

You have to understand this in considering the 19th-century brand of politics, when political machines were strong. You have to consider what the situation was and that some of our ancestors were benefited by these groups. We have to remember that the poor person coming to these shores, sometimes not speaking the language, wanted a job, wanted help. The only one that could help was the ward leader. That ward leader helped and he never asked any return. He didn't have to say to a person on election day, "vote for this or that candidate." No, he depended upon ordinary human gratitude for this. But it is also true, these organizations did take and they took plentifully from the public purse. That day is gone.

This is the day of a much greater and wider citizen alertness. Political attachment is not so strong any more. In my own boyhood, with certain people in certain sections of the country, one followed his father in politics. I lived for some time in Vermont and so far as the puritan conscience knew of a mortal sin, it was a mortal sin to be a Democrat. And so in the South, in the same way it was criminal to be a Republican. But we note the breaking down of these lines, and the greater independence of the voter, which is all to the good. There is now an alertness that we have not known before. For many years, I took a fairly active part in the politics of Chicago. Maybe it's true, as one of our North Side alderman says, (he's the last of the old school) "Chicago ain't ready for reform yet." Nevertheless, he doesn't realize how the world has moved past him because I knew Chicago in the days when not only ballots, but bullets were used. I knew the day when machineguns were emptied into voting places. I've known the day when the election clerks counted and also marked the ballots. I have known the day when they used to vote all of Chinatown and not a person therein was eligible to become a citizen.

This sort of activity has become less frequently practiced. * * * There is reason for great hope in political life. While at times it seems as if we struggle futilely for this kind of reform or that, we really are getting places. I look forward to the time when it can be said that we do have one of the most enlightened electorates in the world.

We are a little bit short, as yet, in our vision of things beyond the seas. It's hard for us as electors to realize that no longer are we in the United States isolated, and that we have taken upon ourselves all the burdens of a tremendous world power. This we are not as yet fully educated for, but that, too, will come.

It is well to realize too, when one considers the extent of Government enterprise, that the U.S. Government, the central government at Washington, has fewer governmental powers than any other central-government in the world. * * * But there is no central government so limited as the U.S. Government. We sometimes bemoan the loss of power in the States, but the States are three times as powerful today as they were in 1860 because of the increasing functions of Government. We do have a limit on the central government and sometimes the ordinary American wishes, I know, that the Federal Government would do less. At the same time he would like to see the Federal Government given much more power so he wouldn't have 50 different kinds of criminal law, 50 different kinds of law dealing with any number of things. As he passes from one State to another he does not like 50 different kinds of traffic laws and traffic codes and traffic fines variously imposed. But this is a Federal system and we must take it with its inconveniences. The cantons of Switzerland nowhere approach the power of an American State. The Provinces of Canada do not have that power. The states of Australia do not have it. * * * We sometimes feel that with all our popular control, our particular desires are not enacted. The first thing we must remember is that democracy is a system of compromises. It's a compromise of the wishes of various groups. It's even a compromise in its selection of our candidates. No one always gets all that he wants. If one regrets this too deeply, and I know people who do, they may end up as pure cynics. I mean the person who says at election time, "Why, I don't find anybody who represents me or what I like." No, you never will find anyone with whom you agree 100 percent. Very often it is a matter of taking the virtues of this candidate and the virtues of that candidate and striking an average. That's what you have to do in this system of ours. We are unlike the French, who have to have a political party for every individual's wish and you see what they get. We have in this country the two-party system, which is a great unifying force. It brings together peoples of various areas and simply says: "For the sake of the party there must be compromise so here is our platform." The platform, of course, doesn't mean a great deal. But at least when it comes to the actual congressional action, well then, of course, there must be action. And it is the wise kind of give and take in legislative action that gives us such a stable society. This is the sign of political maturity. We don't run to the barricades when our desires are frustrated.

Any group in this country that does not know the process of give and take is in for a beating. This is my fear, with respect, to the medical profession. Having adopted a slogan, "socialized medicine," they may resist every suggestion for lifting the high cost of medicine from society. In the history of our country whenever opposition to needed reform has been too subborn, whole sale popular pressure brings far more extensive reform than even the most liberal person contemplated.

* * * * *

You simply cannot dam up these pressures where reform has become an absolute necessity. You cannot meet a demand for reform with a complete negative. The whole thing comes down to this: what is your suggestion? And the suggestion must be positive and constructive.

But as I say, sometimes we feel that we do not get all we want from our elected representatives. I must admit, thinking of the Congress, this is often true because the Congress is badly apportioned. Nothing can be done about the Senate, it's so fixed in the Constitution. And no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate. But the House of Representatives is badly off balance. The rural areas are very greatly over-represented despite the fact that we have become a great urban country. The reason for this is that the State legislatures are also rurally controlled and they fix the congressional apportionment. It is very interesting that this situation exists and I don't know just what cure can be assigned for it except a reform of our State legislatures. And that is a very difficult proposition. The cities continue to be less represented as they grow in size. I know there are some people who would say, "After all, the great purity and morals in politics is in the rural areas. And these great Babylons, the cities, don't deserve to be represented." The Babylonian nature of the city may be in part due to the fact that they are the places where the rural people come to enjoy themselves. And also, very often, the rural areas will have their own form of political corruption, which I have seen. But having been exercised for years, it has ceased to be regarded as corruption.

* * * * *

A few years ago, a colleague of mine, Mr. Nelson Henry, and I were sent throughout the country to find out if it made any difference whether the school system was incorporated into the city government or was independent. We came back with the statement that it didn't make any difference. Always the school people would say: "Ah, but we'd get enmeshed in politics if we were tied in with the city government." I remember our experience in Los Angeles where they had an independent system. We asked the man, "You're independent?" "Yes." "How were you chosen?" "Elected," "But we always manage to get the right kind of school board." "How do you do that?" "Well, at election time we just levy on the schoolboard employees and teacher to help pay the expenses of the right kind of people for the election." * * * In the city of Denver where they boasted of their independence, the superintendent told us, "of course, we see to it that at the time of school elections there aren't quite as many voting places as during the regular election because then only the good people vote." Yet they resisted being tied into the city because they didn't want to be governed by politics.

* * * * *

Finally, I want to urge upon everyone, as perhaps it has been urged upon all of you throughout this conference, the participation that is essential. It's a great burden that rests on everyone's shoulders. No one has a right to say "what good am I? I only cast one vote." I never knew a draft board to excuse anyone because he can only carry one rifle. There is a great truth in one of Kant's principles—"so act that you could wish your action to become universal." And there are several means of activity. I believe that far too many people avoid the political organizations themselves. There are numbers of people, supposedly intelligent citizens, who couldn't tell you the name of the party Democratic or Republican leader in their area or who do not know who their representative is, either in Congress or the State legislature. These are fundamentals you should find out about. People who are elected to office will tell you that they meet many people and get many questions during a campaign, but then hear from very few until the next campaign. It is good to have some kind of hold upon your representative. If you do go into the political parties, you are entering a kind of military order. You accept the ticket that is presented. You do, however, have your opportunity for choice when the ticket is selected, unless there is an overwhelming leader who keeps things under his hat until

the last minute. But certainly here is a great career, and many honest, intelligent and fine citizens are involved in it.

Next, there are those various organizations of civic reform in which, for the past several years, Catholics have been quite absent. Working for civic reform is difficult; it's tiring work. Again and again you meet. You've been defeated for the 15th time in what you want. The question is, how great is your persistence? The women generally have much more persistence than the men in these things. It is a question of how much energy and time you are willing to devote to good causes. There's a great deal to be said for the community organization of the independent voters that watches over community affairs. Your participation in it can help both you and the civil order.

I always take my hat off to an organization like the League of Women Voters. There is nothing that quite equals it in effectiveness. Yet there is still quite an absence of Catholic women in it. There should be at every Catholic woman's college a branch of the League of Women Voters. I know that in some communities, it is difficult to organize but the community organization is very effective. I can only speak for my own community, a small unit of the fifth ward of the city of Chicago. The Fifth Ward Citizen's Organization meets primarily to put forward candidates for the job of alderman. According to law, this is not a partisan job. Aldermen are not elected on a partisan ticket although in most wards their politics are known. We interview all the aspirants for office and approve one, then we seek support for him. We also raise $6,000 to $8,000 a year for the support of the alderman's office, because we want him to have an office right in the ward where he can be available. * * * From time to time the alderman reports to us on matters before the city council. Is this thing possible in other sections? It's quite possible, but there seems to be much lethargy. There's nothing more effective than an organization of this kind and the parlor meeting that goes with it. At election time we do not have big mass meetings. The candidate goes around to various homes where he sits down and talks to a group of neighbors. This sort of action is at the very grassroots of the democratic process and I recommend it to you for consideration.

I hope you will not go away from this confernece with the idea of government as something up above us. We should not say of the government, "they are doing this" or "they are doing that." It is we who act. Most of the people engaged in government are not grafters and corrupt. The millions of people serving us in government posts today are poorly paid and yet serve well. When one considers the expansiveness of government operation, it can be said that the work is well performed. I know it can stand improvement on the local and county level particularly. Nevertheless, it is a tremendous enterprise. One very able professor of political science, the late William Bennet Munro of Harvard, made the assertion that by and large there is more efficiency of operation in government than there is in private business. This is a startling statement, but here is a man who spent 50 years as a student of government.

I hope someday we will find means of giving recognition for self-sacrificing service over the years in various administrative posts of government. For example, some kind of national award to the top civil servant of the United States, and so on down the line. We have come to the point where there are fewer out-and-out political jobs. Government has become too complex for the amateur. We now must have the trained public servant. I hope that we shall see in the future, government on all levels operated by a career service, people who come out of our universities and colleges, well-trained, adequately paid in their positions and assured of adequate arrangements for their retirement; people in whom we can place our trust because of their ability and their devotion to the service."

Dedication of New Housing Site in New York City in the Name of Helen Hanning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Port Morris Community Council, New York, N.Y., favoring the dedication of one of the new housing sites in New York City in the name of Helen Hanning, and an article entitled "Helen Hanning, Chairman of Housing," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

At a regular meeting of Port Morris Community Council, held on the 16th day of April 1947, the following resolution was proposed and was unanimously passed.

Whereas Hon. Helen Hanning was a former vice president of Community Councils of the City of New York, and former chairman of the Housing Committee of Community Councils of the city of New York; and

Whereas as a resident of Harlem she devoted the greatest portion of her life to the welfare and benefit of the people of Harlem; and

Whereas the said Hon. Helen Hanning gave her time and energy toward better housing in the city of New York, the clearance of slum areas and the enactment of legislation for better rental and housing conditions in congested areas throughout the city of New York; and

Whereas the late Gov. Alfred E. Smith and the late James J. Walker, former mayor of the city of New York, in their judgment, saw fit to appoint Mrs. Hanning to the London and Rome International Housing Conferences; and

Whereas it is appropriate that perpetual recognition should be given to her name in full recognition of her worthy work in housing and slum clearance in the city of New York: It is therefore

Resolved, That the New York housing commissioner dedicated the name Helen Hanning, in full memorium, on one of the new housing sites, as a fitting memorial to her worthy name.

SYDNEY L. BLEICHER,
Chairman.
REGINA MIDDLETON,
Executive Secretary.
JAMES MIDDLETON,
Vice Chairman.

HELEN HANNING, CHAIRMAN OF HOUSING

The relation of community councils to the housing problem of our city has been one of steady endeavor, not only to alleviate present conditions, but also to find a permanent solution—starting with a mass meeting in Carnegie Hall in October 1920, at which Governor Smith spoke, and continuing to the present time.

Last year Governor Smith appointed our chairman a delegate to represent the State of New York at the International Housing Conference held in Paris in July. Mrs. Hanning afterward spent 10 weeks in England, visited all the large industrial centers and studied their slum clearance schemes.

We have been represented and have taken an active part in all legislation, sending many delegates to Albany and actively supporting the city in their efforts to improve our housing. Our chairman has served on every important committee on housing, including the advisory committee of the State housing board and the citizen's committee to study and give publicity to the New Dwelling Act. This act has passed both houses and is now before Governor Roosevelt.

Much has been accomplished by our committee in investigating and bringing to the attention of the health and tenement house departments the very bad condition existing in many of the Harlem apartments. Indeed, Mrs. Hanning is well known to most of the residents of our district.

OLD-AGE PENSION—HELEN HANNING, CHAIRMAN

Among the many activities of community councils, none is of more importance than the matter of old-age pensions and contributory old-age insurance. The community councils have appointed a committee to study and work with other agencies to bring about this all important measure.

Our chairman was appointed on the committee of 15 representing some 70 organizations to plan the introduction and passage of an Old Age Pension Act. This measure failed of enactment by a very narrow margin. It received the support of Governor Roosevelt and all of the welfare and social agencies.

Proposed Constitutional Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potpourri," published in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans, La., dated February 4, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTPOURRI

It was a weird assortment of proposed constitutional amendments the U.S. Senate put into a package resolution, but fortunately (it seems) action can be taken by legislatures on each item individually, should the House go along with the novelty.

The only meritorious proposal is that of permitting gubernatorial appointments (interim) of U.S. Representatives to succeed those who may die, along with more than half the House membership, in some disaster. Only the Senate has appointive disaster protection, as a body, under the existing Constitution.

The only good thing to be said for tacking on poll tax abolition, or proposing abolition at all, is the recognition implied that it is a constitutional, not statutory question. If the House agrees to this amendment and it is ratified by the States in 4, 5, or 7 years, the leftwingers and so-called big State politicos, who have kept the pressure on in one way or another, will get little or nothing

for cluttering up the Constitution with another section. For there are only five States with poll taxes now, and there probably will be fewer before any amendment is ratified. The States, however, should deny these politicians even a hollow victory by rejecting the proposal. Encroachment of the prerogatives of the States (in this case, voting qualifications) should be repulsed on principle.

Unsavory altogether is the entering wedge to statehood that would be provided for the District of Columbia, to the extent of permitting it a place in the electoral college (presidential voting), and the right to elect delegates like those of a territory, to the U.S. House. The sound reasons for keeping the District of Columbia and its residents out of national politics altogether, except by way of the abstentee ballot, should be apparent to all students of and believers in the American form of government. It would become the worst kind of pressure area with respect to executive and legislative issues and actions.

Wisconsin Farmers Set Record on Soil Conservation Service Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conservation of our soil as well as forests, water and other resources is a major challenge confronting the country.

Fortunately, constructive programs are underway in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation to conserve these natural resources.

In 1959, for example, Wisconsin farmers set a new record for carrying out sound, constructive conservation programs. The accomplishments included the following:

More than 41,000 acres of contour strip cropping.

Renovation of almost 30,000 acres of pasture.

Tree plantings on 15,490 acres, with constructive measures for the woodland carried out on more than 27,000 additional acres.

Wildlife habitats were benefited by the construction of 314 farm ponds, 26,600 rods of hedgerow cover and the protection of 2,282 acres of wildlife area.

According to M. F. Schweers, State conservationist for U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the record of accomplishments was attained through the splendid cooperation of the efforts of farmers, not only with the Soil Conservation Service, but also the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department and Farmers Home Administration.

Recently, the Superior Telegram of Superior, Wis., published an article outlining progress in this field.

Reflecting constructive progress in preservation of our invaluable natural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Superior (Wis.) Telegram, Feb. 12, 1960]

STATE FARMERS SET RECORD ON SCS PRACTICES

"Wisconsin farmers set a new record for the development of farm conservation plans in 1959," M. F. Schweers, Madison, State conservationist for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, said today. "Plans were developed on 2,313 farms in 1959 as compared with 1,921 in 1958 and 1,740 in 1957. A farm conservation plan is a blueprint for a farm. It indicates the proper use of each acre, and the conservation practices which will be applied to prevent excessive soil and water loss," Schweers added.

"More than 41,800 acres of contour strip cropping were established in 1959, and almost 30,000 acres of pasture were renovated," Schweers said. "Trees were planted on 15,490 acres and farmers agreed to protect 27,147 acres of woodland."

"Wildlife habitat was benefited," Schweers said, "by the construction of 314 farm ponds, the planting of almost 26,600 rods of hedgerow cover, and the protection of 2,882 acres of wildlife area."

Other major accomplishments in 1959 include almost 629,000 acres soil surveyed, 364 miles of terraces and diversions, 289 large structures, 240 miles of grassed waterways, 813 miles of tile lines, and 242 miles of shallow field ditches and open drains.

Almost 14,000 farms were serviced by SCS personnel in connection with the agricultural conservation program. "The Soil Conservation Service receives ACP funds to carry out specified technical responsibilities of this program," Schweers continued. "Many of the permanent type practices would not have been installed were it not for the cost of sharing assistance from ACP," he pointed out.

Primary credit for these fine conservation accomplishments belongs to the people who own and operate the land," said Schweers. "It is only through their interest and desire that we are able to serve them. Soil conservation district supervisors deserve a great deal of credit for their enthusiastic leadership. Moreover, this record of accomplishment could not have been attained without the fine cooperation extended by personnel of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Wisconsin Conservation Department and Farmers Home Administration."

The Late Honorable Charles A. Boyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 6, 1960

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered a great loss in the tragic death of our esteemed colleague, CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Chicago. He was an outstanding public servant, dedicated to his service in the House of Representatives. No one in recent years has served his constituents as faithfully and well. He was loved and admired by all who knew him. He had a host of friends in Illinois, not only in Chicago but downstate as well. He had many, many friends throughout the whole country.

CHARLIE BOYLE was one of the most astute politicians we have ever known in the State of Illinois. He was a very able attorney, a great legislator, and an outstanding father. He had great love for his family and lived by the laws of God. We were always proud to have CHARLIE BOYLE serve with us in the Illinois delegation. He was the type of man we like to have serve with us, and we shall all miss him greatly in the years to come.

I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his gracious wife and his wonderful family. May God give them strength and guide them in the difficult years ahead.

Wisconsin Press Association's 1960 Midwinter Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the press of America continues to be one of the major forces and influences in the lives of individuals, and in the public affairs of this country.

A free press—one of our precious constitutional freedoms—carries with it, of course, a great responsibility.

Fortunately in our Republic, the industry itself—and the vast majority of highly qualified individuals serving in this fine profession—are doing a splendid job in maintaining high standards of reporting, editorializing, and generally presenting to the American people significant articles on a wide variety of topics.

In Wisconsin, we are particularly proud of the high caliber writing and publishing by our editors, writers, reporters, publishers, and many others in the field.

Recently, the Wisconsin Press Association held its annual midwinter meeting at Eau Claire, Wis.

The conference—among other objectives—aimed its efforts at resolving some of the basic problems confronting the profession, itself; in addition, it seriously considered ways and means by which it could more effectively serve the public.

The January issue of Wisconsin Press carried a thoughtful and informative article entitled "Records Set at Wisconsin Press Association's 1960 Midwinter Meeting at Eau Claire."

Reflecting a creative, constructive realistic approach by members of this outstanding profession toward better serving the American people, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORDS SET AT WISCONSIN PRESS ASSOCIATION'S 1960 MIDWINTER MEETING AT EAU CLAIRE

"The power of the people will be exercised whether or not its exercise is guided by complete information. It behooves all in government and all in control of the press to better inform those who make the ulti-

mate decisions. The cure for the gravest defects in democracy is not less, but more information.

"The information of the people is the foundation of our political system, and the source of power of our democratic society. When the citizen is fully informed, his political acts are his own. When he is only partly informed, his acts are the acts of those who have partly informed him."

These were the words of Wisconsin Attorney General John W. Reynolds at the evening banquet of the midwinter meeting of the Wisconsin Press Association at the Eau Claire Hotel, Eau Claire, on Friday, January 8. Mr. Reynolds spoke on "The public's right to know," and his remarks were based on the State's new "open meeting" statute.

Mr. Reynolds complimented the Wisconsin Press Association for having supported this bill and for having assisted with its ultimate passage. He expressed his department's intention to see that the terms of the law are complied with and then concluded his speech with this caution:

"You have a good antisecrecy law. But the benefits of this law will only be realized if we have a vigilant and vigorous press working with conscientious public officials who insist upon compliance with its provisions. Remember that if you are ever refused admittance to a meeting which should be public and if you fail to protest, then you are responsible for losing one of the battles in the continuous struggle for complete freedom of information."

ATTENDANCE RECORDS

The audience to which Mr. Reynolds spoke was a record one—as was every gathering of the 1960 midwinter meeting, which was held January 8 and 9. Extra tables had to be set to accommodate the 136 at the noon luncheon and the process was repeated again in the evening when 180 were seated for the banquet. Most surprising of all, however, was the turnout of 81 for the Saturday morning breakfast. As one association member observed, "at this rate, the midwinter meeting will soon be as large or larger than the spring convention."

Bolstered by a contingent of 47 persons on the Thursday "400" of the C. & N.W., the hotel was well populated with meeting delegates long before the registration dask went into operation Friday morning. From about 10 a.m. until lunch time the editors and their staff were shown new offset plates by a Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing demonstration setup; a new collator by Mechanical Development Enterprise of Viroqua, and both Fairchild cuts and the new "Dycril" plate as furnished by Crier Cut Service. On another floor of the hotel the Print-N-Etch engraving display held the interest of others.

The formal agenda of the midwinter meeting began with the noon luncheon at 12:30 Friday. Following knife and fork exercises, WPA President Lowell Larson spoke a few words of welcome and introduced the individuals seated at the speakers' table after which he called on City Manager Douglas Welford, who officially welcomed the association to Eau Claire.

Ed Kane, research director in printing of the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co., was the featured luncheon speaker. "Printing in the new decade," he pointed out, would bring into use many new processes and techniques; he mentioned the experimental use of television for transmission and composition of copy. To illustrate some of today's most advanced developments in the graphic arts he showed a 10-minute colored slide presentation of exhibits shown at the recent graphic arts exposition in New York.

Following Mr. Kane's address, President Larson turned the meeting over to Robert Harvey, publisher of the Clark County Press, Neillsville, chairman of the afternoon session.

AFTERNOON PROGRAM ON SHOP

Use of the small offset press for commercial work was the first topic. On this subject the Wisconsin Press Association is fortunate in having as a member a real expert in offset printing—Don MacGregor of the Park Falls Herald. Basing his remarks on experiences before the Herald acquired large offset equipment, Mr. MacGregor gave a comprehensive discussion of the possibilities and limitations of the small offset press for commercial work. Samples of the various pieces of work referred to in his talk added much to the effectiveness of his presentation.

Small offset presses are used for commercial work by several other Wisconsin publishers and C. F. Eames of the Elkhorn Independent (who substituted for his son, Frank) and Dwayne Schoepke of the Juneau Independent added brief comments to the basic material given by Mr. MacGregor.

Engraving processes came next on the program and Max Ninman of the Reedsburg Times-Press, Bart Brown of the Oconomowoc Enterprise and Palmer Sondreal of the Amery Free Press described their methods and experiences, and gave some of their problems in producting zinc cuts for their newspapers. John Shinners of the Hartford Times-Press volunteered some comments from the floor on his shop's experience with the Klischograph engraver.

Two veteran Wisconsin weekly newspapermen were highlighted in the portion of the afternoon session given over to shortcuts and gadgets in printing. They were Clarence A. Seidl of the Barron County News-Shield and Lyle Speed of the Hawkins Chronicle. Their shop hints and shortcuts will be expanded and illustrated, where possible, in separate articles in future issues of Wisconsin Press. Among other things, Mr. Seidl described a simplified way to figure paper poundage and an easy way to center linotype lines of more than 30 ems while Mr. Speed described use of wax holding slanted lines, an antioffset gadget, and other timesavers.

For the final topic on the afternoon program President Larson described the experience of the Columbus Journal-Republican in adopting a 10½-em column width and a 9-column makeup.

An innovation of the Friday afternoon program was a special session for women attending the meeting. This had been requested because several of the ladies had stated that they had little interest in shop problems, which constituted the bulk of the afternoon discussions, but that they could profit by a strictly feminine discussion of book work, subscriptions records, gathering of local items and so on.

Mrs. John Shinners presided at the women's meeting and a profitable discussion was held. The ladies requested that the separate women's session be made a regular part of the midwinter meeting program and also of the spring convention program.

Affiliate members of the Wisconsin Press Association were hosts at the cocktail party that preceded the evening banquet.

Attorney General Reynolds delivered the principal speech at the banquet; some of his remarks were quoted at the beginning of this article and copies of the address were sent to all newspapers in Wisconsin.

INTERN PROGRAM STRESSED

Following Mr. Reynolds' address, President Larson called on Paul Creviere of the De Pere Journal-Democrat and chairman of the association's journalism internship program committee. Mr. Creviere reported that in 1958 the internship program had received excellent support and a good number of papers participated, but last year, 1959, the number had dropped to six—and three of these interns went to daily newspapers. He called for renewed support and participation in the current year.

Since the best way to sell is to demonstrate the merchandise, Prof. Les Hawkes of the University of Wisconsin School of Journalism and Prof. Don Ross of Marquette University College of Journalism, liaison representatives in the internship program, were present with two journalism students who had participated in the program.

Professor Hawkes introduced Joan Fischer, UW journalism student, who had spent the summer working as an intern at the Burlington Standard-Press. Miss Fischer said that "from the student's point of view it was wonderful. It gave me an opportunity to gain experience * * * but even more important, I gained an insight into the workings of a newspaper which cannot be learned in a classroom." She "covered everything from obituaries to town board meetings, from straight news to every kind of feature." There was no lack of interesting personal happenings in Miss Fischer's summer job, and she recounted a few of these. In concluding her comment on the internship program she told the publishers, "I feel it is definitely worthwhile. Where else can you get new approaches to the same stories that appear yearly? Where else can you get reporters who are egear to write and even more eager to learn all about newspapering?"

Professor Ross then presented a Marquette student, Bob Jozwiak, who had served as an intern with the two Radde papers, the Monroe County Democrat and the Sparta Herald, and who said, "I feel that the program can be of great benefit to you—the publishers of Wisconsin's community newspapers. I feel strongly about this program because I know, from personal experience, the benefits I received from it."

Mr. Jozwiak pointed out that one of the purposes of the internship program is to introduce—and interest—students in the community newspaper field, and in the process to debunk the myths that have formed in the minds of some. To illustrate how effectively the program has accomplished this he quoted some of his classmates who had served as interns. And from his own experience, he said, "I learned that the weekly newspaper field was no pushover. I learned that in order to survive in this field you have to become a jack-of-all-trades; reporter, photographer, proofreader, advertising salesman—and of course, there was that glorious, character building task known as 'stuffing'."

Summarizing the advantages of the program, he listed:

1. The eradication of faulty conceptions about the community newspaper business and the building up of student interest in this field.

2. The supplementation of education for journalism with practical in-the-field experience.

3. The opportunity for publishers to examine and recruit potential employees, and train them at nominal cost.

4. The securing of extra manpower to perform special projects and tasks that might otherwise be left undone.

5. The possibility of an increase in reader interest.

6. The freeing of the publisher for other pursuits, be they business or recreational interests.

EIGHTY-ONE AT BREAKFAST

Despite the extra-curricular exercises following the Friday night banquet, a record crowd of 81 persons reported at 8:30 Saturday morning for the breakfast and program. This actually turned into one of the highlights of the meeting.

Past President Palmer Sondreal was drafted as chairman for the morning program and did his usual fine job. The only difficulty encountered was that the interest in the topics presented was so great that the ses-

sion threatened to run uncomfortably close to train time.

Roy Rollins, public relations representative for the Wisconsin Motor Carriers' Association, spoke first and described the series of ads his organization is furnishing Wisconsin newspapers to be sold on a cooperative basis.

A fascinating discussion of covering local governmental meetings was given by Alvah Axtel, of the Rice Lake Chonotype; Robert Burns, of the Ladysmith News; Elliot Zander, of the Brillion News (whose paper was read by Ralph Goldsmith of the Boscobel Dial); and Douglas Larson, of the Sturgeon Bay Advocate (whose paper was read by Bill Stewart, of the Spooner Advocate).

For the uninitiated who wonder what news there can possibly be in a small community the two panelists in the following discussion demonstrated the answers. These speakers were Walter Brovald, of the Cadott Sentinel, and Dennis Losness, of the Cornell Courier.

Tips on news coverage and how to maintain a schedule to assure a full coverage were the topics of William Branen, editor of the Burlington Standard-Press, and Oliver Witte, Jr., news editor of the two Mauston newspapers. Branen illustrated the use of the card file he has set up to keep track of local organizations as well as the portrait cut file that is so handy for quick reference. Witte gave a comprehensive picture of the news-gathering system used for the two editions they publish each week and told of some of the special problems they run into and how they go about meeting these situations.

A panel on editorial writing consisted of Bill Heath of the Phillips Bee, Curtis B. Gaylord of the Balsan Lake Ledger and Don Griswold of the West Salem Journal. These three editors had assured themselves of a no conflict presentation by getting together before the meeting to compare their remarks and thus there was no overlapping. The audience was greatly interested in Mr. Heath's description of his paper's troubles with the postal department and the ensuing editorial comment. Editor Griswold offered something new in telling about his experiment at field testing editorials.

The final topic on the morning agenda was the use of pictures in small newspapers. Miss Doris Cottet, managing editor of the Green Lake County Reporter (which is printed offset), gave a detailed description of the Reporter's policies and desires in pictures and told something of the equipment used in obtaining what they want. Roy Ruehlmann, editor of the Sharon Reporter, had one eye on the clock as he told briefly of his practices in using pictures; he uses both Fairchild cuts and zinc halftones—the type determined by the time element and whether or not an enlargement or reduction of the original picture is needed.

At the close of Mr. Ruehlmann's remarks Chairman Sondreal quickly closed the meeting and the delegates hurried to grab a bite to eat and dash for the train.

Ethics Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ethics Is Everybody's Business," written by Mr. Roland Gammon and published in Variety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ETHICS IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

(By Roland Gammon)

Even as Charles Van Doren played out his scapegoat role in the recent television quiz scandals, he wrote an article for the new literary quarterly, Leisure, in which he quoted the English poet William Wordsworth:

"The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers."

Unconsciously, perhaps, Van Doren wrote his own epitaph—and that of the dollar-dedicated society in which we live. The plain fact is that the sicknes of an acquisitive society has become so acute we either must redeem it or perish.

Today, as both industry and government widen their scandal inquiries, sharp censures stir the air Madison Avenue thought it owned: "an unholy mess," "this leeching industry," "vapid huckstering" "ill-gotten gains," "a diet of violence," "chromium-plated materialism." Slowly, a morally awakening America begins to suspect that television's bloated face may be its own.

Indeed, TV's tarnished image illuminates the landscape around us. The festering rottenness of much of media not only supported a fraud on the American people, but belatedly caused cries of alarm from its leaders. CBS President Frank Stanton admitted to the Harris committee, "Whoever may be to blame in this whole tawdry business, all broadcasting has been hurt."

"Clean up or give up," cried Donald S. Frost, president of the Association of National Advertisers.

"Greed is the universal denominator in all this," wrote Journal-American radio-TV critic Jack O'Brian.

"Integrity is our deepest lack today," dedeplored the Reverend Robert McCracken from his Riverside Church pulpit.

"The flannel-suited faithful have crammed our souls into a tube of toothpaste," bristled Drew Pearson's aid, Jack Anderson.

And New Jersey's Governor Robert Meyner dipped deep into U.S. history for the most damning quote of all: "It is a thing of splendid abilities, but utterly corrupt. It shines and stinks like a rotten mackerel by moonlight."

HISTORY REPLETE WITH LESSONS OF TOLL CORRUPTION MUST PAY

Of course, smile the cynics. It has all happened before and will again. Didn't Aristophanes indict a luxury-loving Greece with the charge, "Whirl is king, having driven out Zeus." Didn't Louis XV, contemplating the corruption of his court and the poverty of his peasants, accurately prophesy, "Apres-moi, le deluge." And when Swiss theologian Leonard Ragaz was asked why czarist Russia collapsed, didn't he answer, "Karl Marx came because Jesus Christ was not allowed to come."

Dare we ask, even at Christmas and Chanukah, does the Christ spirit (i.e. love, charity, unselfishness) still abide in America? Or are mechanized, manipulated Americans too busy and too grasping to care? Beyond the crowded churches and synagogues, beyond the staggering statistics in church attendance, building and organized giving, is the bedrock of honorable conduct stil there? Of deep faith, fair play, and righteousness in action? Of all things, dare we ask, can an honest man succeed on Madison Avenue?

The current convulsion along ad alley—and the idiot dream life which is its television product—only reflect a decadence disease wasting the entire country. In themselves, the television scandals are more effect than cause. They are part of a creeping corruption that stains almost every area of American life. They are the result—as is the mounting evidence of wrongdoing in business, labor, and government—of our substitution of thing worship for God worship, our debasing of moral values into money values, our surrender to the bitch-goddess success no matter what the cost. Because this crisis in character persists, we are deep in our time of trouble as a civilization.

Sordid as the recent revelations are, the tragedy of what President Eisenhower calls the "TV mess" goes far beyond the spiritual illiteracy of a few hundred producers, directors, sponsors, and contestants directly involved. It goes beyond the overcommercialism and business-as-usual callousness of certain network brass, agency nabobs, and major advertisers who only now have begun to clean house. The heart of the matter remains: the TV, deejay, and deceptive-ad scandals were spawned by a society that has overthrown its traditional values system and substituted lip service to religious principles for their practice. Replacing "In God we trust" with "What's in it for me?" has not only changed the national motto; it has hastened America's twilight of honor.

IF AMERICA EVER CEASES TO BE GOOD, AMERICA WILL CEASE TO BE GREAT

More than a century ago, the French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville wrote of our new democracy, "America is great because she is good and, if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great." Today the majority of Americans are still good. But how long can any society survive what has been called "this revolution in self-indulgence"? At the present rate, it is only a matter of time before the poison of our elaborate make-believe—the papier-mache worlds of films, frills, fashion, broadcasting, advertising, and slick publicity—destroys the glossy animal who manufactures it.

Several years ago, assigned to write a magazine article on war hero John Crown, I visited the wounded veteran in Halloran General Hospital. This young paraplegic, who had "come back from death to a world I no longer care for" and who was soon to die, spoke of his shock at our cakes-and-circus culture. "All the world's troubles originate in the common man," he told me. "The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of individual man multiplied a thousandfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the United States and the world. Until each of us stops demanding more wages and more profits, stops 'hogging' the road with his car, stops fighting over a seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass or occupy Trieste, there will be no peace in the world."

Any observer doubting this drift need only recall the events of the last two decades. Despite the heroism, sacrifice and generosity excited by war and postwar recovery, we also produced enough corruption to shame a land built on law, liberty, and love of God. Instead, worshiping the dollar as deity, we lived fast but not deep; wallowing in a fun morality, which made liquor, television, gambling, brand loyalty, credit buying and banal entertainment tribal rites for millions. We failed to develop an ethical counterpart to our materialism. Today, too much is spoiled by overuse and enslavement to a vulgar conformity.

A FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR THE RECENT TRADE SCANDALS

The results: individual and collective tragedy. Read and heed any page in our postwar saga of scandal—the conviction of both Congressmen and businessmen for war-

time profiteering; the recurring inquiries into influence peddling from Capitol Hill to the Pentagon to the Government's regulatory bureaus; the rise and fall of "boiler room" swindlers in Wall Street; the corruption of college stars in the conspiracy to "fix" intercollegiate basketball games; the payoff bribes in New York's fire department (not to mention similar rackets in the welfare, building, police, and weights-and-measures departments) which resulted in the imprisonment of Commissioner James Moran; the gangster infiltration of big labor with such union leaders as Beck and Hoffa under indictment or investigation; the revelations about conniving executives, who in such telltale novels as "The Hucksters," "The Great Man," "The Big Wheel," "Executive Suite," and "The Hot Half Hour" foul their nests; the insurance company swindles in Texas, the gambling gyps in Nevada and Florida, the Apalachin underworld conference in New York, as well as the dope, prostitution, and numbers rackets in most major cities, and most recently the long-overdue exposure of greed and corruption in the boxing business, the "payola" deejay and disgrace, the paid radio-TV "plugs" and blatant commercials that "exaggerate, irritate, and nauseate."

Are these but isolated incidents unrelated to a spreading skein of deceit? Not at all. They are the outcroppings of a society whose values run cockeyed, whose once-rugged individualists are hollow men and whose fat-dripping prosperity in part derives from plain cheating. Silently, contagiously, sometimes inside and sometimes outside the law, the national cheating habit deepens: contract kickbacks, shady deals, political grafting, media payoffs, business embezzlement, income concealment, labor featherbedding, capital price fixing, farm overpayments, shoddy workmanship, venal journalism, academic cribbing and, perhaps worst of all, a goof-off psychology which Madison Avenue's Charles Brower, president of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, has labeled an American stampede away from responsibility * * * with laundrymen who won't iron shirts, waiters who won't serve, with carpenters who will come around some day maybe, with executives whose minds are on the golf course, with spiritual delinquents of all kinds who have been triumphantly determined to enjoy what was known until the present crisis as the new leisure.

The fuzzy minded, morally warped public relations field has been as guilty as any other. In their headlong haste to tell and sell, fake and take, plant a story, rig a "plug," or pay off a columnist or picture editor, public relations practitioners generally condone the very malpractices they have helped to create. From corporation consultants to Broadway press agents, too many publicists would rather be rich than right, safe than courageous, self-important than self-denying. Too many press agents, who can't think a straight thought or write a declarative sentence, are the not-so-hidden persuaders who believe the communications system exists only for their own manipulation. Little or no creative thinking has been done regarding the need for stricter morality in business or worthier aims for the Nation.

I speak from experience. On rare occasions during my editorial career on Life, Pageant, and See, I heard the siren song of fixers who wanted editorial space at a price (as most editors do, I refused outright); more often the blandishments took the form of free lunches, whisky, watches, lighters, leather goods, toiletries, parties, jewelry, and junkets. Today, as a freelancer who writes inspirational articles and as vice president of a public relations agency which is trying to set standards of excellence in a profession painfully lacking them. I recognize the problem persists. I recognize, too, that the price is never right when people sell themselves for a mess of pottage.

ANGLES REACHING NO RETURN; WHY NOT REVERT TO HONESTY?

Having tried everything else, let us try honesty for awhile. If we can't go back to plain living, let us at least practice high thinking, gracious speaking, just dealing. In good conscience, Madison Avenue's everyman must learn to be the gentleman he seems, must lead in correcting the professional abuses that prevail. He also must learn to say "No" to both client and cash when the proposition turns out to be something less than the best.

"No man can serve two masters * * * God and mammon," was the winged warning of Jesus to Israel. Its terrible truth applies as inexorably to us as it did to Canaan, Babylon, Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, medieval Europe, and a dozen other civilizations that passed from the earth because of inner decay and outer attack. In fact, more than 100 years ago, the British historian Lord Macauley warned, "Your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th, with this difference: that the Huns and vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Only changed men can change that course. Only rededicated men, cherishing the American dream more than they do the American dollar, can build the city of God instead of the city of swine. For if our godless grasping continues, if our preoccupation with singing commercials, rock 'n' roll, the Dow-Jones ticker, and intercontinental rocketry grows apace, then our perpetual adolescent society careens blindly toward its doom.

When Gen. Robert E. Lee was an old man, a war widow came and asked him to bless her son. "Teach him he must deny himself," Lee replied. Today, in an era of moon shots and 600-mile-an-hour jets, the greatest distance we have to travel is still within. Indeed, if we media men would reestablish respect for television and advertising, help reform the excesses of much of American business, we too must learn to deny ourselves, mend our ways, live according to the moral laws which are binding on all men. Then, and only then—when, with all our getting, we get understanding—can honest men succeed on Madison Avenue and America rise to the world leadership to which she is called.

Splendid Labors of Variety Clubs International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in key cities around our Nation, groups of 10,000 showmen pledged unselfishly to humanitarian endeavors have recently observed Variety Clubs Week.

The event marked another heartwarming chapter in the 33-year story of "The Heart of Show Business." Taking time out of their busy lives in the theatrical and entertainment fields, members of the numerous "tents" of the Variety Clubs have assumed the obligation of striving to improve the lot of underprivileged and unfortunate children of America. Their activities thus foster one of our Nation's most treasured resources, the rising generations.

I believe it appropriate to take notice of the devoted and often unsung contributions which the Variety Clubs have made, through these activities, toward a better America. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an inspiring review of various humanitarian projects which this public-spirited organization has carried on.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VARIETY CLUBS INTERNATIONAL RÉSUMÉ OF TENT PROJECTS

Since an unusually humble beginning in 1928, Variety Clubs International have grown in size and scope of operations until today Variety is recognized and respected as one of the world's leading charitable and humanitarian organizations.

In 1928 the founder of Variety Clubs International provided a name, a home, and an education for a deserted baby girl. Today more than 10,000 Variety members in 46 cities throughout the world, provide comfort and medical care for thousands of children each year. They build and sponsor children's hospitals, clinics, orphanages, and foundling homes. They raise money for the treatment and research of such diseases as cancer, cerebral palsy, polio, heart diseases, and rheumatic fever. From Dublin to Detroit, Variety's show business members raise more than $3 million each year to fight disease and pain in the United States, England, Ireland, Canada, and Mexico.

Every Variety chapter, or "tent," has—in addition to its general charitable projects—one main charity that it pledges to support. The rollcall of Variety tents, and their various projects, is eloquent testimony to the tireless work of Variety members and the diverse assistance they provide the handicapped and needy.

The mother tent of Variety, Tent No. 1 in Pittsburgh, has as one of its main charities the operation of Camp O'Connell, which offers to handicapped children of every race, creed, and color the privileges and joys of a summer camp and escape from dirty and hot city streets. Two years ago Tent No. 1 completed a new hospital building for the Roselia Foundling Home at a cost of approximately $1 million.

In Dayton the tent sponsors the Variety Manor for Children, a hospital for treatment of emotionally disturbed children. More than 200 children receive treatment and understanding at the Variety Manor each year.

The Variety Club of Boston's Jimmy Fund Buildings—recognized as the world's center for cancer-afflicted youngsters—were built at a cost of $4,500,000. More than 2,900 children not curable by surgery have been treated by new forms of chemical therapy under research in the Children's Cancer Research Foundation. At the present time 532 children are being cared for, under the direction of Dr. Sidney Farber. Also maintained are diagnostic laboratories and clinics from which physicians all over the world receive—free of charge—advice concerning the treatment and care of children suffering with this dread disease. The annual Jimmy Fund drive is a household word throughout the United States and particularly in the New England States. For the third consecutive year it has raised more than half a million dollars. The drive is sponsored annually by the motion picture industry; more than 600 theater collections are taken in New England movie houses, with the assistance of the Bos-

ton Red Sox and police and law-enforcement agencies.

The children's rehabilitation center sponsored by the Variety Club of Buffalo is considered one of the finest of its kind in the country. In Atlanta, Variety members maintain the cerebral palsy school and clinic. Children treated in the school clinic have been the subject of much attention in the press, as many of the youngsters have benefited in a manner bordering on the miraculous.

Variety of Las Vegas supports a day nursery and school for special education. Its school for handicapped children is modeled after the vocational training school for crippled children which was designed, built, and equipped entirely by the Variety Club of Toronto, Canada, and is known as Variety Village. Built at a cost of $400,000, the school opened in 1949 and has helped 132 crippled boys find employment after graduation.

In Houston, Variety operates a boys' club which contains recreational and educational facilities that serve 3,000 boys. The Memphis Variety Club maintains a home for convalescent children, for youngsters suffering with heart disease.

Variety's Cincinnati Tent sponsors an important and often overlooked project—industrial rehabilitation of the mentally handicapped. There are some 2,000 young people, 16 years and older, with impaired minds, in the Greater Cincinnati area. Many of them, however, are capable of being trained for jobs in industry. In many instances these young people can, with proper supervision and training, became partially self-supporting, thus taking some of the financial load from public agencies and the community. As a result, Cincinnati's Tent No. 3 organized and now operates the Variety Workshop for the Mentally Handicapped, with the assistance of Good Will Industries.

Worldwide recognition has been given to the care and training of blind children by the San Francisco Tent's blind babies foundation. This variety project offers sympathetic understanding to, and training for the parents of blind babies, in addition to its care of the children themselves. The foundation presently cares for 233 blind youngsters of preschool age and instructs their parents in how they can help in the development and training of their blind children.

The London Tent established the Heart of Variety, Ltd., to assist smaller charitable organizations, such as orphanages, hospitals, and playgrounds for children, in their work. In Washington, D.C., Variety members have contributed toward the construction of a new research building at Children's Hospital. The new building is known as the Variety Club Research Center of Children's Hospital, and it provides facilities for research in allergic diseases, antibiotics, cancer, cerebral palsy, and virus infections.

The Variety Club of Philadelphia sponsors the most modern camp for handicapped children of its kind in the world. In Chicago, Variety members sponsor La Rabida Park Sanitarium, an institution of children afflicted with rheumatic fever. The New York Variety Club supports the Cancer Control and Research Foundation, under the direction of famed Dr. Emanuel Revici.

Hospital care for 18,000 patients annually is provided handicapped children by Miami's Variety Club. In addition, much of the clinic work for doctors of the Florida Crippled Children's Commission is done at the Variety-sponsored Children's Hospital in Miami. The Variety Club of Des Moines contributes funds to the Cystic Fibrosis Association.

In Minneapolis, the Variety Club has, as its main charity, the sponsorship of the care and treatment of heart diseases. In December of 1958 the completion of the University of Minnesota Hospital was made possible by this club. The floor is devoted entirely to research in the field of heart study. Doctors from all over the United States visit the hospital each year to witness the lifesaving operations performed on the now-famous fifth floor.

The principal charity in Milwaukee is the Variety Club Epilepsy Center, where last year more than 700 cases received prompt and expert care. In Baltimore, numerous established charities for handicapped children have received contributions.

Los Angeles' Variety members are proud of their Variety Boys' Club. Here, each year, more than 3,400 boys are helped to become good citizens. This project is a favorite of at least one show business immortal: Sophie Tucker has pledged $100 a month to the boys' club for the rest of her life.

Albany, a relatively small tent with a big project, finances Camp Thacher and provides underprivileged boys of its city with a 2 weeks' vacation.

Cleveland's Variety members provide a summer camp, too. This one for diabetic children of all races, creeds, and colors. Grand Rapids gives financial aid to Youth Commonwealth, which operates three youth centers.

Mexico's tent operates the Luis R. Montes Boys' Club, which provides a wholesome environment for youngsters whose families can provide their children with only the bare necessities of life.

In Charlotte, the Variety Club erected a children's clinic as a part of the Charlotte Memorial Hospital. Two public health centers have been built and are being maintained by the Variety Club of Oklahoma City, one in Oklahoma and the other in Tulsa, one in Oklahoma City and the other in Tulsa. The St. Louis Variety Club maintains a day nursery care program. Miles apart, but with the same purpose, Dublin, Ireland, Variety Club provides care for the blind children of Ireland. For several years, New Orleans assisted United Cerebral Palsy of Greater New Orelans, Inc. Seattle's principal charity is the Children's Heart Clinic at the Orthopedic Hospital.

This almanac of tents and charities is impressive, to be sure. But it includes only a brief mention of each tent's major charitable projects. Not mentioned are the other activities of each tent, all of them designed to brighten the lives of the children in each tent city. These include the showing of movies to shut-ins in hospitals and other institutions; furnishing radios, television sets, athletic equipment and other facilities for boys' clubs, camps, and hospitals, and providing free tickets to athletic events, circuses, theaters, and other attractions. From taxi services for the blind to contributions for a large number of local charities, the showmen who make up Variety Clubs International make the time to help others.

Their reward is the health and happiness they have brought to unhappy and maladjusted youngsters, the hope they hold out each year to thousands of physically handicapped kids. Their reward—and what more could show busness people ask for—is really the light and laughter they bring to their very special audience of unfortunate children everywhere.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

President Eisenhower's Radio-TV Talk To Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we know President Eisenhower today began his four-nation tour of Latin America. With him goes the love, respect, and best wishes for a successful trip of the citizens of this country.

Throughout the Western Hemisphere, too, there are high hopes that our President will accomplish the major objectives of his mission, which include: Further improve the relations with our southern neighbors; promote greater cooperation among Latin American countries; create a better understanding, not only of our programs and policies, but of our willingness to participate in future plans to strengthen the bonds of friendship—as well as undergird efforts to promote greater economic, cultural, and intellectual progress—among these nations.

During his radio-TV address last night, the President also wisely included a reaffirmation of our policies for: maintaining the security of the Americas; adhering to our faith in the rule of law; and willingness to work to further strengthen the democratic institutions of the Western Hemisphere.

Overall, the address, in addition to putting the U.S. defense program in proper perspective, clarified the realistic, constructive "climate of intention and objective" in which the President is undertaking the trip to our Latin American neighbors.

Illustrative of the kind of statesmanlike and realistic, yet humanistic, approach of Mr. Eisenhower in attempting to find ways and means for further improving U.S. relations with other countries, this time with nations of the Western Hemisphere, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the President's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1960]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S RADIO-TV TALK TO NATION

My friends, early tomorrow I start a journey to several of our Latin American neighbors, with three major purposes in mind.

These are: To learn more about our friends to the south; to assure them again that the United States seeks to cooperate with them in achieving a fuller life for everyone in this hemisphere; and to make clear our desire to work closely with them in the building of a universal peace with justice.

Our interest in our sister republics is of long standing, and of deep affection. This, in itself, is reason sufficient for this journey.

But in these days of world tension, of awakening ambitions, and of problems caused by the growing interdependence of nations, it is vital for national partners to develop better undertakings and to improve common programs.

TO REAFFIRM BONDS

The bonds among our American Republics are not merely geographic; rather they are shared principles and convictions. Together we believe in God, in the dignity and rights of man, in peace with justice, and in the right of every people to determine its own destiny. In such beliefs our friendship is rooted.

Yet even among close comrades, friendships too often seem to be taken for granted. We must not give our neighbors of Latin America cause to believe this about us.

So I shall reaffirm to our sister republics that we are steadfast in our purpose to work with them hand in hand in promoting the security and well-being of all peoples of this hemisphere.

To do so, calls for a sustained effort that is, unfortunately, sometimes impeded by misunderstandings.

One such misunderstanding, at times voiced in Latin America, is that we have been so preoccupied with the menace of Communist imperialism and resulting problems of defense, that we have tended to forget our southern neighbors.

Some have implied that our attention has been so much directed to security for ourselves and to problems across the oceans to the west and east, that we neglect cooperation and progress within this hemisphere.

It is true that we have given first priority to worldwide measures for security against the possibility of military aggression. We have made many sacrifices to assure that this security is and will be maintained.

But I hope to make clear, on my journey, that our military programs at home and abroad have been designed for one purpose only—the maintenance of peace, as important to Latin America as to us.

That there is need for these programs, postwar history clearly proves.

For the first 5 years after World War II, we in the United States, hopeful of a global and durable peace, pursued a policy of virtual disarmament.

But the blockade of Berlin, the military weakness of our European friends living face to face with the Communist menace, and finally the Korean war—together with arrogant threats against other peaceful nations—belatedly made it clear to us that only under an umbrella of military strength could free nations hope to make progress toward an enduring just peace. World uneasiness rose to the point of alarm.

ARMS TO SUSTAIN PEACE

Since then our Nation has developed great arsenals of powerful weapons to sustain the peace. We have created a great deterrent strength—so powerful as to command and to justify the respect of knowledgeable and unbiased observers here at home and abroad.

Our many hundreds of Air Force bombers deployed the world over—each capable of unleashing a frightful destruction—constitute a force far superior to any other, in numbers, in quality, and in strategic location of bases.

We have, in addition, a powerful nuclear force in our aircraft carriers and in our host of widely deployed tactical aircraft. Adding constantly to these forces are advanced types of missiles steadily augmenting the armaments of all ground and other military units.

As for longer range ballistic missiles, from a standing start only 5 years ago we have literally leaped forward in accomplishments no less than remarkable.

Our Atlas missile, already amazingly accurate, became operational last year. Missiles of intermedaite range are in forward bases. The first Polaris missile submarine—an almost invulnerable weapon—will soon be at sea. New generations of long-range missiles are under urgent development.

STRESSES VARIED FORCE

Collectively, this is a force not unduly dependent upon any one weapon or any one service, not subject to elimination by sudden attack, buttressed by an industrial system unmatched on earth, and unhesitatingly supported by a vigorous people determined to remain free. Strategically, it is far better situated than any force that could be brought to bear against us.

As we have strengthened these defenses, we have helped to bolster our own and free world security by assisting in arming 42 other nations—our associates in the defense of the free world.

Our part of this indispensable effort is our mutual security program. It makes possible a forward strategy of defense for the greater security of all, including our neighbors to the south.

I am certain that our Latin American neighbors, as well as you here at home, understand the significance of all these facts.

SAYS SHIELD IS AMPLE

We have forged a trustworthy shield of peace—an indestructible force of incalculable power, ample for today and constantly developing to meet the needs of tomorrow.

Today, in the presence of continuous threat, all of us can stand resolute and unafraid—confident in America's might as an anchor of free world security.

But we all recognize that peace and freedom cannot be forever sustained by weapons alone. There must be a free world spirit and morale based upon the conviction that, for freemen, life comprehends more than mere survival and bare security. Peoples everywhere must have opportunity to better themselves spiritually, intellectually, economically.

We earnestly seek to help our neighbors in this hemisphere achieve the progress they rightly desire.

We have sought to strengthen the Organization of American States and other cooperative groups which promote hemispheric progress and solidarity.

We have invested heavily in Latin American enterprise.

New credits, both public and private, are being made available in greater volume than ever before. Last year, these approximated $1 billion. Our outstanding loans and investments in Latin America now exceed $11 billion.

LISTS OTHER STEPS

With our sister republics, we have just established the Inter-American Development Bank. With them we hope this new $1 bil-

lion institution will do much to accelerate economic growth.

Additionally, we have expanded technical cooperation programs throughout the Americas.

To improve our own knowledge of our neighbors' needs, we recently established a distinguished panel of private citizens under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State.

This national advisory committee will by continuous study of inter-American affairs, help us at home better to cooperate with our Latin-American friends. Members of the committee will accompany me on my journey.

This will be a busy trip, for our neighbors' problems are many and vexing—the lack of development capital, wide fluctuations in the prices of their export commodities, the need for common regional markets to foster efficiency and to attract new credits, the need to improve health, education, housing, and transportation.

These are certain to be subjects of discussion in each of the countries I visit.

CITES BASIC PRINCIPLES

And wherever I go, I shall state again and again the basic principles and attitudes that govern our country's relationships in this hemisphere.

For example:

Our good-partner policy is a permanent guide, encompassing nonintervention, mutual respect, and juridical equality of states.

We wish, for every American nation, a rapid economic progress, with its blessings reaching all the people.

We are always eager to cooperate in fostering sound development within the limits of practical capabilities; further, we shall continue to urge every nation to join in help to the less fortunate.

We stand firmly by our pledge to help maintain the security of the Americas under the Rio Treaty of 1947.

We declare our faith in the rule of law, our determination to abide by treaty commitments, and our insistence that other nations do likewise.

We will do all we can to foster the triumph of human liberty throughout the hemisphere.

We condemn all efforts to undermine the democratic institutions of the Americas through coercion or subversion, and we abhor the use of the lie and distortion in relations among nations.

RED "FALSEHOOD" MENTIONED

Very recently, in a faraway country that has never known freedom—one which today holds millions of humans in subjugation—impassioned language has been used to assert that the United States has held Latin America in a colonial relationship to ourselves.

That is a blatant falsehood.

In all history no nation has had a more honorable record in its dealings with other countries than has the United States.

The Philippines are independent today—by their own choice.

Alaska and Hawaii are now proud partners in our federated, democratic enterprise—by their own choice.

Puerto Rico is a commonwealth within the United States system—by its own choice.

After the two world wars and the Korean war, the United States did not annex a single additional acre, and it has sought no advantage of any kind at the expense of another.

And in all of Latin America, I repeat, we adhere honorably and persistently to the policy of nonintervention.

It is nonsense to charge that we hold—or that we desire to hold—any nation in colonial status.

These are but a few of the matters that friends in this hemisphere need to talk about. I look forward with the keenest pleasure to exchanging views with the Presidents of Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, and with their colleagues.

It is my profound hope that, upon my return, I shall be able to report to you that the historic friendship and trust among the nations of this hemisphere have been strenghened, and that our common cause—justice and peace in freedom—has been reaffirmed and given new life.

Good evening, and to my Latin American friends, buenas tardes (good afternoon).

The Father of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the States-Graphic, a weekly newspaper published at Brownsville, Tenn., on Friday, February 19, an editorial on George Washington written by Mr. Paul Sims, the editor of this paper, who is an outstanding editor not only in our congressional district and the State of Tennessee, but the Nation as well.

I think this editorial is very timely and to the point:

THE FATHER OF OUR COUNTRY

February 22 is the birthday of George Washington.

This was the man who was most influential and successful in the founding of the United States.

This was to become, and is today, the greatest nation under heaven.

George Washington was the general who led the colonies to victory over Great Britain to make them independent. He was the Nation's first President.

However, the popular observance of Washington's birthday did not come about overnight, after his death. The colonies and the States were slow to recognize the magnitude of Washington's accomplishments and the contribution he had made to the young Nation.

Not only had Washington won independence for the colonies and served as first President, he had had established the foundation principles for American government, one of them being to stay out of other nations affairs. He had also set the precedent for a two-term limit for chief executives.

After Washington's death on December 14, 1779, at Mount Vernon the Congress, then meeting in Philadelphia, proposed that February 22, 1800, be observed throughout the country with proper exercises in honor of the first President of the United States.

Thereafter the observance of Washington's birthday rapidly spread throughout the United States. It is today a national holiday, and should continue to be as long as we enjoy liberty and freedom.

Washington's high standards of conduct, morality, ethics and statesmanship were then, and are today, an example for all Americans who would offer their services in times of war and in positions of public trust.

For because Washington had all of these characteristics, and in abundant measure, it is possible for us to enjoy today liberty and peace.

Washington's birthday, then, is more than a simple national holiday, observed by workers, by banks and other public businesses. It is a day for all loyal Americans to rededicate their lives to the principles for which he fought and served.

Gen. Clark L. Ruffner Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1960, Hon. Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business Magazine, of Decatur, Ga., presented to Gen. Clark L. Ruffner, who until recently served with distinction as commanding general of the U.S. 3d Army, the magazine's distinguished service award designating him "Honorary Citizen of the South." The presentation was made upon the occasion of General Ruffner's departure to become the American representative to the NATO Military Committee. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Lee's remarks of presentation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS MADE BY HUBERT F. LEE IN PRESENTING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD DESIGNATING GEN. CLARK L. RUFFNER, "HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE SOUTH" AND CONFERRING HONORARY MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOUTH'S HALL OF FAME ADVISORY COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 16, 1960 AT FORT MCPHERSON, GA.

General Ruffner, as founder of the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living" honor group, I believe I speak for the leadership of the South and of the Nation in saying we are proud of you.

As commanding general of the famous 3d Army, you head the South's biggest business enterprise. In this assignment, your leadership has been notable, as it has been through all your military career.

We are proud that here you were promoted to lieutenant general and now to a four-star general. We are proud that you have been selected for U.S. representative to the NATO Military Committee where you will shortly assume your new duties for the Nation.

I think it fitting that these honors should come to you in the South where you attended Virginia Military Institute and learned the fine traditions of the greatest profession in the world—the profession of arms.

I believe your comrades in arms will agree with me when I say you exemplify the fine old ode to a soldier:

"For gold the merchant plows the main,
The farmer plows the manor,
The soldier's gold is glory
And the soldier's gain is honor."

This is a gesture of good will to you and it is a gesture of good will to the memory of another soldier who went to Virginia Military Institute, the late Gen. George C. Marshall, who was a member of the South's Hall of of Fame Advisory Council. It is likewise a tribute to two retired lieutenant generals, who are former commanders of the 3d Army and are members of the South's Hall of Fame for the Living. Gens. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., and A. R. Bolling.

It was my privilege to have served in the old Army Air Service in the formative days of

Camp Benning; in the first B.M.T.C. in 1922 and later in the Georgia National Guard. It has also been my privilege to serve in a humble civilian capacity since March 4, 1942, at the Atlanta General Depot, Forest Park, Ga.

I was much impressed with Rudyard Kipling's description of a great American as quoted by the Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, JR., who did me the honor of making the "Man of the South for 1959" award to Mr. Norman A. Cocke at the Charlotte Country Club December 14, 1959.

I think I can say about you what Senator ERVIN said to Norman A. Cocke as a fitting description of you:

"Leal servant, loved master,
Rare comrade, sure guide."

General Ruffner, on behalf of the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor group, and on behalf of the Editor's of Dixie Business, it is my happy privilege to present you this illuminated scroll as a gesture of good will, which brings you into the circle of unselfish leaders of the South.

"The American's Creed" Should Be Our National Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to offer for consideration a resolution to establish "The American's Creed" by William Tyler Page as the national creed of the United States. Mr. Page was born in the city of Frederick, Md., on October 19, 1868, and lived in Montgomery County, in the Sixth District of Maryland, which I am proud to represent in the House of Representatives.

In 1916, when half the world was aflame with war, the thought occurred to many Americans that we should more seriously than ever before consider the duties and obligations of American citizenship, lest we forfeit its rights and privileges. Among those who felt these things was Henry Sterling Chapin, of New York, who conceived the idea of promoting a countrywide contest for the writing of a national creed. The creed would be the briefest possible summary of our political faith in terms of fundamental things most distinctive in American history and tradition.

In March 1917, on behalf of the city of Baltimore, Mayor James H. Preston offered an award of $1,000 for the winning creed. In addition to a committee on manuscripts and a committee on award, a number of well-known men and women agreed to act as an advisory committee. The President of the United States informally approved of the contest, and many Governors, U.S. Senators, and Congressmen were members of this advisory committee of which the U.S. Commissioner of Education was, ex officio, chairman.

Of the thousands of creeds submitted from every State in the Union, the one chosen by the committees was submitted by William Tyler Page, a lineal descendant of Carter Braxton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. From a lifetime practice of retiring to his library for a careful study of the great documents of American history on each Fourth of July, Page was able to express the essence of American faith in a simple yet comprehensive summary.

The American's Creed was selected in March 1918. In the following month, the creed was publicly announced at a ceremony held in the Office Building of the House of Representatives. The entire proceedings, together with the official reprinting of the American's Creed appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 1918. A few days after receiving a check for $1,000 from the city of Baltimore, Mr. Page stood upon the Capitol steps in Washington and purchased a $1,000 bond of the third liberty loan.

All citizens of the Sixth District of Maryland are proud of William Tyler Page. In addition to having captured the very essence of American patriotism in a short and succinct statement, Page had the distinction of having served as an employee here at the U.S. Capitol for 61 years. He served under 11 Presidents from Chester Arthur to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. During this period there were 15 Speakers of the House of Representatives. His career began as a congressional page in the Clerk's Office of the House of Representatives on December 19, 1881. Page served in various capacities until he retired in 1942. He died in 1948 at the age of 80.

Today and every day the patriotic essence of his "American's Creed" should be daily practiced more intensely. For this reason I have proposed that "The American Creed" should formally be made by congressional resolution our national creed.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED
(By William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Trade Between Hawaii and the West Coast—Favorable Action by U.S. Court of Appeals on Application of Pacific Far East Line, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 21, 1959, I informed the Senate that something effective should be done to end the alleged near monopoly that the Matson Navigation Co. has on trade between Hawaii and the west coast. There was considerable discussion about that matter, and a good many persons came to discuss it with me.

At the time, I wondered whether I was on bad ground; but I am happy to inform the Senate that on February 4, 1960, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit unanimously decided that the Federal Maritime Board had erred in excluding the Pacific Far East Line, Inc., from becoming the only competitor of Matson in the Pacific coast-Hawaii trade.

I am pleased that—for the first time, to my knowledge—a U.S. court has taken cognizance of Matson's apparent monopolistic position. The Department of Justice is to be commended for its strong stand, taken at my request, in arguing against this monopoly.

I am now informed that the Maritime Board—which is not an independent agency, but is a part of the executive branch, under the authority of the Department of Commerce—is considering opposing its own attorney, the Justice Department, and is seeking Supreme Court review of this historic decision which is so important to our new State of Hawaii.

In its decision the Federal court made clear that the Maritime Board had never even given consideration to the public interest in ending Matson's monopoly. I submit that the public interest involved in this matter requires that the Maritime Board submit to this decision and bow to the decision of its own attorneys, namely, the Department of Justice. For the Maritime Board to oppose the Justice Department in the Supreme Court is not only against the public interest, but also seems to me to be just a little rediculous.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the New York Herald Tribune of February 4, which supports this position. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed a short excerpt from the decision of the court of appeals in this case.

There being no objection, the article and the excerpts from the decision were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC LINES WINS APPEALS COURT VICTORY—MARITIME BOARD TO RECONSIDER RULING

Pacific Far East Lines won a major victory yesterday over the Federal Maritime Board and Matson Navigation Co. in a ruling handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington.

The court ordered the Maritime Board to reconsider its order denying Pacific Far East permission to maintain a nonsubsidized service between west coast ports and Hawaii in competition with Matson. The court further ruled that the Board had "practically equated unfair competition with effective competition" in its original decision.

John R. Wagner, executive vice president of Pacific Far East, hailed the decision as clearing the way "for establishment of a broader base of transportation between the States of Washington, Oregon, California, and the new State of Hawaii."

The court fight was marked by the unusual spectacle of the Department of Justice appealing the ruling of the quasi-judicial Federal Maritime Board in the court of appeals. The Justice Department supported Pacific Far East's contention that the Maritime Board had made an erroneous ruling. As a result, it is not expected that the court of appeals' decision will be taken to the Supreme Court.

Judge John A. Danaher said in the ruling that "preservation of Matson's monopoly is not an object or policy of the [merchant marine] act."

"On the contrary, the public interest in ending this monopoly should be considered," he continued. "The act does not exempt the California-Hawaii trade from the anti-monopoly policy which Congress has often expressed.

The Maritime Board made its ruling while Hawaii was still a Territory. Since Hawaii is now a State, the question whether ship services between it and the west coast comes under the Federal Maritime Board or the Interstate Commerce Commission has still not been resolved.

EXCERPT FROM U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, DECIDED FEBRUARY 4, 1960

Intervenor Matson has operated in the Pacific coast-Hawaii trade for more than 70 years and is said to carry 98 percent of the cargo in that trade.

The Board practically equated unfair competition with effective competition. But what is bad for Matson is not necessarily bad for the country. However adequate Matson's service may be, and in whatever sense Matson may "need" to retain its monopoly of the California-Hawaii trade, we cannot accept the Board's view that Matson is "fundamentally entitled" to retain this monopoly as against a competitor that is subsidized—as Matson itself is, through its subsidiary Oceanic—in a different trade. Service and need would be important if the Board were a public utility commission passing upon an application to enter a regulated field, but have nothing to do with the question whether PFEL's competition with Matson would be "unfair."

Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Showing Receipt by the States of Surplus Real and Personal Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a report from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which shows that the States received surplus real and personal property valued at $88,842,822 for the period October through December 1959.

The Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, which was established by Chairman DAWSON of the Government Operations Committee and consists of myself as chairman, Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN, and Congressman ROBERT R. BARRY, keeps a close watch on the operation of this program which has proven to be of great value to our institutions. As a matter of fact the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that the donable surplus property program constitutes the greatest assistance now being given to our educational institutions. It is well known that many engineering and industrial schools throughout the Nation would have great difficulty operating without the machine tools and other pieces of equipment made available to them through the donable property program.

The report follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, October 1 through December 31, 1959 (acquisition cost)

[In accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong. as amended]

State	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$85,486,916	$3,355,906	$88,842,822
Alabama	2,237,413		2,237,413
Alaska	259,170	66,590	325,760
Arizona	730,687	7,040	737,727
Arkansas	1,001,385	208,835	1,210,220
California	11,995,539	39,823	12,035,362
Colorado	2,188,625	162,345	2,350,970
Connecticut	2,066,442		2,066,442
Delaware	287,900		287,900
Florida	3,562,217	35,955	3,598,172
Georgia	1,949,200		1,949,200
Hawaii	200,685		200,685
Idaho	589,462	19,423	608,885
Illinois	2,675,933		2,675,933
Indiana	1,197,437		1,197,437
Iowa	944,413	1,500	945,913
Kansas	733,270	8,822	742,092
Kentucky	1,455,417	24,159	1,479,576
Louisiana	895,584		895,584
Maine	658,389	40,000	698,389
Maryland	1,796,870		1,796,870
Massachusetts	2,613,814		2,613,814
Michigan	2,168,880		2,168,880
Minnesota	1,731,579		1,731,579
Mississippi	1,341,957		1,341,957
Missouri	1,316,827	30,104	1,346,931
Montana	249,850		249,850
Nebraska	653,282	22,357	675,639
Nevada	132,389		132,389
New Hampshire	314,993		314,993
New Jersey	1,514,497	5,000	1,519,497
New Mexico	871,450	80,223	951,673
New York	6,145,395	41,957	6,187,352
North Carolina	1,582,364		1,582,364
North Dakota	132,941		132,941
Ohio	2,681,242	7,537	2,688,779
Oklahoma	1,842,510	575	1,843,085
Oregon	1,212,371	11,451	1,223,822
Pennsylvania	1,698,773		1,698,773
Rhode Island	565,423		565,423
South Carolina	1,155,538		1,155,538
South Dakota	564,621		564,621
Tennessee	1,391,227	2,314,420	3,705,647
Texas	3,369,380	39,812	3,409,192
Utah	2,451,995		2,451,995
Vermont	162,750		162,750
Virginia	2,768,049	9,389	2,777,438
Washington	2,763,123	170,424	2,933,547
West Virginia	949,036		949,036
Wisconsin	2,718,524		2,718,524
Wyoming	359,355	8,165	367,520
District of Columbia	252,797		252,797
Puerto Rico	383,946		383,946
Virgin Islands			

Putting the Missouri To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, South Dakota is fortunate in having among the editors of its daily press a man who is outstanding in his knowledge of the Missouri River and its potentialities. He is Robert B. Hipple, editor and publisher of the Pierre Capital Journal.

Mr. Hipple recently looked into the future and wrote two editorials which I regard as significant in predicting the impact of Missouri development on South Dakota. One dealt with navigation; the other, with irrigation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital Journal, Jan. 28, 1960]

THE BIGGEST BENEFIT

Hydroelectric power is the smallest and least important benefit that the people of South Dakota can derive from the comprehensive program for Missouri River development.

Navigation is the largest, and the most important, benefit that South Dakotans could enjoy. Irrigation falls between power and navigation.

This is a fact; but it is a fact that is not realized or appreciated by most of the people of this State, including some of the people who are well informed on the general subject of the construction plans.

This lack of comprehension arises from the fact that hydroelectric power is such a large and important benefit that it is almost impossible for people to realize that other benefits could be larger; and from the further fact that power is not an established fact, while neither the benefits of irrigation or of navigation are now in existence.

The main benefit of hydroelectric power comes from the difference in cost to the consumer, between what he pays for power generated by falling water and power generated by burning fuel. This is less than 2 cents per kilowatt-hour; but even at that figure the South Dakota family using 500 hours monthly will save $10 per month or $120 annually.

The main benefit of navigation comes from the difference between the cost of hauling things overland and the cost of hauling them by water. The possible savings here are spectacular in the case of many commodities in daily use by most South Dakota families.

There is also the fact that there is a top limit to the amount of electricity that can be generated by the water flowing in the Missouri; but there is practically no such limit on the amount of tonnage that water can carry.

A waterway is a better carrier than a heavy duty truck highway. We ought to be getting such a carrier built into South Dakota.

[From the Pierre (S. Dak.) Capital Journal, Jan. 29, 1960]

GET WHAT WE PAY FOR

Some time between now and the first of July the Huron area office of the Bureau of Reclamation will complete a detailed study of the proposed Oahe-James irirgation project. The study will have been reviewed by people from a regional office at Billings, Mont., and from the central office in Washington.

We do not know just what conclusions will be reached. When the study is completed and approved it will be made available to the people of South Dakota for their own examination. It will then be up to the people to decide whether they want to make use of Missouri River water for irrigation purposes.

as proposed. If they do, it will be necessary for South Dakotans to take some action. Particularly they will have to make some promises to pay a share of the costs that will be involved.

Obviously nobody is going to make any such promise until it is known how much is involved. This is the information that can be expected from the report now in preparation. Our guess is that when the information is available South Dakotans generally will be surprised to learn how much of the project they will be paying for in any event, through the monthly bills they now pay for electricity. They will also be surprised to learn that in the event they do not decide to build the irrigation project their bills for electricity are apt to rise instead of decreasing.

This somewhat paradoxical situation arises from the fact that money advanced to build irrigation projects is interest-free, as far as repayment is concerned, while money advanced for construction of electrical installations carries a charge for interest.

The subject can, and undoubtedly will, be discussed at great length. However it all adds up to the ultimate conclusion that South Dakotans are going to pay for an irrigation project, whether it is built in South Dakota or not. Once this fact is thoroughly understood by South Dakotans generally we feel fairly sure they are going to insist upon having what they pay for.

The Man Behind the Bylines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, last month death came to one of the truly great newspaper editors of our time. C. G. "Pete" Wellington, executive director of the Kansas City Star, contributed materially to the high standard of journalism so clearly in evidence when one reads any edition, morning or evening, of that great midwestern newspaper.

Although his place will not be easily filled, because of his thoughtfulness for others, his devotion to duty and to those with whom he worked, and his constant effort to make even better newspapermen of his associates, capable men are prepared to step into his place and undertake to assume his responsibilities.

Facts, and only true and complete facts, were, to Mr. Wellington, the basis for any story. Integrity of the press was his first any most important objective and he never swerved from that ideal.

A son, Robert B. Wellington, is editor of the Ottawa Herald, Ottawa, Kans., and, with the outstanding career of his father as an example, he is pursuing a similar and fearless course. His son, his friends, and his associates on the Kansas City Star will continue to strive for perfection and will do a better job because of the exemplary life of Pete Wellington.

Because Mr. Wellington had many friends and admirers in all corners of the earth, Mr. Speaker, I ask that an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Times—the Morning Star—and which expresses the thoughts and admiration of his coworkers be included in my remarks:

C. G. WELLINGTON

To more than a generation of newspapermen C. G. Wellington has been known as one of the great technicians of his profession. Quiet of manner, unerringly considerate of people who worked under him, he kept up a constant pressure for top performance.

His professional life was a continuous drive for perfection. Of course he knew that in the massive, fast-moving production of a metropolitan newspaper there could never be absolute perfection. Few persons outside a newspaper office could have any conception of the task. As executive editor, Pete Wellington headed a day-and-night operation in which 12 separate editions roll off the presses every day. It requires assembling and evaluating news ranging from the danger spots of the world to a human interest episode on Charlotte Street. Many stories must be rushed to the copy desk a few lines at a time as they are written. Through the many departments and features the operation covers the full range of human activity.

Pete Wellington presided over this operation with an apparent calm and a constant vigil. In this he worked through many people in Kansas City and in the bureaus at the State capitals and Washington. Far more than most staff members realized, he followed their individual work. He maintained a close association with many of the reporters for the press services and other agencies who covered the world.

To some newcomers, perhaps, his quiet and reserved manner was interpreted as aloofness, which was far from his real nature. Persons who knew him realized that Pete Wellington was deeply concerned for the welfare of all the people in the Star operation. He wanted to hear about individual problems. He recognized that in a large organization talent varies widely and he went to strenuous lengths to find the work that would bring out the best in each person.

In the production of the Star, Mr. Wellington was the man in the background. Of course he was known intimately to a very large number of personal friends. But the city as a whole seldom heard his name. He was an editor, not a writer. He was the man behind the bylines of many fine reporters and thousands of stories. He seldom made speeches and was seldom found in the spotlight. The nerve center of his world ranging news interest was at his own desk.

The Wellington reputation as a perfectionist was made as assistant city editor and city editor, jobs that put him in the closest direct contact with reporters and copy readers. He was known for the high standards of Star style that have become familiar to many newspapers. But his conception of fine writing went much deeper than anything that could be specified in a style book.

Ernest Hemingway credits him with bringing a concept of flexible narrative writing to a profession that was then tied to a cut-and-dried dogma of leads and secondary leads. From afar he could sense the drama of a big story. But in his book the fundamental was absolute integrity of facts. A sloppy piece of reporting called for an item-by-item grilling that many a seasoned newspaperman can remember even to this day.

Wellington was a newspaperman's newspaperman. Through his leadership in national professional associations he had friends in the key posts of hundreds of papers. For him a convention of editors was like old home week. And from the delightful visits with friends he brought home a wide range of ideas.

Friendships were extremely important to the exacting Pete Wellington, friendships and his closely knit family. Those of us at the Star, especially, realize that we have lost an extremely warmhearted and devoted friend. We are confident that the professional standards of excellence set by him have left an imprint on the Star that will last for many years.

The Lincoln Family in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article writen by John T. Harris, Jr., of Harrisonburg in March 1887, with respect to the history of the Lincoln family in Virginia.

I feel this is of interest, particularly at this time when we have only recently observed the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LINCOLN FAMILY IN VIRGINIA

Adversity has its compensations. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 did more than disrupt interracial evolution in the South.

It awakened thoughtful Americans everywhere to a gradual realization that the Constitution will always be imperiled by well organized, clamorous balance-of-power minorities able to convince the political appointees on the high bench, that "the end justifies the means" even when those means violate clearly prescribed restrictions of the Nation's basic law.

Another beneficial effect of the Warren-Myrdal decision was that it revived interest in our history, and—after almost a century of bitter prejudice—reminded Southerners that Mr. Lincoln was not a malevolent fanatic, determined to free and enfranchise the largely illiterate Negro—but was concerned basically with the preservation of the Union.

Thanks to the preservation of the Union, the essentially conservative South remained as a check against the Marxist demagoguery of the North's big city "liberals" and thereby has fortified national resistance against the invasion of Soviet ideology.

The North long ago recognized the heroic stature of Robert E. Lee.

The South, I believe, will in time arrive at a less distorted image of the Civil War President born 151 years ago today.

Quite by chance I came upon a letter (in the same old Century magazine of March 1887) by John T. Harris, Jr., of Harrisonburg, delineating the prerevolutionary Virginia background of the Lincoln family.

The following excerpts from that letter may prove interesting to the historically minded:

"The early ancestors of Lincoln lived in Berks County, Pa., and moved thence to Virginia.

"The records belonging to the Lincoln family during their residence in Rockingham County, Va., were destroyed by the Federal Army during the Civil War, but fortunately there are yet in existence certain official and indisputably authenticated documents, only discovered upon a recent search, which the torch of war did not touch.

"In the year 1768 that portion of the Shenandoah Valley, Va., now contained within the county of Rockingham constituted a part of the county of Augusta, from

which county Rockingham was detached and organized in 1777.

"Prior to this date—1777—all transfers of real estate in the county now comprising Rockingham County were recorded in the clerk's office of Augusta County at Staunton, the county seat. The records of this office disclose the fact that on the 16th day of August 1768 there was recorded a deed from the heirs of Robert McKay to John Lincoln conveying a tract of 600 acres situate on Linvill's Creek in the county of Augusta, now in the county of Rockingham.

"This tract of 600 acres was a portion of a very extensive body of land patented to McKay and others as early as 1739, and was doubtless regarded then, as it unquestionably is now, as among the finest tracts of land in the fertile Shenandoah Valley.

"In view of this purchase of land in Virginia by John Lincoln, it may certainly be regarded as settled that he—the great-grandfather of the President—located in what now constitutes Rockingham County, Va., as early as 1768.

"Messrs. Nicolay and Hay intimate in the Lincoln history, and Mr. Nicolay states in his article on Lincoln in the 'Encyclopedia Britannica,' that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Thomas, and John, sons of John Lincoln, were born in Virginia. Unless it can be shown that John Lincoln located in Virginia a considerable time prior to the year 1768, it may be fairly assumed that his sons just named were all born in Pennsylvania and accompanied their father to Virginia upon his settlement in that State. This idea receives corroboration from certain conveyances to his sons made by John Lincoln.

"On the 11th of August 1773 only 5 years after the date of the conveyance from the McKays to John Lincoln, he with his wife, 'Rebekah R.,' transferred to their son Isaac 215 acres of the original 600-acre tract, and on the 17th day of August 1773 they also conveyed to their son Abraham—the grandfather of the President—210 acres of this same tract.

"At what time did Abraham Lincoln, the grandfather of the President, remove from Virginia to Kentucky? Messrs. Nicolay and Hay fix the date as 1780. The date of the land warrants to Abraham Lincoln, the 4th of March 1780, and the subsequent entries of the land in Kentucky thereunder certainly confirm the time of his leaving Virginia as being as early as 1780, but the statement by Messrs. Nicolay and Hay 'that he took his wife and five children with him' at this time is not borne out by record evidence in Rockingham County.

"There is still in existence the original deed from Abraham Lincoln and Bersheba, his wife, to one Michael Shanks, dated the 18th of February 1780, whereby, 'in consideration of the sum of 5,000 pounds current money of Virginia in hand paid,' they granted and conveyed to Shanks a tract of 250 acres, consisting of the 200 acres received from John Lincoln, his father, and another tract of about 40 acres obtained from one Munsey.

"There can scarcely be any reasonable doubt that this was the sale of Abraham Lincoln's real estate preparatory to his emigration to Kentucky. The deed was recorded on June 17, 1780, but without the privy examination of Bersheba, his wife, attached to the transfer. Consequently, in order to remedy this defect in the conveyance, there was issued on September 8, 1781, by the county court of Rockingham, a commission of privy examination of his wife Bersheba, she being unable to travel to our said county court of Rockingham to be privily examined apart from her husband whether she is willing to relinquish her right of dower in the land in the said deed mentioned, as the law in that case directs. This commission was executed by the commissioners named therein on September 24, 1781, returned to the county court, and recorded the same day; and the acknowledgment of Bersheba Lincoln, grandmother of Abraham Lincoln, that she had signed the said deed of her own free will, without any threats, force, or compulsion of her said husband, was complete, and with it, doubtless, passed all remaining material interest of the President's grandparents in Virginia.

"Lincoln himself states that his grandfather settled in Kentucky about 1782, and this privy examination certainly shows that his grandmother was still in Virginia as late as September 24, 1781.

"If Abraham Lincoln, the pioneer, removed to Kentucky prior to this date—September 1781—his wife did not accompany him, and it may be reasonably supposed, considering the difficulties and dangers attending travel at that time, that his wife and children did not migrate until the spring following."

JOHN T. HARRIS, Jr.

HARRISONBURG, VA., *March 1887.*

Loyalty Oath Has Proponents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, several educators have proposed that the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act should be modified, striking the clause which disclaims membership in any organization which seeks to overthrow the U.S. Government by unconstitutional means.

Today, thousands of youths who are required to sign the oath are joining an organization which supports the provision as it is now written and administered. There follows an article from the Tablet which presents a part of the story. This movement stems from the students, themselves, rather than "from the top, down":

A national student organization founded for the object of preserving the student loyalty oath and nonsubversive affidavit in the National Defense Education Act was announced here this week.

The organization's name is the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath. Twenty-five colleges and universities across the Nation are represented on its governing board and more are to be announced in the near future.

Chairman of the organization is Douglas Caddy, a senior at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. Caddy is presently State chairman of the Young Republican College Federation for the District of Columbia. Executive secretary-treasurer of the student committee is David Franke, a junior at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Franke is also at the present time the editor of the Individualist, official student publication of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists.

COLLEGES REPRESENTED

The committee is bipartisan in political character. Its activities will be confined solely to fighting for the preservation of the loyalty oath and affidavit presently embodied in the NDEA and will not enter into the other areas of controversy currently attached to the NDEA.

Colleges represented by students on the governing board of the organization include Harvard University, Boston College, University of Connecticut, City College of New York, Manhattan College, College of New Rochelle, University of Indiana, Butler University, University of Wisconsin, Antioch, Marquette University, St. John's University (Minnesota), University of Michigan, Wittenberg College (Ohio), Iowa Central College, Kansas State University, William and Mary University, University of Houston, University of Arizona, University of New Mexico, Georgetown University, George Washington University, American University, Dunbarton College, and Trinity College.

ENDORSED BY SENATOR

The committee has been given the endorsement and blessing of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of Senate Republican Policy Committee. Senator BRIDGES, in a recent letter to the committee, wrote in part:

"The formation of your nationwide committee has come to my attention, and I offer my congratulations for the example of patriotism being expressed by our young American college and university students. It should serve to inspire our future leaders in every field of endeavor to renew their knowledge of the fundamentals upon which our Nation was founded.

"Throughout our history thousands of our young people have daily saluted the American flag and repeated the pledge of allegiance without any thought of hesitation. It has always been my belief that it was an honor to take any pledge of allegiance or subscribe to any oath of loyalty on behalf of our Nation. Why this should become unpopular in some circles is almost beyond my belief and comprehension.

"I wish the committee well and hope it receives support throughout the country. It is most certainly a worthwhile endeavor.

"STYLES BRIDGES,
"Chairman, Senate Republican Policy Committee."

DEPLORES OPPOSITION

In announcing its formation, the student committee termed "deplorable" the actions of the 19 colleges and universities who have refused to participate or have withdrawn from participation in the NDEA because of the loyalty-oath requirement. The committee raised the questions (1) whether it is proper for the officials of these colleges and universities that have refused participation to act as a superlegislature and deny qualified students the opportunity to seek the benefits under a public law designed to aid them individually, and (2) whether such officials are not by administrative fiat depriving the students of the very freedom they seek to preserve. The committee called attention to the fact that while only 19 institutions have refused participation in the NDEA, over 1,370 other institutions are participating without protest of the benefits of NDEA.

Hazards of Alaska Motoring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, driving a car in congested city traffic, or even out on the main highways of the heavily settled sections of this country, presents constant risks, and is not in any case recommended as a sovereign remedy to

keep the nervous system free of jingles and jangles.

The Sterling Highway, in Alaska, extending from Homer to Anchorage, is less heavily traveled. Indeed, a bumper-to-bumper situation never does occur.

However, driving there has its perils too. If a fellow motorist does not "get" you, a moose—who feels he has as much right to the highway as you do—may dispute the right-of-way with you.

Twice recently this occurred on the Taylor Highway, according to a news article in the Inlet Courier, published in Homer by Marie and Jim McDowell.

How would you like to be confronted by a moose's foot coming right through the windshield at you? Yet that is just what happened recently on the Sterling Highway to Frank Wise.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, published in the Inlet Courier, which tells of this unique motoring hazard to be found in Alaska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Inlet Courier, Homer, Alaska]

TWO CARS DAMAGED BY MOOSE

Tuesday night as Frank Wise was returning from Kenai with members of the Homer High School basketball team he ran into a moose in the vicinity of Kasilo Hill. The moose's foot came through the windshield and Frank suffered a badly lacerated thumb. No one else was hurt in the car and the boys came home in it but the moose had a broken leg and had to be disposed of by the game department.

On Tuesday morning Leonard Catledge also collided with a moose and his car was badly battered but no other details are available.

The Co-op Tax Dodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the question of co-ops and taxes is one which has been highly controversial in recent years. Many of us in Congress are friendly toward the principle of co-ops and we have seen definite benefits to our constituents from the cooperatives. However, there are those who believe that the cooperative plan has in some instances grown all out of proportion, and they object to the fact that the cooperatives are given a tax-free status which places privately owned business and industry at a disadvantage. Time magazine for February 15 gave a very interesting report on this situation. This indicates there is a definite need for a better understanding by both sides. I submit it for publication in the RECORD:

THE CO-OP TAX DODGE—CONGRESS SHOULD CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE

Next to the oil-depletion allowance, the hoariest unsettled tax argument in Washington involves the virtual immunity of giant cooperatives from income taxes. More than 10,000 co-ops gross more than $13 billion a year, yet pay less than 6 percent of their profits in Federal and State income taxes, compared with the 52-percent Federal corporate tax alone. This year, in his budget message, President Eisenhower asked for new taxes for co-ops, and last week the House Ways and Means Committee started hearings on the question: How much should co-ops be taxed?

Originally, the co-ops were small neighborhood associations set up to improve farmers' competitive position by pooling their marketing and purchasing power. When Congress in 1909 imposed the first peacetime corporate income tax of 1 percent, co-ops were held to be exempt as "agricultural or horticultural organizations." There were no objections, since at that time their tax advantage over other businesses was so small. Subsequently, Congress spelled it out: a co-op was totally exempt if it did half or more of its business with members and met certain other tests, such as limiting dividends on capital stock to 8 percent. If it did not meet these requirements, it was still exempt on its regular income if it was paid out to members in cash or in shares simply allocated to them on the books. Such allocations do not bind the co-ops, which can redeem them in cash when and if they want to, even lose the money without a comeback from members. Only when a member finally gets cash is the co-op income taxable—at the personal income tax rate.

Virtually excused from taxation, the co-ops expanded enormously. The Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, founded in 1938 with only $30,000 in capital, today has a net worth of more than $40 million, largely finances the powerful Farmers Union, which runs the propaganda machine behind the scandalous farm-subsidy program. FUGTA pays no Federal income tax. It holds 80 percent of its members' share of the profits until they quit farming or die. FUGTA has not only expanded its own elevators and feed mills, but bought out privately owned, tax-paying businesses unable to compete. Since 1950, FUGTA's annual reports show $29 million in profits and only $9 million distributed as cash to members, the rest plowed back into the business.

Many co-ops have spread far afield of agriculture, own oil wells, tankers, insurance companies, banks, papermills, lumber yards, phone companies, hospitals, and even mortuaries. The Consumers Cooperative Association, a farm organization headquartered at Kansas City, owns three oil refineries, 1,000 or so oil wells, 935 miles of pipelines, three fertilizer plants, two feed mills, a steel-fabricating plant, a paint and grease factory, and a packinghouse, counts assets of $118 million. Grossing $154 million last year, Consumers had a net of $10.3 million. It paid only $1,237,000 in taxes, less than one-fourth the Federal tax alone that a non-co-op would have paid on the profits.

In 1951, over bitter co-op protests, Congress tried to close the co-op loophole by providing that co-op members pay personal income taxes on allocated profits even though they got no cash. But the courts ruled against this, holding that such allocations are untaxable because, being nontransferable, noninterest bearing, and payable only at the discretion of the co-op, they have no market value. To head off real tax reform, co-ops now are willing for Congress to pass a new law, forcing co-op members to pay personal income tax on allocations but keeping the organizations themselves exempt. To overcome the court objections to taxing script, the Treasury recommends that all exempt allocations be made in cash or in certificates that would pay a minimum of 4 percent interest, have a maximum maturity of 3 years. This would, in effect, make the scrip short-term notes, give it a value for personal income tax purposes. But many tax experts believe that this is not enough, since it would leave the co-op itself exempt from corporate tax. Thus other proposals before Congress would subject co-op income to both corporate and personal income tax when the profits are distributed, just as the profits of corporations are taxed.

No other country grants cooperatives such tax advantages: France allows no corporate tax exemption for profits paid to members; Belgium disallows allocations; Canada and Denmark levy regular corporate taxes on a minimum of 3 percent to 6 percent of capital invested. Even on the mild Denmark plan, U.S. co-ops would pay some $90 million to the support of the U.S. Government. To many tax experts it is high time they paid. Says former Under Secretary of the Treasury Roswell Magill: "The exemption may have been necessary in the infancy of cooperatives. Now that cooperatives have come of age, it is quite unnecessary to their continued growth and health."

Observance of National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the 27th observance of National Brotherhood Week—February 21 to 28—is underway in about 10,000 communities throughout the country.

Sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brotherhood Week has as its laudable objectives:

Promoting civic cooperation among different religious groups.

Combating forces of bigotry and hate.

Training youth in responsibility of democracy.

Helping to promote good will and understanding of spiritual values among the youth of America.

Bringing the science of human relations to business, labor, civic and educational leaders.

And in other ways to attempt to make more people aware of a personal responsibility for making the ideals of brotherhood a reality.

With President Eisenhower as its honorary chairman, the splendid programs for Brotherhood Week also seek to promote:

First. Rededication of the basic ideals of respect for individuals and people.

Second. Practical steps which people can take to better understand and realize these ideals.

Third. Enlistment of contributing members in year around activities to build brotherhood everywhere.

In an era in which development in the physical sciences, including jet, atomic, missile power, is of such magnitude, the spiritual, human factors all too often become lost. The fact that these are intangible, rather than tangible, of course makes it more difficult to achieve accomplishments in this field. Nevertheless, experience has taught us that these can be a greater force than that which emanates out of physical or natural forces.

In fact, survival of humanity may well depend on whether or not the world can effectively put into action the ideals of brotherhood: Of common interest; of the need for recognition of dignity for humanity, and respect for rights and privileges of others; of a realization that by greater cooperation—rather than antagonism, conflict, war—humanity can lift itself to higher planes of not just an existence, than ever before in history.

When these principles of brotherhood become a reality—and not just a subject for armchair fireside chats without realistic efforts to put these into effect—this tremendous, potential force will contribute greatly to a better life for mankind on the globe.

Recently the National Conference of Christians and Jews published a brochure containing some basic practical steps by which individuals can make an effective contribution to making brotherhood a reality, not just for a week, but all the year round. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the brochure printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN YOU DO FOR BROTHERHOOD?

Remember, brotherhood means giving to others the rights and respect you want for yourself. Brotherhood—man's concern for his fellow man—has become the key to human survival. If mankind is to escape destruction, all of us must cultivate the ability to put ourselves in the other fellow's shoes, to understand his hopes and aspirations, and to recognize how close these are to our own. We must teach ourselves to become more sensitive to the pain of others and more determined than ever to relieve the suffering of our neighbors. This means we learn to practice brotherhood.

IN YOUR OWN ATTITUDES

1. Deal with people as individuals. Don't generalize about groups of people. Never be guilty of stereotyping an individual—or a group of people. Take every person at his own value.

2. Have friends in all religious, racial, and national groups. Cultivate this acquaintance—look for the good in them.

3. Don't blame others for your own faults and troubles; don't make others scapegoats for the problems of society.

WHEN YOU HEAR A BIGOT

1. Challenge prejudiced statements quietly with moral principles and facts.

2. Insist that each person be judged as an individual; do not allow generalization to go unchallenged.

3. Ask proof of prejudiced charges.

4. Point out that religious principles and democratic ideals call for fair play for every person.

IN YOUR HOME

1. Give your children good example by talking about and acting with people as individuals. Children pay more attention to action than words.

2. Give your children love and affection so they will be secure and not aggressive against others.

3. Give your children experience with children of other groups through books, stories, movies, visits, etc.

4. Give children the care for proper mental health, which is as important for their happiness as physical well-being. Parents protect their children from catching germs that spread disease—measles, scarlet fever, polio, etc. Scarcely ever do they realize that prejudice is a disease and seek to immunize their children against it.

IN YOUR SCHOOL

1. Use new and tested materials on intergroup education so that, in addition to the three R's, the children will have the benefit of knowing about the fourth R—better human relations.

2. Encourage teachers to attend workshops or institutes on intergroup relations.

3. See that all children have the best possible education and that none receive less because of race, religion, or national background.

IN YOUR CHURCH OR SYNAGOGUE

1. Have more brotherhood sermons: "Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself." Preach and teach that prejudice is sin.

2. Eliminate prejudice and promote better intergroup education in religious materials.

3. Get men's, women's, and youth organizations to meet with similar groups of other religions—not for worship, but for social periods and discussions on topics of civic concern.

IN YOUR FRATERNAL AND CIVIC CLUBS

1. See that persons are not barred from membership because of race, religion, or nationality when they are otherwise qualified for membership.

Tight Money Costs Sheboygan, Wis., Taxpayers Over $1 Million on Single Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I spoke on the Senate floor about the heavy budren of the tight money, high-interest rate policy of the Federal Reserve on education in America. I have received a number of letters supporting and corroborating my charges against tight money. One of the most interesting came from the fine superintendent of schools in Sheboygan, Wis., Mr. Leslie Johnson.

Mr. Johnson writes me that the city of Sheboygan recently floated a $4 million bond issue, 95 percent of which is for school construction and renovation purposes. Mr. President, I have personally calculated that the cost of this money to Sheboygan is going to be $1 million more than it would have been if 1952 interest rates still prevailed, and probably considerably more than that.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Johnson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1960.

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for sending me your statement concerning tight money policy in regard to schools. We have just floated a $4 million bond issue in the city of Sheboygan of which $3,800,000 will be used for school building construction and renovation. We were able to get this at an interest rate of 3.5 which is not too bad; but in the light of what we were paying back in 1952, it is costing our local taxpayers a considerable amount of money. I concur with you that this is a great hardship on school financing and school construction, as in this community we are charged in our budget with the retirement of the debt and with the payment of interest. This means that our school costs go up terrifically which may, in the future, endanger our operation because of the high property tax that will be required to provide for all types of services including debt service.

Very truly yours,

LESLIE W. JOHNSON,
Superintendent.

Increased Domestic Sugar-Beet Acreage Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, so as to insure that the American farmer will have priority on all growth or increased consumption of sugar beets and sugar cane, and to allow new sugar-beet growers on Federal reclamation projects to share fairly in increases in quotas.

Under my proposal, the Sugar Act would be extended for 4 years, to December 31, 1964; the President would be delegated authority to reduce the quota of a foreign nation when he finds it to be in our national interest; the U.S. sugar-beet farmers' basic quota would be increased by 150,000 tons and mainland cane quotas would be increased by 50,000 tons; 100 percent of the growth quota or increase due to U.S. population expansion would be allocated to domestic growers; new sugar-beet growers on lands served by Federal reclamation projects would receive at least 60 percent of any increase in beet quotas due to population expansion; and the methods of handling quota deficits is restated and clarified. My proposal limits the quantity of white sugar that can be marketed by foreign suppliers, and prohibits the importation of sugar "ex-quota" in the form of syrups.

As you know, under the present law which expires December 31, 1960, domestic areas receive 55 percent and foreign nations receive 45 percent of the growth quota. No provision is now made for earmarking portions of the growth quota to new growers. At present, the President does not have authority to alter quotas.

I feel very strongly that consideration should be given the American farmer and that he should have priority on all growth or annual increased consumption. The American farmer has long expressed a desire for this priority since he started needing more than the basic 1,800,000 tons on or before 1955. I feel that the farmers would have been en-

titled to these increases even if the present strained relations with Cuba had not come about.

Let me point out the effects of the Sugar Act on various producing areas, since 1955, when the ASC, a division of the Department of Agriculture, took over the job of breaking down the national sugar beet quota and alloting it out to individual farmers. Prior to this time this had been a function of the individual beet companies. At that time each grower's acreage for the years 1952, 1953, and 1954, was used to establish his history for allotments. This resulted in a serious inequity to some new reclamation projects who happened to be historically a few years late in receiving water to get their base built in these years. The Columbia Basin of the State of Washington, one of the best beet-producing areas in the United States, is one of these.

The older projects had good bases established for these years and consequently have been able to gain fairly good increases under the amendment to the Act, which has allowed domestic beet growers to participate at the rate of 22.3 percent of the increased national consumption since 1956.

On the other hand, the area of one sugar company of the Columbia Basin, whose average yield of 29 tons per acre was top in the United States in 1958, has not gained one acre of beets above its 1955 acreage. Having a very small base history because water had not been available soon enough, its participation in the increased national consumption has been negligible. At the same time growers could not move in from other States with acreage and growers could not move from the old area of this State, because this is all an area of another company. These inequities would be corrected under the provisions of the legislation I introduced today. I feel that this legislation is vital to the future economy of the several new reclamation areas of the United States, and I am hopeful that hearings on this proposal, and all other proposals dealing with sugar legislation, will be scheduled for early consideration.

The New Germany and the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, men of good will throughout the world have been shocked and disturbed by the recent outbreak of anti-Jewish expression in Germany and elsewhere. On January 23, 1960, two excellent editorials on this subject appeared in the Catholic magazine, the Ave Maria, published at Notre Dame, Ind.

In the first, Dr. Eric Waldman, director of the Institute of German Affairs at Marquette University in Milwaukee, points out that the hate campaign is in direct opposition to the efforts of the German Government and the vast majority of the German people to bring about friendship and harmony between the West Germans and the Jews.

In the second, the editors of Ave Marie discuss Catholic and anti-Semitism, and point out that hatred is a tool of Satan wherever and however it is used.

The editorials follow:

THE NEW GERMANY AND THE JEWS

(By Eric Waldman)

Germans demand that the Jews get out. These were the words smeared on the wall of the new synagogue in Cologne on Christmas Eve. From Cologne the hate campaign spread to other parts of Germany, to Austria, England, and even to the United States.

As expected, some observers see in these incidents signs of rising anti-Semitism and of a growing neonazism. Others believe that these acts of hate are the work of a few incorrigible anti-Semites, Nazis, and crackpots.

Whatever the truth, these acts of hate stand in complete opposition to the conscious German effort to bring about friendship and harmony between the West Germans and their Jewish fellow citizens. The same synagogue in Cologne which became the first target of the recent sneak sign campaign, was consecrated about 3 months earlier in the presence of Chancellor Adenauer. He pleaded then with the members of the Jewish community to include in their prayers for their own dead the many Christians who had also been murdered by the Nazis.

The Federal Minister of All-German Affairs, Dr. Ernst Lemmer, declared on September 27, 1959, at the occasion of the consecretation of the rebuilt Jewish community center in Berlin:

"We need the presence of the Jews and cooperation with them, in order really to come to grips and grow beyond our recent history. * * *. In this hour in which our memories pay tribute to the never-to-be-forgotten victims of an inhuman chapter in German history * * * I may perhaps be permitted to confirm that the German Government is filled with determination to do everything and to leave nothing undone in order to prevent our country from ever relapsing into barbarism."

These statements, reflecting the position of Germany's Christian Democratic Government and of the overwhelming majority of her population, stand quite in contrast to Hitler's fanatical policies. They stand also in contrast to the recent incidents of hate and prejudice.

In 1947, 2 years after the end of the war, 125,000 Jews of different nationalities were still in Germany, most of them waiting impatiently for an opportunity to emigrate; 90,000 succeeded in leaving, the majority of them going to Israel. The remaining Jews organized themselves in 85 congregations—the largest group, about 5,000, in West Berlin. By the end of 1959, the number of Jews in the Federal Republic had increased to about 30,000, as result of a tendency among some German Jews to return to their former homeland.

Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Government does much more than make speeches and admit Nazi crimes. A program of restitution genuinely attempts to make up at least for the material damages inflicted upon the Jews. But beyond that, all Jewish returnees to Germany are helped substantially by the Federal Government. Each returnee receives 6,000 deutsche marks ($1,500) in addition to any other compensation he might be entitled to as a result of losses suffered to real estate or other property during the Nazi rule.

The restitution payments of the Federal Government to individual Jewish returnees is but a very small fraction of the money paid to Jewish survivors living throughout the world and to the State of Israel. The cost of this program, expected to be completed in 1963, is estimated at $6 billion.

According to Dr. Nahum Goldmann, the newly elected president of the World Jewish Congress, "Israel has received more money from Germany than from all the Jews in the world put together. Hundreds of thousands have been given the opportunity to found a new life and a better existence." He also declared that "people should * * * bring to an end this nonsense about the German people as the heirs of Hitler's Germany."

And while neither the German people nor the Christian Democratic Government are Hitler's heirs, they are proving by their attitude and deeds that they really wish to live together with their Jewish fellow citizens. There are still remnants of anti-Semitism in Germany as the recent incidents demonstrated. This fact was, however, recognized in a special message Chancellor Adenauer sent to the American Jewish Committee as recently as October 1959.

Dr. Adenauer wrote that "anti-Semitic, antidemocratic phenomena" had come to the surface in Germany. But he cautioned that the impact of these events should not be overestimated. He declared that the German people "are fully aware of human rights of liberty promulgated in the German Constitution" because the "recent dictatorship on German soil gave an awful lesson in experience as to what befalls a people disregarding these rights."

This and no more is the significance of the recent sneak smear attack.

CATHOLICS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

On page 18 of this week's issue, Dr. Eric Waldman, an authority on German affairs, explains in some detail the position of the West German Government in relation to the Jews and what that government has done concretely to compensate the Jews who suffered under Hitler's dictatorship. To Dr. Waldman's excellent summary, we feel compelled to add a footnote.

That some Catholics are anti-Semitic is no secret; but that any Catholic should fall prey to the disease of anti-Semitism is a matter of scandal and concern. And it should be publicly noted, particularly at this time, that the church stands foursquare against the sin of anti-Semitism.

If anyone wished, they could easily compile a book of quotations from the Pope, the hierarchy and clergy and responsible Catholic laymen condemning racism—including anti-Semitism—in all its forms. Indeed, such a useful book has recently been revised, "The Challenge of Interracial Justice," by Msgr. Daniel M. Cantwell (Divine Word Publications, Techny, Ill.) This fine compilation of documents and statements is replete with proof that the church is a deadly enemy of prejudice in all its many forms.

But we believe there are some additional points it is necessary to ponder.

Have we forgotten, for example, the horror of Germany under Hitler, the murder of countless Jewish—and Christian—men, women and children who were innocent of any crime? Hitler did not create anti-Jewish feeling; he merely systematically cultivated it and fanned it into a white heat of hatred which allowed him to perpetrate his crime against humanity in the name of justice.

When the parlor bigots today sit around and make their anti-Semitic remarks, do they not realize their Hitlerian heritage? Do they not understand that they are the kind of people who made it possible for the

mad paperhanger to build a dictatorship? Have we learned nothing from the slaughter of the innocents within our own lifetime?

We are astounded, too, that the Catholics guilty of this sin are so naive as to be unaware that anticatholicism is the other side of the coin of anti-Semitism. Hatred is a tool of Satan and he cares not where or how he uses it: In one place it is anti-Semitism, in another anticatholicism, in another racial hatred—the list is too long to attempt. But one thing is clear: Catholics who indulge in Jew-baiting have little to complain about against those who practice the old sport of Catholic-baiting.

It would be well for Catholics to remember always the words of Pius XII: "There remains no other way to salvation than that of repudiating definitely * * * the pride of race and blood * * * and to turn resolutely toward that spirit of sincere fraternity which is founded on the worship of the Divine Father of all."

Rabid Chinese Bolsheviks in U.S.S.R. Irritate Average Ivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the ultimate size and scope of the Communist menace to the free world security may well depend, to a large degree, upon the success of the Communist bloc in maintaining a closely knit unity.

From time to time evidence has developed pointing to the possibility of cleavages within the Communist countries. These have included not only reports from inside the Soviet Union, but also interpretations of the relationship between Peiping and Moscow, as well as other countries in the Communist orbit.

We recognize, of course, that, as of now, the Communists are ruling the Soviet Union and China, and, as well, directing the governments of the so-called satellites, with an iron hand.

Believing in the ultimate triumph of freedom, of the innate will of men to fight eternally for self-determination, I am hopeful that the repugnance of human beings to slavery—in every country within, as well as outside, of the Communists' orbit—will ultimately make a contribution toward defeating the efforts of communism to conquer and subjugate the world. Realistically, we recognize that this is not likely to happen tomorrow, or even in the immediate future. Instead, the erosion of Communist power can be expected to take a long time. However, in the East-West struggle, time, I believe, will in the long run serve the cause of freedom, not communism.

Meanwhile, we hope and pray that the establishment of a strong deterrent power in the free world will discourage the leaders of the Kremlin and Peiping from undertaking military aggression, which might ultimately result in a nuclear-missile war destroying vast areas of the free and Communist realms.

The intermittent reports coming from the Communist world of clashes of ideas, objectives, and interests within the bloc, however, are always heartening.

The Sunday edition of the Washington Post, contained an article entitled "Rabid Chinese Bolsheviks in U.S.S.R. Irritate Average Ivan," written by George Sherman.

Reflecting that Sino-Soviet relationships are not those of "just one big happy family," I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RABID CHINESE BOLSHEVIKS IN U.S.S.R. IRRITATE AVERAGE IVAN

(By George Sherman)

LONDON.—Late one night shortly before leaving Moscow I shared a taxi to the hotel with a Russian friend, a liberal from the young intelligentsia. The streets were deserted, the temperature at −20° C., the windows curtained with thick frost. Our free-ranging conversation naturally touched on China.

"The truth is that the Russians know less about what is happening in China than you in the West," Ilya ventured. Through diligence and privilege he himself had regular contact with Western ideas. "Your press is biased, but at least it prints opposite views of travelers and correspondents. Our papers give nothing but statistics and boring accounts of the great leap forward in China." Ilya ought to know; he is a journalist.

Russians like Ilya complain that the Chinese have retired into a shell just when they are leaving theirs. Personal contacts have dwindled to an absolute minimum. Thousands of Chinese students and technicians still study in the Soviet Union, but they seldom leave their groups.

An American student on exchange at Moscow University told how a Korean had made a point of emphasizing he was not Chinese; he wanted to be friendly. A Russian student in Leningrad recounted the scandal caused when one Chinese began frequenting student clubs with Russian girls; he was indicted by his collective, confessed, and went home in disgrace.

The new Chinese Embassy is a monument to this isolation. It stands like a stark white compound up on Lenin Hills. It has a hotel for visiting Chinese, a restaurant to feed them, and dormitories for students at the nearby skyscraper university. Down in the city Muscovites have one Chinese restaurant in the Hotel Peking. Flamboyant decorations and Chinese menus do not cloak the terrible parody of Chinese cuisine. Food is prepared by Russians, served by Russians. The Chinese chef and staff returned home after teaching their technique.

Russian students who do meet Chinese are troubled by their mentality. Their amazing self-discipline is alien to Russian nature. Their almost superhuman capacity for work is disturbing.

"They volunteer for the hardest work during vacations and then refuse payment," one student almost shouted over the clanking of metal in the self-service canteen of the university. "They seem to love political meetings. Nothing official like ours. Someone simply decides a subject, they all excitedly agree, and then spend days priming for it."

One of his friends joined the conversation. "Do you remember what happened when our Komsomol organized that voluntary Sunday?" He did indeed.

Times had changed, he said, since the twenties and thirties when people donated free Sundays for "socially useful" projects. "This project was rubbish clearance. Twenty out of 22 Chinese appeared. The other two were certified ill. And how many Russians came? He paused, they both laughed: "Two out of 300—the organizer and the secretary of the Komsomol."

A student in Leningrad was more scathing. He had lived in a Chinese hostel. "They do not believe in human nature," he moaned. "They are such purists about doctrine." He illustrated. Several had angrily accused the Soviet cinema of decadence.

"These Chinese were horrified by our two best recent films—'The Forty-First' and 'Fate of a Man.' In the first, a girl in the Red Army during the Civil War falls in love with a White officer. In the second, a Soviet soldier in World War II drinks vodka with his Nazi captors to save his life. 'How could this possibly happen in a revolutionary society?' they wanted to know.

The simple answer is that Soviet society is no longer revolutionary. Relaxation is as evident as the increased numbers of consumer goods heralding it. The Russians work hard, but they are beginning also to enjoy the fruits of their labor. For 40-odd years they have been publicly beating their collective chest about the glories of building socialism. Now it is built. More affluent Russians are already worrying less about the Socialist image and more about the substance of their own lives.

The Chinese offend this mood. They offend because they remind. There they are suddenly aping all the earlier Soviet antics with a vengeance. They blaze with a revolutionary fervor most Russians abandoned to lipservice long ago. They sound a clarion call from the past which many would like to ignore but cannot. China has become the revolutionary conscience, irritating because it can neither be stilled nor forgotten.

Each year in Moscow the anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution on November 7 becomes more like an unorganized carnival. In the evening the three interlocking central squares look like Piccadilly Circus and Trafalgar Square on New Year's Eve. All motor traffic is banned. Masses of gay holiday-makers dance and gossip their disorderly way through the streets. Some are drunk, some are not. Some have just left crowded restaurants, others are trying vainly to enter.

Last year a modest cinema screen was set at one end of Manezhd Square, beside the Kremlin, in front of the old Tsarist stables, which now serve as an exhibition hall. The Chinese celebration of their revolutionary holiday the month before was the feature. The organized pageantry was breathtaking. Thousands of colorful Chinese seemed to march endlessly across the screen on Technicolor parade. What striking contrast to the noisy scrum here, I thought, or even to the mixed ranks who had paraded jovially through Red Square that morning.

"We are moving Westward, aren't we?" Sergei, one of my companions, seemed to read my thoughts. After a long look around, he added with noticeable sarcasm: "Perhaps we shall even become democratic. Then those Chinese can occupy us all."

Foreign Aid Reappraisal Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the great need for a searching reexamination of American foreign aid policies is pointed up by an excellent editorial

which appeared in the February 18, 1960, issue of the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal. It is entitled "Let's Dissect Foreign Aid." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S DISSECT FOREIGN AID

There are many Americans who vigorously support foreign aid in principle and yet agree with Representative PASSMAN of Louisiana, when he branded the President's economic assistance budget as unrealistic and excessive.

One cannot quarrel with the President's warning that the Communist threat in Asia is growing and that the needs of our friends there are greater than ever.

But Congress and the American taxpayers are within their rights to question the continuance of a program of this magnitude without an honest, complete investigation to scrutinize, reduce or eliminate some obsolescent elements of the massive foreign aid organism.

It is highly probable that the administration of foreign aid has become a powerful vested interest, all tied up with sales and profits and job security for millions of Americans—an aspect totally unrelated to the good it accomplishes in the world.

And whatever happened to the bold plans for sharing and coordinating the foreign aid burden with our European allies?

Congress should not limit debate of this matter to the issue of expanding or reducing foreign aid. It should not shrink from a thorough, searching probe to reexamine the character and aims of foreign aid. The world has changed quite a bit since the Marshall plan was launched. It is high time that foreign aid reflected some of these changes.

Castro Has Made United States the Laughingstock of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appearing in U.S. News & World Report under date of February 29, 1960, indicates that the U.S. sugar policy has made us the laughingstock of Cuba. There are a lot of us who think it has also made us the laughingstock of all of Latin America and many other parts of the globe, including the United States itself:

THE JOKER IN CASTRO'S SUGAR DEAL WITH RUSSIA—MIKOYAN'S SUGAR PACT WITH CASTRO HAS MADE THE UNITED STATES THE LAUGHINGSTOCK OF CUBA. THAT'S THE REACTION IN HAVANA. REASON: THE UNITED STATES, DENOUNCED BY CASTRO, STILL PAYS A BONUS FOR SUGAR. RUSSIA GETS SUGAR—AT BARGAIN RATES

HAVANA.—The position in which the United States finds itself at this time in dealing with Cuba's Fidel Castro is described here as "laughable if it were not so serious."

Soviet Russia's First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan came here and agreed to purchase Cuban sugar at the going price on the world market. He signed up to take 1 million tons a year for 5 years. However, he will pay cash for only 200,000 tons of sugar a year. He will barter Russian products for the rest, with Russia to decide the price Cuba pays for these products.

To Americans who do business in Cuba, the deal with Russia may be all right if Castro wants it that way.

However, what they cannot understand is the American position.

Under a quota set by the U.S. Government, Cuba sells 3 million tons of sugar in the United States. Cuba receives for this sugar not the world price but almost double the world price. Cuba also gets a reduced tariff on sugar. In exchange for the sugar, Castro is getting hard American dollars that he can spend anywhere for anything he wants to buy.

Yet, in the face of that situation, the United States is regarded by the government here as public enemy No. 1.

Billion-dollar grab: The property of Americans in Cuba—nearly 1 billion dollars' worth of it—is being grabbed by the Castro government, with vague promises of some possible remuneration for some fraction of the spoils. The U.S. Government is pictured as doing little if anything to protect the interests of Americans who are having their property taken. Instead, Castro is being paid what amounts to an American subsidy of about 120 million American dollars each year.

It is this situation which Americans in Cuba refer to as "laughable."

Soviet Russia—a little customer for Cuba's sugar—is pictured daily as the great new benefactor to Cuba. The U.S.—the big customer—is the whipping boy and object of all variety of attacks. Castro now has warned the United States that, if it cuts down on the amount of sugar it buys or on the price it pays for Cuban sugar, he will hold the United States guilty of economic aggression. There are hints of reprisals—but of what nature—is not clear.

It is reported from the United States that President Eisenhower does not want to do anything that would harm the people of Cuba. Many Americans in Cuba who are losing everything express wonder as to whether their Government in Washington is interested in any way in the harm that U.S. citizens are suffering.

"Concern" in United States: Among these people, a feeling is beginning to develop that perhaps Washington's patience with Fidel Castro is wearing thin. It wasn't overlooked here when Secretary of State Christian A. Herter described relations between the two countries as a "deteriorating situation" which "gives us real concern."

Sugar experts also wonder about the future. The seizure of sugar lands, setting up of farm cooperatives and other activities under Castro's land reform could seriously reduce the next sugar crop. Castro may not always have so much sugar to sell. And, if Cuba becomes an uncertain supplier, the United States will have to build up other sources—thus putting a permanent crimp in Cuba's market.

As a result of his deal with Soviet Russia, Castro is opening the door to technicians and agents from Russia to build this island into a Communist beachhead. This whole situation gives the appearance of a tangle that grows steadily more mysterious.

WHEN RUSSIA AND UNITED STATES BUY CUBAN SUGAR

Russian terms, under a new agreement:

To buy 1 million tons of Cuba sugar each year for 5 years.

To pay the world price, now about 3 cents a pound, or $60 a ton. Total: About $60 million worth of sugar per year.

Of the $60 million, only $12 million will be paid in cash—U.S. dollars—and the remaining $48 million in Soviet products.

And note this: Russia will fix the prices of what it sends to Cuba. Just how much Cuba will get remains to be seen.

U.S. terms, which have been in effect for years:

To import about 3 million tons of Cuban sugar a year.

To guarantee Cuba the U.S. price, which nets the island about 5 cents a pound or $100 a ton. Total: About $300 million a year.

Thus, United States buys three times as much Cuban sugar as Russia promises to buy, and pays Cuba five times as much for sugar each year.

And: United States pays entirely in U.S. dollars, which can be spent anywhere in the world.

Tight Money Drives Up School Taxes Paid by Wisconsin Farmers and Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another excellent letter protesting the tight-money burden on schools came to me from Ray Glynn, the administrator of the Common School District in Frederic, Wis. Mr. Glynn's letter dramatically illustrates how cruelly and quickly the high interest rate is reflected in higher local school taxes for farm communities, which already are suffering from a punishing property tax burden at the very time when their income from milk and hogs continues to sink. Mr. Glynn declares that the Frederic School District levy for debt service alone for 1960 was over 26 percent of the district's levy for all operating costs. This would, of course, include teachers' salaries. Interest amounted to a fat 52.8 percent, or more than one-half of Frederic's principal payment on the debt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREDERIC COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Frederic, Wis., February 18, 1960.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Your speech on "tight money policy" and its effect on interest rates on school bonds. You surely hit the nail right on the head. Those of us who have been trying to finance our needed school construction in northern Wisconsin have been well aware of this for years. But few, if any, of us could have put it as well as you did. My only regret is that you didn't figure it on a 20-year basis rather than 30 since that is the maximum length of our borrowing period in Wisconsin—we are limited to 5 percent of our equalized and 20 annual payments in Wisconsin—this is a constitutional provision and is pretty hard to change.

It might be of interest to you to know that Frederic is a large (in area) rural district with practically no industry within our district and only $10,000 of equalized valuation back of each of the 800 children we are trying to educate—and house in decent

buildings. That means that when we raise a mill of tax on full equalized valuation as determined by the State tax commission not the assessed valuation determined by our several local assessors (one from each village and township in the district)—this mill of tax on full valuation raises only $10 per pupil. Is it any wonder that we are in favor of our improved State aid formula, championed by Gaylord Nelson when he was a senator and even more so as our Governor. This formula helps us greatly in our operational costs but we are strictly on our own when it comes to building costs and debt repayment.

Our experience bears you out to the letter. We sold our first bonds to build some needed elementary rooms in 1951 at 1½ percent. We made our last loan on January 1, 1960, for 4 percent. We have borrowed every dime we can borrow under Wisconsin law and are still way short of what we need to properly house our pupils. Our levy for debt service alone for 1960 was over 26 percent of our levy for all of our operating costs and our interest payment amounted to 52.8 percent of our principal payment on this debt.

We need Federal aid to education and we are mighty thankful that you, Senator HUMPHREY, and a few others are sincerely for it—please keep plugging away at it. We know that the vote on the bill the other day was a political gesture on the part of many Senators but we are confident that your vote and the feelings expressed in your speech are very genuine. More power to you.

You talked in our school some months ago and this is the first opportunity I have had (or rather taken) to thank you and tell you how favorably you were received by our student body. My teachers tell me that considerable discussion of your talk took place in our social science classes for the next day or two.

One more thing—thank the Lord you restored the cut in school milk funds.

Keep up the good work and, if you have 20 or 25 extras of that speech, will you mail them to me?

Sincerely,

R. P. GLYNN,
Administrator.

Public Opinion Supports Repeal of Present Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, having introduced H.R. 10350, to repeal the present farm price support programs, I am hearing from citizens from various parts of the country in support of such a plan.

Of course, when it comes to a proposed solution of agriculture problems, my voice does not reach many ears. I am not a member of the House committees concerned with farm legislation, and I would be less than honest if I gave an impression of being an expert in this field.

Rather, Mr. Speaker, I hold my capability to being a listener as such. I hear the voice of the people and overwhelmingly it calls for an end of subsidized programs that have created such huge commodity surpluses and cost such vast sums of money.

So, as I say, while my voice is faint, nevertheless, where word reaches that I am proposing elimination of acreage and price controls the people respond and send encouraging messages of support.

For example, from Malaga, N. Mex., a woman writes saying my remarks on the national disgrace, the farm program, are heartening to the taxpayer. In four closely handwritten pages this woman expresses her opposition and indignation with the farm program, ending with a hope that "men of like courage will get this mess killed" and a final heartwarming, "May God bless you."

Then here is a letter from a Kansas farmer which I quote in full:

FARMERS LIBERTY LEAGUE,
Hillsboro, Kans., February 19, 1960.
Representative THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: It was mentioned on the news the other evening that you had introduced a bill to do you away with the ASC (the farm control and subsidy program). I want to express my thanks to you for introducing this bill. If I knew the number of the bill and the wording of it, I would try to get some support for it.

I have just recently moved to this community and I do not know how the farmers here feel about it, but the community from which I moved, Burns, Kans., where I still own land and farm it—was heavily against the whole ASC. As I understood the report of your bill, they would be wholeheartedly in favor of it. Would petitions be helpful to you?

The ASC activities have been extremely harmful to the most of us who are small farmers. I have a 75 acre wheat allotment and when I bought the place there weren't any controls. So when they put in the program, they knocked out the very crop I planned to pay for the farm with.

I don't see how anyone can think that the Government can subsidize agriculture successfully. The Federal Government is in far worse financial shape than are we farmers. I think it has been pretty well demonstrated that the Government does not have a money tree. Any money that the government gives to the farmer in the form of subsidies or otherwise must be taken from someone else. The someone else usually means the oil industry, the steel industry and a few others. However the money taken from these industries in the form of taxes becomes a part of the cost of operation of these industries, thereby raising the cost of the products these industries sell. Now as everyone knows we farmers are heavy users of steel and oil products so we ourselves have to pay the subsidies which we get. In addition we have to pay the cost of the vast ASC bureaucracy which benefits us not one penny. Your bill to do away with the ASC would benefit us greatly, not necessarily that it would raise farm prices, but that it could cut farm costs.

I want to encourage you to continue your efforts to free us from the ASC. While I am not a constituent of yours, I do appreciate the stand you are taking. Any man who stands for American freedom deserves the support of all of us.

Sincerely,

CARSON E. CRAWFORD.

Here are other random opinions as expressed to me which indicate that the people are fed up with farm subsidies:

Let the farmers choose their crops, work as they should; there is too much molly-coddling.

Price supports: I farmed without them some time ago. A reduction as soon as possible should be enacted.

In regard to the farmers, I think that all subsidies, price supports, soil banks, etc., should be abandoned, abolished, eliminated. Farmers already get all their own food free, i.e., they can raise it themselves and thus don't have to pay income tax or State sales tax on the money they used to buy it. Also, about one-third of U.S. farmers have other jobs besides farming, either part-time or full-time jobs, or have other ways beside farming of making money.

In our State farmers control more than one-half the votes although they don't comprise one-half the population. This is because there are so many farm counties and farm communities in our State, and also because of the way the State legislature is made up.

As long as we have such a problem on farm surpluses, why isn't some action taken to keep new or reclaimed land out of production?

As a small example, in your own State, from the Columbia River to Moses Lake and on toward Ritzville, a few years ago this area was nonproductive except for some grazing; now we have wheatfields, sugar beets, potatoes, etc., all surplus.

The farmer being paid supports sells produce cheaper to the middleman. Therefore, we are subsidizing the middleman. Can we be honest with ourselves in these vital matters?

What is wrong with the farm program? Plenty. I think all price supports should be eliminated. Then the farmers will keep their production more in line with consumption.

I do believe that by lowering price supports it might help us in lowering our surplus products and in doing this would save money in storage rates and also would make the farmer a more responsible businessman and not have him rely so heavily on the Federal Government.

The question of agriculture is a sickening and disgusting one to most taxpayers.

As I understand it, the Government asks the farmers to cut their acreage and pays them for not producing and I have heard that many of them receive more than they ever made while producing. Then they pep up the remaining acreage and raise more than ever and the Government guarantees them a good price and on top of all this the Government buys whatever they are unable to sell.

How long are we going to play Santa Claus. I think it is time that the farmers stand on their own feet.

Federal Measures in Which New Jersey State Officials Have Expressed Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for several years Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, has come to Washington to fete the New Jersey congressional delegation at a breakfast at the Congressional Hotel whereat he presents in-

formally the viewpoint of himself and his State agencies on Federal legislation. There is always an exchange of views which is helpful and wholesome.

Today I present a letter just received from Governor Meyner with a compilation of Federal measures in which heads of the State executive departments have expressed interest, this following this year's breakfast which was held on Friday morning, February 5, 1960.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, February 15, 1960.

HON. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: It was good to see you in Washington and to have the opportunity for an exchange of views on problems facing National and State government. It was helpful to me to hear your views, and I trust it may have been helpful to you to hear from us at the State level.

The members of my cabinet have indicated to me the areas of Federal action which are of particular interest to them. I was able to touch upon some of these at the breakfast, but time did not permit to review all of them. So that you may have full opportunity to know of the interests and views of the State departments, I enclose a compilation of the items in which they have expressed interest. All of the members of State government stand ready, as I do, to provide further information at any time upon your request.

Thank you for kindnesses to me and other members of State government while we were in Washington.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT—COMPILATION OF FEDERAL MEASURES IN WHICH EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS HAVE EXPRESSED INTEREST

I. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

A. Social security:

1. Coverage:

(a) Urges amendment to authorize extension of social security coverage to those members of a retirement system who want it, rather than majority referendum system.

(b) Urges amendment to authorize extension of social security coverage to police and firemen on referendum basis.

2. Administration:

(a) Return of employer contributions: When teachers transfer from district to district the State frequently contributes on salary in excess of $4,800. Urges amendment to allow return of excess to State.

(b) Urges statute of limitations on collection of contributions by public employers. Now limited to private employers. Statute for private employers limits to 3 years, 3 months, and 15 days after close of tax year.

(c) Urges amendment to permit State to determine whether employment is public or private. Have had problem re constables, whether covered by State's agreement.

(d) Urges amendment to permit retroactive inclusion of new public entities. Now limited to calendar year in which agreement is modified.

3. Rates of contribution: Division of pensions expresses fear that ascending rates of contribution may jeopardize our pension position. State's payment of employee's share is fixed at 2¼ percent, but employer's share will rise as rates rise.

4. Income limitation: Division of pensions expresses dissatisfaction with $1,200 maximum income level for eligibility. Confines the aging to part-time work. Also thinks that income limitations should be same whether recipient is under or over age 72.

B. Taxes:

1. Telephone service tax: Urges no renewal of local service tax by Federal Government, so that States may pick it up on July 1, 1960.

2. Death tax: Extension of Federal death tax credit to cover 50 percent of total amount of Federal death taxes rather than 80 percent of taxes computed under 1926 Act as at present. Would increase New Jersey revenue by $11 million.

3. State income tax on nonresidents: Urges amendment to Federal Constitution to prohibit. Little hope because more than 30 States now tax nonresidents' income.

4. Income tax: Urges that exemption of retirement benefits be extended to exempt all benefits paid by public bodies.

C. Lamb and mutton grading: Secretary Benson recently gave notice of intention to suspend meat grading for lamb and mutton. Director Sullivan of division of purchase and property is vigorously opposed to suspension.

D. Surplus to penal institutions: Director Sullivan urges Federal legislation to permit allotment of surplus commodities to penal institutions.

II. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

A. Proposed Federal aid program—teachers and construction: Raubinger notes pending bills without recommendation. Does, however, express view that aid should be general. Feels that categorical aid, other than building construction aid, is undesirable.

B. National Defense Education Act (existing program): Aid for science, math, and foreign languages. We should receive $1.4 million in 1959–60. (Received $0.6 million in 1958–59.) Eisenhower has recommended full appropriation. Urges approval, despite categorial nature.

C. Federally affected areas (existing program): Direct aid for construction and current expense to districts receiving pupils who live on Federal property. Our districts received $2.9 million for 1958–59. Eisenhower recommendation for 1960–61 is low. Urges approval of amount recommended by Office of Education in Washington.

D. School lunch—special milk (existing programs): Received $3.3 million for 1958–59. Eisenhower has recommended full appropriation. Urges approval.

E. Vocational aid (existing program): Received $1 million for 1958–59. Eisenhower has recommended full appropriation. Urges approval.

III. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A. Quarantine of foreign plants: Urges additional funds for quarantine enforcement system. This is critical in light of St. Lawrence Seaway and increased speed of travel.

B. Domestic plan pest control: Urges continued support of cooperative Federal-State efforts in eradication and control. Gypsy moth and white fringe beetle of particular concern in New Jersey.

C. Purchase of cranberries: Urges Federal Government to purchase $25 million worth of good cranberry stock in coming months, with section 32 funds.

D. Cranberry scare: Urges that Congress resist pressures for hasty legislation on plant chemicals. Our agriculture depends upon chemicals for high yield per acre. Also urges end to "blitzkrieg" tactics of Flemming.

E. Research and marketing funds: Urges more matching grants under Research and Marketing Act of 1946. We now get only $41,000. Need more. Federal appropriation is now $1.2 million. Should be $1.5 million at least.

F. Lamb and mutton grading: Strongly opposed to proposed suspension. Decision expected shortly. (See view of Department of the Treasury.)

G. Egg pricing: Secretary Alampi is chairman of national committee seeking alternative to egg pricing through mercantile exchange. Asks that Congressmen await committee report.

H. New product research: Urges increased efforts by U.S. Department of Agriculture to develop new products.

I. Animal disease control: Cut in brucellosis funds to $17½ million in 1959–60 hurt us badly. Eisenhower has recommended same figure for 1960–61. Urges increase to $21 million.

J. Milk marketing: Alampi notes that proposals are pending before Benson for a marketing order for eight southern New Jersey counties and Philadelphia. Favors this and urges that order be a joint Federal-State order.

K. Interstate milk certification: Secretary Alampi opposes H.R. 3840 (Johnson bill). Would impose standards below those now maintained by New Jersey.

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

A. Hill-Burton Act: $186.2 million appropriated 1959–60. Eisenhower asks for only $126.2 million in 1960–61. Dr. Kandle thinks cut is serious. Need money for city hospitals, also for research and other facilities in proposed health building.

B. Water pollution control: Eisenhower would cut grants from $45 million in 1959–60 to $25 million in 1960–61. H.R. 3610 (BLATNIK of Minnesota) would raise appropriation to $80 (or $100) million, and would raise ceiling on grant to each community. Dr. Kandle thinks program extremely important in development of sewage disposal. Passed both Houses; went to conference committee. Also urges extension of law providing $3 million program grants to States. Existing provision expires June 30, 1961.

C. Air pollution: Urges legislation to extend and expand Federal program for air pollution control. Now $5 million per year until 1964.

D. Radiation control: Urges support of bill to amend 1954 Atomic Energy Act to cede greater responsibility to States in radiation control. (S. 1648, HILL.)

V. DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A. Recreation: Urges bill to create Federal Recreation Service (S. 2491 cosponsored by Senator WILLIAMS) to provide technical assistance on community recreation problems.

B. Military reservations: Fish and game council opposes military reservations bill unless amended to give States sole jurisdiction to regulate fish and game and sell licenses re military reservations. (H.R. 2565, SIKES.)

C. Housing-senior citizens: Urges support for $50 million appropriation under title II of Federal Housing Act of 1959.

D. Forestry: Urges more money for forestry programs, for forest fire control, for salaries of foresters, for tree nurseries.

E. Area redevelopment: Urges bill to create Area Redevelopment Administration to conduct loan and grant program to aid economically depressed areas.

F. Surplus property-Wildlife: Fish and game council urges support of bill to authorize transfer of surplus property to wildlife agencies. (S. 2103.)

VI. DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES

A. Hill-Burton: Urges increased appropriations. (See views of Department of Health.)

B. Urges support of Federal juvenile delinquency bill (ELLIOT of Alabama). Provides grants-in-aid to States for prevention and control programs.

C. Urges youth conservation corps bill (S. 812, now in House Education Committee) or revival of CCC on modified basis.

D. Public assistance: Urges support of anticipated program to create fifth category of assistance (general assistance), or otherwise broaden assistance.

E. Social security: Urges support of:

1. Forand bill: Free hospitalization for 60 days, surgical care, etc., for insurance beneficiaries.

2. Disability insurance: Bills to eliminate age 50 requirement (e.g., S. 2763, COOPER; H.R. 9522 (WEISS, New York)).

3. Increased survivor's benefits: Raise ceiling on payments to widow of insurance beneficiary from 75 percent to 100 percent of payments to husband.

VII. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

A. Unemployment compensation: Urges support for national standards for unemployment compensation benefits.

B. Minimum wage—general: Urges support of bill to raise national minimum wage and expand coverage to include large farm and hotel businesses. (S. 1046, cosponsored by Senator Williams.)

C. Migrant labor: Urges support of:

1. Minimum wage: S. 1080 (MCNAMARA and CLARK) would include agricultural workers under minimum wage law.

2. Migrant housing: H.R. 11793 (ROGERS of Florida) would amend Housing Act of 1949 to authorize loans for migrant housing. Migrant labor board endorses principle.

3. Migrant crew leaders: S. 1778 (JAVITS and KEATING) would regulate crew leaders. Prohibit holding back wages, taking workers into substandard conditions, etc.

D. Federal mediation: Bill to clarify Federal-State spheres in mediation and to insure adequate mediation service coverage.

E. Vocational rehabilitation: Urges enactment of "independent living" bill. Would extend Vocational Rehabilitation Act to persons not returning to labor market (three bills: H.R. 1119, FOGARTY, of Rhode Island; H.R. 3465, ELLIOTT, of Alabama; S. 772, HILL).

VIII. PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

A. Taxes:

1. Commutation expense: Allow commutation expense as deduction for Federal income tax purposes.

2. Allow more rapid amortization of new railroad facilities for Federal tax purposes.

3. Ten percent Federal transportation tax: Urges repeal of this tax. Was originally imposed as a wartime measure to discourage use. Now unduly burdensome.

4. Local telephone service tax: Urges Federal discontinuance. (See views of Treasury.)

B. Return postal business to railroads on profitable basis.

C. Eliminate Federal practice of negotiating lower rates with railroads.

D. Transportation Act of 1958: Urges amendment to:

1. Provide for public hearings and appeal.

2. Eliminate 4-month deadline on decision.

3. Place burden of proof on railroads.

4. Require consideration of future as well as present convenience and necessity.

5. Require offset of passenger losses against freight revenues (including interstate freight revenues).

6. Repeal limitation on duration of order for continuance of service.

7. Require posting of public notice of date of hearing, as well as notice of application.

8. Confer power on ICC to initiate investigations.

9. Eliminate jurisdiction of ICC over purely intrastate service.

IX. DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND INSURANCE

National bank branches: Urges support of bill to require FDIC approval of branch of national bank. FDIC approval now required re branch of State banks. Would provide equal treatment. (H.R. 9184, MULTER, of New York.)

X. DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY

A. Transportation Act of 1958: (See Public Utility Commission).

B. Motor vehicles: Urges support of:

1. Register of rejects: Bill to establish Federal register of names of revoked and refused drivers (H.R. 5436, RHODES of Arizona), though might be better to allot to FBI rather than Department of Commerce.

2. Uniform registration: Bill to provide uniformity in auto registration. Desirable if would not affect our revenue. (H.R. 867, MULTER, of New York.)

3. Require State license: Bill to make Federal offense for person to operate auto in interstate or foreign commerce without State operator's license. (Would also establish register of rejects.) (H.R. 4946, RHODES of Arizona.)

XI. STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

A. Transportation Act of 1958:

1. See Public Utility Commission.

2. Urges liberalization of restrictions on half-million dollar fund used for guarantee of loans to railroads.

B. Railroads:

1. Urges long-term low-interest Federal loans to State and local governments for improvement of rapid transit systems.

2. Urges amendment to Highway Act of 1956 to permit States to use portions of highway trust funds for improvement of rapid transit systems.

C. Interstate compacts: Federal consent will be necessary after State action on Delaware River and Bay Authority. Federal legislation also will be necessary to amend the existing act concerning the Memorial Bridge to authorize continuation of tolls after bonds are paid. Latter step must not be taken until Delaware commits itself to compact and transfer of Memorial Bridge. Urges Congressmen to watch carefully for any Delaware move to amend existing act prematurely.

Martin B. McKneally: The Magnificent Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. KEATING: Mr. President, as a resident of New York State, as a Legionnaire, and as an American, I am pleased to salute Martin McKneally of Newburgh, N.Y., for his magnificent work as national commander of the American Legion. Elected to this high post last August, he has already demonstrated the qualities of leadership and dedication to high ideals which those of us who know him expect of him.

His ascendancy to the highest position in the American Legion is a direct result of his selfless and untiring labors for good causes. His performance in office has won the admiration of all Americans.

Mr. President, I am proud to claim Martin McKneally as a friend and delighted to offer this brief tribute to him. I wish him continued success in carrying on with his outstanding endeavors. So that more people will have a better understanding of this dedicated patriot, I ask unanimous consent to have an article about Martin McKneally, which appeared in the American Legion magazine for November 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION—MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY, OF NEWBURGH, N.Y., WAS ELECTED TOP EXECUTIVE OF THE LEGION FOR 1959–60 AT THE 1959 NATIONAL CONVENTION

(By Robert B. Pitkin)

Martin B. McKneally, of Newburgh, N.Y.—44-year-old Pacific veteran of World War II—is the new national commander of The American Legion.

McKneally, an attorney and a judicial secretary, was named to the American Legion's highest office for 1959–60 by the 41st national convention at the twin cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., on August 27, 1959.

The new national commander is well-built, stands 5 feet 11 inches tall and weighs 182 pounds. He has dark hair; heavy angular brows; a strikingly moulded face; a judicious, thoughtful appearance; an erect and soldierly posture.

Deliberate in speech, exact in diction, McKneally combines a reputation throughout New York State as a serious thinker in public affairs with a manner of expression that mixes precision with charm.

He was born in Newburgh, December 31, 1914, one of five children of George F. and Ellen (Leahy) McKneally. Both parents were born in Newburgh. His father's parents came from England, his mother's from Tipperary in Ireland. His father, who died in 1944 while the new Commander was in service, ran a successful building construction firm in Newburgh, the George F. McKneally Co. It is still operated by Martin's brother, George, Jr.

McKneally is unmarried, lives with his mother in the same house where he and his father were born. He has three sisters, all residing in Newburgh. They are Mrs. Joseph B. (Dorothy) Leavy; Mrs. Charles (Katherine) Curry and Mrs. William (Elizabeth) Auffredou. The McKneallys are Catholic.

Martin McKneally attended the Broadway (public) grammar school in Newburgh and the Newburgh Free Academy (public high school), graduating in 1932.

He went to Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., and graduated with an A.B. degree in 1936. He then went to Fordham University Law School in New York and earned and LL.B. degree in 1940.

In public school he had taken a liking to debating, public speaking and dramatics, and his success in debate helped form his youthful ambition to become an attorney.

A photo accompanying these words shows him at the age of 4 playing the part of a doughboy in a Newburgh Liberty Loan parade in World War I. In a school play he won the role of George Washington. As the reader will soon see, no part is more prized in Newburgh.

American history was also an early passion of McKneally's. He was steeped in it during a boyhood that was also well taken up with the delights that the Catskills and the Hudson Valley so well offer youngsters—scouting, fishing, hunting, hiking, swimming.

At Holy Cross College he continued his debating and dramatics activities, studied all the American history he could, and was a member of the college History Club.

Before he could set up a law practice after getting his law degree at Fordham, the Second World War intervened. McKneally was inducted into the Army on March 17, 1941, 9 months before Pearl Harbor.

On completion of basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., he was assigned to further training in artillery. However, his captain told him to apply for officers candidate

school in compliance with a request from the Adjutant General's Office for officer candidates with legal training.

McKneally was accepted by the AGO and went to officers candidate school at Fort Washington, Md. He was commissioned a second lieutenant and sent to Grinnel College, Iowa, as an OCS instructor. He then went to the University of Minnesota where he was an assistant professor of military science and tactics until ordered overseas to the 10th Army in December, 1943.

He was sent to Hawaii, where he was detached from the 10th Army and assigned to the staff of General Robert C. Richardson, commanding general of the mid-Pacific area.

He remained on the staff of the mid-Pacific command for the balance of World War II, rose to the rank of major, and was separated from service at Fort Dix, N.J., in January, 1946, after nearly 5 years in uniform.

Thanks to the war, he started his professional career in 1946 at the late age of 31. He joined a law firm in New York City, and shortly afterward opened a law office of his own in Newburgh. After several years of practice in two cities 60 miles apart he withdrew from the New York firm and devoted full time to his general practice in Newburgh—where he had become active in civic affairs.

His thoroughness, competence, and judgment attracted the attention of Judge Samuel W. Eager, justice of the Ninth Judicial District of the New York State Supreme Court, with chambers in Middletown, N.Y. In 1952, Judge Eager invited McKneally to become his confidential secretary—a job involving research and drafting of reports for State supreme court decisions.

McKneally accepted, and combined the court secretaryship with his general law practice in Newburgh down to the moment of his election to the Legion's national commandership. He shares law offices in Newburgh with attorney Donald H. McCann.

Nearly all of McKneally's interests outside of professional hours have spilled over into civic and public affairs, on both the community and State level. This year he was named by New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller to be one of 11 gubernatorial appointees to the New York State defense council—a group which would have the heavy responsibility of assuming the government of the Nation's most populous State in the event of the destruction of the regular government in a defense emergency.

For some 6 years, McKneally was a member of the Newburgh board of education, during which time it was generally conceded that the city school plant would need new construction. During the same 6 years, his American Legion post—Judson P. Galloway Post 152 in Newburgh—repeatedly discussed the desirability of improving its handsome quarters.

In 1955–56, McKneally became simultaneously president of the board of education and commander of Post 152. He promptly projected plans for immediate action to bring about the new construction of the city school system and the Legion post, both of which very shortly became realities.

His family shares his civic and historical interests. His sister Dorothy is a trustee of George Washington's Newburgh headquarters, whose buildings and grounds are kept in excellent shape there. His brother, George, Jr., is a member of Newburgh's city council.

Commander McKneally joined his Legion post in 1946. The Legion's Americanism programs and ideals particularly appealed to him. In 1948 he became the post's Americanism chairman. He inaugurated a program, under post sponsorship, of bringing well-known national figures to Newburgh to give public talks on aspects of current national and world problems. The list of celebrated figures he brought to Newburgh included Dean Clarence Manion, William Buckley, Dr. Thomas Dooley, George Sokolsky, Roy Cohn, Irene Kuhn, and others.

McKneally also served his post as judge advocate, and—4 years ago—as post commander. In 1956 he was elected New York State American Legion Commander. At the end of his term of office in 1957 his State Legion convention endorsed him as a candidate for national commander.

He was New York State American Legion Americanism Chairman for 3 years and has served as a member of resolutions committees of New York State American Legion conventions.

He has also served the national American Legion with distinction in various capacities in the past. He was parliamentarian of the national convention at Miami in 1955, has been a member of the convention committee on Americanism at several national conventions. Since the fall of 1955 he has been a member of the National American Legion Foreign Relations Commission, and the Foreign Relations national convention committees. He has served as American Legion representative on the New York State Governor's Committee on Youth and Delinquency.

Martin McKneally has a deep concern for the future of America, and an abiding belief that American policies and actions in these tense years must avoid expediency and stand on firm principle. In common with all citizens of Newburgh he is deeply conscious of the permanent lessons of American history.

Newburgh is steeped in that history.

There George Washington kept his headquarters from the spring of 1782 until August 1783, in the old dutch farmhouse of Jonathan Hasbrouck which is still preserved.

Everyone in Newburgh is conscious that in a very real sense their city of 33,000 is the birthplace of our Republic. There, where the long ribbon of the Hudson River reflects the towering greenery of the Catskill Mountains, a junta of Revolutionary officers led by Col. Lewis Nicola offered General Washington the crown, to be King of the United States.

There, in today's Washington Park above Newburgh Bay, Washington rebuked his officers on May 27, 1782 and refused to make a kingdom of our country.

Newburgh is also the site of the first GI bill in a sense, for there Congress was petitioned to correct grievances of the Revolutionary soldiers, and there the final arrangements were made to demobilize all of Washington's troops at the end of the long struggle for American independence.

"Today, as then," says McKneally, "America faces a threat to its independenec and the freedom of its people. The resolution and determination and willingness of the people to fight and sacrifice for their freedom carried the day against the foe in the 18th century.

"The people here in this valley lived in constant expectation of the arrival of British warships in Newburgh Bay. Though few in numbers and weak in preparation they were ready for the fight. As they tended their farms and stores they kept constant vigil throughout the Revolution, to repel the enemy at whatever the cost in lives or fortunes.

"Then they were fearless with nothing. Now, with everything, should we be fearful? Today, as then, if our people are prepared to sacrifice and do what is necessary, even suffer losses, we shall see the crisis through. And today, as then, out of unity and a strengthened singless of national purpose we can release the energies for a greater America tomorrow.

"We need a nation today that is visibly ready to follow through in any crisis, whose people again leave no doubt in any mind that their will is steeled.

"If we again show our determination to be free now and forever, we will strengthen the hands of our negotiators at the conference tables. We will prevent another dictator from mistaking our spirit—as Hohenzollern, Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini did at such cost in blood and lives in this century."

Americans have proved over and over again the sacrifices they will make when the chips are down, but in times of peace they show a conciliatory spirit which is too easily (and tragically) mistaken for softness, he says.

The American Legion can and should play a greater role in making the true American spirit more visible. Able Legionnaires, he says, should spend more time demonstrating the soundness of Legion Americanism concepts to non-Legion individuals and groups.

On this, says McKneally, the future greatness of the American Legion rests. Its destiny from the beginning was to offer America a unified image of itself as seen by men and women who had offered their lives in its defense.

The corrosion of fundamental ideas and ideals on which democracies stand, and the now-proven possibilities of brainwashing whole masses of people, make the Legion's duty to uphold American concepts even more obvious today than in 1919.

Commander McKneally has vigorously lived this concept of the Legion's mission. His rise to eminence in the Legion in his home State stems largely from his willingness to accept any and all assignments to work or speak on behalf of American ideals for the American Legion, and from the sincerity, ability and levelheadedness with which he has done it.

In carrying the Legion's message far and wide in his native State, the commander has been an able salesman for America and the Legion. His engaging manner of speaking has never failed to please, while his passion for exactness has left no room for misunderstanding of his words.

At the Legion's 41st National Convention in Minneapolis-St. Paul, last August 27, McKneally was unopposed as a candidate for National Commander.

He had spent the better part of two years traveling and speaking to State Legion conventions in support of his candidacy since his own New York State convention had endorsed him in 1957.

When New York National Executive Committeeman Louis E. Drago nominated him, every delegation was in McKneally's corner and promptly seconded Drago's nomination.

On a motion to suspend the rules and elect him by acclamation to succeed outgoing National Commander Preston J. Moore of Oklahoma, McKneally was named to the Legion's top office without the formality of a ballot.

He is the third National Commander from New York State. The others were the late Edward E. Spafford (1927-28); and Edward N. Scheiberling (1944-45).

In his acceptance speech, McKneally first acknowledged his indebtedness to his mother, his brother and sisters—who had made the "keynote of our family life" the same as the Legion's keynote—"For God and Country."

He then acknowledged a personal debt to E. Nelson Mooney, Newburgh neighbor, WWI veteran and Legionnaire who brought McKneally into his home post in 1946 and "who introduced me to The American Legion and its programs long before World War II."

At the conclusion of his acceptance, Commander McKneally charged all Legionnaires with his own creed:

"Legionnaires, be dedicated, be alive to your responsibilities, be filled with love of your country, be unabashed in your patriotism. Be not dissuaded by councils of confusion nor believe that all will somehow magically come well. The road ahead is steep, but the rewards of service are immense. Serve the American Legion and you serve men of good will all over the world."

Adlai E. Stevenson: Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the least unlikely events of the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles on July 11 and the following would be an unprecedented nomination of Adlai E. Stevenson as the Democratic presidential candidate for the third time. In the light of this prospect comments on his personality and achievements are highly significant. Perhaps the best of these appeared in the February 1960 issue of the Progressive magazine authored by the Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. This article correctly reflects the stature and independence of Mr. Stevenson and I submit it for your consideration, as follows:

ADLAI E. STEVENSON: LAST CHANCE

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

In 1956, after his second defeat for the Presidency, Adlai E. Stevenson made a statement regarding the highest elective office in the free world which was both renunciatory and philosophical. He said, "I can contemplate in tranquillity the distinct possibility that I will never be President of the United States."

Because millions of his fellow Americans do not share this tranquillity, Stevenson continues to be regarded as the most likely nominee of his party for the third consecutive time. Many Stevenson enthusiasts happen to be intellectuals, civic leaders, and generous campaign contributors. They might be called the catalytic agent of the Democratic Party. They are what make the water fizz. They create public opinion. And they feel a sense of kinship with Adlai Stevenson that they seem to sense in no other presidential hopeful in either party.

Thus, in spite of all the zeal and fervor for that brace of tireless compaigning Democratic Senators, JOHN F. KENNEDY and HUBERT HUMPHREY, many adherents of these men continually make it evident that KENNEDY and HUMPHREY are their first choices only if Stevenson does not actively enter the field. At innumerable Democratic gatherings, I have heard people volunteer the information that their heart belongs to Stevenson even though they happen to be wearing somebody else's campaign button on their lapel or bosom at the moment. This was vividly demonstrated at the banquet in New York honoring Eleanor Roosevelt's 75th birthday. Most of the Democratic White House potentials were present. Stevenson received by far the most vociferous ovation. Raymond P. Brandt wrote in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch that only Stevenson and Mrs. Roosevelt herself "came away with increased popularity and respect."

Stevenson has told me that he will not spend a 4-cent postage stamp to win the Democratic nomination. He is personally fond of both HUMPHREY and KENNEDY, and he has given each of them a sort of may-the-best-man-win benediction. But if a stalemate should occur at the Los Angeles convention, it is probable that Stevenson will be available for the party's nomination—even though some of his closest friends trust this will not be the case, for they wish to see him spared the ordeal of a third nationwide campaign. "I'd die if Stevenson lost again," said the attractive wife of a wealthy and enlightened date grower near Palm Springs.

It is my judgment that most of the leaders of the Democratic Party look upon Stevenson as the Nation's intellectually best prepared man to serve in the White House. Who can rival his eloquence and basic wisdom? Yet many of these same individuals confess to some doubt that Stevenson can be elected. If it were not for this doubt, he probably would be a certainty for the nomination in 1960. But Stevenson has been beaten twice. One defeat was by a margin of 6,500,000 votes, the other by 9,500,000. These were not photofinishes. They were landslides. Over and again this is the dry comment of Palmer Hoyt of the Denver Post: "Who could have licked George Washington? That was how General Eisenhower was presented to the American people."

This is the great behind-the-scenes debate within Democratic ranks regarding Adlai Stevenson. Were 1952 and 1956 fair tests of his national vote-corraling ability? If they accurately measured his appeal, then Democratic Party delegates will shy away from him as the 1960 nominee. But if the previous two elections are written off as forlorn hopes for the Democrats, regardless of the identity of the party's candidate, Adlai Stevenson could still be the overwhelming choice of those who will assemble in Los Angeles next July to make a fateful decision. I was told by a generous and liberal-minded California contributor to Democratic coffers:

"If I could appoint a President, I'd appoint Stevenson. He has what it takes to be a truly illustrious President. But if Stevenson is unable to win at the polls, I would rather succeed with a Democrat of lesser stature than to lose again with Stevenson."

It is Hamlet's dilemma repeated, because it involves so many hypotheticals. What if the Suez crisis had not occurred on the eve of the 1956 elections? Had Republican demagoguery over the unpopular Korean war in 1952 made it impossible for a Democrat to succeed? Had the Democratic string run out after 20 years in national office? Many of Harry Truman's intimates believe that Stevenson was too indecisive, that he did not conduct fighting campaigns, that he equivocated on issues of vast potential appeal for the Democrats. But one of Stevenson's faithful has replied wryly, "Don't ever forget that Truman ran against Dewey. That's a whole lot different from running against Eisenhower."

THE LINGERING DOUBT OF WHETHER HE CAN BE ELECTED

The debate is endless, but it also narrows down to another question. How much have the two defeats by Eisenhower hurt Stevenson's political prestige, no matter how blameless he may be for what happened? One theory holds that too many voters among the present electorate cast their ballots against Stevenson for him ever to be able to reverse the verdict. Would millions of voters confess, even to themselves, that they could have been wrong twice before? Yet, arrayed against this is the fact that many political figures in America have won major offices after numerous defeats—Senators JOHN CARROLL, of Colorado; WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, and RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, to mention only a conspicuous few on the contemporary scene. And if the British people had permitted earlier political failures to shape their attitude perpetually, they might have been denied the gifted leadership of Winston Churchill during World War II.

I am confident that Adlai Stevenson is the private 1960 favorite of the overwhelming majority of influential Democrats. But there exists among some of these same persons the lingering doubt of whether or not he can be elected.

Why is Stevenson such a favorite? What accounts for his enduring appeal to so many thoughtful men and women? He is not so liberal as HUMPHREY. He lacks the handsome youthfulness of KENNEDY. He cannot match the political skill of LYNDON JOHNSON. He has many more overt handicaps—his divorce, for example—than SYMINGTON. He is not currently in high elective office like Govs. Robert Meyner, of New Jersey, or G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, of Michigan. Yet mere mention of Stevenson's name can inspire and thrill many a gathering of Democrats.

I have tried to locate the secret of Stevenson's appeal to intellectual and thoughtful voters. I think one of his strengths is a trait which most orthodox politicians regard as virtually his principal weakness—what they describe as his indecisiveness—his tendency to see both sides of a difficult question, his melancholy and prolonged grappling with highly complex issues.

Of some of these things there can be no doubt. In 1952, Stevenson thrashed about like a salmon in a fish ladder, trying to make up his mind whether to run for the Presidency or for reelection as Governor of Illinois. His attitude on farm price supports has never quite satisfied those who favor a continuation of big agricultural subsidies; nor are public-power groups content that he is 100 percent committed to their side. I have heard criticisms from certain labor leaders that Stevenson has seemed to encounter difficulty making up his mind about amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

Yet these very qualities, so disturbing to some groups, are a factor in endearing Stevenson to the intellectuals, teachers, and writers who predominate in quite a few Democratic circles. Here is a man who does not pose as having a pat solution for every problem of these troubled times. He rarely indulges in the glib slogans which pretend to offer such easy remedies for grim maladies. He reserves his doubts about ready answers to monumental problems like farm surpluses, competing with the Soviets, or raising the necessary funds to finance Government in the 20th century. This, in the minds of many people, is a welcome contrast to President Eisenhower's bland promises of 100 percent of parity, liberation of the satellite nations, and the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek. Also, these Democrats occasionally recall that certain prominent members of their own party have heralded, with much fanfare, the unveiling of a marvelous new farm program—a program which they have not yet produced.

STEVENSON WEAKEST WHEN HE LISTENS TO CAMPAIGN STRATEGISTS

To extreme Democratic partisans, Stevenson at times can be somewhat less than satisfying. This is probably true of any political figure who broods extensively and who often appears indecisive. Lincoln, also a melancholy brooder, was not sufficiently hard toward the South to please the Republican radicals who unsuccessfully plotted his defeat for reelection in 1864. Indeed, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman of New York, former confidant of Franklin D. Roosevelt and an intimate of President Truman, has said somewhat disparagingly of Stevenson:

"I don't think his views are those of a liberal, but more of a middle-of-the-roader. On domestic issues, there's not much difference between Stevenson's ideas and those of President Eisenhower."

This is undoubtedly an oversimplification of Stevenson's reluctance to accept felicitous answers merely because they have voter appear. Any person who has read his book, "What I Think," will know there is a gulf, vast and wide, between Stevenson's ideas and those of the war hero who has twice conquered him for the Presidency. There also have been the numerous occasions when Stevenson was ahead of his time. During the 1956 campaign he took the risk of urging a suspension of nuclear tests. Vice President NIXON called this suggestion extraordinary and appalling, catastrophic nonsense—the

height of irresponsibility. Yet today, nearly 4 years later, NIXON himself has opposed a resumption of nuclear testing. Nor can it be wholly forgotten that Judge Rosenman's beloved patron, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was quite universally looked upon as a conservative among Democrats prior to his brilliant unfurling of the New Deal.

Stevenson is not a particularly adroit politician, and he himself probably would be the first to admit it. Eric Sevareid relates how Stevenson, shortly before the Illinois elections of 1948, told him they had written off PAUL DOUGLAS as a possible winner and that if he, Stevenson, won at all, it would be by a very narrow margin. Actually, DOUGLAS was elected to the Senate overwhelmingly, and Stevenson went to the gubernatorial mansion at Springfield by one of the most colossal majorities in the history of the State.

In 1952 my wife Maurine and I were visiting Governor Stevenson in the Illinois capital. He then was being casually discussed for the Democratic presidential nomination. Maurine pleaded with him not to consider this because Eisenhower was sure to be the Republican nominee. "And nobody could beat Ike," she added.

Stevenson countered with the information that Senator Scott Lucas, of Illinois, the Democratic Senate leader, believed Taft had the GOP nomination all wrapped up. "I agree with Lucas," said Stevenson.

It is probably an irony of our era that Stevenson, poor politician though he is, suffers the most when he permits his political peers to persuade him to be out of character. This occurred in the campaign of 1956. Departing from the 1952 style which had inspired and lifted so many Americans, he allowed himself to get down to such narrow specifics as the price of hogs or the cost of kilowatts. This was supposed to be shrewd politics in certain States. Some Democratic politicians also felt, with audible relief, that it removed Stevenson from the lofty plane and high ideals which had characterized his 1952 appearances. The metamorphosis didn't work. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has observed: "In 1956 Mr. Stevenson lost the support of some of his 1952 admirers when he followed the advice of certain campaign strategists and deviated from his 1952 policy of talking sense to the American people."

No persons is more thoroughly aware of this than Adlai Stevenson. "If I ever am foolish enough to let myself run for President again," he told me one day, "I will run exactly as my own man. I won't be met at the Iowa State line or the Oregon State line by people who will tell me the purportedly appropriate thing to say to win votes in that particular locality. I will relate to voters—everywhere—the blunt, hard facts about our position in the world and about the sacrifices required if we are going to improve it."

STEVENSON WORKS HARD ON HIS OWN SPEECHES

Kenneth S. Davis, biographer of Stevenson in the book, "A Prophet in His Own Country," has written that Stevenson's counselors in 1956 assumed he would delegate the writing of speeches to others while he was left free to concentrate on public appearances and personal "politicking." On many occasions in 1952 local bigwigs could not see the candidate because he was busy polishing his speeches until curtain time. The new division of labors in 1956 was an unhappy one for Stevenson. It helps to explain why the genuine Stevenson shone through so little of the oratory during that campaign. He later explained to Kenneth Davis that the actual preparation of speeches, "the creative thing, is what I like to do. It's the fun of my life."

This, too, may be the key to a good deal of the basic Stevenson image. Ours is an age of the synthetic—of the ghostwriter, the teleprompter, of makeup to hide the candidate's bald spots. We all know of the advertising agency which plans a promotional campaign for whiskey one day and a crusade for the Presidency the next. Neither is elevating nor meaningful. Candidates in both parties frequently have speech manuscripts thrust into their hands at the last moment. There is not even time in which to scan the ghost writer's product before it is presented to the waiting audience and to the Nation. People sense this and yearn for the days in our history when Lincoln and Jefferson wrote, under crucial stress, what they themselves felt and believed in. They remember tales of Jefferson, in rented lodgings in Philadelphia, drafting the stirring and rhythmical language of the Declaration of Independence.

In our era Stevenson, alone among leaders, seems to respond to these gleaming chapters from our past. Most topflight politicians make no secret of the synthetic authorship of their speeches. Indeed, they often boast of the task force of skilled experts in each field whom they have recruited for this task. Although Stevenson has had at his disposal some of the most gifted literary talent in the land, he has a hard time relying upon it. Davis, in "A Prophet in His Own Country," has thus described the reaction in 1952 of those who made the pilgrimage to Springfield to fortify the Stevenson cause with their pens and typewriters:

"All of them became convinced, if they were not at the outset, that Stevenson was a far better writer of Stevenson speeches than any of them ever could be. Most of them were initially perturbed by the fact that the final drafts of speeches generally bore little resemblance to the drafts they had painfully prepared, but * * * with pride and truth they could proclaim that the speeches as Stevenson finally gave them—speeches which would be gathered into a bestselling book months after the campaigning had ended—were very much Stevenson's own."

I still have my own vivid memory of Stevenson in the cramped bedroom of Portland's then only union-operated hotel in October of 1952. It was nearly midnight. He had just completed a long airplane flight. His dinner consisted of a bowl of canned vegetable soup and crackers, eaten off a lap tray. While he ate, he revised a speech on power and conservation which he expected to deliver the nxet day. His eyes were hallow and gaunt with exhaustion. It all seemed dreadfully inefficient for the candidate thus to drain his energies and strength, especially when I thought of Eisenhower's smoothly functioning campaign colossus with its troupe of writers and public relations experts. I knew the General was not polishing speeches at midnight. And yet when I came away from Stevenson's room that night with Jebbie Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, there were tears of pride in our eyes.

Just how liberal is Adlai Stevenson? This question disturbs some Democrats, as exemplified by the strictures and doubts voiced by Judge Rosenman. When former President Truman endorsed Averill Harriman for President before the 1956 Democratic Convention, he said candidly that Stevenson was not liberal enough for him. Yet, by contrast, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whose liberalism has never been diluted, constantly reiterates her admiration and affection for Adlai Stevenson. So does former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, another of unquestioned liberality. It could even be a matter of temperament. The precinct liberals have rarely cottoned to Stevenson. But the intellectual liberals consider Adlai their nonpareil. They are his shock troops. Their allegiance to him seldom wavers.

Stevenson himself is definitely not a doctrinaire liberal. Many of his early affiliations, in business and corporation law, have helped to anchor him to rather orthodox economic ideas. In the grave crisis of World War II, he was assistant to Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, who had been the 1936 Republican running mate of Alf M. Landon. After Knox's death from a heart attack, brought on by assiduous adherence to duty, Stevenson said:

"I loved that man. He was brave and honest. And he made a very great contribution to his country in her hour of greatest need. It cost him a lot. I'm sure it shortened his life. He was no intellectual, God knows, but he was highly intelligent—which a whole lot of intellectuals aren't, you know—and he knew his fellow man from a rough and crowded life. His loyalty to President Roosevelt, his political adversary in 1936, had a defiant quality, and his admiration and respect for his chief seemed to grow as the going got tougher."

WHAT KIND OF PRESIDENT WOULD STEVENSON MAKE?

It is perhaps a clue to Stevenson's outlook that he took no cognizance of the fact that Colonel Knox was not a liberal, but only that he was not an intellectual. In his personal associations, Stevenson does not dampen litmus paper to test if each acquaintance is simon-pure on every possible public question. This may accentuate certain suspicions concerning how far left-of-center Stevenson really dwells. Yet F.D.R. kept Jesse Jones in his Cabinet and he enjoyed cruising on Vincent Astor's yacht. Nor can Harry Truman be said to savor his bourbon and branch water exclusively in the company of those who score 100 percent on ADA's voting scoresheet on Capitol Hill.

I first met Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco in 1945. We journeyed together to Yosemite's granite cliffs and plumed waterfalls, and we hiked in the majestic fastnesses of Muir Woods. My impression of him was not necessarily of a fervent liberal but rather of a fascinating intellect, who knew not only world diplomacy but also the subtle differences between a Douglas-fir and a ponderosa pine.

What kind of President would Stevenson be?

I rather imagine he would be a President who tried the patience of every special-interest group in the Nation. On agricultural legislation I would guess that he might be too conservative to please the National Farmers Union and not conservative enough to satisfy the American Farm Bureau. He would be too much of a loyal Democrat to win over partisan Republicans, but might be too fair and temperate to delight the extremists in his own party. For example, this is Stevenson talking to a Democratic National Committee dinner in Chicago in 1955—slightly later than midway between his two presidential defeats:

"Let us be very clear that Republicans want a safe and sane world every bit as much as Democrats. And in this day, when our position is more perilous than it has been since Korea, let us also profit from our past mistakes, while we deplore them, and let us think of foreign policy not as partisans but as Americans. Let us, indeed, remember that he who plays politics with peace will lose at both."

Noble and stately words, these, but not the kind to make a partisan audience leap onto its chairs. They tell why Stevenson is a greater favorite with the PTA president than with the local ward chairman.

Excesses are frequently the fuel of political fires, but Stevenson cannot bring himself to light such faggots. On the eve of the 1956 campaign he was finally persuaded to endorse 90-percent price supports on so-called basics. But he did not quite let go of the lanyard. He made it evident that he was approving an expedient and not an ultimate answer:

"While firm price supports keep income up they don't keep surpluses down, and I say again, lest the dam burst and engulf us, we Democrats must press on, with Republican help, I hope, to develop the much broader national farm program which is required to restore the full parity of total farm income. At the risk of misunderstanding and misrepresentation, I will say again and again that restoring 90 percent price supports to meet the present emergency is not to say they are a solution, but only that it is a better program than sliding supports which slide only one way."

STEVENSON'S RECORD AS GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

And there you have it, the strength of Stevenson intellectually and the weakness of Stevenson politically. He did come out for 90 percent price supports to cope with a crisis, but he could not quite bring himself to claim for such supports any panacea status. Perhaps the statement reveals why he has never carried a State in the Nation's breadbasket. Zealous advocates of 90 percent price supports rarely appreciate such gingerly backing. But the statement also revels that Adlai Stevenson is a sincere and honest man in bigtime politics.

This honesty was established for all the Nation to see in August of 1952, when Governor Shivers, of Texas, called ostentatiously at Springfield and asked Stevenson to favor the return on the rich oil tidelands to the States. This was a major issue in the four States which stood to profit heavily from such a transfer—Texas, Florida, Louisiana, and California. Many electoral votes were potentially at stake. Stevenson could have ducked the question completely, or he could have imitated Eisenhower's ambiguous acceptance of the States rights position. Instead, Stevenson crisply endorsed the majority Supreme Court opinion that the petroleum-laden tidelands were properly within the custodianship of the Federal Government. Quite obviously, this shut off his meager campaign exchequer from benefactions by the powerful oil industry.

An issue like the tidelands was no problem for Stevenson. On some other subjects, however, it has not been so simple for him to accept the traditional position of liberal Democrats. I have heard him sharply question several of my Senate colleagues from the Northwest about high interest rates. He was definitely not in favor of increasing the cost of borrowing money, but he wondered if there were anything to the claim that this might be necessary to quench the fires of inflation. I have listened to Stevenson asking the same kind of penetrating questions on the issue of Hells Canyon Dam. He did not instantly assume the attitude that a Federal dam was, ipso facto, better than a private utility company dam. He had to be convinced, with irrefutable figures, that the private dam would leave a good deal of the potential hydroelectricity of the Snake River undeveloped. Positions which some liberals take, almost by reflex action, do not come so automatically to Adlai Stevenson. Furthermore, I would classify him as relatively prudent on the broad issue of Federal spending. Deficit financing, which is attractive to quite a few congressional liberals is not found in the Stevenson litany. For example, one of the accomplishments of which he boasts as a feature of his service in the Illinois governorship is this: "* * * Kept State expenditures on a pay-as-you-go basis by ending the use of extensive deficiency appropriations at the end of a biennium."

Some liberals find it easier to propose methods of spending governmental funds than in raising revenues to finance these undertakings. Stevenson's record as chief executive of Illinois makes it likely that he would not be in this group, which perhaps accounts for the questioning of the degree of his liberality by former President Truman, Judge Rosenman, and others. A sound measuring stick of Stevenson's philosophy might be found in some of the other features of his gubernatorial reign which excite his own pride and satisfaction. Here are a few as compiled by Stevenson's staff shortly before he closed his desk at Springfield for the last time:

"Put the State police force on a merit basis, removing it as an item of patronage.

"Eliminated nonworking political appointees with whom State payrolls had been padded.

"Restored many sales tax evaders to the rolls and insisted on equal treatment to all on tax collections.

"Improved the care and treatment of the 49,000 patients in State mental hospitals, and provided for collection by the State of the cost of such care in cases where the patient or his family are able to pay.

"Enforced the overweight truck laws to protect the deteriorating highway system, and increased highway revenues.

"Pressed for elimination of chiselers and cheaters from the public assistance rolls.

"Initiated a program for State financing of tuberculosis sanitaria.

"Avoided new general taxes so that only two States, on a per capita income basis, have lower per capita State tax collections than Illinois.

"Reformed the administration of parole laws by appointing experts free from political pressure.

"Brought Illinois from the lowest to one of the highest levels of State aid for common schools."

A DEMOCRATIC TICKET OF STEVENSON AND KENNEDY

These acts reveal a man who has a warm humanitarian heart, who possesses fiscal soundness and prudence, who administers government without fear or favor, and who is not afraid of political pressures. They do not inevitably describe an orthodox political liberal in the conventional meaning of the term. Such a person might have tried to do away with the sales tax altogether rather than bring honesty to its enforcement. I recall talking to the late Phil Jackson, publisher of the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, after his newspaper had given a luncheon in honor of Stevenson, whom the Journal had indorsed in the 1952 campaign.

"All my fat-cat friends at the Arlington Club have been telling me what a radical this man is," said Jackson. "Why, he's no radical at all—in fact, he's barely more liberal than I am, and I'm certainly no New Dealer, I can tell you that."

Similar episodes may have occurred elsewhere in the Nation, serving to explain why some flaming liberals cool off when confronted with a third candidacy for Stevenson. Still, a thoughtful man's performance in the American Presidency never can be predicted in advance with supreme safety and confidence. Walter Lippmann might hope to expunge the column which he wrote on January 8, 1932, about the man who was subsequently to become the Democratic nominee that year: "Franklin D. Roosevelt is no crusader. He is no tribune of the people. He is no enemy of entrenched privilege. He is a pleasant man who, without any important qualifications for the office, would very much like to be President." It may just be possible that the prophecies of F.D.R.'s amanuensis, Judge Sam Rosenman, could prove equally inaccurate about Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

Stevenson, grandson of Grover Cleveland's Vice President, will be 60 years old this February. This year, 1960, is virtually the last call for him. He either will be nominated in July at Los Angeles, the city of his birth, or he never again will be considered seriously for an office which many people regard as the natural niche for his talents of intellect, originality, and temperament.

I refuse to pass upon the dilemma of whether or not Stevenson's two previous defeats at the hands of Eisenhower stamp him indelibly as doomed to failure in quest of the Presidency. Only a seventh son of a seventh son could answer this question. It lends itself no more to authentic assessment prior to the event than does the whole question of the religion of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and California's Governor Pat Brown. We only can hope that the bigotry which plagued Al Smith in 1928 is no more. But can this actually be determined until it is put to the test? A casual inquiry at the front door fails to duplicate the emotions of an election in which hysteria and fanaticism might run wild. Intolerance cannot be measured apart from the conditions and atmosphere which tend to create it. The Stevenson riddle may not be quite so difficult to unlock, and yet surely the impact of previous failures is a generally unknown quantity in most elections.

I personally favor a Democratic ticket of Stevenson and KENNEDY. Despite all the current flyspecking as to his record in the Senate, I look upon JACK KENNEDY as one of the superior Senators of our era. Courage is a prime requisite in politics. Certainly it required courage to tackle the inflammable issue of labor reform. Regardless of the course he followed, KENNEDY was damned if he did and damned if he didn't. This has been demonstrated by the fact that, although KENNEDY strived successfully to pull some of the sharpest fangs in the Landrum-Griffin bill, he nevertheless now is enduring bitter criticism from some politicians with close labor alliances. At 42, KENNEDY'S youthful magnetism and personality might also be a useful foil to what some look upon as Stevenson's lack of lure to the distaff vote.

Why Stevenson for President? Franklin Roosevelt once described the Presidency as preeminently a position of moral leadership. If it had not been that in Lincoln's time, would the 16th President have been able to persuade his countrymen to accept the first military conscription and the first income taxes in American history, so that the Nation might be kept united? Stevenson, to me, possesses Lincolnesque qualities of soul searching, of personal inner doubts, of a brooding awareness that the way ahead is stern and hard. If somebody were to ask what I think is the vital difference between Stevenson and all other candidates in both parties, I would answer that it was an almost indefinable ingredient which might be called "stature." Within Stevenson, I believe, are the essentials to be a great President. This is quite different from being a good President or a successful President, as a number of the other aspirants unquestionably could become.

America today desperately needs a great President.

Foreign policy is the supreme challenge. With his flourishes of worldwide travel and pilgrimaging, Eisenhower has substituted the appearance of a policy for policy itself, in the view of James Reston, of the New York Times. After the cheering is over, the enigma of a divided Berlin or Soviet space supremacy still remains. Stevenson has persisted in recognizing that good-will journeys or vague platitudes are seldom substitutes for "generosity and decency in human relationships, and equality in human opportunities."

Discussing the unrest among the teeming millions of Asia and Africa, Stevenson has said, "Underneath the recriminations of diplomats and the conflicts of nation-states, there boils up today the hopes, resentments, and aspirations not just of leaders but of great masses of people seeking for themselves and their children the rights and privileges which [Woodrow] Wilson said, 'all normal

men desire and must have if they are to be contented and within reach of happiness.'"

It is easy to be superficial about foreign policy because the guideposts are frequently so far away. The test of a farm program may be in the price of hogs, only 25 miles off at the railhead. The test of foreign policy may be in the sprouting seeds of a war which Americans a decade hence might have to fight on the opposite side of the globe. Not even 20–20 vision can discern these measurements. That is why it is so easy to promise ultimate liberation for their relatives to foreign-language voters in large American cities, or to hint that eventually the Soviets will be overthrown by revolution, and thus we do not need to worry about Russia's spectacular shot at the moon or its satellites in far orbit.

ADLAI STEVENSON IS AMERICA'S HAIRSHIRT

Stevenson has never indulged himself in these luxuries. He is the pragmatist who threatens his own political chances by reminding audiences that we cannot thumb our noses even at countries which occasionally offend our precious sensibilities. "I know some politicians tell us that we don't need allies," Stevenson has observed. "Life would certainly be much simpler if that were so, for our friends can be highly irritating. But it is not so. We need allies because we have only 6 percent of the world's population. We need them because the oversea airbases essential to our own security are on their territory. We need allies because they are the source of indispensable strategic materials. We need, above all, the moral strength that the solidarity of the world community alone can bring to our cause. Let us never underestimate the weight of moral opinion. It can be more penetrating than bullets, more durable than steel."

Stevenson is America's hairshirt. He is the man who offers blood, sweat, toil, and tears when others are hinting temptingly at tax reduction or more Federal subsidies and benefactions. Indeed, people have come to expect candor of Stevenson. One of the highest tributes which he received was when he strayed briefly from this role during the 1956 Presidential campaign. Men and women instantly complained that he was out of character, that the 1956 campaign product was definitely not the authentic Stevenson. Somehow, Adlai Stevenson has come to epitomize in many minds a political figure who tells the truth, irrespective of political consequences.

Nikita Khrushchev's doorstep has become a favorite platform for American political hopefuls. It has introduced a jarring and even frightening element into our political life. The Communist Party is unable to poll a fraction of 1 percent of the vote at American ballot boxes. Yet the world's top Communist, Khrushchev, may possess the power to shape an American election simply by rattling the nuclear sword of fluttering the dove of peace at appropriate moments. Bismarck did this as a calculated policy in Prussia to influence French politics. What if Khrushchev finds that the mailed fist or the gloved hand, on his part, can stampede American voters into favoring one party or the other as an instrument of supposed peace?

I think this is one of the truly disturbing developments of our era. That is why the visits of leading Americans with Khrushchev must be reported faithfully and realistically, and without self-serving embellishments. If public opinion in our country is to be unmoved by Soviet bombast or blandishments, then American statesmen must be entirely candid in analyzing their impressions of Khrushchev's motives and aspirations. Stevenson, as I see it, has come closer to such a goal than any other important visitor to the Soviet dictator.

For example, in interviews with the Progressive and the New York Times on Khrushchev's disarmament address at the United Nations, Stevenson exclaimed: "This is the first time I have ever felt encouraged on the subject of disarmament. His replies to my questions left me with the clear understanding that in his view an international control body should have the power and facilities to control and inspect each step of the disarmament process to the extent necessary to insure compliance with the step, such power and facilities to vary according to the needs of each phase.

"While I wish I were more sanguine that something positive might come of Mr. Khrushchev's sweeping disarmament proposal, he certainly gave me new hope that they meant business this time. And above all, we should not hastily and cynically dismiss his proposals as 'clumsy propaganda,' 'old stuff,' or 'utopian nonsense.' For thereby we only redouble the propaganda impact—if that is all it is—of Russia's posture as the peacemaker—the mighty Russia which first put a satellite in orbit and has just pinned her colors to the moon.

"We must pay attention, cautiously but carefully, to what Mr. Khrushchev says about disarmament because he has a lot to say about the life and death of all of us. And I wish we could learn that with the Communists the important thing is not always whether they are sincere but whether they are serious."

STEVENSON WOULD SHAPE A TIME OF GREATNESS

Stevenson has a nobility of spirit which is rare in politics. Lincoln said, "I shall do nothing through malice. What I deal with is too vast for malice." Alas, this counsel of restraint is frequently honored far more in the breach than in the observance. Many men in politics, flattered beyond belief and the object of constant sycophancy, whine and wail whenever matters do not suit their fancy. After a defeat at the polls, they blame everyone except themselves. I have sat beside former Governors and former Senators, listening to hours of abuse against those responsible for their political downfall.

Stevenson is a different kind of bird from the usual political breed. He was twice vanquished for the Presidency under the most trying and difficult circumstances. He brought tears to millions of eyes besides his own on the night of his defeat in 1952, when he told those who had worked in his losing cause:

"Someone asked me, as I came down the street, how I felt, and I was reminded of a story that a fellow townsman of ours in Springfield used to tell—Abraham Lincoln. They asked him how he felt once after an unsuccessful election. He said that he felt like a little boy who had stubbed his toe in the dark. He said that he was too old to cry, but it hurt too much to laugh."

I have never heard Stevenson bewail his political fortunes. I have never heard Stevenson deride his conqueror or speak poorly of those who failed to support the Stevenson campaign. His references to the President of the United States, whether spoken in public or in private, are always in terms of personal respect. This is not usual in American politics. One should listen to former Senators commenting on those who occupy their chairs.

One night at a dinner party in Washington, my wife and I heard the Dean Achesons ridiculing and denouncing Stevenson. The vilification continued for a long time and was obviously no secret. They seemed anxious to make known their utter contempt and dislike for the Democratic Party's unsuccessful nominee of 1952 and 1956. Some weeks later we mentioned this episode to Stevenson. He shook his head sadly with a wry smile. "Dean was a fine Secretary of State," he said. "I only wish he and Mrs. Acheson thought better of me." And there the topic ended.

I do not know whether Adlai Stevenson ever will become President of the United States. The path ahead of a two-time loser is pocked with perils, and 1960 is undoubtedly his last chance. Destiny often foils those who seem most prepared for destiny's climactic events. But what I do know is this—if Stevenson does not go to the White House, millions of his fellow Americans will feel they have been robbed of their opportunity to live in a time of greatness.

Public Reaction Favors Throwing Out Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently in Seattle the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, in a press conference said that the wheat situation is "almost a national scandal."

Later in the day in a speech Mr. Benson said:

The billions we have invested in Democrat farm program failures are tragic. Were this money accomplishing the adjustment so sorely needed in agriculture, it might be worth the cost.

But we are not getting our money's worth, not while programs designed to meet the needs of a depression and revised to help win two wars are still in effect long after depression and wars have vanished. They are antiquated, outmoded and outrageous. The most glaring example is wheat.

This monster is not the Benson program. Neither is it the administration's program. Fixing the blame won't help. Correcting the situation can and will help.

The administration has the answer, which is not easy because adjustments will be difficult. The cure requires legislation. Only Congress can correct this obsolete outmoded, scandalous wheat problem.

Congress must strike out decisively for solid ground, or public reaction might well throw out all farm programs—the good along with the bad.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any idea which programs Mr. Benson considers good. As for me, I think it is more a matter of degree and of which program is worse but there may be Government assistance plans which help the farmer and do not harm anyone else. I respect the Secretary and I only wish nonpartisanship and unselfish interests would have given him half a chance to demonstrate that by degrees he could remove farm price supports.

The Washington Post in a recent editorial expressed the view that acreage controls have proved to be an illusion, and doubted whether marketing quotas tight enough to be effective would be tolerated. This newspaper's conclusion was that in the confused picture the most hopeful form of relief seemed to lie outside the realm of general price-support subsidies.

To this, the American taxpayer will say "Amen" if comments from my constitutents are any criteria.

Here is a sampling of such views:

It seems to me from what I read in the papers and magazines that the United States of America is being "took" plenty if the articles have any truth in them. According to one article, the Government is paying over $1 million a day for storage and people were renting warehouses from the Government at a price and renting them back at a neat profit. And why with such a surplus of wheat should the loaf of bread be the price it is, and why should Government land be leased for a wheat crop which never is planted and the lessor be paid for such a crop that never grew? These are what we read about and wonder. Something should be done.

I strongly favor abolition of all farm price support—particularly wheat price supports.

The agricultural price supports, soil bank payments, have not solved anything, but have given the large landowner-corporation-farmer huge benefit payments. * * * There is no reason why any particular segment of our American citizens should receive a subsidy, such as the farmers. The whole farm subsidy program should be repealed.

I protest subsidies of any nature unless they have to do with maintaining national defense. I believe a person and a nation is stronger for having worked out its own problems without having to lean on Government to work them out for him.

I don't understand why we should need farm price supports any more than we would need industrial price supports.

I would like to see the Congress return management of the farm to the farmers.

Farmers that are blaming Mr. Benson for their troubles should be told that the Democrats passed the farm law and they are in control of Congress.

I feel strongly about farm controls. They should be taken off. Now. And no price supports of any kind. Let supply and demand be their only control. A man should be able to grow what he wants and as much as he wants—this is the American way.

I am heartily and all out for Secretary Benson's efforts to seek improvement and relief for the agricultural situation.

I think storing of grain is a sin.

Let the farmers run their business as other businessmen do.

Agriculture price support: yes, they should be entirely abolished.

Nothing Is Really Ever New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to learn that Labor Secretary Mitchell has found the wisdom to tell the Congress that a modest increase in the present $1-an-hour minimum wage would not adversely affect low-wage industries.

The viewpoint expressed by the Secretary is not new. There has been before the Congress for some time excellent legislation which would raise the hourly minimum to $1.25.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the February 20, 1960, edition of the AFL–CIO News:

MITCHELL SEES MODEST HIKE IN MINIMUM

Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell has told Congress that a modest increase in the present $1-an-hour minimum wage would not adversely affect low-wage industries.

The Secretary did not spell out the amount of increase the administration is prepared to support. He is expected to give the exact figure in testimony scheduled March 2 as a House Labor Subcommittee begins hearings on wage-hour law amendments.

Mitchell in his annual report on the effects of the $1-an-hour minimum required under the Fair Labor Standards Act renewed an administration request for an extension of minimum wage coverage to several million additional workers not now protected, and said that extension of coverage was the most important action Congress could take.

He did not indicate whether the administration would support extension of coverage beyond the approximately 2.5 million workers he recommended both in 1957 and last year.

The AFL–CIO is backing the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill that would extend coverage to approximately 7.8 million workers in large interstate industries and raise the hourly minimum to $1.25. This bill is now pending in the Senate Labor Committee after subcommittee approval last year.

Mitchell's report said that the impact of the 1956 increase in the minimum wage, when the rate was lifted from 75 cents to $1, had now been substantially absorbed. Another increase now, he indicated, would not result in serious economic dislocations or loss of employment in the low-wage industries to which the minimum applies directly.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of February 20, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

The proposal to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds and to give the Treasury Secretary flexibility in debt management is the chief fiscal issue currently confronting Congress and our Committee on Ways and Means. Every taxpaying citizen, every business and financial institution, even the free enterprise system is involved. Unfortunately, political considerations are distorting the facts, in addition to the understandable confusion surrounding the complex workings of Government financing. Two misconceptions, widely held, are stressed by Secretary Anderson, and need to be understood:

(1) "Increases in Government interest rates are necessarily inflationary." This is not so. "Interest rate" is simply the price of borrowing money, and reflects the supply and demand of money at any given time. Interest rates also act as a corective balance wheel. A cheaper rate reflects a greater supply of money and becomes an inducement to borrow. A higher rate evidences increased competitive demand for the loan money available and is also a damper on borrowing. Therefore, higher interest rates encourage saving, discourage spending, and help to resist inflationary pressures. Obviously, artificial creation of money by Government (through deficit financing) and/or artificially set interest rates can hurt our people and competitive enterprise.

(2) "Only large financial institutions—the bankers—benefit from high interest rates on Government bonds." Not so. Individuals, many of relatively modest means, benefit directly or indirectly. Even the financial institutions pass on the interest received as earnings to all the people who have invested their savings. This debt management problem is concerned only with the currently owed $291 billion of recognized debt. Our total debt, including contingent liabilities and c.o.d. commitments, today approaches $750 billion.

The House Rules Committee this week reported out the controversial civil rights bill for debate on the floor. The bare newspaper accounts of this action leave a lot unsaid, for the footwork of the committee's conservatives in handling this bill was something to behold. The odds are that the Rules group acted in just the nick of time before a discharge petition offered by the rights' bill author, EMANUEL CELLER, had gained a sufficient number of signatures to remove the bill from the committee's jurisdiction, anyway. Many leftwing liberal-backed bills, having cleared the appropriate standing committee of the House, have run into tough sledding in the Rules Committee, which determines when, if, and how a bill shall be considered on the floor. Though Democrats control 18 votes to 4, the committee chairman, HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, and BILL COLMER, of Mississippi, often vote with the four Republicans, throwing the committee into a 6–6 deadlock, and thus preventing consideration of a great deal of popular but ill-advised legislation.

When it became apparent this week that the discharge petition would succeed, the Republicans joined several Democrats in voting to grant a rule for civil rights debate. This way, at least, the Rules group set the ground rules for debate, whereas the rule requested by Mr. CELLER would have prevailed had the committee been discharged. The lineup of Members on this petition points up once again the unbridgeable conflict in the Democratic Party. Of course, no southern Congressman, Democrat or Republican, signed the petition. But, according to one authoritative report, of those who had signed by the first of the week, 164 were Democrats and only 42 were Republicans. A breakdown of those who had refused or declined to sign may be equally significant—outside the South and border States, 110 Republicans declined and only 9 Democrats.

The annual prayer breakfast was attended by the President, numerous Members of Congress, court justices, administrators, and people from all over the United States and abroad. Those on the program stressed that America's greatest strength, and that of the free world, is spiritual and moral. Most simply stated, our problem, it seems to me, is to practice as individuals in Government what we preach and, by so doing, present a correct image of U.S. conviction to the world, thereby retaining genuine prestige and respect as the leader of the free world.

"A Conservative's Answer to the ADA Brand of Modern Liberalism" was the subject of the Georgetown University Forum—a 30-minute Sunday show in Washington. I joined Brent Bozell, youthful writer and speaker, and Frank McNamara, counsel for the Un-American Activities Committee, to present this answer. The future of this Nation today is the balance, as I see it—whether we embrace the regimented, planned economy of the welfare state or whether we keep and rebuild free, competitive enterprise and individual

freedom. All should know that the determined liberals are planning more spending, more Federal control, higher taxes, and more deficits. There's still time for people to stop this national suicide.

My television series (WFAA–TV, 10:30 a.m., Sunday) thus far has included interviews with Charlie Halleck, House minority leader; Dana Latham, Internal Revenue Commissioner; Maurice Stans, Budget Bureau Director; Wallace Janssen, Food and Drug Administrator; Frances Knight, Passport Director; and George Allen, U.S. Information Agency Director. A weekly radio report may be heard over KLIF at 6:45 p.m. Sunday. Those wanting to receive my newsletter need only to ask for it.

George Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States Contains Up-to-Date Advice That Should Be Considered Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, George Washington's Farewell Address was written primarily to eliminate himself as a candidate for a third term. The address is in two parts. In the first, Washington definitely declines a third term, gives reasons and acknowledges a debt of gratitude for the honors conferred upon him and for the confident support of the people. In the second more important part, he presents, as a result of his experience and as a last legacy of advice, thoughts upon the Government.

The U.S. Constitution was approved by the unanimous order of the Convention, September 17, 1787, George Washington, presiding.

Exactly 9 years later, September 17, 1796, George Washington delivered this farewell address. It was never actually delivered but was dated September 17, 1796.

It was addressed, "To the People of the United States."

The manuscript which Washington gave to Claypoole, who printed it in Claypoole's "American Daily Advertiser," in Philadelphia, Pa., on September 19, 1796, was ordered to be sold after Claypoole's death, at auction on February 12, 1850.

January 24, 1850, Senator Henry Clay offered a joint resolution for its purchase by the Government, but the resolution was not signed by President Taylor before the day of sale.

The manuscript was sold to James Lennox for $2,300 and passed with his library to the New York Public Library. There is no evidence of any bid on behalf of the National Government.

This information was obtained from "The Story of the Constitution," by Sol Bloom, director general of the Sesquicentennial Commission of 1937.

GOVERNMENT OF LAW, NOT OF MEN

Many people believe that there is a trend among many public officials to ignore the law and Constitution and substitute therefor regulations and decisions of men. Washington warned against such usurpation in the following language:

If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

RELIGION AND MORALITY

In this farewell address, which was more than 165 years ago, Washington gave advice which is timely and opportune in the United States today in our dealings with Russia. In other words, Washington had something to say about a nation ignoring religion. Washington in his farewell address stated:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. * * * And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

EDUCATION

On the question of education, Washington had something to say in his farewell address. An exact quote is as follows:

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric? Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

NATIONAL DEBT

Concerning the use of public credit, Washington had some good advice. This farewell address was read today in the House of Representatives by a distinguished Representative from the great State of Missouri, Hon. CHARLES HARRISON BROWN, in such an impressive way that some points heretofore passed over lightly were emphasized and made very timely by this great orator. One of the points I refer to is about the United States obligating itself through the use of public credit to the payment of a huge debt to successfully prosecute unavoidable wars. Washington was so right when he gave us the following words of caution and advice:

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. Our method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in times of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives; but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate.

In times of prosperity, such as we have now, Congress should not only have a balanced budget but should make a substantial payment on its national debt. At a recent public hearing before the Joint Economic Committee, a very prominent economist recommended that the President have the power to increase taxes, if necessary, to balance the budget, if Congress should adjourn without making adequate provisions for balancing the budget. This recommendation appears to me as being worthy of very serious consideration. Possibly we should not only allow the Chief Executive to raise sufficient revenue through flexible tax provisions to balance the budget, but should also allow him by the use of the same method to raise an additional amount of revenue to make a substantial payment on the national debt in times of prosperity, if Congress should adjourn without doing so.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S RULES OF CIVILITY AND DECENT BEHAVIOR IN COMPANY AND CONVERSATION

George Washington's "Rules of Civility and Decent Behavior in Company and Conversation" are very interesting and I believe should be reprinted in the RECORD that contains an observance of his birthday. They are as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S "RULES OF CIVILITY AND DECENT BEHAVIOR IN COMPANY AND CONVERSATION"

From a paper found among the early writings of George Washington copied from the original with literal exactness and edited with notes by J. M. Toner, M. D., 1888.

The text following is an exact copy from the original manuscript, having been carefully compared with the corrected therefrom, even when errors or omissions are obvious.

This book has been knawed by mice. Rule 12 and all at bottom of any of the pages had been nearly destroyed. Every word and letter remaining has been copied and are here given:

"1. Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are present.

"2. When in Company, put not your Hands to any Part of the Body, not usually Discovered.

"3. Shew Nothing to your Friend that may affright him.

"4. In the Presence of Others sing not to yourself with a humming Noise, nor Drum, with your Fingers or Feet.

"5. If you Cough, Sneeze, Sigh, or Yawn, do it not Loud, but Privately; and Speak not in your Yawning, but put Your handkerchief or Hand before your face and turn aside.

"6. Sleep not when others Speak, Sit not when others stand, Speak not when you Should hold your Peace, walk not on when others Stop.

"7. Put not off your Cloths in the presence of Others, nor go out your Chamber half Drest.

"8. At play and at Fire its Good manners to give Place to the last comer, and affect not to Speak Louder than ordenary.

"9. Spit not in the Fire, nor Stoop low before it neither Put your Hands into the Flames to warm them, nor Set your Feet upon the Fire especially if there be meat before it.

"10. When you Sit down, Keep your Feet firm and Even, without putting one on the other or Crossing them.

"11. Shift not your self in the Sight of others nor Gnaw your nails.

"12. Shake not the head, Feet, or Legs, rowl not the Eys, lift not one eyebrow higher

than the other, wry not the mouth, and bedew no mans face with your Spittle, by appr * * * r him * * * you Speak.

"13. Kill no Vermin as Fleas, lice ticks &c in the Sight of Others, if you See any filth or thick Spittle put your foot Dexteriously upon it, if it be upon the Cloths of your Companions. Put it off privately, and if it be upon your own Cloths return Thanks to him who puts it off.

"14. Turn not your Back to others especially in Speaking, Jog not the Table or Desk on which Another reads or writes, lean not upon any one.

"15. Keep your Nails clean and short, also your Hands and Teeth Clean, yet without Shewing any great Concern for them.

"16. Do not Puff up the Cheeks, Loll not out the tongue rub the Hands, or beard, thrust out the lips, or bite them or keep the Lips too open or too close.

"17. Be no Flatterer, neither Play with any that delights not to be Play'd Withal.

"18. Read no Letters, Books, or Papers in Company but when there is a Necessity for the doing of it you must ask leave: come not near the Books or Writings of Another so as to read them unless desired or give your opinion of them unask'd also look not nigh when another is writing a Letter.

"19. Let your Countenance be pleasant but in Serious Matters Somewhat grave.

"20. The Gestures of the Body must be Suited to the discourse you are upon.

"21. Reproach none for the Infirmities of Nature nor Delight to Put them that have in mind thereof.

"22. Shew not yourself glad at the Misfortune of another though he were your enemy.

"23. When you see a Crime punished, you may be inwardly Pleased; but always shew Pity to the Suffering Offender.

"* * * too much at any Publick.

"25. Superfluous Complements and all Affectation of Ceremonie are to be avoided yet where due they are not to be Neglected.

"26. In pulling off your Hat to Persons of Distinction, as Noblemen, Justices, Churchmen &c make a Reverence, bowing more or less according to the Custom of the Better Bred, and Quality of the Persons Amongst your equals expect not always that they Should begin with you first, but to Pull off the Hat when there is no need is Affectation, in the Manner of Saluting and resaluting in words keep to the most usual Custom.

"27. Tis ill manners to bid one more eminent than yourself be covered as well as not to do it to whom it's due Likewise he that makes to much haste to Put on his hat does not well, yet he ought to Put it on at the first, or at most the Second time of being ask'd; now what is herein Spoken, of Qualification in behaviour in Saluting, ought also to be observed in taking of Place, and Sitting down for ceremonies without Bounds is troublesome.

"28. If any one comes to Speak to you while you are Sitting Stand up tho he be your Inferiour, and when you Present Seats let it be to every one according to his Degree.

"29. When you meet with one of Greater Quality than yourself, Stop, and retire especially if it be at a Door or any Straight place to give way for him to Pass.

"30. In walking the highest Place in most Countrys Seems to be on the right hand therefore Place yourself on the left of him whom you desire to Honour; but if three walk together the middle Place is the most Honourable the wall is usually given to the most worthy if two walk together.

"31. If any one far Surpasses others, either in age, Estate, or Merit, * * * would give Place to a meaner than himself * * * the one ought not to except it, So * * * it above once or twice.

"32. To one that is your equal, or not much inferior you are to give the chief Place in your Lodging and he to who 'tis offered ought at the first to refuse it but at the Second to accept though not without acknowledging his own unworthiness.

"3. They that are in Dignity or in office have in all places Preceedency but whilst they are Young they ought to respect those that are their equals in Birth or other Qualitys, though they have no Publick charge

"34. It is good Manners to prefer them to whom we speak before ourselves especially if they be above us with whom in no Sort we ought to begin.

"35. Let your Discourse with Men of Business be Short and Comprehensive.

"36. Artificers & Persons of low Degree ought not to use many ceremonies to Lords, or Others of high Degree but Respect and highly Honour them, and those of high Degree ought to treat them with affibility & Courtesie, without Arrogancy.

"37. In Speaking to men of Quality do not lean nor Look them full in the Face, not approach too near them at lest Keep a full Pace from them.

"33. In visiting the Sick, do not Presently play the Physician if you be not Knowing therein.

"39. In writing or Speaking, give to every Person his due Title According to his Degree & the Custom of the Place.

"40. Strive not with your Superiors in argument, but always Submit your Judgment to others with Modesty.

"41. Undertake not to Teach your equal in the art himself Professes; it flavours of arrogancy.

"Courtesie be proper to the * * * Dignity of his place * * * t yr. same with a * * * Clown and a Prince.

"43. Do not express Joy before one sick or in pain for that contrary Passion will aggravate his Misery.

"44. When a man does all he can though it Succeeds not well blame not him that did it.

"45. Being to advise or reprehend any one, consider whether it ought to be in Publick or in Private; presently, or at Some other time in what terms to do it & in reproving Shew no Signs of Cholar but do it with all Sweetness and Mildness.

"46. Take all Admonitions thankfully in what Time or Place Soever given but afterwards not being culpable take a Time or Place Convenient to let him know it that gave them.

"47. Mock not nor Jest at anything of Importance break no Jest that are Sharp Biting and if you Deliver anything witty and Pleasant abstain from Laughing thereat yourself.

"48. Wherein Wherein you reprove Another be unblameable yourself; for example is more prevalent that Precepts.

"49. Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.

"50. Be not hasty to believe flying Reports to the Disparagement of any.

"51. Wear not your Cloths, foul, unript or Dusty but See they be Brush'd once every day at least and take heed that you approach not to any Uncleaness.

"52. In your Apparel be Modest and endeavour to accomodate Nature, rather than to procure Admiration keep to the Fashion of your equals, Such as are Civil and orderly with respect to Times and Places.

"53. Run not in the Streets, neither go too slowly nor with Mouth open go not Shaking Yr. Arms * * * not upon the toes, nor in a Dancing * * *

"54. Play not the Peacock, looking everywhere about you, to See if you be well Deck't, if your Shoes fit well if your Stockings Sit neatly, and Cloths handsomely.

"55. Eat not in the Street, nor in ye House, out of Season.

"56. Associate yourself with Men of good Quality if you Esteem your own Reputation; for 'tis better to be alone than in bad Company.

"57. In walking up and Down in a House, only with One in Company, if he be Greater than yourself, at the first give him the Right hand and Stop not till he does and be not the first that turns, and when you do turn let it be with your face towards him, if he be a Man of Great Quality, walk not with him Cheek by Jowl but Somewhat behind him; but yet in Such a Manner that he may easily Speak to you.

"58. Let your Conversation be without Malice or Envy, for 'tis a Sign of a Tractable and Commendable Nature, & in all Causes of Passion admit Reason to Govern.

"59. Never express anything unbecoming, nor Act ag'tt ye Rules of Moral before your inferiours.

"60. Be not immodest in urging your Friends to Discover a Secret.

"61. Utter not base and frivilous thing amongst grave and Learn'd Men nor very Difficult Questions or Subjects, amongst the Ignorant or things hard to be believed, Stuff not your Discourse with Sentences amongst your Betters nor Equals.

"62. Speak not of doleful Things in a Time of Mirth or at the Table; Speak not of Melancholy Things a Death and Wounds, and if others Mention them Change if you can the Discourse tell not your Dreams, but to your intimate Friend.

"63. A man ought not to value himself of his Atchievements or rare Qual * * * les Virtue or Kindred.

"64. Break not a Jest where none take pleasure in mirth Laugh not aloud, nor at all without Occasion, deride no man's Misfortune, tho' there seem to be Some cause.

"65. Speak not injurious Words neither in Jest nor Earnest Scoff at none although they give Occasion.

"66. Be not forward but friendly and Courteous; the first to Salute hear and answer & be not Pensive when It's a time to converse.

"67. Detract not from others neither be excessive in Commanding.

"68. Go not thither, where you know not, whether you Shall be Welcome or not. Give not Advice whth being Ask'd & when desired do it briefly.

"69. If two contend together take not the part of either unconstrained, and be not obstinate in your Opinion, in Things indifferent be of the Major side.

"70. Reprehend not the imperfections of others for that belongs to Parents Masters and Superiours.

"71. Gaze not on the marks or blemishes of Others and ask not how they came. What you may Speak in Secret to your Friend deliver not before others.

"72. Speak not in an unknown Tongue in Company but in your own Language and that as those of Quality do and not as ye Vulgar; Sublime matters treat Seriously.

"73. Think before you Speak pronounce not imperfectly nor bring out your Words too hastily but orderly and Distinctly.

"74. When Another Speaks be attentive your Self and disturb not the Audience if any hesitate in his Words help him not nor Prompt him without desired, Interrupt him not, nor Answer him till his Speech be ended.

"75. In the midst of Discourse ask * * * but if you Perceive any Stop because of * * * to Proceed: If a Person of Quality comes in while your Conversing its handsome to Repeat what was said before.

"76. While you are talking, Point not with your Finger at him of Whom you Discourse nor Approach too near him to whom you talk especially to his face.

"77. Treat with men at fit Times about Business & Whisper not in the Company of Others.

"78. Make no Comparisons and if any of the Company be Commended for any brave act of Virtue, commend not another for the Same.

"79. Be not apt to relate News, if you know not the truth thereof. In Discoursing of things you Have heard Name not your Author always A Secret Discover not.

"80. Be not Tedius in Discourse or in reading unless you find the Company pleased therewith.

"81. Be not Curious to Know the Affairs of Others neither approach to those that Speak in Private.

"82. Undertake not what you cannot Perform but be Careful to keep your Promise.

"83. When you deliver a matter do it without Passion & with Discretion, however mean ye Person be you do it too.

"84. When your Superiors talk to any Body hearken not neither Speak nor Laugh.

"85. In Company of these Higher Quality than yourself Speak not till you are ask'd a Question then Stand upright put of your Hat & Answer in few words.

"86. In Disputes, be not so Desirous to Overcome as not to give Liberty to each one to deliver his Opinion and Submit to ye Judgment of ye Major Part especially if they are Judges of the Dispute.

"87. * * * as becomes a Man Grave * * * Settled and attentive * * * dict not at every turn what others Say.

"88. Be not tedius in Discourse, make not many Digressions, nor repeat often the Same manner of Discourse.

"89. Speak not Evil of the absent for it is unjust.

"90. Being Set at meat Scratch not neither Spit Cough or blow your Nose except there's a Necessity for it.

"91. Make no Shew of taking great Delight in your your Victuals, Feed not With Greediness; cut your Bread with a Knife, lean not on the Table neither find fault with what you Eat.

"92. Take no Salt or cut Bread with your Knife Greasy.

"93. Entertaining any one at table it is decent to present him wt meat. Undertake not to help others undesired by ye Master.

"94. If you Soak bread in the Sauce let it be no more than what you put in your Mouth at a time and blow not your broth at Table but Stay till Cools of it Self.

"95. Put not your meat to your Mouth with your Knife in your hand neither Spit forth the Stones of any fruit Pye upon a Dish nor cast anything under the table.

"96. It's unbecoming to Stoop much to ones Meat Keep your Fingers clean & when foul wipe them on a Corner of your Table Napkin.

"97. Put not another bit into your Mouth til the former be Swallowed let not your Morsels be too big for the jowls.

"98. Drink not nor talk with your mouth full neither Gaze about you while you are a Drinking.

"99. Drink not too leisurely nor yet too hastily. Before and after Drinking wipe your Lips breath not then or Ever with too Great a Noise, for its uncivil.

"100. Cleanse not your teeth with the Table Cloth Napkin Fork or Knife but if Others do it let it be done wt a Pick Tooth.

"101. Rince not your Mouth in the Presence of Others

"102. It is out of use to call upon the Company often to Eat nor need you Drink to others every Time you Drink.

"103. In Company of your Betters be not * * * than they are lay not your Arm but ar.

"104. It belongs to ye Chiefest in Company to unfold his Napkin and fall to Meat first. But he ought then to Begin in time and to Dispatch with Dexterity that ye Slowest may have time allowed him.

"105. Be not Angry at Table whatever happens & if you have reason to be so, Shew it not but on a Chearfull Countenance especially if there be Strangers for good Humour make one Dish of Meat a Feast.

"106. Set not yourself at ye upper * * * of ye Table but if it be your Due or that ye Master of ye house will have it so, Contend not lest you Should Trouble ye company.

"107. If others talk at Table be attentive but talk not with Meat in your Mouth.

"108. When you Speak of God or his Attributes, let it be Seriously & * * * Reverence, Honour & obey your Natural Parents altho they be Poor.

"109. Let your Recreations be Manfull not Sinfull.

"110. Labour to keep alive in your Breast that Little Spark of Celestial fire called Conscience."

The U.S. Navy Band Goes to South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today on George Washington's birthday, the U.S. Navy Band gives the first of a series of concerts in South America in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

I am told that the band, its chorus—the Sea Chanters—and its Navy Band combo will play for several days in the Buenos Aires area. On subsequent days the band will be heard in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and in Montevideo, Uruguay.

The opportunity to introduce the Navy Band to our friends in Latin America came without much warning. It was the best of surprises because band members have wanted to make the trip for a long time. A lack of money for such purposes made it impossible.

Then early this year the Navy authorized that a cruiser, the U.S.S. *Macon*, make a series of official state visits to certain coastal ports along the eastern shore of South America. The U.S. Navy Band which is trained in protocol was the logical choice to accompany the officer making the visit. The next step was to make the necessary arrangements.

This meant making sure engagements for the band here were not canceled without proper replacements. It entailed, I learned, the finest sort of cooperation among the armed services. It was done quietly and efficiently.

Early this month arrangements were completed. Now final scheduling for the traveling group is in process.

FLY TO CARIBBEAN

On February 6 the band and chorus flew to the Caribbean where they boarded the *Macon*. On or around March 10 they will return to this country.

The actual story of how this came about really includes as a major hero the element of chance. The opportunity to go came unexpectedly. Arrangements to go could be made. The band went.

It is a simple story. One which I feel will do much to improve relations with our friends in South America. Friendship, of course, always can be improved. The moment it is taken for granted it deteriorates.

I have tried for some time, since July 1, 1958, to see if funds for the Navy Band's visit to Latin America might not be made available through the Department of State. It seemed to me that this type of musical people-to-people contact is diplomacy at the best level. The language of music dissolves the barrier of language. Musicians themselves generally are excellent ambassadors of good will.

On July 1, 1958, I wrote to the late Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, as follows:

JULY 1, 1958.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently I had the privilege of listening to the Navy Band and its chorus, the Sea Chanters, make a recording of the Oregon State song. If you have heard them or about them, then I don't need to tell you what a superb group of performers they are.

It occurred to me that they would be good-will ambassadors of a high order wherever they went, representing as they do not only the spirit of the Navy, but of the America we all cherish.

With their discipline, dash and virtuosity they could do us a lot of good in Latin America. My suggestion is that such a tour be arranged and announced at an early date. I should like very much to have your reactions to this suggestion and would be glad to discuss it further with you or your representative.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

MANY BRIDGES TO CROSS

There were many bridges to cross. On July 20, 1959, Rear Adm. C. C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy Chief of Information, at my request provided me with details concerning the cost of sending the U.S. Navy Band to South America. A copy of his letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: In response to your verbal request for information pertaining to the proposal that the U.S. Navy Band make a tour of Latin American countries, the following is submitted in answer to your specific questions:

Question. What is the background on previous action taken, particularly the results of discussions with other governmental agencies on the matter of financing the tour?

Answer. In 1957, proposals for such a tour were made separately by both Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS of Pennsylvania, and the commandant of the Potomac River Naval Command. The idea was thoroughly explored and was supported in principle by the Chief of Naval Personnel, the Chief of Information, and the Chief of Naval Operations, but funds to effect its implementation could not be found within the Navy Department. At that point the Vice Chief of Naval Operations personally investigated the possibilities of assistance from such other Government agencies as the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration. Each agency endorsed the proposal as a fine idea, but none was in a position to provide the necessary funds. The proposal was also endorsed by the Department of Defense provided funds could be found to cover the expense. Despite all efforts, no funds could be found and the project was dropped for the time being.

Your letter of July 1, 1958, to the Secretary of State revived the Navy's interest in the idea and again the matter of funds was thoroughly explored both by the Navy's Cold War Advisory Panel and the Special Assistant for Public Affairs to the Secretary of the Navy. This action took place shortly after the Vice President's trip to South America

and the proposal was subsequently brought to his attention. He endorsed the idea and offered his support.

During the 1958 attempt, the possibility of setting up the tour under the President's fund was explored. The President's fund, administered by the Department of State, is used for the purpose of transporting individuals throughout the world on what is basically a cultural mission. Although representatives of the State Department were in favor of the Navy Band making the tour, they did not wish to designate moneys from the President's fund because (a) it would mean canceling some other (civilian) program from the schedule, and (b) no other Armed Forces unit had ever used moneys from the fund and they did not wish to establish a precedent. The project was again shelved due to lack of funds.

Question. What are the costs involved?

Answer. Costs have been estimated on the basis of the attached proposed itinerary for a 35-day tour. The band would consist of 70 enlisted musicians and 2 officers. In round numbers, the per diem for the band would amount to approximately $38,000. Transportation requirements include space for 7,300 pounds (654 cubic feet) of equipment as well as 72 individuals and their personal baggage.

Approximate figures have been worked out as follows:

(1) MATS special air mission: Two MATS C–118/R–6D-type aircraft, if available, could perform the airlift. Total cost including crew per diem, aircraft operating costs, and minimum daily charge while the aircraft are in an inoperative status, would be approximately $110,000. Thirty days leadtime is generally required for such airlifts.

(2) Navy air: Three U.S. Navy R–5D-type aircraft would be required for the tour, however the availability of these transports cannot be ascertained until the date of the tour is known. If the aircraft are available, at least 6 weeks, leadtime would be required for planning.

The total cost, including crew per diem and aircraft operations, would be approximately $27,854.

(3) Commercial air: Scheduled commercial air (Pan American) is available to most of the cities as shown on the attached itinerary. The cost, for band members only, figured at the 30-day excursion rate, would be approximately $43,315.

Band equipment and other cargo would have to be airlifted by an extra aircraft. Commercial air costs for this are not available but can be expected to be high. Pan American would have no objections if the cargo aircraft were provided by the Navy. Navy crew and aircraft costs would be approximately $9,000 for one aircraft.

Question. How much leadtime is required?

Answer. To insure a well-planned tour, it is believed that at least 9 months, and preferably a year of leadtime would be required. It would be essential to have an officer assigned full time as an advance man to visit all countries concerned several months prior to the commencement of the tour to insure that adequate facilities are available and that the band would be well taken care of and well received.

Question. Would sponsorship by an organization such as the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation be appropriate?

Answer. Sponsorship by a nonprofit, noncommercial organization would be acceptable and might have certain political advantages, since possible charges of military motive could not be made. Preliminary investigation regarding financing of the tour by industry was not encouraging.

* * * * *

The proposed tour of Latin America would be an expensive operation, but it is believed it would be extremely worth while as a people-to-people effort. If the money for such a tour can be found, you may be sure the Navy would enter into the project with the greatest enthusiasm.

Your continued personal interest in sending the U.S. Navy Band to Latin America is deeply appreciated. Please do not hesitate to call upon me if you desire additional information.

Sincerely yours,

C. C. KIRKPATRICK,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Information.

CONGRESSMEN INTERESTED

Other Members of Congress have expressed interest in the proposed southern visit. The Honorable CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, probably this House's stanchest and best friend of music, told me he thought the visit would be a good idea. In 1957 he proposed such a trip.

The Honorable CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat of Connecticut, wrote me December 23, 1959, as follows:

I agree that the idea of sending the Navy Band to South America is a good one but frankly I can't see any likelihood that one of the major private foundations could see its way clear to subsidize it. I do hope that some way can be found to send the Navy Band to South America. I hope there will be official reconsideration by the Government.

Reconsideration in this particular case would not have to be made, but similar financial need may arise again and again. I hope that more funds may somehow be apportioned for this sort of work.

I know that the Navy Band will be warmly welcomed in South America, as have other groups such as the National Symphony Orchestra.

The U.S. Navy Band will have one of the most important assignments of its historic career when it plays at the American Embassy in Buenos Aires for the reception honoring the President of the United States. The assignment was not prearranged, I am told. It was a happy coincidence, a most opportune crossing of schedules for the President, the citizens of Argentina and the U.S. Navy Band members. It is a day of special honor for able Comdr. Charles Brendler and the other Navy men taking part in the tour.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my recent letter to Secretary of State Herter suggesting earlier that there might be funds within the department for a visit and the reply for the Department by Assistant Secretary William B. Macomber, Jr.:

JANUARY 4, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is not a new idea to have an American band tour Latin America in the interest of improved relations. A recent tour by the National Symphony was, as you no doubt know, a great success. Not long ago the Air Force Band, as I recall, had great successes also in Latin America.

Enclosed is a thermofax of a letter I received July 21 from Rear Admiral Kirkpatrick. The Navy would like to send its band to South America but they need about $53,000 for a 30-day tour and apparently this money cannot be located.

I am referring this matter to you in the hopes that there may be funds within the State Department or available to it which could be used for this very worthy purpose.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1960.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Your letter of January 4, 1960, inquiring about the availability of State Department funds to finance a tour of the Navy Band has been received.

There is no question that the appearances abroad of bands, orchestras, and other musical groups drawn from our military services have enjoyed great success in appearances before civilian audiences abroad. Tours by units from the Army, Marines, and Air Force have handsomely supplemented our efforts in many areas where our financial resources were inadequate to have as extensive a program as we would have liked.

The Department has worked actively with the service units involved in laying out itineraries and other details to insure the success of these appearances. Among many others, the appearances of the Air Force Symphony in the Far East, the Seventh Army Symphony in Europe, and the Marine Band unit at Edinburgh perhaps deserve special mention. These tours were all undertaken at no cost to the cultural presentations program of the Department of State.

The Department would be delighted to see the Navy Band join the ranks of these groups appearing abroad. It regrets, however, that it is unable to offer financial assistance to this end. With limited resources at its disposal, the Department feels that it should emphasize the artistic and creative achievements of this country under a free enterprise system. This has meant emphasis on the presentation of groups which have developed and flourish in America without Government support or subsidy. Since the funds to portray this kind of development are inadequate to do the job that our Foreign Service posts believe needs to be done, we see no way we can support the requests of the military services to assist them on goodwill tours.

Should the Navy find the resources which are apparently available to other service units for tours of music groups, we would be happy to work with them in developing a tour itinerary and assist any other way possible. We offer them the strongest encouragement to contribute to a truer complete picture of American musical and cultural life.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Constituents Are Indignant at Congressional Failure To Repeal Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that before too long a bill such as was recently introduced by 16 House Democrats will be reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. In this connection, it would seem to me that the provisions of that particular bill are so wide of the guidelines laid down in President Eisenhower's farm message that there can be no meeting ground or agree-

ment between this legislation and the views of the administration.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I see in this bill the basis of a partisan debate, a veto, and finally of an election issue, but the consumer, the farmer, and the taxpayer, I predict, will continue to suffer under the present price support program which everyone must agree was aptly described by the President when he said: "It defies commonsense."

As the author of H.R. 10350 to repeal farm supports and in doing so to use the Government-held surplus food products in a way so as not to disrupt domestic or world marketings, I have strong reason to believe that the public will not accept failure of Congress to enact a new program in a kindly light.

The people accepted a program to prevent wartime scarcity when there was a war. But continuing it year after year in peacetime with ever-increasing surpluses through its stimulating effect is no longer accepted.

Also the people looked favorably on its objective of easing the plight of small farmers, but with the large percentage of the subsidy going to big operators, there is strong and widespread objection to the way the legislation has worked out.

My mail is heavy with expressions of constituents who are indignant about the failure of Congress to do anything about the problem.

My barometer of grassroots opinions is significant. It registers that if Congress fails to enact, and promptly, a measure which does away with an outmoded law the voters will surely visit their wrath on both city as well as rural representatives who neglect to end this fiasco.

This is a sample of what my people at home say:

I consider our handling of the farm surplus to be disgraceful.

I am not in favor of subsidizing large corporations in agriculture.

We feel farming has evolved to the point it is a form of mass produced, big business. It, therefore, should stand on its own competitive feet as any industry does today.

Stop handing out money to farmers.

The Colfax, Wash, grain growers, a co-op recently built, are operating a bowling alley. If they have excess capital give it back to the farmers.

Mr. PELLY, I want to congratulate you on your agricultural bill. I feel it is a step in the right direction.

In regard to the farm program, it definitely should be cut. Even the cost of storing surplus grain is a staggering sum of money each year.

I have no sympathy for price support and soil bank when its purpose is defeated by devious tactics like increasing the yield and holding worthless land out of cultivation. The latter should call for severe censure if not prosecution. It is a fraud.

The farm problem is really serious now and I do not presume to know the right answers, only I know the big farmers have grown richer while the smaller family sized farms are disappearing.

I feel Secretary Benson is sincerely trying to do right by both farmers and the Nation at large.

No businessman or wage earner gets a guarantee of an income by the Federal Government. Why farmers? Farm subsidies and price support is unfair to 95 percent of the people and bad for the other 5 percent.

Agriculture price supports should be dropped, period.

There should be none.

Stop making millionaires out of the big farmers.

Never thought I would live to see such a crazy deal as we have now and I used to be a stock rancher. Better to sell the grain cheaper for feed than storing it.

Income taxes should be drastically reduced and Federal expenditures should be curtailed correspondingly by dropping price supports.

I think the Government should not meddle with the farmers' affairs too much.

Don't you think we taxpayers are getting sick and tired of the ridiculous farm support program?

I feel the farm subsidy should be discontinued entirely.

Stanford Radar Signal Bounced Off Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to call your attention to a recent article in the Hayward, Calif., Daily Review dealing with a breakthrough by a group of Stanford University scientists who have succeeded in bouncing radar signals off the sun.

I commend the article to the reading of my colleagues.

STANFORD RADAR SIGNAL BOUNCED OFF SUN—ROUND TRIP IN 17 MINUTES

PALO ALTO.—For the first time, man has made direct contact with the sun.

A radar signal was sent with the speed of light from the Standard University campus to the center of the solar system, from which it bounced back to a waiting receiver 17 minutes later.

This epochal achievement was reported by scientists of the university's Radioscience Laboratory (formerly the Radio Propagation Laboratory).

The sun, an object of worship since primitive times, continues to be regarded with great interest and respect by modern scientists. They considered it one of the most difficult bodies in our solar system to reach by radar, not only because of its stupendous distance, but especially because of the thunderous radio noise arising from its turbulent surface.

The Stanford achievement was disclosed by Prof. Von R. Eshleman, Lt. Col. Robert C. Barthle, and Dr. Philip B. Gallagher.

CODIRECTORS

Drs. Eshleman and Gallagher are codirectors of the project. Colonel Barthle is an Army Signal Corps officer now studying for a doctoral degree at Stanford. Their work was supported primarily by the Air Force Cambridge Research Center.

These initial contacts open the way for intensive solar explorations by radar, using improved techniques and more powerful transmitters.

Stanford and other radio science centers, probably including some in Russia, are readying such equipment.

Scientists hope, among other things, to learn more about solar flares and similar violent eruptions that hurl streams of particles into space.

These particles, trapped in the earth's magnetic field, from the radiation belts which pose a serious threat to space travel.

Their release from the sun is usually followed on earth by vivid displays of Northern Lights, by magnetic storms, and by complete blackout of long-distance radio communications. They are believed to affect weather, too.

Scientists also are anxious to study disturbances in the sun's outer corona. It probably is not possible to foresee the most valuable information to be gained, they suggest.

The Stanford achievement climaxes radar space explorations that began in 1946 when a Signal Corps group bounced a signal off the moon. The sun, at 93 million miles, is 400 times farther away. It is equal to more than 7,000 times the distance around the world.

Radar contact with the planet Venus, 8 million miles away, was announced last year by MIT's Lincoln Laboratory. The Venus signal took about five minutes for the round trip.

The Stanford solar contacts were recorded on magnetic tape at daybreak of April 7, 10, and 12, 1959. To the human ear these tapes reveal nothing but unintelligible crashing sounds.

GIVEN MEANING

Translated into decibels and wave patterns, the sounds commence to have meaning. In this form they also can be analyzed by electronic computers.

The Stanford group spent months examining the material. Tens of millions of computations were required to separate the signal echoes hidden in the background noise, which was 50,000 times stronger. The final tabulation shows a 99.999 percent certainty of their results.

Professor Eshleman said the echo did not come from the sun's visible surface, but from its outer corona. He estimates that the reflection occurred approximately 500,000 miles out.

The group emphasized that their equipment was not especially designed for the solar radar try. Most of it is used in ionospheric research. Rather they attributed their success to the combining of equipment used in various radio science research projects, plus the enthusiastic cooperation of other scientists at Stanford and elsewhere.

In particular they singled out for credit Prof. O. G. Vilyard, Jr., director of the Radioscience Laboratory; Prof. Allan M. Peterson; Dr. Philip Newman and the late Dr. Joseph Casey, Jr., both of the Air Force Cambridge Research Center; research assistant T. V. Huang; and graduate students William A. Long, Richard D. Egan, and David S. Pratt.

FORTY THOUSAND WATTS

The groups' transmitter is a standard model, about the same as those in major commercial short-wave radio stations. Its average output is 40,000 watts.

The antenna is a four-unit rhombic array used for both sending and receiving. It consists of wires strung out on 22 power poles over 14 acres of campus meadow.

The signal frequency was low for radar—25.6 megacycles. It was chosen to minimize signal absorption by the sun's corona.

The transmitter was turned on and off in 30-second pulses for 15 minutes, then kept silent while awaiting the echo.

Radar is a fresh addition to science's growing kit of tools for exploring the heavens.

Its use is designated "radar astronomy" to differentiate it from that other, slightly older technique, radio astronomy.

The latter depends on radio signals that originate in the cosmos, but radar astronomy generates its own man-made signal. Study of the signal's transmission time and power loss tells something of the unknowns its encounters out in space.

Scientists expect to be able to use radar to explore the entire solar system. Beyond the planets, radio noise becomes too intense and distances too great. And one would have to wait more than 8 years for a radar echo from the nearest star outside our solar system.

Nathaniel Plumer Fetterman Outstanding Western Pennsylvania Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, as a matter of western Pennsylvania history, the biography of Nathaniel Plumer Fetterman, one of the outstanding Pennsylvania lawyers of the 19th century which is outlined in the Biographical Encyclopaedia of Pennsylvania of the 19th century. This encyclopedia was published by the Galaxy Publishing Co., in Philadelphia, Pa., in 1874:

NATHANIEL PLUMER FETTERMAN

N. P. Fetterman, lawyer, was born in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania, February 4, 1804. While in his infancy, his mother and father re-moved to this country, where he resided and acquired his preliminary education until ready to commence the study of law. His course of legal studies he pursued in the office of his elder brother, Washington W. Fetterman, for many years an influential and leading member of the bar of western Pennsylvania; and, upon attaining his majority, was admitted to practice August 14, 1825. Subsequently he re-moved to Bedford in this State, where, after a residence of several years, he represented Bedford County in the lower branch of the legislature for 3 successive years, about the year 1828. To him may be credited the origin of the present common-school system; while through his ability and perseverence, the first law inaugurating it in this State was passed through the legislature. At the expiration of his third term, he was urged to become a candidate for Congress from the Bedford district; declining the proffered honor, however, he devoted his time and attention almost exclusively to the fulfillment of his professional duties. In 1830, he re-moved to Beaver, Pa.; resided there until 1949, and finally returned to Pittsburgh. He was the leading member of the bar in the region comprising the counties of Beaver, Butler, Mercer, and Lawrence; his principal competitors at that time being the Honorable Daniel Agnew, now chief justice of this State, and the Honorable John J. Pearson, now judge of the Harrisburg district court. To these three eminent practitioners was chiefly allotted the task of settling the many complicated questions of title resulting from the peculiar system under which the lands west and north of the Allegheny River were held; and in the numerous and highly important actions of ejectment continually arising, he constantly took an active and able part, his opponents invariably being one of the two above-named judges. In all such cases he evinced unusual attainments and valuable abilities. In 1849, he returned to Pittsburgh and entered into partnership with his nephew, Gilbert L. B. Fetterman, under the firm name of N. P. and G. L. B. Fetterman, this association continuing for several years. Subsequently, he was a leading member of the Pittsburgh bar, and attended also the courts of the neighboring counties, participating in almost every case of importance, both civil and criminal. In the celebrated case of the *Commonwealth* v. *Montgomery et al.*, for the murder of Dinsmore, in Washington County; and also in the case of the *Commonwealth* v. *Streets*, for murder in Beaver County, he was retained by the Commonwealth, and distinguished himself by his learning, patient research, and shrewdness. Until the outbreak of the war, he was a prominent member of the Democratic Party, and one of its leading orators in western Pennsylvania. During the Presidency of James Buchanan, he was repeatedly solicited to accept various positions of trust and honor, but invariably declined both public office and emolument. While the conflict was raging, he warmly advocated the Union cause; acted as a War Democrat, and finally joined the Republican Party, of which he afterward became an active and influential ally. He gave two sons to the U.S. Army, as members of the 101st Pennsylvania Volunteers, and was bereft of a son-in-law, who was mortally wounded before Atlanta, Ga. He was also actively engaged in assisting the enlistment, and aided more than one company in the purchase of its necessary equipment. He served as chairman of the examining committee of Pittsburgh, to pass judgment upon all applications for admission to practice; and, in this responsible position, acted with admirable judgment and impartial discretion. He was constantly consulted by attorneys from all parts of the State, for his opinion on points of law; and, upon such occasions, his decisions ever evidenced close research and the most thorough knowledge concerning the various complicated points at issue. He was married December 28, 1828, to Anna M. Dillon, daughter of Humphrey Dillon, a well-known citizen of Bedford, Pa. He has left eight children surviving him, among whom is S. C. Fetterman, a prominent member of the bar, and of the select council of Pittsburgh, Pa.

In Commemoration of the Heroic Dead of the Battleship "Maine"

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following letters from Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo and Minister Plenipotentiary Mauro Calingo of the Philippines and the Minister and Chargé d'Affairs Enrique Patterson of the Republic of Cuba:

FEBRUARY 16, 1960.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have been informed by Minister Mauro Calingo of the eloquent and inspiring address that you made today on the floor of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 62d anniversary of the destruction of the battleship *Maine*. It was the destruction of the *Maine* which, by a chain of events, led to the Spanish-American War, which in turn brought the United States to the Philippines.

Our association for about 50 years has been most cordial and friendly and, indeed, of mutual benefit to our two peoples. As we look back over the years, we arrive at a common point of origin of our historic association, and that is the destruction of the *Maine* on February 15, 1898.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the remarkable work you have done and are doing almost singlehandedly in reminding the American people of the proper significance of the destruction of the *Maine*.

Sincerely yours,

CARLOS P. ROMULO.

EMBASSY OF THE PHILIPPINES.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I wish to thank you for inviting me to be present when you addressed the House of Representatives today on the occasion of the 62d anniversary of the destruction of the battleship *Maine*. It was a stirring and eloquent speech and it reminded me of the previous commemoration of this historic event at the Department of Commerce Auditorium during which I had the honor of sharing the stage with you.

The destruction of the *Maine* is memorable not only for the peoples of the United States, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, but also for the people of the Philippines because it was this event which started the historic association between our two countries. The warm and friendly understanding which has marked that association has not diminished, but has grown with the years. I have no doubt but that the problems now facing our two countries can be solved to our mutual satisfaction if we but allow the spirit of 1898 which led the United States to liberate Cuba to permeate the negotiations between our two Governments.

Permit me to congratulate you, sir, on your inspired and stirring address today and to salute you on this occasion which, more than anyone, you have done so much to project before the American people.

Sincerely yours,

MAURO CALINGO,
Minister Plenipotentiary.

The people of Cuba during the 19th century had been fighting for their freedom from Spain. The final chapter of her struggle was initiated on February 24, 1895, under the leadership of Jose Marti, the apostle of her independence. The sinking of the *Maine* on February 15, 1898, in the harbor of Havana, marked an episode of great significance because it brought as a consequence, the Cuban-Spanish-American War, and the emergence of Cuba as an independent State.

Today, with dignity and pride, Cuba shows a will and determination to preserve her freedom and democratic way of life. She extends her friendship to all the peoples of the world and particularly to the people of the United States with whom she has strong bonds of respect and affection.

It is highly commendable to praise the persons and organizations that throughout the years have helped to maintain in the mind of the people a historical event of such importance.

ENRIQUE PATTERSON,
Minister and Chargé d'Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the above letters be inserted in the permanent RECORD immediately following my remarks on February 16, 1960, in commemoration of the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.

Appendix

The Modern District Attorney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very learned address by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] delivered in the city of New Orleans on February 19, 1960, entitled "The Modern D.A."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE MODERN D.A."

(Address of Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, before the Third Annual Attorney General's Conference, New Orleans, La.)

When Jack Gremillion asked me to address the Third Annual Attorney General's Conference of Louisiana, I was pleased to accept. I always enjoy coming to Louisiana. And in my first year in the Senate I have been grateful for the counsel and help of your two distinguished Senators, RUSSELL LONG and ALLEN ELLENDER. They are capable men of good will who represent the State of Louisiana and the United States in a fine and honorable fashion. I know you are rightfully proud of them.

Being a lawyer and having been a judge and a prosecutor, I thought I could talk rather informally to my fellow members of the bar who are working in the field of criminal law enforcement. It was after I accepted the invitation that I learned that there would be included in the audience not only the district attorneys, but their strong right arm—the sheriffs of the 64 parishes of Louisiana and also your coroners who I understand to be professional doctors.

It was with some trepidation that it dawned upon me that I just couldn't while away some time with my friends at the bar, but instead would be addressing a formidable group of dedicated public servants including the ancient and honorable institution of the sheriff and the respected and professionally competent office of the Louisiana coroner.

The challenge seemed a rather confusing one, but after reflecting on my own experience I concluded that I have a good background in dealing with confusing problems. In my own State, we have a rather unique situation in that we have both a county attorney and a district attorney who have a divided jurisdiction in criminal matters. The county attorney has the responsibility for issuing the complaint and proceeding with a criminal case through the initial stage of a preliminary hearing. If the preliminary hearing results in a "bind-over" the county attorney then loses all jurisdiction and it becomes the responsibility of the district attorney to proceed with the trial. The county attorney has both civil and criminal jurisdiction, but the district attorney has only criminal powers, except he handles reciprocal support cases.

I submit that having been a judge for 10 years and a county attorney for 8 years under such an arrangement makes me an authority on confusing situations.

In a more serious vein, however, all of you have the same objective—and that is the diligent and just administration of the criminal law. This is a most important and sober public business—and particularly so in view of the international climate of the 20th century.

Underlying the structure and fabric of our law is a Bill of Rights designed to protect the life of every citizen, his liberty and his property. At the time they framed this charter of liberties, the lawyers who in an earlier day set the fires of the Revolution were mentally smarting from the personal abuses heaped upon them by king and government and the violation of personal and property rights that had been secured to freemen by the Magna Carta. Officers of the king had broken into shops and homes of friends and neighbors, searched and seized anything and everything at pleasure. Respected and honored citizens had not been free of arrest upon a hint or a sly suggestion of a petty official. Often they were imprisoned on suspicion with no opportunity to be heard and without a fair trial.

Out of their bitter memories they wrote into the Constitution basic and fundamental principles to restrain any excesses of government and check any arbitrary power that might invade the rights of personal liberty and private property.

Today the principles of freedom and fair play are being challenged and opposed around the world by totalitarian ideology that denies the existence of God and subjects the individual to arbitrary naked power of the state.

The greater threat to the rule of law in any of the nations of our free world is the danger that the people will become dissatisfied with the functioning of their system of justice and do irreparable injury to it, without realizing that by so doing they are destroying the very foundation of the rule of law in their society.

It is our professional responsibility to keep the pulse of life beating strongly in the law. We cannot do this by treating our fundamental freedoms as abstract theoretical concepts of a legal system. The people of the free world must learn to believe those freedoms to be what we believe them to be, the practical dynamic concepts for living, unalienable in every human being.

In earlier days the status of law in other nations was not a vital concern to us. But we are living in an era where it is no longer possible to ignore the attitudes of other peoples. This state of society is the result of two factors. Under the impact of science and technology our world is shrinking. And old empires are dissolving into new nations, filled with aspiration not unlike our own.

The tremendous success of scientists and technicians has left a gap between our scientific discoveries and their beneficial and peaceful utilization within the framework of the institutions devised to insure freedom and rights of the individual. The bridging of this gap may well prove to be the legal framework of free societies in the making.

If we reflect on the issues at stake in the cold war, if we analyze its deepest meaning, we come to the inevitable conclusion that among the most essential values at stake are legal ones: the relation between citizen and state, the liberty and liberties of individuals.

Obviously, our system is under attack and tremendous pressure from without. Our national survival will depend upon our internal social strength. We cannot be strong in a democracy unless we can effectively enforce the criminal laws and at the same time safeguard the sacred right of the individual.

You are the agents of your State who from day to day must work and live with the criminal law, its ramifications and complexities. The strength of our Nation and the reputation it enjoys in the world are in your hands. Only if the criminal law is fairly and properly administered can this Nation survive in its present democratic form.

Keeping in mind the necessity of effectively enforcing the criminal law and at the same time safeguarding the rights of individuals it is somewhat disconcerting to look at the results.

J. Edgar Hoover in the February 1960 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin made this rather dramatic statement:

"America today is threatened by a sinister, unholy alliance which saps the strength of our Nation and besmirches our country's dignity.

"To the profession of law enforcement, this dark force is known as organized crime—a lawless legion of extortionists, strong-arm hoodlums, and professional racketeers whose greed reaches into every community of our land. Their lust for power and profit costs American citizens an astounding $22 billion a year. No longer are their victims necessarily rich individuals of position who were the targets of the so-called 'syndicates' of the 1920's and 1930's. Professional hoodlums have turned to looting every class. Their prey is the small businessman; the legitimate industry; and the unwary community which leaves its door open to supposedly minor vices.

"Organized crime exists by exploiting weaknesses throughout our society whether they be city ordinances, county codes, State statutes, or Federal laws. The lawless legion infiltrates through every loophole, its booty flowing into underworld coffers whether it be nickels and dimes from a jukebox in a bar in the smallest town or from a multimillion-dollar stranglehold on large metropolitan centers obtained through the domination of a few dishonest labor officials. The depredations are an endless shame to the countless honest, law-abiding labor leaders and businessmen across the Nation."

The latest available figures dealing with criminal activity in the United States are published in the 1958 Uniform Crime Reports. The figures are astonishing. For the 1958 calendar year the following criminal offenses were reported:

Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 3,870 for an increase of 3.2 percent over 1957; forcible rape, 7,622 for an increase of 13 percent over 1957; robbery, 56,207 for an increase of 13.7 percent over 1957; aggravated assault, 72,460 for an increase of 3.5 percent over 1957; burglary, 427,457 for an increase of 11.8 percent over 1957; larceny ($50 and over), 272,805 for an increase of 10.3 percent over 1957; auto theft, 196,784 for an increase of 1.9 percent over 1957.

It should be of interest to us that during the calendar year 1957 45 police officers were killed in the performance of their duties.

It is apparent that organized crime is growing. Starting with the days of prohibition, we saw the advent in America of organized crime on a large scale. There were different mobs operating in well-defined territories in the handling of liquor and these mobs often warred with each other. Their organization was loose and their methods were crude compared with the type of organized crime which I perceive to exist at the present time.

Since the 1930's crime has become better organized and criminals often operate with the best legal and accounting advice. They have adopted corporate methods in the handling of vast enterprises.

There is no lack of money in these criminal enterprises. It is estimated that narcotics peddlers take between 180 and 300 million dollars a year from a gullible public. In the field of labor racketeering the take could amount to $100 million very easily. It is estimated that between 14 and 16 billion dollars are involved in gambling enterprises of one sort or another in this country. Of this amount, over $2 billion goes into the pockets of the gamblers and the syndicates. I shall not try to estimate the millions of dollars which are involved in the distilling and sale of illegal alcohol, or in the other areas of criminal activity.

Needless to say, most of this money is not reported on income tax returns—it is "hot money." As such, it goes into the channels of illicit trade such as narcotics, vice, and other enterprises. Some of it, I believe, goes into bank accounts in Switzerland identified only by a number and kept in great secrecy by bank officials, and is siphoned off abroad where it can be invested without fear of discovery.

It is no wonder then that these organized criminals recognize the necessity of setting up as a control an invisible government whose edicts are carried out by unknown enforcers and nameless assassins and who, themselves, are not prohibited from employing the most modern devices to perpetrate their crimes and to conceal them. It is not beyond conception that they will attempt to buy protection from those who enforce the law.

I do not wish to belabor the point and I do not wish to appear as an alarmist, but it is important to recognize the threat posed by the modern criminal—he is a modern man, with modern tools at his disposal and the know-how to use them. He is represented by modern attorneys. He deals in and with the modern corporate institutions. He circles the globe in modern airplanes and he has readily available to him modern means of communications that can put him, within minutes, in touch with almost any place in the world.

We cannot cope with a jet-age criminal with a horse and buggy prosecutor. We need a modern district attorney, with modern tools and the legal right to use them. The right to wire tap, with proper safeguards, is essential.

The prosecutor needs to become a specialist and as such should have some specialized training. There was a time when the only training a prosecutor received was on the battlefield. As a specialized profession, however, the situation is changing, and for the better. The prosecutor now has some inservice training schools which are doing a great deal toward professionalizing the office. The good that is accomplished through conferences such as this is immeasurable. There is the short course for prosecutors at Northwestern University. There are the PLI, the University of California, and some others. I submit that it is in the public interest that attendance by prosecutors should be at public expense since the public reaps the benefits in better service.

The professional prosecutor needs a professional library and the public needs to be educated as to the wisdom of paying for one. In many States the bar association can be persuaded to cooperate in the development of a good library for the prosecutor.

I am proud of the small part I have played in the National Association of County and Prosecuting Attorneys—now the National District Attorneys' Association. Through this association of prosecutors there is a continual exchange of information and ideas. And through this exchange, members not only become more competent in their duties, but they discover that many situations arise where they can be helpful to each other and thereby discharge their duties better. This cooperation of district attorneys can be and is fruitful.

Of course, the prosecutor can do a great deal to improve the effectiveness of his office by helping to train the personnel of the other offices with which he works. Classes and lectures for the police officers and sheriff's force can pay untold dividends in cooperation and in giving direction to the efficient performance of their duties.

Fortunately the prosecutor is beginning to learn the value of new and modern tools in meeting the challenge—and fortunately new and better tools are becoming available—the wire tap—the FBI lab—the medical examiner and other scientific laboratories. Also the regular exchange of information about criminals and their activities has been greatly facilitated. The best tool which we have, however, is the well-trained, competent and imaginative professional prosecutor.

In the complex society of a democracy the modern district attorney must be a man of dedication, strength and honor beyond reproach. This is by far the most important quality.

When the district attorney obtains a guilty verdict from the jury in a criminal case, people usually crowd around offering him congratulations for his victory. I suppose that everyone has witnessed this kind of scene. But what I often wonder is whether these congratulations are offered because of a job done with diligence and skill or whether the congratulations are offered simply because the district attorney has won his case. When the district attorney gets a conviction and particularly when the case has notoriety and widespread attention, there are crowds of people who push forward and exult. On the other hand, when the prosecuting attorney dismisses an indictment or dismisses a case after it has come to trial or when he for reasons of his own refuses to seek a complaint or an indictment, how many are there to congratulate him then? I submit that the usual reaction in the latter case is for people to raise their eyebrows or to suggest darkly that the prosecutor has been bought off by money or political pressure or by some other nefarious action.

A district attorney who has wrestled with the facts and the motives and the people involved in a human situation and who has perhaps spent sleepless nights thinking about his case may well be exhibiting more courage and may well be better executing his office when he dismisses and fails to prosecute than when he takes the defendant before a jury.

In saying this I do not wish to convey the impression that there are vast numbers of people improperly accused of crime because I recognize that usually when a person is accused by a police officer or other law enforcement personnel there is substantial basis for the accusation and the ordinary procedure is for the prosecutor to go ahead with his presentation in court. But there are situations occurring in every prosecutor's office where the honorable and human thing to do is to dismiss, even though such action usually will be unpopular with law enforcement agencies and with the press.

And on the other hand, the prosecutor must be ever watchful not to usurp the legitimate function of the court. This is a constant challenge to the prosecutor's attitude, courage, intellectual honesty and motives in the exercise of his office.

Another of the important aspects of the prosecutor's job is to deal with the public. In some cases the police department creates a friendly and cooperative relationship with people, but more often than not, a rather hostile relationship ensues. The court is remote from the people and few citizens have an opportunity to deal with the court unless they are involved in a trial, and then of course, the relationship must be very formal and somewhat impersonal. But the prosecutor has to deal daily and on a close personal basis with the people in his jurisdiction. His office should be a place where people can come with their problems and can receive a sympathetic hearing. One admonition that I would give to every prosecutor is to remember that whenever a citizen comes in with a problem, it is to that citizen a problem of great importance and seriousness. The event may seem routine to one experienced in the law. There may be a dozen or more of these incidents brought into the office every day, but to the individual who brings his problem, this event is the most important thing in the world at that time. A prosecutor who properly discharges his duty will treat people in his office so that each feels that he has a sympathetic hearing and that he is understood. And of course the people who come daily include victims of crime, worried parents, evicted tenants, deserted children, and some who might be classed as crackpots. Even in the case of the crackpot, it is desirable to take enough time to let him feel that he has been heard and then to dismiss him without harshness or abruptness.

Many people who come to the office of the prosecutor will be seeking legal advice in personal civil maters. The ordinary citizen who is unlearned in the functions of the prosecutor's office feels that the elected prosecutor is his public lawyer and he will present questions of nonsupport, rental evictions, unpaid debts, and all manner of problems. If the prosecutor undertakes to advise fully all of these people, he not only will spend his full time so doing, but he will run afoul of the bar association which will resent the diversion of civil business from the practicing lawyers in the area, and rightly so. But in explaining the necessity of seeking legal counsel from a private practitioner, the prosecutor can be human and helpful. Many people can be helped with just a word or two of counsel, whereas others will have long and complicated problems. Each case must be dealt with as it arises, but the prosecutor should be careful not to brush off or refuse to see citizens who come in with private legal problems. He should be helpful where he can and he should direct the person to seek private legal counsel with a full explanation of the necessity for so doing.

Still another area where a prosecutor finds many of his problems is in dealing with juveniles. Most States have statutes which provide that a juvenile cannot commit a crime but that if he performs the acts which would constitute a crime if they were performed by an adult, then the juvenile is considered a delinquent child. There usually is an additional provision that under certain circumstances and in certain age groups a juvenile may be prosecuted as an adult. In principle, however, a juvenile is considered in a different manner from the adult and the prosecutor must be fully cognizant of this difference. He must be prepared to work with the juvenile authorities in a situation which is completely dif-

ferent from his court appearances in ordinary criminal cases.

Another problem which confronts every conscientious prosecutor is the relationship which he maintains with the police force or the sheriff's office in his jurisdiction. No prosecutor can function properly without the help and cooperation of the police department or sheriff who is charged with the apprehension of criminals and is responsible for the gathering, preservation and presentation of evidence before the court. Ordinarily the police officials expect the prosecutor to vigorously prosecute and surely convict every person who is arrested and charged with a crime. To be popular with the police department, it would seem that a prosecutor would try every person accused, regardless. And it is true that in cases where in his judgment it is not legally feasible to prosecute and he dismisses or for some other reason the case is dropped, there is often a feeling of resentment and hostility from the police department. To avert such resentment and conflict, it is my recommendation that the prosecutor take the police department into his full confidence in the consideration of every case. It is my belief that he will be better respected for standing his ground and refusing to prosecute when he has a sound reason for taking this action, provided that he clearly states this reason to the police. Some prosecutors tend to be patronizing or even a little disdainful of the police. Of course this attitude brings the expected reciprocation from the officers. It is also sometimes a problem when the prosecutor maintains an investigative force of his own. Unless the closest of liaison between the prosecutor's investigators and the police force is maintained, they will often be at cross purposes and the police will be suspicious and resentful of the activity of the investigators. If proper liaison is maintained, the investigator from the prosecutor's office can serve a very useful purpose and, of course, be a safeguard against corruption within the police force.

A very important part of the prosecutor's relationship to the police department is with reference to the public image created by the relationship. I suspect that there is nothing that will cause the public to lose its confidence and trust in both the prosecutor and the sheriff faster than the image of bickering and lack of cooperation between these two offices. And the effectiveness of both offices can be seriously jeopardized by such a public image. But neither should the public feel that the prosecutor always followed the police, that he was in their pocket.

The relation of the prosecutor with the judge or judges before whom he appears is of great importance. It must be remembered that the prosecutor occupies a sensitive position in his community and that figuratively all eyes are upon him. If the prosecutor maintains an extremely close personal relationship with the court, it is then suspected that the judge is influenced to do exactly what the prosecutor wishes, or that "things are worked out in advance." If this impression grows in the minds of the people, then their confidence in the administration of justice is undermined. It is apparent, however, that the prosecutor should maintain a friendly, although respectful, relationship with the court, because he must work constantly with the judge and he can better discharge his obligation if they are working in harmony. But again the local situation must be evaluated. Each prosecutor must decide for himself to what extent he can develop a close social relationship without impairing his effectiveness in the community. Judges are human, too, and cannot be totally ignored socially, but without a doubt some degree of restraint must be exercised.

The relationship of the prosecutor with the local press is of great importance. Of course the cynic will say that it is of importance for the prosecutor to get a laudatory press so that he can be reelected or can use his office as a steppingstone to higher political endeavor. But I mean that the relationship is of great importance in getting the job done with which the prosecutor is currently charged. In the first instance, the inhabitants of the jurisdiction must have confidence in the prosecutor. Unless the press reports his activities in a reasonable and straightforward manner, he can be greatly misunderstood and can be hampered in the execution of his office. The press, of course, is anxious to print news and vie for a scoop in running a story. Oftentimes the press will uncover bits of evidence unknown to the prosecutor or to the police. In those instances the press can be of great value if their cooperation has been obtained. Sometimes the press comes into possession of information which should be kept confidential for a period of time and the question arises then whether the press can be persuaded to exercise restraint on publishing the information. If the prosecutor has built the right kind of relationship with the press over a period of time, his request ordinarily will be respected. It is recommended that the prosecutor habitually take the press into his confidence and reveal whatever information he has with the request that matters which could be damaging to his investigation or prosecution be withheld for a reasonable length of time. If the prosecutor is reasonable in his request for restraint and if he is scrupulous in keeping his word with the press, he can ordinarily have complete cooperation. The matter is, of course, a two-way street, and whenever the prosecutor is in possession of information which is newsworthy and which can be published without damage, then he should go out of his way to reveal it to members of the press who are charged with gathering such information. The conscientious and fairminded prosecutor most certainly will refrain from trying his case in the newspapers. Restraint is indicated because of the temptation to use the press before trial.

Perhaps one of the greatest problems facing today's prosecutor is that of his salary. He is generally a well-trained, competent and professional attorney. His responsibilities are large and complex, and the demands on his time are excessive. This is the age-old problem of salaries for public officers, but here it is magnified since the public at large fails to realize the responsibilities involved and the value of professional legal competence. To hold any public office generally involves personal sacrifice but in the case of attorneys, the sacrifice is usually larger.

Because of this simple fact new problems are created. The prosecutor usually needs and looks for additional sources of income. He practices law on the side, either solo or in partnership and then the delicate problem of conflict of interest raises its head to haunt the prosecutor and constantly to subject him to criticism, either warranted or unwarranted, of the press and the profession. The result is, of course, a loss of confidence by the public. I needn't tell you what this leads to.

In the same general area the prosecutor is always subject to the pressures and influence of groups who want favors and the temptation is strong to dispense such favors in the hopes of winning votes. It is interesting to note that such favor seekers consist of not only the criminal element, but also the chamber of commerce, labor groups, racial groups, churches, in fact, almost everyone—this seems to be the American way of life. The prosecutor who succumbs, however, is surely undermining his own effectiveness and will eventually pay the price.

It is necessary because of these problems for the prosecutor to have the finest sense of discretion—to be absolutely honest and of unquestioned integrity. This seems to me to be the only answer and it is a standard which the great majority of prosecutors meets.

I have spent considerable time talking about the problems of prosecutors—these are the problems you live with daily—the problems each prosecutor must resolve for himself. But, the trust and the challenge of the prosecutor are greater than any one of these problems—in fact, greater than all of them put together.

The Supreme Court of New Jersey has said:

"In his county, as we have seen the prosecutor is the foremost representative of the executive branch of the government in the enforcement of the criminal law. (*State* v. *Winne*, 96 A. 2d 63.)"

And in Kansas, the supreme court held:

"He is the officer upon whom the State relies for the prosecution of all criminal offenses within his jurisdiction. If he fails or refuses to act, the law is voiceless and powerless. It is paralyzed. (*Johnston* v. *Foster*, 32 Kans. 14 3P. 534.)"

You must keep in mind that you are the chief law enforcement officers of America. By way of contrast, the courts are too remote and too formal—the public cannot speak with, deal with, or negotiate with the courts. On the other hand, the police department often is regarded by the public as being hostile, antagonistic, severe, and unapproachable. Thus, it is the prosecutor who must deal with the public on a day-to-day basis—on whom the public relies—who must shoulder the responsibility and the honor of maintaining peace and order.

The public must feel that the DA is alert, incorruptible, and understanding. He must be a man of courage—but he must also be a man with a heart and wisdom.

It would be well for you to stop and realize that in this context, the office which you hold is as important as any other office in Government. Justice is the cornerstone of our democracy, and the framers of our Constitution and the drafters of our statutes have entrusted this cornerstone in your keeping.

The Supreme Court of the United States identified this trust in the case of *Berger* v. *U.S.* when it said:

"The * * * (prosecuting) attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the two-fold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor—indeed, he should do so. But while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one."

The prosecutor has a trust unsurpassed by any other officer in our great democracy. The challenges are many and are complex.

The most important assets a prosecutor must have to enable him to successfully meet the challenge are dedicated and efficient sheriff's force and professionally competent scientists, such as your coroners. If you will reflect upon this for a moment, I think you will agree that a prosecutor can be no more effective than his sheriff or his experts. Without your sheriffs and your coroners you would be helpless—you might as well lock up the office and go home for all

the good that you can do. And so, while I have talked largely of the prosecutor, I want it known that I use this term to include your sheriffs and your coroners. They are an essential part of the prosecutor's office and what I have said about prosecutors applies equally to them.

In my experience, the district attorneys of America have been people who are devoted to the public welfare and are concerned with the effective execution of the office which they hold. Many of our finest DA's have turned down the opportunity to sit on the bench or to hold other public office because they were devoted to the position of prosecutor. Many others who have chosen to move on to other fields have nevertheless given their best efforts while holding the office of prosecutor. In any field of public endeavor where many are involved, there will always be a few misfits and downright rascals. Fortunate it is that we have had so few in America in the past 50 years. The office of the modern prosecutor is one of great power and a fine tradition. He who takes the oath and embarks upon this service should be prepared to devote his heart and mind and his personal life to the service of his people.

An Analysis of Our National Defense Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an excellent weekly news analysis, recently given by Howard K. Smith, of the CBS news division. Mr. Smith gave a very objective analysis of the present situation in relation to our national defense posture.

The analysis follows:

CBS NEWS, WEEKLY ANALYSIS, FEBRUARY 7, 1960, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Howard K. Smith)

In France this week General de Gaulle won his historic battle against the insurgent settlers and colonials of Algeria. Uncontested power is restored to the civilian government from the army, and to Paris from Algiers; and the first conditions are created for settling the long bloody war in Algeria. The general has proceeded to consolidate victory and prepare settlement by assuming special near-dictatorial powers for a year, and undertaking a purge of government and army.

In Cuba this week, the boiling pot of Castro's revolution boiled over in the streets. While the government welcomed Chief Communist Salesman Mikoyan with great warmth and affection, students protested against the event and gunfire broke out.

Despite these stirring and portentous events abroad, nothing has dislodged from first place in the interests of the Nation's Capital a lively debate on the adequacy of our national defenses. The questions are—are we strong enough, and are we doing the right things to be strong enough in the future against rising Russian military power?

The debate, launched by congressional opponents of the administration, has been suspect in that some commentators have argued that the main force behind it was the need to find a political issue in a presidential year in which the administration is in a favorable position on most issues. The new feature of the debate this past week has been the expression of doubts about the adequacy of defenses by an unusual array of professional military men. The week's events have caused many to believe that the real force behind the quarrel is genuine concern, not politics.

Before going to the elements of the argument, it may be well to remember why the dispute is important.

The concern most often expressed is the most dramatic one: The Russians know where every single base from which we could hit them by plane or missile is located. If their lead in missiles became substantial, they might risk a nuclear missile Pearl Harbor and drop hydrogen bomb warheads on every one of those approximately 100 bases. We have no warning system against so swift an attack. In 30 minutes with a mere 300 missiles U.S. power could be eliminated, Russia would have no further opposition in the world. The vision Karl Marx described in "Das Kapital" exactly 100 years ago would be a matter of simply collecting the spoils.

This terrible prospect is still a little too dramatic for most minds. There is a less dramatic but more immediate and more likely danger from our lagging behind Russia in defenses:

The year 1960 is going to be an unusually active year of diplomacy. In the condition of sharp controversy we find ourselves in with Russia, diplomacy consists mostly of exerting mutual pressures and threats of pressure to induce one another to agree to opposing settlements of outstanding questions. The ultimate pressure diplomats must have in mind is military power to be used if a showdown is forced. The immediate danger we face in 1960 is that our diplomacy will not be confident, but will be diffident, inclined toward concessions if we feel we are inferior, or are getting inferior to Russia in military power. The Russians on the other hand are likely to be aggressive and pushing in their diplomacy, to be unaccommodating and willing to take risks of conflict if there is reason to believe they are growing militarily superior to us. That is the immediate and important basis for the current defense debate.

Since sputnik aroused all kinds of military implications in people's minds everywhere, this trend in diplomacy has already been marked. The West has seemed to many to grow timid in its diplomacy; and Khrushchev has begun to take daring risks.

Khrushchev's provocation of the Berlin crisis last year was an example of his daring to take risks. An example of our apparent timidity was the abrupt abandonment of the tough policy of John Foster Dulles last year and our offering at the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference of unilateral concessions to Russia in Berlin; we offered to put an end to anti-Communist propaganda and reduce our troops in Berlin, and the Russians promptly displayed their newborn cockiness by rejecting even those concessions. That is how diplomacy is affected by nations' defense postures.

It is true that Khrushchev called off his Berlin threat on his visit to the United States. The evidence is, however, that his accommodation was limited and temporary. It was to give him a chance to exploit to the most a concession he had long sought—for the President's invitation to him to come here was distinctly a concession aimed to induce him to call off the threat to Berlin.

Now, there is evidence the period of suspension is over. The threats are being revived. The basic attitude of cockiness of the Russians is revealed, Marguerite Higgins commented in the New York Herald Tribune this week, by a minor incident that happened here in Washington recently. It is usual for an ambassador who wants to talk with a chief of state to tender his request some days or weeks before he expects to receive the audience. Recently, Soviet Ambassador Menshikov asked to see the President the same day as he made the request. The President was hauled out of a Cabinet meeting for the talk which turned out to involve a minor matter that could easily have been dealt with by subordinates.

More recently, the Russians in their diplomatic moves have indicated the same cocky, pushing attitude in more important matters, and these events are tokens of what we can expect in the diplomatic pressuring of 1960 if there is doubt about our capacity to deliver power in a showdown.

In the Far East, the Russians have issued an ultimatum to the Japanese. The Russians have said they will hold onto two Russian-occupied Japanese islands unless Japan scraps here security treaty with the United States. The Russians had promised to return the islands on signature of a peace treaty but have not done so. Their ultimatum was blunt in threatening Japan with, I quote, a "tragic fate" in nuclear war that might result.

On the other side of the Eurasian land mass Russia dominates and would like to possess, it was revealed in West Germany that Khrushchev has sent Chancellor Konrad Adenauer the kind of insulting note usually sent only as a prelude to hostilities. The note called Adenauer a duplicate of Hitler and hinted he was provoking war by his attitudes of resistance to Soviet policies.

Meanwhile, in Moscow, Russia held what has been called a Red summit meeting. All chiefs of Warsaw Pact governments—that is the Soviet satellites in Europe—met with Khrushchev and signed a communique. The communique contained all the elements we are obviously going to have to contend with, this diplomatic year. It boasted flagrantly about Russia's missile performances and power. It made its old very thinly veiled threats of war unless we yield to Russia on Berlin.

The likely quality of the Russian propaganda assault to come was shown by one assertion among several. The communique accused NATO countries of, I quote, "not only maintaining inflated armies but actually increasing their numerical strength." The facts are the United States has a mere 14 divisions to Russia's 175 divisions. All NATO has but 31 divisions—several of them under strength—to Russia's 175 divisions. The technique of repeating a lie so often and so brazenly that the uninformed will accept it as a truth is obviously being intensified.

And with this rise of Russian cockiness there have been hints that there may be a return of Western diffidence. The New York Times reported both from Germany and from the State Department here this week that our officials are prepared to let the East Germans examine the credentials of our military convoys to West Berlin—though that is a flagrant infringement of agreement and a moral concession that may gravely diminish the West Germans' faith that they can count on us to stay firm under pressure.

These are the reasons why the defense debate now raging here is of vital importance. The debate this week intensified, but it did not improve in clarity. General Power of our strategic bomber command repeated his thesis that 300 Russian missiles could eliminate U.S. power from the earth, and Russia will before long have 300 missiles while we will have only a third as many. General Power would like to get money to keep most of our strategic bombers always in the air so we would risk no such Pearl Harbor.

Defense Secretary Gates admitted Russia will have what he called a moderate superiority to us in missiles, but he called Power's estimates unrealistic and said our overall

strength—that is bombers included—is such that Russia will not risk hitting us before we get a new type of missile into mass production and start to catch up.

Power stuck by his stand. The President entered the debate to maintain we are adequately defended and spoke angrily of "too many generals" talking too much. However, the generals went right on talking. Former Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor delivered an especially strong attack, calling our missile force "limited in size, uncertain in reliability, and immobile on exposed bases."

Taylor's successor, the present Army Chief of Staff, General Lemnitzer, disagreed, saying our overall capacity is enough to meet any assault. However in dealing with his own branch of the services, the Army, Lemnitzer turned out to be in complete agreement with Taylor. Our Army is of marginal strength against Russia's much bigger and much better equipped army. Since the Army has had to do most of our confronting of Communists in actual engagements, and since if Berlin is whipped into a new crisis as seems to be happening, the Army will once again be decisive, this was a serious matter.

In the same week, General Medaris, late of the Army missile business, said it made no sense to keep our civilian and military space efforts separate. And Spaceman Wernher von Braun testified that even with increased appropriations it is not possible to catch up with Russia in space in the near future.

The sum impression of a nonpartisan reporter in this week of intensifying debate is of a growing army of doubt in regard to our defense situation. It is deepened by some noteworthy journalistic comments. In the Reporter magazine, out this week, retired Gen. Thomas Phillips wrote, "U.S. forces are not suited to our needs and the United States in the past 6 years has fumbled until Khrushchev (in his recent speech) could say confidently, 'Now it is clear that the United States of America is not the world's most powerful military power'."

Possibly of greater moment, the Luce publications, generally devoted supporters of administration programs, have come out this week with highly critical comments about defense. Time expressed frankly, to quote its words "doubts about the adequacy of the administration's defense program." And Life summed up the defense debate so far with these words, "We must ask the question, Are we strong enough? The answer is, We are not."

The uninstructed layman finds it hard to thread his way to a conclusion through all this conflicting, and highly expert testimony. It is natural that the politicians who question the experts are striving to bring out points that will aid them in the political campaign. It is true that each general is bound to be wedded particularly to the special interests of his particular service.

But when all this has been taken into account, doubts remain. The public in the end may be compelled to a broad conclusion. If there are serious doubts by serious and well informed experts, the question may be asked, why not play safe and improve our defense program. The world's richest Nation can afford to spend more in order to be sure of being first in a race in which no prize is given for second.

Some commentators have pointed out that the diplomatic struggle to begin this year is largely a psychological thing. Even the mere willingness to do more can be a factor of increased weight in the pressures and arguments to come.

Lincoln Day Address by Eugene J. Lyons at Cumberland, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 17, 1960, Mr. Eugene J. Lyons, special assistant to President Eisenhower, made a Lincoln Day address in the city of Cumberland, Md. Seven years ago, Eugene Lyons was aked to join the crusade to restore to the Government the dignity and principles which made our country great. Upon the culmination of that crusade in victory, Eugene Lyons was asked to become a part of the White House team; on the team he has served with distinction. His official position is Special Assistant to the President for Personnel Management.

The Lincoln Day address which Mr. Lyons delivered in Cumberland contains many excellent passages related to the basic principles of our Government. I think that it would be a good thing for the Members of this body to read the text of Mr. Lyons' splendid address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mr. Eugene Lyons' Lincoln Day address in Cumberland, Md., on February 17, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY EUGENE J. LYONS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, CUMBERLAND, MD., FEBRUARY 17, 1960

Ever since coming to Washington 7 years ago, I have looked forward to a visit to western Maryland because I heard so much about the beauty of this section of our great State. I say our great State because, while I am a native of Colorado and came to Washington 7 years ago from New Jersey, I am now a legal resident of Montgomery County, Md.

My information about this area comes from your one-man chamber of commerce in Washington—Senator GLENN BEALL. He not only boasts at every opportunity about your scenery, but he never fails to mention the advantages of Cumberland as a fine industrial community. He has told me about Kelly-Springfield tires, the Celanese Corp., Allegany- Ballistics, and Pittsburgh Plate Glass.

He must mean what he says because he is constantly trying to persuade the Congress that if the Members are going to spend more of the taxpayers' money, they should invest it in the Cumberland area. The Savage River Dam and the model Cumberland flood control project are evidence that his energetic championship of your interests has brought results.

But you did not invite me to Cumberland to gossip about your community. You have asked me to say something about Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party, and what is going on in Washington.

My experience in politics is limited. Certainly, I lay no claim to meeting the qualification which a distinguished visitor to Washington described as being most essential for a successful politician. Winston Churchill said that qualification is to foretell what will happen tomorrow, next week, and next year—and then to explain why it did not happen. Most of my life has been devoted to private industry. You ask then—Why am I here? Seven years ago, I was asked to join a crusade to restore to National Government the dignity and basic principles that have made our country great—principles vitally necessary to the maintenance of national safety and peace in a troubled world. I have remained in Washington because I support with all my heart the sound growth of our country under a philosophy of government that can provide the greatest opportunity for all the people.

What is this philosophy? Ladies and gentlemen, it is the philosophy of the Republican Party. I think it can be simply stated.

The Republican Party stands for a government that discharges every legitimate obligation to its citizens and does so within the framework of a sound fiscal policy.

It is a party that recognizes our competitive enterprise system as the very wellspring of America's growth and opportunity. It is the party that encourages rather than shackles private industry, and thus provides productive jobs instead of relief programs.

The Republican Party stands for a government determined to place the best interests of all its citizens above the special interests of any selfish group.

In short, it is the party that has inherited a sacred trust—the custody of the ideals and principles of Abraham Lincoln. This warm and direct connection with the martyred President who belongs to the ages imposes a tremendous challenge.

For Lincoln's principles were not abstract ideals. They form a basic code by which we can direct our actions so that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

What Lincoln said in his own time is true today:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think and act anew."

There is a curious parallel and inspiration for the Republican Party in the events of a century ago. Lincoln had just been badly defeated in the off-year election of 1858. He had done his best to win the support of a majority of voters, but had failed—as we Republicans failed to win majority support 100 years later in the 1958 election.

This 1858 defeat which Lincoln sustained was only the latest in a long series of setbacks he had suffered, and by 1859 it would have been understandable if he had given up. But he refused to bow to adversity.

Instead, Lincoln and the Republican Party spent 1859 spreading the message of the party, addressing their fellow citizens, developing party organization, and seeking to win support from previously hostile or politically inactive citizens.

The next year, 1860, Lincoln and his party were ready for the election. They won a victory which was vital not only to the party, but to the very preservation of the Union.

On the centennial of that 1860 election, we, the current members of Lincoln's party, must be as ready as were the Republicans of that earlier time. We can and we must be ready, if progress is to continue in the dynamic and bountiful America we have known since 1953 under a progressive and courageous na-

tional administration. Such an administration is essential to deal with the problems of these times. It is vital in fighting inflation and in grappling with our tremendous problems of taxation.

For, make no mistake, we are at grips with deadly inflationary forces. We are under the gun of onerous taxation—taxation that can effectively prevent the accumulation of private capital and the incentive for productive expansion. We are facing a grim and deadly competitor for economic supremacy—world communism and the slavery for which it stands.

So the Republican administration is not fighting the battle of the budget just for the sake of balancing some figures. In our deadly serious fight against inflation, one fact today stands out very clearly:

If public spending soars far beyond the revenues of government, inflation will infuse itself more deeply and dangerously throughout the economy.

Unrestrained spending can only result in deficit financing, higher taxes, and cheaper dollars. And in such event, who must bear these burdens? You—you and your family—and every other citizen of our country.

Inflation feeds on the income and the savings of every individual, every enterprise, in America.

It eats away the savings we cherish for our family's security. It robs us of the real value of the dollars we earn. A quick glance at the family food basket can make that point painfully clear.

In 1939, a dollar would fill the basket with potatoes, bread, coffee, cabbage, milk, and eggs. Today's dollar will buy only the cabbage, milk, and eggs.

Twenty years ago, you could buy a pound of round steak, a pound of bacon, a pound of pork chops, and a pound of sugar for what it costs you today to buy just the pound of steak alone.

And so it goes with everything we buy.

Every American, therefore, has compelling reason to be concerned over the gigantic spending schemes that already have been voiced by one House or the other of the present Congress. Together, just to date, these schemes represent several billion dollars of needless, unjustifiable spending. And more of the same is in the offing.

All are the creations of political pressures of special groups.

But if they become law, it will be every American whose dollar is cheapened—every American whose paycheck must yield steeper taxes—and every American whose children must bear the future debt.

I am sure you are aware that the Communist challenge is many-sided.

It is military, political, spiritual, and economic.

We and our allies have steadily rebuffed the military and political threats. Wherever the Communists have probed, they have found us standing firm. At Lebanon, in the China Sea, in the unity of our NATO Alliance—and in the Berlin issue—we have met the challenge with unmistakable evidence of the strength of our purpose.

We shall continue to keep our military power equal to any test.

Our overall might in planes, missiles, ships, and other equipment, must always be capable of deterring—and if ever necessary—defeating any attack upon us.

We shall continue to meet the Soviet political challenge.

We shall lead the way in exploring every avenue of reasonable hope for justly solving the issues that divide the world.

In the battle of spiritual values, we cannot lose so long as we preserve the freedom and moral strength on which our way of life is built.

The Soviets know all this very well.

Why, then, are they confident of ultimate victory?

Because they are concentrating on all-out economic war—and they believe they can defeat us in such a war without risking their own total destruction.

They intend to become the world's one first-class economic power, forcing us into second-class status. And for us, such an outcome would be just as tragic as nuclear devastation.

Today we are well in front. But they believe we have not the system or the will to maintain our economic strength and growth.

They expect inflation to explode our economy while theirs continues to grow.

My friends, let me emphasize that we dare not look lightly on their great expectations. For here we do, indeed, stand at the crossroads of decision. The soundness of our economy is threatened by forces that have wrecked other nations in the past. They are the forces of inflation and onerous taxation—and we are not yet united as a people to overcome them.

Our friends of the majority party in Congress have strayed a long, long way from the sound philosophy of government that guided the great Americans of the past. I understand that even in Cumberland there are some who have strayed from the fold and support the opposition party. I wonder if they recall these words, spoken 150 years ago:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Those, my friends, are the words of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, third President of the United States.

What party stands for those principles today?

If there are Jeffersonian Democrats in Maryland, I invite you to come home. Come home to the party which today stands for the principles in which you really believe. Join the Republicans.

Under a Republican national administration you have seen a tremendous national industrial development—an industrial development that has meant more jobs and better wages and greater opportunities for most citizens. At the same time you have seen the great northern industrial State of Michigan go bankrupt, unable to meet State payrolls, under the reckless spending programs of a gentleman known as Gov. "Soapy" Williams. This same gentleman has kindly volunteered his services as a presidental candidate—not, thanks be, as a Republican candidate.

For reasons best known to themselves, the majority party members in Congress have become extremely sensitive to criticism of late—so sensitive that one of their number, a Senator from Oregon, destroyed the usefulness as Ambassador to Brazil of a very able woman with a fine record of public service, all because 10 years ago she made some uncomplimentary remarks about his adopted political leaders. I refer to that gracious lady, Clare Luce.

So perhaps I had best be very subtle in criticism of what's going on in the Congress.

I can't refrain from pointing out, however, that it was not a Republican Congressman who rented his front porch to the Government, and it is not Republican Congressmen who are advocating reckless spending of Government funds to appease the insatiable appetite of special interest groups.

Perhaps it is time that we looked at the record of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration—the record on which any Republican candidate should be proud to stand.

Seven years ago we were in the grip of a merciless inflation that already had added nearly 50 percent to our living costs.

Today we have achieved relative stability in prices—the increase in living costs has been held to less than 10 percent for the 7 years of the Republican administration as compared to 48 percent for the 7 years prior to 1953. But even 10 percent in 7 years is too much; we must do better.

Seven years ago we were far behind the Communist empire in missile development. Today we have 41 types of war rockets in operational status or in the advanced stages of development—the most powerful defense mechanism in all our history. And yet we must listen to the carping of amateur experts who have the effrontery to pit their judgment on defense matters against that of the greatest soldier of our time—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

You know, if he were not a Republican President, these same gentlemen would be begging for his advice.

The appetite of the military for money is insatiable. And, of course, the opposition can always find some frustrated generals or admirals who disagree with their boss.

To continue with the record, need I remind you that 7 years ago a tax decrease appeared impossible? Yet, in 1954 the Republican administration did reduce taxes—saving the average family $100 a year. True, we need further tax reform, but at least we have taken the first step.

Seven years ago, employment and a shaky prosperity were based on the needs of a shooting war. Today, in a time of peace, the statistics released for the month of December reveal that 65,700,000 Americans had jobs—the largest number for any December in all our history—in peace or war. And their average salaries were the highest in our history, too.

Seven years ago we were in a shooting war with no end in sight to the casualty lists that saddened American homes.

Today, we are at peace—true, an uneasy peace, but an honorable one.

But you are familiar with these facts. You know, too, that President Eisenhower prevented wild public spending from wrecking the economy when frantic pressure developed during the recent business slowdown. We have recovered fast and solidly from that recession without panic-stricken spending of Federal funds, thanks to the sound fiscal policies of a Republican administration.

So where do we go from here?

Well, how deep is your belief in this land of ours?

Is it deep enough to forget petty differences in political philosophy?

Is it deep enough to cease the clamor for special privileges based on self-interest?

Is it deep enough to give of your substance, your time, and your genius to preserve the principles that have made our Republic great?

Today our country desperately needs just one kind of Republicans—American Republicans.

A hard and fateful struggle is being waged. Your voice and your efforts are more than important—they are vital.

They are vital on specific current issues. They are vital on long-range issues. They are needed at political campaign time, and between campaigns. Sound political leadership must have the active support of those who want sound government.

Sometimes, even as you, those of us in Washington become tired, discouraged, frustrated. Our plans go wrong and caustic criticism rings in our ears from Congress, the public, and employees alike. We wonder if it is all worth while.

And then we remember. We remember that we live and work in a country blessed above all others. We remember that we serve the greatest Nation on earth—a nation that is the world symbol of peace, progress, and freedom.

We remember the giants among men who made us free and preserved our Union.

We hear the measured tread of the sentry who paces before the marble tomb in Arlington where rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God.

We see the clean, towering spire of the Washington Monument and the majestic lines of the temple where the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever.

And we are humbly grateful that we are citizens of the United States.

A great challenge confronts us this year. The time to start is now.

I am sure the enthusiasm shown here tonight is not superficial.

It is deep rooted.

It is devoutly felt.

And I know you will meet the political campaign of 1960 with renewed vigor—a rededicated to the great traditions of the Republican Party.

Right To Know Versus Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current discussion of the right to know in connection with information concerning the status of our military defenses, I was pleased to read the following editorial which appeared in the New Haven Register on February 16, 1960, and pointed out the salient fact that the state of our defenses is a matter of public concern and that the suppression of legitimate information must not be carried too far or the Nation will suffer:

RIGHT TO KNOW VERSUS SURVIVAL

We agree in principle with Senator PRESCOTT BUSH's contention that national survival must take precedence over our treasured freedom of the press and the people's right to know.

But—

Great care must be taken in any efforts to attain any such heightened security objectives.

It would be fatal indeed to democracy were we to gain tightened security regulations and better protection for our military secrets at the price of a diminution of our democratic freedoms—or a complete loss of such freedoms.

The American people, we are sure, want no part of a dictatorship, be it invoked in whole or in part under the guise of military necessity and national survival.

The American people have had, and are having, experiences with governmental bureaucracy which they do not like.

Some of these experiences are of a nature that not long will be tolerated.

We want none of the canned bureaucratic handout, the press release which tells the people exactly what the heads of Government want the people to know—and nothing more.

Senator BUSH shows a recognition of this.

He emphasizes that ours is a democracy and that it is important that our people be as fully informed as possible on all major issues of public policy.

He is swift to admit that the state of our defenses is a matter of public policy.

But he then contends that there is a point beyond which we disclose information at our peril.

He thinks that this is done through the contrived leak to favored sources and by those who talk out of turn on defense issues merely to make political capital for themselves, or their party.

We join the Senator in deploring these things and desiring their elimination—insofar as that be possible.

But again we must warn against any possible corrective steps that would make the cure worse than the sickness.

It may be all very commendable to keep classified information behind closed doors.

But great care must be taken not to extend classified information to ridiculous lengths.

The officeholder, at Federal, State, and local levels, must be kept responsible to the people, not permitted to hide his foolish, or even illegal, acts behind a classified label.

We do not, of course, wish to give our enemies any vital secrets if we can avoid doing so.

But we must not endeavor to protect ourselves by surrendering democratic methods for those of the police state.

The Crimes of Chessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to record my disapproval of interference by the U.S. State Department in the case of Caryl Chessman in the State of California.

It would appear that he has had every legal and judicial consideration. Certainly the Governor of California has the responsibility to grant reprieve if he finds such action to be proper.

My criticism is of Federal meddling and pressure in State affairs, and especially State affairs concerned with the meting of justice.

Too much of this is going on in both the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government. It should and must be stopped.

I ask unanimous consent that the long list of the crimes committed by Chessman be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRIMES OF CHESSMAN

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVEN

Arrested in Los Angeles at age 16 for auto theft and burglary. Sent to reform school.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHT

Arrested again, after release from 1937 sentence, and sent back to reform school.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE

Sent to prison on five counts of robbery, one of assault with deadly weapon.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE

Escaped from prison.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR

Returned to prison with additional count of first-degree robbery. Released December 8, 1947.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHT

Sent back to prison after conviction for these 17 crimes, committed in a 20-day period:

1. Robbery of shoestore, January 3.
2. Theft of auto on January 13.
3. Robbery of man driving along highway on January 18.
4. Robbery of man parked in isolated area with woman companion on January 18.
5. Robbery of man parked in isolated area with woman companion on January 19, and
6. Robbery of the woman, and
7. Kidnaping of the woman, and
8. Sex perversion against the woman.
9. Attempted robbery of a man and girl, parked in isolated place, on January 20.
10. Attempted robbery of man parked in isolated place on January 22, and
11. Kidnaping of the girl, and
12. Attempted rape of the girl, and
13. Sex perversion against the girl (now in a mental institution).
14. Robbery of owner of clothing store, on January 23, and
15. Robbery of a clerk, and
16. Kidnaping of the store owner with bodily harm, and
17. Kidnaping of the store clerk.

It was the two kidnap cases, on January 19 and 22, that produced the original death sentence for Chessman.

Presentation of the Annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association to Joe Weinstein, Chairman of Board, J. W. Mays, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, at the Towers Hotel, on February 11, 1960, on the occasion of the presentation of the annual gold medal of the Downtown Brocklyn Associated to Joe Weinstein, chairman of the board of the J. W. Mays, Inc. Mr. Roscoe is also president of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association and adjunct professor of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. I should also like to include Mr. Weinstein's response:

It is our privilege today to welcome to Brooklyn's Legion of Honor a new member, the 30th. The qualifications for membership in this distinguished group are many and exacting. But, its most rigid demand is service to the community, service to neighbors—selfless service—and absolute integrity. Fortunate is the group that finds such members. The Downtown Brooklyn Association takes great pride in naming as

the recipient of this year's annual gold medal, Joe Weinstein, chairman of the board of J. W. Mays Department Stores.

We rightfully honor Mr. Weinstein as an outstanding retail merchant. And speaking of merchants, there is no bolder or braver group in our whole business fabric. They venture their own capital and, taking in stride normal business risks without guarantee and subsidy, they truly justify the term "enterprise."

I know that I am voicing the sentiments of all present here when I say that Joe Weinstein exemplifies the foremost concept of that good, old-fashioned, rugged, American private enterprise.

We honor Mr. Weinstein as a highly esteemed businessman who understands the ethical basis for the privilege of that precious franchise that we call "freedom of enterprise." It is simply wonderful that our huge department stores, of which the one headed by our merchant prince, Joe Weinstein, is one of the greatest, continually strive to enhance the standard of living of that low-income citizen by providing him with the necessities, the amenities, and some of the luxuries of life at a low cost, stretching his wage dollar, and compensating to a large degree for the evils and scars of inflationary forces.

We would cite Mr. Weinstein as a great leader of vision and courage, who provided strong and effective support to the progress of Fulton Street during the darkest days of its history by acquiring the old Loesser building and developing it without government aid into a very attractive unit contributing a lion's share to the gigantic task of preserving the finest shopping center in America.

His recent, beautiful improvement on Livingston Street is an added milestone in his historic accomplishments for which we honor him today.

However, we salute Mr. Weinstein for still greater attainments. During the past decades it was the privilege of many of us to call on him for advice, guidance, and assistance, both moral and substantial. Whether the community project involved the construction of the Red Cross building, of a hospital, support of education, the academy of music, one of our boys' clubs, the PAL, or a multitude of community efforts, I do not know a single instance when Mr. Weinstein had not espoused and enthusiastically supported a worthy objective. We have always found an understanding reception, filled with love and effection for the people of Brooklyn—never a question of quid pro quo or expediency.

Providence endows men with wisdom, capacity, and courage and a few thus blessed acquire great material wealth. The question of the ethical side is, what is the moral basis for their wealth, their power, their influence, and their authority? The fundamentals of economic and social morality lie in the recognition of the general welfare, in the recognition of the need of rendering utmost service to provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

Mr. Weinstein, we know that all of your functions are always guided by the highest ideals, by that summum bonum—the maximum good—and that you have always aimed to pattern your life along a great moral code; along traditions that you and I hold exceedingly high; traditions that have been deep graven and enshrined in the emeralds of time.

Joe Weinstein, we are proud to recognize the enormous amount of work that you have done and we extend to you today, with warm friendship and deep sincerity, this expression of our high regard and esteem, as well as our everlasting gratitude for your devotion to the well-being of your neighbors and your community. Proudly we present to you this gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association for "most distinguished service for Brooklyn."

REMARKS BY JOE WEINSTEIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF MAYS DEPARTMENT STORES, AT DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON, HOTEL TOWERS, FEBRUARY 11, 1960

Mr. Roscoe, distinguished guests, and friends, first, I want to thank you, Andy, for the very warm and kind introduction that you gave me.

While it sounded indeed very flowery, it was beautiful, and I deeply appreciate the kind remarks you have made.

Now, as for the beautiful token that I received today, I do want to express, in my humble way, my deepest appreciation.

A few weeks ago, on my way to Europe, I was told that I was going to be the recipient of this beautiful award, and to make sure that I would return in time to receive it.

While I mention Europe, I would like to have you know that they are enjoying the greatest prosperity ever. And, that is due to the great leadership which brings me to our own Brooklyn, and, Andy Roscoe, who in a very short span of time heading the Brooklyn Downtown Association, we have been able to see the new face-lifting job that has been in our downtown area. Yes, it is leaders like you, Andrew Roscoe, John Cashmore, Joe Sharkey, John R. Crews, and many others that make our Borough of 3 million people, the great borough that it is today.

Of course, we have not even scratched the surface yet, and with these strong leaders we will get stronger and stronger every day.

Again, my thanks to the officers and directors of the association, for this award. May God be with us.

Thank you.

Cuban-Soviet Past Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we face the future, a major challenge in the East-West struggle will be to prevent the Communists from gaining a real foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

We realize, of course, that the Commies are attempting by every way and means possible—through trade, cultural delegations acting as fronts, and other tactics—to penetrate the Americas.

As a matter of policy, we are not, of course, in a position to interfere with the negotiations of other countries, with the Soviet Union or other Communist nations.

However, the Communist tactics, of themselves, may prove to be a weakness.

Following the recent sugar agreements between the Cubans and the Soviet Union, for example, there has now elapsed sufficient time to appraise these negotiations.

Recently, a conservative Cuban newspaper pointed out that Cuba would lose $64 million in foreign exchange in the next 5 years by its new trade pact with the Soviet Union.

According to experts, the U.S.S.R. well might have bought an equal or similar amount of sugar in the coming years. Instead, the Soviet Union has now found an important market for its products—through attaching strings to the agreements. At the same time, the newspaper points out Cuba in exchange for a product so vital as sugar will receive machinery and equipment about whose necessity, convenience and quality much remains to be written.

As more and more of the real factors come to light in the Cuba-Soviet agreements, I would hope that the experience of Cuba would serve as an illustration to more of our Latin American neighbors—who might be tempted by carrot-type trade offers—to tread cautiously, so to avoid becoming a victim of Communist opportunistic—but often deceptive—policy.

The Washington Sunday Star carried an informative article relating to the recent agreements called Cuban-Soviet Pact Assailed. Reflecting an enlightening aftermath on the real factors in dealing with the clever Soviet "horse traders"—or perhaps I should say "sugar traders," handing out their own kind of lumps. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN-SOVIET PACT ASSAILED

HAVANA, FEBRUARY 20.—The conservative newspaper Diario de la Marina said today Cuba will lose $64 million in foreign exchange in the next 5 years by its new trade pact with the Soviet Union.

The newspaper reported the Soviet Union has bought nearly 2 million tons of Cuban sugar since 1955 without a formal agreement and paid $139 million in cash for it.

Under the new agreement, the Soviet Union will buy a million tons a year for the next 5 years but will pay dollars for only one-fifth of the sugar. The rest will be paid for in goods. Diario estimated the Soviet Union will pay $75 million in cash in the 5 years.

"You must come to the conclusion," the newspaper said, "that the brand-new pact means Cuba loses * * * $64 million in foreign exchange with the aggravating factor that, according to experts, the U.S.S.R. would have bought an equal or similar quantity of sugar in the coming years.

"In the final analysis, we find the Soviet Union has found an important market for its product which it did not have before. And Cuba, in exchange for a product so vital as sugar, will receive * * * machinery and equipment about whose necessity, convenience and quality much remains to be written."

Diario called fallacious the Cuban Government's argument that the United States paid a premium of about 2 cents a pound on Cuban sugar only to protect U.S. sugar producers.

The newspaper said the United States could pay the premium to its own producers and buy from Cuba at the cheaper world price if it were concerned only with helping its own people.

Diario said that if the United States abandons the system of paying a higher price for Cuban sugar, misery and hunger will come to Cuba.

Women's Duties and Responsibilities as Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, included in the February and March issue of the magazine Topics is an article written by my distinguished colleague the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS U.S. Representative in Congress from the Fifth Massachusetts District, entitled "Women's Duties and Responsibilities as Citizens."

I know I echo the sentiments of the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation when I say—the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is truly one of God's great noblewomen.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WOMEN'S DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS CITIZENS

Privilege is only one side of the coin of citizenship. The other is clearly labeled "Responsibility." In government, one without the other is valueless. Privilege without the restraints of responsibility becomes dangerous. On the other hand, responsibility without the freedom of a democracy becomes meaningless.

The continued responsible exercise of our democratic rights by all our citizens—women as well as men—will be the determining factor in the future destiny of our country.

In a broader sense, it seems almost a rule of life that every privilege carries with it a corresponding duty. In the field of government, the full privileges of citizenship, which women of America have been granted, carry with them certain responsibilities. It was only 39 years ago that American women were given the constitutional right to vote. In the history of our Nation that is not a very long time, but what our women have accomplished in this short period since their enfranchisement has encouraged other countries to give women a voice in their governments.

It is interesting to me that our Constitution and the amendments to it are mainly concerned with granting our people certain rights. Perhaps our patriots and statesmen who had given so much to obtain these precious freedoms believed that it would be unnecessary to remind us of our responsibility to use them.

Ideas, rights and hard-won benefits become rusty through disuse just as our more tangible possessions. And so it is with the American woman's rights and duties of good citizenship. Certainly, it has been my conviction that the women of America have, just as have the men, made a substantial contribution to the wise operation of this Republic. In the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, women have proven that wisdom, judgment and ability are possessed in equal degree by both men and women.

And so I would urge every American woman, whatever her role in life, to take full advantage of her privileges as an American citizen. For those who are inclined, this may mean running for public office or serving in some appointive position. For others, it may mean helping with the numerous tasks of a political party. At the very minimum, it will mean becoming thoroughly informed on the great issues and current problems and voting on each election day and encouraging others to do so.

In these important ways, American women will be fulfilling their duty and making certain that the coin of our democracy is spent wisely and well.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
U.S. Representative, Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District.

Major General Toftoy Retiring—Not Mad at Anybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Baltimore Sun, there appeared an interesting news article on the retirement of Maj. Gen. H. N. Toftoy, commanding general of Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. The article appears under the heading, "Missile Expert Is Not Mad at Anybody as He Retires."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news article, as it appeared in the Baltimore Sun of February 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSILE EXPERT IS NOT MAD AT ANYBODY AS HE RETIRES

ABERDEEN, MD., February 22.—"I'm not mad at anybody."

Coming after a wave of protests against national defense policy by retiring high-ranking military men, that statement in itself is news when it comes from a general who has been in the midst of Army missile work since World War II.

But that is the way Maj. Gen. H. N. Toftoy, commanding general of Aberdeen Proving Ground, feels in the last week of his military career.

The general, called "Mr. Missile" by many experts in and out of the Army, will retire next Monday after 33 years as an officer.

TO DEPART FROM COURSE

He made it clear today that he would depart from the controversial course taken on retirement by such others close to the missile program as Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

On the specific subject of missile development, General Toftoy could buttress any arguments he cared to make on more solid experience than perhaps any officer in the Service.

SET UP LABORATORIES

It was he who cut War Department red-tape to import Germany's rocket experts to this country, then headed the rocket branch, research and development division, Office of the Chief of Ordnance, for 7 years, from 1947 to 1952.

He set up the rocket "laboratories" at White Sands, N. Mex., and Huntsville, Ala., then took over the ordnance missile program at Huntsville (Redstone Arsenal), laying the foundation for nearly all American missile work that has followed.

Under his command, key research on the Jupiter, Redstone, Pershing, Sergeant, Corporal, LaCrosse, Honest John and Little John rockets was carried out.

Working with him were Col. John R. Hamill, now director of the ballistic research laboratories at Aberdeen, and the German rocket genius, Wernher von Braun.

Since August 1958, he has been commanding general at Aberdeen dealing with every other kind of Army ordnance.

MEDICAL REASONS

Now, he is being retired for medical reasons—ulcers, to be specific, and it should be no secret why he has them.

Despite his involvement in the most frantically debated weapons developments of the decade, he insists:

"I am not going to lambaste anybody. I'm not going to write any books. I'm not mad at anybody."

That is the negative side of his retirement plans.

On the positive side is retirement in Florida. He will start driving toward that happy fishing ground immediately after retirement ceremonies Monday morning.

Resolution Urging Repeal of the Oath Requirement of the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Michigan Senate, composed of faculty members with professorial rank, adopted a resolution on April 27, 1959, urging repeal of the oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act.

The text of this resolution is as follows:

The faculty of the University of Michigan believes that the oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act (sec. 1001f) should be repealed and urges Congress to do so immediately.

The requirement of an oath to obtain a loan under the act is inconsistent with sound educational policy. The right to a Federal loan for education should not be treated differently from the right to use tax supported or tax exempt educational facilities generally—regardless of membership even in the Communist Party. Our best hope to demonstrate the fallacies in such doctrines to college-age persons is to permit them to be exposed to academic training and to associate with their peers in an atmosphere of free inquiry. The psychological effect of such an oath on non-Communist students surely is not beneficial and possibly is damaging because it may cast a shadow, however slight, upon the atmosphere of fearless pursuit of truth so essential to an academic community of students and scholars. In any event, the oath seems very unlikely to have any practical effect on Communists.

The faculty believes even more strongly that no justification can be found for that part of the oath requiring a statement of nonbelief in overthrow of the U.S. Government by force. It is one thing to make actions, such as membership in an organization, a criterion for qualifying for a loan, unwise as we think this is. It is quite another to require a statement of beliefs unaccompanied by any overt act. In the first place, the definition of such belief is most difficult. If the language is taken literally probably most of us would be unable

to sign the oath because we would believe in forceful overthrow of the U.S. Government if it should be changed sufficiently from its present form, even if the change were achieved by proper legal procedures. Secondly, and more importantly, we do not believe that beliefs alone—without action—should be made a test for receipt of a benefit any more than it is for imposition of punishment. This smacks too much of the heresy trial and the star chamber technique.

Our belief in the superiority of democracy is communicated best by a free exchange of ideas. By requiring a questionable, even dangerous and possibly unconstitutional oath we weaken our position.

Adopted April 27, 1959, by the University of Michigan Senate.

The World Around Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, recently the Record, a weekly paper published by Dr. John R. Steelman in Silver Spring, Md., carried an article by John C. Metcalfe urging more self-examination and less name calling regarding recent anti-Jewish outbreaks in various parts of the world. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Silver Spring (Md.) Record, Feb. 4, 1960]

THE WORLD AROUND US—THE NEO-NAZI HOAX

(By John C. Metcalfe)

WASHINGTON.—The emotional outbursts by individuals and the press in charging a resurgence of neonaziism in West Germany are clearly based far more on prejudice and unfounded fear than on fact. Moreover, we have now the farflung consequences of colosal blundering in playing up a scattering of anti-Jewish incidents instigated by Communist agents to discredit the Bonn government and the democratic German public.

This writer raises his voice in protest at this injustice to the German people against his own long background and widely recognized understanding of naziism which goes back to investigations and study of this type of activity predating the rise of Hitler to power in January of 1933.

WRITER'S RECORD

This record includes investigations in those early years at the request of the FBI on activities of Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese agents in the United States; leading the investigation of the Chicago Times in 1937, in disguise as a Nazi storm trooper of the German-American bund, which broke the back of that movement and created the House Committee on Un-American Activities; being the first agent hired by the committee and placed in charge of its Nazi-Fascist probe; having testified for that committee perhaps oftener than any other person in its history; being officially qualified by the Department of Justice as an "expert" in this field and retained by the Criminal Division as the Federal Government's key witness in prosecutions which resulted in the internment and deportation of several hundred Nazi leaders; having testified for the Senate committee which developed the present Foreign Agents Registration Act that successfully prosecuted leading Communists; and having testified as an "expert" in loyalty probes.

This, then, is in part the authority with which we comment.

INTEREST CONTINUED

This writer has continued his interest in Germany across the postwar period by having visited that country year after year to witness its rise from ashes to become the most powerful economic unit of all Europe; by having come to know personally many of her government figures, political leaders, distinguished editors, and prominent citizens.

Therefore, this writer comments not only with longstanding authority but also an intimate understanding of present day Germany.

Here are some things which should be pointed out to clarify the situation and bring the truth to light.

The sordid anti-Jewish incidents which broke out in Germany recently have been thoroughly investigated by the Federal police. It has taken time to run down the facts. They reveal some of these incidents were inspired and instigated by Communist agents to damage the position of the Federal Republic of Germany in light of the approaching summit meeting which will take up the question of the Berlin crisis and German reunification.

NO ORGANIZED NAZISM

Only a handful of extremists, hatists, and mainly misguided youths participated in these lunatic acts. There is no evidence of any organization backing resurgence of nazism.

Not long before these incidents broke out in Germany we were plagued with the same thing here. In fact, those in the United States were on the whole of an even more violent nature, such as the bombing of synagogues by crackpots.

Many of our prewar native Fascist crackpots are still around. Investigations by such agencies as the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee over the postwar years reveal far more anti-Jewish activity in the United States than in Germany.

It is to the high credit of the Bonn government that so very few persons in Germany have engaged in these foul activities when not too long ago there were millions of followers of Hitler in that country.

BOTH PARTIES TOLERANT

The Christian Democratic Union, led by Chancellor Adenauer and in power, is 60 percent Catholic, 40 percent Protestant. The Social Democratic Party, the major opposition force, is 40 percent Catholic and 60 percent Protestant. Both parties are bitterly opposed to racial and religious hatred and a number of their key figures suffered in Nazi concentration camps.

We had a very big hand in writing the German Constitution and it explicity forbids these antidemocratic activities.

There are some former Nazis in the German Government. It would have been impossible to set up an efficient government without having called on some of them, when nearly every one had belonged to that party in the earlier years. Very few of them hold key positions and none has given any evidence of pronazism. Not even the severest non-German critics can point to any Nazi act by them.

BRITISH ARE BIASED

The British have been particularly boisterous in their denunciations of the Germans over these incidents. It is no secret, however, the British have become increasingly disturbed over Germany's growing economic power, which surpassed them not long ago. They have also openly criticized Chancellor Adenauer for his determined stand in refusing to appease Premier Khrushchev on the defense of Berlin and reunification of Germany. It is only natural, therefore, that suspicion exists the British denunciations reflect an interested point of view. This is not allayed by the fact that the British are taking the softest line with Premier Khrushchev and that they do not themselves have exactly a clear slate at home in racial prejudice.

The colossal blunder in this whole affair was committed by those who exaggerated these incidents all out of proportion to their importance and played smack in the hands of the Soviet propaganda machine.

UNLEASED THE LUNATICS

Thus, it created a chain reaction around the world. It unleashed a whole string of lunatics. They don't expect to see their names in the press. They get enough satisfaction and excitement by just reading about their dirty handiwork or hearing about it on television and radio. In other words, the play these incidents received simply fanned the flames of hatred.

If the story of the first incident had been played down or killed and followed with swift investigations and tough prosecutions, the whole affair would have fizzled out promptly.

This is the most effective way of dealing with the problem.

A few years ago there was a wave of phone calls to airlines reporting bombs on planes. As long as the press continued to play up these reports all the crackpots got into the act. When the reports were finally ignored by the press, they died down. The best proof is that the current big stories of insurance bombings of planes have revived the bomb scare reports. In one day a couple of weeks ago there were ten false reports of this character.

PRAISE DUE, NOT CARPING

If those who are continuing these emotional and exaggerated outbursts against Germany are really sincere and intelligent, they will stop their rantings and take a positive approach by praising the German people for what they have accomplished toward a democratic way of life and by supporting them in their efforts to maintain freedom, justice and peace in their land.

These critics might also devote a little more attention to the same problem on the domestic scene. When the problem at home has been diminished, they will be in a more justifiable position to criticize their friends and allies abroad.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include copy of my newsletter Keenotes which was released Monday morning, February 22, 1960:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Two messages received by Congress this week will touch off lively debate.

1. A request for slightly more than $4 billion to carry on the foreign aid and mutual security program during the next

fiscal year received a chilly response from many Members, both Democratic and Republican. Not only were objections raised to the size of the proposed program—$1 billion more than voted by Congress last year—but many Members were sorely disappointed that it did not reveal that a portion of the burden has been shifted to other nations which are in a position to share a part of the load. Congress is likely to insist on a sharing of this burden.

2. The President's request for an additional 1-cent increase in first-class and airmail postage rates was also coldly received. Many Members will not vote to increase mail rates on these two types of mail. First-class and airmail rates at present are high enough to pay their own way and increased rates should not be asked. After all, increased postal rates on the type of mail used by the vast majority of the people would constitute a tax increase. I seriously doubt that Congress will be willing to increase these postal rates again in the foreseeable future.

COAL RESEARCH BILL PASSES

The House has passed a coal research bill. There was little opposition to this proposal to create a Coal Research Office in the U.S. Department of Interior to strengthen this great industry. Inasmuch as the bill was amended to meet objections voiced last year by the President in a veto message, there is an excellent chance the bill will now become law. Those of us from coal-producing States strongly supported the measure.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PROPOSED

The House has passed a bill which will help about 10 million self-employed persons—small businessmen, lawyers, doctors, accountants, engineers and others—to build up a retirement fund.

The House-approved bill allows a self-employed person to deduct up to 10 percent of his annual net earnings or $2,500 (whichever is less), provided it is put into an approved retirement program.

When the self-employed person starts drawing benefits under his retirement program, the accumulated earnings would be subject to ordinary income and taxable as such.

The cost to the Government would be relatively small. But it would give the small businessman a concession similar to that enjoyed now by about 18 million persons under corporate pension plans. It is good legislation and I hope the Senate will follow the lead of the House in approving it.

Retirement Plans for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this month the Alaska State Medical Association met in convention at Anchorage. Judging from newspaper reports and communications I have received, the convention was fruitful and constructive.

Dr. George Hale, president of the association, has made available to me certain resolutions adopted by the convention. As a cosponsor of S. 1009, Mr. President, I am naturally pleased that the Alaska State Medical Association has expressed support of legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to encourage voluntary retirement plans for the self-employed.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Alaska State Medical Association relating to retirement plans for the self-employed be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Keogh-Jenkins bill provides for needed tax relief for self-employed professional men who are not eligible for social security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Medical Association recommend passage of the bill.

A Million Voteless Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent action in the Senate indicates that we are moving closer to a long-cherished dream for the people who live in the District of Columbia—the right to vote. It is hoped that the House will also act favorably on Senate Joint Resolution 39 with the amendment calling for the right to vote, on the part of the residents of the District, for President and Vice President.

In this connection, under unanimous consent, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Des Moines (Iowa) Register on February 5, expressing the same hope that I share about favorable action on this measure.

The editorial follows:

A MILLION VOTELESS CITIZENS

Wednesday was a great day for several hundred thousand voteless residents of the District of Columbia. The Senate took the first step on the way to making them "first class" citizens.

One of the three proposed constitutional amendments approved by that body grants residents of the Nation's Capital the right to vote in the election of a President and Vice President. It authorizes them to name three presidential electors. And it grants them a delegate to Congress who will have a seat but no vote in the House of Representatives.

The proposed amendment must be approved by the Senate and be ratified by two-thirds of the State legislatures to become effective. Nevertheless, the action of the House marks the first real progress that has rewarded years of effort by residents of the District.

The recent admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood can be credited with removing much of the objection to granting residents of the District of Columbia voting rights. Although most fairminded persons felt that Washington residents were being discriminated against, many Members of Congress had contended that they could not grant privileges to residents of the Capital that were denied to residents of Alaska and Hawaii while they were territories.

During the early formative years of the Nation, there were other reasons advanced for keeping the District of Columbia residents voteless. It was felt, whether justified or not, that political appointees holding jobs in the Capital might be able to exercise undue influence on Congress and the affairs of government if they were permitted to vote. The writers of the Constitution set up safeguards against that possibility.

The District of Columbia was created as a nonpolitical unit, governed exclusively by Congress. Government employees were expected to have only temporary residence in the District. They were permitted and expected to retain their legal and voting residence in the States from which they came.

Through the years, many changes have come about. Civil service has made most Government employees permanent residents of the District. The population has grown to nearly a million, larger than that of 12 of the smaller States. A large portion of the residents are not Government employees. Washington is their permanent residence. They bear all the obligations of a citizen of the United States but are denied the privilege of voting and representation.

No longer is there any reason or excuse, if there ever was, for denying residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote in the election of a President.

We are confident Iowans will place no obstacle in the way of granting them this right if and when the proposed amendment comes before the State legislature for ratification.

Top 10 Ratings Will Be Junked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we have been busy in the Communications Subcommittee with TV channel allocations. We may not be able to get to further study of TV ratings for some time. Meanwhile there has been a new development. Trendex, Inc., one of the prominent rating services, has abandoned the top 10. It was sloughed off the pocketbook. Beginning this month, it offers instead DTAR, the "Dimensionalized Television Audience Report."

Is this the slight ray of light which could mean a new dawn?

Coupled with the independence of ratings suggested by recent announcements of varied TV public service programs scheduled in prime time by the networks, I suggest that we may be seeing a break in the clouds of rating-dominated TV.

I was encouraged especially by the quoted statement of a Trendex vice president that with the new system, they "hope to introduce sanity to the business of evaluating the TV audience."

It has been my contention for some time that the ratings we have known in the past didn't make sense. We shall see if the new ones have a sane contribution to make.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a description of the new rating, DTAR, written by Miss Marie Torre, syndicated TV columnist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, of Jan. 15, 1960]

TOP 10 RATINGS WILL BE JUNKED

(By Marie Torre)

The first significant development in the TV rating chaos is a major project that will convert Trendex, Inc., effective February 1, from a diffident nose-counter to an aid to better television.

No more will there be a Trendex top 10.

No more will clients receive the monthly Trendex pocketbook, which meant sudden death for a faltering show.

Attempting to step in tune with the times and answer the cry for quality programs, Trendex is overhauling its entire operation to de-emphasize audience numbers (the scourge of good television) and emphasize a qualitative yardstick.

"This isn't the result of impulsive thinking," said Eugene L. Reilly, Trendex vice president. "We have listened to and digested what Dr. Frank Stanton has said on the need for new measures to improve programing. We believe him. We believe the serious intentions of some advertisers with respect to better programing. With our new system, we hope to introduce sanity to the business of evaluating the TV audience."

The outgrowth of this thinking is a new service bearing the unwieldy title of "The Dimensionalized Television Audience Report." This will be issued to clients (networks, agencies, and advertisers) on a bimonthly basis, replacing discarded elements of the Trendex service (the top 10, the monthly pocketbook, etc.).

Considerably more than the number of viewers watching a given show is contained in the DTAR report. It includes such categories of information as "type of viewing home," "audience composition," "program selectivity," "audience composition of unanimous," "frequency of viewing," "reaction to program," "opinion as to future viewing of this program," "percent of respondents," "sponsor identification," and "uses or owns sponsor's product."

"This," Reilly notes, "will offer a truer evaluation of what people like and don't like. When a person watches a TV show it doesn't necessarily mean he favors it above the competitor's. So many factors enter into what a man or woman watches on TV.

"When children, for example, insist on watching a western what chance have the parents got of selecting their favorite program?

"What it all boils down," he added, "is that the events of the past months have underscored the fact that the television audience can no longer be measured sensibly in one dimension, that a better measure must be found to offer qualitative perspectives where previously there have been only quantitative ones."

In line with the expansion, Trendex is extending its survey wires to the west coast. Heretofore limited to 25 cities east of Denver, the research company has added 5 western cities to its list—Los Angeles, San Francisco-Oakland, Portland, Oreg., Seattle-Tacoma, and Spokane. It will still employ the telephone method of measurement, meaning 1,000 calls per half hour of TV.

For Trendex officials, the task at hand is to present its new prospectus to clients. "So far," says Reilly, "reaction has been good. Should we find strong resistence in the coming weeks, we may have to alter our plans, but I don't think this will happen. If the TV scandal did anything for the industry, it stressed the need for a greater knowledge of its audience."

Secretary Ezra Benson's Concern Is What Is Best for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, anyone who knows Ezra Benson knows him to be a gentleman endowed with great integrity. In my opinion and I am joined by millions of Americans he will properly be recorded in history as the greatest of our Secretaries of Agriculture; a credit to himself and a credit to the millions of American farmers whom he honestly and soundly represents.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial taken from the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., under date of February 21, 1960, entitled, "Based on Need."

The editorial follows:

BASED ON NEED

New farm legislation offered to Congress by Secretary of Agriculture Benson reflects his persistent refusal to permit political considerations to cloud his judgment. His concern is not for votes in this election year but what is best for agriculture. With the support of President Eisenhower, Benson is striving to reduce the surplus burden and restore the independence of the farmer.

The wheat bill he has submitted would greatly reduce price supports and eliminate production controls. It is a realistic measure that would work toward eventual elimination of the surplus glut that is making the farm problem increasingly critical.

The administration bill would gear price supports to market prices rather than the old parity formula. The measure would support grower prices of 1961, 1962, and 1963 wheat crops at 75 percent of the previous 3-year average market price. Under present law, supports cannot be less than 75 percent of parity.

After 1963, the bill provides, wheat support would be 90 percent of a 3-year average market price. The latter rate would be expected to work out at about the same level as the 1961–63 supports, because during this 3-year period market prices would be moving downward.

The administration feels that in order to cut back the wheat pileup effectively, it will be necessary to extend the soil-bank program 3 years and expand it from the present 28 to 60 million acres. The soil bank is good in principle, but it has not worked well in practice.

Benson's statesmanship is shown in his renewed request for higher interest rates on loans to the Rural Electrification Administration. For several years, Congress has turned a deaf ear to administration pleas that something be done about interest rates under the present loan-making operations of REA, which currently obtains money from the Federal Treasury to make long-term loans to co-ops.

The taxpayers have suffered because the Treasury has been making loan funds available to REA at an interest rate of 2 percent, while the Government has had to pay for its money at a considerably higher rate. Thus the Government is providing a subsidy for REA, which now is competing with private utilities in industrial and urban areas.

Secretary Benson stands out as a man of integrity who has far greater concern for the interest of the farmers and the national economy than the Democratic-controlled Congress, which is intent on playing politics with the farm problem.

The Case for the Wilderness Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "The Case for the Wilderness Areas," written by Burton W. Marston, and published in the Laramie Daily Boomerang on February 6, 1960.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—THE CASE FOR THE WILDERNESS AREAS

(By Burton W. Marston)

The debate over proposals to set up a national policy affecting our wilderness area is now going into its fifth year in Congress and throughout our land. It is doubtful if any subject of legislation, particularly affecting the western regions of our country, has been of greater interest to the public in recent years. The battle over the wilderness proposals goes on through the local press, in conventions, board, committee, and commission meetings, through resolutions passed, in congressional committee meeting, and elsewhere. It has been a hot issue in the past terms of Congress and will undoubtedly be one of much concern in the present one.

As one who has spent a lifetime as a resident of Wyoming, the writer has visited most of the presently designated wilderness areas in the national forests of our State and, as a result, has a deep-seated appreciation and pride in them as part of our great public heritage. Being thus a believer in the idea of wilderness preservation and having given the matter some thought, the writer would like to review here the present proposed legislation in Congress and tell why he believes a bill incorporating the desirable features of such legislation should be passed.

The wilderness bill, as it is called, first appeared in 1957 in the form of measures introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and others. It was the basis of a series of public hearings held in four different locations in the West. Later that year a hearing was held in Salt Lake City, during which several thousand persons representing various shades of opinion for and against the legislation gave testimony.

As a result of these hearings and various proposed amendments, a new bill, known as S. 1123, was introduced in the Senate on February 9, 1959, by Senator HUMPHREY (for himself and 17 other Senators from States extending from coast to coast). It was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior

and Insular Affairs, of which Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana is the chairman; our Wyoming Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY is a member.

The present bill has been in the hands of this committee since February of last year. It was to have been introduced in the Senate last summer, but, at the request of Senator O'MAHONEY, who was ill at the time and had not been able to to attend the meetings, its introduction was deferred until the second term of this Congress. At that time Senator MURRAY promised that the bill would be taken up as the first order of business with the committee at the beginning of the present term. It has not yet come up for consideration in the House.

As to the present form and status of this bill and because of the many changes that have been considered, it has been difficult for the layman to follow. The present bill has undergone a long list of amendments, some of which are of undoubted merit while others are probably designed to weaken the bill. We understand the committee is now considering what is termed as "Committee Print No. 2," the last in a long series of versions developed by proponents to meet criticisms and objections. Here in Wyoming lately we have been reading news dispatches from Senator O'MAHONEY's office in which he has raised objections to certain features of the bill, and of progress which he believes that he and others have made in clarifying the bill, making it more generally acceptable and more in keeping with congressional precepts. This, of course, is undoubtedly all to the good.

The bill as it now written (and also in its original form) states a positive national policy for wilderness preservation: "For the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations, particularly for those uses of such areas that facilitate recreation and the preservation and restoration of health." Under the policy thus stated in the bill the Congress "gives sanction to the continued preservation as wilderness of those areas federally owned or controlled that are within national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, or (certain) other public lands and that have so far retained under their Federal administration the principal attributes of their primeval character." It gives Congress the opportunity to review all existing areas before their formal inclusion in the wilderness system and to review additions to or eliminations from the system in the future.

To make clear what is meant by the term "wilderness," the bill gives a definition of the word: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

Separate sections of the bill deal with the designation of wilderness areas in the national forests, the national parks and monuments, the national wildlife refuges, and other areas except the Indian reservations (this section in the original bill has been deleted.)

Insofar as the national forests are concerned, the bill indicates that the present areas within the forests classified as wilderness, wild, primitive, or roadless shall be used as the basis for study of proposed designated areas, and that the final designated areas must be of predominantly wilderness character.

In one of the section of the bill it is declared to be the policy of Congress to administer the national forests with the general objectives of multiple use and sustained yield, and "the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to administer the national forests on a multiple-use basis so that all the resources thereof, including recreational and wildlife habitat resources, will be used and developed to produce a sustained yield of products and services, for the benefit of all people of this and future generations."

In the procedures outlined in the bill for bringing national forest lands, national-park-system lands, national-wildlife-refuge lands, and Federal lands of other classes, public notice and public hearings are provided for. Deadlines are prescribed. Apparently final decisions in cases of protest would be made by the heads of agencies, reviewable by the courts only under extraordinary circumstances.

Also provided are procedures to accomplish later adjustments such as area additions and eliminations. Each of these, so far as new authority granted in the bill is concerned, would become effective only after a waiting period, during which Congress might adopt an opposing concurrent resolution.

Existing commercial uses (notably grazing) will still be permitted in these areas. In none, however, at the present time is lumbering permitted.

Contrary to statements that have been made by many stockmen and livestock associations, the measure specifically permits grazing of livestock on these areas; but it does prohibit use by commercial enterprises conflicting with wilderness purposes. Of special interest to miners is a provision that would allow prospecting and mining in a particular national forest wilderness area, along with water and related road projects, only if the President determines that such use will serve the public interest. Language aimed at preserving the existing State water rights in these areas has been clearly written into the bill.

The provision to establish a National Wilderness Preservation Council, which was the last section of the original bill, has been deleted. This was done because of the concern of the Departments of Interior and of Agriculture and of opponents that this would set up another agency which might create conflict of interests. In its present form the bill apparently meets with no objections from the Department of Interior or the Department of Agriculture. However, each of these departments has had long experience in the administration of wild and wilderness areas and probably feels that the traditional methods they have been following are satisfactory so far as they are concerned.

Wilderness areas already set up in our national forests in the United States now number 81—classified into wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless—with a total area of about 13,860,000 acres. These occur on 73 national forests in 12 States, all of which are in the West except Minnesota and North Carolina. The areas comprise 8 percent of the total national-forest acreage. In Wyoming there are three wilderness areas comprising 1,429,600 and five primitive areas totaling 871,000 acres, all within the national forests. These comprise about 2 percent of the total land area of the State outside the Yellowstone and Teton National Parks and the Wind River Mountains Indian area. These wilderness areas are adjoining or contiguous to the national parks, along the Wind River range and one is in the suggested high Big Horn Mountains.

Everybody or Nobody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable effort to explain the long and continuous drop on the stock market. Every effort has been made to halt the steady decline and stage a rally but in vain.

Below I am including a front page article from today's Wall Street Journal which explains it and with it the increase in unemployment and the general decline in business economy throughout the country:

RURAL RETRENCHING—FARMERS CUT PURCHASES OF EQUIPMENT AS DROP IN INCOME DEEPENS—DEALERS TRIM PRICES OF NEW AND USED EQUIPMENT, FEEL A PINCH ON THEIR PROFITS—A CURB ON AUTOS, APPLIANCES?

(By John F. Lawrence)

ESMOND, ILL.—Red-Cheeked Auctioneer Donald Whitman raps a fist against the side of an aluminum grain wagon and pleads hoarsely with the 50 farmers gathered at the Scott farm, some 80 miles west of Chicago.

"Come on, boys. Somebody start it. That wagon was bought new last summer for $120."

There was a shuffling of feet. No one makes a bid. The auctioneer asks twice more. Finally, a farmer offers $35 and the wagon eventually is knocked down for $72.

"Last winter that wagon would have brought at least $100," Mr. Whitman says. "Now it's tough even to get an offer. Farmers go up $1 at a time where a year ago the bids jumped $5."

The difficulty Mr. Whitman experienced in selling Scott's wagon points up a sharp downtrend in demand for tractors, implements, and other types of farm equipment. Not only are prices of used equipment off, but retail sales of new machinery are down sharply from a year ago. The slide has accelerated in recent weeks.

SIGNIFICANCE IS BROAD

Significance of this slowdown extends far beyond the farm machinery industry. Farm equipment is usually a reliable guide to rural spending generally, and farmers normally are big buyers of autos, appliances, and a host of other items. Over 20 million people live on farms. Rural buying is one of the weakest spots in the Nation's generally prosperous economy.

Factory sales of tractors, cornpickers, plows and other types of farm equipment climbed about 15 percent last year to over $1.8 billion, just short of the $1.9 billion record high reached in 1951 during the Korean war boom. But over two-thirds of the nearly two score farm machinery dealers, checked by the Wall Street Journal say sales thus far in 1960 are below the year before. The declines average around 50 percent but range as high as 80 percent. Five of seven major manufacturers polled said their own dealers' sales now are running below a year ago.

The decline in rural income which began early in 1959 is mainly responsible, farm equipment men say. Farm income hit an annual rate of $13.2 billion in the fourth

quarter of 1958, slipped to $12.5 billion in the initial 3 months of last year and, at last count, was down to a level of $9.5 billion in the quarter ended September 30. Farmers maintained their equipment buying at a high rate through the harvest period last year. But, as it has become increasingly apparent an upturn in income is not immediately in prospect, they have curtailed machinery purchases.

THE DEALER SALES TREND

The slide in farm machinery sales shows up most vividly at the dealer level.

"This is the worst start I've had in 19 years as a dealer," says Edward McGirr, a Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., farm machinery dealer in nearby De Kalb, Ill. "I've done only $5,000 in farm equipment business so far this year, under half what I'd done by this time a year ago." The De Kalb area is a top corn and hog producing and cattle fattening region.

"We didn't sell a single tractor last month and we've sold only one in February," reports Louis Freese, partner in a Monticello, Iowa, Ford farm equipment dealership. At this time last year the firm had sold five new tractors. Monticello is in the northeast corner of the State, also a heavy corn and hog raising region.

"We've sold only $22,000 worth of equipment in January—$8,000 less than a year ago," says Alfred Risinger, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. dealer located near Kansas City, in wheat raising country.

A Salinas, Calif., Deere & Co. outlet, in the lettuce raising region near the coast south of San Francisco, reports it sold only five tractors last month, down from seven in January a year ago.

MANUFACTURERS REPORT DECLINE

Most manufacturers keep close tabs on retail sales of International Harvester Co., Chicago; Deere & Co., Moline, Ill.; Minneapolis-Moline Co., Hopkins, Minn.; Oliver Corp., Chicago; and Ford Motor Co.'s tractor and implement division, Birmingham, Mich. All report their dealer volume since harvest time has lagged behind a year ago.

The sales picture at the factory level is mixed. Harvester is showing substantial gains in factory farm machinery sales compared with a year ago, but at that time volume was at a low ebb because a United Auto Workers strike halted output for 67 days in November, December, and January. Output of other firms was curtailed last fall because of shortages resulting from the steel strike. But the retail slowdown has started to show up in factory sales of some producers.

"Sales have been very slow," reports Merritt D. Hill, vice president and general manager of Ford's tractor and implement division. Latest figures show the fourth quarter about 20 percent below a year ago, he says. Dealers have about 15 percent more unsold tractors in their showrooms now than in 1959, he adds. So they'll probably order less in the weeks ahead.

January sales of Deere & Co. trailed far enough behind last year to erase a 7-percent increase in volume registered in November and December, the first 2 months of the company's fiscal year, says Ed W. Ukkelberg, sales manager.

Farm equipment retailers have been taking double punishment. Not only are sales down, but profits on this smaller volume are slimmer.

"Deals sure are harder to make," complains Paul Lewis, Humbolt, Nebr., Oliver dealer. "We've always tried to keep a 13-percent profit margin. So far this year we've barely averaged 10 percent."

"I don't think there's an item in our line on which we haven't cut the price," says a Deere dealer located near Waterloo, Iowa. He's selling a four-row cultivator, used to prepare the ground for planting, for $675. It's supposed to bring $750. "A year ago I seldom made a deal on which I didn't get the $750," he continues. In contrast to lower prices at retail, manufacturers' prices are about 2 percent higher.

"We're allowing about 7 percent more on trade-ins compared with last year; we've got to do it or we lose volume," says R. M. Kennon, Tifton, Ga., dealer, whose sales so far have held about even with last year's pace.

Auction sales, like the one here in Esmond, reflect farmers' hesitancy toward buying. During the winter months many auctions are held in the barnyards of farmers who've decided to quit and get rid of their machinery. L. F. Wessel, Ft. Dodge, Iowa, auctioneer, calculates tractors 10 to 15 years old now bring as little as $850 and no more than $1,100. As recently as December they sold in a range of $1,000 to $1,250, about equal to a year ago, he reports.

At Yoder & Frey, an Archbold, Ohio, firm that holds big auctions of farm equipment every month, bidding has become so slow many machines simply aren't being sold. Of 350 tractors on the block at a recent auction, 4 of 10 were unsold, reports Timothy Yoder, vice president. At January and February sales last year there were half that many left behind when folks headed home. Both dealers and individual farmers patronize the Yoder & Frey auction.

LESS MONEY TO SPEND

Most dealers figure farmers just have less money to spend than they did a few months ago—or fear they will have less money soon.

"The farmer plans what he spends this year largely on the basis of what he made last year," contends E. A. Mohr, Allerton, Ill., John Deere dealer.

"Lower prices for corn, beans, wheat and livestock are cutting my sales," says G. H. Andrews, Macon, Mo., Allis-Chalmers dealer. "The price situation has scared the heck out of farmers who have money and just made matters worse for those that don't."

Comments George P. Hinds, who sells Minneapolis-Moline equipment in Greenfield, Ind.: "With incomes cut, many farmers around here can't pay equipment repair bills from last year, let alone buy new equipment."

Many dealers report an increase in the number of missed payments on equipment bought previously on installment plans. "About 50 of our customers have come in this winter and asked for extra time on payments coming due," says Martin H. Veatch, International Harvester dealer in Crawfordsville, Ind. "Last year nearly every payment was made on time."

"We have about a dozen back bills now against almost none a year ago," reports Maynard Meyer, J. I. Case dealer in Ridgeville Corners, Ohio, at the eastern edge of the Corn Belt. "Farmers with back bills are dead prospects for sales," he asserts.

Reports Oliver Corp.'s sales vice president, D. W. Koegle: "We began to see a slowing down in dealers' payments to us in early fall. Our receivables currently are about $50 million, up 8 percent from a year ago. We made a study 10 days ago and found the reason is farmers aren't paying the dealers."

The decline in farm income has been sharpest in the Corn Belt. This major cattle-fattening and hog-raising country has suffered from the big drop in livestock prices. Compounding the situation has been unusually damp weather. This has left some corn harvested last fall so moist it would spoil if placed in closed storage. The Federal Government won't give support loans on the high-moisture corn until the grain dries. So many farmers are long on corn and short on cash.

Tight money and higher interest rates are also hurting equipment sales. With thinner pocketbooks and bills to pay, farmers are likely to seek a loan at the local bank to tide them over. "The banks definitely are being a lot more particular than they were early last year," says Auctioneer Wessel, at Fort Dodge.

Mr. Speaker, summing up the situation, this is only one of many instances in which the efforts of the rest of the country to live at the expense of the farmer has proven futile.

The farmer works longer hours and is feeding the country—both in variety and quality—better than ever before, and in return for that service is receiving less than any other worker in America.

Mr. Speaker, the American farmer cannot subsidize the rest of the country by feeding it at less than the cost of production—indefinitely.

Either include the farmer in the Nation's prosperity or take the consequences.

International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since World Bank directors on February 1 agreed upon a charter for the International Development Association and sent it to member governments for approval, there has been a great deal of favorable comment on the new lending organization, which the Senate, in passing a resolution by Senator MONRONEY, first urged the administration to study in 1958.

Last week President Eisenhower sent to the Congress the articles of agreement for the establishment of the International Development Association, and recommended legislation authorizing U.S. membership in the Association and providing for payment of the subscription articles prescribed in the articles of agreement, prepared by directors of the World Bank. Although IDA's supporters had hoped for a larger capital investment, available more quickly, I hope the Congress will quickly approve the legislation which was offered last week by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The establishment of this "poor man's world bank" has won wide support from the press. I have seen only one critical editorial. In general, the reaction has been favorable, whether from interested citizens eager to find a better way to meet some of the world's unmet development needs, or from intellectuals who have spent years studying the situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a few of the editorials.

An editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 4, 1960.

A news story by David Corbett in the same newspaper on February 1, 1960.

An editorial from the Washington Post, February 2, 1960.

An editorial from the New York Times, February 3, 1960.

An editorial from the Washington Evening Star, February 7, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Feb. 4, 1960]

OKLAHOMA HORSESENSE

WASHINGTON.—Here, sitting on a hill, are 537 men, some ordinary and some extraordinary, grappling daily with a range of problems that would make an oracle gasp.

Every day they are assailed by the ifs and buts of intellectual nicety, the equations of erudite confusion and the abstractions of experts. It is a miracle that anything is achieved.

And yet, from this hill come decisions which more often than not make sense. For when you get through the maze the experts make you invariably find, as Oklahoma Senator MIKE MONRONEY sagely remarked this week, that two and two still makes four.

This is not a remarkable thought, but it is a remarkable fact. Senator MONRONEY could tell you.

For the past 2 years he has been embroiled in a theory—his own theory—of international finance so complex that it would make most ordinary men despair. But he had an unswerving conviction which enabled him to win for it, this week, the endorsement of the World Bank and the support of economists, diplomats, bankers, statisticians, and sundry other experts around the world.

His brainchild is the International Development Association, which the World Bank chartered this week.

At first the experts were supspicious. They examined IDA microscopically; they worried out every flaw and followed through every ramification. But IDA survived, because it had what in Oklahoma is called horsesense.

The horsesense of it was this:

For years Uncle Sam has been doling out foreign aid money to needy nations to lift them out of poverty and keep them from falling into Communist clutches. Too often, the gifts have yielded neither gratitude nor good will, for no nation enjoys being a charity case. It offends the sense of national pride.

But, reasoned the Senator, give the needy nations a self-respecting business deal and they will love us for it. Loan them money at interest rates they can afford and they will manage for themselves better than we can manage for them. And as much less cost to the American taxpayer.

That was MONRONEY'S idea. But where would the cheap money come from?

He hit on the notion of putting to use the "soft" currency which the United States and other hard-currency nations have received from needy nations in return for such assistance as surplus crop shipments. This money is not easy for a hard-currency nation such as the United States to put to use.

The experts loved this Oklahoma-born brainwaive. They saw in it a way of spreading Uncle Sam's foreign aid burden among such newly-rich nations as Germany and Japan. The New York Times this week called IDA "an oasis in a desert of new ideas."

Of course, Senator MONRONEY is no plowboy in international fields. He studied economics at the University of Oklahoma and he has served on the banking and currency committees of Congress for years.

But we like to think that the thing which carried this idea through was plain old Oklahoma horsesense. That, and the persistence of an ordinary man who kept demanding of the experts: "Tell me why it won't work."

That's the stuff of democracy.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Feb. 1, 1960]

ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN LOANS NEARER—MIKE'S PLAN FOR NEEDY NATIONS RELIEF BOOSTED

(By David Corbett)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—Oklahoma Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY'S dream of helping needy nations to help themselves, rather than perpetually subsidizing them with gifts of American money, reached the threshold of reality today. It happened with the announcement by the World Bank of a $1 billion charter for the International Development Association, which he first envisioned and propounded in 1958.

The IDA's purpose is to provide money—$1 billion initially—for low-interest loans to needy countries, on the theory that what both they and the U.S. taxpayer prefer is a self-respecting business deal, rather than a handout.

The key to the plan is that many of the loans can be in the form of so-called soft currencies, which the United States in particular has accumulated from poorer nations in payment for the U.S. surplus crop shipments.

These are currencies which it is sometimes difficult for a hard currency area such as the United States to put to use.

Under the charter, IDA can open for business September 15, but only if at least 45 of the 68 World Bank member nations approve.

The initial $1 billion kitty is made up as follows: United States, $320 million; Great Britain, $131 million; France and Germany, $53 million each; India, $40 million; Canada, $37 million; Japan, $33 million.

One of the major advantages of IDA is that it helps spread the foreign-aid burden which America has been bearing virtually alone. Germany and Japan, arisen from the ashes of defeat to a new-found prosperity, now are in a position to help other nations.

The need for a loan rather than a gift program was first brought home to Senator MONRONEY in 1956 on a visit to Thailand. There he saw two major projects under construction.

The first, of which the Thai were tremendously proud, was an irrigation dam built with an $18 million loan from the World Bank. It has increased rice production enormously and the Thai displayed it with great glee to foreign visitors.

The second project, about which the Thais were somewhat politically embarrassed, was a 148-kilometer section of the northeast highway. It was made with American equipment and American money. Twenty-one million dollars of the cost was borne by the American taxpayer and only $1 million by the Thais themselves.

The outright gift seemed to offend their sense of pride when compared with the irrigation achievement.

From that incident the IDA took shape in the Oklahoma Senator's mind. As an economic student at the University of Oklahoma, he had had some basic acquaintance with the theories of finance. But his real education on the subject was during his 12 years with the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and 4 years on the same committee of the Senate.

He helped floor manage the bill creating the International Monetary Fund and World Bank and was on the Herter committee that worked out the details of the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan was a great device for helping postwar Europe back onto its feet, but it didn't fit the needs of poverty-stricken Asia. Europe had the business know-how and much of the equipment; Asia had neither plant nor know-how.

It was the problem of what he describes as "fitting the size 12 Marshall plan shoe onto the size 6 Asian foot" that led him into the present plan.

The day he introduced his IDA bill in Congress in February 1958 it seemed, he recalls, "as if every embassy in Washington wanted an appointment."

They were enthused at the prospects and its implications.

Since then the Oklahoma Senator has been deeply involved in the problems of international finance. He concedes that sometimes he has felt lost in the maze he has gotten himself into; but invariably, he says, he has found that commonsense still makes "two and two add up to four."

Today Senator MONRONEY expressed gratification that the plan, which President Eisenhower's administration has borne along to success, has been acted upon so speedily by the Directors of the World Bank.

"I am greatly encouraged that the Directors were able to resolve conflicting points of view among various countries without compromising any of the basic purposes which led me to advocate creation of IDA," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1960]

A BEGINNING

Member nations of the World Bank ought to lose no time in approving the charter of the Bank's new soft-loan subsidiary, the International Development Association. The intial capitalization of $1 billion, with about four-fifths of it in hard currencies, will support a lending program of only some $160 million a year to underdeveloped nations. Obviously this will need to be expanded before IDA can take on a truly significant share of the economic development task.

India alone, for example, will require several times as much assistance annually if it is to break the tightening grip of poverty. Thus the industrial countries cannot view their IDA subscriptions as alternatives to continuing national programs, at least until the IDA's sights are materially lifted. Nor should there be any illusion that the subscription of soft currencies by countries which have acquired large amounts will significantly lessen the need for hard capital in the early stages.

With the experience and integrity of the World Bank behind it, IDA ought in time to attract a growing proportion of the industrial nations' foreign economic assistance funds. Through such a multilateral approach, the broadest possible participation would be assured, while the political and other inhibitions that often attach to strictly bilateral aid programs could be avoided. Ultimately, this new "window" at the Bank could become the focal point for a mighty free-world effort to bridge the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots," to which the latter could in time make their own growing contribution.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1960]

THE IDA

The World Bank has just completed the articles of agreement for the proposed International Development Association. This plan, it will be recalled, originated in the United States and follows lines first proposed by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma. The plan was approved here last fall by representatives of the 68 nations that are members of the World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development).

In keeping with the spirit of the World Bank, all member countries will be asked to contribute to the initial capital of $1

billion. However, since this new adjunct to the World Bank would emphasize assistance to the underdeveloped nations, which have limited access to hard currencies, most of the hard currency of just under $800 million will be provided by 17 of the industrial member nations. The United States, as one of them, will contribute $320 million of this.

The absolute dollar total of the contribution in immediate sight for the proposed new institution is a good deal less than staggering. Not only is the amount of capital called for of moderate proportions, but subscriptions will be spread out over a period of 5 years. This means that lendable funds available the first year will be only $160 million. The association is designed to provide "soft loans," which means loans issued on terms that could not be granted to ordinary borrowers from the International Bank, since the latter raises most of the funds by selling its own securities in the world capital markets.

Perhaps the chief significance of the proposed new institution is that it recognized so far as it goes, the need for a reorientation of the pattern of international aid to conditions of 1960, rather than those of the fifties, when, in a world that had not fully recovered from World War II, the United States carried a greatly disproportionate share of the burden. Not the least important aspect of the association is the virtual certainly that the funds it dispenses will achieve the maximum results. This is insured, it seems to us, by the fact that they will be administered by President Eugene R. Black and his colleagues on the Board of the World Bank.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 7, 1960]

PROMISING VENTURE

The World Bank, whose more formal title is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, now has cleared the way for a new lending institution well designed to speed up economic progress in needy nations throughout the globe.

As explained by the Bank, the projected agency—once it becomes an operating reality—will make it easier for all such nations to borrow the money they must have to undertake a wide variety of building programs that cannot now be readily financed. Thus the agency, which is to be known as the International Development Association, is designed to begin its operations with a fund of $1 billion (in both hard and soft currencies) that will be made available for long-term loans on the most relaxed sort of terms.

Such loans, for example, even when made in dollars or other hard currencies, will not have to be repaid in kind. Soft currency will suffice, and the repayment itself will be postponable indefinitely in certain instances. Moreover, some of these loans will carry no interest charges, and they will be available for projects like housing, sanitation, and water-supply development—projects which produce no revenue or which are not self-liquidating, and which the World Bank, whose lending operations are strictly confined to undertakings that pay for themselves, is not allowed to finance.

To make this new institution a going concern, the United States, given congressional approval, will contribute $320 million over a 5-year period. Britain's contribution will be a bit more than $131 million, and West Germany and France will each put up close to $53 million. The balance of the $1 billion basic fund will come from the World Bank's other members, including the underdeveloped countries, whose investment in the enterprise will be made up largely of their own soft currencies, though they will also put in a small percentage of their gold or convertible money.

Secretary of the Treasury Anderson and Democratic Senator MONRONEY, who first proposed the idea, have both hailed this prospective setup as a highly promising venture, and with good reason. For there can be little doubt that it will be of real help to the underdeveloped nations if it is put to work with vigor and imagination.

Pamphlet Called Awful Offense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on February 20, 1960. The article is entitled "Manual of Shame" and was written by Roscoe Drummond:

PAMPHLET CALLED AWFUL OFFENSE

The U.S. Air Force has committed an awful offense against the United States. It did so by allowing one of its training manuals for reserves to be used to try to smear the Protestant churches with undocumented, unproved, false charges that the clergy are knee-deep with Communists and fellow travelers.

It seems to me that the National Council of Churches is absolutely right in rejecting as inadequate any pro forma Defense Department action which does not go way beyond just saying, in effect: "Oops, too bad. We'll throw them away and promise not to do it again."

This is an evil, pernicious, dangerous thing which some officers in the Air Force contrived to get into an Air Force manual. The churchmen not only have a right but a duty to insist that how it happened be investigated to the bottom and that the Pentagon demonstrate that it is taking measures equal to the offense and equal to guaranteeing that it won't be repeated.

Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and Air Force Secretary Dudley Sharp have, of course, instantly repudiated the poisonous, pernicious accusations and innuendoes contained in the military manual. They could hardly do less. It is only fair to say that if they had been consulted the stuff would never have appeared.

What Secretaries Gates and Sharp repudiated was:

The charge that "Communists and Communist fellow travelers have successfully infiltrated our churches."

The accusation that pastors of certain (unnamed) churches "are card-carrying Communists."

The bland observation that any idea that "Americans have a right to know what is going on" is "foolish."

The suggestion that the Air Force Reserves should "keep an eye on anybody" who disagrees seriously with "Air Force policies."

The innuendo that the National Council of Churches must be Communist ridden because some of its leaders helped to bring out the "Revised Version of the Holy Bible."

All this is sickeningly reminiscent of the notorious charges against the Protestant clergy which J. B. Matthews made in the American Mercury magazine in July 1953, when he was serving as research director for the McCarthy committee. On that occasion Mr. Matthews let go with a blast which charged that the "largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States is composed of Protestant clergymen." He tossed out 7,000 as a nice round number. Senator McCarthy fired him.

To make blanket, meat ax, guilt by association accusations against any group is a mean and evil thing. To let some people, whoever they are, infiltrate a Government military manual with such charges is meaner and more evil.

The charges are false.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has never been one to understate the Communist problem, issued this finding after investigation:

"A minute number of case-hardened Communists and Communist sympathizers have actually infiltrated themselves into the ranks of the loyal clergy. * * * Only a very small number of clergymen in the United States have been fellow travelers. * * * The members of the clergy who have associated with Communist causes is a minute percentage of the hundreds of thousands of loyal, patriotic men of the cloth."

I think we can count on Secretaries Gates and Sharp to go the full distance to deal with this egregious misuse of an Air Force manual. The admission of an awful mistake is the beginning, not the end, of reform.

What is needed is to find out who wrote this stuff, who had anything to do with clearing it at every level, where it was distributed and assurance it won't happen again.

The National Council of Churches ought not to let go of this thing until it is thoroughly aired and cleaned up.

If the Pentagon can't do it—and fast—we can be sure that Congress will. And should.

Admiral Nimitz Calls Joint Chiefs of Staff Workable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Post of Sunday, February 21, 1960, entitled "Nimitz, 75, Calls JCS Workable." I solicit the careful consideration by all of the Members of the sage views of our greatest admiral.

Incidentally, Seaman Fred Hagner of San Antonio, Tex., the bluejacket who made the sundial that keeps time to the minute, is my old and good friend and he still lives in San Antonio. From a bluejacket, he went on to become the greatest inventor of navigational instruments our country has produced. His inventions have revolutionized the science of navigation.

The article follows:

NIMITZ, 75, CALLS JCS WORKABLE

(By Robert Eunson)

BERKELEY, CALIF.—The Joint Chiefs of Staff setup "has not proved effective," Admiral of the Fleet Chester W. Nimitz feels, "because various Secretaries of Defense have not functioned in the manner contemplated by the National Defense Act."

However, the silvery haired sea dog who commanded the most powerful naval force

in the world's history doesn't believe that the Joint Chiefs should be scrapped and the services merged.

"You would have the problem of the man on the horse," Nimitz says, "an all-powerful fellow with a budget of $40 billion a year. I don't say it would happen here, but it could. A man on horseback can always become a dictator."

In a prebirthday interview at his home in the Berkeley hills, Nimitz, who will be 75 Wednesday, sailed full steam ahead into the most controversial topics of the day.

He firmly believes that Defense Secretary Thomas Gates can and will make the Joint Chiefs function properly.

"The principal criticism of the JCS," Nimitz said, "has been that service jealousies prevent the Joint Chiefs from making a decision. The Security Act set up a Secretary of Defense who would be the source of decisions when the Joint Chiefs couldn't agree.

"Their not being able to agree is not an unhealthy state of affairs, because it employs the various points of view from responsible people. The National Security Act foresaw these situations and set up the Secretary of Defense to make decisions.

"Up to date," he said, "it has not proved effective because various Secretaries of Defense have not functioned in the manner contemplated by the act. Now Gates has proposed a new scheme for carrying out his responsibilities which I think is very sound and workable.

"That is, when important matters arise, the Secretary of Defense will join the JCS and decide small points as they arise, so the members can't reach a position from which they cannot retreat."

Question. Such as Taylor?

Answer. Yes.

(Gen. Maxwell B. Taylor resigned last year as Army Chief of Staff. He contends that the Joint Chiefs setup has failed and should be scrapped.)

"I don't agree with Taylor in scrapping the JCS," Nimitz said, "because the resulting organization would be so large it would be impossible to find a man properly qualified to handle it. It takes each Secretary (of Defense) years to know precisely what is going on."

Nimitz was wearing a green jacket, green tie, and gray flannels. We were sitting in a small office off his living room.

The walls were covered with photographs, most prominent of which was a picture of Nimitz accepting the Japanese surrender aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay. On a stand nearby was a bust of John Paul Jones.

Nimitz has quit smoking, but he still drinks Navy coffee. It would be better to call it "Nimitz" coffee, because he buys the beans and grinds them himself—one-third Italian and two-thirds American.

There was a "pot brewing" he said, so, "let's go out in the kitchen."

Mrs. Nimitz was sitting on a stool at the sink, preparing string beans. The Treasure Island Naval Base loomed from the fog on San Francisco Bay below us.

"These are nice green beans," she said, "but they're almost too thin to slice."

He handed me a cup with five stars and his name painted on the side. "A bluejacket made that for me," he said as we sat down in the breakfast nook. The coffee curled my toes, but I managed to squeak another question:

"Do you feel that this is the most dangerous period in our history?"

"Any country that reaches the top of the heap in world power and wealth is always the target for less powerful nations," he replied. "That was true in the past and will be true in the future."

"Threats come from different directions. The present threat appears to be about as serious as any we ever had. To that extent, I'll agree with General Taylor."

What of the Navy's future in the missile age?

"The Navy has played an important part in this country from the beginning. In fact, it was seapower from a navy, not the Continental Navy, but that of France, which forced the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown and brought the Revolution to a successful end."

The conversation turned to the finger missing from the admiral's left hand.

"I built the biggest diesel engine in the Navy in 1916," Nimitz explained. "It was for the oil tanker *Maumee* at New York Navy Yard. I had a canvas glove on and the glove got caught some way and the machine smashed my finger up to the last knuckle. My Annapolis class ring saved that much of my finger."

Another accident in Nimitz' career resulted in a court-martial, a story which has been kicked around a good deal in Navy clubs from Norfolk to Pearl.

"When I was Chief of Naval Operations and Mr. (the late James Vincent) Forrestal was Secretary of the Navy, we had a court-martial and a captain was reduced in numbers," Nimitz said. "The press was pretty indignant and at a news conference demanded to know if any officer who had been convicted by a court-martial ever rose to flag rank.

"'I don't know,' Forrestal said. 'How about you, Chet? You know of any?'

"'You're looking at one,' I said. 'Me.'"

Nimitz chuckled and took another belt of coffee.

"In 1907 I was an ensign in command of a destroyer, the U.S.S. *Decatur*. On a dark night I ran it onto a mud bank in Manila Bay.

"It was dark. I didn't know we were in the mud. Anyway, there was a court-martial and the committee decided on a reprimand."

At 75, Nimitz still rises early, about 6:30 a.m., and makes the coffee. He likes to walk and pitch horseshoes. He and Mrs. Nimitz are busy raising money right now to help the financially ailing San Francisco Symphony. They go to a movie occasionally and often enjoy their evening meal at the Faculty Club of the nearby University of California.

When it was time to go, we walked out into the yard.

"If the sun were shining," he said, leading the way to a marble stand, "I'd show you a sun dial that keeps time to the minute. A bluejacket made it for me."

Did he remember the name?

"Why, yes. He was Seaman Fred Hagner, of San Antonio, Tex. We shipped together the first time I went to sea. That was in 1905, right down here in San Francisco Bay."

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when horseracing was considered the sport of kings because it provided for their amusement and helped to breed better horses.

But, that was a long time ago. As horseracing grew in popularity, betting became more and more general among people. Today, horseracing is no longer the sport of kings for amusement but the sport of Governors for revenue—it is no longer used to breed better horses but to improve State treasuries.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, because horseracing today is a lucrative business, many of our States are taking full advantage of and capitalizing on the natural gambling urge of the American people. Throughout this Nation, State racing commissions have been lengthening their racing seasons and enlarging their daily racing cards not for the amusement of the public but because it brings more and more money into the State coffers.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey is the latest State to become concerned over the track tax competition from neighboring States. The Governor of New Jersey admits that the revenue is essential to balancing his State budget and has proposed "suitable action to protect its racing revenue against the possibility of a decline."

Mr. Speaker, all of this competition for more horseracing time means not only a recognition of the fact that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in human beings but that a tax on this gambling activity produces a great revenue.

Yet, in spite of this competitive movement among the States, we, in Congress, continue to keep our eyes closed and ignore the obvious, we refuse to accept the glaring fact that the desire to gamble is not confined to racetracks only.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress would only remove the blinders, it would discover that a national lottery could easily satisfy the natural gambling spirit of the American people and, at the same time, pump into the U.S. Treasury $10 billion a year in additional income. This added revenue would mean a tax cut for the hard-press wage earners and a reduction in our growing national debt.

Let us get smart and also compete for this gambling revenue which the States now enjoy alone.

He Helped Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in tribute to the renowned Revolutionary War hero, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Evening Herald, of Shenandoah, Pa., on February 10 as follows:

HE HELPED WASHINGTON

A valiant defender of liberty's cause and one of our renowned Revolutionary War heroes was Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko. For

a time he served as General Washington's aide-de-camp and also as adjutant. As a topflight engineer, his contributions in the service of the Continental Army were of major proportions.

General Kosciusko was responsible for the fortifications of the Delaware River, those at Saratoga and also at West Point. He was among the first of the Continentals to enter Charleston, S.C., after its evacuation by the British. His brigadier's commission from the Continental Congress dates from October 13, 1783.

After the American independence was won, this talented soldier returned to Poland and sought without success to reestablish that country's freedom. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

Both Poles and Lithuanians claim Kosciusko and, as a point of information, both are technically correct. His own will made in Paris, June 28, 1806, starts out thusly:

"Know all men by these presents that I, Thaedo Kosciusko, formerly an officer of the United States of America in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain, and a native of Lithuania in Poland * * *." The explanation is that the grand duchy of Lithuania was, at the time of his birth, embraced in the Kingdom of Poland.

February 12 marks the 214th anniversary of the birthday of General Kosciusko. Like Abraham Lincoln, whose birth date he shares, he was opposed to slavery.

All Americans can be proud of this great patriot; we remain in his debt.

Lippmann's Utopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy being waged on who is right when it come to matters of running the Federal Government, national security and the like, we hear many comments being made by many people on what we ought to do.

The Chicago Daily Tribune of February 19, 1960, editorialized on "Lippmann's Utopia" as they put it, where he expressed himself as an expert on all these things being discussed.

You know, for myself, I am willing to take the President's word. In my mind, he knows as much about these things as the top minds in the country, if not more. Above all, he has a direct pipeline to the people who are supposed to know and he does not need to get his information secondhand.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to is as follows:

LIPPMANN'S UTOPIA

Walter Lippmann, 70, has come to the conclusion that President Dwight Eisenhower, 69, is talking like a tired old man who has lost touch with the springs of our national vitality. The corollary apparently would be that Lippmann is a Ponce de Leon who has discovered the fountain of youth. And guess where he has located it? In your wallet.

This canned brain, in his most pretentious manner, discusses the President's observations at his news conference of February 3. Mr. Eisenhower was then asked whether, in the face of Soviet boasts to superiority in space, rate of economic growth, development of engineers, etc., there was not a risk that Americans might develop a dangerous frame of mind which would reconcile them to being second best.

The President replied that there was no defeatism in his soul. He said that dictatorships, such as Hitler's, can put up an appearance of efficiency. But he pointed to the loss of values which are inevitably sacrificed when a people are regimented and put under forced draft to reach designated goals.

Certainly, said Mr. Eisenhower, we could go into a garrison state, too, and get all steamed up, as if we were actually at war. But would that be consonant with our free system, dedicated to individual freedoms and rights? The President thought not. He also thought that this system in the long run produces more happiness, more satisfaction, more pride in ourselves, and more goods and more wealth.

For all these reasons, Mr. Eisenhower felt, we should treasure our own system and have greater faith in it. The President also expressed impatience with those with a parochial viewpoint who are always bellyaching. We should imagine that Lippmann, though not numbered among the generals Mr. Eisenhower was specifically discussing, might fall into this category.

Now, our reading of Mr. Eisenhower's remarks would lead us to conclude that, far from being tired and a defeatist, they more nearly correspond to a ringing affirmation of faith in his country, its ideals, and its enduring liberty.

But this does not suit Mr. Lippmann. He has a fixed idea: no matter how much Government spends and does, it should spend and do more. He regards it as a personal affront that people are living reasonably well and that they manage to keep something from the tax collector. He fumes at the President:

"It is he who is saying that with a $500 billion economy the American Nation will lose its freedom if it devotes to public purposes a somewhat larger share than it does today."

We have seen it said that when all taxes—Federal, State, and local—are counted, they are taking 41 percent of national earnings, and that, to meet the Federal spending bill of almost $80 billion, every American worker gives 2 hours and 16 minutes of each 8 hour day to State and Federal laws. How much more does Lippmann think ought to be squeezed out?

"In that struggle (with communism)," he says, "we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people."

So the prescription is more taxes and more spending—for missiles, for space rockets, for schools, for public housing, for all the gadgets of the welfare state. Mr. Lippmann has a touching faith in the ability of Government to wave the wand and make everything come out exactly right. He is tart with those who do not regard the Government as "an indispensable good" rather than as "a necessary evil."

Just take a swig of old Doc Lippmann's Ponce de Leon water and everything will be OK, even if in the end you find yourself floating in his copyrighted fountain of youth clothed in a barrel, the indispensably good burocracy having relieved you, with his assistance, of everything else.

American Bar Association Tax Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the American Bar Association I have today joined with my distinguished committee colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON] in cosponsoring legislation embodying the recommendations of the American Bar Association with respect to amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. These bills are H.R. 10591 and H.R. 10592 and have been introduced by us as chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Our purpose in introducing these bills is to make them publicly available to interested persons, including the many thousands of lawyers, accountants, and other citizens throughout the country who have particular occasion to study our internal revenue laws.

As many Members are no doubt aware, the section on taxation of the American Bar Association has spent a great deal of time and effort in studying the existing internal revenue laws. That group is to be commended on the work it has done in drafting these legislative recommendations for study by the Congress and the public. It should be understood, of course, that in introducing these bills neither Mr. MASON nor myself has had opportunity to give consideration to these recommendations at this time. The introduction of these bills now is undertaken merely to facilitate public study of them.

In addition to the preparation of the legislation, the American Bar Association has prepared a comprehensive analysis and explanation of each section and provision contained in this bill. So that this document may also be made available to the interested public, I include it in the RECORD following my remarks. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer of $1,255.50 for the cost of printing the estimated 15½ pages which will be required. It is worth the cost, however, to make this explanatory document widely available to all of the many interested individuals, groups, and organizations throughout the Nation.

The recommendations follow:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 10591 AND H.R. 10592

CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Amendment of 1954 code; effective date.
Sec. 2. Alimony and separate maintenance payments.
Sec. 3. Computation of employees' contributions for retirement benefits.
Sec. 4. Transfers of life insurance contracts for valuable consideration.
Sec. 5. Deduction of employee contributions under disability benefit plans.
Sec. 6. Losses on securities in affiliated corporations.
Sec. 7. Demolition loss.

Sec. 8. Carryovers of excess charitable contributions.
Sec. 9. Net operating loss deduction.
Sec. 10. Expenses concerning legislation.
Sec. 11. Deduction for certain title expenditures.
Sec. 12. Expenses of estate planning.
Sec. 13. Elimination of limitation on deductions for dividends received by corporations.
Sec. 14. Amortization of organization, reorganization and stock issuance expenditures of corporations.
Sec. 15. Transactions between related taxpayers.
Sec. 16. Attribution rules for disallowances in transactions between related taxpayers.
Sec. 17. Distributions of property by corporations.
Sec. 18. Corporate obligations held by shareholders.
Sec. 19. Constructive ownership of stock.
Sec. 20. Involuntary conversions in section 337 liquidations.
Sec. 21. Liquidation trusts or agencies in section 337 liquidations.
Sec. 22. Successive liquidations of controlled corporations in section 337 liquidations.
Sec. 23. Exclusion from dividend carryover in complete liquidations of subsidiaries.
Sec. 24. Retroactive amendment of stock bonus, pension, or profit-sharing plans.
Sec. 25. Treatment of distributions under stock bonus, pension, or profit-sharing plans made from accumulations during periods of qualification.
Sec. 26. Employer contributions under unqualified deferred compensation plans.
Sec. 27. Organizations engaged in more than one exempt activity.
Sec. 28. Denial of exemption to otherwise exempt organizations.
Sec. 29. Taxation of unrelated business income of certain religious organizations.
Sec. 30. Burden of proof rule in accumulated earnings tax proceedings.
Sec. 31. Amounts distributed or credited by estates and trusts to charitable beneficiaries.
Sec. 32. Capital gains and losses of estates and trusts allocated to corpus.
Sec. 33. Charges allocable to corpus of estate or trust.
Sec. 34. Effect of local probate law on income tax of estates.
Sec. 35. Guaranteed payments from partnership to partner.
Sec. 36. Deduction of organizational expenses of partnership.
Sec. 37 Closing of taxable year of partnership on death of partner.
Sec. 38. Termination of partnership.
Sec. 39. Character of gain or loss on disposition by a partner of distributed property.
Sec. 40. Payments to a retiring partner or to a deceased partner's successor in interest.
Sec. 41. Income with respect to a deceased partner.
Sec. 42. Sales or exchange of interest in partnership.
Sec. 43. Treatment of partnership distributions as sales or exchanges.
Sec. 44. Definition of unrealized receivables.
Sec. 45. Partnership inventory items.
Sec. 46. Limitation on partner's distributive share of losses.
Sec. 47. Exclusion of certain unincorporated organizations from partnership provisions.
Sec. 48. Western Hemisphere trade corporations.
Sec. 49. Basis of joint tenancies in community property States.
Sec. 50. Basis of property acquired from a decedent prior to his death.
Sec. 51. Limitation on gain on repossession of property.
Sec. 52. Gains and losses on purchase money obligations.
Sec. 53. Uncompleted employment rendered for 36 months or more.
Sec. 54. Exclusion of domestic corporations engaged primarily in foreign trade from consolidated return.
Sec. 55. Extending period of limitations on credit for State death taxes.
Sec. 56. Credit for gift tax against estate tax.
Sec. 57. Valuation of unlisted stock and securities for estate tax purposes.
Sec. 58. Deduction from gross estate for divorce settlement.
Sec. 59. Renounced or disclaimed interests.
Sec. 60. Application of marital deduction to allowance or award to surviving spouse.
Sec. 61. Exclusion for gifts of certain future interests.
Sec. 62. Prohibition of adjustment of amount of taxable gifts made in prior years.
Sec. 63. Definition of employer under Federal Unemployment Tax Act.
Sec. 64. Definition of price for manufacturers excise tax purposes.
Sec. 65. Stamp taxes payable by regulated investment companies.
Sec. 66. Elimination of stamp tax on certain transfers of stock or certificates of indebtedness in corporate mergers and consolidations.
Sec. 67. Elimination of requirement for returns as to formation or reorganization of foreign corporations.
Sec. 68. Jurisdiction of Tax Court over manufacturers excise taxes.
Sec. 69. Elimination of conditions on credit or refund of manufacturers excise tax.
Sec. 70. Limitation on assessment and collection when false return filed.
Sec. 71. Relief of fiduciary from personal liability for fraud committed by decedent.
Sec. 72. Limitations on credit or refund.
Sec. 73. Release of funds from jeopardy assessments.
Sec. 74. Jeopardy assessments.
Sec. 75. Effect to be given by Tax Court to court of appeals decision.
Sec. 76. Use of registered and certified mail.
Sec. 77. Costs awarded to prevailing party in refund suit.

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE; EFFECTIVE DATE

Amendment of 1954 code

Subsection (a) provides that except as otherwise provided, amendments are to a provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Except in two instances, an amendment is to a provision of the 1954 code. The bill provides for two amendments to title 28 of the United States Code (the Judicial Code). Subsection (e) of section 74 of the bill amends section 2201, and section 77 of the bill amends section 2412(b), of title 28 of the United States Code.

Effective date

Subsection (b) provides in general that amendments made by the bill shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment. Some provisions of the bill by their nature call for a different effective date. There are few retroactive amendments.

SECTION 2. ALIMONY AND SEPARATE MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

Section 71 of the 1954 code added a new provision including in the income of the wife periodic payments made under written separation agreemtns executed after the date of the enactment of the 1954 code. Such payments are deductible by the husband. The provision was not made applicable to separation agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment of the code in order to prevent the possibility of upsetting arrangements which had therefore been worked out with the understanding that the wife would not include the payments in her income. Consonant therewith, this amendment would make section 71 applicable to preexisting agreements if both parties to the agreement elected to bring themselves within the new provisions.

SECTION 3. COMPUTATION OF EMPLOYEEES' CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Pension for employees with foreign service

Present law is ambiguous as to how retirement benefits are taxed to an employee with a period of foreign residence. Section 72 of the code now seems to tax employees differently depending on whether their benefits were funded before or after 1951. Section 72(f) reads in terms as if, in computing the employees' contribution toward his retirement benefits, the consideration paid by him will be deemed to include contributions of the employer attributable to a period of foreign service of the employee only if the employee qualified under section 911 at the time the employee's contributions were made. Under many retirement plans the employee's pension benefits are not only not fully funded year by year as the service is rendered, but are not even fully funded at the time of retirement, and there is no specific allocation of funds to or accounting for funds attributable on behalf of a particular employee. Unless the single sum cost required to provide an employee's pension benefits (appropriately reduced to reflect trust earnings, etc.) may be used in applying section 72(f), the procedures outlined in section 72 cannot be applied, at least without penalizing the employee.

Subsection (a) is intended to correct this situation and to provide that the consideration paid by the employee shall be deemed to include contributions of the employer attributable to a period of foreign service of the employee qualifying under the rules of section 911.

Income taxable to trustee

Subsection (b) corrects what is believed to be an unintended change made by the 1954 code, in that income of a trust not qualifying under section 401(a) is at present taxable to an employee when distributed even though the income has been previously taxed to the trustee. Under the 1939 code such income was distributable to the employee free of tax.

Tax-exempt income

Subsection (b) also provides that income excludible from the gross income of the trustee of an unqualified trust shall not be taxable to the employee when distributed, since such income would not have been taxed if received by the employee directly.

SECTION 4. TRANSFERS OF LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS FOR VALUABLE CONSIDERATION

The 1954 code provides two exceptions to the general rule that in the case of a transfer for a valuable consideration amounts paid by reason of the death of the insured under a life insurance contract are excludible from gross income only to the extent of the consideration and premiums paid by the transferee. The first exception restates prior law. The second of these exceptions was new in the 1954 code and is applicable when the transferee is the insured, a partner of the insured, a partnership in which the insured is a partner, and a corporation in which the insured is a shareholder or officer. If any of these persons is a transferee all amounts

paid to such person by reason of the death of the insured are excludible from gross income.

This amendment would extend the second exception to apply to certain persons in addition to those now enumerated in the code. These persons include a spouse, former spouse, parent, lineal descendant or adopted child of the insured. If the transfer is to a person who is a shareholder of a corporation in which the insured is also a shareholder and is for the purpose of funding, in whole or in part, a buy and sell agreement relating to stock of the corporation, the second exception will also be applicable.

Those who are included in the amendment could initially buy a policy on the life of the insured without adverse income tax consequences. Therefore, it does not seem desirable to exclude any of these persons from the general exempting provisions of the 1954 code.

SECTION 5. DEDUCTION OF EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER DISABILITY BENEFIT PLANS

The laws of some States, in providing for disability benefit programs, permit a choice between participation in a State plan or participation in a private plan. The contribution of an employee is deductible only if paid as a tax. Such contribution might constitute a tax under a State plan, but never under a private plan.

Under this amendments employees contributing under a private plan are allowed a deduction to the same extent as if they had contributed under a State plan.

SECTION 6. LOSSES ON SECURITIES IN AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

The 1954 code changed from 95 percent to 80 percent the percentage of stock of a subsidiary which the parent company must own for inclusion of the subsidiary in a consolidated return. However, the percentage of stock of the subsidiary which must be owned by the taxpayer, in order to take an ordinary loss under section 165(g)(3) on the stock or securities of the subsidiary if they become worthless, was left at 95 percent. At the time the predecessor of section 165(g)(3) was inserted in the 1939 code, in 1942, it was indicated that this provision should be correlated with the consolidated return provisions (S. Rept. No. 1631, 77th Cong., 2d sess.). This amendment effects such correlation.

SECTION 7. DEMOLITION LOSS

Present law imposes a heavy burden of proof of intent whenever the taxpayer voluntarily demolishes or removes existing structures. A claimed loss on demolition may be disallowed on the ground that the taxpayer acquired the property with intent to demolish. This may necessitate going back many years to establish intent at the date of acquisition. See *N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc.*, 17 T.C. 631 (1951), turning upon intent at date of acquisition 13 years before demolition occurred and 26 years before the issue arose upon the sale of the property. Furthermore, while the Commissioner has taken the position that the intent at the time of acquisition is determinative, the court decisions are not in agreement on this point.

This amendment provides that demolition or removal expenditure incurred more than 3 years after the property was acquired shall not be disallowed as a business loss or other deduction solely because the taxpayer acquired the property with intent to demolish and remove existing structures. The amendment eliminates the necessity of proof of intent at the date of the acquisition provided the demolition or removal occurs more than 3 years after the property was acquired.

SECTION 8. CARRYOVERS OF EXCESS CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

These amendments to section 170 will extend to individuals the right to carry over excess charitable contributions as deductions to the two next succeeding taxable years, similar to the right now possessed by corporations.

SECTION 9. NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION

Libson Shops, Inc. v. *Koehler*, 353 U.S. 382 (1957), announced the principle that under the 1939 code a surviving corporation in a merger may not carry over or deduct a premerger net operating loss one business against postmerger income of another business which was operated and taxed separately before the merger. Rev. Rul. 58-603, 1958-2 Cum. Bull. 147, states that this principle will not be relied upon by the Internal Revenue Service under the 1954 code as to a merger or other transaction described in section 381(a) of the 1954 code.

In *Mill Ridge Coal Co.* v. *Patterson*, 58-1 USTC par. 9489, 1 AFTR 2d 1627 (N.D. Ala. 1958), aff'd 264 F. 2d 713 (5th Cir. 1959), cert. denied, — U.S. — (1959), it was held that a corporation could not carry forward a loss from operations from the production and sale of coal to offset the earnings from a new business of selling and distributing bunker oil. The decision of the district court, with which the court of appeals agreed, was based on the language in the Libson Shops case that a corporation is not entitled to a carryover where the income against which the offset is claimed "was not produced by substantially the same business which incurred the loss."

Mill Ridge Coal involved a change in the ownership of all the corporation's stock and hence under the 1954 code section 382(a) would apply. However, there is no indication in the opinion in Mill Ridge Coal that the decision would have been different had there been no change in stock ownership. Where the current earnings and the earlier loss are those of the same corporation, and there has been no or only a minor change in stock ownership, section 381 does not apply and section 382 would allow the net operating loss deduction only by inference.

The amendment would clarify the law by providing that unless other provisions in the 1954 code called for disallowance of a net operating loss deduction, it shall not be disallowed because the loss occurred in a business which is different from the business from which the profits were derived.

This amendment takes effect as if it had been reflected in the 1954 code at the time of the enactment of such code.

SECTION 10. EXPENSES CONCERNING LEGISLATION

This amendment adds to the 1954 code a new section 180 providing that certain expenses otherwise deductible shall not be disallowed because they relate to the legislative process.

The legislative process today is conducted in such fashion that taxpayers may incur certain expenses, such as those in connection with appearances before congressional committees, which, although technically lobbying expenses, are nevertheless ordinary and necessary business expenses. Under this amendment reasonable expenses (including traveling expenses, the cost of preparing testimony and the like) incurred by a taxpayer in connection with appearances before or submission of statements to the committees of Congress or of any other legislative body will be deductible from gross income.

The amendment does not cover expenses in connection with referendums.

SECTION 11. DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN TITLE EXPENDITURES

This section adds a new section 181 to the 1954 code, to provide for the deductibility of attorneys' fees and other expenditures incurred to conduct litigation or other controversy even though title to business property, income-producing property or cash is involved. The amendment is designed to insure that expenditures otherwise governed by section 162 (relating to business expenses) or section 212 (relating to nonbusiness deductions) shall not be made nondeductible by the fact that they are incurred in litigation or controversy involving title to property. At present the law is uncertain.

Section 181(a) authorizes the deduction of expenses even though incurred in a controversy involving title to business property or to income-producing property, or to money. The inclusion of money as a third classification of property is due to two circumstances unique to money: first, money cannot have a basis different from its face value, and hence the capitalization of an expenditure to recover or retain money is tantamount to denying the deduction altogether; second, money cannot be classified as exclusively business property, property held to produce income, or property devoted only to personal use, because its owner can devote it to any of these uses.

Section 181(b) recognizes the fact that litigation expenses are often paid in a single year in such a large total as to exceed the income of a single year.

Section 181(c) contains three exceptions to the general rule. The first is to prevent current deduction of expenditures incurred in the quiet title and similar actions customarily employed to establish title to recently acquired property in States where title insurance is not used. It is felt that such expenditures are essentially substitutes for title insurance and should be treated as such. The second exception specifically limits the interpretation of "and other expenditures" in section 181(a) so that it is clear no deduction may be claimed for amounts paid out to satisfy judgments. The treatment of such amounts will continue to be covered by sections 162, 212, and 263 and other relevant provisions of existing law.

The amendments made by this section apply to title expenditures incurred on or after the date of enactment.

SECTION 12. EXPENSES OF ESTATE PLANNING

Under section 212 of the 1954 code the Treasury Department will presumably allow a deduction of the expenses incurred in connection with the creation of a revocable trust of income-producing property, but will probably deny a deduction for such expenses incurred in connection with the creation of an irrevocable trust or the drafting of a will.

Proper planning for the management of property during life and its disposition after death are interrelated. Since there has been an increasing tendency to approach taxation from the standpoint of the burden that a family unit should bear, it appears appropriate to permit as an additional deduction to an individual, as this amendment will do, all the expenses incurred in arranging for the disposition of his property during his life and after his death.

SECTION 13. ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON DEDUCTIONS FOR DIVIDENDS RECEIVED BY CORPORATIONS

This section amends sections 246(b)(1) and 172(d)(6) of the 1954 code to eliminate an inequity.

Section 243(a) permits a corporation to deduct 85 percent of the dividends received from a domestic corporation, limited by section 246(b)(1) to 85 percent of the taxable income computed without regard to the net operating loss deduction allowed by section 172. Section 246(b)(2), however, provides that section 246(b)(1) shall not apply where there is a net operating loss as determined under section 172. Section 172(d)(6) provides that the deduction allowed by section 243(a) shall be computed without regard to section 246(b).

The result is that the limitation under section 246(b)(1) is not applicable where the income computed by including 100 percent of dividends received from domestic

corporations is less than 85 percent of such dividends.

The inequity which this amendment corrects is illustrated in the following example:

	A	B	C
Dividends received	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
Current operating loss	0	150,000	150,001
Taxable income computed without the dividends received deduction	1,000,000	850,000	849,999
Dividends received deduction computed under sec. 172(d)(6)	850,000	850,000	850,000
Net operating loss	0	0	1
Dividends received deduction under sec. 246(b)(1) and (2)	850,000	722,500	850,000
Taxable income	150,000	127,500	0

In A, the corporation received the full benefit of the dividends received deduction. In B, where there is a current operating loss of $150,000 the corporation's dividends received deduction is reduced under section 246(b)(1). In C, however, where the corporation has a net operating loss deduction of $1 under section 172(d)(6), the section 246(b)(1) limitation does not apply, and the corporation is entitled to the full dividends received deduction. This amendment will eliminate this unequal treatment.

The amendments made by this section apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

SECTION 14. AMORTIZATION OF ORGANIZATION, REORGANIZATIONS AND STOCK ISSUANCE EXPENDITURES OF CORPORATIONS

Section 248 of the 1954 code presently allows the amortization, over a 60-month period, of corporate organizational expenditures. It does not apply to any expenses in connection with the reorganization or recapitalization of a corporation, nor does it in terms apply to stock issuance expenses. The principles which allow the amortization of organization expenses should permit the amortization of reorganizational (including recapitalization) and stock issuance expenses.

Section 248 now provides that the amortization shall be over a period of not less than 60 months, beginning with the month in which the corporation begins business. This is obviously inappropriate for reorganizational and stock issuance expenses incurred at a later date. Also, organizational expenses may be paid prior to the incorporation, before the charter is filed or the corporation is legally in existence. A bill may be rendered before organization of the new corporation is completed and may be paid by a parent corporation or others, with subsequent reimbursement from the new corporation. The amendment therefore provides that amortization shall begin with the month in which the expenses are paid or accrued, or in which the corporation begins business, whichever is later.

SECTION 15. TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN RELATED TAXPAYERS

Prior to the enactment of the 1954 code the revenue laws prohibited the deduction of losses sustained upon sales or exchanges between certain related taxpayers but did not preserve the basis of the seller or permit the offsetting of similar gains (sec. 24(b) of the 1939 code). Section 267(d) of the 1954 code cured the first defect by providing for the preservation of the seller's basis. The second defect remains.

These amendments to section 267 will permit the offsetting of such gains occurring in the taxable year whether the losses arise in transactions with the same or a different related taxpayer. The adoption of the offset principle requires a change in the preservation of the basis provision so that the basis is preserved only in respect of that portion of the loss which is not allowed as a deduction.

SECTION 16. ATTRIBUTION RULES FOR DISALLOWANCES IN TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN RELATED TAXPAYERS

Subsection (a) of section 267 disallows losses on sales or exchange of property between related persons and, within certain limitations, expenses or interest paid to the related party. The relationships which bring section 267(a) into play are prescribed in section 267(b) and rules for determining the ownership of stock in a corporation for purposes of subsection (b) are contained in subsection (c).

This amendment makes certain changes in the list of related persons in section 267(b) to broaden the relationships. The stock ownership attribution rules of section 267(c) are made unform with those of section 318.

There are conforming amendments to section 1235(d), defining related persons for purposes of the income tax effects of the sale or exchange of patents.

SECTION 17. DISTRIBUTIONS OF PROPERTY BY CORPORATIONS

This section amends sections 301(b)(1) and 301(d) of the 1954 code.

Present law permits a domestic corporate shareholder to take property distributed with respect to the stock of a foreign corporation into income at the lower of fair market value or adjusted basis to the distributing foreign corporation. Present law also permits a foreign corporate shareholder to take property distributed with respect to the stock of a domestic corporation into income at the lower of fair market value or adjusted basis to the distributing domestic corporation.

The underlying policy of the 1954 code seems to require that the fair market value of property distributed to a corporation be fully taxable as a dividend in cases where no dividends-received deduction is allowable to the recipient corporate shareholder. The amendment provides that the amount of the dividend will be the fair market value of the property distributed in kind if received (i) by a domestic corporate shareholder from a foreign corporation, to the extent such dividend so received is not entitled to a dividends-received deduction in the hands of the domestic corporate shareholder, and (ii) by a foreign corporate shareholder, not entitled to such deduction, from a domestic corporation.

The amendments made by this section apply to distributions received, or in the case of an accrual basis taxpayer, accrued by the distributee after the date of enactment.

SECTION 18. CORPORATE OBLIGATIONS HELD BY SHAREHOLDERS

This section amends section 317 to provide, through the addition to the 1954 code of certain nonexclusive rules, an area of certainty as to the income tax treatment of debt obligations of a corporation held by such corporation's shareholders. For many years the courts have considered questions of whether the interest held by a corporate shareholder, as evidenced by a particular security, should be regarded as a creditor's claim or an equity interest in the corporation.

For the most part such of the decided cases as have reached the result that what purports to be debt is in substance an equity interest have reached this result on grounds that the provisions of the security more nearly resemble a shareholder's interest than a creditor's claim. Thus, where the obligation to pay is not unconditional; where there is no fixed maturity date; where inadequate consideration is given for the obligation; where the obligation is subordinated to the claims of creditors generally; where payment for the use of the principal is not unconditionally due at or before maturity; or where the amount of payment for the use of the principal is dependent on earnings, the courts in numerous cases have held that the interest created was an equity interest for tax purposes. In most cases, facts showing such obligations to be held pro rata by shareholders, or that a high ratio of debt to equity capital existed, have been relied on as additional evidence of intent to create an equity interest because the obligation failed to conform with the normal characteristics of true debt in other respects. However, instruments conforming in all respects with true debt obligations have been treated as stock by the courts where the debt-equity ratios were high.

Under this amendment no corporate earnings escape tax which they would otherwise bear. The effect taxwise is simply to provide a mechanism whereby the investor in a corporate enterprise may recover a substantial part of his basis or stake before he is called upon to pay personal taxes on the income from his investment. When and as he reduces such income to his possession the tax will be collected.

The amendment establishes a nonexclusive set of conditions, which if observed in the issuance of corporate debt obligations, guarantees the investor that the obligations will be treated as debt for all purposes under the income tax laws. The conditions proposed are those which generally characterize true debt as distinguished from the mixed debt-equity interests which have occupied so much attention of the courts.

It is specifically provided that corporate debt obligations are not to be limited to those which conform with the prescribed conditions and also that even the failure to meet some of the prescribed conditions will not disqualify the obligation if such failure is due to business requirements of the corporation. For example, to obtain outside financial assistance a lender may require the stockholders also to loan some money to the corporation on a subordinated basis. Establishment of such a requirement would permit the shareholder's debt to qualify, even though it failed to meet the condition that such obligations be not subordinated to the claims of trade creditors generally.

In prescribing a ratio test, the comparison is between the principal of the obligations held by shareholders and the fair value of their stock rather than the basis of such stock. Fair value has been used because in cases where assets appreciated in value have been exchanged for stock in a tax-free incorporation, the basis of the assets and hence the stock might be so low as compared with fair value as to exceed the 10-to-1 ratio at the outset. The principal purpose of the amendment would be defeated in such cases. Since any obligation to qualify under the amendment must be based upon adequate consideration, abuse through inflation of values is prevented. Further, since the basis of the obligations received in such tax-free incorporations would be the same as the basis of the assets exchanged for them, a tax would result on repayment or sale of the obligation.

SECTION 19. CONSTRUCTIVE OWNERSHIP OF STOCK

General

This section makes extensive amendments to section 318 of the 1954 code.

Although the general principle underlying section 318, dealing with the constructive ownership of stock, may be sound, experience has shown that the section as presently drafted is confusing in many respects and is badly in need of clarification and modification. The Mills advisory group on subchapter C has made recommendations for amendments directed toward this end, and

the language of the amendments proposed by that group has for the most part been adopted in the revision of section 318 and certain related sections as herewith proposed.

Attribution in the case of spouses separated by interlocutory divorce decree

Section 318(a)(1) of the present law provides that there shall be no attribution of stock between spouses legally separated under a decree of divorce. The suggested amendment to section 318(a)(1)(A)(i) provides specifically that there will be no attribution between spouses separated under an interlocutory decree of divorce.

Attribution from and to partnerships, estates, trusts, and corporations

Under section 318 as presently drafted, extremely difficult and confusing problems have arisen because of the requirement that stock be reattributed into and out of partnerships, trusts, estates, and corporations. Because of this reattribution it is possible, theoretically at least, that ownership of stock could be attributed to a person who had no knowledge of nor economic connection with the actual owner of the stock. In the proposed revision this reattribution is eliminated—see section 318(a)(5)(C).

Attribution from partnerships, estates, trusts, and corporations

Under present section 318, stock owned by a partnership, estate, trust, or corporation is considered as owned proportionately by the partners, beneficiaries, and shareholders, except that stock owned by a corporation is attributed to a shareholder only if that shareholder owns 50 percent or more in value of the stock of the corporation. In the proposed revision of section 318 a 5 percent limitation is provided for in all cases, so that persons having small interests in corporations, partnerships, trusts, and estates will not have to bother with the attribution rules. Specific rules are also provided with respect to preferred stock and methods of determining proportionate interests.

Attribution to partnerships, estates, trusts, and corporations

Present law provides for attribution to a partnership of stock owned by partners, attribution to an estate of stock owned by beneficiaries, attribution to a trust of stock owned by beneficiaries except where the beneficiary has only a remote contingent interest in the trust, and attribution to a corporation of stock owned by a shareholder who owns 50 percent or more in value of the stock of the corporation. In section 318(a)(3) as proposed, stock owned by a partner or a beneficiary of an estate or trust will only be attributed to the partnership, estate, or trust where the owner has an interest of 5 percent or more in the entity, computed on the same basis as the 5 percent interest is computed for purposes of attribution from partnerships, estates, or trusts. Also, under the proposed section 318(a)(3), stock which is limited and preferred as to dividends is excluded in determining 50 percent ownership in the attribution from a shareholder to a corporation.

In the case of attribution to a partnership of stock owned by a partner, the 5 percent minimum will not serve to eliminate inequity involved in according dividend treatment to some partners on a redemption of stock owned by the partnership merely because one of their partners, having a partnership interest greater than 5 percent, owns stock in the redeeming corporation. To provide adequately for this situation section 302 is amended by inserting a new section 302(b)(2)(D) requiring that the disproportionality test be applied separately for each partner, as though the stock owned by the partnership had been distributed to the partners immediately prior to the redemption and the stock redeemed had been redeemed in the hands of each partner.

Application of constructive ownership rules of section 318(a) to section 302(b)(1)

The amendments proposed would specifically provide in sections 302(b)(5) and 302(c)(1) that the constructive ownership rules of section 318(a) shall not apply in determining whether the redemption is not essentially equivalent to a dividend within the meaning of section 302(b)(1), but that for the purpose of that determination the relationships described in section 318(a) may be taken into account along with all other facts and circumstances.

Incidental amendments

Other amendments modify provisions in sections 304(b)(1), 304(c) and 382(a)(3) which in present law provide in certain special cases for attribution of stock from a shareholder to a corporation whether or not he owns 50 percent or more of the stock of the corporation. Under the amendments there would be a 5 percent minimum stock ownership required for such attribution in those special cases.

Comparison with recommendations of Mills advisory group on subchapter C

The principal change from the recommendations made by the Mills advisory group on subchapter C relates to the matter of attribution to grandchildren of stock owned by grandparents. In the present recommendation the statute would remain in its present form in this regard, and stock owned by grandparents would not be attributed to their grandchildren.

SECTION 20. INVOLUNTARY CONVERSIONS IN SECTION 337 LIQUIDATIONS

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled (*Rev. Rul. 56–372*, 1956–2 Cum. Bull. 187) that the receipt of fire insurance proceeds from the complete destruction of a building by fire, resulting in an involuntary conversion, does not constitute a "sale" for the purpose of obtaining nonrecognition of gain or loss where there is a liquidation of corporate assets pursuant to section 337. The fact that section 1033 characterizes destruction of property and indemnification for its loss as an involuntary conversion, it is held, does not establish that the events constitute a sale or exchange; nor are the provisions of section 1231(a) effective to characterize the events as a sale or exchange.

The amendment extends the non-recognition treatment provided by section 337(a) to all compulsory or involuntary conversions if the plan of complete liquidation was adopted prior to the conversion or within 60 days thereafter. Moreover, it relaxes the strict distribution requirements of the section with respect to such conversions, provided the proceeds of conversion are distributed promptly after receipt. Under the amendment, the distribution requirements of section 337 are considered met if the proceeds of the conversion are distributed within the prescribed 12-month period or within 60 days after the receipt thereof by the corporation, whichever is later.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C has adopted the amendment proposed herein.

SECTION 21. LIQUIDATION TRUSTS OR AGENCIES IN SECTION 337 LIQUIDATIONS

Sometimes a liquidating corporation has assets such as mortgages and claims in litigation that are not susceptible of prompt distribution to shareholders. In such cases, it may be difficult for the corporation to effect a complete liquidating distribution within the 12-month period prescribed by section 337. The purpose of this amendment is to make specific statutory provision regarding the transfer of such assets to a liquidating trust or agency as a means of completing the liquidation of the corporation.

The amendment specifically states that the transaction will be treated as a transfer of assets by the shareholders to the trust or agency, thus making it clear that the basis of the assets in the hands of the trust or agency will be the same as it would have been in the hands of the shareholders had the assets been distributed directly to them. Moreover, in order to provide specifically for treatment of any income on the assets received by the trust or agency, and in order to make clear that the trust or agency may not be created or operated in such manner as to be an associattion taxable as a corporation, it is required that the income of the trust or agency be currently taxable to the shareholders.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C has adopted the amendment proposed herein.

SECTION 22. SUCCESSIVE LIQUIDATIONS OF CONTROLLED CORPORATIONS IN SECTION 337 LIQUIDATIONS

Section 337(c)(2) makes section 337 inapplicable where the liquidation is one to which section 332 applies, if the parent corporation takes over the subsidiary's property basis. This rule—an entirely sound one when the liquidation of a subsidiary alone is involved—raises problems of procedure, i.e., order of sales and liquidations, where parent and subsidiary both contemplate the sale of assets and complete liquidation. Under the present law, if a subsidiary adopts a plan of complete liquidation under section 332 which is completed within the 12-month period gain or loss is recognized upon the sale of assets by it during the period, even though the parent corporation within the same period completely liquidates outside section 332. However, if the subsidiary were first completely liquidated into the parent under section 332 and the parent, following the adoption of its own plan of complete liquidation, sold the assets received from the subsidiary, no gain or loss would be recognized on the sale of the assets formerly owned by the subsidiary. Similar problems arise where intermediate holding corporations are involved. There appears to be no policy reason why section 337 should not apply where the parent corporation completely liquidates outside section 332. The amendment would make section 337 applicable in that situation.

An amendment in substantially identical terms has been recommended by the Mills advisory group on subchapter C.

SECTION 23. EXCLUSION FROM DIVIDEND CARRYOVER IN COMPLETE LIQUIDATIONS OF SUBSIDIARIES

Section 562(b) provides that in the case of amounts distributed in liquidation the part of such distribution which is properly chargeable to earnings and profits accumulated after February 28, 1913 (and, in the case of certain complete liquidations, any distribution to the extent of the current earnings in the year of distribution), shall be treated as a dividend for purposes of computing the dividends paid deduction used in determining personal holding company tax. Section 564 provides, in general, that the excess of the dividends paid in a particular year over the taxable income of that year is a carryover for purpose of computing the dividends paid deduction in the 2 succeeding years.

Regulation section 1.562–1(b) confirms that the liquidations referred to in section 562(b) include a tax-free complete liquidation (or statutory merger) of a subsidiary into its parent under section 332. Under section 381(c)(14) the dividend carryover of the subsidiary in a section 332 liquidation is available to its parent in computing the parent's own dividends paid deduction for personal holding tax purposes.

Thus, under existing law it appears that for 2 years following a tax-free liquidation of a subsidiary under section 332 the parent

will have available to it as a dividends paid deduction the excess of the entire post-1913 accumulated earnings of the subsidiary over the subsidiary's taxable income in the year of liquidation, even though the liquidating distribution in no way increases the parent's taxable income or personal holding company income.

It is considered that such a result is not justified. It is proposed that it be corrected by eliminating from the carryover to the parent the dividends paid deduction generated for the subsidiary by the tax-free liquidating distribution made by it to the parent. There would be retained the carryover to the parent of excess distributions by the subsidiary which were taxable, such as earlier ordinary dividends or partial liquidations. It is considered that any required limitation of the carryover with respect to distributions in consolidated return periods, referred to in section 562(d), can best be handled in the consolidated return regulations.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C has adopted the amendment proposed herein.

The American Bar Association has adopted a number of resolutions which, while not proposing precise statutory language, contain recommendations to the Congress with respect to provisions of the revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C, nearly all reflected in H.R. 4459 introduced by Representative MILLS on February 12, 1959. These resolutions of the American Bar Association are either by way of approval of or opposition to a proposal of the advisory group, and recommend to the Congress either that it enact or not enact legislation embodying the principles of such proposal of the advisory group. Summaries and explanations of these resolutions appear below:

Opposition to Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Relating to Dividends Payable in Stock on Certain Shares and in Cash on Other Shares

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it not enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C (see sec. 6 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to amend section 305 so as to include as taxable dividends distributions made to holders of common stock which are payable in additional shares of stock with respect to part of the outstanding common stock and are payable in cash or other property with respect to the balance of such stock.

This proposal provided an additional exception to be made by statute to the general rule of nontaxability of stock dividends in those instances in which distributions made with respect to one or more classes of common stock are payable in stock with respect to part of such shares and cash or property with respect to the remainder of such shares. The proposed statutory amendment would apply where a corporation has issued two classes of common stock, one paying cash dividends and the other paying an equivalent amount in stock whether or not the latter class is convertible into the former class. It is considered that the advisory group proposal extends to situations in which no tax is justified, and should not be enacted.

Unless each class of common stock carries rights either identical with, proportionate to, or dependent upon, the rights of another class of common, both as to dividends and as to distributions in liquidation, there would appear to be no justification for taxing the holders of one class of stock on a stock dividend merely because simultaneously the holders of the other class of stock receive a dividend in cash or property. Unless the issuance of a stock dividend on one class of common stock, or to one group of common stockholders, effects a change in their equitable interest in the assets of the corporation vis-a-vis the other stockholders in the corporation, there would, in fact, appear to be a serious question as to whether there is any income subject to tax under the 16th amendment.

There is nothing objectionable in a corporate capitalization which enables one class of stockholders to receive its share of earnings in cash and the other class of stockholders to have its share of earnings reinvested in the company. Legitimate business reasons (aside from tax considerations) frequently exist for such a form of corporate capitalization. Under existing legislative policy, the holder of common stock is not subject to tax on the receipt of a stock dividend merely because the corporation also has outstanding a class of preferred stock in which cash dividends, limited in amount, are paid. There would appear to be no justification for different treatment of a stock dividend merely because the holders of the other class of stock who receive cash dividends are not limited as to the amount of dividends they may receive. If there is a deliberate accumulation of earnings beyond the reasonable means of the business through the issuance of stock dividends in lieu of cash dividends, other provisions of law are adequate to take care of such situations.

Opposition to Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Relating to Charitable Contributions of Section 306 Stock

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it not enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the Mills advisory group on subchapter C to amend section 170 (revised report of advisory group, sec. 7) so as to reduce the amount of the deduction for a charitable contribution of section 306 stock by the amount of gain which would have been realized as ordinary income by the donor if he had sold the stock.

Section 306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides, in general, that if a shareholder receives preferred stock as a tax-free dividend on common stock and sells the preferred stock to third parties, the proceeds of sale will be treated as ordinary income. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that if the shareholder, instead of selling the stock, donates the stock to a charity, he realizes no income on the transfer but may deduct the value of the stock as a charitable contribution. The Mills advisory group on subchapter C has recommended to Congress that in such case the amount of the charitable contribution deduction be reduced by the amount which would have been taxed to the shareholder as ordinary income if he had sold the stock rather than contributing it to charity. It is considered that there is no valid distinction between section 306 stock and other stock or property insofar as the allowance of the charitable contribution deduction is concerned.

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Relating to Basis-Over-Basis Principle in Recognizing Gain to Shareholders in Corporate Liquidation

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 12 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to limit recognition of gain in corporate liquidations to the excess of the corporation's basis of the assets distributed over the shareholder's basis of his shares exchanged.

Under existing law a shareholder is, in general, taxable on the excess of the fair market value of property distributed in a corporate liquidation over the basis of his shares. This results in taxation without change in beneficial ownership but may also permit a conversion of ordinary income into capital gain through the consequent stepup in basis. Under the advisory group proposal (the so-called basis-over-basis rule) the gain realized on a corporate liquidation (excess of the value of the distribution over the basis of the shares, as under existing law) would be recognized (and taxed) only to the extent of the excess, if any, of the corporation's basis of the assets distributed over the shareholder's basis of his shares exchanged. Any loss realized would be fully recognized under the provisions of existing law. The basis of the distributed assets in the hands of the shareholder would be appropriately adjusted. Because the basis-over-basis principle permits greater consistency with the treatment of related transactions and greater simplicity and certainty in administration, its adoption is recommended.

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Regarding Revision and Simplification of Rules relating to Collapsible Corporations

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principles of the proposals of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 16 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.), to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to collapsible corporations so as to simplify the present rules, to substitute objective tests for the present subjective test in defining a collapsible corporation, and to make such rules more equitable by taxing to the shareholders at ordinary rates only the gain attributable to property which if sold by the corporation would have produced ordinary income.

Section 341 of existing law, which is intended to prevent the use of a corporation to convert ordinary income into capital gain, defines a so-called collapsible corporation in terms dependent upon subjective intent. If the section applies, the entire gain realized by a shareholder is taxed as ordinary income. Section 341(e), which was added to provide additional objective tests, is extremely complicated.

The proposal of the advisory group would substitute objective tests for the previous tests depending upon the intention of the shareholders. It would provide for fragmentation of the gain, so that only so much of the shareholder's gain as is equal to his ratable share of the unrealized appreciation on specified assets will result in ordinary income. The proposal would avoid the possibility present under existing law that items which would otherwise produce capital gain will be converted into ordinary income through the use of a corporation. Generally the section would tax as ordinary income to shareholders only items that would have produced ordinary income had no corporation been used.

Opposition to Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Imposing a Net Worth Limitation With Respect to Corporate Separations

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it not enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 20 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to amend section 355 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to impose a requirement that the business distributed or retained have a value of not less than 20 percent of the net worth of the distributing corporation immediately before the distribution.

The advisory group has proposed, as part of a general recommendation that section 355 be coordinated more fully with section 346 (relating to partial liquidations), to limit the application of section 355 to cases where the fair market value of the stock or securities distributed is not less than 20 percent nor more than 80 percent of the excess of the fair market value of the assets over the

liabilities of the distributing corporation immediately before the distribution. It is believed that whatever justification the similar 20 percent requirement has under proposed section 346(c), a 20 percent limitation under section 355 is both unnecessary and unsound; also, that because of the necessity under such a limitation of determining the relative value of the assets distributed or retained, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to secure advance rulings on legitimate corporate separations due to the Internal Revenue Service's policy of not making such determinations in valuation matters.

Adoption of Certain Principles of Recommendations of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Relating to "Boot" Distributions

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principles of the proposal of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 21 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to amend section 356 of the Internal Revenue Code so that the provisions with respect to the taxation of "boot" under the section apply only to transactions that, independently of its provisions, qualify as reorganizations or as divisions under section 355 of the Internal Revenue Code, and so that, in the case of a "boot" distribution which has the effect of a dividend, the tax applies to the full distribution whether or not the stockholder has a gain.

The advisory group on subchapter C has proposed that, among other amendments of a technical or coordinating nature to section 356, that section be amended so that its provisions shall apply only to distributions of taxable property in connection with reorganization exchanges or in connection with transactions qualifying under section 355. The amendment to limit the application of section 356 to reorganization and divisive transactions is advisable for the sake of certainty in view of the language of *Howard* v. *Commissioner*, 238 F. 2d 943 (7th Cir. 1956), which implied the contrary, despite the generally held view that the rule established by this proposed amendment was already applicable.

Adoption of Principles of Recommendations of Advisory Group on Subchapter C Relating to Definitions of Corporate Reorganizations

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying those principles of the proposal of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 26 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) involving amendment of the definitions of reorganizations in section 368 of the Internal Revenue Code so that the definitions of (A), (B), and (C) reorganizations will all be subject to the same rules as to what consideration must be received, and so that two-thirds of such consideration must consist of stock which may be either common or preferred, voting or nonvoting.

The proposal to modify the definitions of reorganizations so as to apply uniform rules to (A), (B) and (C) reorganizations will introduce more uniformity of tax effect into substantively and economically similar transactions and will reduce the possibility of making slight changes in a transaction to produce subatantially different tax results. In codifying the continuity of interest rule as a two-thirds stock interest requirement, the proposal makes more certain the somewhat indefinite continuity of interest requirement already recognized by the courts in (A) reorganizations. The elimination of the voting stock requirement in (B) and (C) reorganizations to coincide with the existing rule in (A) reorganizations is advisable; it eliminates the "solely for voting stock" requirement which had little logic. It should be noted, however, that the allowance of greater latitude in meeting the requirements for (B) and (C) reorganizations is coupled with the taxation of "boot" as a dividend regardless of gain. Hence, the overall effect of the proposals should not lead to large boot distributions.

Opposition to recommendations of advisory group on subchapter C relating to special limitations on net operating loss carryovers

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it not enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the advisory group on subchapter C (sec. 29 of H.R. 4459, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to amend section 382 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit the net operating loss carryover of a corporation, upon a change in ownership of 50 percent or more of the stock of the corporation (whether by purchase, reorganization or change in outstanding shares), to 50 percent of the amount of the fair market value of the business.

The advisory group has proposed that net operating loss carryovers be limited to 50 percent of the fair market value of the corporation, as determined by the terms of the acquisition, where there is a 50 percent change in stock ownership of a corporation in a period of 2 taxable years. In the case of reorganizations, the degree of change of ownership would be tested on the continuing stock interest in the continuing corporation. The proposal, while eliminating some undesirable complexities of current law, would impose a rule of thumb for the purpose of eliminating the more flagrant cases of dealing in loss corporations. Such a rule of thumb is inadequate to deal with tax avoidance problems in this area. Moreover, the rule would impose undesired hardships on stockholders in loss corporations involved in transactions having no tax avoidance aspect.

SECTION 24. RETROACTIVE AMENDMENT OF STOCK BONUS, PENSION, OR PROFIT-SHARING PLANS

Section 401(b) of the 1954 code, purporting to deal with retroactive changes in stock bonus, pension or profit-sharing plans, does not now specifically provide that if a plan is amended in such a manner that the plan continues to qualify, the plan, as amended, shall be considered to qualify from the time the amendment is put into effect. The Internal Revenue Service has so administered section 401(b). However, in view of the lack of statutory authority, it is deemed advisable to give taxpayers assurance that a plan so amended will not be disqualified during the period after the amendment and prior to the time the Internal Revenue Service, after reasonably prompt request by a taxpayer, issues a favorable letter.

SECTION 25. TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER STOCK BONUS, PENSION, OR PROFIT-SHARING PLANS MADE FROM ACCUMULATIONS DURING PERIODS OF QUALIFICATION

This section amends sections 402(a)(2), 403(a)(2), 2039(c) and 2517(a) of the 1954 code.

Under present law the tax status to an employee of a distribution received by him under a pension, stock bonus or profit-sharing plan depends on whether or not the plan qualifies in the year of distribution. Disqualification of a plan for any year is generally due to some act of the employer or of a trustee beyond the employee's control and for which he is not responsible. The present treatment to the employee of a distribution made in a year in which the plan has ceased to qualify defeats the employee's reasonable expectation.

Under the amendments made by this section, the amount of a distribution attributable to employers' contributions made, and income of a trust realized, during a period in which the plan was exempt, and all net unrealized appreciations therein, and amounts attributable to premiums paid under an annuity contract during a period in which it met the requirements of section 401(a), will be taxed to the employee in the same manner as if the plan qualified during the year of distribution, for income, estate and gift tax purposes.

The amendments to section 2517(a) apply to the exercise or nonexercise by an employee of an election or option described in that section, occurring after the date of enactment.

SECTION 26. EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER UNQUALIFIED DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLANS

This section amends section 404(a)(5) of the 1954 code.

Under present law the employer's contributions under an unqualified plan are deductible when made if the employee's rights are at that time nonforfeitable. Under the regulations (sec. 404(a)-12) an employer's contributions are not deductible at any time—i.e., even when rights become nonforfeitable—if the employee's rights are forfeitable at the time the employer's contributions are made.

Employers can now enter into unfunded or uninsured deferred compensation arrangements with employees whereby the employer gets a deduction when the deferred compensation is paid to the employees. From the employer's standpoint sound business reasons may dictate that the payment to the employee of the deferred compensation be secured, but subject to the performance of services or compliance with other conditions. The present law places at a disadvantage in attracting and keeping needed personnel those employers who are not as good a credit risk as other employers. It is felt that an employer should not be penalized because, to "secure" his contingent obligation, he funds the deferred compensation arrangement.

This amendment allows the employer a deduction when an amount is paid or made available to the employee under an unqualified plan, whether or not it is funded and whether or not the employee's interest is forfeitable or nonforfeitable. If payments are made from a trust, the trust income must have been included in the employer's gross income for tax purposes, and if made under an insurance contract the amount paid to the employee in excess of premiums paid must have been included in the employer's gross income.

SECTION 27. ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGED IN MORE THAN ONE EXEMPT ACTIVITY

This section amends section 501(a) of the 1954 code.

Many of the definitions of exempt organizations include a condition that the organization be engaged exclusively in certain activities. The amendment would prevent loss of exemption to a charity engaged in more than one exempt activity so long as it does not engage in activities which taken separately would result in tax. See *Algemeiner Arbeiter Verein* v. *Commissioner*, 237 F. 2d 604 (3d Cir. 1956); *Allied Trades Club, Inc.* v. *Commissioner*, 228 F. 2d 906 (3d Cir. 1955).

SECTION 28. DENIAL OF EXEMPTION TO OTHERWISE EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

Section 504(a) denies exemption to certain organizations otherwise exempt under section 501(c)(3) or section 401(a) if the accumulated income is unreasonable in amount, is used for purposes other than those constituting the basis for exemption, or is invested in a questionable manner.

While the exemption is denied only for a taxable year in which paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 504(a) are found applicable, a determination by the Commissioner of such applicability will normally take place in some later year. The present section 504 has retroactive application in that the exemption may be denied for a number of years

even though the management of the organization had no intention of proceeding in an unauthorized manner and upon notification thereof would have been prepared to make changes satisfactory to the Commissioner.

Section 504(a) is amended to deny exemption only for taxable years after the organization has been notified by the Commissioner that it has been operating in derogation of such section, so that the procedures complained of by the Commissioner can be eliminated and the exemption retained.

SECTION 29. TAXATION OF UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

This section adds a new section 516 to the 1954 code, amends section 512(a) and contains a conforming amendment to section 511(a)(2)(A).

The amendment would prevent abuses now prevalent, through the loan of income tax exemption, by taxing the income from rented property and from the active conduct of a business to the extent that the rented property or the business was acquired by a church, etc., through the use of borrowed funds. Taxes now imposed under such circumstances upon hospitals, schools, and other exempt organizations have effectively prevented these organizations from "lending their exemption" to third parties. Churches (like other exempt organizations) will continue to receive, tax-free, income from rented properties and (unlike other exempt organizations) from the active conduct of a business to the extent purchased with their own funds or with donated funds or property.

The amendment is prospective not only with respect to the taxable years affected but also in the sense that it affects only properties or businesses acquired after the effective date of the amendment.

SECTION 30. BURDEN OF PROOF RULE IN ACCUMULATED EARNINGS TAX PROCEEDINGS

This section amends section 534 of the 1954 code.

The amendments are designed (1) to make the burden of proof rule of section 534 applicable to refund as well as deficiency proceedings; (2) to provide that in any case where the taxpayer files a statement referred to in section 534(c), the burden of proof as to unreasonableness of the accumulation of earnings shall be on the Commissioner, irrespective of any pleading he may file with respect to such statement; and (3) to eliminate the requirement of a statement of facts in a section 534(c) statement.

Burden of proof rule in refund proceedings

It has been a traditional concept of tax procedure that the taxpayer should be allowed to select the forum that is most convenient to him. Accordingly, if the burden of proof can be shifted to the Commissioner in deficiency proceedings, it should be possible to shift it to the Commissioner in refund proceedings. Section 534 of the Code is therefore amended to apply the burden of proof rule to refund as well as deficiency proceedings.

Burden of proof as to unreasonable accumulation

Section 534 now shifts the burden of proof to the Commissioner in an accumulated earnings tax case if the taxpayer files "a statement of the grounds (together with facts sufficient to show the basis thereof) on which the taxpayer relies to establish that all or any of the earnings" have not been unreasonably accumulated.

In the cases which have arisen to date involving section 534(c) statements, the Commissioner has, in his answer to the taxpayer's petition to the Tax Court, consistently denied the sufficiency of the grounds and adequacy of the facts set forth in the section 534(c) statement. The Commissioner has also consistently pleaded an affirmative answer. In those cases where the taxpayer has presented a motion requesting the Tax Court to rule on the issue of burden of proof, the court has uniformly denied such motion.

It is therefore felt that legislative changes are desired to implement the operation of section 534. These changes involving elimination of the present subparagraphs (1) and (2) of section 534(a) and the insertion of new matter providing that the burden of proof shall be on the Commissioners in all cases where the taxpayer files a section 534(c) statement, notwithstanding any pleading by the Commissioner to the contrary. Section 534(c) is amended to eliminate the requirement of stating facts in support of the grounds in a section 534(c) statement.

Under the proposed amendment, the section 534(c) statement will constitute prima facie evidence that all of the earnings have been permitted to accumulate within the reasonable needs of the business. The prima facie evidence created by submission of the section 534(c) statement is intended to place on the Commissioner the burden of proof of going forward with respect to whether all or any part of the earnings have been permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business.

These amendments apply to proceedings trial of which on the merits commences after the date of enactment.

SECTION 31. AMOUNTS DISTRIBUTED OR CREDITED BY ESTATES AND TRUSTS TO CHARITABLE BENEFICIARIES

This section eliminates as such the special deduction now allowed to an estate or trust for amounts of gross income paid, permanently set aside or to be used for charitable purposes and, generally speaking, provides that a distribution to a charitable beneficiary shall be treated in the same manner as a distribution to a noncharitable beneficiary. The basic amendment is to section 642(c) of the 1954 code. The change calls for numerous amendments, including conforming amendments, to other sections of the code.

The present treatment in subchapter J of chapter 1 of charitable contributions made by an estate or trust departs from the general statutory pattern of basing the includibility of distributions upon the distributable net income of the estate or trust. The present section 642(c) requires that the charitable contribution be traced to gross income. Implicit in the tracing requirements are difficult problems of correlation with distributions to noncharitable beneficiaries where tracing is rendered unnecessary by the distributable net income formula. Moreover, the present provisions on charitable contributions operate unfairly as between beneficiaries entitled to income required to be distributed currently and other beneficiaries.

Under the amendments made by this section a distribution to charity would, in general, be treated as a distribution to any other beneficiary. The beneficiary's status, with respect to whether the beneficiary is subject to or exempt from tax, becomes immaterial.

There is one major exception to the general premise that distributions to charity shall be treated in the same manner as distributions to any other beneficiary. This is to treat an amount of gross income of the current year which is permanently set aside by the fiduciary for a charitable beneficiary as an amount currently credited to such beneficiary. If the amount so set aside consists of capital gains allocable to corpus, the fiduciary will receive a distribution deduction for such capital gains. Where an amount which has been permanently set aside is distributed to a charitable beneficiary in a subsequent taxable year a double deduction is denied under section 663(a)(3). To this limited extent tracing the source of charitable contributions to gross income is still required.

The amendments made by this section apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

Amendments to achieve the same general purpose have been recommended by the Mills advisory group on subchapter J.

SECTION 32. CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES OF ESTATES AND TRUSTS ALLOCATED TO CORPUS

This section amends section 643(a)(3) of the 1954 code.

Under present law, even though capital gains are allocable to corpus, they are includible in distributable net income if the gains are paid, credited or required to be distributed to the beneficiary during the taxable year. Inclusion of the gains in distributable net income shifts taxability from the fiduciary to the beneficiary.

The statute now leaves uncertain whether a distribution of principal will be deemed to include capital gains realized during the same taxable year. A question of this importance should be clarified in the statute and not left to regulations.

Under the amendment capital gain will not be deemed paid, credited or required to be distributed to a beneficiary unless (1) the governing instrument so provides, or (2) the gains are realized in the year of termination of the estate or trust.

The amendment made by this section applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

The final report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter J does not adopt this amendment.

SECTION 33. CHARGES ALLOCABLE TO CORPUS OF ESTATE OR TRUST

This section adds a new paragraph at the end of section 643(a) of the 1954 code.

Under present law deductions which are properly allocable to the principal account rather than to the income account nevertheless reduce distributable net income. The benefit of the deductions is thus derived by the income beneficiaries rather than the remaindermen. It has been indicated that probate law may require the fiduciary to make necessary adjustments between income and principal accounts in order to reimburse the remaindermen for the tax benefit of which they are now deprived.

According to the legislative history, the present provision was adopted to prevent the wastage of deductions which might otherwise occur where all the income was currently distributable. The statute, however, goes beyond the declared objective. The benefit of corpus deductions is shifted to income beneficiaries even where there remains gross income taxable to the fiduciary, such as capital gain.

The amendment would not shift the benefit of corpus deductions to the income beneficiary where sufficient gross income remains taxable to the beneficiary to absorb them. This is accomplished by taking corpus deductions into account in computing distributable net income only to the extent that they exceed items of gross income allocable to corpus and excluded from distributable net income. Gross income allocable to corpus must first be reduced by the capital gains and personal exemption deductions. The benefit of corpus deductions is not passed through to the income beneficiaries where capital gains allocable to corpus, reduced by these deductions, exceed the corpus deductions, even though the alternative method for computing tax on capital gains is employed.

The amendment made by this section applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

An amendment to achieve the same general purpose has been recommended by the Mills advisory group on subchapter J.

SECTION 34. EFFECT OF LOCAL PROBATE LAW ON INCOME TAX OF ESTATES

In general this section amends section 663 of the 1954 Code (1) to exclude from the distributee's gross income distributions, other than those which can be paid or credited only from income, by estates of certain gifts or bequests of specific sums of money or of specific property, whether or not consecutive, if properly paid or credited in not more than 3 years; (2) to provide that for a period of 36 months plus the balance of the taxable year in which the 36-month period expires, amounts properly paid from and charged to corpus as bequests or as a statutory award or allowance to a spouse shall be excluded from gross income; and (3) to make applicable to estates the separate share rule now applicable to trusts.

The general effect is that for a period which cannot exceed 48 months estates are treated in the same manner for income tax purposes as they are treated for probate purposes under local law.

The amendments made by this section apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment, except that they are retroactive to any prior taxable year to which the 1954 Code applied if the beneficiary whose tax is affected so elects.

Amendments to achieve the same purposes have been recommended by the Mills advisory group on subchapter J.

SECTION 35. GUARANTEED PAYMENTS FROM PARTNERSHIP TO PARTNER

Section 35 of the bill amends section 702(c) of the 1954 Code.

Section 702(c) provides that where it is necessary to determine the gross income of a partner, such amount shall include his distributive share of the gross income of the partnership. Section 707(c) excludes certain guaranteed payments to a partner from partnership gross income, but only for purposes of section 61(a) and 162(a).

This amendment will preclude the possibility of such guaranteed payments being included in a partner's gross income twice, first as part of his distributive share of the gross income of the partnership under section 702 and again as payments made to one considered not a partner under section 61(a) by reason of section 707(c).

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted this amendment.

SECTION 36. DEDUCTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENSES OF PARTNERSHIP

Section 36 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 703 of the 1954 Code.

Under present law a corporation may deduct its organizational expenses over a period of 60 months, but a partnership must capitalize its organizational expenses.

The amendment permits legal fees and other organizational expenses of a partnership to be amortized over a period of 60 months, beginning with the month in which such expenses are paid or accrued. The term "organizational expenses" is broadly defined so as to include the cost of preparing a partnership agreement for an existing partnership or of revising or amending the partnership agreement.

Any organizational expenses not previously deducted are deductible by the partnership in the year of its termination.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted this amendment.

SECTION 37. CLOSING OF TAXABLE YEAR ON DEATH OF PARTNER

Sectnon 37 of the bill adds a new paragraph to section 706(c) of the 1954 Code.

Section 706(c) provides as a general rule that the taxable year of a partnership shall not close as a result of the death of a partner. This avoids a bunching of income in the year of a partner's death.

On the other hand a deceased partner may have deductions and exemptions which could be offset against his share of partnership income if the taxable year of the partnership were closed with respect to such partner on the date of his death. Then both his share of the income and his offsetting deductions and exemptions could be reported together in his final return. The regulations (sec. 1.706–1(c)(3)(iv)) permit this treatment only if there is an agreement for the sale or exchange of his interest as of the date of his death.

This amendment will establish the general rule of closing the partnership year for such partner as of the date of his death, but will allow the executor or other successor in interest to elect to continue the taxable year for such deceased partner.

With such an election three alternative dates can apply for closing the partnership year with respect to such deceased partner:

1. The normal close of the partnership year when there has been no prior sale, exchange, or liquidation of the partnership interest;

2. The date of such a sale, exchange, or liquidation as may be negotiated by the successor in interest; or

3. The day after the decedent's death even though a sale, exchange, or liquidation may be effective on the date of decedent's death.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted the substance of this amendment.

SECTION 38. TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIP

Section 38 of the bill contains two amendments to section 708(b) of the 1954 Code relating to the termination of a partnership.

Termination on sale of 50-percent interest

Section 708(b)(1)(B) now provides that a partnership shall be considered terminated if there is a sale or exchange of 50 percent of the total interest in the partnership within a 12-month period. This section will remove from such rule sales or exchanges among partners. To prevent misuse of this modification in the rule, it is provided that such sales or exchanges must be to partners who have been members of the firm for at least 1 year.

Under this amendment either a liquidation of a partner's interest or a contribution of capital by a partner is considered a sale or exchange of a partnership interest.

Section 708(b)(1)(B) now speaks of a "sale or exchange." Under the amendment the partnership will be terminated if within a 12-month period at least 50 percent of the total interest in capital and profits of the partnership passes into the hands of persons who do not meet the previous-partner requirement, whether in one or more sales or exchanges.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted this amendment.

Termination of two-man partnership on death or retirement of one partner

Section 708(b)(1)(A) now provides that a partnership shall be considered as terminated if no part of any business, financial operation or venture is carried on by any of its partners "in a partnership." This creates a problem in the case of a two-man partnership where one partner retires or dies and the business is thereafter conducted by the survivor in a proprietorship form. The regulations attempt to solve the problem by providing (sec. 1.736–1(a)(6)) that if payments are made to a retiring or deceased partner which qualify under section 736, the partnership is considered as continuing so long as such payments are made. This amendment will give the regulation statutory force.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has not adopted this amendment.

SECTION 39. CHARACTER OF GAIN OR LOSS ON DISPOSITION BY A PARTNER OF DISTRIBUTED PROPERTY

Section 39 of the bill amends section 735(a) of the 1954 code.

Section 735 provides in effect that if a partnership distributes unrealized receivables or inventory items to a partner, the gain or loss realized by that distributee partner upon a subsequent sale or exchange of such unrealized receivables or inventory items will be ordinary income to the distributee partner. The section by its express language applies only to the gain or loss on the disposition of property "by a distributee partner." If section 735 is literally applied, a distributee partner could make a gift of the unrealized receivables or inventory items received by him as a distribution from a partnership, and the donee would escape application of the ordinary income consequences prescribed by the present statutes in the event of sale by a distributee partner.

The amendment extends the ordinary income characterization of section 735 to sales or exchanges of unrealized receivables or inventory items by a taxpayer who acquired them from a distributee partner and whose basis for such property is determined by reference to the distributee's basis.

The revised report of the Mills Advisory Group on subchapter K has adopted the present amendment.

SECTION 40. PAYMENTS TO A RETIRING PARTNER

Section 40 of the bill amends section 736(a) of the 1954 code.

Section 736 provides that amounts paid to a retiring partner or to a deceased partner's successor in interest are subject to ordinary partnership distribution rules to the extent they are paid in exchange for the partner's share of partnership property. If the amount paid is in excess of the fair market value of the partner's share of the property, section 736(a) provides that the excess will be treated either as a distributive share of partnership income or as a guaranteed payment.

Section 1.736–1(a)(2) of the regulations as originally proposed provided that payments qualifying under section 736(a) must be made in money and that such payments must be made in more than 1 taxable year of the partnership. The final regulations contain no such requirement, presumably because of the lack of statutory authority. The amendment adds requirements to section 736(a) similar to those in the proposed regulations in order to prevent unexpected and undesirable tax consequences.

For example, the A–B–C partnership agreement provides for payment of $50,000 for the interest of a deceased partner in the partnership. Payment is to be made in cash within 90 days after death. Liability for the payment is funded with life insurance. The partnership agreement makes no reference to a payment for a deceased partner's interest in goodwill. Partner C dies and the continuing partnership of A and B makes the $50,000 payment to C's executor in full retirement of C's interest in the partnership. If it is later determined that the fair market value of C's interest in partnership property (exclusive of good-

will) was $30,000. C's estate would have ordinary income of $20,000, representing a payment under section 736(a). The taxable income of A and B would be reduced by $20,000, a fact that might influence their ideas with respect to the valuation of C's interest in the partnership property.

If there is a lump sum payment for the interest of a retiring partner or deceased partner, or if the interest is retired by a distribution of property other than money, it is probably the usual intention of the parties that the transaction be considered a capital transaction rather than an income distribution. Accordingly, the amendment adds a new paragraph (2) to section 736(a) dealing with limitations on the treatment of a payment as a distribution of income or a guaranteed payment.

Under the first limitation, the payment must be made in money and payments must be made in more than one taxable year of the partnership. However, if the parties clearly intend a lump sum payment or a distribution of property other than money to be a distribution of income, and assuming it otherwise qualifies, there is no apparent policy reason why such payment or distribution should not be treated as a section 736(a) payment. Accordingly, in paragraph (2) there is an alternative limitation that would recognize a lump sum payment or a distribution of property as a section 736(a) payment if the parties so agree, and if the payment or distribution otherwise falls within section 736(a). The regulations can specify the requirements as to such an agreement.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted this amendment.

SECTION 41. INCOME WITH RESPECT TO A DECEASED PARTNER

Section 41 of the bill amends sections 743(b), 753 and 1014(c) of the 1954 Code.

Section 743(b) provides that a partnership may elect under section 754 to adjust the basis of partnership properties for transferee partners in the event of a sale or exchange or upon the death of a partner. It is very possible that the present statutory provisions could be interpreted so that a successor in interest of a deceased partner is entitled to an adjustment to basis of unrealized receivables of the partnership under section 743(b), assuming a proper election is made under section 754. There is nothing in section 743(b) that specifically denies the right to adjust basis of unrealized receivables in the case of a transmission of a partnership interest upon death of a partner. The fact that section 753 is restricted to payments qualifying under section 736(a) tends to indicate the absence of any limitation on the adjustment to basis of unrealized receivables of a partnership.

Assume that the A-B-C partnership has unrealized receivables of $30,000 at the time of A's death. If the partnership makes payments to A's successor in interest for his interest in the partnership, section 736(b)(2)(A) requires that the payments for A's $10,000 interest in unrealized receivables shall be treated as payments under section 736(a). Section 753 defines such payments as "income in respect of a decedent." The payments in retirement of A's interest in the unrealized receivables are ordinary income to A's successor in interest and reduce the partnership income taxable to B and C. If, however, the partnership should file an election under section 754 to adjust basis of partnership property, pursuant to section 743(b), to reflect the transmission of the partnership interest to A's heirs, then A's successor in interest could claim that under section 743(b) there should be a $10,000 adjustment to basis of unrealized receivables. This adjustment would be confined in its effect to A's successor in interest. Thus, by continuing the partnership and filing the election under section 754, A's successor in interest completely avoids the realization of taxable income with respect to A's interest in unrealized receivables as of the date of his death. B and C would be willing to go along because they are taxed on $20,000 of ordinary income in any event.

If the adjustment to basis under section 743(b) can be made to unrealized receivables of the partnership, A's successor in interest could also avoid the realization of income with respect to A's share of unrealized receivables through a sale or exchange of A's partnership interest. Section 751(a) would still be applicable, but there would be no taxable gain attributable to the sale of A's interest in the unrealized receivables.

The amendment to section 743(b) provides specifically that no adjustment may be made to the basis of unrealized receivables upon the death of a partner. The amendment also extends the application of section 753 so that such unrealized receivables fall within the definition of income in respect of a decedent. Finally, the amendment clarifies section 1014(c) so that there can be no question but that the amount which is considered income in respect of a decedent under sections 753 and 691 is not included in the basis of the partnership interest of a deceased partner.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted the substance of these amendments.

SECTION 42. SALE OR EXCHANGE OF INTEREST IN PARTNERSHIP

Section 42 of the bill amends section 751(a) of the 1954 code in several particulars.

Section 751 governs sales and exchanges of partnership interests and certain partnership distributions which effect exchanges of partnership interests in unrealized receivables of the partnership or in partnership inventory items which have substantially appreciated in value. Section 751(a) provides in effect that an allocation shall be made of a portion of the sales price of a partnership interest to unrealized receivables or substantially appreciated inventory. The regulations (sec. 1.751–1(a)(2)) require that basis of the interest sold in the section 751 property shall be determined as though such property had been distributed to the transferor partner immediately prior to the sale or exchange of his interest in a pro rata distribution. This formula for determining gain or loss on sale of a partnership interest allocable to unrealized receivables or appreciated inventory items is extremely complicated in practical application.

The new section 751(a)(4) adds a definition of the term "section 751 property." The term is defined as meaning unrealized receivables and substantial appreciated inventory items. This is the definition found in the regulations (sec. 751–1(a)(1)).

The amendment also provides that the gain or loss of the selling partner attributable to the sale or exchange of his interest in section 751 property shall be determined as though the partnership had sold such section 751 property at market value. It is contemplated that the actual sales price of the partnership interest will be used in determining the sales price at market value. This modification is designed to prevent the use of a theoretical market value of the section 751 property that does not take into account the valuation used by the parties in fixing the sales price of the partnership interest. The amendment is also designed to cover the situation where a partner sells less than his entire interest in the partnership.

The present section 751(a) does not adequately cover the case of a sale or exchange of an interest in a partnership having section 751 property where the transferor partner acquired his interest by a transfer within 2 years prior to the date of such sale or exchange but the election under section 754 is not in effect. The regulations at section 1.751–1(2) attempt to cover this situation by providing that the transferor partner's basis of the section 751 property "shall be an amount equal to the basis such property would have had under section 732 (including subsection (d) thereof) if the selling partner had received his share of such property in a current distribution made immediately before the sale." By bringing into account the section 732(d) adjustment, the regulations do achieve the effect of the adjustment to basis of partnership property under section 743(b) which would have been made had the election under section 754 been in effect. The new section 751(a)(3) incorporates a provision having an effect which corresponds to the relief afforded by section 732(d).

The original report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K adopted the approach proposed herein. The advisory group's revised report retains the same general concept but considerably alters the form and method of both its earlier proposals and of this amendment.

SECTION 43. TREATMENT OF PARTNERSHIP DISTRIBUTIONS AS SALES OR EXCHANGES

Section 43 of the bill adds a new subparagraph to section 751(b)(2) of the 1954 code.

In allocating a portion of the sales price of a partnership interest to unrealized receivables or to substantially appreciated inventory, the purpose of section 751 is to deal with the problem of the "collapsible partnership." If a partnership has section 751 property (i.e., unrealized receivables or substantially appreciated inventory), part of the gain realized upon sale of a partnership interest is attributed to the section 751 property and is taxed as ordinary income. If the partnership distributes property to the partners, and if the result of the distribution is to change the interests of the partners in the section 751 property, section 751(b) provides for recognition of gain or loss to the partners on the theory that there has been an exchange of an interest in the section 751 property for an increased interest in other partnership assets. The application of section 751(b) to a distribution that does not completely liquidate the interest of a partner creates complexities and possible traps for the unwary, especially in the case of a current distribution of cash or property. Other provisions of the statute adequately protect the revenues where there is a distribution that does not completely liquidate a partner's interest. The amendment is therefore designed to confine the application of section 751(b) to those distributions which are made in complete liquidation of a partner's interest.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted a different approach. Instead of clarifying and limiting the application of section 751(b), the advisory group's proposal is to delete section 751(b) in its entirety even though the advisory group recognized that the deletion of section 751(b) makes it possible to shift ordinary income between partners. The advisory group then attempts to prevent conversion of this shifted income into capital gains by amendments to sections 735(a) and 755. It is believed that although the advisory group's approach to the problem greatly simplifies the statute, its solutions will result in unexpected and inadvisable tax benefits which the amendment made by section 43 of the bill would prevent.

SECTION 44. DEFINITION OF UNREALIZED RECEIVABLES

Section 44 of the bill amends section 751 (c) of the 1954 code.

Section 751(c) defines "unrealized receivables" as including the right to payment for services to be rendered or for goods to be delivered in the future. The concept of "unrealized receivables" is significant in determining the income tax consequences of a sale of a partnership interest (sec. 751(a)) or upon certain distributions by a partnership (sec. 751(b)).

The present definition of "unrealized receivables" is broad enough to include the value of rights to payment under uncompleted long-term contracts which are generally considered to be part of the goodwill of the business. For example, a partnership, whose business is servicing television sets, might be required to treat the value of its right to compensation for services to be rendered 2 years in the future under a long-term contract as an unrealized receivable. Furthermore, "unrealized receivables" as defined by section 751(c) might be considered to include orders for future delivery of inventory items which have not yet been acquired by the partnership even though such orders represent part of the partnership's going concern value and should not be treated as an unrealized receivable.

The amendment limits the concept of unrealized receivables in two respects: It excludes from the definition of unrealized receivables both rights to payments for services to be rendered in the future and rights to payment for the delivery of goods not then owned by the partnership.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K seeks to accomplish the same purpose as the amendment made by this section by eliminating the detailed definition and, instead, by providing that the character of the income of the transferor partner will be determined by the rules which would apply if the transferor partner sold the property directly instead of selling or exchanging an interest in the partnership. For the purpose of making this determination the business of the partnership is attributed to the transferor partner; and it is further assumed that, at the time of the transferor partner's sale or exchange of his interest, all partnership property had been sold or exchanged in a single transaction.

SECTION 45. PARTNERSHIP INVENTORY ITEMS

Section 45 of the bill amends section 751 (d) of the 1954 code.

Definition of substantial appreciation

Subsection (a) deals with the problem of redefining the concept of substantial appreciation of partnership inventory items. Section 751(d)(1) now provides that there is substantial appreciation of partnership inventory items if the value of such items exceeds 120 percent of the partnership's adjusted basis of such property and 10 percent of the fair market value of all partnership property other than money. It is possible to avoid the 120-percent test by planned action, such as causing the partnership to purchase additional inventory having a market value no greater than cost. It is also possible to avoid the 10-percent test by causing the partnership to use its cash to purchase securities, or to borrow money to purchase securities, or otherwise to juggle assets and liabilities.

To make the test of substantial appreciation more meaningful and less vulnerable to planned tax avoidance, it is proposed that substantially appreciated inventory be determined by a comparison between the appreciation in value of the partnership's inventory and the total appreciation in value of all of the partnership's property whose fair market value exceeds adjusted basis. In order to illustrate the operation of section 751(d)(1), assume that a partnership had inventory with a fair market value of $35,000 and an adjusted basis to the partnership of $20,000, that the excess of fair market value over basis is $15,000, and that the partnership also had properties X and Y with basis and fair market values as follows:

	Adjusted basis	Fair market value
Property X	$50,000	$140,000
Property Y	80,000	30,000
Total	130,000	170,000

The excess of fair market value of items X and Y over adjusted basis is $40,000. However, the excess of fair market value over adjusted basis with respect to property X is $90,000. Under the amendment of subsection (a) property X would be considered in the measure of whether the inventory was substantially appreciated and property Y would be omitted from consideration. The computation would be as follows:

	Market value	Adjusted basis	Excess of market value over adjusted basis
Inventory	$35,000	$20,000	$15,000
Property X	140,000	50,000	90,000
Property Y	30,000	80,000	
Total			105,000
Ratio of excess market value of inventory to total excess market value			14

The excess of market value over adjusted basis of inventory is less than 20 percent of the total appreciation (i.e., excess of market value over adjusted basis of partnership property) of those partnership properties that reflect an appreciation in value. Consequently, the inventory, in the example, would not be considered as substantially appreciated in value.

In addition to being substantially appreciated under the foregoing test, the inventory also must have a market value that exceeds 120 percent of the excess of the market value of all partnership property over the partnership liabilities. This is to avoid the problems of fragmentation where the appreciation in value of partnership property is insignificant in comparison with the total net worth, at market value, of the partnership. The measure is made the excess of market value of partnership property over partnership liabilities, rather than merely the market value of partnership property as in the present law, so as to eliminate obvious opportunities of increasing the partnership's property through borrowings.

Definition of inventory items

Subsection (b) of section 45 of the bill restates and restricts the definition of the term "inventory items" now contained in section 751(d)(2). Section 751(d)(2)(B) now includes in the definition of inventory items any other property which on sale or exchange by the partnership "would be considered property other than a capital asset and other than property described in section 1231." This definition is broader than necessary and has applications not expected when the section was enacted. Among the items which are not capital assets and are not property described in section 1231 (and consequently would be inventory items) are—

1. Real property or depreciable property used in the trade or business but which has been held for a period of six months or less (sec. 1221(2)), and

2. Accounts or notes receivable acquired in the ordinary course of trade or business for services rendered or from the sale of inventory (sec. 1221(4)). This would include accounts receivable of an accrual basis partnership even though the amount realized on sale of goods or for services rendered has been included in the partnership's taxable income.

The inclusion of these items in inventory gives a distorted result which may work to the detriment of either the Treasury Department or the taxpayer.

The amendment specifically excludes from classification as inventory items accounts or notes receivable acquired in the ordinary course of trade or business, section 1231 property, and real property or depreciable property used in the trade or business of the partnership but which has been held for a period of 6 months or less.

The amendment refers to property "with respect to which the amount realized on a sale or exchange by the partnership would be considered as an amount realized from the sale or exchange of property other than a capital asset" to prevent the contribution to a partnership of section 306 stock or of stock in a collapsible corporation (sec. 341). Under the present section 751(d)(2)(B) it is possible to argue that such stock is not inventory as defined in section 751(d)(2)(B). The amendment includes section 306 stock or stock of a collapsible corporation in the definition of inventory.

Under the present section 751(d)(2)(C) inventory items also include property which may not be held as inventory or for sale in the ordinary course of the partnership business but which would be so held if owned by the selling partner or the distributee partner. Presumably this provision was intended to prevent the avoidance by dealers in real estate of ordinary income consequences by participating in partnerships which hold real property for investment purposes. However, in the case of a distribution of partnership property to which section 751(b) applies, section 751(d)(2)(C) may have unexpected and unfair consequences to some partners. For example, the A-B-C partnership holds real property which is a capital asset of the partnership. The partnership has no property other than the real estate and cash. If the real estate is distributed to A, who is not a dealer in real estate, it would not be an inventory item of the partnership and consequently section 751(b) would not be applicable. However, if the real estate is distributed to C, who is a dealer in real estate, it would be an inventory item under section 751(d)(2)(C). If the real estate had substantially appreciated in value, A and B would realize ordinary income under section 751(b), to the extent of their shares of the appreciation, as a result of the distribution of the property to C.

The amendment reclassifies property as inventory, by reference to its status if held by the distributee partner, only as to property owned by the partnership after the distribution. If property is distributed, the distributee partner, in effect, has reduced his interest and hence sold or exchanged his interest in the property remaining in the partnership. He realizes ordinary gain or loss if such property, in which he has relinquished or reduced his interest, would be inventory if held by him. On the other hand, if the property in question were distributed to such partner, so that the remaining partners are in effect selling or exchanging their interest in such property, the continuing partners only realize capital gain or loss if the property is otherwise a capital asset to them.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has approached the problem of section 751(d)(1) as it did the problem of unrealized receivables under section 751(c); that is, by recommending a simple test of whether the sale of the assets

by the partnership would have created ordinary income or capital gain for the partnership. The advisory group, therefore, combined its suggested amendments in respect of "unrealized receivables" and "inventory items" into one section, to permit the elimination of any distinction between inventory items and unrealized receivables.

The advisory group has also made its new test inapplicable unless the gain attributable to the present 751(c) and 751(d) assets exceeds $1,000. Then the advisory group's proposal would be effective only if the combined value of unrealized receivables and appreciation in inventory items exceeds 15 percent of the amount realized in the sale or exchange of the partner's interest.

Aside from these changes in method the advisory group's recommendations are designed to achieve substantially the same results as the present amendments.

SECTION 46. LIMITATION ON PARTNER'S DISTRIBUTIVE SHARE OF LOSSES

Section 46 of the bill amends section 752 of the 1954 code.

Section 752, relating to the allowance of a partner's losses, is amended to allow a partner his share of partnership losses in excess of the adjusted basis of his partnership interest, if the partner is unconditionally obligated to the partnership for his share of the partnership losses.

Section 704(d) provides that the excess of a partner's share of losses over the adjusted basis of his partnership interest is deductible only in the year in which such excess is repaid to the partnership. In determining his adjusted basis, any increase in his share of liabilities to third parties is taken into account, so that the partner may deduct his share of a partnership loss to the extent he becomes liable to partnership creditors. However, no logical distinction can be drawn between a liability of a partner to the partnership and a share of liabilities of the partnership to third parties.

The amendment would permit a partner to deduct in the year of the loss his full share of partnership losses, although in excess of the basis of his partnership interest, if he is obligated to repay his share of such losses. Although the partner's liability to repay his share of losses is referred to as a liability to the partnership, it is intended that the same result shall obtain where the liability to repay is to the other partners or to some of them, rather than directly to the partnership. The interests of the revenue are amply protected against the subsequent forgiveness of a partner's obligations to the partnership or to partners by other provisions of the code which tax the amount of such forgiveness as income.

The amendment does not allow losses to a partner in excess of the basis of his partnership interest where he is obligated to repay such losses on a conditional basis only (e.g., out of future profits), since in these circumstances the amount of the partner's loss, if any, has not been finally fixed.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has made substantially the same recommendations.

SECTION 47. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN UNINCORPORATED ORGANIZATIONS FROM PARTNERSHIP PROVISIONS

Section 47 of the bill amends section 761(a) of the 1954 code.

For income tax purposes section 761 now excludes an unincorporated organization from the concept of a partnership, but only if all the members elect to be excluded. Experience has indicated the impracticability of elections by all the members.

The amendment eliminates the requirement that all the members must elect to be excluded. At the same time the amendment permits an unincorporated organization (as distinguished from its members) to elect to be taxed as a partnership.

The revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K has adopted the substance of the changes made by this amendment.

The American Bar Association has adopted a number of resolutions which, while not proposing precise statutory language, contain recommendations to the Congress with respect to provisions of the revised report of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K, reflected in H.R. 4460 introduced by Representative MILLS on February 12, 1959. These resolutions of the American Bar Association are either by way of approval of or opposition to a proposal of the advisory group, and recommend to the Congress either that it enact or that it not enact legislation embodying the principles of such proposal of the advisory group. Summaries and explanations of these resolutions appear below:

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter K Relating to Rearrangement and Simplification of Subchapter K

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K (sec. 2 of H.R. 4460, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) that the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the taxation of partners and partnerships be rearranged in the interest of simplification by grouping together at the beginning of subchapter K the provisions generally applicable to small partnerships.

The most commonly voiced criticism of subchapter K is that it is excessively complicated for the small partnership. While it is recognized that many of the so-called complications are essentially relief provisions or are designed to curb abuses not usually found in small businesses, an effort should be made to simplify the statutory provisions. After considerable study, it appears that it is not practical to provide two sets of partnership rules, one for small partnerships and the other for more complex business arrangements in partnership form. Such an attempt would result in increased complexity.

Under the advisory group proposal the basic rules, applicable to typical partnership situations, would constitute part I of subchapter K. More complicated provisions, such as the collapsible partnership provisions, would be placed in separate parts. The various elections which treat the partnership as an aggregate of individuals instead of as a business entity would also be placed in a separate part. Finally, definitions and effective date provisions would be placed at the end of the subchapter.

The rearrangement would require relatively few changes in section numbers. The basic provisions would in the main follow the existing section numbers. Provisions relegated to the second or third parts of the subchapter would be given new section numbers. Appropriate cross reference would be provided between the basic provisions and the special rules.

As part of the simplification of subchapter K under the advisory group recommendations, the alternative method prescribed in section 705(b) for computing the basis of a partner's interest in a partnership would be made the general rule. The detailed or historical method would be applicable only if the taxpayer or the Commissioner demonstrated that the simplified method was substantially inaccurate.

The proposal for simplification and rearrangement of the partnership rules would be of material assistance to smaller partnerships not affected by complicated tax rules in subchapter K. It would generally facilitate a better understanding of the partnership provisions.

Opposition to Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter K Relating to Clarification of the Rules for Determining the Character of Partnership Income

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it not enact legislation embodying the principle of the proposal of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K (sec. 702 of subch. K contained in sec. 2 of H.R. 4460, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) that the character of partnership items be determined at the partner level.

This resolution contemplates that the character of gain or loss on the disposition of property owned by a partnership shall be determined by reference to the activities of the partnership and not, as the advisory group suggests, by reference to the individual activities of the different members of the partnership. The recommendation of the advisory group for amending section 702(b) appears technically defective and unnecessary. The advisory group proposal to add a new section 702(d) providing that any limitations with respect to exclusions or deductions shall be applied solely at the partner level is premature and should be deferred until additional experience has been gained with the present regulations.

The advisory group has apparently adopted the view that, in a case of the sale of property owned by a partnership, the character of the gain or loss should not be determined at the partnership level but at the level of the individual partners. Under this approach a sale of property by a partnership may result in ordinary income to a partner who is a real estate dealer and capital gain to other partners.

It is believed that the advisory group has adopted an erronerous view of existing law and that the statute should be clarified to provide expressly that the character of gain or loss on property held by the partnership shall be determined on the basis of the operations and activities of the partnership.

Where a dealer and investors participate jointly in the development or sale of property, the determination as to whether such property is held for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business should be made by analyzing all the activities of the partnership, including any actions by the dealers on behalf of the partnership. If the partnership is a dealer, by virtue of activities of one or more persons on its behalf, then the gain will be ordinary income to each of the participants. On the other hand, if the partnership is determined, after analyzing all facts relevant to its operations, to be holding the property for investment, then the capital gains characteristics should apply to each of the partners. Under this view the character of partnership gain or loss would be the same for all participants in the venture.

It is recognized that in some cases the business purpose of the partnership can only be determined from an analysis of the actions of one or more members of the partnership acting on behalf of the partnership. However, the purpose of such inquiry is to ascertain the business of the partnership and not to disregard the partnership as a factor in the determination.

The resolution contemplates determination of the character of gain on the sale of property by the partnership by reference to the activities of the partnership itself. The same treatment could also be applied with respect to sales of a partnership interest by a partner in lieu of the present provisions of section 751(d)(2)(C). This rule has merit not only as a matter of realistic treatment of partnership-owned property but also in that it avoids the difficulty of making a hypothetical determination as to what the character of the property would be if, instead of being owned by the partnership, it were owned by the individual partners.

The resolution is not intended to countenance tax avoidance. If any member of the partnership is a dealer and he in effect acts as an agent for the partnership, the partnership itself would be regarded as a dealer and ordinary income consequences would attach to the sale, as they properly should. On the other hand, it will be clear that if the partnership is holding the property for investment, the dealer partner will participate in capital gains treatment upon a sale. This does not involve tax avoidance since the dealer could have held the property individually for investment.

The advisory group amendment with respect to section 702(b) provides that the conduit rules shall apply to general partnership profit or less as determined under section 702(a)(9) as well as under the other provisions of section 702(a). This amendment appears to be unnecessary since the regulations expressly provide that there shall be segregated from general partnership profit or loss any item of partnership income, gain, loss, deduction, or credit which would produce a different tax result in the returns of the individual partners. Moreover, the amendment would fail, as a technical matter, to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended, namely, that of requiring that the character of gain or loss be determined at the partner level and not at the partnership level.

The advisory group amendment relating to the proposed new section 702(d) would provide that wherever a limitation is imposed upon an exclusion or deduction in terms of a fixed amount or percentage of income, the limitation is to apply solely at the partner level and the partnership is to be disregarded. The present regulations under section 702(a) apply such a rule with respect to the limitation on the deduction for exploration expenses. It is questionable whether a blanket rule should be adopted requiring that all limitations be applied at the individual partner level. It is believed that additional experience should be obtained under the existing provisions of the regulations before adopting a legislative provision.

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter K for Conforming Rules on Sale of Property to Controlled Partnership to Rules on Sales to Controlled Corporations

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principles of the proposal of the Mills Advisory Group on Subchapter K (sec. 765 of subch. K contained in sec. 2 of H.R. 4460, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) that the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to sales to a controlled partnership be revised generally to accord with the rules relating to sales at a gain or loss to a controlled corporation.

The proposal to bring partnership rules relating to sales at a gain or loss into line with those involving sales between other related entities would tend to simplify the tax provisions and provide a greater measure of uniformity in tax treatment. In the case of sales at a gain, it is believed that no greater burden should be imposed on sales to a controlled partnership than on sales to a controlled corporation. The present provisions are discriminatory against partnerships and create serious inequities.

The present section 707(b) prescribes the treatment applicable in the case of sales or exchanges between a partner and a partnership in which he has a controlling interest, and between partnerships owned by the same person. Under section 707(b)(1) a loss is disallowed on a sale between a partner and a partnership in which he has an interest of more than 50 percent in the capital or profits, and between partnerships in which the same persons have more than a 50 percent interest in the capital or profits.

It is contemplated that the provisions on sale of property at a loss between a partner and a partnership should conform more closely to the rules of section 267 pertaining to sales of property at a loss between related persons. Several minor technical differences between the two provisions should be eliminated and the exclusive rule governing the tax consequences of such sales should be contained in section 707(b)(1).

Where there is a gain on a sale between a partner and a partnership in which the partner owns an interest of more than 80 percent in the capital or profits, or between partnerships in which the same persons have more than an 80-percent interest in the capital or profits, section 707(b)(2) requires that the gain be treated as ordinary income if the property is not a capital asset in the hands of the transferee. This provision is considerably broader than section 1239, which relates to sales or exchanges between a stockholder and a controlled corporation. For example, the partnership provision covers property other than depreciable property. It may result in an ordinary income tax on sales of land to a partnership to be used for the construction of rental property, or the sale of timber, which would normally produce capital gain. There is no explanation for the inconsistency in treatment.

Since there seems to be no reason for the application of different and more stringent rules to gains involving controlled partnerships than to gains involving controlled corporations, it is recommended the provisions of section 707(b)(2) be amended, as suggested by the advisory group, to conform with section 1239. If the Congress should desire to expand the scope of section 1239, comparable action could then be taken with respect to section 707(b)(2).

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter K Relating to Liberalization of the Election To Adjust the Basis of Partnership Property for a Transferee

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principles of the proposals of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K (sec. 780 of subch. K contained in sec. 2 of H.R. 4460, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) that the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the election to adjust the basis of partnership property be amended so that the partnership shall be permitted to make separate elections with respect to distributions of partnership property and transfers of partnership interests.

The advisory group proposal would allow two separate elections, in lieu of the present single election, with respect to adjustment of the basis of the partnership assets. Tying the two elections together as under the present law imposes an excessive burden upon the partnership operations.

The advisory group recommendation would allow the partnership separate elections to adjust the basis of partnership assets (1) in the case of distributions and (2) in the case of transfers of partnership interests. Under present law there is a single election to adjust the basis of partnership assets both for distributions and transfers. As the advisory group explains, different considerations may be applicable to adjustments of the basis of property (1) with respect to distributios and (2) with respect to transfers of partnership interests. A single election imposes such heavy burdens upon the partnership that it may be reluctant to exercise the election even though it is obviously desirable with respect to a particular transfer of a partnership interest.

The advisory group considered but did not adopt a proposal to allow the transferee partner individually to make the election with respect to his share of the basis of partnership assets. It was of the opinion that the decision as to whether or not to make the election should be within the control of the partnership, and the partnership should be responsible for computing the amount of the adjustment. The advisory group felt the transferee partner was adequately protected under the separate election proposal.

In many cases the individual partner will not have direct access to the data concerning the basis of partnership assets which would be necessary for him to make the computations and will have to obtain such information from the partnership. The election would probably be used much more extensively if made available to the individual partner.

Adoption of Recommendation of Advisory Group on Subchapter K Relating to Simplification of the Collapsible Partnership Rules

The American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it enact legislation embodying the principles of the proposals of the Mills advisory group on subchapter K (pt. II of subch. K contained in sec. 2 of H.R. 4460, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) involving the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to collapsible partnerships so that the collapsible partnership rules shall not apply to distributions of property.

The advisory group proposal to eliminate the collapsible partnership rules applicable to distributions of partnership property is recognized as a substantial simplification of the present law.

The advisory group has recommended the complete elimination of section 751(b), both as it pertains to current distributions and distributions in complete liquidation of a partner's interest. The advisory group proposal was based on the complexities involved in determining whether or not a distribution is pro rata, and in computing the amount of gain not only to the distributing partner but to the other members of the partnership. The advisory group made certain technical changes in sections 735(a) and 755 which it felt would minimize tax avoidance. It is believed that the advisory group recommendation has merit as a simplification of the statute.

SECTION 48. WESTERN HEMISPHERE TRADE CORPORATIONS

Section 48 of the bill amends section 921 of the 1954 code.

The Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions contained in sections 921 and 922 were enacted to encourage U.S. capital to invest in the Western Hemisphere outside the United States, and to make the Western Hemisphere operations of U.S. investors competitive with those financed by foreign capital. The competitive equality was to be achieved by allowing a domestic corporation qualifying as a Western Hemisphere trade corporation a special deduction which, under present law, reduces the effective corporate tax rate by 14 percentage points.

Prior to the enactment of the 1954 code any activity outside the Western Hemisphere disqualified a corporation from the advantages of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions. To correct what appeared to be an obvious inequity in the administration of the Western Hemisphere trade corporation provisions, present section 921 as enacted in 1954 provides that incidental purchases made outside the Western Hemisphere will not disqualify a corporation from the special Western Hemisphere trade corporation deduction if it is otherwise eligible.

The present amendment eliminates interpretation of "incidental purchases" and extends the permitted activities of otherwise qualified corporations so that they can purchase goods, equipment and the like outside the Western Hemisphere without being disqualified. Allowing purchases to be made outside the Western Hemisphere by a Western Hemisphere trade corporation would

seem necessary to effectuate the policies for which the provisions were originally enacted. Furthermore, the present statute can be circumvented through the use of a non-Western Hemisphere trade corporation to make purchases outside the Western Hemisphere followed by a resale within the Western Hemisphere area to the Western Hemisphere trade corporation. The amendment would make it unnecessary to adopt such devious procedures.

The amendment made by this section applies to taxable years of Western Hemisphere trade corporations beginning after December 31, 1959.

SECTION 49. BASIS OF JOINT TENANCIES IN COMMUNITY PROPERTY STATES

Section 49 of the bill amends section 1014(b)(6) of the 1954 code.

Section 1014(a) provides in general that the basis of property acquired from a decedent shall be the fair market value of the property, at the date of the decedent's death. Section 1014(b) enumerates the categories of property deemed to have been acquired from a decedent and therefore taking such date of death basis.

Section 1014(b)(6) provides that a surviving spouse's one-half share of community property shall be considered as acquired from the decedent spouse if at least one-half of the community interest in the property was included in the decedent's taxable estate. The amendment extends the same treatment to the surviving spouse's one-half share of any property acquired with community property and held as joint tenants or tenants in common. This causes joint tenancies to receive the same treatment in community property and noncommunity property States, in addition to causing joint tenancies in community property States to receive the same treatment as community property.

Although the amendment achieves identity of treatment of tenancies in common with community property and joint tenancies in community property States, it does not achieve the same identity with the treatment of tenancies in common in noncommunity property States.

SECTION 50. BASIS OF PROPERTY ACQUIRED FROM A DECEDENT PRIOR TO HIS DEATH

Section 50 of the bill amends section 1014(b)(9) of the 1954 code.

Section 1014(b)(9) now contains a departure, in the case of property acquired from a decedent prior to his death, such as by a gift in contemplation of death, from the general rule laid down in section 1014(a) that the basis of property acquired from a decedent is its fair market value at the date of the decedent's death. Under section 1014(b)(9) the basis of such property is the market value of the date of death reduced by the deductions allowed to the surviving taxpayer for depreciation or depletion prior to the decedent's death.

This rule does not seem justified. Depreciation and depletion ordinarily are matched by an actual decline in the value of the property. There would seem to be no more reason for reducing the taxpayer's basis in the case of an acquisition before the decedent's death than where the property passes by reason of the decedent's death.

The amendment eliminates, in the case of property acquired before the decedent's death, the present reduction in basis for depreciation and depletion allowed to the taxpayer prior to such death.

SECTION 51. LIMITATION ON GAIN ON REPOSSESSION OF PROPERTY

Section 51 of the bill adds a new part IX, consisting of sections 1111 and 1112, to subchapter O of chapter 1 of the 1954 code.

Under present law, as expressed in sections 1.453-5(b) and 1.453-6(c) of the regulations, where property previously sold is repossessed, the fair market value of the property is treated as a payment on the obligations of the purchaser. The result can be unrealistic and a real hardship to the seller. For example, assume that real estate costing $5,000 is sold for $50,000, the seller receiving a down payment of $5,000 and a contractual obligation for the balance. Upon default, before any further payments are made, the property is repossessed at a time when its fair market value is $40,000. Since the seller treated the $5,000 down payment as a recovery of cost, the entire $40,000 is taxable, with no visible source of funds to pay the tax other than a resale of the property at a time of declining market values.

Under the amendment the gain taxable upon such a repossession will be limited to the excess of payments previously received over the sum of the previously reported gain and a constructive allowance for interim depreciation and depletion. On the facts of the example given above, gain would be recognized only to the extent of $5,000, the cash received.

The proposed amendment applies the rule presently applicable under sec. 1.543-6(b)(1) of the regulations where title to the property has not passed to the purchaser, with the exception that the amendment does not take the value of improvements made by the purchaser into account in calculating the repossession gain.

Subsection (a) of section 1111 states the general rule as to limited recognition of gain. In order to avoid undue complexity, the statute does not cover loss situations, nor does it cover situations where property has been sold without deferral of gain.

Subsection (b) sets forth the extent to which gain is to be recognized. Paragraph (2), which provides in effect that the recognized gain will not exceed what would otherwise be recognized under present law, will cover the unusual situation where the value of the property at the time of repossession has declined below its adjusted basis at the time of sale.

Subsection (c) sets out basis rules corresponding to the treatment under subsection (b).

Subsections (d) and (e) define the terms "repossession" and "obligations" broadly, to effectuate the purposes of the amendment.

The new section is designed to insure equal treatment of gains and losses on all repossessions of property. Under section 453(d)(1) of the code, the nature of the gain or loss on a repossession of property previously sold, where the sale was reported on the installment method, is determined by reference to the gain or loss on the original sale. Where the original sale was reported in accordance with the deferred-payment method, the regulations (sec. 1.453-6(c)) state that the gain on a repossession is ordinary income. The case law is unclear. There would seem to be no justification for differing treatment.

SECTION 52. GAINS AND LOSSES ON PURCHASE MONEY OBLIGATIONS

Section 52 of the bill adds a new section 1245 to part IV of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the 1954 code.

Under existing law payment on purchase money obligations may result in ordinary income to the seller, even though payment in cash at the time of the sale would have entitled the seller to capital gain treatment. *Joseph E. Gilbert*, 6 T. C. 10 (1946); *A. B. Culbertson*, 14 T. C. 1421 (1950). Conversely, in the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, a loss due to worthlessness of a purchase money obligation may result in a capital loss under section 166 even though the entire transaction would have resulted in an ordinary loss if all of the consideration had been paid in cash at the time of the sale.

The amendment in general treats the proceeds of purchase money obligations as though they were proceeds of the original sale.

SECTION 53. UNCOMPLETED EMPLOYMENT RENDERED FOR 36 MONTHS OR MORE

Section 53 of the bill amends section 1301(a) of the 1954 code.

To prevent bunching of income in 1 year, section 1301 provides that in the case of employment covering a period of 36 months or more from the beginning to the completion of such employment, if the compensation received or accrued in the taxable year is not less than 80 percent of the total compensation from such employment, the compensation may be spread over that portion of the period of employment which precedes the receipt or accrual of the compensation.

At present a prerequisite to the right to spread the compensation over the years in which it was earned or accrued is completion of the employment at the time of receipt or accrual of the compensation. If the employment has not been completed at that time, the right to spread has not yet ripened and may be destroyed by the receipt of additional compensation in the future.

This amendment makes the 80 percent test determinable with reference to compensation received or accrued in the taxable year and prior tax years, without reference to compensation received or accrued in subsequent years. It accordingly establishes the right to spread at the close of the taxable year.

A comparison of the operation of existing law and the amendment made by this section is illustrated in the following examples:

Compensation	A	B	C
1st year	20	10	20
4th year	80	80	80
After 4th year	None	10	10
Total	100	100	110

Under A and B, existing law permits the compensation to be spread in the fourth year, although the right to spread is not established in the case of A until it is known that there will be no additional compensation after the fourth year or, in the case of B, until the exact amount of the compensation received or accrued after the fourth year is determined. The amendment would not affect the result in either of these cases, but the right to spread would be fixed in the fourth year.

Under C, no spreading is permitted under existing law because the amount received after the fourth year disqualifies the fourth year compensation under the 80-percent test. The amendment permits spreading in this case at the close of the fourth year, regardless of how much compensation is received or accrued in later years.

SECTION 54. EXCLUSION OF DOMESTIC CORPORATION ENGAGED PRIMARILY IN FOREIGN TRADE FROM CONSOLIDATED RETURN

Section 54 of the bill adds a new paragraph (9) to section 1504(b) of the 1954 code.

Under present law a domestic corporation engaged primarily in foreign trade must be included in the consolidated return of the group with which it is affiliated if the stock-ownership test is met.

The amendment excludes such a corporation from the consolidated return unless it files an election to be included. Such an election may be revoked, but only if there has been a change in the tax laws or regulations of the United States or of any foreign country which would make the continued inclusion of such corporation in a consolidated return less advantageous to it or to the affiliated group of which it is a member. A corporation whose election has been re-

voked may again elect to be included in a consolidated return. There are restrictions regarding taxable years to which an election or a revocation thereof may apply.

The amendment gives recognition to differences in the operations of an ordinary domestic corporation and of one which is engaged primarily in foreign trade. Enactment of an excess profits tax law is an example of an event which might make disadvantageous continued inclusion in a consolidated return of a corporation engaged primarily in foreign trade, and which would therefore permit it to file a separate return.

SECTION 55. EXTENDING PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS ON CREDIT FOR STATE DEATH TAXES

Section 55 of the bill amends section 2011(c)(3) of the 1954 code.

Section 2011(c) now provides generally that the credit for State death taxes against the Federal estate tax, under section 2011(a), shall be allowed only if the State tax was paid and the credit therefor was claimed within 4 years after the filing of the Federal estate tax return. It presently contains the following three exceptions to this 4-year rule:

1. If a timely petition is filed with the Tax Court, the period is extended until 60 days after the Tax Court's decision becomes final;

2. If the time to pay the Federal estate tax has been duly extended under section 6161, the period runs until the date such extension expires; and

3. If a claim for refund is duly filed, the period is extended until 60 days after the mailing of a notice of disallowance by the Commissioner of the claim or until 60 days after a decision by any court of competent jurisdiction, in a suit on the refund claim, has become final.

The third exception was added to section 2011(c) in 1958 by Public Law 85-866, as a new paragraph (3). It is felt that this addition does not solve all the problems in the area. If the Federal estate tax is deductible in computing State inheritance taxes, it may be impossible to determine the amount of the State tax until the Federal estate tax liability has been finally settled. The 60-day period provided in section 2011(c)(3) does not in all cases give sufficient time to determine the amount of the State tax, first requiring determination of the amount of Federal tax. The present amendment extends the period in which the credit for the State tax may be claimed until the last payment of Federal tax.

The amendment applies with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

SECTION 56. CREDIT FOR GIFT TAX AGAINST ESTATE TAX

Section 56 of the bill amends section 2012 of the 1954 code.

Under the present section 2012 the calculation of the credit for gift tax against estate tax involves the use of ratios and has other complications. A principal difficulty arises from the use of an average tax rate in allocating gift tax paid to a specific gift and also in allocating to the gift its share of the estate tax.

The present section 2012 requires that the credit be determined in accordance with its relationship to the gross estate rather than to the net estate. If two taxpayers making gifts in the same year pay the same gift tax and both die later with taxable estates identical in amount, but one has a larger gross estate and offsetting deductions, his estate will receive a smaller credit than that of the other donor. The amendment eliminates this inequity.

The amendment simplifies the computation of the credit. Under the amended as well as the present section 2012, the starting point is the amount of gift tax paid. However, the limitation is much simpler under the amended section. The total gift tax credit on account of all gifts of property included in the gross estate may not exceed that portion of the estate tax which is attributable to inclusion of the gift properties in the gross estate. Under both the present and amended section 2012 the credit allowed is the lower of the gift tax paid or estate tax allocable to the included transfer or transfers. The amended section 2012 provides in effect that the estate tax is determined in the top applicable bracket or brackets. This is adopted from the deduction allowed under section 691(c) for income tax purposes for estate tax paid on income in respect of a decedent, already familiar to those dealing with estates.

Ordinarily the credit will be limited to the gift tax paid. Mathematically a significant difference is possible in large estates when the lifetime gifts have also been large, but the number of such cases is considered too small to justify continued use of the present formula method. The simpler procedure can reduce administration costs both for the Treasury Department and for taxpayers.

The amendment applies to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

SECTION 57. VALUATION OF UNLISTED STOCK AND SECURITIES FOR ESTATE TAX PURPOSES

Section 57 of the bill amends section 2031(b) of the 1954 code.

Section 2031(b) now provides that to determine the value for estate tax purposes of unlisted and untraded stocks and securities, comparison is to be made with stocks and securities of corporations, engaged in the same or similar line of business, which are listed on an exchange.

Generally speaking, a corporation whose stock is quoted but not listed is much more comparable in size to the company whose unlisted shares or securities are to be valued, and is much more likely to have similar product lines and similar conditions as respects operations, distribution of products and management, than the similar corporation whose stock is listed on an exchange. The amendment therefore provides that comparison is to be made with the value of stocks and securities of a similar corporation, whether or not listed on an exchange. This permits the best comparison; it does not preclude comparison with listed stocks or securities.

The amendment applies to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

SECTION 58. DEDUCTION FROM GROSS ESTATE FOR DIVORCE SETTLEMENT

Section 58 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 2043 of the 1954 code and adds a new subparagraph to section 2053(c).

Section 2516 exempts from gift tax transfers arising out of divorce settlements. There is no corresponding section in the estate tax provisions. In *Commissioner* v. *Maresi*, 156 F. 2d 929 (2d Cir. 1946), claims against a decedent's estate arising out of a divorce settlement were allowed as a deduction for estate tax purposes only if incorporated in the divorce decree. There appears to be no valid reason for different treatment for gift tax and for estate tax purposes.

The amendment removes property transferred in divorce settlements from the taxable estate, with the exception that liabilities arising from the decedent's obligation to support the issue of the marriage are excluded only to the extent that such liabilities represent support payments for the period prior to the decedent's death. This exception departs from the gift tax treatment, where the exemption applies to a transfer for the support of the issue of the marriage during minority.

SECTION 59. RENOUNCED OR DISCLAIMED INTERESTS

Section 59 of the bill adds a new section 2045 to part III of subchapter A of chapter 11 of the 1954 code, and a new section 2518 to subchapter B of chapter 12.

Certain cases have held that renunciation or disclaimers of property received by inheritance are transfers subject to estate and gift tax. *Hardenbergh* v. *Commissioner*, 198 F. 2d 63 (8th Cir. 1952), cert. denied, 344 U.S. 836 (1952); *William L. Maxwell*, 17 T.C. 1589 (1952). Other cases have long held to the contrary as to property received by will. *Brown* v. *Routzahn*, 63 F. 2d 914 (6th Cir. 1933), cert. denied, 290 U.S. 641 (1933). The decisions depend in large measure on State law.

The differences in result are considered undesirable from the standpoint that similar transactions are not now treated uniformly for estate and gift tax purposes. Uniformity seems desirable regardless of whether the property interest in question passes from the estate of a decedent dying testate or intestate, and regardless of the State law applicable to the passage of title at death.

The amendments accomplish these purposes by exempting renunciations and disclaimers from tax if they are effective under local law. They equate the tax treatment whether the property was received by inheritance or by will. They also provide that a gift of property received by inter vivos transfer can be renounced without estate tax. Similar amendments are made to both the estate tax and gift tax provisions so that the same rules will be applicable for the purposes of either tax.

At present the Treasury Department apparently takes the position that no partial disclaimer is effective even as to property passing by will. § 25.2511-1(c) of the regulations. The new rules apply to partial as well as to complete disclaimers and renunciations, provided local law has been complied with.

If the renunciation is made in part for a consideration, the new provisions apply to such renunciation to the extent that it is made without full and adequate consideration in money or money's worth.

The amendment made by subsection (a) (relating to the estate tax) applies to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment, and the amendment made by subsection (b) (relating to the gift tax) applies to renunciations and disclaimers made after the date of enactment.

SECTION 60. APPLICATION OF MARITAL DEDUCTION TO ALLOWANCE OR AWARD TO SURVIVING SPOUSE

Section 60 of the bill adds a new paragraph to section 2056(b) of the 1954 code.

At present the question of whether an allowance or award to a surviving spouse qualifies for the marital deduction may be answered only after the effect of the laws of the particular state is determined by the courts. *Cf. Estate of Edward A. Cunha*, 30 TC. 812 (1958), with *King* v. *Wiseman*, 147 F. Supp. 156 (W.D. Okla. 1956), and *Estate of Proctor D. Rensenhouse*, 31 T.C. 818 (1959). The amendment eliminates the present uncertainty and the necessity for litigating in each State the treatment of a widow's allowance or award for marital deduction purposes.

The time limit for payment of the allowance or award is the period of limitations for assessment of estate tax.

The amendment applies to estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

SECTION 61. EXECUTION FOR GIFTS OF CERTAIN FUTURE INTERESTS

Section 61 of the bill amends section 2503(c) of the 1954 code.

The amendment extends the annual $3,000 gift tax exclusion to all gifts of future interests (to both minors and adults) where the property will be used solely for the benefit of a specified donee during his life and the remainder of the property, if any, will, on his death, be included in his gross estate. Section 2503(c) (the so-called gifts-to-minors provision) is amended to eliminate the present requirement for dis-

tribution to the donee at age 21 and to permit gifts over to third persons should the donee die prior to termination of the interest.

Criticism of section 2503(c) has been directed mainly to its requirement for complete distribution at age 21 and to the impossibility of providing for a gift over to a third person upon the minor's death prior to termination. The original purpose of the future-interest exception to the annual exclusion was the apprehended difficulty, in many instances, of determining the number of eventual donees and the values of their repective gifts. This policy can be preserved, however, so long as the property given to a donee will be used by or for him alone during his life and will be subject to estate tax at his death. It should not be material when the donee will receive the benefit from the property or who will receive it after his death.

Under the amendment the donor can provide for termination at any particular age or even run the trust through the donee's entire lifetime. He can (but need not) provide for gifts over to third persons on the donee's death, so long as the property will be includible in the donee's gross estate.

The amendment applies either to outright gifts or to gifts in trust for the benefit of the donee, and whether the donee is a minor or an adult.

It is not intended that this amendment provide an exclusive method of creating a present interest. Nor is it intended to affect the application of the annual exclusion to outright gifts, whether or not the donee is under disabilities arising under local law by reason of minority or otherwise.

The amendment applies to gifts made after the date of enactment.

SEC. 62. PROHIBITION OF ADJUSTMENT OF AMOUNT OF TAXABLE GIFTS MADE IN PRIOR YEARS

Section 62 of the bill amends section 2504(c) of the 1954 code.

Section 2504(c) now provides that the value of a gift made in a prior year cannot be readjusted in subsequent years if a gift tax was actually paid on the gift made in the prior year and the period of limitations for assessment has expired for such year.

The amendment extends such protection to the allowance or disallowance of the $3,000 annual exclusion from taxable gifts.

The amendment applies to gifts made in the calendar year 1961 and subsequent calendar years.

SECTION 63. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER UNDER FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT

Section 63 of the bill amends section 3306(a) of the 1954 code.

This amendment would reduce the arbitrary significance, in present law, of the timing of an acquisition in a situation where an employer, before the 20th week of the calendar year, acquires the assets and business of another person and employs individuals who were employees in the same calendar year of such other person.

Chapter 23 imposes on an employer a tax of 3 percent of the first $3,000 of wages paid to an employee during the calendar year. Section 3302 allows a credit against this tax for contributions to a certified State unemployment compensation fund, not in excess of 2.7 percent. Section 3306(b)(1) provides that where an "employer" acquires substantially all the property used in a trade or business of a predecessor employer, and takes over employees of the latter, wages paid to such employees by the predecessor in the same calendar year prior to the acquisition shall be considered as having been paid by the successor.

Section 3306(b)(1), however, applies only with respect to "employers" and under section 3306(a) an "employer" is a person who employs four or more individuals on each of some 20 days during the calendar year, each day being in a different calendar week. Thus, if the successor employer takes over the predecessor employer's business and employees on May 31, wages paid by predecessor count toward the maximum base of $3,000 of wages paid to an employee during the calendar year. Both predecessor and successor receive credit against the Federal unemployment tax for taxes paid to State funds.

If, however, the acquisition occurs earlier in the calendar year, before 20 weeks have passed, the result is quite different. Predecessor is not liable for Federal unemployment tax and wages paid to his employees are not attributed to successor, who must pay Federal tax on the entire first $3,000 he pays to each employee taken over from predecessor. At the same time successor is generally not entitled to full credit for State tax in respect of the entire first $3,000 he pays to each such employee.

This amendment would cause some persons to pay Federal unemployment tax who would not under present law. Persons having less than four employees for 20 weeks in the taxable year, but who had four or more in the preceding year, as well as those persons who terminated their trade or business before the 20th week of the calendar year, would be "employers" and would pay tax where they would not under existing law. However, an advantage to the form of this amendment is that it would conform the definition of employer to that in the majority of State unemployment compensation laws. In view of the interrelationship between Federal and State law in this field, such conformity is desirable.

The amendment applies to the calendar year 1961 and subsequent calendar years.

SECTION 64. DEFINITION OF PRICE FOR MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAX PURPOSES

Section 64 of the bill adds a new paragraph to section 416(b) of the 1954 code, which defines the price for which an article is sold for manufacturers excise tax purposes.

Section 4216 originated as section 619 of the Revenue Act of 1932. The report of the Ways and Means Committee on that bill (H.R. 708, 72d Cong., 1st sess., pp. 37–33) showed an intent to base the tax on the normal factory price and where, by reason of the relationship of the parties, the price charged did not represent a fair value, the tax was to be on the same value as in the case of similar sales between independent parties. The courts have held, however, that where the manufacturer acts as distributor or sells through a controlled agency, the tax must be measured by the distributor's sales price, while the manufacturer who does not perform the economic function of distribution is taxed only upon the factory price. See *F. W. Fitch Company* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 582 (1945).

The amendment excludes from the tax base, in such situations, costs attributable to selling and distribution, as distinguished from manufacturing.

The amendment takes effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than 15 days after the date of enactment.

SECTION 65. STAMP TAXES PAYABLE BY REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Section 65 of the bill amends sections 4303(a) and 4381(b) of the 1954 code, and adds a new subsection to section 4382.

These amendments are intended to apply the "conduit" theory to Federal excise taxation of "regulated investment companies" (including certain common trust funds), as is now done in the case of common trust funds coming within the definition in section 584. It seems inappropriate to tax regulated investment companies while exempting some common trust funds from tax since both are essentially vehicles for the same purpose—that of providing the investor of limited means with more expert investment management. It also seems inappropriate to single out investment company securities for up to three documentary stamp taxes on each sale while other securities in normal market activity usually bear only one such tax, especially where the required excise taxes have been paid on the securities underlying the investment company shares.

Subchapter M of the 1954 code applies the "conduit" theory of income taxation to regulated investment companies. A unit investment trust or an open-end or closed-end management type investment company duly registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, meeting certain requirements of the code with respect to investments, nature of income, and disbursement of dividends, and electing to be so treated, pays tax only on income not distributed to its shareholders. This theory recognizes that an investment company primarily serves to provide persons of limited means with a diversified, lower risk, professionally managed investment.

The funds received by investment companies from their security holders are used to purchase securities on which the required original issuance and transfer taxes have already been paid. When any such securities are eliminated from the portfolio, appropriate transfer taxes are paid, and the securities acquired to take their place have likewise been subjected to original issuance and transfer taxes. These amendments would eliminate what is in effect a duplication of taxes on the shareholders of regulated investment companies. The taxes eliminated include the original issuance and one or two transfer taxes imposed on the sale to shareholders of open-end management type investment company shares and, on increase of shares by charter amendment, closed-end company shares, as well as the further original issuance tax on the sale of so-called contractual plans issued by unit investment trusts. Securities of unit investment trusts and open-end management type companies are redeemable securities and are not usually subject to transfer taxes when presented for redemption; all investment company securities, however, are subject to transfer taxes when transferred for reasons other than redemption and cancellation.

These amendments are designed to include those few common trust funds presently encompassed in the definition of regulated investment company, and to make it clear that the qualification of a security as one issued by such an entity is determined as of the date of the issuance or transfer involved and not (as in the case of income taxation) on the basis of events occurring subsequently in the taxable year.

Under section 851, a regulated investment company must meet the standards therein set forth at the close of the taxable year. This is impracticable for stamp tax purposes, and therefore a test measured by the preceding year is being substituted. Where the preceding year test is not available because the regulated investment company is new, such companies are presently required to set forth in their registration statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission an indication of their intention to qualify under section 851. Under these amendments new regulated investment companies must meet this test for stamp tax purposes.

The amendments take effect on the first day of the first calendar month beginning more than 15 days after the date of enactment.

SECTION 66. ELIMINATION OF STAMP TAX ON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF STOCK OR CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS IN CORPORATE MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATIONS

Section 66 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 4321 and a new subsection to section 4331 of the 1954 code.

The courts have held that where one corporation is merged into another, even where shares of the acquiring corporation are issued directly to the shareholders of the disappearing corporation, the stock transfer tax is payable upon a constructive transfer from the disappearing corporation to its shareholders of the right to receive shares of the acquiring corporation.

In such cases the stamp tax upon the issuance of the shares of the acquiring corporation to the shareholders of the disappearing corporation is due. Thus two stamp taxes are imposed, an issue tax and a transfer tax.

The amendments eliminate the tax on the constructive transfer of the right to receive shares of the acquiring corporation. They extend the same relief where securities rather than stock of the acquiring corporation go to the shareholders or security holders of the disappearing corporation. However, the amendments are limited to cases where the shares or securities are issued directly by the acquiring corporation to the shareholders or security holders of the disappearing corporation.

The amendments take effect on the day after the date of enactment.

SECTION 67. ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR RETURNS AS TO FORMATION OR REORGANIZATION OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

Section 67 of the bill repeals section 6046 of the 1954 code.

Section 6046 requires a report to be made with respect to the formation or reorganization of foreign corporations; it contains an exemption with respect to confidential disclosures. Investigations indicate that the reports required under this section have been little used by the Internal Revenue Service. Initially, it was believed that the reports furnished statistical data, but they have not been so used; and if they were, the statistical data would, of necessity, be incomplete because of the exemption for confidential disclosures. These reports, which are troublesome to prepare and submit within the required time limit, do not bear upon tax liability of the person submitting the report or upon the tax liability of the person receiving payment from him.

The amendment applies with respect to the formation or reorganization of a foreign corporation completed after the date of enactment.

SECTION 68. JURISDICTION OF TAX COURT OVER MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES

Section 68 of the bill gives the Tax Court of the United States jurisdiction over controversies involving manufacturers excise taxes. The jurisdiction of the Tax Court over manufacturers excise taxes will correspond to that which it now has with respect to income, estate, and gift taxes.

Numerous sections of the 1954 code are amended.

At present the deficiency procedure available to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with respect to income, estate, and gift taxes is not available to him with respect to manufacturers excise taxes. On the other hand, when the Commissioner presses an assertion that such tax is payable, the taxpayer has no practical alternative but to pay the tax and bring suit in a court other than the Tax Court.

These amendments apply to manufacturers excise taxes the payment of which becomes due after the date of enactment.

SECTION 69. ELIMINATION OF CONDITIONS ON CREDIT OR REFUND OF MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAX

Section 69 of the bill amends section 6416(a) of the 1954 code.

Section 6416(a) now provides that no credit or refund of any overpayment of manufacturers excise tax shall be allowed unless the person who paid the tax establishes, first, that he has not included the tax in the price of the article with respect to which it was imposed or has not collected the amount of the tax from the vendee, or, second, that he has either repaid the amount of the tax to the ultimate purchaser of the article or has secured the written consent of the ultimate purchaser to the allowance of the credit or refund.

Under these limitations the manufacturer must show that he actually bore the burden of the tax, as well as the fact that he paid it. This is a very difficult burden of proof.

The present section 6416(a) assumes that the tax has been illegally collected. In many instances the tax paid by the manufacturer has not been reflected, at least in the same amount, in his price for the article. The present provisions discriminate against a manufacturer who has promptly paid the taxes claimed of him as compared with a manufacturer who, in contest of the tax, has withheld payment.

The amendment eliminates the conditions laid down in section 6416(a) with respect to the recovery of overpayments of manufacturers excise taxes.

The amendment applies with respect to overpayments of manufacturers excise taxes made after the date of enactment.

SECTION 70. LIMITATIONS ON ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION

Section 70 of the bill amends section 6501(c)(1) of the 1954 code.

At the present time there is no period of limitation on the assessment of deficiencies where returns which are held to be fraudulent have been filed. This not only means that so much of the deficiency as is held to have been due to fraud may be assessed at any time, but also means that the assessment of deficiencies resulting from nonfraudulent transactions is not barred by any period of limitations if there is a single fraudulent item in the return.

There is, however, a 6-year period of limitations on the criminal prosecution of a taxpayer accused of criminal tax evasion. The legislative policy which requires a statute of repose for criminal prosecutions also requires a statute of repose for civil purposes.

The policy behind the criminal statute of limitations is not that time cleanses a man of his sins. The policy is based on difficulties of proof incident to the passage of time, such as indistinct memories, the death of witnesses, and the loss of records through destruction, fire or accident. These same difficulties are just as real and troublesome in a civil case as in a criminal case, with the differences that they can do a defendant more harm in a civil case because of the Government's lighter burden of proof.

At the present time, taxpayers cannot with assurance destroy their financial records, including their cancelled checks, merely because a large number of years has elapsed.

As time goes on some witnesses, including the taxpayer himself, may pass away and their testimony be lost.

The amendment prescribes an 8-year period of limitations for civil fraud proceedings.

It is not expected that the cost of this amendment to the Treasury will be large.

The amendment applies to returns filed after the date of enactment.

SECTION 71. RELIEF OF FIDUCIARY FROM PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR FRAUD COMMITTED BY DECEDENT

Section 71 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 6501 of the 1954 code.

Under present law, an executor or trustee who distributes assets of the estate or trust becomes personally liable for taxes which may be due at the time of the distribution. If, unknown to the executor or trustee, the decedent for a period prior to his death, or the grantor for a period prior to the transfer, filed a fraudulent income tax return, there is now no statute of limitations which bars the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, after the executor or trustee has distributed assets, from asserting a deficiency against the executor or trustee for personal liability in respect of the income taxes of the decedent or grantor.

The amendment allows the executor or trustee to protect himself against liability for such income taxes of the decedent or grantor. The fiduciary may request the Commissioner that all income taxes of the decedent or grantor for all taxable years ending prior to or with the date of death or transfer be assessed within 18 months or within the normal 3-year period, whichever expires later, unless the Commissioner can establish that the fiduciary had actual knowledge of a fraudulent return of the decedent or grantor, or of fraudulent failure to file a return.

SECTION 72. LIMITATIONS ON CREDIT FOR OR REFUND OF OVERPAYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO FOREIGN TAXES

Section 72 of the bill amends section 6511(d)(2)(A) of the 1954 code.

Section 6511(d)(2)(A), extending the statute of limitations in the case of a claim for credit or refund relating to an overpayment attributable to a net operating loss carryback, is not clear on whether it covers an overpayment resulting from an election to deduct foreign taxes paid rather than to take credit therefor. The amendment provides that the section covers such an overpayment.

SECTION 73. RELEASE OF FUNDS FROM JEOPARDY ASSESSMENTS

Section 73 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 6861 of the 1954 code.

The right to levy jeopardy assessments against taxpayers is a drastic and far-reaching power which was originally intended to be used sparingly, and only in situations in which there is good reason to believe that the taxpayer is planning to conceal his assets or otherwise place them beyond the reach of the collection officers of the Treasury Department. Whatever the reasons which prompt its issuance, a jeopardy assessment has far-reaching and often disastrous effects on the taxpayer. At times the interests of the Government are also jeopardized. The freezing of the taxpayer's bank account may prevent him from paying fire insurance premiums on his property and from making necessary repairs, thus exposing the Government as well as the taxpayer to a risk of loss. The Government's interests, as well as the taxpayer's, require some means of relief in this situation. Similarly, the taxpayer should be permitted to make use of his property to pay his current income taxes, as well as deficiencies for years other than those involved in the jeopardy assessment.

Even more compelling than these considerations, however, is the necessity for safeguarding the right of the taxpayer to make an effective defense against a criminal charge of evading the alleged tax deficiency on which the jeopardy assessment is based, and to contest in the Tax Court the alleged liability for such taxes.

The amendment empowers the district court, in its discretion, to release such funds as are necessary for the purposes stated in the statute. Since the release of funds would be under the supervision of a district court, there would be reasonable safeguards against unwarranted expenditure of funds.

The amendment takes effect on the day after the date of enactment.

SECTION 74. JEOPARDY ASSESSMENTS

Section 74 of the bill adds a new section to part II of subchapter A of chapter 70 (relating to jeopardy assessments) of the 1954 code. It also amends section 2201 of title 28, United States Code.

The authority of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make a jeopardy assessment when he finds that assessment or collection of a tax will be jeopardized by delay is not, under present law, subject to judicial review. The absence of independent review permits the exercise of this authority in situations for which it was not intended, with, as a practical matter, relief usually not available to the taxpayer.

The amendment to the Internal Revenue Code enables the taxpayer to obtain a review in the district court of the question whether jeopardy exists, and authorizes the court to annul the jeopardy assessment if the taxpayer is able to prove that delay will not jeopardize the assessment or collection of the tax.

The amendment grants the taxpayer the right to have the Commissioner's administrative determination as to the existence of jeopardy reviewed under the declaratory judgment procedure in order to permit speedy determinations of the administrative determinations of the existence of jeopardy. The amendment also authorizes the district court to stay any further proceedings under the jeopardy assessment already made pending the outcome of the declaratory judgment suit.

Section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, now authorizes declaratory relief in cases except those dealing with Federal taxes. Conforming amendments to section 2201 permit a taxpayer to seek a declaratory judgment as to the existence of jeopardy and limit the court's jurisdiction solely to determination of the question of whether the collection of the proposed deficiency will be jeopardized by delay in making the assessment.

The amendments take effect on the day after the date of enactment.

SECTION 75. EFFECT TO BE GIVEN BY TAX COURT TO COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION

Section 75 of the bill adds a new subsection to section 7459 of the 1954 code. The Tax Court has stated that in the absence of action by the Congress or the Supreme Court, it will not consider itself bound to follow a rule of law announced by the court of appeals to which an appeal could be taken in a case pending before the Tax Court. Various courts of appeals have held that the Tax Court must follow a previous decision of the Court of Appeals on the same point. The problem was present in a case decided by the Supreme Court (*Commissioner* v. *Sullivan*, 356 U.S. 27 (1958)), but its opinion is silent on the question.

The argument most frequently expressed for the position of the Tax Court is that it produces a uniform application of the Internal Revenue Code on a nationwide basis. However, decisions of the Tax Court can be reviewed by eleven different courts of appeals, a situation not calculated to produce uniformity. Viewing uniformity as the paramount consideration would point to a Tax Court of Appeals, or providing for direct appeal to the Supreme Court. Both the district courts and the Court of Claims have original jurisdiction of suits brought on claims for the refund of taxes. Within this jurisdictional framework, uniformity, however desirable, is a practical impossibility.

The view that the Tax Court should follow the court of appeals to which an appeal could be taken in a pending case is rooted in the common law doctrine of stare decisis. The court of appeals has traditionally been recognized as making the law of the circuit and the orderly administration of justice requires that it be followed within that circuit. Furthermore, there is the practical consideration that neither the taxpayer nor the Commissioner should be put to the expense of an unnecessary appeal.

The amendment provides that the Tax Court shall give effect to a decision of the courts of appeals on the same basis as do the district courts.

The amendment applies to all decisions made by the Tax Court after the date of enactment.

SECTION 76. USE OF REGISTERED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

Section 76 of the bill amends paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7502(c) of the 1954 Code.

Paragraph (1) of section 7502(c) now provides that sending certain documents by U.S. registered mail shall be prima facie evidence of delivery to the person to whom addressed, and that the date of registration shall be deemed the postmark date. Paragraph (2) permits the Secretary or his delegate to provide by regulations the extent to which the provisions of paragraph (1) with respect to prima facie evidence of delivery and the postmark date shall apply to certified mail.

Under present section 7502(c) there is uncertainty whether evidence of fruitless search would rebut the presumption of delivery; and if it would, the entire effect of the section would be largely negated. The amendment substitutes conclusive effect for merely prima facie effect.

The amendments apply with respect to all affected documents mailed by registered or certified mail after September 2, 1958, the date of enactment of Public Law 85-866, which amended section 7502(c).

SECTION 77. COSTS AWARDED TO PREVAILING PARTY IN REFUND SUIT

Section 77 of the bill amends section 2412(b) of title 28, United States Code. The present section 2412(b) sharply limits the costs which can be recovered in suits against the United States, including tax refund suits. The court decisions are not clear as to the costs which a successful plaintiff can recover in a tax refund suit brought against a district Director of Internal Revenue. Some decisions treat the district director as a private litigant with respect to costs; others limit costs to those which would be allowed against the United States. Where the district director is the successful party, costs are fully recoverable against the taxpayer as against any private litigant.

The amendment liberalizes the allowance of costs to a successful plaintiff in tax refund suits, whether the United States or a district director is the defendant. Costs are allowed on the same basis as in suits between private litigants. The uncertainty as to the allowance of costs in tax refund suits against a district director is eliminated.

The amendment applies with respect to actions in which judgment is entered after the date of enactment.

Gates Versus the Heralds of Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis News of February 2, 1960:

GATES VERSUS THE HERALDS OF DOOM

(By Stan Evans)

The cries of anger being directed at Defense Secretary Thomas Gates carry a noticeable ring of election-year politics. For when Gates "revised" downward U.S. estimates of Soviet power, he snatched away from LYNDON JOHNSON & Co. the allegation that something called "intelligence" backed their shrill declamations about the Kremlin's lead in missilery.

Gates is criticized for founding intelligence estimates on what the Soviets "probably will do," rather than on what they "are capable of doing." One angry Senator characterized this approach as placing us at the mercy of Moscow's beneficient intentions—a fantastic twisting of Gates' meaning and of the facts in the case.

The reference to "intention" does not mean "what the Soviets are going to do with their arsenal of weapons," but "what kind of weapons they are actually manufacturing." The question is not one of beneficence, of which the Kremlin has none, but of known activity.

The charge that "unprovable surmise" has replaced "known fact" is thus precisely the opposite of the truth. It is the theoretical "capability estimate," so joyfully wielded by the true believers in Soviet supremacy, which has no connection with known fact, and which has been constructed to serve in the place of fact.

Last September this column called attention to the failings of "intelligence" based on theorizing about "capability," rather than on cold facts about what was going on. It was then asserted that such estimates "necessarily incorporate a great deal of Soviet say-so as to their achievements, and have in the past proved misleading." Cited in evidence was the "capability" forecast conjured up for the Red air force, envisioned as an airborne colossus ready to pulverize American cities.

In backing up Secretary Gates, President Eisenhower last week made the same point that was raised here 5 months ago. "Only 3 or 4 years ago," the President said, "there was a great outcry about the alleged bomber gap in favor of the Russians * * * Now subsequent intelligence investigation showed that estimate was wrong and that, far from stepping up their production of bombers, the Soviet were diminishing it or even eliminating that production."

Gates is the third Secretary of Defense to voice skepticism about the missile lag. Secretary Wilson, it will be remembered, was regularly flayed for presuming to question Soviet omnipotence. Secretary McElroy, although for a time enmeshed in the missile gap doctrine that evolved from the capability estimates, was frank to say that we had no real evidence that the Soviets were ahead of us.

Testifying before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee about some contrary statements by his subordinate, Dr. Von Braun, McElroy said: "My problem is this: That I do not know how fast they are going to go. Moreover, I have no assurance that they are ahead of us, Mr. Chairman. I have read what Mr. Von Braun has said, and he also I regard as a very excellent man, but whether he knows positively the things he said there I don't know. If he does I think he has knowledge that we don't have."

McElroy, of course, had available to him all the real intelligence information there was, as does Gates. The problem was that, by and large, there simply wasn't much information of any kind. The theoretical projections of a 3-to-1 missile lag were thrown together in the absence of data, and were based largely on the Soviets' own declarations.

In the meantime, a few shards of factual information have been pieced together—and, oddly enough, they do not support the apocalyptic visions being evoked by our heralds of doom and appeasement. One key fact, referred to previously in this space: In spite of diligent snooping, our intelligence operatives have been unable to locate even one Soviet ICBM launching site.

Churches and the Needs of Older Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased at the growing recognition that steps must be taken to provide a healthy and constructive life for our older citizens. During the last half century more years have been added to our lives than in the previous 2,000 years of history. Fifty years ago a baby girl could expect to live to age 48. Today she can expect to live beyond the Biblical threescore years and ten.

With these increased expectations comes a need for a reorientation of our thinking and for legislation.

I have introduced a bill which would provide hospital and medical care for our older citizens, and I hope that hearings can be held and action taken promptly upon this measure.

An excellent discussion of the relationship between churches and the needs of older persons is contained in the current issue of Social Action, a publication of the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the first article in that publication, by William C. Fitch, executive director, American Society of Retired Persons, and formerly Director of the Department of the Aging, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is entitled "Churches and the Needs of Older Persons," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHES AND THE NEEDS OF OLDER PERSONS

It is a privilege to have part in the Consultation of the United Church of Christ on "The Church's Responsibility for the Aging." Because you represent a denomination with over 2 million members, this meeting can have far-reaching effects. We need a realistic approach to the needs of our older citizens. Too much emphasis has been placed on the problem, too many meetings of experts have been held to devise plans for study and research, and too little practical action has been taken at a level where the aging individual can feel its impact.

Our older citizens are not mere statistics. But it is important to know that we have over 15 million individuals in the United States 65 years of age or older. It is equally important in our long-range planning to know that there are over 35 million in the 45–64 age group.

There has been a dramatic increase in life expectancy. It has been extended 20 years since the turn of the century. Judging from the stacks of newspaper clippings about interesting older persons, one might almost assume that the promise of extending the life span to age 100 has already been fulfilled.

Never before in our history has the spotlight been so frequently focused on the aging. Much of this is due to the accelerated activity in preparing for the White House Conference on Aging. A great deal of the credit is due to the organizations that have been working in the field for many years. They have prepared the way for this tremendous growth of interest and activity. Unlike meetings held on other national issues, there is a remarkable degree of agreement on the main problems confronting the aging;

Insufficient income: It is a generally accepted fact that a large segment of our aging population does not have sufficient income to enjoy the later years. They live in constant fear of the diminishing value of the retirement dollar.

Age restrictions of employment: The employment barriers because of age are unrealistic. Mandatory retirement at 65 is not only demoralizing but is a tremendous waste of productive manpower.

Inadequate housing: Suitable housing for the elderly at prices they can afford is still a fond dream for most older persons.

Meaningless leisure time: The increasing amount of free time has little meaning unless interesting, enjoyable, and worthwhile programs are developed. The need to prepare for these years is no less important than for any other period in our lives.

Illness and the high cost of medical care: There is a greater incidence of illness among the aged. The fear of a chronic illness or disability is a constant threat to enjoyment of the later years. Financing the cost of medical care is challenging the best minds of the medical profession. It is no longer a question of whether, but how to provide against the economic hazards of hospital and medical care in the later years.

Into these five areas fall practically all of the major problems confronting our aging population. As we seek better understanding and more effective programs to meet these needs, we should examine each in the light of the church's opportunity to find practical ways to fit them into its program.

WHAT CHURCHES CAN DO

There may not be much the church can do to increase the income of retired workers, but it should be aware of the economic status of its members to be sure that those who are marginal know about the facilities and services to stretch the retirement dollar which are available in the church and community. Staff members of the church should become informed about the local resources and accept their share of community responsibility for expanding or establishing new services to meet the needs.

What has the church done to demonstrate that chronological are is no criterion for employment or service? Is there a mandatory retirement age for church employees? To what extent are mature workers being hired or kept in key positions, paid or unpaid, within the church organizations? This is not a plea for the hiring of older workers, as might be done in the case of the handicapped. It is a plea to consider the older person as an individual, able, qualified, and willing to meet the requirements of the job.

The churches have perhaps given their greatest support and leadership in the field of housing. The need is still great and the churches must review their progress and decide which direction their next efforts should take.

Housing is not just a shelter. It is many things. It may be an individual home, built to take advantage of all of the latest devices and plans that will make it comfortable, safe, and convenient. It may also be a cooperative type of dwelling, house, or apartment. For some it may mean a rest home or a nursing home planned, staffed, and equipped to provide limited services that do not require hospitalization. There will also be a need for modern hospitals to serve those in need of skilled medical care. Our aim must be to help individuals to live independently as long as possible and to provide various types of accommodations to meet the changing conditions of aging.

Free time can be a curse or a blessing depending on how it is used. We continue to need satisfaction from meaningful activity. We would not be content with "busy work" at any age, and certainly would not accept it as a substitute for job satisfaction. There is a place for hobbies, travel, yes, fishing, too—but not on a full-time basis.

For the church this is a challenge, opportunity, and responsibility. Every active church has need for volunteers to assist in implementing all of its many programs. The older members not only could, but would be thrilled to be asked. They have already demonstrated their skill as community fundraisers, and unless my church is unusual you also have an urgent need for these services.

Many churches have their senior citizens groups as well as youth groups. This is good, too, but it would be better to place greater emphasis on continuing the older persons as a part of the other groups of the church. They would prefer this if given an opportunity and if they were made to feel welcome.

Health needs may seem remote from the church's role, but there is a universal need to educate people concerning the preventive measures that are already available.

EDUCATION FOR RETIREMENT

Studies of successful retirement have shown that those making the best adjustment made some overt efforts to plan for the later years. Society is confronted with a two-phased problem: (1) To meet the needs of those already advanced in years, (2) to educate and prepare those approaching retirement to make the most of their free time, and the gift of added years.

Because the church is the center of our lives and the heart of the community it enjoys a unique opportunity for service which is not possible to the same degree in any other organization.

How will your church meet the challenge?

Wasn't World War I a War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which should be vitally important to all of us who are interested in the plight of our forgotten veterans of World War I. The editorial appeared in the Reese River Reveille of Austin, Nev., on February 17, 1960.

The editorial follows:

WASN'T WORLD WAR I A WAR?

We're little old men whom nobody'll pay, baa, baa, baa.
It's many a year since we had our day, baa, baa, baa.
Veterans lost to all memory,
Men our country has ditched are we,
Congress hopes we'll just fade away, baa, baa, baa.

That paraphrase of the Gentleman Ranker song—better known in this country as the Whiffenpoof song, since somebody in Yale stole it and messed it up—describes the plight of the World War I veterans.

Too old—most of them—to be employed, never given a tenth part of the benefits, pay, and pensions showered on veterans of later wars, who today need it all much less, the veterans of 1917 and 1918 are justified in feeling they have been—and are being—given scurvy treatment by the country they served. Many of them are living precariously, many even impecuniously.

They are what rich organizations, many Congressmen, and even the administration, sneer at as "healthy veterans"—who are trying to rob the Government of money that should be distributed among foreigners.

The soldier of World War I was paid $30 a month—$33 overseas. When he was discharged he was given $60—not $20 a week for 52 weeks. He was given no help in getting education or training, starting in business or buying a home. The war was over. He had done the job he set out to do. The country had no further use for him.

With $60 and a wornout uniform he went out to find a job in a country where stopping of war industries had raised unemployment sky high. He learned what it was to skip meals and go hungry—not in the trenches as he had done at times—but in his own homeland, the country for which he had been fighting, and which didn't need him any longer.

Congress finally opened its heart. It passed what it called "adjusted insurance." That was a form of insurance under which—before the veteran was quite old enough to totter off the scene—he would be given some money, according to his length of service—but years in the future.

Then came the great depression. Those who are not old enough to remember it are lucky—but the veteran of World War I remembers it. Most of those veterans lost whatever they had managed to put together—and many others went into the soup line. Most of them lost the war insurance they had managed to carry up to that time. The only bright spot they could see among all the clouds was the fact the Government had promised them some compensation for their war service.

They appealed to the Government to make that payment then—when the veterans needed it so desperately—instead of at some time in the distant future, when they might no longer need it so badly—or would have starved to death. Congress sidetracked all their requests.

Probably the majority of Americans today have forgotten—if they ever even heard of—the march to Washington, by veterans hoping to persuade Congress to make at least some kind of a payment on the money that had been promised them. By that time they had families and small children going hungry. Many veterans disapproved of that march, and did not participate in it, but they all knew the truth about it.

Those hungry veterans moved into Washington—not to threaten—as cringing high officials in Government declared—but to plead. They were peaceful. They maintained strict order among themselves. Some were accompanied by their wives and children, who had no homes. As a part of their demonstration, they paraded—but they paraded at night. They did their best to cover their own condition and the Government's treatment of them by parading at a time when their rags and tatters would be less visible. One famous syndicated columnist, horrified by what he saw, described that parade to his readers as the "march of the ghosts."

Yet those ragged ghosts without even a thought of a threat among them, scared the administration of that day out of its wits. It ordered General MacArthur, who had under him and commanding part of his forces an officer named Eisenhower, to disperse what it called dangerous revolutionists, rioters and whatnot—of which not a single word was true.

Those American soldiers, acting under orders of their officers, fired on American veterans—unarmed and peaceful veterans. The blood of American veterans was shed by American soldiers under orders of American officers. Then their camp and pitiful belongings were burned and they were driven out of Washington.

That was a proud day in American history.

Every American officer and soldier who participated in that affair—and every official who ordered it—today would like to forget it—and probably can't.

There is no surer cause of lasting enmity—even hatred—on the part of one man toward another man that coming from a knowledge of guilt. Why is there so much determination on the part of certain groups and government officials that nothing shall be done for the veterans of World War I? Why is President Eisenhower so bitterly outspoken in his opposition to any such plan, although he is eager to distribute billions to foreign countries?

Today those veterans are old. Most of them are unemployable. Many of them are in need. The country for which they fought has done little for them—and that little grudgingly.

Now those veterans are dying at the rate of more than 130,000 a year. That means about 360 every day—1 every 4 minutes.

Whatever gratitude for past service the country may be willing to extend them will not be required too far into the future. It will amount to a lot less than we spend in foreign aid.

Yet year after year, as efforts are made to pass legislation that would give a lift to those old veterans of World War I, bitter opposition springs up. That opposition comes from many sides—the administration, Congress, and rich organizations of wealthy men.

Why? How much of that opposition springs from the realization of guilt, relating to deeds committed far in the past?

Day of Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Day of Glory," which appeared in the February 18, 1960, issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

DAY OF GLORY

We in the West are bound to view with mixed feelings the emergence of France into membership in the world nuclear club.

As a military man and leader devoted to the restoration of his country's former glory, French President Charles de Gaulle understands the decisive character of nuclear weapons in modern warfare.

With evident logic, he seeks this means of giving France a larger voice both in world affairs and within NATO and other Western councils. The explosion of an atomic device in the Sahara is intended as at least a partial cure for an inferiority which dates from the early years of World War II.

Possibly there will in fact be some gain to the West if France gets a feeling of greater equality from having entered the select nuclear circle, and from having freed itself, to an extent, from nuclear dependence on the United States and Britain.

But there are also serious drawbacks to this development. The explosion in the Sahara does not make easier the conclusion of a nuclear test ban agreement or general nuclear disarmament, which for 15 months has been under discussion in Geneva.

Thus far, France has not demanded a place at the Geneva parleys, but it may. If it does, the presence of a stiff-backed De Gaulle representative could delay even further the reaching of an accord.

Furthermore, France's entry into the club stresses once more the danger that still more nations will master nuclear technique and add to the double threat of nuclear war and contamination of the peacetime atmosphere.

On top of all this, the West may reasonably regard as wasteful the French diversion of funds and industrial capacity to nuclear effort which duplicates that of America and Britain.

More useful in the overall Western defense picture would have eben the fuller support of French ground armies needed for the fleshing out of NATO's far too slender barriers in Western Europe. France's detonation of a relatively crude atomic device is hardly compensation for this loss.

And this accomplishment in the Sahara could hardly come at a poorer time, in the light of France's deteriorating relations with Africa. The native peoples regard the event as both a physical danger and a deep affront.

No one can daresay the gains outweigh the losses from France's "big day" in the North African desert.

Water Pollution Control Saves American Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the value of water pollution control to America and to the protection of the health of our citizens is well expressed in the Anderson Countian of Garnett, Kans., of which Mr. Leonard McCalla, Jr. is the publisher. He is associated with Mr. Earl L. Knauss who publishes the Garnett Review. Both of these men are leaders in the newspaper field and perform a single service to their community.

On February 18, 1960, an editorial appeared in the Anderson Countian in which it was pointed out that due to water treatment facilities, water-borne disease has been greatly reduced, and that death rate due to typhoid fever has been cut from 27 percent to zero in some areas.

The editorial expresses, Mr. Speaker, that although the Kansas public water supplies are in many ways better than the national average, constant attention must be given to the increasing needs for safe and unadulterated water.

With the water use in this country expected to double within the next 20 years, it is of the utmost importance that rapid progress be made in the purification of our water supply and in eliminating its contamination.

May I request, Mr. Speaker, that the article from the Anderson Countian be published in the extension of my re-

marks as its contents are very appropriate at this particular time:

FIFTY YEARS OF WATER PROTECTION—HUNDREDS OF KANSAS CITIES USE CHLORINATION AS DISINFECTANT FOR SAFETY

Kansas people demand that the quality of water be protected for all uses—human health, animals, plant life, and industrial uses. Promoting safe water supplies is one of the tasks of the State health department's division of sanitation.

When the division was established in 1907, Kansans were drinking unfiltered, unchlorinated water from rivers and wells. Fifty years later—in 1957, there were 449 municipal water supplies, only three of which did not disinfect the water by chlorination. At the end of 1959, only one town, Galena, did not provide continuous chlorination. In 1907, fewer than 50 towns had sewers to carry wastes out of backyards and ditches—in 1957, 305 cities had sewers, and all but 15 had sewage treatment facilities. Constant progress has been made since then.

Improvement in water treatment plant facilities has been paralleled by a marked reduction in water-borne disease. Since 1945, no major outbreaks of illness have been traced to this cause. Better water purification and sewage treatment practices were partly responsible for reduction of typhoid fever death rates from 27 per 100,000 population in 1907, to no deaths in 1957, and none through 1959.

More than 70 new city water supply wells were drilled during the 1956–58 biennium, replacing improperly located or unprotected old wells. In these 2 years, 20 new public water supply systems were built, replacing hundreds of private wells of questionable quality. Industry has matched municipal progress in control of its wastes.

Kansas public water supplies are better in many ways than the national average. But, constant attention must be given to increasing needs for safe water, the need to expand and modernize water and sewage treatment plants now in use, and the need to be on guard against new sources of contamination. With the customary citizen support—this can be done.

Communist Infiltration Into Churches and Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the recent furor raised by some members of the National Council of Churches in regard to a statement in an Air Force NCO manual has brought forth many ideas and comments. I have found no one who denies that there are no ministers to be found in the international Communist conspiracy. The statement in this Air Force manual simply said this:

From a variety of authoritative sources there appears to be overwhelming evidence of Communist antireligious activity in the United States through the infiltration of fellow travelers into churches and educational institutions.

Everyone who has only read just a country newspaper knows that is a true statement. The Committee on Un-American Activities has probably hundreds of names throughout America of people who follow this classification either in the churches or in the educational field.

This Air Force manual in substance says that many people are innocently duped, deceived, and flagrantly exploited by the social gospel doctrine that has been advocated by many ministers. This article does not condemn churches and religion it simply calls attention to a well-known fact that some ministers fail to see that their placing of emphasis on the political-economic and social gospel matters is simply following the collectivist Communist road.

This article in no way belittles spiritual values or basic beliefs of religion. All this article is attempting to point out is this fact—that many persons in some church groups who support political-economic fronts render a greater service to these international propaganda projects than card-carrying Communists.

A few years ago an organization called the Circuit Riders of Cincinnati, Ohio, printed a list of 2,109 Methodist clergymen who were engaging in political, economic, and social gospel activities. The basic objective of this list was to point out the dangers involved in these propagandizing socialistic political activities and the sly attempt to whitewash the communistic attempts to defeat American ideals and concepts.

A few weeks ago I had occasion to read the following article by Rev. Billy James Hargis, minister, of Tulsa, Okla., who also points out these dangers. Here is his article:

APOSTATE CLERGYMEN BATTLE FOR GOD-HATING COMMUNIST CHINA

A United Press International News dispatch of May 27, 1959, said, "A distinguished American theologian has some stern words to offer on the problem of communism and Christianity." The distinguished theologian was none other than Dr. John A. Mackay, well known leftwing Presbyterian leader who has a long record of supporting Communist Party line objectives. The news dispatch went on to state, "Dr. John Mackay, retiring president of the Princeton Theological Seminary, charged that America is turning its back on untold thousands of Christians in Red China. Dr. Mackay called for the recognition of Red China—backing a resolution that had been adopted at the general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church meeting at Indianapolis. Dr. Mackay told the delegates that while Red China has done some terrible things, so has the United States."

Here is a typical example of the twisted and deceiving play on words used by leftwing clergymen in their attempts to disguise their blatant support of important Communist conspiracy objectives. Let's analyze Dr. Mackay's charge that "America is turning its back on untold thousands of Christians in Red China." This charge is merely a continuation of a propaganda campaign Dr. Mackay has been carrying on in behalf of the Red Chinese slavemasters for years. He called for recognition of Red China and its admission to the U.N. back in December 1949. On December 10, 1956, he spoke before 400 religious executive in Indianapolis, Ind., and called for the sending of a delegation of American church leaders to Red China to "reestablish contact with colleagues there." He said that it was absolutely imperative that this be done. From his actions and words, one gets the impression that Dr. Mackay is on fire for this vital objective of international communism.

Dr. Mackay and other apologists for communism in the churches would have us to believe that there is actually freedom of religion in Red China and other Communist conspiracy held nations. They refuse to face the documented and indisputable facts about the Communist conspiracy's takeover of churches in Communist nations, and how the Communists are utilizing these churches to promote the cause of atheistic communism. Now let us remember one thing—that is, that Dr. Mackay is not speaking of the suffering, persecuted Christians of China who have been tortured, sent to slave camps, and denied the right to worship God. Many were killed. Dr. Mackay is speaking of the so-called Christian leaders who were intimidated into cooperating with communism by converting their churches into tools for promoting Communist propaganda and objectives. He is speaking of the phony pastors placed in the churches by Communist leaders.

In 1949, the Chinese Reds set up what they called the Religious Bureau whose function was to supervise all religious bodies in China. The actual purpose was to operate behind Communist double talk and take over the churches for use as instruments of Communist policy in China. The techniques used were taxation and terrorism. The pastors were told that they could continue to conduct services if they would deliver sermons prepared for them by Communist propagandists or preach sermons along the Communist propaganda line. Those who refused had their churches closed by impossibly heavy taxes. These who defied the Religious Bureau were quickly arrested, imprisoned, and subjected to torture and brainwashing, or execution. Many Chinese Christians have suffered because they chose Christ instead of Mao Tse-tung.

Most Americans are unaware that there are two Protestant and two Catholic church groups in China. In April 1951, the Communists established the Three Self-Reform Movement to separate their collaborators from the faithful Christians. Only a small minority registered with this atheistic Communist movement, and this small minority's pastors are the Christians on whom Dr. Mackay claims America is turning its back. His interest is not in the true Chinese Christians who are persecuted, are underground, and who have formed a "Bible eating" movement in which each member takes certain Bible passages to memorize.

During March of this year, author John C. Caldwell, who has spent a number of years in China, reported recent church developments in Red China. Peiping's 65 Christian churches of a dozen denominations have been reduced to 4. Excess buildings were taken over for government use. One hundred and fifty excess preachers, Bible women, and assistant ministers were released and assigned to labor on a farm commune. Shanghai's 200 Protestant churches were cut down to 15, releasing another sizable group of ministers for forced labor. Attendance at the churches left open has dropped drastically, and average attendance is about 20. Of course, if some prominent visitor from outside the Iron Curtain nations visits one of these Communist-operated churches, he or she would find it packed full. The Communists would see to this. They always do.

The Red Chinese tyrants are moving to scrap the whole denominational system and create a Communist-controlled Chinese Christian church. This is the church with which modernist American churchmen are anxious to establish contact. When and where has John A. Mackay, or any like him, ever expressed compassion for the enslaved and persecuted Christians of Red China? Who is turning his back on untold thousands of Christians in Red China? What a

bit of subtle poisonous propaganda is contained in Dr. John A. Mackay's statement. Unfortunately it will make sense to a number of uninformed and brainwashed American church members, because they have not the foggiest idea about the nature, methods, and objectives of anti-Christ communism, or what it has done to churches under its rule.

In his statement, Dr. Mackay admitted that Red China has done some terrible things, but toned this down by saying that so has the United States. All nations governed by fallible human beings have done things which were wrong, but imagine comparing our Nation with the cruel inhuman dictatorship of Red China. These agents of anti-Christ communism have committed unspeakable atrocities against millions of Chinese and quite a few Americans; Chinese family life has been broken up and millions of Chinese men, women, and children herded like animals into communes to work as slaves of the Red government. Our Nation is indeed in deeper peril than ever before in its history when church members will listen to men with the ideology of Dr. John A. Mackay and take him seriously. Here is a man who has classed anti-Communists as being more dangerous than Communist conspirators. Our Bible warns us that by their fruits shall ye know them. Pray more for an awakening among sleeping members of American churches.

Senator Keating Honors Rabbi Goldstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on January 31 there was an important meeting in New York. The World Academy in Jerusalem held a reception in honor of Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

It is fitting that this great man of God should be honored by the junior Senator from New York. Senator KEATING has been honored many times by Zionist organizations. In a recent trip to Israel, he was present at the dedication of the Ken Keating Forest.

The junior Senator from New York and I have agreed on many matters in both Houses of Congress. One of these is in our deep admiration for the people of Israel and for their great cultural attainments.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator KEATING's address and the one delivered by Rabbi Goldstein be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, REPUBLICAN OF NEW YORK, AT A RECEPTION GIVEN BY THE WORLD ACADEMY IN JERUSALEM IN HONOR OF RABBI HERBERT S. GOLDSTEIN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY, IN THE GRAND BALLROOM OF THE PLAZA HOTEL AT 8 P.M., JANUARY 31, 1960

Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the celebration committee, ladies and gentlemen, this is a warm and wonderful occasion—because we honor tonight a man who, in a sense, has honored all of us by the gift to humanity of so long a life of service, of friendship, of dedication. Rabbi Goldstein, there are two ways in which I could reveal your age—by saying you have lived for 70 years—or—that the world about you has been enriched for 70 years. I think the latter is the best way to tell your age.

Many of your friends and associates here tonight have been privileged to have their own lives touched, and inspired and ennobled by your own. I have only read the story of the fruitful years you look back upon, across the vista of memory, but, that story of achievement—that generous giving of yourself to great causes, to great purposes over the years, is no less inspiring to me than to those so fortunate as to have been within the happy circle of your influence and your friendship.

Anyone studying your long and splendid career, Rabbi Goldstein, might well be moved to say: Here is a man who has made a happy blending of vocation and avocation—for, on the one hand he collects honors, on the other, he collects friends.

Surely, one of the most preeminent causes with which your name has been so closely associated is that of the World Academy in Jerusalem. No one can build you a finer monument than you have built for yourself—by your unceasing efforts in behalf of this outstanding cultural contribution to the history of the Jewish people.

I do not know of any way in which the meaning of the World Academy can be better expressed—or its essence better described—than in the words of the late chief rabbi of Israel, Isaac Halevy Herzog, who said: "The World Academy is to the State of Israel what the soul is to the body."

One has only to visit Israel—as I recently had the privilege of doing, to realize the truth of this statement—to appreciate the intensity and the scope of the spiritual and intellectual contribution of the World Academy. The facets of its program are many and they are vital. The academy is at once a repository and a source—filled with the great treasures of the past, enriching the present and the future with its research, its energies, its wisdom.

I look back with fond recollection on my visit to Israel. It remains one of the most vivid and illuminating experiences of my life. I was invited by the Israeli Government on the occasion of the dedication of the Ken Keating Forest—a great and cherished honor for me.

I do not believe I shall ever forget that dedication ceremony, high up on one of those beautiful Judean hills that look down upon Jerusalem. The soil was hard and rocky, and I could not help but remark to the chairman of the occasion: "It does not seem possible that trees would take root in this stony ground."

He smiled and said to me: "In Israel, the trees, like the people, are inspired to grow by the very difficulties of growing."

I have told this little incident to many of my friends, and I have impressed upon them that, to me, it sums up the greatness of spirit which alone can explain the success of Israel.

To read of Israel, her people, and her institutions is, in a sense, like reading the review of a book. To me was given the wonderful opportunity to read the book itself—to turn its pages, to dwell upon their grandeur, to study their meaning in terms of human spirit.

This fountainhead of Jewish culture has been built from the heart outward. It is a striving into which life has been breathed by a dedicated people. It is a historic breakthrough, out of the past and into the present.

Our guest of honor tonight has exemplified in his own life this spirit I found in Israel. The willingness—the hunger, almost, to meet new challenges—the freshness of what one might call constructive dissatisfaction—that is, an impatience to build, to achieve, to improve—to push, pioneerlike—toward new frontiers of creativity, toward a richer, fuller expression of the free spirit of man. These are the traits of a great culture because they are the traits of the great men who make that culture—men like you, Rabbi Goldstein.

One of the discoveries that impressed me most in Israel was the balance that has been maintained in the broad field of culture, between science and the broad fundamental values of the spirit and the intellect. The tremendous economic upsurge of Israel, with all the materialistic aspects it implies, has been accomplished in a perfect equation of the demands of existence with the demands of the spirit. Important as it is to the growth of Israel, science has its place, not its pedestal, in the total concept of Israel's meaning and its mission.

The Weizmann Institute, which I had the pleasure of visiting in the company of my good friend, Abba Eban, is unique in its part of the world. There is no other scientific research center between Rome and Tokyo that compares with it. Together with the famous Technion at Haifa—which Dr. James Killian called the "M.I.T. of the Middle East"—the institute has been the main factor in meeting and solving Israel's industrial development problems.

In this pattern of counterbalance I have referred to, the World Academy in Jerusalem stands as a prime and perfect example of the emphasis given by Israel to the deep spiritual and religious values in man's life as contrasted with the purely scientific and utilitarian.

Israel today stands as a great act of faith. Everything is related to that act of faith—is part of it—whether it takes the form of scholarly research into the roots of this great culture or scientific probing into the undiscovered and unknown.

Yes, Israel can well be summed up as an act of faith, brought to glowing life by the zeal and the energies of its people. Believe me when I tell you that, to the visitor, it inspires faith as well. It shows him what man can accomplish in this world when a great and noble purpose is infused with the heart and the will and the muscle to make it succeed.

In this regard, it is timely to pay tribute to the truly magnificent contribution made to the growth and to the success of Israel by her many and generous friends here in America. Rabbi Goldstein epitomizes this devotion of self to a great cause, but whether the giving is to be reckoned in time, in generosity, in energy, or in moral and spiritual support, Rabbi Goldstein finds himself in a numerous and dedicated company.

We know too well, all of us, that the great, overshadowing problem remains—the island status of Israel in an unfriendly surrounding sea. Yet, in this very metaphor of land and water, lies, I feel, the best hope of an ultimate resolving of the problem. By this I mean that the great force and influence of Israel is like a tide breaking upon a shore. The shore must change. It cannot ignore the tide. It must feel its pressures, it must take nourishment from its waters, it must one day realize the tremendous flow of vitality and health and human betterment that this ceaseless tide represents. By its will and its energies, Israel has pounded through the granite wall of the impossible to create a new nation. The wall of hatred and distrust that now confronts it is man-made and man can break down what man has erected. It is your fervent hope—and my own—that each passing day may bring us nearer to the realization of that sublime hope.

In general, we have done well as a nation in helping our friend Israel grow and prosper. However, I am greatly disturbed by some recent incidents.

In a news story a few days ago it was reported that the Navy had included cancellation clauses in its contracts with U.S.-flag

ships to take into account the Arab boycott of Israel. What the Navy had said in effect is that, if Arab nations won't let a ship with a Navy cargo use the Suez Canal or trade with Israel, the shipper is obligated to cancel his contract and to substitute another and exactly similar vessel to the Navy. As a consequence, no American shipper who does business with Israel could conceivably bid for a contract involving shipment through the Suez. The New York Times in a recent editorial recorded (and I quote) "shock to learn that the U.S. Navy is supinely accommodating itself to the Arab boycott of ships trading with Israel." The American Jewish Congress, in commenting on this same situation, noted that the Navy is in effect acting as enforcement agent for the Arab boycott.

The news about the Navy's Suez shipping policies is all the more troublesome because it comes so soon on the heels of the World Bank's endorsement of the Arab boycott in loaning the UAR $56 million. This will never do. Official American Government policy cannot and must not back the wholly indefensible tactics of Israel's hostile neighbors. The policies and official pronouncements of our Nation should not disadvantage our close friend and ally, in its efforts to engage in trade and commerce with the rest of the world.

Last week, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy on this matter asking for a full report on the Navy's policy precluding American shippers who deal with Israel from bidding for Navy contracts to carry goods of the American Government through the Suez.

I have asked the Secretary to answer the following questions, and I am anxiously awaiting his reply.

1. What are the reasons behind this official pronouncement of Navy policy which to many people seems to have the effect of backhandedly and subtly endorsing the Arab boycott of American ships trading with Israel?

2. Does the Navy intend in this way to indicate official or tacit approval of this boycott?

3. What, if any, steps have been taken by the Navy to protest the Arab boycott in general and to deal with the specific ramifications of the Navy's shipping policy towards American shippers who do business with Israel?

Now perhaps I should not have gotten into this serious subject on this auspicious occasion but it was very much on my mind and I couldn't refrain from sharing some of my thoughts with you.

Rabbi Goldstein, in my earlier remarks I spoke of the many lives you have touched in your long and distinguished career. I would be remiss, indeed, if I did not mention that your influence has radiated into my own life. Not directly, perhaps, but, under the circumstances, I think I could use the expression, "by remote control."

I must explain to our audience that one of the rabbi's fine sons, Simeon was one of the architects of my 1958 victory in the New York senatorial race. I suppose it's part of the old story: if the rabbi can't be there in person he'll send somebody.

We do honor to you tonight, Rabbi Goldstein, but I know that you would be the first to insist that it be a shared honor—that your life has borrowed from many lives to make you deserving of our tribute. Above all, the unfailing devotion of your wonderful wife—with all that she has meant to you in inspiration, in support, in the tenderness and sympathy that makes the burden seem less and the way seem brighter—his devotion richly entitles her to share in the tribute we pay to you on your 70th birthday.

Now most people who reach the age of 70 feel that they have arrived at a destination. I know, as well as Mrs. Goldstein does, as well as his family and his friends do, that to our guest of honor 70 is not a destination. It's a mere stop-over en route. His eyes are not looking backward, upon what has been done—but forward to what remains to be done. As you move into a new decade of service, Rabbi Goldstein, let us assure you that the hearts and the thoughts of your legion of friends are with you. May all the years ahead be golden years—and may happiness walking with you every step of the way.

ADDRESS BY RABBI HERBERT S. GOLDSTEIN AT THE RECEPTION HELD IN HIS HONOR AT THE HOTEL PLAZA, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 31, 1960

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Rabbis, Senator Keating, Mayor Wagner, honored guests on the dais, my dear friends all, I want to take this means of thanking each and everyone of you as fervently as I can for coming here tonight in connection with my 70th birthday. At 70, I should like to look back and look forward. I look back at my early manhood when the question of religion was the dominant motif when one was either a religious, or an irreligious Jew. I have seen it change to nationalism and Zionism and the dominant note became, not so much religion as Zionism. A little over 11 years ago the emphasis has been placed upon the recognition, thank God, of the State of Israel, and all that this implies.

Since the creation of the state, we were and are absorbed with the realization of the prophecy that there would be an ingathering of exiles into Zion. We have, both in Israel, and in the Diaspora, evidence of one of the loftiest lessons in the history of brotherhood. No stone is being left unturned to make room for the 1,200,000 refugees who have entered Israel, up to the present time. In Israel our people willingly denied themselves every comfort and unhesitatingly accepted the privations of food rationing, which the tremendous increase in population necessitated. The Jews in the rest of the world have made giving to the United Jewish Appeal and purchasing State of Israel bonds, a top priority, so that our brethren everywhere, may find a haven of refuge in their divinely deeded homeland.

As to the future, we now enter upon a new era in the history of the Jewish people. It requires a searching examination of the very foundation and function of our existence. We have been eminently successful in making the State of Israel a refugee land. We must now enter the next phase of converting the refugee land into our ultimate purpose and goal, namely, to have it become, once more, a holy land. Prof. Hugo Bergman has well put it in an article he wrote in 1949, right after the state was declared, "the question whether we are a nation like all nations; a secular people, or Israelis professing various religions, or whether we are a religious-national group of a special spiritual structure, is not just a question of amusing sophistry, but of great moment." Zionism, dear friends, means a return to Judaism, as well as a return to the land of the Jews. Israel may not be merely a state of Jews, but a Jewish state.

If we are true to ourselves, the conversion of the refugee land into the Holy Land will be a religious event in the life of mankind. Our prophets have envisioned the contribution of Israel to civilization, as a spiritual one. The spiritual one according to the prophets can only be a religious one and thus do we say three times daily in the Shemoneh Esra prayer the following words:

"And let our eyes behold Thy return Oh God in mercy to Zion." Since the destruction of the temple, we pray on the festivals, and on the Day of Atonement. "And gather our exiles to Thy holy courts to observe Thy statutes, to perform Thy will, and to serve Thee with a perfect heart."

The Emet World Academy in Jerusalem is dedicated, through its research in higher Jewish learning, to make clear the role and the responsibility of the Jewish people of this era namely the conception of our history is a holy one. Charles Journet, a Swiss-French writer, a devout Catholic, in his book "Destinees D'Israel," said "The gentile nations were bound to the laws of nature. Israel was chosen in order that through the patriarches, through Moses, and through the prophets, it might rise to a state," and I add with the Torah with its constitution. The Jewish state has yet to bring to the world one of its greatest contributions.

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into prunninghooks; nation shall not life up sword against nation, neither shall they learn the arts of war any more." This prophesy in regard to disarmament, carries with it also an economic solution, namely, that if the swords are turned into plowshares and the spears into prunning hooks there will be enough food for all peoples and there will be no need of worrying about the overpopulation of the world. It will also mean the saving of billions and billions of dollars spent upon the swords and the other implements of war which could be turned into peaceful pursuits and last, but not least, it shall mean that men "shall not learn the arts of war anymore."

I propose, as a task for the future for the World Academy in Jerusalem, the establishment of "an institution for the advancement of world peace." We were never so ripe for this study in all of its ramifications, as we are today. It has become the new tune for the nations—even Mr. Khrushchev is now appearing as a pied-piper for disarmament—I hope and pray, it is not what the Psalmist said "High-sounding phrases are in their mouths, but the two-edged sword is in their hands."

With the help of God, I want to dedicate the coming years, with which I may be blessed, to the furtherance of world peace through the World Academy in Jerusalem. To help us realize this dream, we need a Joseph, a dreamer, whom the Bible also calls "A man of action," who can, as Joseph did, save mankind and make himself immortal, by the promotion of this holy task for the advancement of world peace. Without the prophetic idea of disarmament the world is doomed to destruction. With it, the Bible promises to all mankind peace with "none to make it afraid."

I felt it my function tonight, to express briefly my views concerning the past—my 70 years since my birth in my beloved city of New York, and to refer you to the present, so ably described by Dr. Leo Jung, and to the future task of the World Academy.

I can envisage our invitation to all the nations, to send their representative scholars to our campus in Zion, each one bringing his people's contribution, for the advancement of peace. From such a historic gathering, there is bound to emerge a blueprint, and inspiration, for all mankind to follow. Then will we realize the prophecy of Micah and Isaiah, "And many people shall go and say, 'Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths.' for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of God from Jerusalem."

I close with the same thought as does our Talmud, in its closing Mishnah, "There is no vessel that can contain true and full blessing unless it is the vessel of peace. May the World Academy sail on a vessel of peace until we reach the true blessing of God, namely, universal disarmament and world peace, and let us all prayerfully say, amen."

Our Thoughtful Collegians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a letter to the editor taken from the Daily Northwestern, newspaper published for Northwestern University students and faculty. Student John Kolbe, class of 1961, treats of the loyalty oath requirements of the National Defense Education Act. He favors the oath provisions as they are now carried in the law.

The letter follows:

I would like to add my voice to the controversy concerning the National Defense Education Act, and introduce an argument which, in my opinion, is all too seldom expressed in regards to the situation.

I, too, wish to criticize the stand which the administration of this university has taken in disapproving the affidavit requirement of that act, but for different reasons than those expressed by other letters to the Daily.

It appears that Northwestern has jumped on the "me too" bandwagon, already occupied by a dozen and a half eminent institutions of higher learning.

There seems to be something highly distasteful about declaring one's loyalty to the United States these days. People ask for money from the people of this country, but feel insulted if they are asked to promise to remain loyal to the country who loans it to them.

In the words of one institution who opposed the oath, "It trammels inquiry, affronts academic freedom, and unfairly and unjustifiably singles out as objects of distrust the needy students in our colleges."

Now I ask you. How can signing a loyalty oath possibly be an affront to academic freedom or a trammeling of inquiry? I have searched my conscience deeply, and indeed I cannot find an answer.

The affidavit required of recipients of the loan asks the beneficiary to state that he is not a member of an organization which teaches the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government.

The loyalty oath is virtually the same one taken by every elected official of the U.S. Goverment and members of the Armed Forces.

The student's freedom to inquire is no way restricted. If he concludes from his free inquiry that our Government needs changing in some way, there are certain methods enumerated in the Constitution which seem to have worked all right for the past 173 years.

Let us note the first two words in the name of the act under which this money is loaned: national defense. Herein is the true spirit of the legislation.

This is defense money. It comes in the Federal budget under the Defense Department appropriations. It is paid for by the taxpayers of America. The law states that "the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women."

In other words, the purpose of this act is to provide for the security and well-being of the United States, through the further education of some of its citizens.

Not by the longest stretch of the imagination is it consistent with national security to loan our hard-earned money to those who would undermine that defense and break down the system which it defends.

It is argued that this oath would not stop a Communist or a disloyal individual from taking the loan. True. Nor was that its purpose.

But it does give the Federal Government grounds to prosecute an individual who takes the money under false pretenses. Otherwise, there would be no legal objection whatever to a card-carrying Communist to apply for, and get, this loan.

I see no sense in furthering, with our own money, a cause which is so diametrically opposed to our own.

JOHN KOLBE.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week marked the occasion of the 42d anniversary of the independence of the free Republic of Lithuania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two resolutions which were adopted at meetings held in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to honor this important and memorable event. Despite the 20 years during which Lithuania has been under subjugation by the Soviet Union, the Lithuanian national spirit remains unimpaired.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanians of greater Boston held under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Boston in the auditorium of South Boston High School, South Boston, Mass., on February 14, 1960, and attended by more than 1,100 persons with the Honorable Edward J. McCormack, Jr., attorney general of Massachusetts and representatives of the enslaved nations of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Ukraine.

Whereas the 16th day of February 1960 will mark the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian occupation;

Whereas by the treaty of Moscow of 1920 Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily and forever renounced all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and its territory;

Whereas the guaranteed liberty of Lithuania was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in 1940, notwithstanding the solemn treaties and agreements of nonaggression;

Whereas the United States Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Lithuania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we Lithuanian Americans reaffirm our adherence to American Democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world;

Resolved, That we join with all Lithuanians throughout these United States and call upon our representative in Congress to vigorously utilize all available means for the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet enslaved countries;

Resolved, That our government's foreign policy shall include the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet enslaved nations as an integral and inseparable part of its program;

Resolved, That toward this purpose the United States Government bring forth to the United Nations the problem of enslaved Lithuania and demand that the Soviet Government withdraw all troops and control from Lithuania;

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded this day to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Senator John F. Kennedy, United Nations Secretary, Henry Cabot Lodge, Congressman John W. McCormack, the Honorable Foster Furcolo, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Honorable Edward J. McCormack, Jr., attorney general, Hon. John F. Collins, mayor of Boston and to the press.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL
OF BOSTON,
JOSEPH ARLANSKAS,
President.
ANTHONY J. YOUNG,
Resolutions Chairman.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania, one of the small Baltic States in Eastern Europe, declared her independence to the entire world. To commemorate the 42d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, the committee, duly elected for its proper celebration and representing 67 organizations from the two Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, St. Casimir's, and Our Lady of Vilna, from the Lithuanian Aid Association, and from the Worcester branch of the Lithuanian community of the United States in America, arranged appropriate exercises which took place Sunday, February 14, 1960, at 4 p.m., in St. Casimir's Parish Hall. During these exercises, the members of the committee and the official delegates and the more than 1,500 people in attendance unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

Whereas the Government of the United States stands ever firmly for the God-given and sovereign right that all nations, both large and small, have to be free and to choose for themselves their own political, cultural, and economic systems and ever remains convinced that relations between all nations must be guided by justice and charity and governed by the principle of equality; and

Whereas Soviet Russia, having formally recognized in 1920 the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, 20 years later forcibly deprived Lithuania of her freedom and since then continues to this day to terrorize her people by oppression, dispossession, mass persecutions and exile, and to deny them the right of self-determination by staging mock elections, thus converting Lithuania into another vassal state; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral nation ever advocating freedom for all peoples, made astounding advancement and progress in all fields of human endeavor during the years in which she enjoyed freedom (1253–1795 and more so 1918–1939); and

Whereas Lithuania continues in her desire to have and enjoy freedom and constantly reminds the free world: "There is no peace without freedom; there is no security without self-determination"; and

Whereas the Government of the United States in 1940 denounced the Soviet Government for forcibly incorporating Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union and since then has maintained its present policy of not recognizing de jure the unjust absorption of those countries within the Russian orbit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States continue to remind the free world of the injustice committed upon

Lithuania by Soviet Russia by continuing its policy of not recognizing "de jure" the ruthless seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States together with the other Western Powers take appropriate and concrete measures to force Soviet Russia immediately out of Lithuania and to compel her to return to Lithuania all Lithuanians now exiled to and forcibly detained in Siberia and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That the free world ever remember that all nations, regardless of how small they may be, have a right to freedom and justice and that, should be spoils of Soviet aggression ever be recognized, the Soviet would be encouraged to grab other nations neighboring her present boundaries and the cause of world peace would be grievously harmed; be it further

Resolved, That due admission and full approbation of Lithuania as a member of the United Nations be made for thus she would be in a glorious position to state her just case to the entire world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower; the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Richard Nixon; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter; to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable John F. Kennedy and the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall; to the Representative of the 4th Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue, and to the press.

JOHN PIPIRAS,
Chairman.
JONAS PALUBECKAS,
Secretary.

Carlo Bianchi & Co. Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1960, I called upon the Attorney to protect the interests of the United States in the defending of lawsuits instituted against it. I stated that the case of Carlo Bianchi & Co. against the United States, Court of Claims Docket No. 466–54 had come to my attention. This case is one in which the Attorney General's Office had not properly represented the United States and was foreclosed from introducing proof to reduce damages. I also pointed out that this is a case I know about and I wondered how much more money the Government had squandered by reason of the laxity and lack of preparation in protecting the Government's interest.

On February 3, 1960, Mr. George Cochran Doub, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, wrote to me and claimed that I was not correct in my statements. On February 8, 1960, my colleague, Mr. FRANK T. BOW, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which Mr. Doub forwarded to him in connection with the Carlo Bianchi case.

In view of the misleading statements, I am setting forth Mr. Doub's letter to me dated February 3, 1960, and my reply to him dated February 19, 1960, and am forwarding this matter to the appropriate congressional committee for further investigation and for a determination as to the efficiency of the Civil Branch of the Attorney General's Office:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, February 3, 1960.

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANTANGELO: To straighten the record and in fairness to the trial attorney of this Department who is handling the case of *Carlo Bianchi and Co.* v. *The United States*, Court of Claims Docket No. 466–54, I wish to call your attention to some major errors in your extension of remarks referring to this case, contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, January 27, 1960, commencing on page 1293.

Your assertion that, after the Government was held liable in this case by the Court of Claims, the court will not now permit the Department to introduce any testimony with respect to damages, that the Government has been defaulted on the issue of damages and that as a consequence the United States has been held liable in the amount of $680,066 were not correct.

The court has not ruled that the Government may not submit any testimony on damages, has not defaulted the Government and has not held it liable for $680,066 or any other amount. The fact is that the Government attorney handling this case is presently on the west coast preparatory to offering before the Commissioner at a scheduled hearing commencing February 8 in San Jose, Calif., the testimony of one of the Government's most important witnesses, the resident engineer on the project.

A misunderstanding did arise between the Commissioner and the Government attorney regarding the time and place of presenting the Government's evidence and the court did deny a motion of the Government for leave to submit additional testimony on the basis of the situation then existing. However, in the event the Department of Justice concludes, after the taking of testimony later this month in California, that the Government's interest will require additional proof, it proposes to apply to the court at that time for leave to do so and we have no reason to believe that, in the event of such a reasonable application, the court will not permit the Government to present additional testimony on the issue of damages.

I have confidence in the competence and industry of the trial attorney handling this case who, under difficult circumstances with a heavy caseload, has handled an extremely complex and involved matter in an able manner and we cannot avoid the conclusion that your remarks criticizing this lawyer were unjust.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB,
Assistant Attorney General.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1960.

Hon. GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB,
Assistant Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOUB: On February 3, 1960 you forwarded me a letter in which, among other things, you assert that my statements regarding the case of *Carlo Bianchi and Co.* v. *The United States*, Court of Claims Docket No. 466–54, are not correct and that the Government has not been defaulted on the issue of damages. You further state that you have confidence in the competence and industry of the trial attorney handling this case. Based upon the docket at the Court of Claims, I question whether the best interests of the United States were adequately and competently represented by the Assistant Attorney General's Office charged with such responsibility. Our confidence in the ability of your Office to safeguard the taxpayers' moneys must not be weakened.

Under your responsibility, and in the name of the trial attorney whose name I do not care to mention at this point, a motion was made to reopen proof. Said motion was denied by the judge of the Court of Claims on December 18, 1959, with a notation "denied for the reasons that defendant has failed to show the Commissioner's action in closing proof was erroneous." Said decision was filed on December 19, 1959, and as of the noon of February 18, 1960, the docket of this case at the Court of Claims in the clerk's office does not show any permission to the Government to reopen proof. The only entry in the docket after the denial by the court of the Government's motion to reopen for the purpose of introducing proof is an entry showing that a duplicate set of exhibits, renumbered, were filed by the parties. In my opinion, the statements in your letter did not set forth the truth and approved to be intentionally misleading.

I am setting forth several statements in the moving papers which were submitted under your name and under the name of the trial attorney. They speak for themselves and indicate that the Government was foreclosed from offering additional proof to reduce damages.

On page 1 of the moving papers you make this statement: "Defendant respectfully moves the court for an order reopening proof herein so that it may present evidence essential to its defense of this action. Through inadvertence and misunderstanding on the part of defendant's counsel the proof was closed by the Commissioner, before all such evidence was presented."

On page 8 of the same moving papers, you state: "In the present status of this case the Commissioner has closed proof on both sides with the exception of one witness to be heard on behalf of defendant in San Jose, Calif., on February 8, 1960."

On page 8 of the said statement you state: "It is accordingly respectfully suggested, for the reasons hereinbefore stated, that the case be reopened and that a further hearing for the taking of defendant's testimony be set sometime before February 8, 1960."

On page 8 you state: "Although considerable extra expense would be involved, defendant, in the light of the misunderstandings above mentioned, would undertake to bring its witnesses to California for that purpose."

Your motion to reopen the case for the purpose of submitting additional proof was denied by the court, and, therefore, your statement that I am in error when I stated that the court will not now permit the defendant to introduce any testimony with respect to damages was not correct and was made for the purpose of avoiding the responsibility which is yours.

I am forwarding your letter to me and my letter to you to the appropriate congressional committee because I believe that our Government deserves better representation in the defense of law suits against it, and the appropriate committee will draw its own conclusions.

Very truly yours,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
Member of Congress.

Here's Where the Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my contention that one of the main ways we can save money and thereby bring about real cuts in the Federal budget, is to reduce the prices we pay for our armaments of defense.

At this time, I would like to point out the following excerpts from the latest—1959—annual report of the Comptroller General of the United States:

PROCUREMENT

Our audit work in the procurement area during the fiscal year 1959 included reviews and evaluation of the policies and procedures relating to the use of contractor-furnished drawings, the award and administration of procurement contracts, methods employed in the control of Government-owned equipment, and the computations for material requirements. Some of our findings in this work are described below.

Benefits of competition in procurement prevented by inadequate provisions for use of contractor-furnished drawings acquired at Government expense: Initial procurement contracts often require the contractor to furnish design drawings to the Air Force at Government expense. These drawings are essential if the benefits of competition are to be realized in letting additional contracts for the same items. We made a review of the use of contractor-furnished drawings at the Air Materiel Command prompted by the disclosure in our examination of contract award procedures at selected air materiel areas that a number of contracts were awarded to the first supplier on a sole source basis because contractor-furnished drawings were not available for use of other prospective suppliers.

We found in many cases that the Air Materiel Command (AMC) executed contracts without definite provisions giving the Government the right to use for procurement purposes the drawings furnished by the contractor. Contracts not containing the standard clause set forth in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation, which would give the Government unlimited right to use such drawings, were construed by the AMC as forbidding the use of such drawings by the Government. This construction was contrary to the policy of the Air Force and of the Department of Defense that, when the terms of contracts under which drawings are furnished do not specifically restrict their use, the Government has an implied right to use the mfor procurement purposes.

We also found there was no assurance that the Air Force received all drawings required to be furnished under the contracts and no effective controls existed to assure adequate followup action on missing drawings or proper identification of drawings received. The Air Materiel Command's drawing records and records showing whether the Government had the right to use contractor-furnished drawings were unsatisfactory and incomplete, resulting either in additional work and delay in furnishing drawings to procurement activities or a denial of the right to use the drawings in the absence of records of reproduction and use rights.

We recommend that (1) a definite provision be included in all future contracts regarding the Government's right to use drawings furnished under the contracts, (2) with regard to the records already on hand showing that the Government did not have the right to use contractor-furnished drawings, the applicable contracts be reviewed on an as-required basis to determine the correct system be adopted to assure that AMC receives all drawings to which it is entitled. Our recommendations were accepted by the Air Force and corrective action was begun.

Our report on this matter was submitted to the Congress on May 15, 1959.

Excessive costs in procurement of C–123 aircraft spare parts: In our review of the procurement of C–123 aircraft spare parts, we found that the Air Force may have to spend over $1,200,000 for parts which could have been purchased on the aircraft production contract for about $407,000.

Generally, lower prices are obtainable from the contractor while there is concurrent production of the aircraft and spares and before the dismantling or disassembly of the production line. The unit costs quoted to the Air Force by the contractor for items to be purchased after completion of aircraft production were greatly in excess of what the costs would have been had the items been ordered while production facilities were intact.

The C–123 contract provided that the Air Force could order additional spare parts or increase quantities of existing spare parts on order within 90 days before the scheduled acceptance of the last C–123 aircraft. Orders for additional spare parts or increase quantities of spare parts under this contract would have had to be placed by April 29, 1958. Although a computation showing requirements for the additional spare parts had been completed on April 1, 1958, no effort was made to expedite the review and place the items on the existing contract.

The Air Force told us that various factors influenced its decision to delay starting procurement, such as (1) lack of a firm program, (2) nonavailability of funds, (3) unreliable consumption data for the C–123 aircraft, (4) the basing of requirements on use of an aggregate program while aircraft delivery was on a staggered basis, and (5) other factors relating to individual items. We believe that the Air Force should have considered whether the resulting savings would have offset such factors as unreliable consumption data, vacillating flying program, storage, handling, and record keeping costs. If fund limitations were a factor, an effort should have been made to obtain the required funds to make the procurement at the lower prices.

We have recommended that the Air Force strengthen its controls to assure that timely actions are taken by responsible supply officials in determining requirements and starting procurement for spare parts applicable to end items going out of production to obtain the advantage of lower prices.

Review of shipbuliding contracts: We completed a review of 15 claims amounting to $6.9 million which had been submitted by 10 shipbuilders for damages allegedly arising from Government delays in furnishing plans and material. These shipbuilders were constructing, or had constructed, ships for the Navy under fixed-price contracts. Our examination of the 15 claims showed that the settlements were not necessarily representative of the true cost of the delays for which the Government was responsible. Neither the contractors nor the Navy had adequate information concerning the extent of delays or their cost and, for this reason, the claims were settled on the basis of inconclusive data.

To make such information available, we recommended that the Navy's Bureau of Ships (1) issue instructions for the guidance of contractors in preparing delay claims, (2) evaluate the effects of delays as they occur, and (3) encourage contractors to submit claims within a reasonable period after the end of the delays so that settlement can be negotiated before details of the delays are forgotten. The Bureau concurred with our recommendations and indicated that it will take appropriate action to put them into effect.

Review of ship overhaul contracts: Our review of ship overhaul contracting activities administered by industrial managers in the Bureau of Ships brought out that a lack of effective price evaluation procedures permitted the award of contracts at unnecessarily high prices. Our review further pointed out that laxity of controls over supplemental work increased ship overhaul costs. We found that additional repair work authorized after the award of contracts totaled about $16 million annually and that generally the prices negotiated for additional work were between 115 and 170 percent of competitive prices for such work. We found also that (1) failure to use split-bidding techniques unnecessarily restricted competition for ship overhaul work, (2) inequitable pricing of Government-furnished materials allowed contractors unwarranted benefits, and (3) a lack of coordination between inspection and contracting functions permitted overpayments to contractors."

Rising Natural Gas Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 of this year, I introduced the bill, H.R. 10309, to amend the Natural Gas Act to prohibit a rate increase from becoming effective, subject to bond, before a pending rate increase proceeding has been finally determined.

While the purpose of my bill was primarily aimed to affording relief to cities and towns in Nebraska, where gas consumers have been forced to pay many millions of dollars out of their pockets without benefit of final decision, it equally applies to hundreds of towns and cities in other parts of the country.

To be forced to pay one rate increase upon another, without benefit of final decision by the Federal Power Commission, is likened to "putting the cart before the horse," or being convicted without benefit of trial. Relief can be afforded to the gas consumers only by amending the existing provisions of the act.

It is very encouraging to find the case for the consumers being enhanced by an enlightening and aggressive editorial published in the February 11 issue of the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal, a newspaper dedicated to the public interest in the State of Nebraska.

The editorial contains a precise analysis of the various gas rate increases that have been imposed on the consumers in the State of Nebraska since 1951. It should act as a stimulus to the consumer-public pulse, to keep the natural gas companies from further picking their pockets before the FPC regu-

latory body has a chance to sift the evidence and render a just and proper decision.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, may I request this editorial be published in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the hope that it will be read by the many gas consumers throughout the Nation who have been similarly affected by these successive gas rate increases:

RISING NATURAL GAS PRICES

Amid deep concern for rising prices on every front, it is difficult to understand the apparent public apathy over rapidly rising costs of natural gas.

On December 27, natural gas users of Lincoln and many other Nebraska towns were handed their third price boost in 3 years due to increased prices for gas being charged by Northern Natural Gas Co. This imposed a cumulative increase of 23 percent in natural gas rates since 1957.

Few other commodities have risen in price at such a pace. Thus it would not seem amiss to suggest that something is wrong somewhere in the natural gas operation.

That is precisely why Lincoln city officials and executives of the Central Electric & Gas Co., local distributor of gas in Lincoln and a number of other Nebraska towns, are in Washington this week. They are appearing before the Federal Power Commission to protest these frequent raises Northern has loaded on local gas outlets.

Two factors bear close examination in this matter. First is the operation of the FPC itself. This regulatory agency, which has jurisdiction over gas rates, has yet to make a final ruling on whether any of the three raises by Northern Natural are justified.

By law, a rate increase can go into effect 6 months after it is announced if the FPC has not ruled on it. If the increase is later refused or trimmed, the overcharge is returned to customers with 6 percent interest. But this imposes undue burden on customers in the meantime.

Why the FPC now has more than 3,000 rate cases pending, including the 3 by Northern Natural, is a question that needs answers.

The problem seems to warrant passage of a bill introduced by Nebraska Representative LARRY BROCK, Democrat, Third District, to prohibit a gas rate increase from becoming effective while other price boosts requested by the same company are pending.

The second question in the case seems to be the soundness of Northern Natural's operation and the validity of its repeated applications for price hikes. Northern is a pipeline company which buys gas from independent producers and sells it to local distributors such as Central Electric & Gas.

Since 1951, Northern has had FPC rulings on five other price raise applications, in addition to the three still hanging fire. In the five cases disposed of by the FPC, Northern was allowed only about half the rate increases it claimed it needed.

Unquestionably, operating costs have increased in the past decade. But it seems significant that, during that time, Northern, the gas transporter, has asked eight price hikes, while Central, the local distributor, has not raised its rates except to cover increased gas costs imposed by Northern.

Residents of Lincoln and other towns served by Northern Natural have a great deal at stake in the FPC hearings now in progress in Washington. They can at least root from the sidelines for representatives of Central Electric & Gas, and for Lincoln and other towns who are protesting these frequent applications for rate increases.

Crime Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Crime Prevention," which appeared in the February 10, 1960, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

CRIME PREVENTION

There are so many special days and weeks and months that the calendar is not large enough to contain them all, so they overlap and duplicate and what not.

Most of the special periods are for good causes, though some of them are frankly commercial and designed to benefit a particular industry.

This week, in addition to observance of the 50th anniversary of the Boy Scouts, the Nation is observing National Crime Prevention Week, which is a meritorious project for the reason that crime is not only a nationwide problem, but an increasing menace which is causing no end of study and worry.

Huge sums of money are being spent daily in solving crimes, in protecting the public against them and in punishing lawbreakers who have been arrested and convicted. Behind Crime Prevention Week is the idea that the most effective way to rid the Nation of crimes, or at least substantially reduce their number, is to prevent crime before it happens.

President Eisenhower and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover also believe that crime can be prevented, and we note that they have asked for the wholehearted participation of all law-abiding citizens in observance of the special week on the subject.

Late scientific studies tend to identify the home as the real breeding place of crime, and this does not merely mean homes in which there are a shortage of this world's goods. Some lawbreakers come from more fortunate homes, the records show, and here it is believed that the patterns of family life are the prime factors in the formation of juvenile delinquents and the shaping of future criminals.

Poverty and slums, long believed to be prime factors in the crime picture, are revealed now as only second considerations. That is why the slogan of this year's Crime Prevention Week is "Crime prevention begins at home."

This puts crime prevention in a new light and makes the solution seem less complicated. It puts the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of parents—where it properly belongs—and shows them that they need to start doing what is necessary to guide their children into paths of usefulness and honor, rather than neglect parental responsibility and letting kids drift into crime.

This guidance in the home—long practiced by millions of good parents—can be done by creating an atmosphere of love and understanding, in which parents are not too busy to train the children in the ideals and principles which made America great—and which must be recaptured if our country remains great.

Prevention of crime not only is a worthy goal, it is a must in the United States. And it is a must to which every good citizen should dedicate himself or herself.

J. Edgar Hoover and "Masters of Deceit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to bring to the attention of my colleagues three excellent articles by Mr. George Todt of the San Fernando (Calif.) Valley Times, concerning the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and his book, "Masters of Deceit":

QUALIFIED FOR WHITE HOUSE JOB

"The ripest fruit first falls."

—*Shakespeare,*
("Richard II," Act II, Scene 1).

Few items, it seems to me, have done a better job of pointing up the intellectual paucity and depravity of our times than the fact that a large weekly news magazine recently saw fit to devote its lead story and nine full pages of pictures (photos by the dozen) to the dowdy gambling of a most uninspiring New York heiress of something or other.

This is really a case of fiddling while Rome burns.

But it's only a case in point. Never was our Nation in graver peril than today, but few would guess it from any cursory inspection of the majority of the Nation's media in the communications field nowadays. Seems to be something of a mass drive underway to cause us to take our eyes off the ball. How about that?

I think it's time for a lot of serious reading by all of us. If the international Communist conspiracy is what we have been told, then there is nothing more important for Americans than to know their enemy.

On the other hand, if it's only a bogeyman and there's nothing to it—then maybe somebody had ought to tell us. What's the score, anyway?

Actually, if the mental caliber of so much of our mass communications media wasn't of such low grade, a much better job would have been done by this time to alert us to the real menace of Marxist Communism. At least, it seems that way—doesn't it?

On the other hand, we may well wonder whether the intelligence is really lacking—or has it all been planned that way?

This is a good question because we need go back no further than 20 years ago in our country to recall what a superbly brilliant job the communications media did to alert us to the dangers of one Adolf Hitler and his totalitarian National Socialists (Nazis).

So, we licked Hitler well enough. He's dead and his dreams of conquest lie with him in his grave. Now that this bloody despot has been previously taken care of—what about the totalitarian Communists now?

For some strange reason, many of our most vocal friends in the communications media never made it past the has-been Hitler stage. It's really a pity that they have forgotten their former zeal to devote to the modern Reds, too.

One great American whom I admire is a gentleman who has dished it out with both fists to Nazi and Communists alike—which proves that he isn't a phony akin to some we have been previously discussing here. This is J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He's for real in my book.

Somehow, J. Edgar manages to catch criticism from both the extreme left and extreme right at the same time, which only goes to make him more acceptable than ever to the overwhelming body of citizens who beware the equal dangers of Scylla and Charybdis.

I don't know—since I've never asked—what Mr. Hoover's political affiliation may be, but sometime the day may arrive when either of our two major parties may outmaneuver the other one by actually drafting this great public servant to run for the Nation's highest office. This could come at the time of the public's greatest disappointment and disillusionment with the specter of encroaching world communism. Should this indeed happen, my guess is that Mr. Hoover might win by a landslide vote. Could be, maybe. Who knows?

Certainly, Mr. Hoover is probably the best-informed citizen in the United States regarding the true aims and methods of the Reds, both here and abroad. Their vendettas against him are the real tipoff as to his effectiveness, of course. We might have reason to doubt the good job he is doing if we didn't hear so often from the outraged comrades.

Their squeals of dismay should be the sweetest kind of music to our ears and the more they go after him—the more we should rally to his support. A man is known for the enemies he makes. Love that J. Edgar for his'n.

What America needs more than ever before is men and women with deep-rooted knowledge about the machinations of the Reds, not well-meaning dilettantes. Intelligence is required, not merely some good intentions. Although a well-known road is paved with the latter, it's hardly the road to success any way we figure it.

All other things being equal in the equation, I figure that J. Edgar Hoover is still the United States' best-informed scholar on the subject of communism, and—his detractors to the contrary—he continues to be the choice of most of us to spell out danger from the Reds in the most down-to-earth and practical way.

Who knows more about Marxist communism on our side than this man?

GRIM PROSPECT PUT INTO WRITING

"Fear that man who fears not God."—Abd-El-Kader.

Despite certain criticisms from extreme right-wingers which smack of rabble-rousing and bigotry, at least to this writer—I still consider J. Edgar Hoover's scholarly book called "Masters of Deceit" (Henry Holt & Co., New York) to be one of the most monumental works ever put together on the subject of communism and the wily, treacherous manner in which it operates.

Regardless of what one may have heard about this book in the past, my advice is to read it. There is so much intelligence to be conveyed in this masterful exposure of the comrades that anyone who fails to avail himself of its contents is at least two-down on his one-upmanship, and that's for sure.

Hoover is a profound thinker and scratches deep below the surface from the opening gun. Let me bring my readers a few pertinent passages as samples of what one may expect to find in the book:

"William Z. Foster, long-time head of the Communist movement in our country, has boasted that the Communist revolution, after the actual seizure of power, would 'develop even more swiftly' than the Russian.

"All industry would be nationalized and farms taken away from their owners. A small businessman is just as guilty as a large businessman; both must be liquidated. Rents, profits, and insurance would be abolished. Countless occupations, termed by the Communists as 'useless and parasitic' would be ended. Here is a part of their list: wholesalers, jobbers, real estate men and stockbrokers, advertising specialists, traveling salesmen, lawyers, 'whole rafts of government bureaucrats, police, clericals, and sundry capitalist quacks, fakers, and grafters.' The Communists have special disdain for lawyers. Perhaps it is because there will be no need for lawyers when there are no rights to defend. At any rate, Foster has said, 'The pest of lawyers will be abolished.'

"Action would be drastic, immediate, and without appeal. An armed 'Red Guard' would enforce the orders of party henchmen. Hotels, country clubs, and swimming pools would be used for the benefit of 'workers,' meaning, in most cases, party bosses. The workingmen in the mines, factories, and mills would be told to work certain hours for certain wages. Labor unions, as we know them, would be obliterated. All such organizations would be owned and operated by the Communist government, and no laborer would be permitted to organize a union or to strike against his 'government.'

"The press would be muzzled, free speech forbidden, and complete conformity demanded. If you expressed an opinion contrary to the party line, you should have known better and your 'disappearance' would serve as a lesson for others. Fear becomes an enforcement technique. Movies, radio, and television would be taken over by the government as agencies for government propaganda.

"Churches would probably not be closed immediately, but they would be heavily taxed, their property seized by the state, and religious schools liquidated. Clergymen would be required to accept the party line. 'God does not exist. Why worship Him?' say the Communists. Children would be placed in nurseries and special indoctrination schools. Women, boast the Communists, would be relieved of housework. How? Huge factory and apartment-house kitchens would be set up, so that women would be 'free' to work in factories and mines, along with the men.

"This picture of a Communist America is not overdrawn. Here are the words of William Z. Foster: 'Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, et cetera—will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeoisie rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, rotary clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, et cetera.'

"Under this schedule many Americans are eligible for liquidation not once but several times, depending on their present freely chosen affiliations and social interests."

Pretty grim, isn't it? Can we afford to be complacent? Are we too proud—or too apathetic—to fight?

Why not read Mr. Hoover's instructive "Master of Deceit" and see where some of the bodies are buried?

ECCENTRICITIES OF KARL MARX

"There is no truth in him."—John. VIII. 44.

Just what sort of a human being, if we can afford to call him that, was the superman of dialectical materialism, the fountainhead of wisdom and veritable god of the anti-god Communist religion, and founder of the satannical Marxist cult—none other than Karl Marx himself?

As my readers already know, I have long considered him to have been a third-rate bum in his personal and family life. It is certainly a sign of the lunatic times we live in today to consider that anyone—but anyone—with a brain in his head could consider this false prophet to be the model man of the world of tomorrow.

Recently I was browsing through J. Edgar Hoover's informative book, "Masters Of Deceit," and came upon a thumbnail sketch on pages 16–17 of Marx by one of his contemporaries 100 years ago which bears repeating here. At the time, the Marx family was living in two furnished rooms on Dean Street, Soho, London. Listen to this on-the-spot description translated from an article by Gustav Mayer:

"In private life, Marx is a highly disorderly, cynical person. * * * Washing himself, combing his hair, changing his underwear and shirts are a rarity with him. * * * He is often lazy for days, but if he has a great deal of work, he works day and night with untiring endurance. Very often he stays up the entire night and then lies down on the couch fully dressed at noon and sleeps through until evening, undisturbed by the hustle and bustle of family life. * * *

"The room overlooking the street is the parlor and the bedroom is to the rear. In the entire apartment there is not a single piece of clean and good furniture. Everything is broken, tattered and ragged; everything is covered with finger-thick dust, everywhere there is the greatest disorder.

"In the center of the parlor stands a large table covered by an overhanging oilcloth. It is cluttered with his manuscripts, books, newspapers, the children's toys, scraps of cloth from his wife's sewing as well as some tea cups with chipped rims, dirty spoons, knives, forks, a lamp, an inkwell, drinking glasses, a Dutch claypipe, and ashes. In short, all this conglomeration is piled high and on one table. A junkshop would have to cede honors to this extraordinary ensemble.

"When stepping into Marx's room the coal and tobacco smog makes one grope around the room as in a cave until one's eyes gradually develop a tolerance to these fumes and one is able to make out, as if in a fog, a few objects in the room. Everything is dirty, everything full of dust.

"As for sitting down, that is a really dangerous matter. Here is a chair with only three legs; over there the children are playing at cooking on another chair which happens to be still unbroken. Sure enough, that is the one which is offered to the visitor, but without any effort to clean off the food. You sit down at the risk of ruining a pair of trousers.

"Such is a faithful picture of the family life of the Communist chief, Marx."

Must have been quite a character, what?

And yet, the evil brew distilled from his distorted, wicked and hate-filled mind is the best which the modern purveyors of the mad Marxian cult have to offer our confused, groping world of today, and tomorrow.

How can we be so foolish as to listen to their blandishments for even a tiny moment of our lives?

Worse still, how can we remain apathetic and careless in the face of the inexorable march of world communism at this time?

I can only sadly conclude that the reason lies in sloth and ignorance on our parts. We have been confused by charlatans in the Nation's communications media who have somehow taken our minds off the dangers at hand—often with the cheapest forms of entertainment.

My suggestion is that we all get a copy of J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters Of Deceit" and inform ourselves of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy against man's free agency without further delay in the matter.

In knowledge there is power. Know the truth and it will make you free.

How can we hope to fight effectively against Marxist communism until we know what it really is, and what it is not?

Extension of the GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the Veterans' Affairs Committee today in support of my bill, H.R. 4807, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3807, TO PROVIDE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, EDUCATION AND TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTEE BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE AFTER JANUARY 31, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for giving me this opportunity to appear in support of H.R. 4807. As you know, this bill will provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training benefits, and loan guarantees for those individuals called upon to serve during the cold war. You are also aware, I am sure, of the many efforts made by the Congress and by the Armed Forces to attract adequate manpower into our military services. Many reasons have been advanced concerning the inability of the services to attract and retain, on a voluntary basis, sufficient personnel to supply the manpower requirements of our current military commitments. It is still necessary to induct men into the services. The number of individuals drafted during recent months is not impressive. However, there is no record of the number of individuals who, because of the draft, elect to volunteer for service. This bill makes no distinction between those who, because of the draft, volunteer for service and those who, waiting until the final day, are actually "inducted." Benefits proposed by my bill should be available, without distinction, for all who serve.

There are many arguments in opposition to this legislation. Such arguments, in my opinion, fall within five major categories. First, there are those who oppose this legislation because of the cost. This group, not yet having fully analyzed the statistics published by the Veterans' Administration, look at the estimated $500 million annual cost of these benefits. And yet, data from the Veterans' Administration show conclusively that veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, as a result of educational benefits, have increased their income levels so that they now pay, in additional income taxes, over $1 billion annually into the Treasury of the Nation. At this rate the entire cost of GI benefits will be paid, by those who received them, within the next few years. Thus, the initial cost, over a few short years, will be more than paid into the Treasury.

A second group of individuals oppose this legislation because of the small number who are actually subjected to induction. This group fails to recognize that many individuals, facing induction, voluntarily enlist. Others, offered choice assignments, volunteer for service. For this reason the actual number entering military service because of the draft is unknown. This group fails to consider the entire problem. They refuse to face up to our national obligation—an obligation to every individual—not merely an obligation to groups large enough to exert political pressure.

A third group opposes this legislation on the basis that such benefits will induce trained personnel, personnel who have been in the service for the required 2-year period, to leave the service and accept benefits offered by this legislation. It is true that some individuals failed to reenlist so that they could avail themselves of GI benefits. It is also true that such individuals provided, and still provide, a pool of trained manpower, better trained, in some cases, because of the higher educational level attained as a result of educational benefits. These individuals are available if needed, for the security of our country. They may be lost to the military services; but only temporarily; such loss may cause concern to the services; they may not be available on a full-time basis; but they are available for the security of this Nation and they can, and will, provide trained manpower if or when needed.

A fourth group opposes this legislation because it provides benefits not heretofore provided for the peacetime soldier who faces none of the hazards of war. This group points out that such benefits have in the past been reserved for those who served during periods of war. This group maintains that the peacetime inductee can anticipate the draft and plan accordingly. They say such planning was not possible by the wartime GI. This group points out that an individual can effectively postpone being drafted by attending school, or by enrolling for the 6-month training program. This legislation does not seek to change the law with respect to methods which can be used to delay and, in some cases, actually thwart military service. This legislation is designed to provide benefits for those who for one reason or another do not delay or postpone their obligatory services. To be a draft dodger or patriot is often a dilemma of a college student. Let us not continue to penalize those who choose to be patriots.

It is true that peacetime draftees do not face the hazards of war. It is also true that of the millions of men who were called into the service during World War II and the Korean conflict only a small number were actually involved in combat. And yet the GI bill did not distinguish between those who served in actual combat and those who also served. The cold war has not yet ended. Men are still being inducted into the service—they, too, serve—and deserve the benefits provided in this bill.

Finally, a number of individuals object to this legislation because there is no clear showing of need, that educational benefits should be provided for all individuals who have the capability and desire to continue their education. I agree and will fully support any measure which is designed to increase the educational level of our Nation. Such legislation is a must. But the Congress has not yet enacted legislation broad enough to provide sufficient opportunities for the educational advancement of all our younger citizens. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a step in the right direction. I am sure it will provide opportunities for many of our youths to attain higher education. The legislation here proposed, will not conflict with the objectives of that act. It will supplement the provisions of that law. It will encourage individuals to volunteer for service so that they can pay for their education by serving our country. This legislation will clearly and unmistakably serve as notice to all our youth that their obligation to serve their country is not a one-way proposition—that those who serve in the cold war are not forgotten by a grateful Nation.

There are many other arguments against this legislation and I am sure you gentlemen have already heard most of them. I will not take any more of your time to point out the invalidity of them. I am sure, in your consideration of this bill, you will clearly see that those objections are not founded on a careful analysis of the benefits derived by this Nation from the GI bills of rights. Instead, if I may, I would like to point out that many of the educators of our Nation are in favor of this bill. I would also like to point out some of the benefits derived by the Nation from benefits provided by the GI bill of rights. I feel that the same, or similar benefits will accrue from enactment of H.R. 4807.

The most important benefit to be derived from enactment of this bill seems to me to be our keeping faith with the youth of the Nation. The current draft law and obligatory service hang as a shadow over the youth of our country. Many are called, without their consent, to serve in the cold war. To them service is real. To them 2 years displacement from their friends and jobs places them at a disadvantage in their struggle for a place in our competitive society. They resent this disadvantage. They often feel they have been rejected. On return to civilian life they must once more be recognized. They must compete with those who are not called. Enactment of this bill will assist those individuals to find their place in our society. It will express, in no uncertain terms, the appreciation of this Nation to those who also served. It will assure such individuals an opportunity to compete favorably with those who managed to stay behind.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would like to point out that passage of this bill will increase the educational level of our country and provide, in the long run, further revenue for the Nation. All of you are familiar with the number of veterans who took advantage of the GI bill. All of you are aware that the increased earning capacity of such veteran will in a few years pay in additional income taxes, for the entire program. An increase in the educational level of the Nation, a benefit national in scope, a benefit to enable us to compete with other world powers in scientific fields, is vital to our survival.

The program advocated here, like the GI bill, will increase the educational level of our Nation; it will provide educational opportunities for those who are called to serve in the cold war; it will recognize and provide some means of restitutions for those who, for 2 years, are called away from their jobs and friends; and it will, over the years, provide additional revenues offsetting, in no small way, the expenditures required.

I am certain that after careful consideration this committee will favorably report this much needed legislation.

Admiral Burke's Plea for More Polaris Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For 45 Polaris Submarines," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR 45 POLARIS SUBMARINES

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke's plea for more nuclear-powered submarines to carry the Polaris missiles seems like one that should be heeded. If, as Admiral Burke says, all the significant tests have been completed on this solid-fuel missile it ought to be made operational quickly and in sufficient numbers to serve its purpose.

In combination with nuclear-powered submarines which could fire it from beneath the surface anywhere in the seven seas, the Polaris missile is a mighty weapon, capable of destroying any nation that dared attack the United States. This should mean, it seems to us, that the quicker the United States builds up its fleet of Polaris submarines the better it will be for the country.

Above all, the mistake should not be repeated that was made with the Atlas program of going to great expense to develop a missile only to find that when it became operational that by the time launching sites in adequate numbers could be provided it would be obsolete. That is essentially the consideration holding down production of the Atlas.

As a consequence, although we have a well-tested ICBM, it is not serving its function as a deterrent to aggression, because there are only two exposed sites from which it can be fired. Better coordination of the Polaris program is highly desirable so that when the missile is declared operational it will be ready for immediate use.

Admiral Burke wants 45 Polaris submarines over the next few years, and 6 more right now than the 15 already authorized. The request seems reasonable. Congress and the President should see that it is fulfilled.

Resolution of City of Lawrence, Mass., in Favor of Raising the Federal Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolution of the city of Lawrence, Mass., adopted on February 8, 1960, in favor of raising the Federal minimum wage:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAWRENCE, MASS., IN FAVOR OF RAISING THE FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE

Whereas there is now pending legislation before Congress to increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 per hour; and

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act calls for only $1 an hour; and

Whereas there are nearly 20 million wage earners who are completely without any protection with reference to minimum wage earnings; and

Whereas, in view of the steady rise in the cost of living and increased productivity, the city council hereby adopts this resolution calling upon the Senators of Massachusetts and Representative Thomas J. Lane, Majority Leader Congressman John W. McCormack and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell to lend their support to increase the Federal minimum wage and to support legislation to abolish this obsolete minimum Federal law and to broaden the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the above named.

Attest:

JOSEPH R. SMITH,
City Clerk.

FEBRUARY 8, 1960.

Still a Champion After 30 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD the following column, "Know Your Coast," by Ray Thompson, which appeared recently in the Daily Herald, Biloxi and Gulfport, Miss.

These columns by Mr. Thompson tell of some of the glories, past and present, of the beautiful Mississippi gulf coast or of the fine people who call that area home. They appear in the Daily Herald as a regular feature.

The particular column quoted below is a human interest story about a distance swimming champion, Mrs. Lottie Moore Schoemmell, who now lives in the quiet, but progressive town of Ocean Springs, Miss., across the bay from Biloxi.

The column follows:

STILL A CHAMPION AFTER 30 YEARS

Quietly residing off old U.S. 90 just east of Ocean Springs, and engaged in physiotherapy work along the coast, is a grandmother in her 60's who was, in the late twenties, champion woman distance and endurance swimmer, at one time holding 30 world's records. She is Mrs. Lottie Moore Schoemmell.

The amazing thing is that, according to the files of the International Professional Swimming Association, she still holds at least a dozen of those world's records—still unbroken by anybody else in 30 years.

Just this last summer there was a furor that 26-year-old Diane Struble had finally broken Lottie's famous 1926 record swim around Manhattan Island of 14 hours and 11 minutes. But further investigation revealed that Lottie's record had been based on a distance of 44½ miles, while Diane's record was for only 30 miles.

Lottie is a member of an unusual family. Her father, Ernest Moore, son of a British nobleman, was a deep sea diver who taught her to swim when she was 8 years old. He was one of the heroes of the burning of the *General Slocum* in the East River in 1941, when more than a thousand lives were lost. Moore, in a skiff, the side of which was burned out in his efforts, rescued more than a score of the victims. Her mother was the founder of St. Barnabas Lutheran Church in New York. Her sister, a nurse at Rockaway Beach Hospital, administered the first dose of the miracle drug aureomycin to save a life in 1949. Her brother was the head of the Spanish Department of Syracuse University and the author of several books.

Lottie herself, married at 17, was the mother of two children for whom she took up professional swimming to support in 1925 as the first female lifeguard of New York City, at which job she had 34 rescues to her credit. It was Commodore Harry Siexas, head of the New York Life Saving Service, who became her famous trainer in long distance and endurance swimming.

The twenties, as you will remember, was the era when marathon and channel swims were the vogue, and in 1926 Lottie Moore Schoemmel began to blaze headlines across the Nation with her long-distance swimming exploits. In 2 years time she had won 21 world championships and was the recognized world's best woman swimmer for a distance of 10 miles or more.

She swam around Manhattan Island for a distance of 44½ miles in record time. She lowered by over 2 hours channel conqueror Gertrude Ederle's record from the Battery to Sandy Hook, a distance of 22 miles which she swam in 5 hours and 57 minutes. But her most famous feat was the 153-mile-record-breaking relay swim from Albany to New York in October of 1926, bettering the previous Mille Gade Corson record set in 1921 by 6 hours and 24 minutes. In 11 days Lottie averaged 14½ miles per day in nearly freezing water lashed by a bitter cold wind. In the ordeal the battering of the waves wore out three bathing caps. Veteran Hudson River pilot Captain Grant, who guided Lottie's course, said it was the greatest exhibition of swimming endurance ever made by a woman.

It was in this famous swim on the second day that Lottie, her body chafed and raw by the friction of the bathing suit in cold water, introduced the grease bathing suit, covering her nude body completely with 10 pounds of axle grease.

In December of 1926, in honor of the Sesquicentennial of George Washington crossing the Delaware, Lottie swam the river amid its floating cakes of ice at exactly the same spot, diving overboard from the same island where Washington hid his boats from the Hessians. She completed the 1,200 feet in 10½ minutes. In this exhibition, however, she wore the standard bathing suit, rather than cause comment and criticism among the assembled dignitaries.

In 1927 Lottie stepped out of her swimming role just long enough to set a woman's rowing record of 30 miles in 7 hours and 48 minutes on Lake Champlain. In that same year she entered the rugged $40,000 William Wrigley, Junior Swimming Marathon between Catalina Island and San Pedro, clad in her now-famous grease bathing suit and her father's shark knife fastened to a belt around her waist. Because of a tendon torn in training she was forced to withdraw. But later that year she defeated George Young, winner of the Catalina Island Swim, and 422 other entrants in the 21-mile Canadian National Exhibition Swim at Toronto.

In 1928 she swam the Hudson River for 9½ miles in 2 hours and 15 minutes, handcuffed with the manacles worn by executed criminal Gerald Chapman.

It was also in this same year that Lottie established in the pool of the new Park Central Hotel in New York the world's swimming endurance record of 72 hours—3 days and 3 night without sleep or rest, without leaving the pool or touching its sides. She had just previously established a record of 32 hours in the Deauville Casino Pool at Miami Beach, bringing to America a record held by England for 47 years when, in 1880, Edith Johnson had established a world record of 31 hours in Blackpool, England.

In the early thirties the Queen of the Hudson, accompanied Johnny Weismuller on a nationwide tour under the direction of Steve Hannagan, covering 30,000 miles and chalking up about 20 more swimming records in demonstrating BVD swimming suits. Johnny went on to become "Tarzan" in the movies, but Lottie passed up a motion picture career to stick to swimming.

When the Detroit Times in 1930 sponsored free swimming lessons, for which nearly

10,000 readers enrolled, Lottie Schoemmel taught and supervised. She gave swimming lessons at Luna Park at Coney Island in 1931. It was Lottie who gave swimming instruction to the Chicago Cubs as part of their training. The now famous Dick Pope of Cypress Gardens, Fla., was her pupil at Miami Beach, where she was the first to adopt the bra and trunks as a swimsuit. The Miami River 5-mile swim was born in the fertile brain of Lottie in 1937, when she challenged the lifeguards and all comers to compete with her on the course under its eight bridges from which the spectators watched.

With no more records to conquer Lottie became known from Florida to New York to Texas as a swimming coach. But in 1946, when the 5-mile marathon swim along Galveston's seawall was revived Lottie Schoemmel, then 52 years old, came from retirement and entered. She was the only woman to finish this race, which was conducted in water so rough the small craft warnings were out.

Following the Galveston swim Lottie, having fallen in love with the Mississippi gulf coast on a previous trip through from Florida, came to Ocean Springs where she bought property and where she has been since—pioneering physiotherapy, studying taxidermy and hypnotism, befriending homeless dogs of which she has about 20 in her kennel, and giving swimming lessons at the Ocean Springs, community pier and the Buena Vista pier.

Although 65, Lottie has no intention of resting on her swimming laurels, chops wood every day to keep fit, and wants to make the 1085 Mississippi River relay swim, something that has never been done.

Her former manager, veteran publicist George H. Maines, who originally piloted her to fame and who is now managing Jimmy Durante and Gene Austin, just recently rediscovered her after 30 years. It came about when he read an item in Walter Winchell's column recalling her Washington crossing the Delaware swim and telling where she is now. He and Lottie are already planning a revival of swimming activities in 1960 and he has already booked her for 6 weeks at Lake George, N.Y., where she once established a 20-mile swim record.

Lyndon Johnson's Writing a Record To Run On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of Sunday, February 21, 1960, the Washington Post takes a look at Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON as a candidate for the presidential nomination. The article, first in a series on the various candidates, is compiled and written by reporters of the newspaper's national bureau and is entitled "LYNDON JOHNSON'S Writing a Record To Run On."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the article into the RECORD:

LYNDON JOHNSON'S WRITING A RECORD TO RUN ON

Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, is the one Democrat many of the party professionals think could not win a national election. But JOHNSON and his supporters are just as sure of the contrary: that JOHNSON is the one Democrat who could beat Vice President NIXON in 1960.

Why these violently contradictory opinions, each of which is held with a conviction bordering on the fanatic?

The JOHNSON critics maintain that because he is a southerner and, in their minds, a conservative, he could not win the big industrial States where Negro and labor voters hold the balance of power. Without New York and California, or at least one of them, plus Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, no Democrat can win in 1960, the JOHNSON critics say.

They also argue that JOHNSON has another strike against him, the heart attack he suffered in 1955.

Attacks on JOHNSON by Senate liberals such as Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and by such organizations as Americans for Democratic Action have undermined what support JOHNSON has for his claim to liberalism, the critics say.

THE MAN'S ASSETS

JOHNSON supporters argue, on the other hand, that the country today is not prepared to vote for a flaming liberal like Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. The public is, in fact, centrist or middle of the road in its political frame of mind, they say. It wants a mildly progressive leader, but not a crusading reformer.

The country is concerned primarily about foreign and defense policies and wants a man who has shown ability, as JOHNSON has, to deal with men and issues. Who, these people ask, would be as skillful as JOHNSON, the recognized master legislative leader of his times, in a conference with Soviet Premier Khrushchev?

With no great domestic issues before the country, with business good and labor reasonably contented, the Democratic Party must have a man who is recognized as responsible, astute, and capable, the JOHNSON supporters argue.

They say that because JOHNSON is a moderate, he could win important business support and carry the South, the Southwest, and the border States, part of the Midwest, perhaps a few New England States and one or two of the more middle-of-the-road industrial States such as Pennsylvania or Ohio.

ESSENTIAL TEAMMATE

If this analysis is correct, JOHNSON could win—by a narrow margin—without California or New York.

If JOHNSON should win the nomination, his first aim would be to persuade Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, to be his running mate. A Johnson-Kennedy ticket is what the Johnson people want more than anything else.

In his more realistic moments before he became so deeply involved in his quiet but well-geared campaign, JOHNSON recognized the almost insuperable difficulties ahead of him. He even blurted out once that "I don't think anybody from the South will be nominated in my lifetime. If so, I don't think he will be elected."

That was an imprudent confession for a man running with as much determination as the astute Senate majority leader.

A few weeks ago, when someone dared say in his presence that he, as a Texan, could not win the election, the majority leader angered visibly.

NO KINGMAKER ROLE

For months, JOHNSON said that he was not a candidate and had no interest in even making himself available. But on his February trip to the Southwest, he began talking about his candidacy. He told reporters that he expected to be chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles "and I hope it will be committed to the support of my candidacy."

Anyone who knows JOHNSON knows that he is in the fight to win. He wants the nomination, not just the power to determine the course of the convention.

As the famous majority leader of the Senate, JOHNSON does not need to enter primary campaigns to demonstrate his claim to be of presidential stature. He has long since been a national figure and has as much right as anyone to the title of party leader.

HIS SELLING POINTS

JOHNSON'S strategy is to show himself around the country to the men who will control convention votes. His aim is to drill into their minds these points:

That he will have a big block of votes on the first ballot at Los Angeles, perhaps the biggest or certainly second only to KENNEDY'S. JOHNSON'S votes, unlike KENNEDY'S, will stay with him, too, some of his supporters argue.

That the party should not succumb, as he says, to "bigotry, whether of race, creed or section." The Senator is extremely conscious of the anti-Southern feeling he encounters.

That Texas is less and less a Southern State and more and more a Western State. El Paso, Tex., is west of Denver, Colo.

That the polls show that only he can carry Texas with its 24 electoral votes, sixth biggest block in the Nation, against NIXON. JOHNSON supporters also believe, and they have independent backing for their belief, that he is the only Democrat who can carry Florida against NIXON.

ANNOYED AT LIBERALS

JOHNSON'S major effort will be to guide the Senate so well this year that no one may dispute his claim to the title of Mr. Democrat. He recognizes that he has been hurt already by attacks from the Senate's liberal wing; he is out to repair the damage.

But he is nevertheless extremely annoyed by the criticisms. He thinks they are tearing apart the party record which he has worked to build.

On their part, many liberals have been distrustful of JOHNSON and accuse him, because of his cooperation with the administration, of failing to present the Democratic Party as a distinct and different entity standing in sharp (and, they hope, attractive) contrast to the GOP.

Their complaint about him is like that of the hero of "My Fair Lady" about the French, who "don't care what you do, actually, as long as you pronounce it properly." The liberals contend that JOHNSON'S boasts of enacting long lists of legislation are empty because the half-loaf laws themselves are empty of significant content.

By constructing an impressive record this year, with a strong civil rights bill, JOHNSON believes that he can make incursions into the Northern blocks of convention votes, including New York's 114, without completely alienating the South.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was JOHNSON'S political mentor, and JOHNSON has not forgotten Roosevelt's ability to work with the party leaders (bosses). They often are the key figures in the convention. These men understand JOHNSON much more quickly than they do the more vocal but less powerful persons represented in the ADA, for example, the JOHNSON supporters contend.

As an example, JOHNSON thinks he made a real impression on New York professionals during a trip there in January. New York City's Democratic boss, Carmine de Sapio, and former Gov. Averell Harriman are reported to be leaning heavily toward the JOHNSON camp; a significant number of the Empire State's delegates may be found voting for JOHNSON at some point in the convention next July in Los Angeles.

Until recently, JOHNSON'S legislative aim was to get things done; to reach agreement on bills which would be acceptable to the

administration even if they did not include all the provisions that the Democrats in Congress thought desirable.

JOHNSON did not want to fight Presidential vetoes and he did not want to be an obstructionist. He violently disagrees with the old axiom that the duty of the opposition is to oppose.

Now JOHNSON is more interested in a record—a record on which he and his party can go to the country and win votes. If the records which he writes encounters Presidential vetoes, JOHNSON will not be disturbed this year.

While JOHNSON is at his desk on the Senate floor, he will be campaigning as hard as some of his colleagues who have entered the presidential primaries. And Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN, one of the most skillful politicians of them all, will be quietly organizing support for his fellow Texan.

Pollution Problem No. 1—Georgia Is Rich Field for Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of December 27, 1959:

POLLUTION PROBLEM NO. 1—GEORGIA IS RICH FIELD FOR CONSERVATIONIST

(By Luke Greene)

Many parts of the world, and especially the United States, are in a considerable state of ferment about a possible shortage of water at some time in the future.

This many seem incredible to those who think that water is the one commodity we'll have in plentiful supply for as long as man inhabits the earth.

Yet the experts who study such things tell us otherwise.

INCREASING POPULATION

Not only are populations increasing at unprecedented rates—"exploding" is the term now in fashion—but modern-day living requires such great quantities of water that the tap is in danger of running dry eventually.

There is even talk of taking the salt out of the sea water so as to make it available for populations, but experiments so far show that this is a costly way to get pure water.

It isn't preposterous at all to say that water can be destroyed. When you destroy the usefulness of anything, you have for all practical purposes destroyed the thing itself.

That brings us to the topic of pollution.

When pollution impairs the quality of water to the point that it's unfit for human consumption or use, we have in a sense destroyed that water.

Pollution is something that we have become altogether too careless about in this country.

The dissenter may argue that we have learned how to purify polluted waters, so why go pressing the panic button.

Well, nobody is suggesting that we panic at this point. But we'll have to be less reckless about what we pour into our streams if we're going to make them go on serving our needs, and especially is that true in Georgia where we have so many fine rivers.

The more polluted our waters become, say the experts, the more costly will be their treatment for the uses they must meet.

Polluting our rivers, lakes, and bays and then trying to purify that water to usable condition is throwing the operation into reverse.

What we want and need is prevention rather than cure. It is important that we attack the pollution problem at the point where the wastes are discharged rather than where the water is used.

MANY CITY DWELLERS

A great many city dwellers—Atlanta possibly is an exception—probably would be shocked if they knew how much of their water had already been flushed through someone else's bathroom.

For fear that such a statement may bring agony to Atlanta Waterworks Manager Paul Weir, who takes such fierce pride in this city's pure water, we hasten to concede that today's purification plants provide a liquid that is cleaner and safer than most raw, untreated water.

Even so, this doesn't remove the necessity for a greater public awareness of the dangers of unlimited pollution, and what it can mean to our future water supply.

Lafayette, La., Girl State Winner in Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased and proud that a young lady from my congressional district is the Louisiana State champion in the 1959–60 Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest. She is Miss Carolyn Ory, of Lafayette, who is in Washington this week competing with the other State winners in the finals of the 13th annual contest.

Miss Ory, a student of Mount Carmel High School of Lafayette and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney C. Ory of that city, competed with high school students throughout Louisiana by writing and delivering orally a 5-minute script on the theme, "I Speak for Democracy." A panel of judges determined that this script was the best submitted in the statewide contest and it was selected for entry in the national finals.

Winners from each of the 50 States receive a 4-day, all-expense-paid trip to Washington to see their Government in action.

The Voice of Democracy contest, open to all high school students, is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronic Industries Association in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education and approved by the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, a department of the National Education Association.

The contest is designed to stimulate American youth to think about the meaning of our form of government in their own lives and to communicate their ideas to others.

Activities of the State winners on their visit here began Sunday, the eve of George Washington's Birthday, and will be climaxed by the national awards luncheon Wednesday in the Presidential Ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel, at which time the national winner will receive a $1,500 scholarship to any accredited college. The national champion will be chosen from among four finalists who will be given gold recording of their scripts. A certificate of merit is presented to the winner in each school, community, county, and statewide contest, and other awards may be set up local committees for winners in each community and State.

Miss Ory was accompanied to Washington by her mother.

The essay which won Louisiana honors for Miss Ory follows:

(By Carolyn Ory)

The 15th day of December—in the year 1791—a memorable day indeed, memorable because it influenced the thinking of all mankind from one end of the world to the other. Memorable because it was on that day that the Declaration of Independence was signed.

On that day, so many years ago, the gardeners of America planted the seed of the fruit of democracy which flourishes today. This basic idea of independence and equality has resulted in great products—staples of the American way of life.

From this core, this seed of equality, the roads of liberty are extended as cogs in a wheel to expand into a circumference of heavy duty activities, which are constantly being reinforced and refurbished, never to break down and halt the wheel of progress.

If we analyze each part of our wheel we shall unravel the mystery of its strength. The hub is the idea which was conceived in theory, born in turmoil, nourished by the surge of independence given to the colonies by the Stuarts and the Tudors and finally planted by the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

The roads of liberty are unobstructed and give us the right to do as we please in the activities to which they lead so long as we please to do right. Freedom and independence, the result of industriously exercising liberty, are the jewels we know in our commerce, industry, agriculture, security, professions and recreations.

In contrast to other ways of life our American way is dynamic as it releases the individual personality from bondage and encourages self-expression. In a recent publication entitled "Democracy," Harry Emerson Fosdick writes, "Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities to ordinary people."

It is individualistic and personal for it is left up to the choice of the individual if he is to be associated with the Democratic, Republican, Federalist or any independent political party, if he is to own his home or pay rent to his neighbor, if he is to patronize a Government-owned steel mill or one privately owned; he may choose the school for his children and the church of his choice, and, if his choice is none, then that is his privilege.

It is a free enterprise way of life. Everyone is free to invest or engage in any kind of business and take the chance of profit or loss. Joe Doe may be frivolous in his youth or save his earnings for old age.

It is a capitalistic way of life. Mr. American may be rich or be poor. He may earn private property and if his talents so allow control the use of several thousands of dollars. Begger, orphan, or son of a million-

aire—they may all someday sit in a leather chair in Rockefeller Center.

Our America is logical as it complements the natural tendencies of a human which demand liberty of action. His wisdom tells man that he can only have freedom by exercising liberty justly and his honesty makes him assume the responsibility of his independence by being useful to others.

And what does this democracy mean to me, a 17-year-old high school student? It means that I can grow up normally as my Creator intended, gradually learning responsibility and relinquishing my carefree ways.

It assures me that my physical health and growth will never be stunted by lack of food nor my spiritual life be retarded by lack of Godliness for Americans are a Christian people. I need never fear that my education will be put in second place to physical labor as a machine for the state and also I know that a college education is mine either through the financial help of my parents or my government.

I can see where my father's taxes go and where mine of later years will be spent. The faults and the successes of our government agencies are open to my eyes. I am already a living, working member taking an active part in my great country.

We, both adults and youth, covenant with each other that having before all the world taken up arms against aggressors to our security, we will not lay down our guard until this democracy is secure in the world we live in. For this democracy I pray, in this democracy I live and of this democracy I speak.

MATS Has Delivered in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution which was adopted by the board of directors, Belleville (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce, on February 17, 1960, calling upon Congress to reassess the value of the Military Air Transportation Service and to increase its effectiveness so that it will be ready in any future emergency:

RESOLUTION FAVORING MATS

We have read with great concern the recent articles which are aimed at relegating the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) to an ineffectual arm of the U.S. defense effort.

Furthermore, this effort seems to be coming, not as a savings to the American taxpayer, but as an increasingly heavier load which will fall far short of the defense effort which is required if we, as the United States of America, are to be fully prepared in case of enemy attack.

It is inconceivable that the Congress of these United States could allow the American taxpayer to pay additional costs for services now being rendered by—

1. Turning additional MATS services over to commercial airlines at scheduled tariffs rather than on the heretofore successful bid system.

2. Requiring MATS to fly empty planes in order to keep their teams in combat readiness.

3. Loaning of funds to commercial airlines in order that they may purchase modern cargo jet planes which will enable them to take over MATS services, and further demand a guarantee for the military business to support this increased capability, and, at the same time, allowing MATS cargo fleet to further deteriorate instead of modernizing it as an effective strategic airlift force.

Be it understood that we do not condone the use of the Military Air Transport Service for the unfair competition with the scheduled airlines, but we believe MATS has effectively taken care of this objection through the single-manager system by contracting for $230 million with the commercial airlift during fiscal year 1959, an amount which is steadily increasing each year.

We further realize the partnership which exists between MATS and the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF), but we certainly are not naive enough to believe that this reserve fleet would be able to go into action in a relatively short period of time, and, therefore, will be of little value, particularly in this day of ICBM's carrying atomic warheads which can drop upon us at any moment.

We, therefore, call upon the Congress of these United States to reassess the value of MATS to our overall defense effort in that it has been proven time and time again in past wars that supply lines are of the most vital importance if our country is to be successful if and when another war breaks out, whether it be limited or an all-out effort.

We further call your attention to the fact that MATS has proven itself in the Berlin airlift, the Lebanon and Formosa situations, and, therefore, most certainly deserves your support.

Rather than decrease the effectiveness of MATS, we call upon you to increase said effectiveness by supplying MATS with a modern cargo jet fleet in order that we may depend upon them at all times.

Adopted by the board of directors of the Belleville Chamber of Commerce at their regular meeting, Wednesday evening, February 17, 1960.

ROGERS D. JONES,
President.

Attest:

CLIFFORD M. PEAKE,
Secretary-Manager.

Recognition Due Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, too often, the views of our young people are taken lightly and seldom recognized by those in authority.

I have received a letter from a young lady in my district who has given serious thought to the life of a man who contributed in no small way to the betterment of our way of life. Miss Mary Lou Denman is concerned about the recognition we have given to Thomas A. Edison.

Following is the copy of the letter from Mary Lou which I respectfully call to your attention for your appropriate consideration and action:

LA JOLLA, CALIF., *February 11, 1960.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am a schoolgirl ("A" student) and 12 years old. I have been making a study of the life of Edison. I have found, in every book about him, the fact that he was one of the greatest men who ever lived. Today is his birthday. Did we get a holiday? No. I think that this should not be. A study of Edison's life would prove that he was just as great, if not greater, than Lincoln whose birthday we get a holiday for tomorrow.

I am not just plugging for another holiday. Edison was a colossal, I repeat colossal, man. Please bring this up in front of those in authority. (Congress, President, department of education, etc.) If you do represent me I will do my best to persuade those old enough to vote to keep you in office. Thank you ever so much for your time.

I remain,

MARY LOU DENMAN.

(I am a seventh grader at La Jolla Junior-Senior High School.)

P.S.—I also think we should have postage stamps memorating.

Are Depressed Areas Merely a Topic for Discussion and Not a Problem To Be Solved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the February 12, 1960, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror reveals that aid to depressed areas has gone to metropolitan areas and the so-called stricken areas in rural America have been neglected.

Here we are in the middle of February and the area redevelopment bill is still bottled up in the House Rules Committee. As stated in the following editorial, it appears that Government wants distressed areas just as a topic to discuss, without its ever being solved. The editorial follows:

LITTLE AID GIVEN

Much has been said, but little has been accomplished over many years in districts that have been given the tag of "depressed areas" by the Federal Government and one wonders if the Congress and its associate commissions and committees aren't just using the depression fiction talk to spend more money for other projects, notably national defense.

In the last session of Congress some distressed area bills were proposed, but nothing came from the proposals.

President Eisenhower has pointed out that last year 42.5 percent of the total procurement awards for the Department of Defense went to labor surplus areas. Big cities got most of this money and the so-called stricken areas have been neglected.

In 1959, the Government reported 32 major labor surplus areas and 112 smaller areas. The smaller areas got very little relief, for metropolitan areas, all easy to get into, benefited.

It has been frequently pointed out, with no avail, that industry will not locate in areas which are difficult to reach or get out of. One of the Federal bills did mention paving access roads to plants, but that's only one minor step. Access roads have to lead somewhere.

The most important thing to many depressed rural areas is transportation facilities. For light industry, especially, good roads are essential. Yet the highway pro-

grams, both National and State, always get bogged down in politics and in gas-tax revenues. None of it reaches the small communities. The voters are in the big city areas.

It is regretted, but Congress hasn't accomplished anything worthwhile in helping rural distressed areas, or even helping them to help themselves. Everybody talks about it and nothing happens. It appears that Government wants distressed areas just as a topic to discuss, without its ever being solved.

Admiral Nimitz: Sense on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz at age 75 spoke out some good sense on U.S. defense. It was reported by Washington Star Staff Writer L. Edgar Prina in last Sunday's newspaper. There is a way that considerably more light and considerably less obfuscation regarding the state of the Nation's defense could prevail. That would be for most of those now orating on the subject from shaky presidential platforms to follow the Nimitz example and withhold comment until their 75th birthdays. Mr. Prina's article reads as follows:

NIMITZ ON STATE OF DEFENSE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Chester W. Nimitz, the last of the Navy's fleet admirals, has taken issue with opponents of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and critics of current defense policies.

The five-star commander of the mightiest fleet in history will be 75 on Wednesday. But he has lost little of his vigor and, in answering a series of questions from a reporter at his home in Berkeley, Calif., the snowy-haired admiral did not duck controversy.

Present defense organization is working well and should be maintained, he said, adding: "It is essentially the one with which we won World War II."

He had one suggestion, however: The authority and responsibility of each service Secretary should be "upgraded and preserved."

While Admiral Nimitz agreed that the Joint Chiefs had not, up to now, proved effective, he did not blame them. In an interview with the Associated Press, he gave this as the reason:

"Various Secretaries of Defense have not functioned in the manner contemplated by the National Security Act."

This was a polite way of saying that he thought there has been a lack of decision-making by the Secretaries. He explained:

"The principal criticism of the JCS has been that service jealousies prevent the Joint Chiefs from making a decision. The Security Act set up a Secretary of Defense who would be the source of decisions when the Joint Chiefs could not agree.

"Their (the JCS) not being able to agree is not an unhealthy state of affairs, because it employs the various points of view from responsible people. The National Security Act foresaw these situations and set up the Secretary of Defense to make decisions."

CONFIDENCE IN GATES

The admiral said that he expected things to become better under Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

"Mr. Gates has proposed a new scheme for carrying out his responsibilities which I thing is very sound and workable. When important matters come up, the Secretary will meet with the Joint Chiefs and decide small points as they arise. This way JCS members will not reach a position from which they cannot retreat."

Asked about the recommendation by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who retired last June after 4 years as Army Chief of Staff, that the JCS be jettisoned in favor of a single military chief, Admiral Nimitz declared:

"I don't agree with Taylor on scrapping the JCS, because the resulting organization would be so large it would be impossible to find a man properly qualified to handle it."

The man whose Pacific command in World War II covered 65 million square miles, had another reason for disagreeing with General Taylor.

PRESENT POLICIES OK

"You would have the problem of the man on horseback," he said, "an all-powerful fellow with a budget of more than $40 billion a year. I don't say it would happen here, but it could. A man on horseback can always become a dictator."

The admiral apparently believes that his old five-star colleague, General Eisenhower, is doing all right as far as our military posture is concerned. He told the Star:

"Defense is a matter of confronting the possible aggressor with the power to defeat him, no matter how he chooses to strike. It seems to me that our present national defense policies are designed to achieve this end.

"A military leader always feels he can use much more than he has in men and equipment in order to provide a margin of safety. However, just how much he gets is a matter for the heads of Government who must take into account the economic, diplomatic, and political conditions of the Nation and the world."

As many other military and nonmilitary leaders do, the admiral sees limited war more likely than all-out nuclear war. But, in either case, he is convinced the Navy will have the vital task of projecting our power overseas.

He did not downgrade the other services. On the contrary, he pointed to their importance when he said:

"It is clear that the Navy and the Air Force would play the leading roles in the initial stages of any future war.

"However, the reduction and occupation of certain strategic areas would require the utmost from our Army and Marine Corps. A foot soldier is just as important today as he was in World War II."

Admiral Nimitz cautioned that no potentiality of any of the services should be neglected.

"Each service must be assigned broad functions compatible with its capabilities and limitations and each should develop the weapons systems it needs to fulfill these functions," he said.

This, he believes, could not be done under any merger of the Armed Forces, an idea that still is being pushed despite repeated repudiations by Congress.

On speaking of the idea of a single service, the admiral once told a news conference:

"I see no tendency to merge all newspapers of this country under one newspaper. It has been done in some countries, and then you could have a common editorial policy and a common supply arrangement, and you could run your paper cheaper. Now just think that over."

Although he doesn't list it as such, sea power and its importance remains a Nimitz hobby.

He likes to recall that a naval force—of French ships—forced the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. And he points out, too, that the Union Navy, in operating against a foe without a fleet, helped shorten the Civil War by blockading Confederate ports, bombarding forts, and controlling the Mississippi.

DIPLOMA AFTER 44 YEARS

The Nimitz career began when he left high school, before graduation, to enter the Naval Academy in 1901. Forty-four years and two world wars later he returned to his home town of Fredericksburg, Tex., and finally got his diploma—in his fleet admiral's uniform.

It is said that he first had his eye on West Point, even though his grandfather had been a sea captain. And after his first saltwater experience young Chet Nimitz must have wondered about entering the naval service. While in an Annapolis prep school he once sailed across the bay to Kent Island.

"I got frightfully seasick," he wrote later, "and must confess to some chilling of enthusiasm for the sea."

As an ensign Admiral Nimitz had an experience that probably made the odds prohibitive against his ever becoming Chief of Naval Operations.

"In 1907 I was in command of a destroyer, the U.S.S. *Decatur*. On a dark night I ran it onto a mud bank in Manila Bay. It was dark. I didn't know we were in mud. Anyway, there was a court-martial and the committee decided on a reprimand."

IMPORTANCE OF MORALE

This experience may very well have helped shape his attitude toward subordinates. Although firm, he has always been warmhearted. As commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, a job he got 2 weeks after Pearl Harbor when President Roosevelt vaulted him over 28 senior admirals, he said in an order:

"You can't make a soundman listen or a lookout look or a radarman radiate information by getting tough or putting him on report. You've got to instill morale—an eager desire to do the job not well but perfectly."

As he nears 75 the admiral continues his devotion to fresh air and the vigorous life. He likes to hike over the hills around Berkeley and watch the ships come in and out of San Francisco Bay, from where he first sailed in 1905.

He attends concerts given by the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra, for which Mrs. Nimitz helps raise funds. (She did the same for the National Symphony when they lived here.)

"All members of my family are musical but me, and I am a good listener," the admiral said. "I have to sit up front in the third row because my hearing is not so good any more."

For Better Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include, in connection with the post office appropriation bill which is being considered in the House today, the following

editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News Buffalo, N.Y., on February 22, 1960:

FOR BETTER SERVICE

Representative PILLION, of Hamburg, who has worked for years to obtain a new post office for Buffalo, still is reasonably optimistic that the project will get under way this year as scheduled. This is despite a heavy cut voted by the House Appropriations Committee in requested funds for modern postal equipment in Buffalo and other cities.

Concern has arisen because the Post Office Department has dropped the Buffalo improvement to 18th place in a priority list of 20 projects. Representative DULSKI, of Buffalo, has charged that this was an attempt by the department to pressure the House committee and particularly Representative PILLION, a critic of some aspects of the modernization program, against reducing its fund requests.

However that may be, Buffalo has ample reason to be impatient after 4 years of frustrating delay and false starts on its proposed new post office. The need for this improvement is clear and urgent. Present mail handling facilities in the old post office building, which was opened 59 years ago in the Pan American year, are woefully cramped and antiquated.

In working for this necessary $15 million improvement the Buffalo Congressmen should have sustained community backing. Its realization holds the key to more efficient mail service throughout the rapidly expanding Buffalo area. Any attempt to browbeat Congressman PILLION should be resisted by fellow members of the Appropriations Committee as a matter of self-defense and for reasons of public policy.

Free Trade and Foreign Aid Are Ruining America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to speak in behalf of H.R. 10181, introduced by the Honorable NOAH MASON, of Illinois. I can well understand and appreciate how the Congressman feels when he receives mail from a constituent telling him how he has been injured by the importation of items produced with cheap labor in certain foreign countries. I know that Congressman MASON introduced H.R. 10181 in an effort to do something for his constituents.

I might say that we who support his bill will also be helping our constituents. Scores of residents of my State have been and still are being hurt by the bureaucratic attitudes of the State Department as well as other Government agencies. There are companies in my State which have substantial investments in properties and facilities that were capable of producing lead, zinc, magnesite, tungsten, copper, mercury, and silicon, but they have been forced to cut back or shut down their operations entirely because of the importation of these same minerals from foreign countries using cheap labor and submitting to substandard operating conditions. Labor in this country is protected by law, and sweatshop conditions have long since been eradicated.

Dozens of cattlemen in Nevada are now in competition with foreign beef producers. Again we are in competition with cheap labor. I have been advised that last year 58,300,000 pounds of boneless beef were imported into the United States.

I could go on and on, but in short every facet of our economy is affected by the importation of foreign production. I think it is about time we gave consideration to the American producer and our taxpaying citizens instead of sitting complacently by as we watch our country ruled and ruined by "one worlders" who sit in Geneva as a GATT gang, pointing a "gat" at the basic economy of this country.

I suggest that every Member join me in supporting H.R. 10181.

Michael Aldrich Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Michael Aldrich, a senior student at Rapid City, S. Dak., High School, has authored a most challenging oration setting forth his views on American democracy. He is the South Dakota winner of the "Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored annually by the Nation's broadcasters and affiliated industries.

In spite of current problems of delinquency, I believe that America's youth are the finest this Nation has produced at anytime in its history. A reading of Michael Aldrich's essay has given me additional reassurance of my faith in American youth.

I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the contest selection entered by this fine South Dakota student:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Michael Aldrich)

Last summer I made a trip to the east coast.

While traveling I saw Independence Hall, Congress, and the United Nations—places where men have gathered to build democracy.

I saw Valley Forge, Gettysburg, and Arlington—where the graves of American men reveal the struggle for democracy.

I saw the Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson Memorials, symbolic of the leaders who have guided our Nation in democracy.

But besides buildings and monuments, I saw the people of democracy: A Mexican boy and a Chinese girl, standing in the lobby of the Chicago YMCA, discussing of all things, race relations; a tall, Irish guide at the Smithsonian Institute helping a young Negro boy find his way to the exhibitions; and a group of 120 young people in New York City, studying for a week at the United Nations, learning about the world in which democracy must thrive.

In reality, democracy is people working for individual freedom in a representative government. On behalf of these people, I speak for the principles of democracy and their advancement throughout the world.

And what are these principles? The principles are freedom—and they are best illustrated by individuals: Freedom of decision, as the voter marks his ballot and as the Senator battles for his legislation; freedom of protection, as the policeman directs traffic and the judge gives interpretation of law; freedom of expression, as the radio commentator analyzes all the news, and the clergyman tells his religion to anyone who will listen.

These are the principles, the concepts of democracy. The problem is how to make those principles known throughout the world.

To solve that problem, we must first understand the global situation. This situation was aptly described by a member of the American mission to the United Nations, who said:

"Take any group of people. Divide that group down the middle into two equal camps. To one side distribute rifles, and to the other give hand grenades. Feel the tension build up, increase? And to make matters worse, very slowly start to dim the lights—don't turn them out all the way, but leave just enough so that one side can barely see what the other is doing. In that tense situation, a shot or a shout can cause chaos."

And that is the situation that democracy faces in the world today. The question is, How shall our country compete in that tense, explosive atmosphere? Here's how:

Place between the two groups a small but effective organization: A peaceful body, called the United Nations. It is through that international assembly that we logically should spread democracy to the peoples of the world.

Of all the methods to peace, the U.N. is certainly the least expensive. Did you know that the total cost of the United Nations, in all the years it has functioned, has equaled the cost of about 2 hours of World War II?

Let us use the principles of democracy in the United Nations—and thereby show each nation the standards of American life. By doing so we accomplish our purpose with peaceful means. We can fulfill our goals at little expense with great return.

Yes, throughout America, one sees the working principles and historic monuments of democracy. I can look out my own back door and see Mount Rushmore, symbolizing more of our country's leaders. And I can look out the front door onto an American street, and everywhere see the principles of democracy in action.

I speak for these democratic principles, and for their perpetration throughout all countries. I stand with democracy, as it boldly faces the world.

Some Still Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial about the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* on February 16, 1898, which appeared in the

National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes on February 18, 1960:

SOME STILL REMEMBER

It is a long time ago since the people of our country awakened on the morning of February 16, 1898, to learn of the destruction of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor on the previous night. But there are some now alive who still remember.

We remember it vividly, perhaps because it was the most important thing that had ever happened in our young life—counting even death in the family which we could not understand at that early age.

Throughout the Nation in the days that followed the sinking of our proud battleship in Havana Harbor on the night of February 15, 1898, there arose the cry "Remember the *Maine*." The old men, survivors of the Civil War, shouted it. Perhaps their voices were not as loud as they might have been nearly 40 years earlier, but the spirit of patriotism was still strong within them.

The young men cried it out. Young men filled with the vigor of youth and the will to avenge the willful destruction of a vessel of the U.S. Navy which, only a few weeks earlier, had been sent to Cuba on a mission of peace.

The children joined in the cry and sang it out at the top of their shrill voices as they saw the young men march off to war when President McKinley called for volunteers in the war with Spain. There was no hesitation when the President's call was issued. Nearly 200,000 responded immediately—volunteers all—for in those days the spirit of patriotism ran high and the youth of our country felt no other urge than to fight for that country—to die even, if need be.

Yes, there are still some who remember that eventful day. There are survivors of those who fought in the years of 1898–1902—widows and children who still remember the stories they had been told of the tropical hardships in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines—the embalmed beef in southern camps and the lack of medical care and supplies in every campaign.

There are still others who remember. They are the men who volunteered for service against Spain and again in the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection. Yes, these still remember although there are few of them left at this time, some 40,000, at the most.

But though their steps may falter and their eyes are dim with the advancing years, their memories are still bright as they recall the days of their youth.

We are fortunate here to come in contact with such men almost daily and it is a pleasure to see them and hear them. The spirit of the volunteer which made them fight for their country in the long ago is still strong.

Some of them are erect and some of them bent but they still remember the sinking of the *Maine* and the service they rendered for 4 long years.

True, like all ex-service men, while they remember the hardships, their greatest memory is of the pleasant days and it is of those days they talk about now. They apparently get more fun now about recalling the crazy antics of this soldier or that recruit or some ridiculous incident of service and the bad times are forgotten when they get together.

But there is one time in the year when these veterans do recall with proper solemnity the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* and that time comes on or about the anniversary of the battleship's destruction. At such a time those who are still alive, members of the United Spanish War Veterans and the older members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—a veteran group formed from service from 1898–1902–meet together and reverently pay tribute to those 266 officers and men whose lives were lost when the *Maine* went down in 1898.

Yes, these men still remember. And why not? It might be well said that their young lives actually began with the sinking of the *Maine* and that all which followed after developed from the service they rendered their country.

While it may be true that if you were to ask the young high school or even the college student why February 15 should be a day set apart they will not be able to give you the answer. Our world has unfortunately grown altogether too far away from some of the finer things of life, such as love of country, such as the patriotism which inspired these volunteers of 1898 and the immediate cause of the War with Spain has never been told to them.

Therefore it is well that at this time those who still remember and are still alive to prove that rememberance and show by their devotion to the cause of freedom they espoused more than 62 years ago, should gather together and, in their quite way, demonstrate to our younger generation that love of country is still paramount in the heart of all true Americans.

Founders of a Great Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Founders of a Great Country," which appeared in the February 19, 1960, issue of the Breckinridge County Herald-News of Hardinsburg, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FOUNDERS OF A GREAT COUNTRY

The man who was most influential in the successful founding of the United States was, of course, George Washington, whose birthday anniversary is observed this month. The Nation's first President, and the General who won a war against Great Britain to make the colonies independent of that nation, is rightly remembered each February 22 and honored as the Father of His Country.

However, the proper observance of Washington's birthday anniversary did not come about overnight after his death. The Colonies and the States were slow to recognize the magnitude of the accomplishment and contribution of General Washington. Not only had he won independence for the Colonies, he had served as the first President, and he had set the precedent for a two-term limit for Chief Executive. Moreover, he had established the foundation principles of American governments—one of them being staying out of the affairs of other nations. That policy was the wisest course for the young Nation at that time, and this doctrine allowed the country to grow and prosper during its early years.

After he died, on December 14, 1799, the Congress—then meeting in Philadelphia—proposed that February 22, 1800 be observed throughout the country with exercises in honor of the first President of the country.

Thereafter observances of Washington's birthday spread rapidly, and today, observance of the anniversary of the birth of our first President and military hero, is general throughout the Nation.

Washington's high standards of conduct, morality, ethics, and statesmanship were, and are today, an example for Americans in public office. Because Washington had all these qualities, we are enjoying the fruits of liberty and strength.

Distribution of Surplus Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the West Virginia Legislature has suggested the enactment of legislation which, in my opinion, will be an effective means of meeting Secretary of Agriculture Benson's challenging disposition of resistance to acts of Congress. In this regard, I wish to direct to the attention of our colleagues the resolution adopted by the West Virginia Legislature on January 28, 1960, requesting the Congress to enact legislation which would transfer the distribution of surplus foods to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Benson has been telling the American public for the past 7 years that Congress has never given him the kind of a farm program he could properly administer. So, last year the Congress gave the Secretary the opportunity to employ his own dexterity in the matter of the distribution of surplus food to the needy in our own country. Instead of directing the Secretary to take action, the Congress gave to the Secretary the authority to institute a food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus food to the needy. What we did was to walk right into Mr. Benson's stockade. The Secretary, apparently, is of the opinion that the grant of authority justifies him in not acting at all. Mr. Speaker, this is just one more instance of the Congress surrendering its legislative prerogative to the executive branch. I commend the West Virginia Legislature for its resolution. The legislature realizes it would be futile to ask Secretary Benson to take action.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE, HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation making the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for the distribution of surplus food to the needy.

Whereas the purchase of surplus food by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is done primarily as a farm commodity price support program; and

Whereas the distribution of surplus food to the needy does not seem a logical duty of the U.S. Department of Agriculture whose primary purpose is the control and encouragement of the producing and marketing of agricultural products; and

Whereas since the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is directly

concerned with the health and welfare of all our citizens it would seem to be more a duty of that department to distribute surplus food to the needy and to see that an adequate diet is provided these unfortunate people; and

Whereas a part of the cost of distributing these foodstuffs is included in the Department of Agriculture budget when in reality it is a cost that has nothing to do with agriculture but of welfare: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation whereby after surplus foods are purchased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and they become available for distribution to those in need that they be transferred to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for such distribution, and that the costs of distribution from that time on be assumed by said Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That if any program is instituted for the purchase of other food to supplement inadequate diets, that the same be placed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates transmit a copy of this resolution to the Members of the Congress from the State of West Virginia, to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I Am Your Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at the 34th annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Tri-City Patriotic Association in Davenport, Iowa, where I was privileged to be the main speaker on "Lincoln and the Civil War," I was thrilled by the introduction I received by Mr. Clifford Dawson, the master of ceremonies.

In his introduction, Mr. Dawson included a statement on "I Am Your Bill of Rights." This first person singular statement carries a ringing reminder for all of us and I ask consent to have it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

I AM YOUR BILL OF RIGHTS

I am 168 years old, having been born on December 15, 1791. I am the first of 10 amendments to the Constitution. Until I was written into the Constitution that document was like a body without a soul.

I am your Bill of Rights.

Don't take me for granted. Like all mortal creations, I can be killed.

The giant shadow of totalitarian state slavery moves over the world. Wherever that shadow falls, I am obliterated. That shadow has fallen over the United States.

Three men—Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Mason—fathered me. As men brought me to life, I can be slain by men—and will be slain unless you and all patriotic American citizens organize to defend me.

I am freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of press; freedom of assembly. I am the privacy and sanctity of your home. I am your guarantee of trial by jury, as I am the policeman who guards your property rights.

Cruel and unusual punishment and excessive fines and bail cannot be visited upon you so long as I am alive: I order that all rights not specifically mentioned in the Constitution shall be retained by you the people. I am rights of the States against engulfing centralized power.

I am the Bill of Rights—your signed lease to spiritual, mental, and physical freedom. I ask you to meditate on all 10 clauses. Memorize them. Engrave them on your hearts.

My existence depends on your vigilance—on how vigilantly you watch your rulers. My eternal enemies, known as dictators, are abroad in the world, and here in the United States.

Personal unlimited power has destroyed the liberties of many peoples in ancient and modern times. It can happen to you, and, maybe subtly and unknowingly to you, it is happening.

Put every law that is proposed in Washington and elsewhere into the crucible of my 10 commandments. Your question must always be: Not what does a law give me, but what does it take away from me?

I am the Bill of Rights.

When I am violated, a part of you dies.

I am 168 years old. Will I reach my 200th year? That depends upon you and your children.

Khrushchev Fears Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, February 9, 1960:

KEY TO SURVIVAL: KHRUSHCHEV FEARS OUR NAVY

In a speech before the San Diego Council of the Navy League Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, First Fleet commander, pointed out that the Soviet Union regards the U.S. Navy as a prime obstacle to Communist world domination. He attributed the current Soviet campaign to downgrade naval forces as a move calculated to weaken Allied seapower.

While Soviet propaganda minimizes the need for naval and conventional forces, Admiral Libby reminded, the Reds continue to strengthen their own navy. They somehow hope to keep us so bemused with the grim prospects of general war as to cause our limited war preparations to receive inefficient treatment.

Like Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Libby regards complete reoccupation with missile and nuclear power as a fatal trap. But that is what the Soviets want us to do. They want us to concentrate on massive retaliation to the exclusion of limited warfare capabilities.

Admiral Libby gave an idea of what it would be like to be a second-class naval power. There would be isolation from our allies and from our continental European bases. Once we were cut off, the Reds could nibble the world to death with impunity.

This has not happened because the doctrine of the Navy as the first line of defense has been documented as historical truth. The Nation on occasion after occasion has seen that a powerful Navy and Marine Corps with deep and broad amphibious capability has permitted quick application of military force wherever needed. A strong Navy has enabled this country to exploit the flexibility, the mobility, and the operational economy in using the sea as a base. It is uniquely designed for limited war situations. And with it the United States has reaped the rewards of a system which relies upon trained landing forces—the U.S. Marine Corps—and fast-moving surface and undersea naval craft.

It may be seen that the Russians want us to forsake the maritime formula for the so-called fixed base or continental formula. If they can remove the bridge—the Navy—between our fixed bases, they can move as they will it.

Lebanon, Quemoy, Greece, and other troubled areas have demonstrated the overriding advantages of the maritime formula. With a balance of forces concept operating with a mobile Navy the United States has been able to put its power where it is needed, when it is needed. And it has been able to move that power around at will and without restrictions.

A downgraded Navy would weaken us so that the Reds would win limited wars. So the Reds are calling us down that path. We will not go.

The key to survival in the nuclear age is mobility. As long as we recognize that truth and keep it before us, we will have a strong Navy. For the Navy is synonymous with mobility—and security.

Don't Take Water for Granted—It's Valuable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permisison granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of December 28, 1959:

POLLUTION PROBLEM NO. 2: DON'T TAKE WATER FOR GRANTED—IT'S VALUABLE

(By Luke Greene)

The industrial revolution that has swept through Georgia in recent years has brought great changes in the economic, social, and political life of the State—a development that doesn't come without certain strings attached in the form of greater responsibilities on us all.

No longer is the State geared to a strictly agrarian economy.

LUCRATIVE JOBS

Greater numbers of people are moving from the country to the city, seeking the lucrative jobs that so many manufacturing plants and industrial newcomers are dangling before them.

Even those who prefer the greater living freedoms of rural areas frequently find it necessary to supplement their income with a job in the city. This leads to daily commuting between home and job.

How did all this change come about? Why are so many industries finding it feasible to locate in our midst?

There are many reasons of course—not the least of which is a plentiful supply of water.

Most industries nowadays are thirsty. They gulp water by the millions of gallons. And all the additional people that are concentrated in any one area because of an

industry consume water in increasing quantities.

Our water needs are a far cry from the day when thirst could be quenched with a trip to the nearest well.

Water in many forms—flowing in streams, dammed up in lakes, confined in reservoirs, or circulating through mains—has become an important adjunct to business.

Before they locate in a specific spot, a great many businesses inquire into the laws and policies governing pollution in that locality.

And it's well that they do. For adequate pollution control is one of the best assurances that their water supply will not be curtailed in the future.

Another aspect of Georgia's future as an industrial State is the increased interest some of our leaders are showing in the erection of dams on major rivers.

Some water experts argue that a dam isn't the industrial attraction it's sometimes made to appear. They contend that building so many dams and interrupting the free flow of streams is not helping the pollution problem either, because dams destroy some of the natural means of purification.

Yet others look upon dams as offering even greater opportunities for pollution control because water can be released during low-water seasons and carry away pollution-causing wastes.

This was recently advanced as one of the reasons for seeking development of the great Altamaha River Basin in south Georgia.

ELECTRICAL ENERGY

Dams also make possible an increased supply of electrical energy—which is certainly needed by industry—and open the way for more river navigation. Their recreational and flood control advantages are well known.

So it looks as if the positive outweighs the negative when it comes to building dams.

The point being made here is that water, which we so often take for granted, has become a valuable commodity from many standpoints, and it behooves us to have such policies and laws as will contribute to its conservation.

Battle of Antietam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, Civil War historians tell us that the battle which took place at Sharpsburg, Md., on September 17, 1862, frequently referred to as Antietam, was the climax of the first of two attempts on the part of the Confederacy to prosecute the war into northern territory. General Lee with some 41,000 Confederate troops was opposed by a force of some 87,000 Union troops under the command of Gen. George McClellan. It is said that if the South had won a decisive victory it might have foreshadowed the final independence of the Confederacy. It is believed that the last chance of foreign intervention vanished when Lee turned back into Virginia.

It is reported that there were more men killed and wounded in the Battle of Antietam than on any other single day of battle in the Civil War; 12,410 men were killed and wounded on the Union side and the Confederate losses in killed and wounded were 10,700.

The Antietam National Battlefield site was established by an act of Congress in 1890. The National Cemetery at Antietam is the burial place of Union dead largely from the battles of Antietam and South Mountain.

In the face of growing commercial and residential developments over the past few years tending to threaten the integrity of the site, the House early this year passed H.R. 1805, an act to provide the protection and preservation of the Antietam Battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter from Attorney Herschel G. Holland, one of my distinguished constituents which contributes an interesting sidelight on the Battle of Antietam and the importance of preserving this important national site:

MANSFIELD, OHIO, *February 15, 1960.*
Hon. ROBERT W. LEVERING,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: With reference to the battlefield at Sharpsburg, Md., or Antietam, as it is usually called, I think few people realize the significance of what transpired here.

Up to this time the Union forces had been defeated at the First Battle of Bull Run, the Peninsular Campaign had been a fiasco, and then came the Second Battle of Bull Run, in which we suffered another serious and embarrassing defeat. In fact we had not won any major engagement since the opening of hostilities and the troops in the valley of the Shenandoah had their tongues hanging out running up and down the valley either trying to capture Jackson or getting the hell out of there when he turned on them. Morale in the North was at its lowest ebb. The conservative element did not feel that the preservation of the Union was of sufficient importance to warrant the bloodshed and treasure—particularly treasure that was being spent. The radical element was not at all keen about preserving the Union unless slavery could be abolished. As a matter of fact, the radical element had themselves wanted to abolish the Union, and denounced the Constitution as a compact with the devil because it countenanced slavery.

At the time the war began the South pinned its hopes largely on the supposition that when the supply of cotton was cut off from the English mills that Britain would intervene and assure the independence of the South; as far as the British business and financial interests were concerned they had done everything within their power to bring about this result.

Just prior to the battle of the Antietam, the Prime Minister of Britain had consulted with his Foreign Minister, who advised that Britain should attempt to affect a combination of European powers to work in consort to bring about the end of the war and if the other powers would not go along, he had urged that Britain go it alone.

This, of course, would have meant the recognition of the southern Confederacy and the division of the Union; it probably would have meant southern supremacy on the North American Continent eventually. The military had about given up hope of winning. General Sedgewick had written that there was no question but that the Union would be divided. The only question was where the division would take place.

Lincoln realized that the preservation of the Union was not sufficient to inspire the people to carry on the war. He wanted to inject the issue of slavery. He hoped to do this by an Emancipation Proclamation. Seward warned against this, saying that it would be taken as evidence of our weakness if we issued such a proclamation without any possibility of being able to enforce it. He insisted that unless we waited until after we had achieved a victory of some sort, the issuance of such a proclamation would be ridiculous. Lincoln had the proclamation prepared and it needed a victory to enable him to issue it.

England was waiting to see what happened to Lee's first invasion of the North before taking action to end hostilities. Thus not only the future of the country, but the future of the world depended upon this battle. Had Lee been victorious there would have been no Emancipation Proclamation; England would probably have intervened, the Union would have been dissolved, and America would probably have not have become a world power.

Projecting this into the future, we can see what might have happened in World War I if the result had been different; might have precluded World War II and the emergence of the Russian states as we now know it; Lincoln could not have issued his Emancipation Proclamation; as a matter of fact, had the battle gone adversely or had it not been fought, the probabilities are that Lincoln would not have survived his first term, and instead of being our national hero, would have been known as the man who was unable to prevent the dissolution of the Union. If he escaped the calumny of history, he would probably been ranked with such unknowns as Tyler, Pierce and others of similar stature.

When we have billions to waste in trying to perfect more efficient ways to commit suicide, it seems a crying shame that we cannot spare paltry thousands to preserve these hallowed spots, such as Antietam, Gettysburg and others from which spring our national heritage.

Very truly,

HERSCHEL G. HOLLAND.

Senior at Mondovi Completing Schooling in Spite of Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a magnificent triumph over handicap was recorded in the February 4 issue of the Eau Claire Leader, of Eau Claire, Wis. The story concerns Arlen Segerstrom, the son of my very good friends, Mr. and Mrs. Rangner Segerstrom, who is completing his high school studies despite the fact that he is confined to a wheelchair because of cerebral palsy.

Arlen's achievement is shared by his parents and teachers, all of whom have worked hard to help Arlen help himself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include his story in the RECORD.

SENIOR AT MONDOVI COMPLETING SCHOOLING IN SPITE OF HANDICAP

MONDOVI.—Arlen Segerstrom, 21, will chalk up a new victory over handicap here this

spring when he is awarded his Mondovi High School diploma with the class of 1960.

Now in the homestretch of his studies, he's as wrapped up in class activities as any other senior with class pictures to exchange, a class ring on his left hand, and excited talk about the graduation to come.

For his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rangner Segerstrom, Route 5, and his teachers, the ceremony will have a special significance, too. The youngest of six children, Arlen was born with cerebral palsy, his mind awake and alert to all that went on around him but his body almost completely unresponsive to control.

Today he pilots an electric wheelchair around the house and yard of the Segerstrom farm southeast of here. He reads books and magazines, improves his speech with a tape recorder, sells cards and knickknacks, and practices typing on an electric typewriter.

Segerstrom has made considerable progress in controlling his arms and hands but they still don't respond well enough to type. He began by hammering the keys with a pencil he held in his teeth. That was slow so he started using his tongue and in a remarkable show of determination has reached the point where he turns out copy that compares very favorably with that of his classmates.

Mrs. Segerstrom notes that teachers have contributed heavily to her son's progress. One of them, Mrs. Ella Olufson, was teaching at Pace School nearby when Arlen reached school age.

"Ella kept wanting me to bring him down," Mrs. Segerstrom recalls. "And finally we did." He attended the rural school with the teachers doing their best to help him learn and his mother and father driving over from the farm several times a day to bring him back and forth and to feed him his meals. Mrs. John Alme and Mrs. Lee Harvey also come in for praise for their assistance. They taught rural school classes he attended.

When it appeared that a high school education might be possible through "homebound" instruction, Superintendent of Schools William Hehli assisted the Segerstroms in making application to the State Department of Public Instruction.

Upon approval of the course of study, high school teacher Don Miles was assigned to instruct Arlen at the Segerstrom home. Four years of study after regular school hours two or three times a week and occasional evening trips followed. Superintendent Hehli points out that Miles became so interested in Segerstrom's progress that he put in teaching time beyond what the program provides.

During his high school years Segerstrom improved his speech greatly, Miles points out, through use of tape recordings of his voice which he played back so he could listen to himself.

His grades are average except for social problems in which he has an A so far this year. The course is one of his favorites. He also enjoys mathematics. "I really got a lot out of it," he says of his schooling.

Miles finds the friendly, cheerful Segerstrom an eager pupil and has helped open several avenues of self-improvement for him. "When he runs across something he doesn't understand he'll call up and ask me about it," Miles explains.

While his high school studies have been pursued in the home, Segerstrom hasn't missed everything. "He's pretty prompt with his money for his activities ticket," Miles says. His parents take him to football and basketball games, the class play, and even to some of the high school dances.

Segerstrom learned how to handle money well enough to conduct a brisk business in cards for special events and in small items, such as salt and pepper shaker sets. He has used the income from the sales to purchase his wheelchair.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, these great United States have always found unity in diversity. America is not one man, one voice, one opinion. America is a blend of beliefs, a medley of voices. To everyone who lives in a democracy it has a special, highly personal meaning. I am pleased to note that this diversity of opinion has been highlighted by the annual Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronics Industries Association in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This contest is a nationwide competition for high school students. Each contestant is asked to speak on the theme, "I Speak for Democracy." Each speaker is given the opportunity to present his or her individual view of what democracy means. In this manner the contest underscores the dominant theme of variety in our citizens' thinking and beliefs and yet sustains a strain of solid unity in that each contestant speaks for the American way of life.

I am happy to have the address of Miss Leila Boyle included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Miss Boyle is a resident of Milford, Conn., and a student at Lauralton Hall High School in Milford. She competed with high school students throughout the State of Connecticut and her 5-minute talk was judged to be the best submitted in the State. Because of this achievement, Miss Boyle was selected to participate in the 1959–60 national contest finals now being conducted here in Washington.

The address follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I speak for democracy, the freedom that I love. I speak for the factory workers, and field hands, and farmers, who, like me, are fortunate enough to be freemen, Americans. I speak for a mezuzah over a door in Manhattan, for a crucifix on a wall in Queens, for a weekly paper in Kalamazoo, for a daily in the city of New York. I speak for a sign which reads "I Like Ike," and for another reading "All the Way With Adlai."

I speak through the lips of an immigrant as he hears for the first time the voice of America. As she beckons him to come, breathe her free air, smell her free smells. As he sees the beauty of a Boston, the nighttime of New York, he brushes away the tears of gratitude that must form in his eyes, for he knows, as only an immigrant can, what it is to be without this freedom that we love.

I speak for the blood we have shed for our cause, for the dead and the dying. I speak for the war-torn days of our first independence, for the civil strife that placed brother against brother, the saddest event in our history. I speak for the first great war, when our blood bathed the fields of France, for the second, with its lonely boy at Okinawa, and I speak for Korea, and the heartache of Heartbreak Ridge.

We have not been sparing of our blood, we freedom-loving Americans. We have shed it plentifully for our holy cause—to protect and spread our way of life.

To protect the way of life we love—a home, a school, a church. The things for which we have in the past, and for which we will in the future give our lives—for these things are far too precious to live without. They are the constituents of the American way of life. Each of us possesses a right to them—a right for which we would gladly die—were it necessary.

But our story is not entirely serious. Oh no, one cannot speak for democracy without speaking for the happy things—for football, the world series, hotdogs and potato chips, for coffee at midnight after the movie, for the Rose Bowl, West Point, and Annapolis; for ice cream and rock and roll, Pat Boone and Pat Rooney; for musical comedy, the Swanee River, the tree that grows in Brooklyn; for Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn; for bicycles and jalopies, popcorn and peanuts—little things, yes, but the things we would miss so much were we not free to enjoy them.

But there are some who do not believe this. To those, skeptics, for that is what they are, I say: Find me a better place to live. Find me a place that has the robust democracy of a New York daily, the competitive spirit of the Army-Navy game that converts to unity in the face of a common enemy, the feeling that comes with voting to choose one's own government, the old-fashioned freedom of a New England town meeting, the silent pealing of the bell of liberty, the peaceful reassurance of prayer, as we see fit to pray. Find me such a place and there I will go. But, skeptic, I beg of you, do not look too hard, nor search too long, for your cause is a fruitless one. I have found the way of life unequaled by any other, and so it is with a tear of gratitude in my voice and a song of joy in my heart that I speak for democracy.

Congress Must Find Some Meeting Ground on a New Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 10350, to repeal agricultural price support subsidies and provide for orderly disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory without disrupting normal marketings, I have received widespread interest and encouragement. One such communication was a letter enclosing an editorial from the February 10, 1960, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The sender hoped I would find time to read it as she said it expressed what most of the people at home have felt about the farm problem. I have read it and commend it to all Members of Congress in the interest of enacting at this session a new program to stabilize the farm economy without excessive Federal aid and controls. The editorial reads as follows:

IT DEFIES COMMONSENSE

There will be disagreement in Congress with the broad goals for farm legislation just offered by President Eisenhower. But there can be little disagreement anywhere

with his description of the present price-support program: "It defies commonsense."

It was designed to prevent wartime scarcity; it has been continued in peacetime, stimulating burdensome surpluses valued at $9 billion. It was supposed to ease the plight of small farmers; the great bulk of price-support payments go to big factory farms which need no subsidies. It was supposed to stabilize the farm economy; it has distorted it, centering excessive Federal aid on one-fifth of American agriculture and destroying foreign markets.

The President devoted most of his message to Congress to the most glaring example of folly—the wheat program. More than one-third of the Government's expenditure on crop surpluses goes into wheat although the crop represents only 6 percent of the cash receipts from farm products. The Government resells the crop surpluses it collects, but usually at a loss, and handling them costs $1.5 million a day. This is only one part of the charge on taxpayers; the other comes in the higher prices of supported crops.

It is only fair to say that processors and distributors of food (not the farmer) get the larger part of the consumer's dollar. But the plain object of price supports is to keep pyrices up, and this has some effect on retail charges. And it is time those who propose lower price supports tell the farmer frankly that this may mean at least a temporary decline in income. Even the President speaks rather of doing something to improve the low net income of farmers.

The candid remedy for this is to stop fostering inefficient farming and help marginal farmers to shift to more profitable work. The rural development program aims to do this and should be greatly expanded. If half the subsidies (some of them in $100,000 gobs) now going to farmers who don't need aid were put into this rural development program, more effective aid could be given small farmers.

The President urgently warned Congress of the danger that the whole present program will collapse—"visiting havoc on the very people this program is intended to help." He pleaded for prompt changes along the general line of less regimentation and less stimulus or surpluses. He offered to join Congress in reforms having such goals, leaving wide latitude for methods. But he barred a two-price system (to which some farm groups are now desperately turning) as bound to bring reprisals from foreign producers and to injure some farmers while seeking to aid others.

His newest proposal is for expansion of the conservation reserve—a plan for taking acreage out of production. He offered payment in kind (out of surpluses now held by the Government) for the reduction of acreage devoted to crops now in surplus. He added one vital proviso—so long as "measures are included to keep production below total consumption." Those measures are the great question here. And any acreage control tends to be ineffective when production per acre can be vastly increased.

We hope that all those who know the present program "defies common sense" will find some meeting ground on a new program within the general lines the President lays down.

Federal-State Relations in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me before the Council of Chief State School Officers at Boston, Mass., on November 12, 1959:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS IN EDUCATION

(By JOHN EDWARD FOGARTY, Member of Congress from the 2d District of Rhode Island)

I am pleased and honored to be invited to appear today before the Council of Chief State School Officers. It seems particularly appropriate that this meeting of the Chief State School Officers is being held in Boston—in a city and in a State which have been so closely identified with the educational and cultural development of America since the earliest Colonial times. It was Massachusetts, as you know, that had the first tax for free schools and first school at Dedham in 1636—the same year saw the founding of Harvard College.

As Chief State School Officers, you have been in the forefront of the struggle that has been waged to improve our schools and provide greater educational opportunities for the youth of America.

Educational legislation enacted in recent years, both by the Congress and by many of your State legislatures, has made changes in the legal framework by which the Federal Government and the State governments have been given increased responsibilities, as well as greater opportunities for service in meeting the challenges of a rapid changing world.

In this changing world, what has been and what is the Federal role in education? Examining the legislative background, we see there has been a Federal role in education since Congress on July 13, 1787 passed the Northwest Ordinance, which has been called the most notable law ever enacted by the representatives of the American people.

Not only did it mark the beginning of one one of the most remarkable growths ever known in territorial expansion, but it furnished the basis for the constitutions of several of our great States. It banned slavery north of the Ohio River; provided for religious freedom, guaranteed the right of trial by jury, and pledged public support to education. The setting aside of one section of land in each township for educational purposes 172 years ago was the first great commitment in Federal aid to education.

With this background, let us examine some of the issues in Federal-State relationships—issues that must be faced and resolved by such leaders as you within the next few years. What are some of the issues?

To my mind one really fundamental question in Federal-State relationships is whether Federal aid to education shall be in the form of categorical aid in specified areas, or whether the Federal Government should give broad, general support to education—or perhaps there might be a combination of both. It is not a question of whether we shall have Federal aid or not, but a question of how much and of what form Federal aid will take. The greater taxing powers of the Federal Government are certain to be utilized for meeting the growing national commitment to education.

Having been in the chair during the debate on the national defense education bill and thereby being able to insure its receiving a full and fair hearing, I was highly gratified, as were other friends of education, when the bill was enacted into law. It touches every level of education, public and private, from the elementary through the graduate, yet it is categorical aid to education. It is a major breakthrough in the effort to see that every young person, from the day he first enters school, should have an opportunity to develop his gifts to the fullest. It is the recognition that in a free society, the individual is the first line of defense, that gives the act its name.

The National Defense Education Act, as you know, is far-reaching in its significance for American education. This is true in several aspects. Not the least of the salutary results of the act is the contribution it has made to the working partnership between Federal and State education officials. It is magnifying the fine spirit of cooperation that has heretofore existed.

The Purchase Guide, which was issued in August of this year by the Council of Chief State School Officers, is a fine example of how the chief state school officers contribute to the common goal. The Purchase Guide is proving of tremendous value in the successful operation of title III, part A, of the National Defense Education Act. It is assisting school administrators throughout the Nation in the wise and economical purchase of materials, apparatus and equipment for improving instruction in the sciences, mathematics and modern foreign languages in the elementary and secondary schools. The Council of Chief State School Officers is to be congratulated for this noteworthy achievement.

As one who has vigorously supported the National Defense Education Act and other legislation administered by the U.S. Office of Education, I can say with confidence there is nothing in the history of the many Federal programs providing funds for education in this country that would justify unreasoning fear of Federal control. In reviewing the interim report on the National Defense Education Act, I am impressed by the virtually unanimous participation of the States and Territories. The speed with which they have submitted their State plans is impressive. It reflects alert competence at the State as well as at the Federal level in striving for efficient working relationships.

Let us review briefly some examples of categorical Federal aid that we now have in operating programs.

A primary objective of the National Defense Education Act is to prevent the loss of many able students who drop out of high schools each year. Some education officials believe that the measure's greatest contribution may be the spreading of testing and counseling programs throughout every State. The effort is being made to encourage and stimulate—on the part of the States at the 45,000 local districts and at the individual institutions of higher education—action to help this Nation do a better job in talent conservation and utilization with its most valuable resource, the vast energies of our youth. The number of guidance personnel working in 43 State departments of education has increased from 58 to 144 in 1 year, largely due to the stimulation of NDEA funds. A total of 2,209 teachers, who were enrolled in 50 short-term counseling and guidance institutes, have returned to their teaching positions in the secondary schools. They are sharing the benefits gained at the institutes with an estimated 750,000 secondary school students they will counsel this year.

In the passage of the act, the Congress recognized that the challenge confronting the Nation in our time is in large measure one which demands the development and utilization of trained intelligence of the highest order. The primary responsibility for meeting this challenge is placed upon American education.

While clearly recognizing that the basic responsibility of education must, consistent with American tradition, remain with the States and local communities and higher institutions, we must examine carefully in the national interest to determine if, and where, areas of weakness exist.

The needs of our educational system, both in quality and scope, require, in the opinion of the Congress, that the Federal Government undertake to assist the States and institutions to develop to the highest level those programs and areas in which deficiencies tend to handicap our national security. Sometimes there are differences of

opinion as to how this may best be accomplished.

Another example of categorical Federal aid was seen when Congress recognized that the national interest and security were at stake in the fact that America is a deplorably backward country when it comes to proficiency in the languages of other people. Millions of people—three-quarters of the world's population—speak languages taught but in few, if any schools and colleges in the United States. Yet this country has a critical need in these times to be better educated linguistically than any other country.

Steps that have been taken under this example of categorical aid include the operation of language institutes for the improvement of the qualifications of language teachers in elementary and secondary schools; the establishment of language and area centers for instruction in the needed, but inadequately offered languages and related area studies; the providing of language fellowships to encourage students to prepare for college teaching in these languages and for other public services; and the making of surveys concerning a wide range of problems in language instruction.

Let us look at the response. Over 250 colleges and universities from 49 States expressed a desire to conduct institutes. Within 3 weeks after the first summer institute was established with places for 100 persons, over 1,500 teachers from 48 States applied for admission.

The funds available for the program, however, could by no means accommodate all those institutions who desired and were qualified to conduct institutes. The act authorized $7¼ million for fiscal year 1959. The initial allocation of $400,000 was used to establish summer institutes at the Universities of Colorado, Maine, and Michigan, and Louisiana State University. These funds were supplemented by an appropriation of $1.1 million on May 20, 1959, which permitted establishment of eight additional institutes at the Universities of Georgia, Missouri, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington, Colgate University, Hollins College, and San Francisco State College. A total of 925 experienced modern foreign-language teachers have returned to their classrooms in public and private elementary and secondary schools, sharing with their students what they have learned in the 12 modern language institutes this past summer. In 1960, 36 summer institutes will be established with places for about 2,500 language teachers.

A total of 171 students preparing for college teaching in the modern foreign language field have been awarded fellowships in one of the following critical languages: Arabic, Chinese, Hindustani, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian. They have begun their studies in various institutions of higher learning. Nineteen centers for instruction in languages rarely, if ever, taught in this country are underway. Twenty research projects have been contracted with institutions of higher learning, organizations, and individuals for the development of more effective methods of teaching foreign languages and the development of specialized materials.

The student loan program—title II of the National Defense Education Act—is another example of categorical aid that has received an acceptance from the colleges and universities of America to an extent that far surpassed expectation. It is designed, as you know, to reduce the costly loss of talent as 60,000 to 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates interested in college and another 60,000 students already in college are prevented each year from continuing their education by lack of funds.

During the first year, 1,190 higher educational institutions in the Nation requested a total of $70 million in loan funds. In this fiscal year, 1,370 institutions are participating, representing nearly 88 percent of the total full-time undergraduate and graduate enrollment. It is estimated that a total of 120,000 worthy students are studying with support from the student loan fund. The average loan is estimated at about $500.

To meet their estimated needs of $60½ million during the 1959–60 school year, the participating institutions will use $15 million on hand from fiscal year 1959 appropriations and will contribute about $4½ million of their own funds as required by the act. This left an original total of $41 million in loan requests, $11 million more than Congress has appropriated. The original total of $41 million in loan requests was reduced upon advice of a consultant panel to $34½ million. The deficit will be reduced somewhat by adjustments in the requests and by reallocation of funds from States where the allotment is greater than the requests to States which are short of funds. If during the first semester, the Federal appropriations turn out to be inadequate, consideration will be given to a supplemental appropriation at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

Let us look at a few highlights of other examples of categorical aid under the act. We see that 50 out of 54 States and territories are engaged in improving their statistical services with the assistance of funds received through the act. Under title III, thousands of local school districts under the provisions of approved State plans in 51 States and territories are purchasing and using equipment and materials and are making needed minor alterations, in strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction. The total distributed to the States in fiscal year 1959 for this purpose was $33,750,000. Under title IV, 1,000 recipients of fellowships are now studying at 123 graduate schools, representing 272 new or expanded programs of study. Under title VII, there are 23 research and 16 dissemination projects underway in the more effective utilization of communications media in the field of education. And under title VIII, thousands of individuals are being trained for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Looking at the other side of the issue, advocates of general Federal aid to education have pointed out that many States and communities under present tax policies and practices cannot hope to be able to pay for the extended education required in the country at large. In the past, public education has been largely supported by taxes on real property. The largest sources of taxable wealth are, however, no longer in real property, but rather in income. Because of the expansion of our industrial society, enormous differences in taxable wealth have been created in and among the several States. School communities with little industrial and commercial activity have relatively small taxable wealth to provide the funds for school purposes, while districts with considerable industrial activities can provide a high quality educational program with minor financial effort. These differences in the ability of the States and communities to support an adequate educational program—with adequately paid teachers—account for marked differences in educational opportunity among our people.

It is argued that if the present inequalities in educational opportunity are to be abolished, the taxing power of the Federal Government must be used to distribute school funds, regardless of their source, to where they are needed to provide a minimum foundation program for all children. If the benefits of education are to be enjoyed by all citizens without regard to place of residence, the tax burden should properly be distributed among the States in terms of their financial resources. From a percentage point of view, the Federal Government has increased from 30 percent of the total expenditures in 1902 to 65 percent in 1956. The States remained about steady, going from 11 percent in 1902 to 16 percent in 1956, but the local sources declined greatly, from 58 percent in 1902 to 19 percent in 1956. The number of dollars increased for each, but this is not reflected percentagewise. This indicates, therefore, that public education must look to the Federal Government for additional financial support since this is where the major amount of money is and there is no indication that a shift percentagewise will develop in the other direction.

Another example of Federal participation generally agreed to be without centralized control, domination, or dictation is found in the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, providing funds for school construction and for operation and maintenance in federally affected areas and on Federal property. Since these two measures were passed in 1950, the Congress has appropriated a total of $962,585,000 under Public Law 815, in funds for school construction, and a total of $932,127,000 under Public Law 874 in funds for operation and maintenance of schools. The total amount appropriated under both Public Laws 815 and 874 from fiscal year 1951 through fiscal year 1960 is $1,894,712,000. A careful check of the records at the Office of Education shows that the total cost of administering this program, since it was enacted in 1950, is less than nine-tenths of 1 percent.

With the funds that have been authorized under Public Law 815 since it was passed in 1950, a total of over 45,000 classrooms and related facilities have been, or will be, constructed to house an estimated 1⅓ million children.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1960 under Public Law 874 is $163,957,000. This will cover an estimated 1,440,000 children. Over 4,000 school districts are participating in the program. The federally connected children in these districts amount to approximately 15 percent of the total enrollment.

Personally, I have been especially interested in that example of successful Federal participation reflected in the cooperative research program which was initiated on July 1, 1956, under Public Law 531.

There are now 17 Federal-State cooperative research projects underway. Ten of these projects in the area of mental retardation are in the States of California, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. The total sum of Federal funds obligated for all 17 Federal-State cooperative research projects amounts to $1,541,942. The 10 projects in the area of mental retardation show a total of $1,032,831 in Federal funds obligated. The States of Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, New York, Texas, and West Virginia have cooperative research projects in areas other than mental retardation for which Federal funds amounting to $509,111 have been obligated.

Educational officials at the U.S. Office of Education have stated that the cooperative research projects with the State departments of education are serving to increase the knowledge that can be gained by sound educational research while promoting excellent working relationships between the Federal and State educational officials. In addition to those significant cooperative research projects just mentioned that have been contracted with State departments of education, a total of 217 cooperative research projects have been contracted by the U.S. Office of Education with colleges and universities throughout the Nation.

Another important problem in Federal-State relationships is that of effective communication. The chief State school officers obviously occupy a key role in the discharge of this responsibility. As the findings of

new knowledge are gained by research, it is urgent that teachers and school administrators be alert and prepared to make application of such findings. Summaries of all completed projects are available from the Office of Education and there is much that can be done in getting the information to the people who can actually make use of the knowledge that has been gained.

Commissioner Derthick told me with much enthusiasm of the responsiveness of the chief State school officers to the problem of communication generally, but particularly of the lines you keep open between your office and the Office of Education. He is particularly proud of your meeting with him and his staff when the stage was set for the administration of the National Defense Education Act. The Commissioner is certainly dedicated to the idea of State control and keeping the Office of Education to a posture of service.

I want to commend unstintingly Commissioner Derthick for the manner in which he is administering the National Defense Education Act. He has stated that the act "will meet important national needs within the priceless tradition of State and local control." With unmistakable dedication and conviction, he added: "This vital new legislation is an extremely significant milestone in the Federal effort to offer leadership without domination and to render assistance without interference." And that is just the way he is administering the National Defense Education Act.

There are many Federal programs affecting education that are not administered by the Office of Education, but time does not permit us to deal with them today. Many of these programs use the purchase-of-service approach. The amount of Federal aid to higher education and research from all such programs in the fiscal year 1957 was $1,165,009,000.

We know there are many problems yet to be solved as we look toward the future. The classroom shortage continues to be a serious problem. The House Education and Labor Committee last June reported out H.R. 22, a modified version of the Metcalf bill, which called for about $1.1 billion annually for 4 years in direct Federal grants to States for school construction and teachers' salaries. Distribution would be on the basis of school-age population. When Congress adjourned on September 15, this bill was stalled in the House Rules Committee by an 8 to 4 vote against clearance. One suggested change in the measure is a proposal to remove the pending bill's provision for Federal aid to States for teachers' salaries. The assistance would then be solely for school construction. Another proposal would require that under certain circumstances and for limited periods, communities and States would be required to match the grants. In August, the Senate Education Subcommittee unanimously approved a $1 billion, 2-year grant program for construction only.

Experience has shown that the State legislatures generally provide the money necessary to obtain their share of any Federal funds that are available on a matching formula. Educational needs have been neglected frequently in past years because of the lack of Federal educational programs in competition with the programs offered for roads and other urgent needs. Tax revenues, whatever the source, are not unlimited. Competition for the tax dollar among various programs that reflect the public's interest in health, welfare, housing, roads, and other urgent needs has never before been so intense, and the list grows from year to year.

What are the present factors that have made it necessary for the Federal Government to become concerned about education in this country? There are three that come to mind as we probe the question. First, we can point to the mobility of population. Advances in transportation and communication and the concentration of industrial activities in urban centers have caused a rapid increase in the mobility of our people. The urbanization of our population has been swift and steady. The statistics of the last census showed that 25.2 percent of native-born Americans lived in some State other than the one in which they were born. Second, the need for technical, professional, and linguistic competence has become increasingly a matter of the greatest national importance. Our economic order is dependent upon how well we develop such competence through education. The general conditions of life and the expansion of the American economic system are determined by the amount and character of education among our citizens. Third, there is an increasing awareness of governmental responsibility to assure access to educational opportunity for all citizens. The welfare of the Nation demands that all children regardless of their place of residence receive a minimum basic education for the responsibility of citizenship, for a productive life and for personal happiness.

Congress, I believe, is coming to recognize this profound national interest in education and will act, in the future, to assist the States, communities, and institutions to strengthen education whenever educational needs require such action in the national interest.

What is the most appropriate way the Federal Government can translate into action the best thinking in this country for meeting the most critical educational needs? It seems to me that we must face the problem and arrive at decisions based upon an accurate observation and appraisal of conditions as they exist in 1959. When national needs have been identified, it is necessary to chart the course of action that is required. The key question which must be faced is whether the Federal Government should substitute its taxing power for the general support of education rather than the approach designed to stimulate or give special assistance for a limited period.

If Federal aid should be extended to broad general assistance, it should be remembered that the pattern of fiscal controls, such as the accounting procedures required by the General Accounting Office, would be applicable in the disbursement of Federal funds and would require compliance on the part of those who receive such Federal funds. There would be fiscal accountability. It would not be possible to bypass the Federal accounting requirements.

Most perceptive people are aware that, in times of emergency, it seems necessary to concentrate our effort on those things which seem most urgent. I fully appreciate your awareness that there are other aspects of education and many phases of the curriculum to which comparable attention and increased resources must soon be given.

In conclusion, as we consider education's contribution to national well-being and to the solution of national problems, we must never forget that in this country the State education departments and the chief State school officers have a prime and essential role. As we look toward the future, we must fully utilize their creative leadership and their traditional authority.

How Pure Is Your City Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker, the question as to how pure the Nation's water supply is at the present time is under careful study and investigation by the U.S. Public Health Service at its Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. Although no report has yet been made official certain findings have been made public.

The investigation has turned up "nematodes" which are microscopic worms in some of the water supplies of the Nation's major cities. These small worms are not in themselves dangerous, the experts tell us, but they feed on virus type germs. The danger is this: While the germs can ordinarily be killed by chlorination the worms cannot. Germ carrying nematodes in our water constitute a definite health hazard.

To help solve the problem the Federal Government should assist local communities in the construction of sewage treatment plants which will prevent the discharge of waste material into our streams and lakes which have become breeding grounds for water impurities. The Congress has enacted a bill providing such assistance. It was vetoed today by the President.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we shall have an opportunity to override this veto. There are few measures coming before the Congress of greater importance and it is my deepest hope that it can become law despite the President's objections.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the U.S. News & World Report for February 29, 1960, entitled "How Pure Is Your City Water?"

HOW PURE IS YOUR CITY WATER?

CINCINNATI, OHIO.—The problem of drinking water—pure and free from disease-carrying organisms—is becoming a matter of increasing concern for American cities.

Unlike the tapwater of most countries, the water of the United States has been considered safe to drink anywhere, anytime. All of a sudden, that confidence is coming under question.

A study just completed at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center here puts new emphasis on the problem. This is a U.S. Public Health Service laboratory. The study reveals that drinking water taken from 13 U.S. rivers contains microscopic worms, called nematodes, that can carry disease-causing bacteria and viruses. These nematodes are able to withstand chlorination, the standard treatment for killing organisms in drinking water.

All the Nation's major rivers were included in the study. Nematodes also were found in a sampling of drinking water taken from Lake Michigan.

"Suds" on tapwater: This is only part of the problem of drinking water. In many water supplies, detergents, which pass right through the best systems of sewage treatment, are showing up in tapwater. This is also a problem in many suburban areas which depend upon well water for drinking and upon septic systems for disposal of waste. In some cases, so much detergent gets into wells that a sudsy "head" appears when a glass of water is drawn from the tap.

Along with the detergent problem, which comes mainly from washing machines and dishwashers in American homes, there is that of new industries which discharge wastes that baffle sewage-treatment experts.

As population rises and demands upon the Nation's water supply grows, research scientists explain that these problems will multiply. They say new methods of sewage and water treatment must be developed if

major rivers are to continue in use for the dual purpose of carrying away sewage and furnishing pure drinking water.

The wriggling nematodes: At the moment, the most excitement concerns the presence of microscopic worms in drinking water. These worms, which are known to breed in sewage-disposal plants, have been discovered in drinking water from one end of the country to the other. Their presence was discovered accidentally in 1955 by Dr. Shih Lu Chang, a microbiologist at the Sanitary Engineering Center.

Dr. Chang has just summarized results of a nationwide study of the nematode problem. The study covered a period of 11 months, ended late in 1959. During this period, thousands of samples were taken from the waterplants of 22 of the Nation's largest cities.

In 15 of the cities, waterplants drew water from rivers. These cities were on the Mississippi River in both Illinois and Louisiana, on the Missouri River in Kansas, the Ohio in West Virginia, the Potomac in Maryland, the Colorado in California, the Columbia in Washington State, the Chattahoochee in Georgia, the Delaware in Pennsylvania, the Detroit in Michigan, the Rio Grande in Texas, the Merrimack in Massachusetts, the Niagara in New York, the Red-Elm Fork in Texas, and the Tennessee River in Tennessee.

The water supply of a city on the Detroit River was found to be free of nematodes. In 14 cities on 13 other rivers, however, the water supplies were found to contain nematodes in both the raw water as it entered the plants for treatment and purification, and the finished water as it left the plants for taps in homes and offices.

In 4 of the 22 cities in which plants were studied, supplies were from manmade reservoirs. These were in New York, Massachusetts, Colorado, and California. Only one of these four, in Colorado, was found to contain nematodes.

Two of the cities with plants in the study were on the Great Lakes—one on Lake Michigan in Indiana and the other on Lake Superior in Minnesota. Nematodes were found in both the raw and finished water of the Lake Michigan plant. Water from the plant in a city on Lake Superior contained no nematodes.

When a member of the board of editors of U.S. News & World Report visited Dr. Chang in his Cincinnati laboratory, he was invited to take a look at the worms under a low-power microscope. Under the microscope, they looked like a can full of wriggling fishworms.

Disease carriers: Dr. Chang explained that the chlorination and flocculation process used in most water-treatment plants will eliminate the adult nematodes and some of the larval forms, but that significant numbers are able to go through the whole water treatment and come out still wriggling.

Asked if the nematodes are dangerous to humans, Dr. Chang said: "No, not by themselves, but we must point out the fact that, since some of these nematodes originate in sewage-treatment plants, there is the possibility that they will ingest pathogens—disease-causing backteria and viruses. And our studies show that these pathogens are completely protected by the nematodes against chlorination and that they can survive at least 24 hours, with 5 to 15 percent remaining alive. Thus, they could serve as carriers of disease."

Dr. Chang was then asked if the nematodes carry bacteria and viruses that cause such diseases as polio, dysentery, and typhoid fever. His reply:

"We have not run tests to isolate these bacteria and viruses from nematodes found in water supplies. We have found in laboratory tests, however, that the nematodes will feed on representative members of these pathogenic bacteria and viruses. Some of these bacteria are those that cause typhoid and paratyphoid fevers and food poisoning. Others cause bacillary dysentery. And, of course, any of the viruses are disease-causing, in the sense that they always cause some illness, ranging from the common cold to polio.

"But we must also point out that the chances of these nematodes to feed on pathogenic bacteria and viruses in the sewage-treatment plant, under normal conditions, are extremely small. The possibility is there, but it's quite remote."

That "musty odor": In addition to their possible threat to health, said Dr. Chang, the nematodes present an esthetic problem.

"Several of the worms that I have isolated produce a very distinct musty or earthy odor," he stated. "They may be responsible for odorous water supplies. In fact, a nematologist named Cobb reported as early as 1918 the possible role played by these nematodes in producing odorous water supplies. At this time most of the waterworks in this country were using slow sand filters. Cobb reported that you could find millions of worms per acre of sand filter, in the top 3 inches of sand. Today, of course, with a few exceptions, waterworks are using rapid sand filters."

Asked if he himself felt queasy about drinking water in cities where a good many nematodes have been found in the water supply, Dr. Chang said: "Usually, when I drink water, I just don't think about nematodes. But, when the worm density in water is high, I feel kind of reluctant to drink that water."

Dr. Chang stated that it would be difficult for cities with the nematode problem to get rid of them completely with present methods of water treatment. He did say: "Probably, at present, the nematode population in any water supply could be very measurably reduced by using superchlorination on the raw water before treatment and by having a more efficient flocculation process."

Needed—new methods: In addition to the need for improved water-treatment methods to deal with problems like the nematodes, research experts at the Sanitary Engineering Center are trying to find new methods of sewage treatment. Present methods cannot cope adequately with the detergents now used widely by housewives because these are soluble in water and go right through the best treatment plants essentially unchanged. In the same category are chemical wastes, particularly the wastes that flow from the petrochemical industries which produce such things as plastics.

"There's been a tremendous growth in the petrochemical industry since the end of World War II," said Bernard B. Berger, chief of the Water Supply and Water Pollution Research Branch at the center. "The problem lies in the fact that the wastes they produce are new to micro-organisms that break down sewage in treatment plants and in streams. Many of them present exactly the same problem as detergents."

Asked if these things were likely to cause cancer, Mr. Berger said:

"This is a question which, unfortunately, we cannot answer. Not only do we need research to determine the effects of these materials, but we need to develop improved techniques to find out just what we are dealing with. We have these materials in water. We know they are there because the water may be discolored, may taste, may have an odor. But still the material may be present in such a low concentration that we can't come to grips with it.

"We have developed a carbon-filter device which will concentrate certain kinds of organic materials present in water. The concentrate is in the form of a complex organic 'gunk,' resembling oil. It is difficult to resolve this gunk into component compounds. We need further research in capturing materials present in water and identifying the material we have recovered."

A growing problem, said Mr. Berger, is that of detergents finding their way into household water in suburban areas where water is drawn from wells and sewage is handled by septic tanks.

"What you have," he said, "is a continuous recycling. You have the water coming out of the house into the septic tank, into the ground, up through the well into the faucets, back to the septic tank. It keeps building up all the time, until sometimes there is a 'head' of suds on water drawn from the tap. We have gotten reports from many parts of the country that this is happening."

Radioactive river: Another water problem is generated by the atomic age—that of wastes from atomic-energy plants. Researchers from the center were called in when citizens of New Mexico became alarmed about radioactive wastes discharged into the Animas River by a uranium-processing plant in Colorado.

The Animas River rises in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado. In New Mexico, it is the water supply for Aztec, a town of around 11,000, and Farmington, with a population of 30,000. In the summer of 1958, sampling showed radium and strontium 90 present in the drinking water of both towns. Source of the radium was the uranium plant, while the strontium 90 resulted from fallout. But materials also were found in food and milk. Adding all the sources of radioactivity together, it was found that the total amount was on the order of 1.6 times the maximum allowable set by the National Bureau of Standards.

As a result of these findings, the uranium plant took measures recommended by a conference of the State and Federal water-pollution agencies concerned. Now, radioactivity in the water of the Animas is considered to be at a safe level.

Through a nationwide quality water network, the center in Cincinnati keeps tab on radioactivity in water in all parts of the United States. This network, now with some 70 stations and more to be added, checks not only on radioactivity but on the whole range of polluting materials in the U.S. water supply.

As to the future of the Nation's water supply, Mr. Berger said this:

"The burden on water is increasing. You put in a new sewage-treatment plant and there is unquestionably an improvement in water below that plant. Working against that, however, is the growing population and the increasing industrial establishment of the country. It's going to take a lot of effort just to stay even with the problem, and more if we are going to make any improvement."

What Counsel and Advice Would Abraham Lincoln Have Had for His Party Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay of Sarah Jane Goodyear, of Kankakee, Ill.

She is 17 years of age and an outstanding young lady in every respect. The title of the essay, in which many young

people competed, is "What Counsel and Advice Would Abraham Lincoln Have Had for His Party Today?"

The essay follows:

WHAT COUNSEL AND ADVICE WOULD ABRAHAM LINCOLN HAVE HAD FOR HIS PARTY TODAY?

Let us consider a speech which Mr. Lincoln might give today if he were to return.

As Republicans we meet today, our country—and our world—in a state of chaos. Upon our shoulders rests as great a task as has ever been faced by men: to preserve for posterity our liberty, our way of life, and the Nation for which men have lived—and willingly died.

Let us hold dear our basic rights which are the foundation of the democracy in which we live. It is painful to me that almost a century after the close of the Civil War men and women are denied equal rights of education and also are denied equal opportunity to vote for the candidates of their choice. Our forefathers etched upon the cornerstone of our Government: "All men are created equal." This is our greatest fundamental principle. If all races within the bounds of our great Nation cannot live together in harmony, then our enemies may rightly call us hypocrites, and the true friends of freedom shall doubt our sincerity.

Our Nation is no longer in its infancy. We are not States learning to live in harmony with one another, but a country, seeking to live in harmony with the world. Let our President speak with the leaders of all countries, and let him see their peoples, but let him no waiver in decision for "Important principles can and must be inflexible."[1]

If we propose to lead our fellow men, we must place before them leaders. We must encourage the people to vote without prejudice and then, in the "faith that right makes might,"[2] give them just and upright men. We must perpetuate "peace and prosperity," giving these words a true meaning for every man and women. With God's guidance and our adherence to that which is right, we surely cannot fail.

SARA JANE GOODYEAR,
WATSEKA, ILL.

[1] Last public address by Lincoln, Apr. 11, 1865.

[2] Address by Lincoln at Cooper Institute, New York City, Feb. 27, 1860.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Rebuts Vice Admiral Rickover's Criticism of School System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, certainly there are persons who do not agree with much of the criticism Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover has spoken and written concerning our school system in the United States. Those who disagree with Admiral Rickover's comments doubtless find much satisfaction in testimony given by Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, before a House of Representatives appropriations subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Bess Furman, published February 20, 1960 in the New York Times, concerning Commissioner Derthick's testimony, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DERTHICK CALLS U.S. SCHOOLS BEST—REBUTS RICKOVER'S CRITICISM AND DENIES NEED TO COPY SOVIET EDUCATION PLAN

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The U.S. Commissioner of Education has made a spirited defense of the American school system against criticisms lodged by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

This was revealed today by the release of testimony that the Commissioner, Lawrence G. Derthick, gave recently before a closed session of a House Appropriations Subcommittee.

In his appearance before the subcommittee, Commissioner Derthick also denied, as the admiral had charged, that the Office of Education had failed in its duty to alert this country to the strength of the Soviet competition in education.

The Commissioner further denied the admirals assertion that the Office of Education was oriented to the progressive-education ideas of the late John Dewey and was influenced too much by the National Education Association.

Admiral Rickover had made his statements in earlier testimony before the full Appropriations Committee.

ADMIRALS IDEA REJECTED

Mr. Derthick said that he flatly rejected the idea implied in Admiral Rickover's statements that "to equal or surpass the Russians in some missile feat he must design an educational system like theirs."

Mr. Derthick said that he flatly rejected the idea implied in Admiral Rickover's statement that "to equal or surpass the Russians in some missile feat he must design and educational system like theirs.

He contended that Admiral Rickover had been overimpressed by the Soviet Union's enthusiasm for its systems. Mr. Derthick contended that the American system was superior.

The Commissioner said that the only aspect of Soviet education that this country might well covet was its "total commitment to education."

For discussing an Office of Education publication of 10 years ago, "Life Adjustment for Every American Youth," Admiral Rickover had described it as "the most anti-intellectual document I have read in a long time."

Mr. Derthick replied that this pamphlet had not been designed to solve the problem of students dropping out of college, and not for college preparatory groups. He said that student dropouts had decreased since the pamphlet was published.

The Commissioner noted that Admiral Rickover had declared himself in favor of building brains rather than character-building, as being more useful for building submarines.

FAVORS CHARACTER BUILDING

Mr. Derthick replied that such a concept did not fit in with the ideals of the school system as conceived by the American people.

"I simply do not believe for one moment," he said, "the contention that in America the schools should bear little or no responsibility for character development."

Commissioner Derthick further contended that the comprehensive American educational system was better than the Western European system, which limits higher education to the talented and thus creates an elite class. He said that many visiting European educators had agreed with his judgment.

"More than 50 years ago American parents decided that they would not give any person the right to close any doors to the future for their 11-year-old children," Mr. Derthick said. "They made this decision with a full knowledge of the system of education used in Europe—and of the social consequences of this system."

A Realistic Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, Saturday, February 13, 1960:

NO MAGIC FORMULA—A REALISTIC FARM PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has made it clear in a message to Congress there is no magic formula for giving American farmers all the prosperity they want and deserve. He pledged, however, his determination to work out the best possible farm program without claiming it is any panacea.

The Chief Executive promised Congress he would approve whatever it enacts within a framework which recognizes realistic price support levels and avoids direct Federal subsidy programs.

Mr. Eisenhower's message reminds us that in this election year there is certain to be considerable agitation over farm legislation and policy. So it is not too early to lay on the line some of the facts concerning this traditionally controversial issue.

Remember, when you hear Members of Congress criticize them, that the current price support and production laws don't represent Republican farm policy.

Basically, these laws date back to 1933. They were intended to meet the crisis of a worldwide depression. Their purpose was to help farmers by raising prices they received for food and fiber. The basic idea was to create an artificial scarcity.

Then at the start of World War II, this policy of a scarcity was reversed to meet food demands created by global conflict. Price supports were raised to a high level during the war emergency and their continuation for 2 years beyond the war was assured.

But—and here's where the trouble started—in 1948, 1950, and 1952, three successive Congresses failed to remove the wartime level of price supports, despite the original intention of a 2-year postwar limit. Hence production began to exceed demand. This is the root of our present farm troubles.

During 22 of the 26 years encompassed by this legislative history, Congress was controlled by the party now in the majority, the Democrats. The Republicans held party responsibility only during 1947–48 and again in 1953–54.

Thus virtually all present farm legislation governing price supports and production controls was written by the Democrats.

They apparently are satisfied with the present farm program, for they have the votes in Congress to change it and have not done so. Yet the Democrats complain about what they call the Eisenhower farm program and blame their favorite whipping boy, Agriculture Secretary Benson.

Remember these facts as farm legislation becomes an increasingly greater issue in the months ahead.

An Invitation to the Academy Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, out in California, we have two events that have become known to all Americans and all the world.

The first is the Festival of Roses and the Rose Bowl football game every New Year's Day. This occurs in my own hometown of Pasadena. Thousands come every year to see it. It is carried by radio and television throughout America and throughout the world.

And there is another annual event in our neighboring community of Hollywood. This, too, attracts the attention of the public in America and in the world. It is the annual presentation of the awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

These awards have put a new word into practically every language on earth. The word is "Oscar."

The time is near at hand for these annual Oscar awards. Yesterday afternoon, the academy announced its nominees for the various categories of the motion picture art. A winner will be selected from each of these categories. And these distinguished Oscar winners will then be revealed on Oscar night—Monday evening, April 4, over an NBC radio and television network.

The annual Oscar presentations are sponsored by the motion picture industry itself. Last year, more than 70 million people saw these colorful ceremonies in the United States and Canada. This year, the industry hopes to have an audience of 100 million in this country and Canada.

I want to extend an invitation to all my colleagues to join the millions tuned in on the Oscar show this year. It will start at 10:30 p.m., eastern standard time, and will last an hour and a half. It has always been a good show, and from what I know of the preparations now going on in Hollywood, I think I can assure you that this year's will be the best Oscar night ever.

Here are the nominations in the key categories for this year's awards:

Best picture: "Anatomy of a Murder," Columbia; "Ben-Hur," MGM; "The Diary of Anne Frank," 20th Century-Fox; "The Nun's Story," Warner Bros.; "Room at the Top," Romulus.

Best actor: Laurence Harvey, "Room at the Top," Romulus; Charlton Heston, "Ben-Hur," MGM; Jack Lemmon, "Some Like It Hot," United Artists; Paul Muni, "The Last Angry Man," Columbia; James Stewart, "Anatomy of a Murder," Columbia.

Best actress: Doris Day, "Pillow Talk," Universal-International; Audrey Hepburn, "The Nun's Story," Warner Bros.; Katherine Hepburn, "Suddenly, Last Summer," Columbia; Simone Signoret, "Room at the Top," Romulus; Elizabeth Taylor, "Suddenly, Last Summer," Columbia.

Best supporting actor: Hugh Griffith, "Ben-Hur," MGM; Arthur O'Connell, "Anatomy of a Murder," Columbia; George C. Scott, "Anatomy of a Murder," Columbia; Robert Vaughn, "The Young Philadelphians," Warner Bros.; Ed Wynn, "The Diary of Anne Frank," 20th Century-Fox.

Best supporting actress: Hermione Baddeley, "Room at the Top," Romulus; Susan Kohner, "Imitation of Life," Universal-International; Juanita Moore, "Imitation of Life," Universal-International; Thelma Ritter, "Pillow Talk," Universal-International; Shelley Winters, "The Diary of Anne Frank," 20th Century-Fox.

Best director: William Wyler, "Ben-Hur," MGM; George Stevens, "The Diary of Anne Frank," 20th Century-Fox; Fred Zinneman, "The Nun's Story," Warner Bros.; Jack Clayton, "Room at the Top," Romulus; Billy Wilder, "Some Like It Hot," Ashton Productions and the Mirisch Co., United Artists.

How To Turn Khrushchev Against Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting report written by C. W. Boldyreff who represents the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists.

The report follows:

HOW TO TURN KHRUSHCHEV AGAINST KHRUSHCHEV

In an effort to increase the spread of Communist propaganda and soften the resistence of the free world, Khrushchev has now launched his peaceful coexistence program.

To assure that the "cultural" exchanges, an important part of the peaceful coexistence program, will serve to enhance the interests of the Kremlin and be least of all beneficial to the cause of freedom, the Soviet Government has sought to make these a purely government-to-government operation. This permits the Kremlin leaders to control the exchanges to their own advantage.

Time and again, in his speeches in this country, Khrushchev insisted that honesty and good will should dominate the relations between his country and ours. He accused the American neswmen of an attempt to "revive the cold war" when they asked him embarrassing questions. He demanded that we should not "throw dead rats into each other's mouths", that "friendship and truthfulness" must characterize Soviet-American relations, and so on. Khrushchev also insisted that the Soviet Union is a truly democratic country, and that the Soviet press is responsible and free.

All of these Soviet propaganda statements must now be put to test. Indeed, it is time that we, private citizens, work to turn Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" slogans to serve the cause of Freedom. As in judo, we must seek to use the strength and weight of our adversary to work against himself.

There is a great variety of things which we, as private individuals, or groups of private individuals, could do to this effect. All of these acts must be legitimate, honorable, and constructive. Their purpose is twofold:

(a) To put the Soviet Government on the spot, and force it to live up to its "peaceful coexistence" promises in such fields as it cannot control;

(b) To open up thereby ligitimate avenues for the people of Russia to put an ever-mounting pressure against their own government for greater democratization of the regime.

Here is a concrete project in which any American citizen may engage, without any financial effort or particular physical exertion. This plan requires only three things of a person: His will, his sincerity, his understanding and faith in America.

UTILIZE THE SOVIET PRESS

We all know that a day seldom passes without an article appearing in the Soviet press which, in one way or another, disparages the United States or her people. But very few of us are able to see these things which are written about us.

The Freedom Fund, Inc. (a non-profit, tax-exempt organization), 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York 17, N.Y., is now engaged in translating such articles, and making them available to any American citizen on request. In reply to these untrue reports in the Soviet press, American citizens can write to the Soviet editors and demand the publication of their letters in the corresponding Soviet papers.

HOW TO MAKE THE SOVIET EDITOR COMPLY

Step 1: Obtain the necessary article or articles from the Freedom Fund. Then compose the letter to the editor. This letter must be factual, honest, and not aggressive. It should point out what inaccuracies appeared in the article, and note the true facts in each case. The letter should make ample reference to Khrushchev's statements about the principles of "peaceful coexistence." On the basis of these statements, and others about the alleged freedom of the Soviet press, the editor should be requested to have the letter published. There should be no criticism of the Soviet regime or communism in this letter, lest it be used by the editor as a pretext for refusing its publication.

It is likely that the editor will simply throw this letter into the wastepaper basket. If no answer is received from him and the letter is not printed (the Freedom Fund will check this fact), this will signal the beginning of step two.

Step 2: A new letter, enclosing a copy of the original letter, should then be sent to the editor. This should be a registered "return receipt requested" letter. In this letter it should be stated that the author attributes the lack of any reaction by the Soviet editor to the fact that "the original letter must have gone astray." A request for the original letter's publication should be emphatically reiterated. A statement should also be made to the effect that, in view of the apparently unsatisfactory postal service, a complaint is being sent by the author to the Postmaster General in Washington and to Premier N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Confronted with the danger of a reprimand from Khrushchev (for how can the editor know that the author is not a friend of the Soviet Union of the "Cyrus Eaton type"?), the editor will most probably write to the author. In his polite letter he will express his regrets that the original letter was lost, and offer some excuse for not publishing it at that time (if he does not publish it), such as that too much time has

elapsed since the original article appeared. He may suggest that if you write again in the future, he will show more consideration, which would provide you with valuable ammunition for any future campaigns of letter writing to his paper.

Step 3: The important thing, however, is that with the copies of the original article, the original and second letters, and the editor's reply, there are the ingredients of a newsworthy story which an American newspaper will use. In this connection the Freedom Fund can be of great help.

When the article in the American newspaper appears, send it, along with the other material, to Premier Khrushchev's office. The whole incident has by now developed into highly harmful publicity for the Soviet Union. For this is a most crushing exposure of the true nature of Khrushchev's "peaceful coexistence" propaganda. There are now good chances that the original letter will be published. It would be most enjoyable to see the commentary which would accompany the letter, trying to make the letter seem misguided and unimportant, for the editors would realize that most Soviet readers could perceive the uncomfortable position they had placed themselves in. The text of the letter itself, which would be read by loyal Communists throughout the U.S.S.R., could have an enormous impact upon their thinking.

We have seen the potential which can be realized by a single letter. If other people in this town, and other towns throughout America, were to begin a campaign of this kind on a really large scale, the results could be devastating to Khrushchev's one-sided truthfulness campaign. The Soviet editors would be simply buried under a torrent of rebuttals whenever they printed anything untrue about America. Not only would this make them far more cautious in fabricating their lies about America, but news of the campaign would leak out to the Russian people. And they, the Russian people, would themselves begin to demand to know what the people (not the Government or the Wall Street sharks) of America want to say to them.

Whichever course the Soviet Government takes, either refusing the people's demands and trying to keep the progress of the campaign secret, or yielding to the demands of the people and allowing more truth about America to come into the U.S.S.R., it will make the Soviet people more anxious than ever to be friendly with America, and more impatient than ever with the irritating, cumbersome restrictions which the regime places on their free travel and communications. News of the American people's truth and friendship campaign would be broadcast around the world, and everywhere, from Chile to Pakistan, the Communists would suffer embarrassment, as the United States made friends.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Obtain the Soviet articles from the Freedom Fund.

2. Write a polite, nonpolitical, factual letter exposing Soviet lies. There is no need to have your letter translated into Russian, for many Soviet newspapermen can read English. Try to get other people in your office, or friends in the neighborhood, to sign your letter, for a collective letter is obviously many times more effective than one signed by a single person. Any editor, Soviet or American realizes that he is dealing with a far more formidable adversary in a group, than in an individual.

3. Send your letter. Keep in touch with the Freedom Fund for additional guidance.

4. Pass on copies of the Soviet articles to other people, and ask them to follow your example. Encourage local clubs to participate.

This is only one of the possible avenues by which you may contribute to the weakening of Communist prestige, and help to release the opposition energies in the Soviet Union and enable the people to increase their pressure on the Communist leaders in a legitimate way. The Freedom Fund can offer other ideas.

When doing things like this, use your own imagination and ingenuity. You can help to develop still more effective plans. As a free people we have a tremendous advantage—we can think, talk, and act independently. In this epic battle between individual citizens and the giant totalitarian colossus, we must take the active part. We must launch a large-scale offensive. Remember, a bite of one mosquito, although detracting and somewhat irritating, cannot accomplish very much. But a swarm of mosquitoes, attacking simultaneously in a concerted effort, may fell an elephant.

C. W. BOLDYREFF,
Representative of NTS
(National Alliance of Russian Solidarists).

British Worry About Television Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "British Worry About Television Too," which appeared in the February 13, 1960, issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

BRITISH WORRY ABOUT TELEVISION TOO

Our cousins the British are worried about television too, but their worries are different from ours.

Over here we worry about quiz show fixes—or at least we did worry about them before we got to thinking about something else. We worry too about patent medicine advertising, about weird conglomerations of plumbing which are supposed to stimulate the human stomach, lungs, or nasal passages—about an overabundance of advertising about laxatives, body odor, and whatnot. These are minor gripes compared with those in Britain.

Our British cousins are upset these days over what their medical journal, Lancet, had to say about British doctors and their fears about what television viewing is doing to the human race. The physical effects, that is.

Because of the positions assumed by the viewer, some of the British medicos think watching television may contribute to heart disease, blood clots in the veins, and the protrusion of the stomach into the chest cavity. In addition, said Lancet, it is responsible for a cervical pain called "television neck."

This seems bad enough, but the indictment which appeared in Lancet gets worse, as shown by this quotation:

"Pressures exerted by the abdominal contents on the posterior part of the diaphragm could be transmitted to the heart and kink it forward—a distortion which, if prolonged and frequent enough, might be supposed to foster atheromas at this site."

Then, we are told, TV can arouse latent disorders into their full symptomatic fury. There are several forms of "acute television collapse," for instance, ranging from "simple faints" brought on by telecasts of surgery to severe chest pains; eye troubles and epileptic fits; aggravated behavior induced in psychotics.

As if all this were not enough, the British medical journal continues:

"Flickering of the apparatus has been known to initiate a fit in a susceptible epileptic. Furthermore, one doctor described a schizophrenic patient who manifested common automatism during commercial programs; an invocation to use certain hair tonic, accompanied by a demonstration, resulted in a patient scooping water from a nearby goldfish bowl and applying it to his hair."

Dreadful, all this, and we must say that we have never heard of such things in our own country, wretched though some of our programs and some of the TV advertising may be.

The worst television malady we know of in our country is boredom, though we heard of an instance or so in which a quick-draw practitioner shot it out with his set during a western. Even at that, the guy was having a good time.

One of the commentators, mulling over the dreadful picture presented by Lancet, said:

"U.S. television is not a statistically important hazard to public health and safety. Where British television seems to immobilize and hypnotize, American TV has the opposite effect, encouraging millions of Americans to get out of the house."

Let Us Build the First Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a thought-provoking article which examines the crucial question of world disarmament and remilitarization of Germany.

The article, "Let Us Build the First Bridge," which appears in the 1960 winter-spring issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., is most timely and stimulating in view of the disarmament negotiations. Its association of the German problem to the goal of world peace merits, I believe, most serious study and consideration.

The article follows:

LET US BUILD THE FIRST BRIDGE

Addressing the National Trade Council in New York last November, Secretary of State Herter noted that there was an overriding common interest on both sides of the Iron Curtain. "That interest," he declared, "lies in simply the basic will to survive, shared by freemen and Communists alike. I think the Soviet leadership is reaching a conclusion similar to ours—that unless the course of events is changed soon, both sides face unacceptable risks of general nuclear war which would approximate mutual suicide."

Seen in the light of the accelerating arms race, Secretary Herter's estimate of the alternatives confronting humanity is a down-to-earth challenge to all preachers of "world disarmament," including Mr. Nikita Khrushchev.

The neat and attractive disarmament package presented to the United Nations by the Soviet Premier last September may have had some propaganda value, but it did not disentangle the disarmament deadlock. Though replete with happy generalizations,

Mr. Khrushchev's "bombshell" offered little in the way of specific and reliable controls. Even those who were comforted by Khrushchev's "pie in the sky" proposition must have been quickly brought back to the real world when he boasted 2 months later that in one Russian plant rockets with hydrogen bomb warheads were being manufactured at the rate of 250 a year.

Statesmen have been negotiating on postwar disarmament for more than 10 years. As their programs to disarm become more elaborate and as their pleas become more passionate, the manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction gathers more speed. Though it is a spectacle that would warm the heart of the cynic, we can ill afford that luxury when human survival hangs on thin threads. We must be wary, too, of the "supreme optimist." Given the present state of world affairs, rent as it is by deep-seated suspicions, unabating conflict and the devious designs of the Soviets, it would be worse than stupidity for the Western democracies to lower their guard, because Mr. Khrushchev smiles. The "supreme optimist" tells us to "forget the past" and dump all weapons into the sea. The "voice of despair" urges us to build bigger and better bombs. In both cases the will to survive is diverted from seeking a real way out from the present impasse.

This is the time for urgent action based on the realities of current world conditions. The gaps dividing states cannot be closed in one fell swoop. It is only by constructing the first bridge that we can build the last. There are too many wounds, too many hatreds, too many disappointments in dealing with Soviet diplomacy that can be assuaged with the balm of universal disarmament slogans. The process of healing depends on how determined we and they are to remove the existing obstacles barring the way to understanding.

Today, in the heart of Europe a time bomb ticks away. Arms and armies continue to multiply and deploy their power. Launching pads for nuclear rockets are beginning to mark the landscape. Germany, the spawning ground of two World Wars, looms as the cockpit of a third, and perhaps the finale for mankind. It is precisely here at this major focal point of the cold war where opposing armies literally glare at each other, that the first gap can and must be bridged. To put it another way, meaningful progress toward universal disarmament is impossible if simultaneously the territory of Germany is transferred into a major "place d'armes."

As World War II came to its close, the allies knew that a remilitarized Germany would again bring to the fore all of the factors that could lead to a new catastrophe. Therefore, their common objective, embodied in official documents and statements, was to prevent the resurgence of Germany's military might. Now, the thing they presumably dreaded and tried to avoid is coming to pass before our eyes. Once more Germany's military power is rising and as its shadow grows, tensions and fears mount while governments begin all over again to jockey for favorable strategic positions.

Five years ago Prevent World War III examined the question of disarmament (see No. 46, 1955, "The Prerequisite for World Disarmament"). At that time we arrived at the conclusion that the universal ideal required an initially powerful impetus, i.e., a concrete move that would take the problem out of the realm of platitudes and promises and demonstrate to a war-weary world that the negotiators meant business. Thus, we proposed a Big Four agreement on Germany's military status based on the following principles:

(a) That both East and West Germany be permanently demilitarized under United Nations control.

(b) That the territorial integrity of East and West Germany becomes the responsibility of the United Nations.

(c) That the United Nations shall establish armed force contingents to be located in Germany and in the states bordering Germany for purposes of implementing that responsibility.

(d) That both East and West Germany shall pay in cash to the United Nations a sum in an amount roughly equivalent to the cost of any occupation forces, or any other forces, which would have to be sited on German territory for the protection of peace and the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. Such funds shall be employed to support the armed forces established by the United Nations for the protection of Germany's territorial integrity.

Perhaps the above proposals require modification of one kind or another in the light of present and future conditions. However, the principle of keeping Germany demilitarized has lost none of its validity or urgency. Indeed, the need is now all the more great because the time is fast approaching when no one will be able to keep the German Pandora box closed.

Even now the German claim for Wehrhoheit (the German term describing a country's exclusive prerogative to determine the size and disposition of its armed forces) has grown louder and more ominous. "In our opinion, the Federal Republic will never, in case of disarmament, submit to any other kinds of control than those to which all of Europe submits. If the Federal Republic were to submit to greater control, this would mean a political degradation which we cannot accept." (Chancellor Konrad Adenauer speaking before the Foreign Press Association, October 13, 1959.) The significance of Dr. Adenauer's categorical statement can perhaps be better appreciated in the context of his basic view on a Big Four summit meeting: "We are not prepared to accept any decision which did not conform with German interests." (Dr. Adenauer addressing a conference of the CDU, October 25, 1959.)

Shall world peace and security be held up by a German veto? Would it be politically "degrading" for the Germans to show the way toward broader disarmament and to prove her will to peace? Would the world be "dictating" to Germany by asking her to set an example, or would Germany be dictating to the rest of us by insisting on her right to restore her military power? Would German interests be violated if a summit meeting should agree at least in principle on the need to keep down Germany's military potential? Dr. Adenauer should answer these questions forthrightly, for the world must know where Germany stands on peace.

It is not vindictive to propose that Germany should be demilitarized. Germany owes it to mankind to do everything in her power to reduce the chances of conflict, just as the world owes it to the victims of World War II to secure a just and lasting peace. Indeed, Germany's own salvation lies in the plowshare and not the sword.

Obviously there can be no durable peace when the heart of Europe bristles with bayonets and nuclear weapons. Therefore, there is an underlying moral obligation on the part of all peoples, particularly the Germans to halt the arms race as its most sensitive point, namely in Germany itself.

What benefits would accrue to mankind if the first bridge were finally constructed and if Germany became a bulwark of peace?

(1) It would serve as a proving ground for a wider area of disarmament in Europe under U.N. control and inspection.

(2) It would provide the foundation stone for a general European security system.

(3) It would loosen the Soviet grip on Eastern Europe by doing away with the spectre of a remilitarized Germany.

(4) It would decrease Germany's ability to bargain with the Russians, to the detriment of Western security.

(5) It would pave the way for the reunification of Germany in peace and freedom.

(6) It could serve as a prototype for the demilitarization of other major areas of conflict and tension, i.e., the Middle East.

(7) It would encourage an international climate of good will and confidence and thus open new doors toward the ideal of world disarmament.

In his same speech before the National Trade Council, Secretary Herter said: "Even today, though the present arms race is dangerous beyond description, it still seems easier to continue on the familiar path than to try to break new ground." The "easier" path leads to a dead end. It returns us again to the awful scenes of World War I and World War II.

"Those who cannot remember the past," the philosopher Santayana said, "are condemned to repeat it." Is mankind fated to seal its own doom? This we cannot believe.

The Role of Military Assistance in Maintaining Peace With Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by Williston B. Palmer, general, U.S. Army, Director of Military Assistance, Department of Defense before the Women's Forum on National Security, Washington, D.C., on January 28, 1960, entitled "The Role of Military Assistance in Maintaining Peace With Honor":

THE ROLE OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN MAINTAINING PEACE WITH HONOR

(By Williston B. Palmer, general, U.S. Army, Director of Military Assistance, Department of Defense, before the Women's Forum on National Security, Washington, D.C., January 28, 1960)

Ladies and gentlemen, the theme of your forum is "Peace With Honor." No theme could better bring out the existing dangers to the security of the United States and what we can and should do to avert those dangers; as President Eisenhower described it in his state of the Union address of January 7, 1960, "the calamitous cycle of frustrations and crises which, if unchecked, could spiral into nuclear disaster, the ultimate insanity." The frustrations and crises have all been caused by threats directed at peace with honor, at peace with freedom, at peace with justice.

President Eisenhower also said in that message:

"Concern for the freedom of other peoples is the intellectual and spiritual cement which has allied us with more than 40 other nations in a common defense effort. Not for a moment do we forget that our own fate is firmly fastened to that of these countries; we will not act in any way which would jeopardize our solemn commitments to them."

To open the discussions of your forum, I have been asked to speak tonight on the military assistance program as a tool for

peace with honor. It is self-evident that our military assistance program is a tool for peace with honor. The question is how effectively the tool is being used. I believe that it is being well used.

There has probably never been a time when a report on that subject was more timely and appropriate. The U.S. Government has been conducting its military assistance program for some 10 years, during which the principal factors of military strength have undergone revolutionary changes; and accordingly during the past year there have been some searching reviews of the program. The results have by now been pretty well crystalized, and tonight I can summarize for you the present status of the military assistance program as brought out in exceptionally careful and thorough studies by exceptionally able and distinguished men.

Our military assistance program is not a private affair of military men; it is an instrument of our foreign policy. Military assistance is a part of our broad program of aid to foreign countries, which in total is called the mutual security program. Since it is an instrument of our foreign policy, the mutual security program, including military assistance, is conducted under the foreign policy direction of the Secretary of State. The whole broad mutual security program is flexibly designed to meet military threats where they exist and to contribute toward economic development among the nations of the free world.

It is to be hoped, of course, that our leadership in assisting underdeveloped countries toward a better standard of living and a richer life will in the long run produce great benefits for the entire world; but the position of the peoples of the free world at the present moment is a good deal like that of our pioneer ancestors who carried the frontiers of civilization westward across America—while they cleared the wilderness and planted their crops, they had to keep their rifles always within arms' reach. Military security is a prerequisite to economic progress, and it is the shield of common defense which permits the nations of the free world to pursue independence and economic growth in honorable peace. That shield of common defense, formed by the combined military strength of the United States and its free world partners, is in large measure the creation of the military assistance program.

It must be obvious to everyone that there is a close relationship between our military assistance to many countries and the availability to us of oversea bases for the deployment of our own advance forces and missiles; that our national security is strengthened by the collective security of our alliances, while reciprocally our allies are strengthened by measures primarily designed for the national security of the United States.

As Secretary McElroy said to the American Legion:

"We intend through our military assistance program to continue to build up the forces of our allies. These are the forces which in many parts of the world would have to take the initial brunt of an aggressor's attack. Dollars spent wisely on them will increase our limited war, as well as our unlimited war capabilities, and save us many dollars in our own defense expenditures. Our Joint Chiefs of Staff recently stated, with complete unanimity, that they would not want $1 added to our own defense expenditure if that dollar had to come out of our military assistance program."

Let me give you some figures that show what the Joint Chiefs of Staff were talking about. The total of all our major national security expenditures over the fiscal years 1951–59 was approximately $377 billion. Of the immense sum, the military assistance program got approximately $23 billion, about one-sixteenth.

About half of the $23 billion was spent during and immediately after the Korean war, when we were striving to strengthen our allies in a hurry. For the past five years, the expenditures on military assistance have averaged about $2,400 million a year. We believe that it will be necessary to maintain a level of spending of about $2 billion a year on military assistance for several years yet—I would not care to guess how many.

You understand that each of the countries to which we give military assistance has a large military budget of its own, and as far as possible we expect it to raise its own forces, feed, pay, clothe and train them, and furnish them with military equipment to the extent its resources permit. And, as the economy of each country has recuperated and become capable of carrying a larger burden, we have asked them to do so.

Some countries have become almost wholly self-sufficient and self-supporting; some we are assisting only with the most complex and difficult of ultramodern devices, which are either beyond their technical capacity or beyond their financial means; while at the other extreme some of our sturdiest and most important allies, like the Turks and the Koreans, are entirely willing to keep large forces in the field, and are immensely valuable to the United States and to the whole free world for that reason, but simply do not have the financial resources to arm, equip, and train such forces and keep them on the payroll without our assistance.

We should all realize that our assistance is forthcoming for reasons of our own national self-interest. Our national self-interest is best served by allies whose defense posture is adequate, whose self-confidence has become stronger, whose determination to resist has become steadily firmer as they have acquired the ability to protect themselves against the threats and probings of aggressors. Knowing that they do not stand alone but that the United States stands with them, they have not faltered nor fallen back when the going got tough.

Consider the inflexible courage with which Norway and Denmark have invariably rebuffed Soviet threats; consider the stanch replies of Greece and Turkey whenever they are threatened—and it is not infrequently.

Consider especially the fine manifestation of NATO's unity in the face of the threatening Soviet moves against Berlin a year ago. The Soviets have endeavored most persistently to split the NATO alliance asunder. They are always full of slogans about the liquidation of foreign bases. They have never been able to open up even a small crack in the bonds of collective security which our military assistance program has nourished.

The existence of NATO's fighting forces is attributable in large part to our military assistance program and is perhaps the single strongest bulwark against Communist aggression. It protects all of Western Europe—an area of more than 1 million square miles, with 270 million people, possessing many of the highest technical, managerial, and cultural skills of the world.

Or consider the effective response of the Chinese Nationalist forces to the attempted aggression in the Taiwan Strait in the late summer of 1958, a response made possible through equipment and training provided by our military assistance program.

Indeed, all around the perimeter of the Communist bloc, allied forces which the military assistance program has helped to train and equip, stand ready to repel Communist aggressions. These allied forces deter and contain Communist probes designed to test the free world's ability and will to resist. I say again that, by the calculation of our own self-interest, the military assistance program has been an effective tool in giving us peace with honor.

In November 1958, President Eisenhower appointed a committee of very eminent private citizens, under the chairmanship of William H. Draper, Jr., to make an "independent, objective, nonpartisan analysis of the military assistance aspects of our mutual security program * * *." The committee gathered an extremely able staff, and over some 9 months examined the subject very thoroughly. Following a series of interim reports, the committee made its final report last August.

Considering the mutual security program as a whole, the Draper committee saw no competitive relationship between our military and economic assistance and did not consider that the military assistance program is too great in relation to the economic aid and development program.

The committee concluded that the mutual security program has played a significant role in deterring a third world war, in keeping many nations free, in supporting our strategic system of alliances and oversea bases, and in providing hope for economic progress among the peoples of the less developed countries.

The committee found:

That the military assistance program has provided cohesion, strength, and credibility to our collective security arrangements. It * * * has been one of the principal instruments abroad supporting our foreign policy objectives.

That is provided a large part of the weapons, material, and other support which made possible the rearmament of Europe. For the past decade further Communist encroachment in this vital area has thereby been denied, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization continues as an essential security bulwark of the free world.

That it had achieved the strengthening of the nations around the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

That the military assistance program had influenced a shift in current Communist tactics from direct military aggression to subversion, propaganda, and economic offensives.

As to the future, the Draper Committee concluded that the necessary average level of expenditures that should be marked for military assistance over the next few years is not likely to be less in general than that required in the recent past. A moment ago I remarked that the average expenditures over the past 5 fiscal years have been at the rate of $2,400 million, approximately, and that we believe we must continue to spend at least $2 billion annually for some years to come. I am not sure that this nonpartisan committee of eminent private citizens would not favor a rate of spending somewhat higher than that, but they did say specifically that the appropriation last year should be for $2 billion. The Congress actually appropriated $1,300 million.

The Draper Committee recommended that the military assistance appropriation should be placed in the Department of Defense budget, in competition with the appropriations for our own Army, Air Force, and Navy, rather than in competition with appropriations for economic assistance, such as the Development Loan Fund and funds for technical help.

The detailed conclusions and recommendations of this Committee of eminent citizens would fill several pages, too much to cover in full here, but I can say that the Department of Defense has moved promptly to strengthen the administration of the military assistance program along the lines the Committee recommended. One of the first measures taken was to project the planning of the program 5 years into the future. The object of this is to provide a long-range, time-phased schedule of actions by areas and by countries, intended to assure that the furnishing of military assistance directly supports the U.S. military and foreign policy objectives.

At the same time, the planning of the military assistance program has been very much decentralized to the unified commanders of the U.S. Armed Forces in oversea regions, particularly to our commander-in-chief in Europe, our commander in chief in the Pacific, and our commander in chief in the Latin American area. It was felt that control had become too much centralized in Washington.

The Draper Committee also felt that too much time elapses between the day when the Congress passes the military assistance appropriation and the day when the money gets into the hands of the man in the executive branch who is to use it. The considerable number of Government agencies which have a legitimate say in how and where we shall use the military assistance tends to slow things down. Nevertheless, spurred by the Draper Committee, much improvement has been made already and I believe there is good ground for hope that next year we may put the money to work within the time limits the Committee recommended.

And last, the Defense Department adopted the Draper Committee recommendation that there should be in the Defense Department a Director of Military Assistance who would have full responsibility for the operation of the program. That position, as it turned out, fell upon me, and here I am.

Taking all these measures together, they obviously effect a major change in the whole management of the military assistance program. I have just moved in this month, but of course like any U.S. general I have had a good deal to do with military assistance in many earlier assignments.

We embarked on this program 10 years ago in a time of extreme danger and urgency, and like all emergency programs, in the early years, it had to be executed before it could be well planned.

During these 10 years, thousands of dedicated people have worked their hearts out to make the program work in spite of all handicaps. Perhaps the most characteristic difficulty has been countries offering to raise forces beyond their actual capacity to raise, and take on modern weapons and equipment far beyond their actual capability in technical and mechanical skills—while neither they, nor we on the American side, knew—or could know without years of investigation—what they really could handle. The world would not wait for us to spend those years investigating. The program had to proceed anyhow. Nobody has been more aware of these problems than the people who were sweating to make the program work. I have seen their efforts and I take off my hat to them.

There has been a steady improvement in the management—I have been in Europe during the past 3 years and noted a great improvement during that time—and when Mr. Draper came over to explain the task of his committee and what help they would want from us over there, I thought it was the most timely thing I had ever seen. There had been a lot of self-improvement and it was now time for suggestions from some distinguished outsiders.

As I have reported to you, the committee found the military assistance idea entirely sound and more than that—essential. They supported and recommended continuance of the level of spending in recent years, and made some excellent suggestions which the Defense Department has moved promptly to put in effect.

There remains one area which greatly disturbed the Draper committee. I their very first report they recommended "that every effort be made within the legislative and executive branches of the Government to bring clearly before the American people the relationship between the mutual security program and the national interest * * *"

And in their final report they said:

"Now, after much further study, we reemphasize the importance of this effort. The average American citizen does not now relate his own security to the effectiveness of the military and economic assistance programs. * * * He is aften unable to acquire a personal feel of the intensity of the cold war—of the deadly seriousness and growing strength of the Soviet threat. It is essential to bridge this gap of understanding."

They urged a major, sustained effort to make available to the public all the facts about the program; and * * * "that unjustified attacks upon the program be answered publicly, promptly, and forcefully."

You ladies and the 15 patriotic organizations you represent could undertake no greater service at this time, could make no greater contribution to the security of our country, than by undertaking to spread the facts on this program and convince the public that this program should be fully supported by annual appropriations. Make them understand that the military assistance appropriations are a part of the cost of our national security just as much as the Army, Navy, and Air Force funds. Make them realize that this program is designed to protect the future of your children and your children's children. I beg you to consider how your organizations can tackle this job, and then go home and get them behind it. You ladies have the strength to shake the world, and if you use it for this cause you will have served the Republic well.

Books for Friendship in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting report written by C. W. Boldyreff, who represents the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists. The report follows:

BOOKS FOR FRIENDSHIP IN FREEDOM

Just as we are curious about the Russian people, so are the Russians about us. They are eager to know the truth about the people of America, their way of life, their beliefs, their aspirations.

There are three principal sources to which the ordinary Soviet citizen may turn for information about the United States. These are—the vituperous Soviet propaganda, the Voice of America, and the books written by American authors for American readers translated into the Russian language.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA

Through years of experience, Soviet citizens have learned that the main objective of the Soviet papers, radio, TV, movies, and so on, is to sell the party line. Although they have mastered the art of reading Soviet papers "between the lines," nevertheless, the continuous hammering about the "evils of capitalism," the "vile designs of the Wall Street sharks," and the like, still leaves a certain impression on the large, less educated masses of the people. But most important is the fact that the Soviet propaganda machine is least of all inclined to tell the truth about America, unless it is disparaging and harmful to the prestige of the United States.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

The broadcasts of the Voice of America as a rule are strongly jammed. Today this jamming is selective (statements considered as harmless by the Soviet censors are permitted to go through, but anything that arouses their suspicion is strongly interfered with by powerful jammers).

Yet the Voice of America is listened to fairly eagerly in Russia, but mainly to hear the other side of the story, which, too, is accepted by the Russian listeners with a considerable amount of "salt." Having developed a well-justified attitude of distrust for their own government's propaganda, the Russian people are apt to be quite sophisticated whenever any official propaganda is concerned. They accept it as a government strategem, designed to achieve a certain political goal. Hence its truthfulness is questioned. "Every propaganda frog is bound to praise his particular swamp," concludes the Soviet citizen in his skepticism.

AMERICAN BOOKS

The only source of information which the people in Russia readily consider as truthful are the books written by American authors translated into the Russian language. These the Russian people read avidly.

The selection of American books in Russia is quite extensive, and they are published in very large numbers. But what are these books? In the first category are novels and stories penned by American Communists and all shades of fellow travelers. The second category consists of the "protest" works of such authors as Theodore Dreiser, Upton Sinclair, Lincoln Steffens. Included here is Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin," for example, and Sinclair Lewis' "Babbitt." It is no wonder, then, that many Russian people sincerely believe that the social, racial, economic, and political conditions in America have hardly changed since the 19th century.

Good, honest books by contemporary American writers must be made available to Russian readers. The Soviet Government, of course, will never translate and publish them. It is our job to find the means and ways to have them translated, published, and distributed in Russia.

Here is a concrete plan on how this could be achieved by private citizens' efforts:

SELECT THE BOOK

The first step is to select a truly representative book. It could be a novel, a biography, an autobiography, a travelog—any form of literary endeavor, but it must be, first of all, expressive of the spirit of America. It must be entertaining, truthful, and well written.

Groups of students, women's clubs, various civic or community groups, church congregations, service clubs, should set up committees to determine first of all what elements the books should have to be considered truly representative of the aspirations and beliefs of the people of America. When the general character of the book is outlined, individual members should be requested to do the necessary reading in search of such books.

Finally the committee selects one book of the several proposed.

APPROACH THE RUSSIAN PUBLISHER

When the book is selected, the committee approaches the N.T.S. publishing house, either directly ("POSSEV," Merianstrasse 24-a, Frankfurt/Main, West Germany), or indirectly, through: Freedom Fund, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N.Y. Constantine W. Boldyreff, 2528 McKinley St., North Arlington, Va.

The N.T.S. and "POSSEV" have among their members several outstanding Russian authors and journalists. Some of them are also proficient in the English language, and they are capable of producing a first-class literary translation.

An estimate will be made by "POSSEV" of the approximate cost of translation and publishing of the book in the Russian language.

It should be noted here that, in view of the purpose of this project, "POSSEV" is willing to handle the job (translation and publishing) at cost price. (Tentatively, as a figure for orientation, a book with about 200 pages of the regular 5½ x 8½ format could be published for around $3,000, giving 5,000–6,000 Russian copies).

RAISING OF FUNDS

The two principal elements are now available; the book and the translator-publisher. The only problem remaining is to obtain the—perhaps—$3,000. A drive should be made among the members of the group concerned. This will produce the total amount, or but a fraction of it, depending on the financial potential and size of the group. If this is a group of students—the amount collected among them would probably constitute but a token sum.

When the drive is finished, and if the amount of money collected is insufficient, the committee should approach one of the various private foundations. There are a number of organizations which would gladly contribute the required amount for this important educational project. The committee could also inform the local community through newspaper, radio, etc., and solicit its help. There are many other ways by which a worthy project can be assured of the necessary financial backing, particularly when the capital needed is so modest.

DISTRIBUTION IN RUSSIA

When all of the elements (book, translator-publisher, funds) are at hand, the group informs "POSSEV" to go ahead with the translation. A copy of the translation will be submitted to the group for perusal and comments before the print is set.

At the same time, the group issues a press release, and approaches individual journalists, radio commentators, and similar people to ask that they inform the American public that several thousand copies of the selected book will soon be available from this group for American tourists planning to visit the Soviet Union, to be distributed as souvenirs to Soviet citizens. A modest price could be quoted, if it is desired to cover the publishing expenses (for example, if part of the capital was borrowed), or to create a revolving fund for further book publication.

In 1959, about 10,000 American citizens travelled in the Soviet Union. Unless conditions deteriorate considerably, an even greater number will visit Russia in the months to come. The great majority of American tourists were anxious to take along with them something they could leave with their new friends in Russia as souvenirs. Could there be a better souvenir than a good entertaining, and honest book about this country?

Many thousands of Soviet citizens visited Western Europe, and some even America, last year. Many more are expected to come this year. These books about our country could be given to them as goodwill gifts all over the world. N.T.S., which has members in many parts of the world, and many groups in this country which welcome Soviet visitors, could joint together in this cooperative effort.

EFFECT OF THE CAMPAIGN

To estimate the impact of this campaign, let us mentally trace the effect one such book could produce in 1 month in Russia. A book given to a Soviet citizen, in the span of 1 month, will be read by approximately five persons. Considering the novelty of the material, it is likely that each of these people will set out to comment upon it in detail to approximately 10 or more other people. And these people, in turn, will comment upon the book's existence to many, perhaps 10 or 20, or their own friends. Thus, in 1 month, a single one of these books could bear some effect upon the thinking of a thousand Soviet citizens. Its effect would be comparable to that of a stone throw into a pool of water. The first circle around the spot of impact would be relatively small but sharply delineated. The subsequent circles, while growing in size, would decrease in intensity. With reasonable luck, the life of this single book could be several years, in which it received far more than the normal wear and tear.

REACTION OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

Under the present conditions, a book that is not critical of the Soviet Union, and contains no anti-Communist propaganda, cannot be confiscated from an American tourist by the Soviet Government. Since the idea is to publish a book of an American writer, designed for American readers, and dealing with matters purely American, the Soviet Government, paralyzed by its own "peaceful coexistence" propaganda, will not be in a position to do anything so long as the book is in the hands of an American citizen. When, however, it gets into the hands of a Russian, he himself will take the necessary measures of precaution to keep it away from the eyes of the undersirable elements. Remember that, even though the State Department magazine "Amerika," which is circulated in exchange for the Soviet "U.S.S.R." publication in this country, is not on sale on newsstands in Russia (it is available mostly on subscription to carefully screened readers, or could be bought in two or three specially authorized bookstores in Moscow), individual pages of this magazine are being sold for tens of rubles on the black market—such is the great thrist of the Russian people to learn the truth about the United States.

It should be added here, that the possession of such a non-political book is not illegal in Russia today, even by a Soviet citizen. However, people know how sensitive is the Communist government to their reading of uncensored literature, and this is the reason why they are so particularly eager to peruse it, and so skillful in hiding it from unsolicited attention of the party supervisors.

There is no need to stress the great importance of the promotion of better understanding and sympathy for America in Russia, but this plan also has an important educative significance for ourselves.

In the process of selecting the right book, we ourselves will start thinking of what is the message of America, what is the most precious of her treasures. While engaging in this creative effort, not only shall we strive to learn more about the Russian people, about the formidable problems which face the world today, but we shall also gain a better understanding of the great all-human purpose of those who have laid the cornerstone of the unique social-economic structure which the world knows today as America.

C. W. BOLDYREFF,
Representative of NTS (National Alliance of Russian Solidarists).

A Poetic Approach to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Edith E. Brown of Cedar Rapids has a rare talent in presenting a poem to present a basic idea. How wonderful it would be if her poem could be made reality without self and fear:

HOW LONG, OH, LORD
(By Edith E. Brown)

The nations met together.
Each one sent their best
To represent them in this conference;
Those who had stood the test
Of wisdom and of magnanimity,
For both were needed.
Together these must rule, or else,
Destruction.
All the distinguished delegates were of one mind
In one respect;
All were agreed
That peace must be attained,
All realized omniscience, almost,
Would be required
To solve the multifarious problems
With justice and with mercy.
Peace was in their hearts,
Peace was their purpose.
Not a peace imposed by numbers or by force,
Not a peace depending on servility,
Nor peace that bribes could purchase.
It must be peace
That hurt no nation's pride,
That left no nation needy;
That announced, and felt, respect for every man
Of every race and creed.
Could it be done?
It could have been.
But there were two persistent devils who crept in
To those peace-loving hearts,
Self and Fear.
So they qualified proposals;
So decisions were postponed,
And peace again retired.
Self and Fear.
When those two devils shall be overthrown
We shall have peace.

Antarctic Continent Territorial Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Military Order of the World Wars, dated October 28, 1959, with a letter to the editor printed in the Washington Post on October 22, 1959, signed by E. A. Kendall of Washington, D.C.:

RESOLUTION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Whereas, over a great number of years the United States has sent exploring expeditions into the Antarctic and American citizens have explored parts of this vast continent; and

Whereas the Antarctic Continent is rich in mineral deposits and strategic in its location; and

Whereas the United States has made no announcement of territorial claims in Antarctica while other nations have laid claim to all but 25 percent of its territory; and

Whereas a proposed treaty with 11 other nations includes a freezing of the status quo relative to territorial claims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Military Order of the World Wars, assembled in national convention in Detroit, Mich., this 15th day of October 1959, urge the U.S. Government an-

nounce its rightful claims and assert sovereignty over areas of the Antarctic that have been discovered and explored by official expenditions of the United States of America and its citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be wired to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State.

CLAIM THE ANTARCTIC

The U.S. public debt is nearing $300 billion. Income taxes are abnormally high. The United States has spent over $50 billion in aid to other countries since World War II. The United States has never yet claimed her antarctic territories.

Her taxpayers have spent $250 million in the antarctic just in the past few years; and during her total of explorations there the United States has paid for vast territories in lives, effort, and tax funds. After a study of these figures, and a study of the U.S. relationship to the Antarctic beginning 138 years ago, one can understand why the leading patriotic societies, some civic groups, and some veterans' groups have taken the position that the United States should definitely lay claim to the great rich tracts that she has earned in the Antarctic.

The kindest thing the United States can do for the world right now is to gird herself economically. There would be no benefit to the world, especially the smaller nations, if the United States impoverishes herself by abandoning any plan to claim her rightful antarctic territories very soon.

The world realizes what splendid work American explorers have done there. There would be no question of imperialism or expansion in connection with the United States making her rightful land claims in Antarctica because her work is well known and her boundaries have been fairly well defined after each expedition as most almanacs show.

The Antarctic Treaty Conference now under way has as its highly commendable themes the maintenance of peace and scientific cooperation there. As far as peaceful purposes and a welcome to scientists from afar may be concerned, these two factors have flourished in the United States since 1776 and there is every reason to think this country would operate her rightful antarctic territories under the same high standards.

Thus, American organizations have voiced their favoring proper U.S. territorial claims.

E. A. KENDALL.

WASHINGTON.

Grants for Sewage Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing amounts of grants which would be made available to the several States for construction of desperately needed sewage pollution control works under three different proposals.

The first is the President's budget proposal of $20 million, a clearly and grossly inadequate proposal which by no means will attack the problem of pollution of our rivers and streams with its accompanying health hazard and economic loss to farmers, business, municipalities, and its tremendous attendant danger to human life.

The second column shows the amount of grants available under Public Law 660 if the full $50 million is appropriated. This amount is about half that required to stimulate a sufficient growth in State and municipal programs.

The last column shows the amount of Federal grants to the several States under the conference report on H.R. 3610 of $90 million.

According to experts in this field this amount of grants will stimulate a sufficient rate of construction of sewage abatement works to clean up the foul, disgusting, and polluted rivers of this country.

I hope my colleagues will study these figures, especially insofar as their own States are concerned, since the President has vetoed H.R. 3610.

The table follows:

State allotments for grants for construction of waste-treatment works, fiscal year 1961

	President's budget	Present program	New program
Total	$20,000,000	$50,000,000	$90,000,000
Alabama	448,890	1,122,225	2,020,005
Alaska	170,650	426,625	767,925
Arizona	223,870	559,675	1,007,415
Arkansas	403,670	1,007,675	1,813,815
California	819,460	2,048,650	3,687,570
Colorado	252,000	630,000	1,134,000
Connecticut	247,770	619,425	1,114,965
Delaware	137,270	343,175	617,715
District of Columbia	180,260	450,650	811,170
Florida	360,146	900,350	1,620,630
Georgia	450,780	1,126,950	2,028,510
Hawaii	213,000	532,725	958,905
Idaho	235,570	588,925	1,060,065
Illinois	702,280	1,755,700	3,160,260
Indiana	419,530	1,048,825	1,887,885
Iowa	354,570	886,425	1,595,565
Kansas	301,030	752,575	1,354,635
Kentucky	431,260	1,078,150	1,940,670
Louisiana	387,160	967,900	1,742,220
Maine	255,560	638,900	1,150,020
Maryland	303,800	759,500	1,367,100
Massachusetts	440,650	1,116,625	2,009,925
Michigan	567,000	1,417,500	2,551,500
Minnesota	372,130	930,325	1,674,585
Mississippi	469,500	1,173,750	2,112,750
Missouri	423,910	1,059,775	1,907,595
Montana	211,440	528,600	951,480
Nebraska	271,030	677,575	1,219,635
Nevada	143,200	358,225	644,805
New Hampshire	213,110	532,775	958,995
New Jersey	445,630	1,116,575	2,009,835
New Mexico	235,520	588,800	1,059,840
New York	1,090,190	2,740,475	4,932,855
North Carolina	507,500	1,268,900	2,284,020
North Dakota	255,410	638,525	1,149,345
Ohio	663,960	1,661,900	2,990,820
Oklahoma	342,500	856,400	1,541,520
Oregon	265,110	662,775	1,192,995
Pennsylvania	839,650	2,099,125	3,778,425
Rhode Island	217,790	544,475	980,055
South Carolina	413,770	1,034,425	1,861,965
South Dakota	258,560	646,400	1,163,520
Tennessee	448,750	1,121,875	2,019,375
Texas	687,170	1,717,925	3,092,265
Utah	236,910	592,275	1,066,095
Vermont	218,010	545,025	981,045
Virginia	414,180	1,035,450	1,863,810
Washington	310,130	775,325	1,395,585
West Virginia	347,070	867,675	1,561,815
Wisconsin	394,890	987,225	1,777,005
Wyoming	181,190	452,975	815,355
Puerto Rico	471,570	1,178,925	2,122,065
Virgin Islands	329,350	823,375	1,482,075

Roseburg, Oreg., High School Students Plan Friendship Tour to Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about people-to-people relationships. Today it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce that the members of the Roseburg High School Spanish Club, Los Conquistadores, hope to be active participants in the growing field of personal diplomacy. The students are working to raise the necessary $2,000 to charter a bus which will take them to Nogales, Hermosillo, and Guaymas, Mexico.

They have earned enough in their special projects to get there. They hope to have the cash for the return trip by the time school ends. The Roseburg School Board has approved this trip. It will be well chaperoned and is directed by Mr. Berton M. Bailey, who teaches Spanish at the high school.

The students intend to pay their own expenses which Mr. Bailey tells me will be modest because of the help being given the club by the Mexican Chamber of Commerce and the department of education. Nevertheless, there still are expenses to be met.

The students plan a variety of work projects. These include car washes, rummage sales, a candy sale, and a Mexican dinner. I know the candy is good because my staff and I received a box from the students. A special cover on the box read "Your purchase will help us take the friendship tour of Mexico." That message was prominently displayed on the cross-country trip from Roseburg, Oreg., to Washington, D.C. I understand the Mason Candy Co. helps students help themselves by making the candy available at a special rate.

I commend the members of Los Conquistadores for their project. I hope they are establishing a pattern which other student groups will follow.

I have brought their project to the attention of the very able and personable Ambassador Representative from Mexico to the Council of the Organization of American States, my friend Vicente Sanchez Gavito.

Persons interested in the project of Los Conquistadores could secure more information by writing directly to the club. I would be happy to relay ideas or thoughts to the students.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include at this time a newspaper article about the project and a portion of the letter I received from Mr. Bailey:

SPANISH CLUB PLANS TRIP—MEXICAN GOAL SET BY ROSEBURG GROUP

"Mexico, here we come."

With this idea in mind approximately 45 Roseburg High School students, who are

members of the Spanish Club, Los Conquistadores, will work toward the goal of a trip to Mexico.

Spanish Club students have received the approval of the school board for a trip to Mexico during June, providing enough money can be raised to finance the expedition. A total amount of approximately $1,600 will be needed in order to make the 10- to 15-day trip possible. If enough money is not raised, then the trip may be delayed for a year or perhaps the money may be spent for travel scholarships which would enable some students to make the trip.

MONEY PROJECTS EYED

As to how the students plan to raise the money—well, they're going to work for it. A candy sale and car wash have already been planned and other fund-raising projects will take place later.

The money which they earn will be spent for chartered bus fare. Each student will pay his own lodging and food expenses while on the trip.

The Mexican Chamber of Commerce and the Department of Education in Mexico are working together in making plans to provide for the students. In some cities the students will stay in private homes of Mexican students. In others they will stay in hotels.

As to the route for the excursion this is the tentative plan: Enter Mexico at Nogales and then proceed to Hermosillo. There they will visit the University of Sonora and the state capital. From Hermosillo they plan to go to Guaymas, which is located on the Gulf of California.

While on their trip, the students hope to see old museums, churches, different cities, and possibly a bull fight.

STUDENTS LIKE IDEA

Naturally the students are sold on the idea of a trip but there is a purpose behind this expedition. The advanced Spanish students will have the opportunity to visit a foreign country, which they otherwise might not visit. A better understanding of the way of life and the system of government in Mexico would be gained. This trip could make for better international relations and would definitely be of educational value.

The trip will be well chaperoned and be under the direction of Spanish instructor Berton Bailey. He has traveled, studied, attended school and lived in Latin America.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT,
ROSEBURG SENIOR HIGH,
Roseburg, Oreg., February 16, 1960.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: Under separate cover I am sending you on behalf of the members of the Roseburg Hi Spanish Club (Los Conquistadores) a box of their Friendship Tour to Mexico candy. I think you will be interested in hearing about this fine project being undertaken by the Spanish students to further their knowledge of Spanish and a Spanish speaking country, while at the same time trying to further friendly relations between Mexico and the United States. And I might add that the students are dead serious about the latter point.

By various work projects, including candy sale, Mexican dinner, car washes, rummage sales, etc., these students are attempting to raise $2,000 to charter a bus to Nogales, Hermosillo, and Guaymas, Mexico, at the close of this school year. At the present they have enough money to get there—and in the next few months they hope to earn the return fare. Each student will pay his own expenses which will be very modest because of the help being given us by the Mexican Chamber of Commerce and the Department of Education. But as you can see, this is still quite a project. And I think that it is indicative of the community spirit of Roseburg in spite of the destructive blast.

If you recall your visit to Roseburg last fall, these are some of the same students to whom you spoke late that day. They are most active in their interest in Latin America.

Sincerely yours,

BERTON M. BAILEY,
Spanish Teacher.

Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, sometimes words can be expressed better in poetry. Using our God-given abundance more fully to help people is my goal. Mrs. Brown's poetry tells the story well:

SURPLUS?
(By Edith E. Brown)

Surplus?
Is no one hungry?
Surplus?
No!
Impossible to grow
More food than needed
While one child says, "Please,"
Or one aged heart agrees
To die so prices may be kept just so.

Surplus?
Why
Should children cry
For food, and mothers weep
While we pay storage tax to keep
Luxury prices at parity?

Surplus!
Oh!
It must be so
The world could find a way
Of distribution, so all needy may
Honestly share . . . without charity.

REJECTION SLIP AND REPLY
(By Edith E. Brown)

"Sorry we must refuse
The quotation from BHAVE,
Though the thought is good.
It seems inappropriate to use
His words, when his religion
Is more religion of philosophy
Than one of deeds.
Ours, as you know,
Is more than one of creeds."
Oh!
Did you ever go,
Barefoot and thirsty
Along dusty roads;
Meagerly fed and scantily clothed,
Nothing to call your own but love
For needy thousands?
Day after day, month after month,
Using that love to say
"Share."
Finding your love pure and unselfed enough
To make others care . . . and give,
As BHAVE did?
Granted, his deeds are not the same as ours,
But are they less or of less worth,
When thousands with no choice but beg or starve
Now have their tiny fertile plots
With harvests enough to feed their own;
And yet the rich man is not poorer.

The Agricultural Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD certain excerpts from a bulletin entitled "Perspective" issued last December by the investment management department of Calvin Bullock.

This material in an objective way gives a summary of the conditions in agriculture which to me strongly call for passage of legislation to repeal farm subsidies and return to the law of supply and demand.

The excerpts follow:

Agriculture has in 1959 been one of the few soft spots in an economy which in toto has been establishing new all-time records. The Department of Agriculture has recently reported that for the first three quarters of this year realized net farm income was at the seasonally adjusted annual rate of $11.2 billion as compared with $13.1 billion for the same period of 1958, representing a decline of almost 15 percent. * * *

In the report of the Department of Agriculture pointing out that net farm income in the first three quarters of this year was down 15 percent on an annual rate basis, there was also included a forecast that a further decline is expected in 1960, but of much smaller proportions than the drop occurring this year. In view of the fact that 1960 is an election year, it is certain that in the months ahead increasing attention will be given to the so-called farm problem. Back in 1952 it was stated in this publication: "* * * for the past two decades the American farmer has been living in what has been called 'the protective embrace of Government,' a position which has been rather unanimously solicited and continues to be fiercely protected by legislative representatives of agricultural constituencies." This statement is every bit as applicable to the current situation as it was 7 years ago. And, unfortunately, a solution to the problem seems no nearer than in 1952. * * *

The continuing protective embrace of agriculture by Government is evident from the composition of the Federal budget for the fiscal year ending June 1960. Expenditures for agriculture are estimated at $5,996 million, or approximately 6 percent of the total budget. In 1952 Federal expenditures for agriculture were $1,045 million, or 1.6 percent of the total. Furthermore, between June 30, 1952 and October 31, 1959, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in surplus farm products has increased from $1,437 million to approximately $9,200 million. However, this accelerated aid to agriculture in the form of price support loans or outright purchase by Government, has in the current year been quite ineffective in reversing the downtrend in farm prices and incomes. * * *

Between 1949 and 1958 farms in operation have declined from 5,722,000 to 4,749,000—a drop of 17 percent. Farm population in the same interval has fallen from 25,954,000 to 20,827,000, or by 19 percent. Furthermore, it has very recently been announced that the 17th Census of Agriculture, now underway, may reduce the number of farms by about 500,000 as a consequence of a more precise definition of just what constitutes a farm. This revision of the basic agricultural

statistics will also probably remove about 4 million persons from the last total of farm population.

Farmers' income from nonagricultural sources has increased from $5,200 million in 1949 to $6,200 million in 1958, or a gain of about 19 percent. Farming is, of course, a highly seasonal business, and in recent years increasing numbers of farm people have found opportunities to supplement their earnings from other sources. It is estimated that the typical farm wage earner spends about 216 days a year in farmwork, whereas farmers engaging in nonfarm occupations spend about 62 days a year in that activity.

This combination of a decline in the number of farms (accompanied by an increase in size) and the total of the farm population, together with the increase in income from nonfarm sources, has made the per capita figures on farm income look very much better than the absolute totals. Specifically, per capita net income of the farm population from all sources has increased from $767 in 1949 to $1,066 in 1958—a gain of about 39 percent.

The problem of surplus-crop production continues, but it should be remembered that this surplus output is confined to a relatively few products—primarily wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco. Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that the big price declines in 1959 have been in livestock rather than in crops. Livestock production moves in rather clearly defined cycles, and, although an early change in the present trend is not likely, the problem of excessive hog and cattle population is much more susceptible of solution than the problem of crop surplus, which, to a certain extent, has been perpetuated by an unrealistic level of price supports.

Finally, it is obvious from some of the preceding statistics that the impact of declining farm prices and income on the total economy is much less today than when farmers accounted for 25 percent of the population, and farm income accounted for over 10 percent of the national income, as compared with 1958 ratios of 12 percent and 4.7 percent, respectively. This is a proposition which will hardly be espoused in legislative councils, but it is, nontheless, an economic fact.

Retirement Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald of February 20, 1960:

RETIREMENT NIGHTMARE

Everywhere in its travels around the country, Senator MCNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging heard anxiety expressed by older citizens as to how they would pay for medical care in their retirement. How can anyone with foresight, old or young, fail to be anxious about this problem? While a man is employed, he can enjoy the protection of some sort of group or private insurance program to cover medical and hospital bills if he becomes ill. The chances are, however, that when he retires he will no longer enjoy such protection; yet this is the time, obviously, when he will need it most—when, indeed, he is certain to need it sooner or later, which is what makes the cost of such private insurance prohibitively high for the aged.

The McNamara subcommittee came to the conclusion that this problem "should have top priority for legislative consideration in 1960" and recommended in its report an expansion of the system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include health service benefits for all persons eligible for OASDI. We think this conclusion is inescapable. The essence of it is embodied in the Forand bill which would cost about $1 billion a year to be financed with one-fourth of 1 percent increase in social security taxes. Like other old age benefits, this would be paid for by a citizen throughout his wage-earning years, with a matching contribution by his employer. It would relieve retirement of one of the worst of its nightmares.

That the American Medical Association would offer its usual doctrinaire opposition to this proposal was as much to be expected as a bill from a doctor after a visit to his office. Senator MCNAMARA has observed that the AMA had "nothing to offer but tired abuse." This is not, by the wildest flight of the most neurotic fancy, socialized medicine or political medicine. It is simply a system, if the AMA could but calm its nerves enough to realize it, which, like Blue Cross or Group Hospitalization or any other insurance program, would enable a patient to go to the doctor and the hospital of his choice and pay the bills resulting from the care he needs in old age. It would help doctors, hospitals, and medicine in general. And it would enable American men and women to retire in their old age with more security and self-respect.

Scents, Cents and Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest explanations of the water pollution control issue now before Congress is contained in the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 19. I recommend that all Members of Congress read the editorial prior to the vote on Thursday to override the President's veto of H.R. 3610.

The editorial follows:

SCENTS, CENTS AND SENSE

President Eisenhower now has before him a bill which appears to have the enthusiastic support of nearly everybody except his own Bureau of the Budget. This is the pollution control program which Congress has just sent to the White House and which has the dubious distinction of facing this year's first presidential veto. It seems incredible that a veto should even be considered a possibility for a program of such proved merit and of such self-evident importance to the health and safety of the Nation—especially when the Potomac's foul waters offer immediate witness to the need for cleansing our sewage-laden rivers.

Consider the impressive record of the existing program. In four years, $163 million in Federal funds has helped finance 1956 projects with a total estimated cost of $938 million—a ratio of $4.70 in local participation for each Federal dollar. Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, author of the legislation, contends that no other Federal grant program can match this extraordinary record of stimulating the kind of local initiative that the President so frequently admires.

This performance helps explain why the pollution program has won so many converts event among State officials who once expressed reservations. State sanitary engineers and water pollution control administrators are virtually unanimous in urging continuation of the program at $90 million a year for 10 years. The League of Women Voters is firmly in support of the Blatnik measure, along with a host of civic and conservation groups. Even the President's own Federal Pollution Control Advisory Board has praised the existing program and has urged the Administration to support the kind of legislation now before Mr. Eisenhower.

In years past, the administration itself favored pollution control aid on a scale comparable to the Blatnik bill. But the counsel of save-now, pay-far-more-later has since prevailed. Surely the President ought to examine the merits of the program carefully before envisaging a veto which all Republicans—Mr. Nixon especially—would find difficult to justify in months ahead.

Tossing Away 20 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the February 9 issue of Chicago's American, in my opinion, is a most interesting and enlightening editorial which I am including in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

TOSSING AWAY 20 PERCENT

You think it's pretty nice that the Federal Government is distributing $9½ billion in grants-in-aid to projects in the various States this fiscal year? That old dream exploder, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, says it isn't so nice; it's one of the important reasons why your income tax load keeps getting heavier.

In an address on this subject in the Senate last week BYRD introduced arithmetic into the discussion—an action which is regarded by many Members of Congress as a dirty trick. And BYRD's arithmetic showed that when the Federal Government makes these grants it is only giving the taxpayers back some of their own money—and charging them 20 percent as a sort of service charge.

The taxpayers lose one-fifth of their money by paying it over to the Federal Government and then getting it back in Federal grants. The 20-percent deduction is spent on Federal administration of the money, which means it is used to pay the salaries and expenses of Federal payrollers.

The payrollers wouldn't be needed if the States and local communities were permitted to keep this tax money at home and spend it themselves.

As BYRD pointed out, the grants-in-aid programs keep growing in number. There were less than half a dozen in 1933. In the present fiscal year [1959] there are 60 such grants to the States, involving expenditures of $6.4 billion, besides the 30 programs under which Federal money is paid directly to individuals, such as payments to farmers for their surplus crops and for not raising things. These will cost $3.1 billion

this fiscal year bringing the expenditures up to $9.5 billion.

Another billion will be added in fiscal 1960 by the Federal aid to education bill passed by the Senate last week if it is passed by the House and President Eisenhower should fail, for any reason, to veto it.

Also, as BYRD predicted, this will start the Nation's schools well on their way toward being controlled by the Federal Government, "with maximum extravagance and minimum efficiency."

Exchange Students Between East Harlem and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 11, 1960, I was pleased to attend a dinner meeting at La Guardia Memorial House, located at 311 East 116th Street in my congressional district. La Guardia Memorial House is named after the famous Fiorello La Guardia, who represented my district many years ago and was the mayor of the city of New York for a period of 8 years. This institution is a central meeting place for all groups of people and a traditional landmark in New York City. This meeting of February 11 was attended by the leaders of the Puerto Rican and Italian-American communities. The leading priests and representatives of the major churches in the area and prominent labor leaders also gathered at this display of unity.

In the past, New York newspapers have proclaimed that tensions existed between ethnic groups residing in the East Harlem area of New York, and that gang rumbles and fights were the result of this seething conflict. On the assumption that a better understanding between these groups and an interchange of aspirations and ideas would eliminate the friction, community leaders gathered this year and initiated programs designed to promote better understanding and intergroup relations.

One of these programs was to send seven outstanding boys of Italian origin from East Harlem to Puerto Rico during the Christmas holidays at the expense of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico would likewise send to our area a similar group of young men in an exchange visit. The young men, who were selected by the church organizations, the schools, and civic organizations, went, saw, and reported. They were chosen because of their outstanding records as leaders in school and community affairs. They left for Puerto Rico on December 26 and returned January 1, 1960. Their observations and experiences were described to the audience by its spokesman, Mr. James Siniscalchi. His talk was a highlight of the evening. The boys who visited the beautiful island of Puerto Rico were: Anthony Bencivenga, David D'Aversa, John Munafo, Joseph Proto, James Siniscalchi, Louis DeRosa and Lawrence Totaro.

The cochairmen of these intergroup activities are the Honorable Manuel A. Gomez, judge of the magistrate court, and Edward Corsi, director of the La-Guardia Memorial House and former industrial commissioner of the State of New York.

During the evening Fortune Pope, editor and publisher of the Il Progresso, and president of radio station WHOM, sent a message through his capable and personable managing editor, Frank Cantelmo. His words reflect the spirit of the meeting and the aspirations of the community leaders who substitute distrust with friendship. I believe that the readers will enjoy Mr. Pope's remarks as much as I did hearing them. His talk follows:

I am delighted to greet you on behalf of Mr. Fortune Pope, editor and publisher of Il Progresso and president of radio station WHOM, who regrets he was unable to attend your dinner meeting tonight and who asked me to represent him. Perhaps the best way to express his feelings is to tell in his own words the thoughts he would have communicated to you had he been present tonight.

Americans of Italian origin in this city and State, who represent the largest single nationality group, desire the friendliest possible relations with all other ethnic groups in our community. They harbor no prejudices and no hostility toward any group. As regards the great mass of Spanish speaking peoples, Italians feel a kinship greater perhaps than with any other nationality group, because they have so much in common. This kinship is based on race, religion, and other common factors all of which serve to create indissoluble ties of friendship and neighborliness.

Mr. Pope was quite happy to participate in the mission of the seven Italo-American boys to Puerto Rico and he was delighted to present Vincenzo Gemito's statue of Columbus to the Governor and the people of Puerto Rico as a symbol of how much, particularly in the exploits of Columbus and the discovery of America, our two peoples have contributed to the greateness of this country. Mr. Pope was also happy to hear from the representatives of Il Progresso in Puerto Rico about the warmth with which these boys were received wherever they went and particularly by the Governor, by Commissioner Sierra, who is here with us tonight, by the mayor of San Juan and other spokesmen of Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rican people themselves who did so much to make these boys feel at home. And these stories appeared regularly in Il Progresso and were broadcast over the facilities of radio station WHOM.

Italian Americans, moreover, being themselves among the latest arrivals in the great migration of Europeans to the United States, and having still fresh in their memory the hardships and difficulties of settling in a new strange land, can understand far better than many others the plight of the Puerto Ricans in this difficult period of adjustment to continental American life.

Much has been said and written concerning the relations of Italians and Puerto Ricans in this city. But despite some bigoted extremists in both groups, Italians and Puerto Ricans are working and living together, side by side, in the same shops and factories, in the same restaurants and hotels, in the same labor unions. They are united in the struggle for a higher standard of living, better working conditions and a greater share in the well-being and prosperity of America.

In all sections of the city they live as neighbors—real neighbors. East Harlem is typical in this respect, and this joint neighborhood meeting—in which those of us of Italian background and you from the beautiful island of Puerto Rico break bread together and share common democratic ideals of fair play and social justice—represents to the greatest degree, the spirit of our common relations.

We wish the Puerto Ricans in this city the best of luck. We extend to them all the cooperation of which we are capable. Mr. Pope, together with Il Progresso and radio station WHOM, assures you that we shall do everything in our power to promote the friendship which is the prime objective of your committee.

As Americans of Italian origin, we feel strongly the Italian heritage of Columbus and that he should be so honored by all peoples. We are not unaware, however, that without the support, the finances and the contributions of Spain, Columbus might never have realized his dream of the New World.

In this connection let me say that Mr. Pope—as president of the Columbus Citizens Committee, which organizes the annual celebrations, together with the city of New York, in honor of Christopher Columbus—is hopeful that some way can be found to include in this huge demonstration, an active participation and representation of the Spanish community.

These are the sentiments of Fortune Pope, which I have had the privilege of communicating to you. For me (I also share these sentiments) this has been a gratifying task, because I am sure that the sentiments of Fortune Pope will do much to foster better understanding between our two peoples.

I thank you.

Two Federal Employees Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker. All too often, those of us who work so closely with laws and proposed laws, with paragraphs and policy statements, are apt to forget those who are serving our Federal Government on the local level.

Last Thursday, the Federal Business Association of Detroit paused to honor two of these Federal employees who have done a remarkable job for the Detroit area, for the State of Michigan and for our Nation.

These men have demonstrated outstanding ability, imagination, and devotion to duty. They are a credit to all of our Federal employees in all 50 of our States.

Mr. Fred W. Kaess was named "Outstanding Federal Administrator of the Year." He is U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan. Recently, the Attorney General of the United States commended his office as being one of the best administered U.S. attorney's offices in the Nation.

The reasons for this recognition are many. The backlog of pending cases was considerably reduced. The office

also vigorously prosecuted those who had flouted Federal law, while at the same time he and his staff were equally diligent in protecting the rights of those who were innocent.

Mr. Carl Hauck, executive housekeeper of the U.S. Public Health Service hospital at Windmill Pointe, received the honor of being named "Federal Employee of the Year."

As head of the housekeeping department, Mr. Hauck is in charge of the cleaning and laundry work at the hospital. This responsibility also involves all of the auxiliary buildings and nine doctors' residences.

He has been officially recognized by the Public Health Service for his outstanding qualities through several letters of commendation, outstanding performance ratings, and superior accomplishment awards from Division Direcors up to the Assistant Surgeon General. He takes exceptional pride in the general appearance and cleanliness of the hospital grounds and has done much to make this hospital an excellent one in every respect.

May I extend to these two loyal Federal employees my heartiest congratulations for the honor which has been bestowed upon them, and I urge my colleagues to take note of their accomplishments.

More Grassroots Opinion on Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the pastor of a church near my home writes me as follows:

Was heartened by the news in the Bremerton Sun the other evening in which you are recommending that Government get out of the price support program and related meddling in farm problems. I hope you will continue on this road—it may be difficult for farmers in the transition, but in the long haul the farmer would be better off left to work out his own problems.

Attached to the letter was a clipping from Christian Economics of February 9, 1960 which contained the following under the caption of "Do you know":

That one rice producer got a Government crop support check of $5,369,078 and another $1,331,723? Other rice checks were in excess of half a million dollars.

That barley price support checks exceeding $1 million to each farmer have been paid, that checks to dry bean growers are in excess of half a million dollars each, that wheat checks are in that category and soy beans, oats and other crops only a little less? How apt Will Rogers' reminder, "We ought not spend money we haven't got for things we don't need."

That 67 farmers received checks of $50,000 or more for withdrawing land from production, much of which would not have been farmed in any event? Two thousand four hundred and forty-two of these soil bank payments were $10,000 or more.

That, not including heavy interest, deterioration or transportation charges, storage costs for agricultural surpluses are running more than $1 million a day?

What Will Be Connecticut's Place in a Changing World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to look over the 1960 report to the people of Connecticut from the founders of the University of Hartford. This is the newest university in a State which has a long and distinguished record in this field.

All of us know, I think, how great an interest the American people are taking in the educational future of the country. Within a few short weeks, I hope we will have a chance to consider constructive aid to help keep open the opportunity for higher education to all those qualified.

The University of Hartford is an outstanding example of the way in which a community, through voluntary effort, can help meet this problem. This university was formed of three components which had been serving the people of Hartford County and the State. It set its goal, recruited people of proven ability to go about meeting them, and selected outstanding leaders for the working staff. To be its chancellor, the university's board chose Vincent Brown Coffin, a distinguished citizen, a graduate of Wesleyan University, a fine executive and administrator, and a man equal to the task of matching the university's goal with its performance.

Today, more than 10,000 students attend classes of the university, between 8 o'clock in the morning and 10 at night. Some 736 courses of high quality are offered, in the same pattern as such Connecticut schools of earlier establishment like Yale, Trinity, and Wesleyan. But what makes the University of Hartford unique is that 70 percent of its students hold jobs other than their studies. They are employed in 1,000, large and small, business, industrial, and professional firms, throughout Connecticut.

These students are fine examples of American men and women. They live at home, commute to college classes, and earn a substantial part, or all, of the cost of a college education while learning.

The University of Hartford is now constructing a new 150-acre campus. More than $13 million has been voluntarily contributed toward this necessary expansion. All of the money goes into instructional facilities. Heading the expansion program are Alfred C. Fuller, head of Fuller Brush Co., and 229 additional founders who are leaders in Connecticut life.

I would call you attention to the University of Hartford as an outstanding working model of how our American people can meet their problems by their own initiative. With the help of benefits that have been wisely written into the law to encourage, or, as the farewell message of our first great President admonished, promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge, the university will, I am confident, continue to grow. I include such benefits as tax exemptions and assistance which may have been or will be authorized to support facilities and scholarship in the public interest.

The university demonstrates the example of young people solving, through their own labor, the problem of financing a college education.

It shows educators solving a problem of increased costs by offering higher education while students live at home, thus saving about one-half the cost of college education away from home.

It shows business and industrial leaders contributing time, guidance, and leadership to solve the problems of expansion.

For all of us there is inspiration in this brilliant example of people working together.

The significance of this achievement, I think, is best stated in the report itself by Austin D. Barney, chairman of the university building and development committees.

Mr. Barney is a public-spirited citizen of first rank in the environs of Hartford. He is chairman of the board of the Hartford Electric Light Co., and he has participated willingly and vigorously in his lifetime in many civic and charitable causes. I know he feels that this University of Hartford program is one of the most important. I believe his statement concerning Connecticut's place in a changing world is a succinct summary of the role of the university and should be reprinted here:

WHAT WILL BE CONNECTICUT'S PLACE IN A CHANGING WORLD?

(By Austin D. Barney, chairman, University Building and Development Committees and chairman of the board, Hartford Electric Light Co.)

When Archimedes said, "Give me a lever and I will move the world," he might well have been referring to Connecticut.

The small State in which we live, only one twelve-thousandth of the earth's surface, has on more than one occasion changed the world's course. Eli Whitney's application of interchangeable parts to industry, for example, may have won the Civil War. And in World War II Connecticut, through both the resourcefulness and might of its manufacturing economy, earned the designation Arsenal of Democracy.

Simultaneously, one of the Nation's smallest States reached the top in average family income, as well as the highest income on a per person basis.

These achievements do not "just happen." In Connecticut's case the skill, resourcefulness, and energy of its people applied to manufacturing, insurance, and business were the "secret weapon" producing great benefits for our people.

Time changes. The world we live on revolves once every 24 hours. Automation, atomic energy, medicine, and scientific breakthroughs hurry the pace of change. Industrial know-how is no longer limited to the United States.

Let us be frank with ourselves: If Connecticut is to continue as the State with the highest average family income in the richest Nation of the world, we must meet, overcome, and ride abreast of the change around us.

How can we do this?

First, let us acknowledge that we never would have achieved our present prosperity on the basis of the State's oil, iron, uranium, or other natural resources. We don't have them. It is—and always has been— the special kind of people ("Connecticut Yankees," Mark Twain called them) who by their brains and brawn forged to the top of the heap.

People identical in quality are with us today. They have the moral fiber, thrift, muscle, and intellect to produce. But all around us—not only in Connecticut—we find that musclepower is losing to brainpower.

You see it daily in industry: production lines in Connecticut are nonexistent. Go see for yourself: small teams of men operating machinery in copper and brass plants; scientists and technicians in 358 research laboratories around the State; craftsmen building faster-than-man computers that function because of preciseness.

What is the "lever" by which we shall "move" this new world and maintain our present high prosperity?

We can sum it up in three words: trained brain power. Willingness and muscle energy are not enough. It is mathematicians, psychologists and artists Connecticut industry needs—physicists, metallurgists, chemists, and engineers.

How do we propose to get them? Obviously, from youth now around us and the population explosion projecting 46,000 Connecticut students in college by 1965.

The question of how education for these people is to be financed is crucial. The University of Hartford has committed itself to the traditional American way—community support through voluntary subscription and student support through proper tuition charge. The decision is based on far more than tax savings. In the university you have a student body studying harder than ever before—70 of every 100 students are holding jobs in addition to their studies—students attending evening school for 8 years to obtain a degree.

One realizes how proud we should be of today's young Connecticut citizens.

For these self-sacrificing, ambitious individuals the University of Hartford offers education of the highest quality. The knowledge they acquire is almost immediately transmitted into the Connecticut economy for today's University of Hartford students work in 1,000 large and small business and industrial firms throughout Connecticut. Alumni are, of course, an entirely separate and much larger group.

To work, a man needs tools. Once it was the ax, then the saw and then the wheel. Today it has become the computer, test tube and formula.

For today and tomorrow, education is the key. It is the key to better tomorrows that the University of Hartford offers for 2½ million people now and close to 5 million Connecticut people in the year 2000.

Castro Dances to Moscow's Tune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the question whether Fidel Castro is a Communist is by now academic. He is serving their purposes well, giving the Communists free reign to carry on their propaganda, to infiltrate, and organize for the takeover in Cuba in due time. Castro, more than anyone else, has enabled the Communists to penetrate into the Western Hemisphere almost at our doorstep. He does not have to be a Communist. He dances well to Moscow's tune.

The longer we wait, the more entrenched he will become in Cuba and the more difficult it will be to dislodge him. In the meantime, he is doing everything possible to convert the friendly Cuban people into enemies of the United States. Although I do not believe he will succeed in this effort, we have seen it happen in other countries through lies and propaganda.

I believe the time for action is now, and it is for this reason that I introduced my bill, H.R. 10570, which calls for a reduction of Cuba's sugar quota by the amount she will export every year to Soviet Russia. This action on our part would remove a major economic prop from the Castro regime and would also serve as a reminder to Castro that we will not tolerate his flirtations with the Communists and thereby endangering the security of the Western Hemisphere.

In this connection, I am inserting into the RECORD a series of three articles on the current situation in Cuba as published in the New York Mirror, February 21, 22, and 23, 1960, and written by Mortimer Davis and Harry Altshuler:

CUBA LOOMS AS REAL MENACE TO UNITED STATES

(By Mortimer Davis and Harry Altshuller)

(What's going on in Cuba? Is Fidel Castro pulling the strings—or is he the puppet of other hands, behind the scenes? A new look at our troubled neighbor is in order—for a clear understanding of what's going on could be vital to all of us. Here is the first article of a Mirror series viewing Cuba's revolution and what it means.)

This time it's different.

That is the one point of agreement among all those in the United States who have cast an anxious or even a casual glance down toward our small but explosive neighbor, Cuba.

You can't write Fidel Castro's revolution off as just one more of those typical Latin-American temperamental upsets in the government, when the outs become the ins, the ins take it on the lam 'til next time, and life goes on as usual with the vast bulk of the people.

This revolution is more than a year old now. The shape of it has been emerging, disquietingly.

More and more, Americans are seeing sharp problems. Few or none mourned the passing of the corrupt Batista regime, so Castro started off with all the goodwill in the world. Friendliness seemed the natural attitude to show, and the natural expectation, originally, was that Fidel was a reformer with aims and objectives along the lines of our own democracy.

It is clear now that this was a miscalculation.

How grave?

Is it as bad as some fear—that we will look up one day into the face of the enemy, grinning at us over a stockpile of missiles on our doorstep?

A lesser matter—but still an embarrassing and dangerous one—could be the possibility of Cuba voting with the Soviet block in the United Nations.

Our Government has been walking softly, speaking in quiet, even tones, even offering quick and humble apology to Castro for something like the private-plane bombing adventure he protested last week, though the United States obviously had no responsibility for it and seeks to halt such incidents.

In the face of this attitude, it is increasingly disconcerting to hear the shrieks about "Yanqui imperialists" rising louder and more frantically.

Are we, one wonders, being used as the "whipping boy," to take the blame for everything wrong with Castro's grandiose and dreamy plans?

Or—an even darker possibility—is what we hear not the authentic voice of Cuba, but a ventriloquist with a detectable Russian accent making all that noise?

There is more than noise going on, too. The recent Cuban visit of shrewd Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, one of Russia's top horse traders, proves that.

Only now is the size of the deal he set up being glimpsed.

Russia will buy Cuba's sugar—at a price a lot lower than the United States pays for it. In return they'll send machinery, tools, manufactured articles. We can't help wondering, what sort of articles? Not MIGs, Castro says. Guns? Who knows? But, without a doubt, along with these articles will come technicians, teachers, propagandists, Communist apparatniks.

If the Reds have their way in Cuba, what far-sighted Americans fear is some manufactured incident, perhaps involving the lives of 6,000 U.S. citizens living on the island, which would force Uncle Sam to step in, however reluctantly. Before all the world, the Red propaganda machine would brand this country as the "imperialist aggressor," treading on the little fellow.

The first big question, then, becomes the flat one: "What's the truth about Fidel? Is he a Communist?"

We have an answer to it, given recently by Gen. Charles P. Cabell, deputy director of our Central Intelligence Agency, in testimony before a secret session of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

About Fidel, he said:

"Our information shows that the Cuban Communists do not consider him a Communist Party member, or even a pro-Communist.

"On the other hand, they are delighted with the nature of his government, which has allowed the Communists opportunity to organize, to propagandize, and to infiltrate.

"We know that the Communists consider Castro as a representative of the bourgeoisie, and were unable to gain public recognition or commitments from him during the course of the revolution.

"It is questionable whether the Communists desire to recruit Castro into the Communist Party, that they could do so if they wished, or that he would be susceptible to Communist discipline if he joined."

The general summed up his conclusion: "Fidel Castro is not a Communist; however, he certainly is not anti-Communist."

What, then, are the Communists up to?

"Their primary interest," General Cabell told the Senators, "is to influence Castro in favor of an aggressive, 'anti-imperialist' nationalism supported by non-Communists, but which will defend the rights of Communists to express their views openly and engage in legal activity. In their attempt to influence Castro, the Communists are known to be utilizing five principal channels."

Cabel listed these channels as:

1. Close associates who are known pro-Communists: those include Castro's brother, Raul, and Reaul's pal, Ernesto (Che) Guevara, head of the Bank of Cuba, a notorious Argentine Communist who flaunts a Red star on his cap.

2. Trying to guide the policies of the government and the 26th of July movement, the revolutionary forces, by getting sympathizers appointed to key jobs.

3. Seeking to implant elementary Marxism as the political philosophy of the nation, to replace Castro's own personal ideas.

4. Propagandizing the Cuban people endlessly through their newspapers, radio and television programs, faking news and hiding truth.

5. Organizational activity among peasants, army men and labor.

So, through longtime personal friends such as Maj. Pedro Diaz Lanz, who headed Castro's air force in the struggle against Batista, have sworn Fidel is an out-and-out Communist, we can discount these personal reactions and accept the sober CIA evaluation:

"Castro is not a member of the Communist Party and does not consider himself to be a Communist."

But where does that leave us? The subcommittee chairman asked the question this way:

"To say the least, the Communist movement has made very great progress in Cuba since Castro took over, has it not?"

"That is correct," General Cabell answered. "Yes, sir."

PEONS ARE HAPPY—FOR THE MOMENT

(By Mortimer Davis and Harry Altshuler)

(Promises are one thing—performance is another. How is Fidel Castro's Cuban revolution working out? Where is it pointing—and what dangers for the Cuban people, for ourselves, and the rest of the free world are becoming evident? Here is the story of what's happening on the island, in the second of a series of Mirror articles.)

The length and breadth of Cuba, the little fellows, the peons, love their hero, Fidel Castro.

Isn't he giving them what peasants the world over have always craved, a bit of land to call their own?

Yes, indeed, one must agree.

But note the tricky wording. They can "call" it their own. And that's just about all they can do with it—except work it as their fathers did before, for the landlord.

As for ownership, real ownership—that's a laugh, though a sad one, for there is nothing funny about people deceived in their aspirations.

The Agrarian Reform Law of Cuba was published last June 3. It banned large landed estates, called latifundios, and laid down the rule that, with certain exceptions, the largest landholding permitted to a person or a corporation should be 1,000 acres.

How it works was outlined several months ago to the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security by an expert in this sort of land reform: Joseph Zack Kornfeder, a former member of the Communist apparatus who was in charge of efforts to organize some of the Latin-American countries. Stalin's purges disillusioned him and he broke with the party in 1934.

"Land distribution," he pointed out to the subcommittee, "had been done in many countries before communism heard of it—but when the Communists use it, it is not an honest reform; they simply use it to ride into power, and once they are entrenched they take the land away. They sort of play the game of Indian givers.

"Now, the pattern that Castro has been playing," he continued, "is similar to that of the Communists, because his land reform, which I studied quite thoroughly, does, and proposes to do, a tremendous job in expropriating, but he does not distribute the land to be fully owned by the peasants. He gives it to them—and at the same time tells them they cannot sell it, cannot buy land, cannot mortgage it.

"Only the state, and what they call the cooperative system, or collectives, can do such things by permission of the authority created under his law, which is an authority entirely under the control of Castro who, on the basis of this law, is the absolute boss of it."

Questioning brought out further points: The peons are required to work the land, the state can take it away from them if they don't; they cannot turn it over to a tenant to farm.

The new occupant can't even make his own decisions on what to plant, where to sell it, or how much to ask for it.

As for the privilege of conveying the land to his children by inheritance—all it amounts to is inherited serfdom, not ownership.

The way Kornfeder summed it up was, "The state becomes the owner—and the new boss, of course, is a worse boss because, as John L. Lewis at one time said, 'I prefer a boss who is not a jail warden at the same time.'"

Head of Cuba's Agrarian Reform Institute, which was set up to carry out the land distribution, is Antonio Nunez Jiminez, not on record as a card-carrying Communist, but a man whose actions follow the party line consistently. Much of the thinking in the institute appears to stem from Dr. Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, editor of the Communist newspaper Hoy.

"The Communists are a part of Castro's revolution," Rodriguez bragged last May. "We are not participating in the actual government," he disclaimed, "but we are participating in the revolution. If you will read our program—written in 1956—you will see the coincidence between the program of the Castro revolution and the Communist program."

The institute has been spreading out, reaching into everything it can lay a tentacle on. Its accounting is invisible—nobody knows how much is being taken in, how much is spent, and who gets it. It's a situation bound to arouse, and justify, suspicion.

For instance, it took over a dredge and tugboat owned by a U.S. citizen, worth $500,000. No authorization, inventory, or receipt was issued. No protests have been heeded. Getting far away from the fields, it even took over the Havana sales and service office of the Otis Elevator Co.

A 23-year-old named Julio Caseres, fresh from school in Mexico, walked in as manager, boss of the staff of 200 persons. His qualifications? He is a friend of "Che" Guevara, Communist head of the Bank of Cuba. The Otis company hasn't been expropriated; merely, as they say now in Havana "intervened." This means it still belongs to Otis—but Otis has no say in the management and gets no part of the income. This puts ownership on the same level with the peons who are told they "own" their farms.

United Fruit Co. has property worth about $32 million in Cuba, spread over almost 149,000 acres, which it has been informed is subject to expropriation. Sugarcane lands will not be taken before the 1960 crop is in. Cuban officials said graciously, but already cattle properties and reserve lands totaling 22,000 acres, worth $2,500,000, have been "intervened."

And even this has not been done in accord with Castro's intervention law, the company reported to its 90,851 American stockholders recently. The company is battling the seizure in the Cuban courts—so far without result.

The big King ranch in Cuba, 35,000 acres, was taken over last November, except for 1,666 acres which the owners were allowed to retain. The land taken will be paid for on Castro's terms—with 20-year Cuban bonds calling for 4½-percent interest.

Much the same thing is happening to other enterprises. Huge losses for stockholders are inevitable. Careless, inexperienced handling undoubtedly means bankruptcy and chaos, eventually, for many of the intervened enterprises.

At this moment, however, that means nothing to the little fellows. What they care about is that they used to get two meals a day, if they were lucky; now they get three meals. It's practically paradise.

The Agrarian Reform Institute has opened stores, across the island, with cutrate prices for countrymen. For their necessities they are paying only half as much as they had to pay before. Their rents have been slashed, often by half. Are they going to worry, at this stage, whether the landlords can stay in business? Hardly.

And yet they are on the path which can lead only to disaster of one sort or another: bankruptcy their children will have to pay for, at higher rates than the current 3-percent wage tax and 4-percent voluntary contribution to buy arms for the nation; or utter chaos, which will give the Reds their chance to step in as rescuers and grab everything.

CUBA'S BOSS WALKING A TIGHTROPE

(By Mortimer Davis and Harry Altshuler)

(Every day, more disquieting news comes out of our troubled neighbor, Cuba. Big-time Soviet trade deals, government control over all private enterprise, denunciations of "Yanqui imperialists." What does it all mean? Is Cuba going Communist? Here is the final article of a Mirror series based on top-level evaluations now being made by concerned quarters in Washington.)

Havana—the glittering Havana of the free-wheeling, free-spending American tourists—is a dead city these days.

There are so few tourists that the shoeshine boys split up jobs; when they can find a customer, two boys share the work. Each shines one shoe.

A see-the-sights taxi ride around town that used to cost $20 can be had for a mere $5 now, so hungry are the cabbies for business.

The extravagant luxury hotels built in Batista's day are almost empty of guests—but they are fully staffed, as usual. Nobody can be fired.

From a naive point of view, this is "protecting the workers"—but anybody except an economic illiterate can see it must lead to bankruptcy in short order.

Situations like this—and the hotels are only one example of many—set the stage for the new Cuban law promulgated over last weekend, bringing all private enterprise under direct government control.

The just-announced law sets up a central planning board to supervise and coordinate the entire business and economic life of the nation. It will make rules by which every business must abide—or be wiped out. Fidel Castro will head the board, but, significantly, one of its other members will be the notorious Communist, "Che" Guevara, who already holds many of the economic strings in his grasp.

Is this what Fidel Castro has been aiming for all along—and does it mean the sovietization of his country? Will it become part of the big Red bloc?

This is the question that worries Washington. For clearly we could not tolerate a bastion of world Communist power on our doorstep.

Careful evaluations of all the information streaming into Washington indicates Fidel himself is not a Communist—either in his own or the Communists' view.

But he thinks he can use the Communist—and they think they can use him.

He is a man on a tightrope. One false step, one miscalculation, and the balancing act comes to a tragic end. The Reds are confident he will fall to the left.

Meanwhile, they keep moving into spots of power. They have "Che" Guevara, the powerful head of the National Bank of Cuba, who keeps a tight grip on export-import affairs and is strangling trade with the United States to the extent that even the familiar American cigarets are getting rare. Russian cigarets are becoming common.

What the tourists don't see is how the Communists have taken over in the middle levels of leadership. For instance, the labor union, which they are turning into instruments of party discipline.

Early this year Jesus Soto, the pro-Communist director of the Cuban Confederation of Labor, got a law rammed through giving him power to purge any officer of an affiliated union whom he considered counter revolutionary.

Promptly, under attacks from the Communist newspaper Hoy, all the leaders who had fought the Communists in the trade union movement, and had beaten them in elections, were tossed out.

David Salvador, well-known Red who is secretary-general of the labor confederation, blandly told one union, the Association of Cuban Theatrical Artists, that they had to get rid of their anti-Communist president, Manuel Fernandez, or be thrown out of the confederation. The actors reaffirmed support of Fernandez, but he knew his time was up—he resigned in order to save the union, then took refuge in the Chilean embassy to keep from being jailed.

In order to hire or dismiss any person, a private business needs an authorization from the Ministry of Labor—whose boss is militantly pro-Communist Augusto Martinez Sanchez.

That has meant, in effect, that anybody who wants to get a job has to sign an application for membership in the Communist Party as his basic credential.

Such a situation suits the Communists. As long as they can keep it going this way, they feel no need to try to push Castro aside and take control in their own name.

In spite of all the power the Communists hold, it seems there is only one government in Cuba today and that is Castro himself. The Reds are quite content to let him stand out front. He's going their way, they feel, whether he knows it or not.

If Castro develops a clear, adult philosophy of government, however, and tries to settle down to sensible democratic policies, he'll find himself in trouble with the Reds. It does not appear that at this stage even they would dare break openly with him. More likely, they would try to set up an assassination and seek to pin the blame on the "Yanquis."

Just in the past month there have been voices in Cuba expressing apprehensions many thoughtful Cubans are coming to feel. The Cuban Confederation of Labor pro-Red slogan, "He who follows the Communist Party supports Castro," has been challenged by a strong group called Autentico, whose members can show anti-Batista and pro-Castro records, though they despise the Communists. Whether they can get anywhere still remains to be seen.

Castro thinks that not only Cuba, but the whole world, has been given a new chance through his revolution. He thinks history is starting now—and he is making it. But what will history think of him? That is the question for all Americans to ponder now before it's too late.

The Truth About Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article "The Truth About Missiles," from U.S. News & World Report, February 29, 1960:

THE TRUTH ABOUT MISSILES

Cutting through the welter of argument over the missile might of United States and Russia turns up these basic points, now on the record:

United States, this year, has the power to destroy Russia. Russia cannot destroy United States.

By 1962, Reds will have an edge in long-range missiles—but it will not be decisive against a variety of U.S. weapons in being.

Beyond the "danger year" of 1962: A standoff balance in armed power on both sides.

Is the United States today faced by the threat of a gigantic Pearl Harbor? Will Soviet Russia in the foreseeable future hold the means to destroy this Nation without risking destruction herself?

In brief: What is the truth about missiles?

The public is bewildered by claims and counterclaims of what Russia can and cannot do to the United States—and of what the United States, in turn, can or cannot do to Russia. President Eisenhower, at his news conference on February 17, felt it necessary to reassure people about America's defenses. On February 21, he scheduled a radio-TV address to the Nation on the same subject.

The truth is that facts are available from official testimony upon which to base a comparison of Soviet ability to destroy the United States with U.S. ability to destroy Russia, over the next 3 years.

How strength compares: What these facts show, as given to Congress, is this—

In 1960. At present, United States is in a position to destroy Russia by a variety of means. Russia, however, is not in a position to destroy the United States, either by missiles or bombers. U.S. strength is centered in its vastly powerful Strategic Air Command. The United States also possesses carrier-based bombers and missile bases overseas. Russia has significant bomber strength, but it is not comparable with U.S. strength. Neither side has missiles enough to knock out the other.

In 1961. Russia's strength in intercontinental ballistic missiles will become dangerous in this period. U.S. strength in long-range missiles will not match that of Russia. But America will possess at least 80 submarine-based missiles of 1,200-mile range—each capable of knocking out a Soviet city. The United States also will possess significant numbers of medium-range missiles based in Europe. Jet-bomber forces will continue to be the main deterrent to attack by Russia.

In 1962. This is the year of greatest danger. Russia then will possess an estimated 300 or more long-range missiles, to launch at U.S. cities. She will have even more medium-range missiles aimed at European cities and military bases. Surprise attack, if carried out successfully, might take out much U.S. strength to retaliate. The United States will have fewer long-range missiles than Russia—perhaps a third to a half as many.

Yet America, in addition to her ICBM's, will possess about 130 submarine-based Polaris missiles, plus 100 Thors and Jupiters on station with their 1,800-mile range. And U.S. bomber strength will remain high, augmented by Hound Dog missiles that can be launched from bombers and that have a 500-mile range.

In 1963 and later. Both sides, by this time, will possess vast strength in long-range missiles. Russia can have several hundred of its long-range, liquid-fueled T-3 missiles. The United States will have 270 of its liquid-fueled Atlas and Titan missiles, and will be getting delivery of its Minuteman super-missiles—with 6,000-mile-plus range, powered by solid fuel and fired without a countdown. This missile can be based upon mobile railroad cars or trucks, as well as on fixed bases.

The United States will possess large numbers of Polaris missiles, with their range increased substantially, and based upon submarines, cruisers, even ocean freighters. Missiles to be launched from jet bombers will be important in calculating national strength, too.

Those are the basic facts revealed in testimony before Congress or in published announcements. There are other recent revelations that help to round out the missile picture.

Ahead: faster warning. On February 16 the Navy announced that the range of its key Polaris missile will be raised in a few years from 1,200 miles to 1,800 and possibly to 2,500—more than double the range of its first model.

Then, on February 17, the significant details of a new Ballistic Missile Early Warning System—BMEWS—were made public. This network of super-radar installations is designed to give 15 minutes' warning time if Russia should launch a surprise ICBM attack. The central station, at Thule, Greenland, is to be finished by the end of this year. Another, in Alaska, is due next year. And a third now is contracted for in Britain. Each will have a range of 3,000 miles, to cover the U.S.S.R.

Two reports during the week add to the picture about the forthcoming Minuteman. In secret testimony before Congress, heavily censored and then made public, Air Force officers reported that Minuteman is likely to become "operational" in 1962, with quantity production well under way in 1963. In addition, there was reference to "thousands" of Minuteman missiles on order.

The danger period: What does all this mean? Simply, officials say, that the years 1961 and 1962 will be the years of greatest danger, with the danger lessening in 1963. Those coming 2 years will be the period in which Russia will hold dominance in long-range missiles and, if planning to attack United States by surprise, would enjoy the best opportunity.

If those are the facts, what has all of the argument in Washington been about?

Argument has concerned what to do for special protection in the principal years of danger, 1961 and 1962. The Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force has favored setting up a constant airborne alert. Under this alert, about 200 bombers, armed and ready to go, would be kept in the air at all times, invulnerable to surprise attack. The White House and top-level defense planners, however, have opposed this type of alert.

Why the opposition? The answer is: cost. An alert of this kind would cost an estimated $600 million for the first year and $1 billion the second year, owing largely to wear and tear on bombers. Instead of a full alert, the administration has favored spending about $90 million to lay a base in standby

equipment for a possible future alert in case of emergency.

Within the Air Force itself, the official view is given by the Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, in secret testimony just released by Congress, in which he says:

"We are continuing to work on our dispersal of the SAC units, and we expect to have, as of next September, the first of the ballistic-missile early-warning sites [part of testimony deleted].

"[Deleted.] Those are the two major elements we have, plus the fact that there are * * * a great many B–47's and B–52's right now on a 15-minute ground alert; so, at the worst, we would assume that, with this segment of BMEWS warning, some of the B–47's and B–52's, or a large segment of them, are going to survive."

Other reasons why the United States is not considered to be a "sitting duck" during the 2-year danger period ahead are cited by other top-ranking defense planners. The charts on these pages give you an idea of what is involved.

A surprise attack? The central point, in a nutshell, is this:

Russia, with no oversea bases, can strike the United States only with long-range missiles, manned bombers or missile-carrying submarines. As a practical matter, the United States has fairly effective defenses against bombers, and Russia still has no Polaris-type missile with which to cover much of the United States from submarines—so that a Soviet surprise attack must rely mainly on a limited number of ICBM's.

The United States, on the other hand, has many ways to strike back at Russia in addition to its ICBM's, now few in number but to be increasing in months ahead.

There are more than 100 bomber and missile bases abroad, ringing Russia. There are carrier task forces which can reach Soviet territory with jet fighter-bombers from the Mediterranean and the Western Pacific. There are squadrons of Matador and Mace pilotless bombers stationed in West Germany. There is a squadron of 6,000-mile, jet-propelled Snark missiles now operational in Maine. And there are Allied forces, such as the 250 British H-bombers, able to strike retaliatory blows.

In addition, there is the prospect of special, nuclear-powered submarines, each armed with 16 Polaris missiles, traveling undetected beneath the surface in waters near Russia, able to launch nuclear attacks while still submerged and invulnerable to Russia's arsenal of big and little missiles.

It is these Polaris submarines which are counted upon to provide sure-fire retaliation, regardless of how successful a Soviet surprise attack might be. At this time, four of the special subs have been launched —the U.S.S. *George Washington*, the U.S.S. *Patrick Henry*, the U.S.S. *Theodore Roosevelt* and the U.S.S. *Robert E. Lee*.

Two of the submarines are to be ready for wartime use, with their missiles aboard, by the end of this year. After that, others are to be commissioned at the rate of one each three or four months under present plans; more frequently, if the Navy gets its way. Polaris missiles themselves are relatively cheap, at 1.5 million dollars each, while the submarines to carry them cost about 100 million dollars each.

The time element: The other factor that U.S. defense planners are counting on strongly is the virtual impossibility of a real surprise attack by the Soviet Union, using today's long-range missiles.

To be effective in preventing retaliation from SAC and America's ICBM's, such an attack would have to strike all U.S. air and missile bases simultaneously and without warning. The new BMEWS system may provide the needed 15-minute warning. But, whether it does or not, there is this to note:

Today's long-range missiles, using liquid fuel, cannot be launched on an exact schedule with any assurance of success. Because of the need for some sort of count-down and the prospects for a delay in the process, even one missile cannot ordinarily be relied upon to fire within 10 minutes to half an hour of its planned take-off time. To fire more than 100 missiles on an exact schedule, so that they will arrive on target at the same time, thus, is considered to be impossible. As a result, some missiles would arrive long before others, providing a warning of attack and time for bombers and missiles to take to the air in retaliation.

Evidence is strong that the Russians still use liquid-fueled missiles, too, and that they are behind the United States in development of solid-fueled types that can be launched quickly and on schedule. Even their submarine-based missile, now in its test stage, is reported to be a liquid-fueled model, despite the hazards of using liquid fuel at sea.

The U.S. arsenal: Just how does the United States stand in long-range missiles? The facts, now coming to light, show this:

Right now, the United States has one squadron of 6,300-mile Atlas missiles available in the hands of troops at Vandenberg Air Force Base, near Los Angeles. This squadron has 10 missiles, half of which are being used for training, with four or five kept ready for emergency use if war comes. Atlas just completed its 19th successful test in a row, is considered highly reliable. Another squadron is due for activation in April at Warren Air Force Base, near Cheyenne, Wyo.

Titan, the planned successor to Atlas, has been plagued by a long series of test failures, has fallen behind schedule despite intensive effort put into its development. One official described the present efforts to push Titan to completion as being "like trying to have a baby in 6 months." There have been official hints that, unless Titan shows spectacular success in the near future, it may be abandoned and Atlas production stepped up instead. The plan, as of now, is to produce 130 Atlas and 140 Titan missiles by 1963.

Minuteman, due in quantity by 1963, is reported to be on or ahead of schedule, with its solid-fuel design and extra-long range.

Balance of destruction: How do the Nation's top military men view the big argument over missiles now? Their conclusions, in thousands of words of testimony, boil down to this:

Russia, in the years just ahead, will be able with ICBM's to destroy much of the United States, but will not be able to prevent effective retaliation by the United States.

America, with missiles based overseas, aboard submarines, on bombers and at home, will be able to destroy much of the U.S.S.R. at any time, but will not be able to prevent massive Soviet attacks.

The time seems to be approaching, with different kinds of missile arsenals built up on both sides, when neither side will have an absolute advantage—and big war may be prevented by an effective balance of destructive power.

Where U.S. Thors Stand Guard

Feltwell, England.—Here on the bleak plains of southeastern England, the first U.S. missiles able to deliver thermonuclear warheads from an overseas base to Moscow have been unveiled and stand ready to fire.

At this Royal Air Force station are 15 Thor intermediate-range ballistic missiles—1,800-mile IRBM's—on 5 separate groups of launching pads. The entire complex covers many square miles, since the firing sites are at least 12 miles apart.

Elsewhere in England, two other Anglo-American Thor units are now operational. A fourth unit will be ready this summer. In all, 45 missiles, able to wipe out Moscow and almost every other Russian city west of Moscow, already are poised for action. By summer, there will be 60.

These missiles are manned around the clock. They can be fired under ordinary alert conditions within 15 minutes. In a full-scale emergency, Thors can be kept fueled up for several hours —and fired within a minute or two.

Normally, the live H-bomb warheads are not kept fitted to the missiles. They are stored in secret pits guarded by men of the U.S. Air Force. But the warheads are mounted whenever international tensions rise.

These Thors are vulnerable to surprise attack because they are above ground, at fixed sites.

But a complete surprise attack is considered impossible. And the 4 Thor units in Britain add 60 H-bombs, ready to fire, to the deterrent power that the United States and its allies are leveling at Russia from many directions.

Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have received from many Iowans expressions of opposition to the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The State Board of Regents in Des Moines, at its regular meeting held January 14–15, 1960, adopted a resolution expressing its support for the loyalty oath but opposing the disclaimer affidavit.

The letter from the Secretary of the State Board of Regents and the text of the resolution follow:

State Board of Regents,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 15, 1960.

Hon. Leonard G. Wolf,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution regarding certain provisions of the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act adopted by the State board of regents at a regular meeting held January 14–15, 1960.

You will notice that our board believes in asking the students who are asking for the loans provided by the act to subscribe to the loyalty oath but that it takes position against the execution of the disclaimer affidavit.

At the direction of the board, I am requesting your consideration of its position and that you support legislation which will remove the requirement of the affidavit.

Most sincerely yours,

David A. Dancer,
Secretary.

National Defense Education Act: Student Loan Program; Disclaimer Affidavit

Whereas section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides as follows:

"No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that

he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemenly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic' "; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the State board of regents that the oath required in part (2) of the above provision should be taken and subscribed to, but that the disclaimer affidavit required in part (1) of the above provision is unnecessary, unfair, ineffective, discriminating, and tends to defeat the purpose of the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Board of Regents of the State of Iowa express its opposition to the disclaimer affidavit required by section 1001(f), title X, miscellaneous provisions, Public Law 85–864, cited as the "National Defense Education Act of 1958," and ask the Iowa Senators and Congressmen in the National Congress to work toward removal from the law the requirement of a disclaimer affidavit.

Resolutions Adopted by the Queens County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, from January 20 to January 23, 1960, the Queens County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A., held its silver jubilee convention in Astoria, N.Y. Among the resolutions adopted in this convention were six sponsored by the Americanism committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of these six resolutions:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Whereas our country has instituted the people-to-people program, which is aimed to promote an understanding, of the coexistence brand, between Iron Curtain countries and the West; and

Whereas we believe an extension of this program will not assist the free West to reach the people behind the Iron Curtain in a more effective way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, urge our Government not to extend, nor expand, the people-to-people program, and to cease appropriating funds for that purpose.

ILLEGAL USE OF PASSPORTS

Wheras the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings, and a study by the Senate subcommittee demonstrate fradulent use of U.S. passports for international use by those serving the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas a recent Supreme Court decision makes it impossible for the Department of State to refuse passports to Communists who are American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, urge the Congress of the United States of America to adopt remedial legislation as recommended by the American Bar Association in this and all matters affecting national security.

LIBERATION OF THE SATELLITES

Whereas the resistance of the free people against the Russian oppressors is continuing constantly; and

Whereas no peace and stability in the world is possible until the Red army is withdrawn from Eastern Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, petition the President and the Government of the United States to use all available means for the liberation of the Communist-enslaved countries.

LOYALTY OATHS

Whereas the heads of the progressive and liberal education movement in the United States have urged Congress to kill a provision in the National Education Act calling for loyalty oaths from students getting Federal scholarships; and

Whereas such denouncing of the loyalty oath requirement, as humiliating and unworkable, is coupled with a refusal to participate in the Federal scholarship program; and

Whereas we, American citizens, who have fought for the protection of our beloved country and who today stand ready to preserve it against all its enemies whomsoever see no fault in the pledge of loyalty to the United States by any of its loyal citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, call upon the Congress of the United States to oppose those who aim to remove this legislation from the defense education act.

SUMMIT MEETING AND INTERNATIONAL DELIBERATIONS

Whereas the President of the United States represents the people of this Nation, at the summit meeting and at other international deliberations; and

Whereas in previous meetings failure to recognize God-led to little, or no, success toward a permanent peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, petition the President and other officials concerned to see that at these meetings appropriate recognition be given to the Supreme Being in all deliberations concerning international negotiations.

AMERICAN TEACHERS

Whereas despite the unquestioned loyalty and self-sacrificing devotion to duty of the preponderant bulk of America's teachers, there are yet many hundreds of teachers who are Communists; and

Whereas Communist teachers radiate an influence much greater than their proportionate number; and their influence has reached out into the community, among parent-teacher organizations, and youth, and Communist-front groups; and

Whereas, a Communist is not a fit person to be placed, or retained, in a position to influence the minds of the youth of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in silver jubilee convention assembled, urge school authorities, colleges and local boards of education to institute positive programs to teach both teachers and pupils the nature of the Communist conspiracy that is attacking the whole structure of our society.

The Case of the Dying Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the American people stand second to none in the world for their generosity to other nations and other peoples. Our glorious history is replete with examples of sharing with the less fortunate the objects of our bounty through famine, flood, earthquakes and disaster of every kind. Mr. Speaker, we would be an unintelligent and ungrateful nation if we did not recognize that as the leader of the free world we cannot escape the responsibility which is ours in helping to maintain the social and economic stability of our friends in the world as a bulwark against international communism that would destroy all of us. But, frankly, Mr. Speaker, in the face of mounting evidence that the giveaways in our foreign aid program are not accomplishing the real objective of mutual security; the unwillingness of those who administer the program to insist upon an accounting from the recipient countries and worse yet an unwillingness to account to the American taxpayer for the billions that have been spent as well as the huge unexpended balances from previous appropriations; the unnamed instances where our local interest is suffering directly or indirectly as a result of the program; a constantly developing attitude that we have enough for our friends overseas but not enough for our own folks at home; a reluctance to place the program on a more business-like basis of repayable loans; the persistent refusal to further substitute food for dollars to effectuate a greater person-to-person approach in the program; a failure to place greater emphasis on self-help projects and technical assistance, together with the unspeakable waste and extravagance involved generally and as exhibited particularly in Laos, has caused many of our people to lose patience and to urge an abandonment of the program altogether.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the February 19 Ashland Times Gazette, a fine daily paper published in my congressional district which reflects to a great extent the thinking of the people it is my honor to represent in Congress:

INTERNATIONAL PAYOLA OR THE CASE OF THE DYING DOLLAR

(By Robert M. Beer)

Our President is asking Congress for a billion more (dollars, that is) for foreign aid

funds to further safeguard the free world against Communist imperialism. This colossal plan, conceived by a Democrat administration and sated and defended by a Republican replacement, is starting its 15th bloodsucking year with a bigger appetite than ever, $3,200 million was granted last year, a third more is sought for the next free ride, $4,175 million in all, over half of it to be used for other-than-weapons aid.

It would seem that the futility of this and comparable visionary remedies would be damnably clear and indisputable. Not so in Washington—not even after Cuba and other beneficiaries of the grand and perpetual handout have accepted it without sense of purpose or appreciation. Advantages that our friends and neighbors have gained from the immortal Marshall plan are beginning to show up in foreign trade circles. The sick and needy countries are now exporting billions of dollars in product value to the United States at prices that our industry cannot hope to match. This competitive merchandise and raw material is produced by low salaried workers whom we have taught to compete and who are nurtured directly or indirectly by free American food, materials, machines and Yankee bucks. When and if tax is levied in many of these nations it is either easily evaded or, if collected in part, never reserved in anticipation of debt payment. No genuine effort is made toward an eventual and honorable return to financial independence and total self-sufficiency.

Our President tells us that we simply "do not understand the need and value of foreign aid." He accuses his critics of shortsightedness and he seems to be convinced that tremendous and lasting respect and national security is being successfully purchased * * * that a vital postwar emergency not only still exists but has become more severe to the extent of $1 billion additional.

Where, oh where, is the end of it? The abused American dollar is pale and anemic from overcirculation abroad and malnutrition at home. Money has become the hapless solution to every problem here and away. It tragically buys unraised grain, stores surplus food that it bought at a premium, pays for work undone and is used in payment of interest on itself for borrowed funds to support the farce.

The hands across the sea, the hands of Uncle Sam, now rich and generous, will be bitten and bloody when they no longer hold a dollar's worth of allegiance. There is not a single so-called free nation that would not establish a dictatorship with either socialistic or communistic principles if that type of government appeared to be expedient. France, top banana on the overseas gift parade for the past 14 years has resorted to the one man domination of a dictator as an emergency measure. Even Japan, defeated, gravely wounded and destitute in 1946, has made a sensational recovery with the aid of its U.S. conquerer. Stores here in America are loaded with low-priced oriental versions of our own cameras, toys, housewares, and hundreds of other well-made articles that hurt our tax-ladened and cost-ridden Yankee producer and those whom he hires.

Ninety percent brackets for the very rich, legalized featherbedding for unproductive labor, billions for subsidies, millions for storage of unneeded food and the idiotic and inconceivable expense of administering the domestic and foreign handout are not, you can be sure, the problems of Russia, our struggling allies or the past enemies of the United States.

Do most of us seriously believe that this course of spending and giving is sound and successful? If any of us thought otherwise would there be anything we could do about it?

In this current dilemma of democracy and abuse of the dollar there seems pitifully small chance that there can be any change in our stupid march to certain oblivion.

With only two major political parties, both hopelessly dedicated to unlimited extravagance and progressive policies (almost identical) of distributing something for nothing, there will doubtless be more of the same regardless of the outcome of November elections. After all, candidates are not selected by the voters. Delegations and conventions do that job for us. They choose the personality most likely to win, reject the ones who are nonconformists and carefully construct a platform designed to please all and and offend none.

Such is the system of government that we try so hard to foist on the rest of the world with $4 billion of international payola.

Indeed, we may pay them for listening to our tune, but they don't have to buy it.

How very interesting it would be if the Gallup people (did they ever ask you?) would endeavor to determine how many of us would vote for a party and a candidate that would actually deliver a sensible and economic government devoid of visionary spendthrift theories and futile giveaways, and be faithfully dedicated to the general well-being, safety and confidence of the citizen who pays the bills.

Some self-styled authorities maintain that the transition is at hand * * * that it's far too late to take the dole out of the dollar * * * that the pattern is set and that we must live or die with the consequences.

Are there no old-style statesmen, no courageous mavericks and no champions for economic survival in this bewildered age of electron, proton and moron thinking?

Where are the great men who came to our rescue in past time of national distress. Are they a lost breed, like Lincoln, belonging to the ages?

If, God willing, we can find such a man again we can make him President * * * whether he's Republican, Democrat or neither.

Notes Uncle Sam Bill in Senate Pigeonhole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1959, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 106, "recognizing the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of Uncle Sam, as a national shrine." This bill has lain dormant in the other body since that date.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the Tablet, Brooklyn, N.Y., on February 13, 1960:

NOTES UNCLE SAM BILL IN SENATE PIGEONHOLE

DEAR SIR: In the readers' column of the Tablet on April 25, 1959, Helen P. Lasell, chairman of the U.S. Flag Committee, called our attention to the "rank propaganda intended to undermine the significance of Uncle Sam and therefore help destroy that which he symbolizes."

Since the above data, patriotic Americans took up the pen in order to repulse the "vicious and sinister attack directed at 'Uncle Sam'," through their representatives in the Congress. Even though the House of Representatives, on July 20, 1959, passed House Concurrent Resolution 106, "recognizing the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of 'Uncle Sam,' as a national shrine" the battle has not been won.

"Uncle Sam" is bottled-up in the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

It is time to counterattack with an expression of support of House Concurrent Resolution 106 to our Senators and the above committee.

H. JOSEPH MAHONEY.

European Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was the privilege, on last Thursday, of the members of the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am honored to be the chairman, to have Mr. André Ladener, French journalist and lecturer, address us on the subject of the "European Common Market" of the "European Community."

Mr. Ladener is traveling over North and South America with an exhibit "Welcome to Europe," consisting of more than 2,000 photographs and several films. Before the trip is completed Mr. Ladener and his party expect to have traveled some 26,000 miles.

Previously he has presented the film "Europe" in all the capitals, and in many towns of Europe, in connection with the Information Service of the European Communities (Common Market, Coal and Steel and Euratom).

Mr. Ladener already has much knowledge concerning the different States of the United States, and of Latin American countries, making him uniquely qualified to present to us his convictions on the European Common Market and related organizations.

Our guest was formerly a parliamentary secretary, and a technical counselor. He writes articles about trade and tourism, agriculture and beverages for various newspapers. He is also a wine expert, and at one time was secretary to former French Minister, Mr. Clapede, for wine and wine questions.

With Count Jean de Brettes and F. Hirigoyen, Mr. Ladener is founder of a committee for the promotion of European industry. This committee is to extend business between America and Europe, to encourage intercontinental tourism, and to affirm the solidarity of the West.

Before departure for New York, Mr. Ladener spoke about the new organization of Europe and the development of South America, in Brussels at the House of Latin America, under the sponsorship of Mr. Carton de Wiart.

Mr. Ladener's address to members of the House Committee on Agriculture follows:

WASHINGTON, *February 18, 1960.*

First of all, I am very glad to meet you; let me thank you for your nice welcome and many thanks to your chairman for his

friendly hospitality. This is my fifth trip around the States and I know pretty well the quiet city of Washington.

Today, I must forget about my citizenship as I want to speak about Europe. I think that it is necessary nowadays to contemplate the problems from a larger point of view. For peace and human progress, the time of nationalism has definitely passed. Our goal is to help you know Europe better by encouraging you to visit it.

Do you know Europe? It is very easy to cross over the Atlantic Ocean with the jets. You can have breakfast before your departure from Washington and dinner in Paris, looking at the Eiffel Tower. We invite you to visit our old continent.

But, dear American friends, false ideas must disappear from your minds. Paris is not Pigalle, heart of Paris by night. In the same way, the little Mannekenpiss is not the principal Belgian monument; Germans do not spend their time drinking beer; Italians do not spend all their waking hours playing the mandolin. Europe is not a "dear, sweet old thing."

Now, all its energies are being put into play; coal, steel, oil, electricity, and the atomic industry are being mobilized for progress. The days of the Marshall plan and of American aid are past for us. Europe is grateful toward the States and the solidarity of the West remains at the service of civilization for the benefit of all mankind.

I think that the power and splendor of modern-day civilization depend on the importance and the vigor of international, technical, and cultural exchanges. Maybe you have some difficulty in understanding me, with my French accent and my bad pronunciation, but, with your kind attention, I am sure that you have understood my purpose.

With my wife, my assistant, Miss Bonnel and Mr. Jaime Devesa, we are taking a trip around North and South America. Our traveling exhibition "Welcome to Europe" (around 26,000 miles by car) is aimed at presenting to the public a synthesis of Europe, from the artistic and cultural point of view as well as the economic and social point. I am speaking in connection with the Information Service of the European Community.

What is our European Community? First of all, the European Common Market is the first step on the way to the free trade, and for you, a new opportunity for the American business.

In the field of commerce, administrative redtape too often hobbles the flow of merchandise which the buyer and seller are anxious to move for their common good. International laws and rules must become more standardized. Economic and social legislation measures must be more closely and progressively alined. We must throw down protectionism. In other words, no longer must there be economically weak nations in a world where science has made such enormous progress.

If Europe's industry and trade enter into lively competition with the American economy, it will be for the good of millions of men and women.

The six following nations: Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands are represented in three organizations: Common Market, Coal and Steel Community, and Euratom, to above all end forever the conflicts which had so long divided the nations of Western Europe. (You remember that a war breaking out in Europe means the war all over the world.)

We wish to restore the weight and importance of Europe in world trade and world affairs, to raise living standards, and speed technical progress in an extending economy. It is necessary to abolish the outdated trade barriers which split up Western Europe into small protected markets.

Finally, we desire to set up the institutions which will form the basis for the future United States of Europe. Yes, Europe is on the move. The European Community has become a reality. Before leaving Paris, I spoke to several ministers in different countries. Mr. Jacques Rueff, Financial Councellor of the French Government said: "The first economic unit in the world and our example are the United States of America and their Federal system of Government."

The Common Market, whose institutions were set up at the beginning of 1958, will gradually (over 12 to 15 years) pool these nations' other economic resources—in a mass market of 165 million consumers. This is a fact. It is possible to extend the Common Market in the future to several other countries.

Near to the Common Market, there is a free exchange area in Europe. It would be advisable for the six members of the Common Market to cooperate with the seven nations of this free exchange area. The Common Market presents an advantage: it has a common economic, financial and social policy.

Euratom, the third European Community, set up at the beginning of 1958, helps to endow the Community with a powerful atomic industry pledged to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Especially associated with the European Community in the Common Market Treaty are those non-European countries and territories which have special relations with its member states. Most of these are situated in the African continent.

A European Parliament, whose 142 members are at present elected by and from the legislatures of the member countries is situated in Strasbourg. Provision is made for direct universal suffrage in the future. Its members are divided into three political groups (Christian, Democrats, Socialists, and Liberal), each of which sits together in the chamber, irrespective of nationality.

We have also a Court of Justice, an Economic and Social Committee, a Monetary Committee, a Transport Committee, and a Scientific and Technical Committee.

I believe that the European Common Market is not only the lowering of customs duties and tariffs and the suppression of import quotas; and it is not only the establishment of an economic policy involving six nations. It is very nearly, above all, the permanent encouragement needed to modify antiquated economic structures.

My first goal is to shed light on the efforts of Europe, its citizens, its statesmen. I do not speak officially, but I am a free citizen of free Europe. I know our difficulties and all our possibilities. United Europe is the way to a lasting peace. We are always ready in Europe to extend a helping hand to further efforts bent on facilitating Internation Exchanges creating international understanding and cementing solidarity among peoples, particularly for the common defense of liberty against communism.

On the table before you is literature on the European Community which I hope you will take and read, in order to get the details of the efforts being made to weld, into one economic unit six European nations, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, in order to end forever the conflicts which so long have divided the nations of Western Europe and thus remove trade barriers.

Thank you for your very kind attention, and I wish to drink with you champagne and wine to the success of men of good will around the world.

Networks' Policy Bans Topnotch Documentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, that fine columnist, Marie Torre, of the New York Herald Tribune, has a most interesting column today, which I commend to my colleagues for reading.

The column follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 23, 1960]

NETWORKS' POLICY BANS TOPNOTCH DOCUMENTARY

(By Marie Torre)

It is not without irony that while the networks are intensifying public affairs programing to show that they're answering the call of duty, perhaps the best documentary ever made on the vital subject of space flight is being withheld from the television audience by network decree. Or, should we say, network whim?

Our uncertainty is real.

For there is no rule in the TV rulebooks that says what each of the networks stated, twice around, with each rejection of "The Race for Space," an independently produced two-part documentary which offers 20–20 insight into the space contest between the United States and the Soviet Union.

All three networks have refused to provide commercial air time for "The Race for Space," which comes with a ready sponsor (Shulton, Inc.), because, they say, "It's a matter of policy." The networks hold, even though there's no such regulation in the TV code, that programs in the field of news and public affairs must be produced by the networks' own staffs rather than outside parties.

In the case of "The Race for Space," which this viewer saw at a private showing, the rejection is akin to a literary magazine turning down an Ernest Hemingway original because he's not a member of the magazine staff.

Nothing the networks have done on the subject of space flight tells the story with the simplicity, thoroughness, and perspicuity of "The Race for Space." Produced by David Wolper at a cost of $100,000, and graphically narrated by Mike Wallace, part one of the documentary represents an unusual assemblage of actual film footage which includes American and Soviet rocket and space films never before seen by any one outside the intelligence services.

The documentary begins just after the turn of the century, with actual films of the Russian scientist Konstantin Tsiolkovsky and his early experiments and theories on space flight. The story progresses to the experiments of Dr. Robert Goddard, an American, who began building rockets using liquid fuel, to the German Rocket Society, to the development of man's first space weapon, the V–2, to the efforts of Gen. Holgar N. Toftoy to get the cream of the crop of scientists and enough V–2's to start a limited missile program in the United States.

The point made in the documentary is that the United States could have launched the first earth satellite nearly 2 years ahead of the Russians, if we hadn't fallen on complacent times after World War II. Lest some regard this a subversive message, it should be known that Mr. Wolper's film

was made with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Ministry of Culture (U.S.S.R.) and the British Information Service.

In addition, "The Race for Space" won the "Best Documentary of the Year" award at the San Francisco Film Festival recently, it's been nominated for an Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Award, and it's scheduled to be shown soon to the cadets at West Point.

There's reason to believe that the networks haven't heard the end of "The Race for Space," for neither Mr. Wolper nor the Shulton Co., it's reported, is of a mind to accept the decision of the networks without a legal flight. One of the areas to be explored is restraint of trade. But there's a more important, though perhaps not legally valid point that ought to be considered, and that is: By what right do the networks, as custodians of public trust, deprive the public of a film that should be seen?

Just the other day the distinguished news analyst and reporter, Howard K. Smith, had edited out of his script some references to Vice President NIXON's differences with President Eisenhower's statements on our defense posture and our defense program.

It seems fundamentally wrong for a network to arbitrarily rule or edit out any program or item on the theory that it conflicts with its own policy. The missile and space race has been, is, and will undoubtedly continue to be the subject of great controversy and even greater confusion. While there has been some partisanship on both sides, no one doubts that it remains a most important and vital issue that confronts our country. The vast majority of Americans, in and out of public office, are sincere in their desire to know just where we stand, and the exceptions, if any, represent a minutia of our people.

As one Member of Congress, I submit that it is not only wrong but self-defeating to exaggerate our weaknesses, if any, in missiles and in space. Similarly, it is less than reassuring and equally wrong to gloss over any gap that may exist. It is less important when the gap occurred, or who was to blame for it, than it is for us to know our position today and what we are doing about it. It also disturbs me greatly to have our President dismiss as "parochial" military experts of the stature of Generals Medaris, Taylor, Power, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, the networks, the administration, the Congress—yes, all of us—owe a great responsibility to our people to give them the facts. We need more than a "father knows best" attitude, more than an arbitrary and capricious ruling that a factual program conflicts with the policy of the networks. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we need the facts. Only in this fashion can there emerge a clearer understanding of our problems and a program to solve them.

Miss Torre certainly deserves a tribute for pointing this up in her column.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Progress in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, addressed the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles on February 15, 1960, on one of the most important problems facing the United States in the space age. In an outstanding address, he spelled out the steps which must be taken if America is to make the kind of progress in space that it has made in the past in developing its own frontiers. Reminding Americans of the great accomplishments of the pioneers in opening up the West, he calls the exploration of space America's new manifest destiny. Senator SYMINGTON has asked America to answer this new call to greatness "eagerly, unafraid, with the spirit and cooperation that has won her a cherished place in the history of man."

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN SPACE

In the year 1484, a young Italian sailor named Columbus approached the King of Portugal with a plan to sail west and find a new route to the Indies.

Columbus wanted the King to outfit three ships, give him the title of "Great Admiral of the Ocean" and assure him one-tenth of all the revenues and precious metals derived from the lands he discovered.

At the same time, he sent his brother Bartholemew to interest the Kings of England and France in the same expedition.

All three monarchs rejected the idea. It sounded good, they said, but it was too expensive.

Eight years later, Columbus made the same offer to the Queen of Spain; and because she undertook it, it was Spain and not the other nations which led the way to discovery and colonization of the New World.

The claims established by Spain, and the wealth that poured in from the treasure houses of Mexico and Peru, changed her from a collection of little states to the preeminent power in Europe for 100 years.

For the next two centuries, command of the ocean routes was to be the basis of wealth and world leadership.

The opening up of the New World had shifted the balance of power among nations.

Discovery became an obsession.

Those countries which channeled their energies into this field were able to compete with Spain and eventually surpass her.

Those who hesitated lost their rank among the nations of the world.

This bit of history points the way to anyone who considers the course of America in the exploration of space.

For man's first ventures into space have opened up a chapter of history as vital to modern nations as the voyages of discovery were for the past.

It is not just another job for government to meet by creating a new agency and requesting a bigger budget.

It is a grand enterprise of discovery, full of opportunities that challenge our imagination.

The world we know today, full of change as it is, is going to be rendered obsolete by what is done in this great new dimension of man's progress.

Eventually, the exploration of space and the results of that exploration will play a major role in the life of man.

Even before that day, what happens in space will greatly influence our security and our position in the world.

I do not speak just of efforts that have already been planned and projected—such as probing the moon, and orbiting a space station. I speak of the even more ambitious projects which will exert increasing influence over conditions on earth, and eventually send men far into the universe, to tap the resources of the planets.

Of course such activities strain the imagination of many of us today.

But the history of progress is the history of accomplishments that could not be envisioned by ordinary men.

It has been estimated that a manned flight to Venus, at a minimum launching velocity of 38,000 feet per second, would take 5 months.

This is no longer than a trip by covered wagon took from Missouri to California in 1849, on the Santa Fe trail.

Deep space flight will pose many dangers, some of which we can predict, others we cannot.

But the covered wagon trips which opened up the West were fraught with many great dangers to the first pioneers.

I believe that the nation which leads the way into space, and follows up that lead, will hold in its hand the key to the future.

The advantages accruing to those who first master this new dimension are enormous—for possible war and for peace, for good or for ill.

The peaceful exploration of space can create world living standards higher than earthbound men can dream of.

Think of the utility of a space vehicle that could predict weather conditions even before they occur.

Through the knowledge gained from such meteorological satellites, we could eventually make giant strides toward controlling the weather.

By regulating rainfall, we could eliminate the arid conditions which now chain the productivity of millions of acres in our Nation, as well as in Asia and the Middle East.

By regulating temperature, we could open up new areas of the earth for comfortable settlement.

Nor can we exclude the possibility, once space flight is achieved, of the discovery and colonization of other planets.

In these ways, many of the basic causes of international tension—poverty, disease, and hunger—could be eliminated, and with them war itself.

Now let me just mention a few of the new applications.

There is now in development a television reconnaissance satellite which can photograph objects 7 feet in diameter, from 300 miles above the earth.

The nation that can orbit such a reconnaissance vehicle obviously has an advantage in the field of intelligence.

There is now in development a nuclear weapon which can first be placed in orbit, then recalled, electronically, to hit any point of the earth.

Any nation orbiting such a weapon literally holds the sword of Damocles over its adversaries.

And it is not outside the scope of present studies to imagine a space vehicle which could, through ground control, turn back aircraft or other space vehicles by the mere turning of a switch or pressing of a button.

Another tremendous reward for leadership in space is the impact on the minds of men.

The heavens can be seen by the eyes of all men. For centuries, people have looked at them in awe. There is no more effective place to display scientific accomplishment.

Last month, the head of the U.S. Information Agency, George Allen, testified before Congress as follows:

"It is hardly an overstatement to say that space has become for many people the primary symbol of world leadership in all areas of science and technology.

"Our space program," he said, "has an importance far beyond the field of the activity itself. It bears on almost every aspect of our relations with people of other countries, and another view of us as compared with Russia."

As the man in charge of America's strategy in the contest for men's minds, this is what he believes.

"The seesaw seems to have tipped solidly in the Soviet direction in world opinion" as a result of sputnik, the moon shot, and other dramatic achievements on this great world stage.

The Soviets do not intend to rest on their accomplishments so far. They intend to press their advantage in space—to play it for all it is worth.

In reading Soviet scientific literature, one cannot help but be impressed by the boldness, the scope, and the dedication of the Soviet effort toward the ultimate conquest of the cosmos: Manned interplanetary travel.

There seems to be no question in the Russian mind that man's most cherished dream will be fulfilled in and by the Soviet Union.

They have already made great strides toward attaining this goal, including their large geophysical research rockets and their massive artificial earth satellites, plus extensive detection, tracking, and data-handling network associated with that satellite program.

Their confidence in the ultimate result is reflected in the fact that, whereas originally sputnik observers were asked to send their tracking data to Moscow sputnik, they now ask that data be sent to Moscow kosmos.

In such a competition, it is essential to have a clear idea of where we are behind and where we are ahead.

Certainly the Russians have the more spectacular accomplishments to their credit. They got there first, with the most.

We have orbited more earth satellites than have they—but the Soviets have put more weight into space in one shot than we did in all of ours put together.

And make no mistake about it: Weight in space is a measure of control of space.

But our situation is far from hopeless. We have made more progress than the Soviets in instrumentation; also in communication from satellites.

We discovered the radiation belts, which must be surmounted if successful manned flights are to be attempted.

We have, right now, the scientific competence and the resources to overtake the Soviets in the space field.

To this end, I would now make the following seven suggestions:

The unrealistic efforts to distinguish between civilian and defense aspects of space activities should be stopped. It was well intentioned, but it has fallen flat on its face.

In most cases, no such realistic distinction can be made, and further attempts to do so will merely add to the wasteful duplication and confusion now characteristic of our space policies.

There must be one coordinated overall space program, not two or more, and the products of such a coordinated program should have both military and civilian uses.

For this purpose, the authority, funding, and responsibility for such a program should be placed under one man.

The head of such agency should be a member of the National Security Council, and he should report directly to the President.

The present Space Council in the White House should be abolished.

A regular flow of information about the space program should include all facts which will not affect adversely this country's security. In a democracy the people have the right to know all truth which will not help the possible enemy.

I make these suggestions with full realization that without a greater sense of urgency the best organized program will continue to stumble along in second place.

More than anything else, our space program needs a topmost priority in the must-do list of our Government.

The exploration of space is America's new manifest destiny.

It must be treated as more than just another Government program.

It must be treated as the opening of a new frontier; as prudent an investment as the Louisiana Purchase; as vital to our Nation as the push over the Alleghenies, the settling of the Mississippi Valley, and the opening of the West.

The age of space has now given us a new chance to shine with the spirit of the American pioneer.

Let us set ourselves to the task—together.

Let history record that America did not end up in second place in space.

But that she stepped forth eagerly, unafraid, with the spirit and cooperation that has won her a cherished place in the history of man.

You and I, all of us, desire a first-rate, first-class, first-place America.

First in space as well as first on earth.

And, above all, first in the hearts of all mankind.

Pollution Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of communications urging me to support H.R. 3610 to authorize an increase in Federal grants to municipalities for sewage treatment works. Since those who urged this increase in the amount of authorized Federal grants under the Water Pollution Control Act are highly responsible groups in my State I feel it is especially incumbent upon me to clarify my position on this legislation.

When President Eisenhower vetoed this bill he pointed to its defects; namely, that it held forth the promise of a large-scale program of long-term Federal support, and thus was actually a temptation to municipalities to delay their essential water pollution abatement efforts while waiting for Federal funds on a priority basis from year to year.

The President in his veto message called for Federal stimulation of State and local action and promised a national conference to make local taxpayers and industrial business firms more conscious of their obligation to prevent pollution. An extended life of the Federal program was recommended in his message.

My own position, Mr. Speaker, on the Federal plan of financial assistance to local communities is based in part on my basic philosophy, but far more on special consideration of my congressional district and the State of Washington. In the river basins of the Pacific Northwest, in our streams and lakes, as with the ocean salt water of Puget Sound and our costal inlets, as with no other area in the Nation, there is a priceless resource which even with present industrialization development and population growth is being despoiled. Our fishery and recreational values are threatened, and I wish the answer were as simple as enacting an increase in the Federal program.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe the reverse is the case. Here is why. The Lake Washington Basin is a case in point.

Assume that all municipalities in this basin could qualify and took advantage of Federal assistance. Assume the affluent of all such treatment plants poured into Lake Washington. Already the chemical properties from existing treatment plants of the lake have so changed the water that excess algae has increased and green scum has blighted the clear water almost beyond cure. The affluent property should be piped to distant and deep salt water where tidal action will dissipate it.

The Seattle metropolitan area has a $40 million project ahead of it and the skimpy potential Federal contribution which could not possibly exceed $450,000 offers no real financial solution.

The Washington State Pollution Commission has made a survey of sources of pollution and it has both the responsibility and policing power to stop it. At the State and local level a comprehensive and complete program should be undertaken. Every individual industrial plant should be required to finance and treat its own waste and with municipalities it should be the same.

Federal assistance sounds good and can help local authorities supply valuable pollution abatement information and advice on interstate matters and frankly I agree that public health is certainly a proper function of the Government. But a city's drinking water supply and its sewage disposal are not Federal problems. This bill is a sewer grant bill. That is really what it is. I do not think the Federal Government should build city sewers or collect and dispose of garbage. This should be local.

I believe my area has more water to protect than any other geographical locality. But the Federal Government has no authority to compel my industrial plants to cease dumping waste into streams and inlets and to stop the killing of fish and ruining the banks and beaches for swimmers and those who desire wholesome recreation. The sports fishermen and the boating fraternity and the conservation organizations have a real job to do in my State. Adequate laws and enforcement on the local level are the answer and that is why, Mr. Speaker, in all conscience I feel compelled to vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 3610. But God knows, Mr. Speaker, I want clean, pure water as much as anyone and will do my utmost toward a proper solution of this serious problem.

A Night To Remember—The Caryl Chessman Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "A Night To Remember," published in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of February 21, 1960. The editorial deals with the case of Caryl Chessman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NIGHT TO REMEMBER

Long after Caryl Chessman has met his maker by natural death, if not by legal execution, the repercussions from the events of Thursday night will re-echo.

Even his depraved crimes against helpless women (one now in a mental institution as a result) seem to have been forgotten in the hysteria of the hour.

To our young people as well as to the world we appear to have demonstrated that no matter how vicious a criminal, or how heinous his crimes, if he is only devilishly clever in invoking all types of technicalities he can cheat the lawful sentence of our courts and the decisions of our juries and can make a mockery of the processes of law and justice.

From now on any condemned man has the assurance that the longer he delays his execution the easier it will be to claim that the very act of prolonging his life in prison will be considered "cruel and inhuman punishment" and will then be taken up by fuzzy-minded people all over the world as a cause celebre.

To be sure there are many sincere people who believe that due to the circumstances of the Chessman case and the prolonged delay in carrying out the judgment of the trial court a basis existed for judicial reversal of the judgment or for executive clemency. But certainly not for the reasons

given by the Goevrnor's office nor in the way it was done.

Is the criteria for justice or clemency in California now to be determined by the threat of mob violence in foreign lands?

Each time that an American President, Vice President or Secretary of State makes a good-will trip is he to be subjected to blackmail? Are we in the position that unless one of the 50 American sovereign States commutes a death penalty or frees a prisoner that ill will and perhaps violence will be directed against our officials?

Far better that all such trips be canceled than that the prestige of our Nation and the dignity of our States be reduced to this sad condition.

Instead of wiring the Governor of California, Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom should have cabled the Government of Uruguay that if their country was not prepared to give the President of our Nation a friendly welcome the visit to that nation would be forthwith canceled but that our Federal system of government would not be compromised.

Then, to cap the climax and to remove the last shred of dignity from legal procedures in California, Governor Brown announced that he is going to pass the buck to the State legislature and throw the whole question into the political arena.

This ignores the fact that the legislature had the chance last April to repeal the death penalty and refused to do so.

Now instead of the issue being determined on its merits, by dragging it into a special session within the 60-day stay of execution period, he involves it in sort of a popularity contest on Caryl Chessman. Probably world-wide demonstrations will be held demanding the legislators vote for repeal of the death penalty and windows in our embassies will be broken if they don't so vote.

Is that how the protection of law-abiding citizens of California is to be determined? Because of violence abroad are gunmen to escape their crimes of shooting down bank tellers and policemen sworn to uphold the law? Are kidnap-perverts practicing their crimes of violence against women and children to be freed of the full penalty for their crimes along with murderers who plot the death of innocent victims?

If 60 days pass and the legislature has not repealed the death penalty, what then? As violence adds to violence abroad has the Governor opened a Pandora's box when those mobs and not he will become the custodian of the constitutional power of clemency in California? Having yielded to international extortion once, will he not be expected to yield again?

The Governor's action and his reasons for the same have stripped dignity from California's legal processes and left us naked before the world.

U.S. Customs Makes Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star, February 15, 1960, carried an editorial entitled, "U.S. Customs Makes Enemies," by Everett Helm, a Minnesota-born composer and critic now living in Wuerttemberg, Germany, who recently had the opportunity of viewing the operations of our immigration and customs departments in New York.

Because of the serious nature of Mr. Helm's observations of the processing of immigrants to this country, I am bringing this editorial to the attention of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CUSTOMS MAKES ENEMIES—THE WAY IT'S RUN, AMERICA SEEMS LIKE A POLICE STATE

(By Everett Helm)

An American returning to the United States after a long stay abroad has a tendency to view his own country in a somewhat impersonal way—almost as if it were another foreign country. This, at least, has been my experience in the past, and it happened again this time. One sees the good and the less fortunate aspects of one's native land through a magnifying glass, as it were.

It has been said that first impressions are extremely important, and if this is so I hate to think what damage is done by the first impressions foreigners receive when they arrive in New York by ship.

First of all they are kept waiting aboard ship to go through immigration until all American citizens have been taken care of—all, that is except those having alien spouses. (Being in this category, I have had ample opportunity to observe and sympathize with the newly-arrived foreigners at the Port of New York) I know of no other country in which landing is made to be such an ordeal as it is here, and certainly of none in which its own citizens are given this kind of preferential treatment.

After all Americans have disembarked, the foreigners then are obliged to line up in endless ques to wait their turn with the immigration authorities, who are generally quite pleasant, to be sure, but who ask all kinds of questions about the nature and purpose of one's visit to the United States, where one will stay, when leave, etc.—all of which has already been covered in the visa application.

I can see no valid reason for this interrogation, which, rightly or wrongly, gives the foreigner the impression of entering a police state. When a visa has been issued by the U.S. consulate abroad, the questions should have been (and were) asked there. That should be enough.

When they have finished this ordeal of standing in line and interrogation, the newly-arrived passengers are then set off the ship into an enormous customs shed—unheated, draughty and utterly confused—to search out and assemble their baggage, which may or may not be placed in the area marked by the first letter of their last name.

When I landed recently, the porter service was functioning hardly at all, and almost everybody was obliged to wait for the appearance of his bags as they came piecemeal and at infrequent intervals from the ship.

It was anything but a heartening sight to see elderly French ladies struggling to carry large bags from one end of the huge pier to the other and struggling as well to obtain some kind of information that would help them understand what was going on amidst this incredible disorder. Needless to say, nobody on the piers—porters, policemen or officials—speaks anything but English.

On this particular occasion it took me, to whom all this is familiar, a good 4 hours to clear customs. For after one has finally assembled all his baggage, a new martyrdom begins: that of standing in line awaiting one's turn with a customs inspector. There were several hundred people in this line, which moved slowly, due to a shortage of inspectors.

The inspection itself went quickly and pleasantly. But then came another wait in line for a porter to take the luggage to a taxi. Although large signs are posted declaring, "Porter Service Is Free," anyone who believes this is in for a rude awakening.

And woe to the well-meaning foreigner who gives what by European standards would be a generous tip. He will find himself no less roundly abused than the returning American.

To cap the climax of this series of indignities, the passenger is even now not able to step into a waiting cab, because the cabs are not waiting. They have to be fetched by a professional fetcher, who makes it clear that he expects a very generous tip for his efforts, since he, unlike the free porters, draws no salary. Fetching a cab oneself is entirely out of the question, for the cabbies would not dare drive up without the protecting escort of a fetcher.

At a time we are trying to make friends and influence people for American democracy, it seems monstrous that foreigners should be given this first impression of our country.

In my inner ear I can hear the screaming and villification that would ensue if American visitors to Europe were given similar treatment. The fact is, they are not, and there is no reason why landing in America cannot be made as relatively painless as it is in Europe.

It is not enough that this or that feature of the process should be improved or made less unpleasant, as the actual baggage inspection has been. The entire system should be revised. Then visitors to our shores would not think of democracy as meaning that everyone is treated equally badly but rather that all are treated equally well. This would be a great step forward.

Disarmament and Missile Gap Incompatible Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of February 24, 1960:

DISARMAMENT AND MISSILE GAP INCOMPATIBLE ISSUES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Politicians are supposed to be pretty good at picking out issues for an election campaign, but sometimes they can't be in the position of urging the American Government to accelerate its missile program and at the same time declare that nuclear tests must be abandoned and disarmament negotiations speeded up.

A political party can't be arguing persuasively for more defense on the theory that war is imminent in the next 2 or 3 years and at the same time be blaming the administration for not bringing about disarmament. In fact, some Democrats have insisted that the United States should abandon its nuclear testing whether or not the Russians agree to inspection.

What will the mood of the electorate be next autumn? Will the public be so scared of the prospect of war that it will wish to punish the administration in power for not having built enough missiles for our Armed

Forces? Will the voters believe the President when he says our overall defense is adequate as a deterrent against attack and that we are not relying on the missile alone or on any one weapon? He isn't running for reelection and will, therefore, wield a powerful influence. Presumably the Democratic candidates are betting on the idea that the country will vote the Republican administration out of power for allegedly having failed to close the missile gap

But what will the Republicans be saying in answer? Already they are getting out charts and tables showing that the Democrats were in charge of the executive branch of the Government to January 1953, and they spent for missiles a total of only $1,155 million from 1947 through the fiscal year 1951.

As for the Republicans, in the ficsal year 1953 they spent $1,116 million on missile programs, and every year thereafter they increased the amounts, so that in 1956 they were spending $2,270 million. In 1957 they spent $4,470 million and added to this until they reached nearly $7 billion in 1959. They have almost that same amount scheduled for the fiscal year 1960.

If money is everything and if budgetary considerations should have been disregarded heretofore, then the query is what happened between 1947 and 1953 when it is presumed the Soviets got their start?

Also, since the hydrogen bomb is the key to vast destructive power today, why was there a lag in developing the H-bomb? Several years elapsed while a battle went on inside the Truman administration against developing the H-bomb as Russia moved on with her tests. One of the principal scientists in our Government who argued against developing the H-bomb was later declared a security risk not because of any act of disloyalty on his part but because of his indiscretions in mingling with Communists.

Anyway, the H-bomb lag is the most serious of all, and if the missile lag is to be a campaign issue, it could be that the whole messy story may be revived.

The principal inconsistency, however, among those who are playing the defense issue is that no candidate can afford to be pictured as concentrating on how to build up more military power at a time when supposedly the world is anxious for disarmament.

Miss Carol Ann Heiss Wins Gold Medal for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us have followed with great interest the VIII Winter Olympic Games now in progress at Squaw Valley, Calif. Therefore, I am sure you can understand my pride in announcing that my constituent, Miss Carol Ann Heiss, Ozone Park, N.Y., has won for the United States its first gold medal. Of course, we had no doubt that Miss Heiss would win this honor as it was the only one left in the figure skating field which she had won.

In 1956 Miss Heiss took second place in the figure skating competition at the VII Winter Olympics. She went from there to Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany, to win the world championship that year. In 1957 she won the women's North American figure skating championship, and in both 1958 and 1959 she won the United States and world championships. With this outstanding record to her credit, I am sure we all share in her joy at winning this coveted honor—one she says she has been working toward for 15 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the telegram I have sent to Miss Carol Ann Heiss:

Miss CAROL ANN HEISS,
U.S. Olympic Team (Skating),
VIII Winter Olympics,
Squaw Valley, Calif.:

Congratulations on your splendid victory. We in Queens County, N.Y., especially Ozone Park and the Fifth Congressional District, take great pride in the honor you have brought to yourself, the United States, and to us in winning the first gold medal for this country. It is impossible for me to find words to tell you how happy I am for you, your coach, your family, and your friends. Your performance in the free skating which I witnessed on television was superb.

Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 24, is the anniversary of Estonian Independence Day. It is a tragic thing that this occasion receives little attention since Estonia, as much as any other nation, stands as a constant reminder of the basic treachery of Soviet dictators and their complete disregard for the rights of mankind.

Estonia, due to her brief span of independence and isolated geographical position with a relatively small population, never received the attention of the world that larger nations receive while undergoing the same brutal oppression. However, we should maintain the moral dedication and strength of our foreign policy by continuing to emphasize to the United Nations the barbaric domination that Soviet forces exercise over Estonia and her neighboring Baltic States—Latvia and Lithuania.

With all the phony Soviet propaganda concerning the termination of the cold war, we should point to a tragic people, such as the Estonians, to remind ourselves that until they are restored to the political, social, economic, and religious freedom that they desire, we will never have true world peace. In the coming summit conferences, President Eisenhower should be forewarned of the constant deceitfulness that is the standard Soviet diplomatic procedure, when he remembers the tragic diplomatic errors of his two immediate predecessors.

Estonia and her brave people in their tragic suffering serve to constantly remind us that only through national strength and support of free nations of the world, and by efforts to constantly expose the insidious worldwide communistic agitation can we maintain for ourselves and all peoples true freedom and world peace.

Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I remark that I was possessed by a great emotion, which I am sure was shared by all my colleagues in this historic Chamber, when the able, dedicated, and beloved GORDON CANFIELD spoke for the last time from the well for the appropriation bill reported by the subcommittee of which he is the ranking minority member and of which he was chairman during the years when the Republicans were in control and JOE MARTIN, deeply embedded in our hearts, was Speaker.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, and I am not ashamed, that there were tears in my eyes when the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey told us of the circumstances of his recent illness, of the strength to fight through and conquer that came from his mother, and now that she has passed to the rarefied realms above, how her presence and her influence remain with him and are the source of his determination to retire from the Congress at the end of his present term.

I wish that every American could read that eloquent tribute of a son to his mother. I feel privileged and grateful that I was present to hear that tribute voiced from the Speaker in the well with the rich eloquence which comes only from deep and sincere emotion, the words springing from the heart.

I shall remember especially three occasions since I have been a Member of this body that stand out. One was when Ed Hart spoke on the death of Joe Tumulty and recalled the days and the personalities of the Woodrow Wilson administration. It was oratory in its very highest expression, and as LEE METCALF remarked to me immediately after its delivery when all who heard it were in a magic spell, "perhaps we have just listened to one of the great orations of history."

Another occasion was when in the early months of the first Eisenhower administration, Dan Reed, tall, athletic, handsome, fighting a losing battle for what he believed was right, so won by his eloquence of sincerity the hearts if not the votes of his colleagues that every Member on the floor and there were few absentees that day, arose as a man and applauded for a very long time.

The third occasion was when GORDON CANFIELD spoke today. There doubtless will be similar occasions as the years roll

on, but none to excel in the drama of pure emotion.

The gentleman from New Jersey represents in my book the first attributes of heart and mind. I doubt if he ever said an unkind word of any person. His consideration of others, his helpfulness and kindnesses, his modesty and entire lack of affection, his constant doing of good deeds dictated by a good heart, stamped him in mind, as I know they did in the minds of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as a true practitioner of the religion of self-abnegation.

I also, Mr. Chairman, would extend my congratulations and heartiest commendation to the outstanding chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and all the members of the subcommittee that has established such an enviable record for close working together and gaining the approval of the House within the very minimum of trouble.

Conservation Workshop Camp Program, Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as Congress attempts to find ways and means for dealing with the many complex problems confronting us, it is always gratifying to find local leaders "picking up the ball" to promote progress in fields in which this can be constructively accomplished at the level of the local community.

Today, I refer particularly to one such endeavor in Wisconsin aimed at promoting conservation of our natural resources.

Recently, I was pleased to have forwarded to me a résumé of the "Conservation Workshop Camp Program," by George W. Barber, superintendent of schools at Waupaca, Wis.

The program, designed for rural teachers, is aimed at promoting creative efforts in utilization, as well as preservation, of our soil, lands, forest, and other natural resources.

In addition to the leadership by Superintendent Barber and his associates, the program has the farsighted participation of such agencies as: Wisconsin Lions Camp for the Visually Handicapped; Waupaca Lions Club; State soil conservaton committee; Wisconsin Conservation Department; extension service; University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture; soil conservation service; U.S. Geological Survey, Ground Water Division; and State department of public instruction.

Reflective of the kind of constructive, creative efforts needed at the local level for not only best utilization, but also conservation of our natural resources, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief résumé of the program and its objectives printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES AND GROUPS

Wisconsin Lions Camp for the Visually Handicapped; Ray Hemple, Popsippi, Wis.,

Waupaca Lions Club, sponsor; Victor Billmeyer, president.

State soil conservation committee; Don Niendorf, Manitowoc, Wis., erosion control agent.

Wisconsin Conservation Department:

1. Arthur Jorgenson, Madison, Wis., supervisor of education and information.

2. Harold Steinke, Oshkosh, Wis., game manager.

3. Robert Heding, Oshkosh, Wis., fish and watershed management.

4. Dale Tubbs, Waupaca, Wis., assistant district forester.

5. Sidney Miller, Waupaca, Wis., forest ranger.

Extension service:

1. Joe Walker, Waupaca, Wis., county agriculture agent.

2. Gene Hoye, Waupaca, Wis., club agent.

University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture; Robert Ellarson, Madison, Wis., extension specialist in wildlife management.

Soil conservation service:

1. John Nimlos, Waupaca, Wis., work unit conservationist.

2. Herbert Tauchen, Waupaca, Wis., soil conservationist.

U.S. Geological Survey, Ground Water Division; Charles Berkstresser, Madison, Wis., survey technician.

State department of public instruction; Miss Leona Fischer, Frank N. Brown, supervisors.

IN MEMORY OF R. S. IHLENFELDT

(By Frank N. Brown)

Conservation is a philosophy of life. While we find many who would agree with this belief, few have made a determined effort to instill such a philosophy in others. When such a person passes on, the loss to a community, state and nation cannot be measured. Thus, the passing of Roy S. Ihlenfeldt on February 13, 1959, has dealt a blow to conservation education in Wisconsin. With his passing go ideas that he had conceived and propagated for perhaps half a century. While there is no substitute for ideas expressed by one who is active, alert, and intelligent, consolation, if there be any, can be found in the fact that Roy has left his imprint in the hearts and on the minds of thousands of people. These imprints have been made by word of mouth and through the printed word. For nearly a quarter of a century, conservation education and Roy Ihlenfeldt were synonymous in the State of Wisconsin. Wherever people assembled to discuss conservation education, Roy was present either in person or influence. If people gathered to share ideas to be put in print, Roy was there to share and in many instances to perform the Herculean task of pulling these ideas together and phrasing them for publication.

Roy S. Ihlenfeldt will be remembered for his work in conservation education. Yet, he never lost sight of the fact that while conservation has its place, it plays only one role in developing and practicing the good way of life. These ideas have been carried to thousands of the youth of Wisconsin through the teachers who studied in the county colleges of the State. It was Roy who worked closely with these institutions in an effort to develop a program of education that would prepare teachers to meet all of the challenges of educating boys and girls throughout the State.

Yes; Roy's energy, enthusiasm, and ability gained for him recognition in many phases of life and education by individuals and organizations. Yet, for those of us who knew him well, it would seem that the greatest tribute that could be paid would be that of continuing to encourage everyone to develop and practice a philosophy of conservation that will help to assure the good life.

CREED OF THE SOIL CONSERVATIONIST

(By C. W. Gee)

I believe God created the earth by His divine processes for the benefit of man, not one man, nor one generation, but mankind for all time.

I believe the Almighty gave man an inheritance of the earth, not to be hoarded as a miser guards his treasure, but to be used with wisdom and in the fullest for the perpetual benefit of all men.

I believe all of mankind, regardless of race or creed are entitled to a fair and equitable share of the earth's bounty commensurate with their own efforts. But in so believing, I hold the irrevocable conviction that man himself owes earth a debt of respect and fealty.

I believe that whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; that he who manages his fields, pastures, woodlands, and streams with respect and wisdom shall reap the bountiful harvest and so shall his descendents while he who uses them selfishly, thinking only of his own immediate gain, shall bring to grief his land, himself, and his children's children.

Holding these beliefs to be true I dedicate myself to the task of helping my fellow men realize their own personal responsibility in conserving the earth for the generations which follow them. To this end I shall devote my best knowledge in guiding the efforts of those who till the soil so that the land which nurtures us shall be fruitful without end.

For truly, the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, but the responsibility for its stewardship is vested in man.

OBJECTIVES

1. To broaden interests through active participation.

2. To enrich teaching methods through a "learn by doing" procedure.

3. To coordinate the efforts of conservationists, lay people, club leaders, and schools in making conservation everybody's job.

4. To organize a systematic approach to the study that will effectively utilize the contributions of all conservation agencies.

5. To create an awareness of and to develop an understanding of conservation problems beginning with the local to countywide, statewide, and national.

6. To consider the possibility of a biannual workshop camp that will become a continuing process open to all conservation-minded persons.

Constituents Oppose Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was last year in debating an agriculture bill that one Member suggested it would be simpler and far more economical to pay a cash sum to each farmer rather than to appropriate the billions of dollars necessary to carry out the price support farm subsidy program. I figure on that

score that each farmer would get about $1,090 a year.

However, the answer lies in repealing the laws and letting the farmer in a free economy work and make his living without all the Federal regimentation.

My constituents are opposed to the current law. Here are a few of the things they say:

I would like to take a minute of your time to express my opinion on the farm product surplus problem. I feel the Federal Government should not lease any federally owned land for agricultural uses whenever it would contribute in any way to increasing the surplus. I feel it would be cheaper to buy up the marginal agricultural land and put it in a federally owned soil bank rather than pay exorbitant rental payments to accomplish the same thing.

Why does the U.S. Government support tobacco raisers when the medical profession has pretty well concluded that smoking is a contributing cause of cancer?

The Kitsap County Republican Women's Club, at their February 11 meeting, heartily endorsed your nonsubsidy farm plan and wish to commend you for your leadership in this matter.

Let's do something about the agriculture surpluses. Somebody should have the courage to change the current mess, even though it might mean political death.

I am against price supports and for a free and open market. Let things seek their own level—they will if the Government would keep out.

We have much surplus grain, some of it spoiling, still we are paying a very high price for bread.

Supply and demand should be the rule.

Why should one small segment of the population be subsidized and guaranteed prosperity at the expense of all?

In times like this it seems ridiculous that we pay taxes to make prices higher.

There is no reason why the farmers have to be paid to not raise foodstuff.

Let's have the farmer go back into competition with other farmers as in other industries. That would eliminate surpluses and require farmers to plan their crops ahead.

Let the farmer run the farms and let us get back to supply and demand. Get the Government out of the various businesses and attend to governing.

Get rid of the surplus, give it to needy countries, or burn it. Why pay millions of dollars to store it when it will probably never be used?

I sincerely believe our farm surpluses should be given as an economic aid to needy peoples here and elsewhere in the world.

The Need for Survival Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in the past 2 weeks the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services have been holding hearings on the Nation's missile and space programs.

Certainly, it is too early at this time to draw definite and directional conclusions from the testimony presented thus far on every subject.

However, Mr. President, I believe that in the conflicting testimony of our experts in the field representing the three major services, it has been made demonstrably clear that our efforts in the fields of missiles and space have been tailored to preconceived budgetary notions. This has been stated by our top men in the Navy, Air Force, and Army.

Certainly, most of us who have given time and study to this vital question of survival and to the crucial need for maintaining an adequate deterrent must realize that we cannot cut too fine the assessments of relative strength between the United States and the U.S.S.R. One miscalculation based on insufficient intelligence or failure to properly read what is now popularly called the "intent" of a potential enemy could lead to disaster.

Mr. President, when all the arguments pro and con are submitted, I am sure that the Congress will respond to the feeling of the people that it would be a wiser course for all of us to take a position of adequate insurance to deter whatever intention the Soviets may have. We are not dealing with a precise mathematical equation in which the numerical factors on both sides are positively known. I believe that it would be incumbent upon us—indeed, it would be our constitutional responsibility—to provide every possible insurance against a fatal miscalculation in our intelligence assessments in the missile field.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the recent column of Joseph Alsop entitled "The Basic Crime," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1960]

MATTER OF FACT—THE BASIC CRIME

(By Joseph Alsop)

Go to the old Navy Department, to hear the story of the great Polaris submarine-and-missile project. It is an inspiring experience. It is also a deeply reassuring experience—until you begin to think about it.

Here are just about the most technically advanced weapons man has ever devised, considerably more complex, over all, than our Atlas ICBM for instance. Here is a weapons system requiring many tens of thousands of human and mechanical components, ranging from men for the missile crews to air cleaners for the submarines, to fabulously accurate gyros for the missiles themselves. Here is a project demanding continuous, coordinated forward movement on countless different fronts.

This marvelous movement began, almost from scratch, in 1956. Less than 4 years ago, the Polaris project was set up on the lines of a smaller Manhattan District, under the brilliant and hard-driving Adm. W. F. Raborn, Jr. Yet today, all the fantastically complex parts are nearly ready to be fitted together in the first operational Polaris. Before the year is out, the *George Washington* will be at sea with 16 missiles abroad, any one of which will be able to kill a medium-sized city.

The Polaris project is inspiring because it shows what we in America can do if we put our minds to it, and it is reassuring because it promises important reinforcements for the American deterrent. But this project is also the very opposite of reassuring, if you just crank the Polaris experience into the current great debate about national defense.

At bottom, the defense debate concerns only one question. The question is whether the Soviets now have or will soon have the small number of intercontinental ballistic missiles needed to wipe out the American deterrent, which is now totally vulnerable. The number needed at this time is only 150 Soviet ICBM's. The national intelligence estimates say that the Soviets do not now have 150 ICBM's, and further say they will not have the still small but gradually increasing numbers of ICBM's they will need later. The President has therefore neglected to budget the relatively modest sums of money that are needed to make the American deterrent less vulnerable, by maintaining an airborne alert and in other ways. Yet, merely by its brilliant success, the Polaris project raises at least two kinds of grave doubts about the dependability of the national intelligence estimates on which so much dependence has been placed.

On the one hand, it raises technical doubts. For example, the able Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, has testified that there are good reasons to believe the Soviets do not have weapons crews for a decisive number of ICBM's. These reasons are fairly persuasive if the Soviets are assumed to need the same large numbers of men included in the American ICBM squadrons. But these reasons are less persuasive when you note 33 men on the *George Washington* will service and if necessary fire a total of 16 Polaris missiles.

Suppose it is certain that the Soviet ICBM is liquid-fueled, rather than solid-fueled like the Polaris and the prospective American Minuteman missile. Suppose that a Soviet ICBM weapons crew has to be proportionally four times larger than a Polaris weapons crew, because of the greater difficulty of servicing liquid-fueled missiles. But suppose also that the Soviet ICBM's are as fully automated as Polaris, and that the Soviet ICBM crews are as economically organized as Admiral Raborn's Polaris crews.

You then get a figure of only about 1,300 men in specially trained weapons crews to fire 150 Soviet ICBM's. And how on earth can anyone but the all-seeing Almighty be sure that a mere 1,300 men have not been specially trained somewhere in the vast reaches of the Soviet land mass?

In the same way the Polaris project also raises what may be called grave organizational doubts about the national intelligence estimates. To be specific, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner, who was eventually fired for being too right about the missile gap, wisely fought for a Manhattan District type organization of our ICBM program. Gardner was defeated in this fight, however. Under Gen. Benjamin Schriever, great things have nonetheless been accomplished with our ICBM program. But because Gardner was defeated, General Schriever has always had to work through channels, and mostly through half-clogged channels. Hence Schriever has lacked the immense organizational advantages of Admiral Raborn in the Polaris project, and of General Groves in the Manhattan District.

Meanwhile, under the prevailing estimating system our own ICBM performance is our yardstick for Soviet ICBM performance. The Soviet program began years before ours did. Only suppose that the boss of the Soviet program has enjoyed the same organizational advantages as Admiral Raborn. Then there is no reason why all the

needful components—missiles, weapons crews, launchers, and so on—may not suddenly be brought together into a complete, decisively powerful Soviet ICBM system in the near future, just as all the Polaris components will be brought together in the near future in the George Washington.

These doubts about the national estimates do not reflect on the CIA, which only claims to produce informed estimates, not gospel truth. These doubts reflect, rather, on the use of the administration is making of the estimates.

Just this is the crucial point. The national intelligence estimates may be correct to the last decimal. Pray God they are. But they may also be wrong by a considerable margin. If the estimates of Soviet ICBM's are wrong, even by a very narrow margin, the error can be fatal. Basically, therefore, it is not merely foolish, it is really criminal to use the national estimates as precision instruments which show how little we need to do. Common prudence demands insurance against error in the ICBM estimate. The national interest demands measures, such as the airborne alert, to end the total vulnerability of the American deterrent. And sound practice demands that the use of mere estimates as precision instruments be abandoned and condemned, as wholly pernicious and improper.

Report of President of Society of American Registered Architects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on last September 25 and 26 the Society of American Registered Architects, an organization representing registered architects, held its first national meeting in Kansas City, Kans. A highlight of that meeting was the report of the society's founder and first president, Hon. Wilfred J. Gregson, of Atlanta, Ga. I ask unanimous consent that the account of Mr. Gregson's report, as carried in the current ARA brochure, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

"You are my report. You are the ones who have made the first great step toward a unified profession of architecture. You are a living report that will go to every part of these 50 United States."

So said President Wilfred Gregson in his report to ARA members at the opening sessions of the national meeting.

"You will take back the olive branch as a token that the waters of selfishness are receding," said the founder of ARA. Describing the founding of ARA through his own efforts and with the aid of many others, Gregson stated that ARA is now a powerful society throughout the United States.

"We have succeeded in proving that there is a great need for the Society of American Registered Architects; that there are unlimited ways such a society can be of value to each architect, his client, his town, State, and nation. * * * We can't cure all the ills at once, but we have started and can see possibilities of great expanses."

The president of ARA predicted that the unselfish work of ARA members will end in "finer architecture and more unified distribution of the proceeds."

He stated that the task of ARA members is to enlist every registered architect in the United States.

"Architects must be represented before Congress," the president declared. He asked that some ancient taboos on advertising be recognized as now out of date."

The theory "it's better to do nothing than to be called unethical" has played into the hands of a few moguls and helped a few gigantic firms to flourish, Gregson stated.

The ARA program is simple. It is all architects for all architects. ARA policy is to build up architects, not fence them in, the president explained.

"We must alert architects to the greatness which is ours. We must teach our own people that there is a God of plenty in the heavens and that the doctrine of insuffiency is evil.

"The control of ARA is by officers who are elected each year at the annual meeting. The nominations committee is also elected at each annual meeting. There can be no stacked vote or perpetuation of officers. This includes your president who automatically becomes past president at the meeting of 1960, when a newly elected president will take the gavel."

As a final charge he told members that ARA must not become overcomplicated, or its objectives forgotten.

WILFRED J. GREGSON,
National President.

Jurisdiction of International Court of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 17, 1960, Mr. Frank B. Ober testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with regard to Senate Resolution 94 which would repeal the Connally reservation.

Mr. Ober is an able constitutional lawyer and his testimony gives scholarly treatment to this most important issue. I recommend a careful reading of its contents to all my colleagues.

Mr. Ober has prepared a short summary of his testimony and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNALLY RESERVATION

Briefly, the history of the present movement, as I get it, is as follows:

1. The United Nations Charter, article II, section 7, expressly prohibits intervention in matters "which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or which require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter."

2. The provision for the World Court required affirmative adherence by separate action. The United States, like 16 other countries, in the Connally reservation (adopted 61 to 12) excluded from the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court such matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America."

3. In 1947, before the cold war and the disillusionment as to communism, a movement was started to rescind this reservation, and was even recommended by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association.

4. Since 1947 the movement was apparently completely dead because of a lot of history under which the State Department started trying to regulate domestic matters by treaty without amending the Constitution. This gave rise to a general proposal to limit the treatmaking power, which failed by one vote of reaching two-thirds because Secretary Dulles assured the Senate committee that no further efforts would be made to pass such treaties.

5. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee suddenly took up the Connally proposal that everybody thought had been dead for more than 10 years, heard two or three witnesses, and was about to propose action in the Senate, but has apparently been deterred by being reminded that it would involve a fundamental change in our Constitution in surrendering to a foreign court the determination of matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America." Yesterday, because of the uproar, they had another hearing and I submitted my statement, but did not go over there because there wasn't time enough to make certain that I would be given a chance to make an oral statement.

6. It seems to me as a matter of constitutional law that to vest a part of the judicial power over domestic matters in a world court instead of the Supreme Court would, at the least, require an amendment to the Constitution.

7. That no such amendment would have a ghost of a chance of adoption, partly because the Court would be composed of 15 judges, only one of which can be from this country, many of them being from Communist and other totalitarian countries where judges regard themselves as agents of their respective states. This seems strange to us, but they haven't the slightest conception of the independence of the judicial function. What, if any, ideas of the judicial function will come from the 40 additional so-called nations being added, from Africa, the Middle East, and parts of Asia, it is impossible to foretell except that they cannot have any training in our kind of law or the constitutional preservation of liberties or property.

Conflict-of-Interest Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the report of the special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on conflict-of-interest problems is reviewed in a very fine editorial in this morning's Washington Post. The editorial emphasizes that the legislation recommended by the special committee of which I am a cosponsor has a double purpose: First, to make it easier to remove from Government positions officials who have a conflict of interest; and, second, to remove unreasonable impediments in existing conflict-of-interest laws to the recruitment of competent well-trained persons.

I believe that the Washington Post editorial will be of interest to many persons, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1960]

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

A special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has handed Congress a very thorough study of the conflict-of-interest problems that are plaguing the Federal Government, together with a bill designed to bring about suggested reforms. The study group takes its stand on the basic principle that "a democratic government cannot risk having its officials in a position where loyalty to their official duties conflicts with their personal economic interest." But the committee also sees that the divestment of public servants should not be carried to the point where it is difficult to hire top executives for high governmental posts. The bill is thus designed to serve a double purpose.

We think the idea of passing a comprehensive new conflict-of-interest statute is excellent. Most of the laws now on the books are related to problems of the post-Civil War period. Since then the Government has grown to enormous proportions; Civil Service has supplanted the spoils system. Administrative machinery has been highly developed. New sources of possible conflict have arisen, and the whole problem needs to be viewed in the light of present-day conditions. There should also be a substantial advantage in bringing together all the law and the rules on this subject so that they will be readily available to administrators, Federal employees and the private interests with which they come into contact.

The proposed statute would write into the law a general provision against gift-taking by Government employees. In general it would strike at gifts from persons having interests that might be substantially affected by an employee's performance or nonperformance of official duties. Enforcement of the law would be sought chiefly by administrative remedies, including dismissal, leaving criminal penalties for the more flagrant cases. The emphasis of the program would be preventive rather than penal.

Not all of the committee's voluminous recommendations are designed to impose new restraints on Government servants. It found that "the strict requirements of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the divestiture of stock have made it difficult for the Department of Defense to procure top level executives." To meet this obstacle to recruitment, the study committee suggests that employees of private companies coming into the Federal service be allowed to continue participating in private pension plans under various safeguards. The Armed Services Committee has been quite erratic in its demands that some nominees to the Defense Department (but not others) divest themselves of stocks in order to win confirmation. It has shown little interest in other forms of wealth held by nominees. The need for a more consistent policy is obvious, and it should encourage the recruitment of highly skilled executives as well as the elimination of conflicts of interest.

The committee would also draw a line between regular Federal employees and consultants who give only par time to governmental work. This distinction obviously would not relieve policymakers of the necessity to guard against special-interest influence from consultants. The constructive and soundly based bar association study offers no panacea for the perennial problems of conflict of interests, but its new approaches should help to isolate a few bad eggs without subjecting the vast majority of honest and conscientious Government employees to impossible working conditions.

The Right To Vote and the Commission on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech entitled "The Right To Vote and the Commission on Civil Rights" delivered at the City Club of Chicago on November 3, 1959, by the distinguished visiting associate professor at Notre Dame Law School, Mr. Harris Wofford, Jr.:

THE RIGHT TO VOTE AND THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Harris Wofford, Jr., visiting associate professor, Notre Dame Law School)

I understand that a recent talk to this club by the scientist Dr. William Davidson was read and cited by Mr. Khrushchev on his trip here. I doubt that my talk will have that fortune or misfortune, but perhaps Mr. Khrushchev should read the report of the Commission on Civil Rights. For one reason, he certainly has civil rights problems of his own—ours must seem small to him compared with those he faces in Eastern Europe and with the educated, restless, questioning Soviet young people. I could list this worldwide ferment for human rights now underway in Africa, Asia, and South America, throughout the colored majority of the human race, as one of the reasons to expect further progress in this country and ultimately perhaps in the Soviet Empire. It is in the context of this world process that the report of the Commission on Civil Rights must be read and its work judged.

Another reason Mr. Khrushchev should read the Commission's report is that there are critics who say he would find some affinity with it. Senator EASTLAND said that many of the Commission's recommendations "could only have been equaled by mutterings from the Kremlin." Senator STROM THURMOND said that he had "never heard the Marxist philosophy more succinctly stated" than in the closing statement of Father Hesburgh at the end of the report. And Senator TALMADGE says that "the Commission on Civil Rights is the antithesis of everything for which we Americans claim to stand."

Two years ago when the Commission was established to find the facts about denials of the right to vote and other alleged violations of the constitutional rule of equal protection of the laws there was also considerable criticism—then in the form of general skepticism. Southern white politicians and Negro leaders alike saw it as a delaying tactic that would stall further congressional action on civil rights. Why study the situation any more? Negro spokesman asked. This American dilemma has been studied and surveyed and appraised for a century, they said. It is now nearly 90 years since the 15th amendment clearly prohibited the denial of the right to vote by reason of race. The American Negro is sick and tired of being studied. He wants his rights.

Those of us who went to work for the Commission also saw this shadow of futility hanging over us. Many of us wondered whether the facts we found would become dead and distant things, whether the report we were writing would turn out to be a cemetery for buried hopes, whether in truth the Commission was an albatross that would serve to plague us all.

The composition of the Commission was not reassuring. With three members from the North and three from the South, with not a single liberal or northern Democrat, with no member who had been in the forefront of the cause of civil rights, there seemed to be a built-in stalemate.

Whistling in the dark, some of us said that at least there would be an interesting dialogue. The three southern members were distinguished lawyers and public servants and presumably believed in the rule of reason. I recalled Chancellor Hutchins' old refrain that ours is the civilization of the dialogue.

But there was a hollow ring to our talk. For at first ours was such an isolated and lonely dialogue. From April 1, April Fool's Day, 1958, when I joined the Commission's staff, one of the first attorneys to arrive, throughout the spring and most of the summer not a single sworn complaint alleging denial of the right to vote was submitted. NAACP officers generally took the position that we were a hopeless bunch and that it wasn't worth wasting time and postage or risking lives sending a complaint to us. But in order to invoke the Commission's duty to investigate there had to be a sworn complaint. This was no Commission to take a broad construction of the Act and go on a fishing expedition. So we studied the laws and read books and wrote memorandums, and our staff investigators spent the summer doing research in the Library of Congress, and some of us began to devise in our minds a musical comedy on the whole fiasco.

Then one day nearly a year after Congress had passed the bill establishing the Commission, and 5 months after the Commission was in real operation a complaint arrived. It was rather a broad one, alleging "that through threats of bodily harm and losing of jobs, and other means, Negro residents of Gadsden County, Fla., are being deprived of their right to vote." The complaining party did not even claim that he himself was being deprived of the right to vote. But nevertheless the Commission by unanimous vote decided to conduct an immediate field investigation. Surprised and encouraged by the Commission's prompt action, other Negroes began submitting complaints from other southern States, first, from Alabama, then from Louisiana and Mississippi, and in each case the Commission unanimously voted to investigate.

Soon a small flood of complaints from black belt Alabama counties led the Commission unanimously to decide to request local officials to let Commission investigators inspect the registration records. When the Alabama officials refused, the Commission unanimously voted to hold a public hearing on all these complaints in Montgomery, Ala., and to subpena the records. You probably recall some of the events of the hearing, generally well covered by television—the 33 witnesses who gave personal accounts of being denied the right to register in 4 counties. Ten were college graduates, 6 of whom held doctorate degrees. All were literate. Only seven had not completed high school. Some were war veterans with battle decorations. You may have seen the dramatic appeal by Commission Member Battle of Virginia, a former governor and avowed segregationist, who

begged the Alabama white officials to cooperate with the Commission and to disprove these allegations if they could.

Perhaps you did not follow the legal tangle after the hearing. Finally the Commission, under court order, was able to inspect most of the records it needed, although the State of Alabama quickly passed a law providing for the destruction of registration records within 30 days after the rejection of applicants. After appraising these records and the sworn testimony, the Commission unanimously adopted findings of fact describing the various ways qualified Negro voters were being denied their right to register.

I have emphasized the unanimity and promptness of the Commission's action in order to show that those who decided that the Commission was not worth using and testing were wrong. It also explains why some of us on the staff felt a growing hope that in some measure the Commission was going to take itself and the country by surprise. My own hope had always been that having been put on the spot, the Commission would rise with the occasion—that it would rise, and be better than the sum of its parts, because it was an instrument of law, of our highest written law, the Constitution, at a time when the law was in motion. Time is needed to fulfill great constitutional promises, but it has been a long time. Our national frustration, I hoped, had reached that necessary critical point after which remedial action, however painful, was probable.

As the reports came in from the field, of hesitant, doubtful Negroes who were ready to risk everything to tell their stories—of an old farmer who received our investigator saying that this was the first time in 60 years that the big Government had shown any interest in him, asking, Is the big Government really going to do something to let me vote?—we could measure the effect on ourselves and more importantly the Commissioners.

I will not try to go through the history of the Commission here. But the momentum of these first investigations led to the scheduling of the hearing in Louisiana and also to hearings on discrimination in housing in New York, Atlanta, Chicago, and Washington, and a conference in Nashville of school officials from districts in Southern and border States that had experienced some desegregation, to compare experience and discover sound methods of desegregation.

Now that our full 600 page report, our 200 page abridgment, and our thousands of published pages of hearings have been submitted to the President and Congress, you may still ask the question, was it worthwhile after all? The facts have been found, unanimously—facts showing clearly that qualified Negroes are being denied their right to vote in a considerable number of southern counties, facts showing that school integration can be and in some places is being used to raise the standard of education of both Negro and white students but that the constitutional requirement of desegregation is not being complied with nor is likely to be complied with in many areas of the South; and facts showing that discrimination in housing exists in cities North as well as South, West as well as East, and particularly it exists in Federal housing programs which are supposed to be subject to the constitutional rule against discrimination.

But what good will all these facts be? Who will be moved to do something about them? In our New York housing hearing Judge Justine Wise Polier cited Disraeli's remark that there was hardly a woman in England who would not be more disturbed by the smashing of the joint of her small finger in a carriage door than by hearing that a million children had died of famine the preceding week in China.

How many Americans will be moved to action by the knowledge that Negro schoolteachers in Terrell County, Ga., are denied registration because they pronounced "equity" as "eequity"; or that in Louisiana Negroes are denied registration if they fail to give a reasonable interpretation of the following clauses of the State constitution:

"The legislature shall provide by law for change of venue in civil and criminal cases."

"The exercise of the police power of the State shall never be abridged."

And ponder this one:

"Prescription shall not run against the State in any civil matter." One registrar disqualified a Negro voter for "Error in Spilling," and in his affidavit the registrar himself spelled it "spilling."

And what good will our collection of county-by-county voting statistics be? While the statistical picture isn't yet complete (there are no statistics county by county yet for Tennessee, and Mississippi is not up to date), it is ugly enough. Consider just these few items: The Commission found that there were 16 counties where Negroes constituted a majority of the voting-age population in the last census but where not a single Negro was registered at last report; it found some 49 other Negro-majority counties where a few Negroes were registered, but less than 5 percent of voting-age Negroes. There are 14 Mississippi counties with a total 1950 population of about 230,000, of whom 109,000 were Negroes, where not a single Negro was at last report registered.

But where will this officially documented knowledge take us?

Let me be the optimist and suggest that the Commission's Report itself is an important milestone that marks and will henceforth measure the progress in this field. First, the facts found took the Commissioners, or all but one of them, to positions some of them had not expected to reach. Five of the Commissioners, including Dean Robert Storey of Southern Methodist University Law School in Dallas, Tex., and former Gov. Doyle Carlton of Florida, joined in recommending that in cases of discriminatory denial of the right to register, the President should be empowered to appoint temporary Federal registrars, from existing local Federal employees such as the U.S. Postmaster, who would actually register citizens who qualify under State law, applied without discrimination.

Most southern legislators and newspaper editorials have professed shock that two such respected southern conservatives would have supported so far-reaching a recommendation.

But Commissioners Storey and Carlton state in the report why they supported it: "We strongly believe in the right of every qualified citizen of the United States, irrespective of his color * * * to register, vote, and have his vote counted," they said. "We regard full protection of these rights of suffrage by both State and Federal Governments as necessary and proper." They joined in recommending temporary Federal registrars because, as the Commission unanimously reported, "Against the prejudice of registrars and jurors, the U.S. Government appears under present laws, to be helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution."

Governor Battle of Virginia could not agree to this drastic remedial action but he did join in the findings of denial of voting rights, he stated that he believed "that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote," and he joined in four less—far-reaching Commission recommendations to strengthen present laws, including a recommendation that voting records be made public records to be preserved for inspection for a period of 5 years.

I am emphasizing the position of the southern members because I believe it points to the way forward. On the right to vote there was no disposition to defend the practices of the black belt counties and two of the three southerners supported all-out preventive action by the President and Congress. As former Governor Carlton of Florida used to say around the Commission on occasion, "We must take the bull by the tail and look the ugly facts straight in the face." The southern members did not like the facts that were found on denials of voting rights in their region. But they were lawyers and public servants sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. And, it is interesting to note, the Southern press, in criticizing the Commission's recommendations, almost unanimously condemned the practices which these recommendations were designed to cure.

Here it seems to me is the open door. The solid South is split on this issue. The wedge of the Constitution must widen that split at just this point. For this is the creative split that we have been loking for. This is the split that can carry Texas, Florida, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia into the camp of the Constitution. Here is the issue that can divide the great cities of the South—Atlanta, New Orleans, and others, where the Negroes vote in large numbers and without discrimination, from the black belt rural counties which are the strongholds of the southern white supremicists and the strangleholds of Southern State politics.

It seems to me also that a shift of focus for a year or so from the frustratingly slow and complex problem of school desegregation to this clear-cut issue of voting rights is politically right and psychologically healthy. The 14th amendment is after all subject to varying interpretations and the Supreme Court school decision reinterpreting the equal protection clause to prohibit what an earlier Court's had upheld is subject to fair criticism. I agree wholeheartedly with this Court's interpretation, and I am glad that the Commission unanimously stated that "The constitutional right to be free from compulsory segregation in public education can be and must be realized, for this is a government of law, and the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land." And I think it was useful to have this Commission, with its three southerners in accord, stating that: "The problem, therefore, is how to comply with the Supreme Court while preserving and even improving public education," and to have the Commission state bluntly that "The ultimate choice of each State is between finding reasonable ways of ending compulsory segregation in its schools or abandoning its system of free public education." But the Commission did not throw much if any new light on how the dominant forces and opinion in a whole region are to be persuaded by law to move in this regard with all deliberate speed. "There remains," as the Commission reported, "the enduring American problem of obtaining the consent of the governed."

But that problem is nowhere near so great in respect to the right to vote. The 15th amendment is after all quite clear, and there has never really been any doubt that it means just what it says: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." By the very terms of the amendment Congress is empowered to enforce this right by appropriate legislation. By exercising this power now, as the Commission has recommended, Congress can cut through the white southern case about "judicial legislation." It can demonstrate that the Government of the United States is not helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution. By

so doing, by at last establishing this first right of Americans, the right to vote, Congress would be giving new momentum to the fulfillment of all other rights, and particularly of the right to an integrated public education. Thus I do not propose a retreat on the public school front but an advance and, I hope, a breakthrough in the field of voting rights at a time when very little advance in school integration is possible.

So I am suggesting that a significant action has already taken place simply in the presentation of the Commission's report with strong new recommendations to protect the right to vote. When the Commission rolled its 2-year factfinding into one ball and tossed it into the hands of the next session of Congress and of the President of the United States, it changed the whole legislative picture. As an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald stated, the Commission's far-reaching voting proposals make the previous Presidential and legislative civil rights proposals "look pallid by comparison." By the way, I should include in the package presented by the Commission the proposal by the Chairman and by Father Hesburgh and Commissioner Johnson for a constitutional amendment to further protect the right to vote by establishing a universal franchise, limited only by State age and length-of-residence requirements. This would prohibit the literacy and interpretation tests through which most of the discrimination occurs. It seems to me that these Commissioners are right that "the time has come for the United States to take the last of its many steps toward free and universal suffrage." Together, the temporary Federal registrar and this universal suffrage amendment, for the first time would enable the Government of the United States to enforce its first principle throughout the land.

These proposals made by the official Commission assigned to find the facts and make appropriate recommendtions seem destined to become the chief civil rights questions before Congress. This will be a particularly important test for the Republican Party. For everyone knows that the Democrats are regionally split on this issue. But if the Republicans in Congress will join the majority on the Democratic side in supporting strong right-to-vote legislation there are enough votes, more than enough, to pass it. LYNDON JOHNSON has underscored the test for Republicans by agreeing that civil rights legislation will be brought to the floor of the Senate shortly after the Republicans have returned from their Lincoln's birthday speeches, this February.

If the congressional Republicans put their cloakroom coalition with Southern Democrats above their public commitments to civil rights, then they will surely pay the price in the 1960 election. And the result, whether this session or after the next election, is surely going to be a strong new civil rights bill. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was the first legislation by that name or for that purpose in 82 years. But the passage of that act, over ineffective southern opposition, and the creation and operation and report of the Commission on Civil Rights, have set a new pace.

The test, however, is not that of Congress alone. Between the lines of the Commission's report emerges a strong plea for greater Presidential leadership. Will the President recommend to his party leaders and to Congress the adoption of the Commission's proposals for right-to-vote legislation? Will he support it with all of his persuasive power? Will he issue the Executive order on equal opportunity in housing, to govern all Federal housing programs, which the Commission unanimously recommended that he issue? Will he, in these last months of his administration, give to this crucial domestic problem of civil rights the direct personal attention that he is now giving to foreign policy?

The Commission reported to the President that "some dramatic and creative intervention by the leaders of our national life is necessary" in order to eliminate discrimination. In the past Executive leadership has proved effective in other aspects of civil rights. President Roosevelt's wartime Fair Employment Practices Committee, established by Executive order, diminished racial job discrimination in the war effort. Discrimination in the Armed Forces was largely ended as a result of President Truman's Executive order calling for equal opportunity for all American servicemen. The Presidential committees on equal opportunity and equal treatment in the fields of Government contracts and Government employment, started by President Truman, have also made contributions. President Eisenhower has continued these earlier Presidential initiatives but he has not given the powerful new leadership that the problem, now at its head, requires.

The President repeatedly says that discrimination is a matter of the minds and hearts of men. But he is sworn to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." In Little Rock he demonstrated that he would carry out this duty even if it took bayonets. But the logic of his position is that since he must enforce the laws and since their enforcement depends on changing the minds and hearts of people, he, as Chief Executive, as the one in the most powerful position to reach and influence the minds and hearts of Americans, must give his full political and moral leadership in this endeavor. "Law," said the Commission's report, "must be inventive, creative, and educational."

Now I have not discussed Chicago and it is too late to do so fairly. The Commission's report, based on its hearing here, says a lot about Chicago. Perhaps I should just leave this as an inducement to you to read the report. You know that the report described Chicago as the most residentially segregated large city in the country. It also raised the question whether Chicago and Illinois should not be considering the adoption of civil rights law prohibiting discrimination in housing at the same time that Congress is debating new civil rights legislation. The Commission found that city and State laws against discrimination in housing and official agencies enforcing those laws primarily through education, conciliation and mediation have been helpful in New York and elsewhere. The Commission found further that in Chicago, where no such laws exist, the Negroes' primary method of securing better housing has had to be through the mutually unsatisfactory system of block-busting with the consequent uprooting of adjacent white neighborhoods and with inevitable racial tension. The Commission also found unanimously that where public opinion makes possible the adoption of laws against discrimination in housing this could make a significant contribution.

Is Chicago not a city and is Illinois not a State where public opinion does make possible such a forward step? Establishing equal opportunity in housing will take imaginative and brave leadership, but will it also not require the leadership of the law?

If those regions of the country that are insisting upon national action to enforce constitutional rights will practice what they preach and embody in their State and local laws the principles they advocate for national application, the prospects for nationwide action will be brighter. At least the facts of discrimination on our own doorsteps are more like an injury or a threat to our own bodies than a famine in China or even a denial of the right to vote in Mississippi. Yet the promise of the Constitution fulfilled anywhere leaves the Constitution stronger everywhere.

Progress on the Nicolet National Forest in the 1950's in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation, and best utilization of our forests, as well as our soil and water resources, is extremely important—if we are to perpetuate such resources for the benefit of the generations in the years ahead.

Throughout the country, constructive programs are underway to meet these objectives.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mr. K. P. Butterfield, forest supervisor from Rhinelander, Wis., a brief résumé of the progress in utilization as well as preservation of the Nicolet National Forest in Wisconsin during the 1950's. In addition to preservation practices, the program has included a wide variety of other activities, including: providing out-of-doors opportunity for recreation for millions of people, carrying forward constructive wildlife management work; sales of timber including over one-half million acres of pulpwood, 30 million board feet of saw timber; treeplanting of over 2,000 acres; and other special uses for recreational, educational, and utilitarian purposes.

Overall, I believe the report is representative of the constructive way in which our national forests' resources can, and should, be utilized. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS ON THE NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST IN THE 1950'S

Since we are now starting on a new decade, it seems to be a good time to take a look back and see what has been accomplished in the past 10 years. Since the forest was established in 1933, our objective has been to increase the productivity of the land to its full capacity for the production of timber, game, fish, and other recreation resources and to satisfy the demands on it within the limits of its ability to produce on a sustained yield basis.

Progress toward attaining these goals is made by protecting the area against fire, insects, disease, and an overpopulation of animals; by providing for young growth where such is lacking either by planting or by proper cutting methods which will insure the establishment of a new crop; by building and maintaining roads into areas now relatively inaccessible; by giving special consideration to roadsides in order that their aesthetic values will be maintained; and by developing picnicking, camping, and swimming areas for the use and enjoyment of people who like that kind of recreation.

The 1950's were years of progress toward our ultimate goal of full productivity and full utilization. In most respects, 1959 was the best year of the decade, giving promise of still greater progress in the 1960's. The following paragraphs have been prepared to give you an idea of what has been going on

in the Nicolet National Forest for the past 10 years.

RECREATION

The estimated number of people using the national forest for recreation purposes has more than doubled since 1950. There were 123,000 in 1950, and 325,000 in 1959. Total for 10 years is 2,706,000: 358,000 picnickers, 316,000 hunters, 531,000 fishermen, 165,000 campers, 41,000 skiers, and 1,295,000 came for other recreation purposes, mostly just sightseers. In an attempt to keep up with the booming demand for picnic and camping sites, 59 new units were constructed and 68 of the old ones were rehabilitated. This has not been enough to prevent severe overcrowding by the 68,000 campers and picnickers last summer.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Most of the wildlife management work for the forest is done with the cooperation of the Wisconsin Conservation Department and some of the sportsmen's clubs. Under this program, 7 dams have been built to provide small water impoundments for the benefit of migrating waterfowl; 30 fisheries have been stocked and apparently are prospering; 330 miles of logging roads have been seeded to clover and grasses for the benefit of ruffed grouse. Timber sales provided untold quantities of deer food on the 100,000 acres cut over. An additional 1,408 acres were treated for the specific purpose of improving game habitat. Dear-hunting laws have been liberalized slightly so that there is now a somewhat more realistic harvest of deer than in the middle years of the decade. However, tihs is still a touch-and-go proposition and we cannot point with a great deal of pride to the progress made toward attaining the proper balance of the deer herd with its food supply. Sixty-six miles of hunter access roads have been constructed which are of considerable benefit in getting hunters back into inaccessible areas.

TIMBER SALES

One-half million cords of pulpwood and 30 million board feet of sawtimber were sold during the 10-year period. The amount harvested was 414,000 cords of pulpwood and 31 million feet of sawtimber. The amount sold in 1959 was the greatest in the history of the forest. It was 89,080 cords of pulpwood and 6.1 million board feet of sawtimber—nearly twice as much as any other year. Our management plan cutting budget allows a sustained-yield cut of 66,000 cords of pulpwood and 5.2 million board feet of sawtimber per year. We have not yet harvested the full amount in any year. The closest was in 1958 when 53,000 cords and 2.5 million board feet were cut.

There is always a lag of 2 or 3 years between amount sold and amount cut. The large amount sold in 1959 and expected sales in 1960 should provide for harvests of close to the allowable amounts in 1961 and 1962.

TIMBER STAND IMPROVEMENT

Nature grows trees in a wasteful manner without regard to their utility to man. Cull trees and trees of unusable species grow along with the good ones. Good forest culture aims to eliminate the undesirables so that most of the light, moisture, and space is used for the growth of trees of greatest value. Part of the job can be done by adopting good cutting methods. The rest of it has to be accomplished by the expenditure of labor in thinning, weeding, and release cuttings. In the 1950's, 15,030 acres were so treated.

PLANTING AND PLANTATION CARE

Over 3,000 acres were planted in the past 10 years. The total to date is 70,037 acres of successful plantations. To keep the plantations healthy and growing it has been necessary to protect them from insect epidemics and to keep them free from the competition of inferior trees. It was necessary to spray 40,000 acres for insect control. Release from overhead competition was accomplished on 29,503 acres.

SPECIAL USES

The regulations of the national forests permit some types of uses by local governments, educational institutions, organizations, corporations, and individuals. Examples on the Nicolet include powerline, telephone line, and road rights-of-way; gravel pits; cultivation; pasture; and town dumps. The Sheltered Valley ski area is on the national forest, but is run by an association under a lease. Trees for Tomorrow Camp at Eagle River operates under a free permit. The Hugo Sauer Tree Nursery at Rhinelander is rented free to the State of Wisconsin. Purdue University has taken over the Lost Lake Organization Camp and is using it as a summer school for its forestry students. In all, about 1,700 acres of the forest are used for these purposes.

FIRE PROTECTION

The U.S. Forest Service furnishes fire protection to 960,087 acres of land. Most of this (640,235 acres) is Government-owned. The other 319,852 acres are intermingled private, State, county and other ownership. In the 1950's there were 282 fires, burning 2,208 acres. This compares favorably with the 454 fires that burned 3,040 acres in the 1940's. During the decade we have installed a completely new ultra-high-frequency radio communications system. This has permitted us to abandon many miles of costly telephone lines.

ROADS

Since the beginning the Forest Service has constructed 557 miles of roads. In the past decade 90 miles were built. Proper signing of roads has been a problem, but a great deal of progress was made within the past 3 or 4 years. Nearly all roads now have number plate identification. Rustic directional signing is about half done. Just this past year the Wisconsin Highway Department has put up signs showing where forest roads enter the State highways. There is an annual budget of approximately $120,000 for road construction and maintenance.

FINANCES

In 1950 receipts from the sale of timber and land rentals were $127,816. In 1959 they were $195,114. Total for 10 years is $1,752,548. Of this, $435,025 was returned to the counties. Amount received by each county, 1950 to 1959 was:

County	Total 10-year period	1959 payment
Florence	$54,509	$6,176
Forest	228,198	25,549
Langlade	21,218	2,367
Oconto	93,028	10,401
Oneida	6,851	763
Vilas	31,170	3,522
Total	435,025	48,778

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST, 1959

General information

Gross area of forest (acres)	988,853
Net national forest ownership (acres)	640,235
Area protected from fire (acres)	960,087
Number of developed recreation areas	30
Fishing streams (miles)	840
Lakes (207) (acres)	34,614
Yearlong employees	34
Seasonal employees	71
Area planted to date (acres)	70,037
Road maintained (miles)	263

Accomplishments during the 10 years (1950–59) and for the year 1959

	1950–59	1959
Pulpwood sold (cords)	500,000	89,080
Sawtimber sold (M board feet)	30,000	6,100
Pulpwood harvested (cords)	414,000	40,484
Sawtimber harvested (M board feet)	31,000	3,285
Tree planting (acres)	3,185	345
Plantation and timber stand improvement (acres)	44,533	7,331
Insect and disease control (acres)	40,000	1,631
Roads constructed (miles)	90.0	19.4
Number of recreational visitors	2,706,000	325,000
Number of hunters	316,000	59,000
Number of fishermen	531,000	84,000
Total national forest receipts	$1,752,548	$195,114
Receipts returned to counties for schools and roads	$435,025	$48,778

It Will Be Eventually

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, water pollution is a subject of particular interest at this time, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enter into the RECORD the following editorial from the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., dated February 8, 1960. Though it deals with the problem on a State level, it is a reflection of the concern which people all across the Nation are feeling:

IT WILL BE EVENTUALLY

There are many who think that pollution has an effect that is as detrimental as hydroelectric dams to the existence of fish and there are some who think its effect is greater. That the State sanitary authority thinks degree of pollution is a powerful factor in maintaining fish runs is evident in its 1959 progress report.

Although improvements in both domestic and industrial pollution control during 1959 resulted, the authority says, in slightly better stream conditions in the Willamette River, there remains much to be done to reduce the dumpings of pulp mills into that river.

There is much that remains to be done to eradicate pollution in this State, but it also should be noted that much has been done. A total of 179 public or semipublic sewage treatment plants were in operation in Oregon as of December 31, 1959. These serve an estimated 835,000 persons, or more than 90 percent of Oregon's residents whose homes are connected to sewers. Only 49 treatment plants, serving 93,200 persons, were in operation when the sanitary authority was credited in 1938.

That the sanitary authority's program to curb pollution is continuing is evident in the report that at the end of last year 13 new treatment plants with a design capacity of 83,420 persons were under construction.

As aforesaid, industrial pollution continues to be a major problem. But it is significant that in contrast to some previous sanitary authority reports, the 1959 summary is generally complementary to progress by the pulp and paper industry.

"Through improved operation of their waste disposal facilities, more efficient chemical recovery, and better inplant con-

trols," the report said, "the pulp and paper mills in the Willamette Basin effected further reduction in the pollution loads being discharged from their operations into the river system. For example, during the month of August, which was the most critical streamflow period, the combined waste discharge from the four sulfite mills on the main river (at Salem, Newberg, Oregon City, and West Linn) had an oxygen demand nearly 15 percent less than for the corresponding period of 1958 and nearly 80 percent less than in 1950, which was before any steps had been taken by the mills to abate their pollution.

"The best performance since monitoring surveys by the authority were started in 1950 was during the first half of September when the pollution load of the wastes being discharged reached the lowest figure on record," the report continued. "This was due in part, however, to the fact that the Spaulding (mill) was shut down during that period."

Industrial pollution will not be eliminated in the immediate future but it will be eventually. The State sanitary authority will see to that.

A Salute to the White House Youth Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the week of March 27–April 2, 1960, the Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth will be held here in Washington.

As we recall, the first such conference was called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909. Since then, successive meetings have been held at 10-year intervals.

A major purpose of these conferences in which citizens and their Government collaborate, has been to assess on a regular basis the needs and conditions of children.

The ultimate objective of this forward-looking program, of course, is to provide each child with an opportunity to grow into a healthy, happy adult and take his place as a responsible citizen in our society.

The theme of the 1960 conference is: "To promote opportunities for children and youth to realize their full potential for a creative life and freedom and dignity."

In response to President Eisenhower's invitation, more than 7,000 persons are expected to come to Washington from Wisconsin, and other areas of the country. These will represent many more thousands of persons and organizations in their home communities who are working to develop constructive programs relating to the wholesome growth and development of our children.

In a rapidly changing world, we realize that the process of child growth does not just occur automatically; rather, constructive programs for care and opportunity to progress must be provided, if these youth are to grow into strong, creative adults, capable of assuming full responsibility in a free society.

Although the era of youth—of growing up—is often thought of as just a "happy time," actually each child faces a series of difficult challenges in his introduction to—attempts to find a place in—and efforts to contribute to—our complex society.

In addition to the individual problems, the child of today can face any of a wide variety of serious social and economic difficulties, including: broken homes, exposure to influences toward delinquency, existence in slum-type housing, lack of educational opportunities, adjustments to migrations from place to place, as more of our families move annually. These, and other problems, confront the child in the 1960's.

Despite these difficulties, however, there are constructive, forward-looking, creative programs, aimed not only to resolve these problems, but to provide ever-greater opportunities for the youth of America.

The White House Conference, I believe—designed to provide guidance and leadership to local community efforts to improve the climate for youth progress—will make a major contribution toward bettering the outlook for our children now, and in the future.

Recently, the Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth prepared a splendid publication entitled "Children in a Changing World."

Among the richly informative data in this booklet is included a "Children's Charter."

Prepared in 1930 for President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, it enumerates the rights and opportunities which we must seek to achieve for all children living under the American flag.

Fundamental in its approach, the charter contains basic objectives still essential to improving the outlook for the youth of America.

I ask unanimous consent to have the charter—accompanied by an article from the Melrose Chronicle, of Melrose, Wis., relating to Wisconsin participation in the upcoming White House Conference, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHILDREN'S CHARTER

President Hoover's White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, recognizing the rights of the child as the first rights of citizenship, pledges itself to these aims for the children of America:

I. For every child spiritual and moral training to help him to stand firm under the pressure of life.

II. For every child understanding and the guarding of his personality as his most precious right.

III. For every child a home and that love and security which a home provides; and for that child who must receive foster care, the nearest substitute for his own home.

IV. For every child full preparation for his birth, his mother receiving prenatal, natal, and postnatal care; and the establishment of such protective measures as will make childbearing safer.

V. For every child health protection from birth through adolescence, including: periodical health examinations and, where needed, care of specialists and hospital treatment; regular dental examination and care of the teeth; protective and preventive measures against communicable diseases; the insuring of pure food, pure milk, and pure water.

VI. For every child from birth through adolescence, promotion of health, including health instruction and a health program, wholesome physical and mental recreation.

VII. For every child a dwelling place safe, sanitary, and wholesome.

VIII. For every child a school which is safe from hazards, sanitary, properly equipped, lighted, and ventilated.

IX. For every child a community which recognizes and plans for his needs.

X. For every child an education which, through the discovery and development of his individual abilities, prepares him for life.

XI. For every child such teaching and training as will prepare him for successful parenthood, homemaking, and the rights of citizenship.

XII. For every child education for safety and protection against accidents to which modern conditions subject him.

XIII. For every child who is blind, deaf, crippled, or otherwise physically handicapped, and for the child who is mentally handicapped, such measures as will early discover and diagnose his handicap, provide care and treatment, and so train him that he may become an asset to society rather than a liability.

XIV. For every child who is in conflict with society the right to be dealt with intelligently as society's charge, not society's outcast.

XV. For every child the right to grow up in a family with an adequate standard of living and the security of a stable income.

XVI. For every child protection against labor that stunts growth, either physical or mental, that limits education.

XVII. For every rural child as satisfactory schooling and health services as for the city child.

XVIII. To supplement the home and the school in the training of youth, * * * every stimulation and encouragement should be given to the extension and development of the voluntary youth organizations.

XIX. To make everywhere available these minimum protections of the health and welfare of children, there should be a district, county, or community organization for health, education, and welfare.

For every child these rights, regardless of race, or color, or situation, wherever he may live under the protection of the American flag.

[From the Melrose Chronicle, Feb. 18, 1960]

SET WHITE HOUSE YOUTH CONFERENCE MARCH 27–APRIL 2

Official invitations were received this week from the President of the United States by the 90 delegates who will represent Wisconsin at the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth. On March 27 to April 2, delegates concerned with the interests of children and youth will meet in Washington to develop recommendations for citizen action programs to meet the needs of America's youth in the next decade.

Eighteen forum topics will provide the framework for conference discussion and will deal with many of the problems anticipated in the rapidly changing world of the 1960's. An entire forum of more than 500 persons will be devoted to the problems of youth in conflict, covering all phases of juvenile misbehavior.

Another forum will review the impact of the mass media on children and youth. Workgroup discussions within this forum will deal with comic books and comic strips as well as radio, TV and motion pictures. Throughout the entire conference runs a central concern for ideals and values.

Delegates from Wisconsin will represent the State generally as well as some national organizations. Seventy persons were selected to fill the State quota by a committee of the Wisconsin Committee on Children and Youth, designated by the Governor's office to serve as liason for the preparation and participation in this conference. Hundreds of nominations were screened to select a broadly representative group which include professional and lay adults, youth and young adults. Other delegates were selected to represent national organizations, were asked to participate on the conference program, served on the President's Conference Committee, or are foreign visitors.

White House Conferences on Children and Youth have been a decennial tradition in America since the first was called in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt to discuss the plight of the dependent child. Every 10 years the President has called such a conference to discuss the ever widening facets of child-related problems and to recommend citizen action and participation. Material for the conference will include State reports and research studies evaluating the past decade. County committees on children and youth contributed county reports from which the Wisconsin report to the White House Conference was compiled.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Soviet Power Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, our colleague, the able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], yesterday delivered a most important address before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at St. Louis, Mo. He gave an account of our visit to Russia. It is an account which I commend to all of our colleagues, because it shows how rapidly the Soviets, under a system of government in which we do not believe and which is in many respects antithetical to ours, are going ahead full steam developing hydroelectric resources while we, under the policy of no new starts, are doing nothing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of our able colleague [Mr. Moss] be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET POWER PROGRESS

On October 9 of last year, nearly 3,000 miles east of Moscow near the border of Outer Mongolia, I stood with 10 other Americans and saw under construction what will be the largest dam and hydroelectric power station in the world. It is the gigantic Bratsk Dam on the Angara River. It is in an advanced stage of construction. Its capacity of 4,500,000 kilowatts will make it more than twice the size of America's largest hydroelectric project, Grand Coulee on the Columbia. A large sign at the site proclaimed that this project would produce more than Boulder Dam and Grand Coulee combined.

Looking down from a height of 100 feet above the Angara River, I had no doubt that we were witnessing the building of the foundation of a great industrial empire for Russia.

For I am sure that no one understands better than do we Americans that even more missiles and rockets and hydrogen bombs, the wealth and world power of a nation rest upon its resources and the state of development of those resources.

We recognize that modern industry requires large quantities of electric power, and that a close correlation exists between the amount of electricity a country develops and its gross national product.

Our inspection trip of the power projects of the Soviet Union came about in this way:

Senator ALLEN ELLENDER of Louisiana, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, visited Russia on three occasions. From him the Senate heard what sounded to some like fantastic reports of a very large hydroelectric power development program. These reports were corroborated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and others. Reported also were plans for even greater developments in China.

So, a year and a half ago, the U.S. Senate, by unanimous resolution, authorized a study of the facts. Two Senate committees were assigned this task, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee. A special subcommittee was appointed, consisting of Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, and myself as chairman.

We were accompanied by four staff members representing the two committees: Vic Reinemer, executive secretary to Chairman MURRAY of the Senate Interior Committee; Milton C. Mapes, Jr., of the committee staff; Michael W. Straus, consultant to the Interior Committee and former U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation; and Theo W. Sneed of the staff of the Public Works Committee.

Four nonpaid consultants also accompanied us—men with a broad background in the fields of engineering, power development, dam construction, and rural electrification: Hon. Clyde Ellis, your general manager and former member of Congress from Arkansas; Harry Kuljian, president of the Kuljian Corp; Harvey McPhail, chief, Hydroelectric Division, Kuljian Corp., and former Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation; and Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association. George Winters, economic attaché of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, accompanied us throughout Russia. He speaks Russian. Our task was to investigate the extent to which the U.S.S.R. is developing its water resources for the production of electric power.

Negotiating the subcommittee's itinerary required more than a year. We wished to see not only the more commonly visited areas of the Soviet Union but also eastern Siberia, where, it was reported, some of the largest dams were under construction. We finally saw most of the projects requested.

The U.S.S.R. possesses the largest water resources in the world, about 10 percent of our earth's supply, compared with about 3 percent for the United States.

Russian river development is complicated by the fact that in the Asiatic part of the U.S.S.R. about 55 percent of the water flows northward into the icebound Arctic Ocean. Russia has, however, a much greater hydropower potential than does the United States.

Let me digress to stress the fact that this large supply of water is, in itself, of great significance. I come from a State that could not have developed as it has without reclaiming thousands of acres of land from the desert and I know my audience today recognizes fully the importance of water. It is only the last few years, however, since tremendous pressure has been placed on our resources, that water conservation has come to be recognized as the national problem which it is.

The United States is presently using about 250 billion gallons of water a day. This alone means that all our readily accessible and relatively inexpensive supplies are in use. Because of spectacular increases both in population and in requirements per person, our rate of consumption is increasing so that our expected need by 1975 will be 350 billion gallons of water a day. This is a 90-percent increase over the amount used in 1950. For the future I can think of no greater asset that any nation could ask for than a large supply of fresh water.

Tremendous effort is being exerted to develop as much electricity as possible on these great Russian river systems. Full development of the resource is the rule. Priority of use has been established, with hydropower development first. Complete surveys and development plans are made to determine size, location and building schedules before construction work begins on any unit. We visited 10 projects on 8 rivers, and saw a variety of sizes and types of hydroelectric power stations.

We traveled more than 12,500 miles inside Russia; 10,800 by air, mostly in very modern jet planes; about a thousand miles by automobile; and 300 each by boat and train. The jets carried 100 passengers, each one flew more than 500 miles an hour. They were filled. Russia has a fairly good network of railroads upon which it depends to move most goods. Other transportation is comparatively primitive, particularly outside the Moscow area.

And now—what did we discover concerning Russia's supply of electric power for the years ahead? How fast is it being developed? Is she catching up with us?

On the Khrami River in the Republic of Georgia, we saw a project being constructed entirely within a mountain. Water from a glacial lake will fall nearly a thousand feet through a tunnel to drive underground turbines.

At Kuybyshev on the Volga River we saw what is presently the world's largest dam with a capacity of over 2 million kilowatts. Grand Coulee develops just under 2 million. Kuybyshev was built as a symbol of Soviet ability and determination to excel in the hydro field. Let's look at its construction schedule: Preliminary access road and city construction started in 1950. Work on the main dam structure began in 1952. In 1953 and 1954 some 1,900 cubic meters of concrete a day and 300,000 cubic meters of earth placements a day were poured. In those years employment on the dam reached its maximum of 16,000. In 1955 the initial turbine and generator were installed, followed by 11 more huge units in 1956. The dam was dedicated in 1958 by Premier Khrushchev with what amounted to a national celebration.

Even if we take into account the Soviet system which enables them to channel money and manpower where it is wanted, this is remarkably fast construction.

Being built lower on the Volga River is the still larger Stalingrad Dam which will have an installed capacity of over 2½ million kilowatts. This giant, alread generating electricity, is a year ahead of its 7-year plan construction schedule. Stalingrad will have 22 generators—2 more than Kuybyshev. We were impressed with the Soviet determination to produce the electricity they want when we saw three of the generators operating under temporary shelters pieced together from used lumber, tar paper, and scrap corrugated iron. The chief construction engineer, Alexander Alexandrov, told us they would get around to putting a roof on the powerhouses when the crews had time.

Stalingrad will be the world's largest dam for a very short time, however. I have already mentioned Bratsk in eastern Siberia, the capacity of which will be 4½ million kilowatts. It is being built in a remote forest. A railroad, highway, and sawmills have had to be built. A worker's city is also going up, and will be the nucleus of an in-

dustrial complex. When we were there, there were 14,000 workers on the payroll. The builders boasted that crews were working around the clock on three shifts and we saw for ourselves the floodlight towers to light the nightwork. We were told that the works in place were 2 years ahead of construction schedule.

The other Siberian dam, which we did not see, is at Krasnoyarsk on the Yenisey River. It is in the initial stage of construction and will be still larger—in excess of 5 million kilowatts. We saw an operating scale model of this Krasnoyarsk Dam, the capacity of which will be almost twice that of all 31 dams in the Tennessee Valley.

The two largest hydroelectric dams going forward outside Russia are in China and Egypt—the Ichang Gorge Dam on the Yangtze and the Aswan on the Nile. We saw test models of the Aswan Dam in one of the hydroelectric project laboratories we visited. The Russian construction engineer who built Kuybyshev Dam stated that he has been designated as the construction engineer for Aswan, and that the generators are now being designed by Electrosila in Leningrad.

The Ichang Gorge Dam was originally planned at 15 million kilowatts by John Savage of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. It is being redesigned by Chinese and Soviet engineers for a first-stage capacity of 25, later going to 40 million, kilowatts. This will be 12 to 20 times the size of Grand Coulee. Several of the top Soviet engineers have been serving for several years as consultants in Communist China which has embarked on a program aimed at developing 70 million kilowatts of hydropower by 1970. Flood control is also one of the principal objectives of Chinese river development.

The past few years have also seen tremendous Russian progress in transmission of electric power. We visited the substation at Noginsk which serves the Moscow area. Its electric power is transported from the Kuybyshev Dam 600 miles away at higher voltages than are presently used anywhere in the United States. Long-range transmission is, of course, one of Russia's particular problems since the sources of their power are, on the whole much further from the customers than are ours.

The current 7-year plan calls for construction of five integrated transmission systems—five great regional grids which will be pulled together into one national network. The five does not include eastern Siberia which is to be brought in later. Seventy percent of Russian cities are now part of interconnected grid systems.

Although the efficiency and economy of shifting peak powerloads over a large geographic area have been recognized for many years, the Soviet program contrasts sharply with the absence of regional grids in America.

We recently made our formal report to the two Senate committees which sent us, and these are some of our conclusions:

The Russians have been in this field only about 30 years. They have caught up with the rest of the world in hydroelectric development techniques, and are preeminent in certain specific aspects.

They have pushed their program with great vigor, and are installing new hydro capacity at a very much faster rate than is the United States.

Although they now have only about one-third of our installed capacity, they allocate some 79 percent of their electric power to industry. The United States uses only about 31 percent for industrial and commercial purposes.

Russian electric production is now being built at a rate which makes it possible for them to overtake us in about 15 years. We have no way of knowing, of course, how long this rate of increase will be sustained; but unless they slow down or we speed up, Russia will be able to produce more electric power in 1975 than will the United States.

In the U.S.S.R., as in the U.S.A., about 20 percent of the electricity is generated by hydro, and about 80 percent by thermal stations. The Soviets intend to maintain this ratio for some time to come. Also in both countries atomic development is not expected to provide significant amounts of power in the next few years.

It must be emphasized that the Russians are doing all this with their own talent. One of the greatest resources a nation can possess is what we Americans have named "know-how," the training and experience which enables us to carry out the thousands upon thousands of tasks that keep our complex civilization operating. The Russians have had to develop this know-how.

Prior to Second World War, the American engineer who went to Russia was commonplace. He is no more. All of the work we saw is being engineered by Russians, designed by Russians, built by Russians. The powerhouses of these dams are being equipped with turbines and generators made in Russian factories.

One of our stops was the Electrosila manufacturing plant in Leningrad where generating and transmission equipment is today being made for half the world. Twenty years ago most of such equipment came from us—and from Western Europe. This fact in itself represents a great change in the relative industrial status between East and West.

The Russian engineers were quite frank in giving America and the nations of Western Europe full credit for the original developments in the hydroelectric field. They admit that they are building on our technical achievements. Numerous times the engineers mentioned to us the building of their first dam on the Dneiper River by Colonel Cooper, an American engineer.

They have, of course, developed techniques of their own to meet their special conditions. Russia is approximately 1,000 miles north of the United States. Moscow is about the same latitude as Hudson Bay. So they have had to find ways of constructing concrete works in freezing weather. Using heated forms and heated mix, they pour concrete the year around.

One of their more interesting applications is the use of large precast concrete blocks. When the Russians build a dam, they first put up concrete block-casting plants. These produce five or six standardized sizes. In some areas of the dam, stacked blocks are sufficient to hold the reservoir. They are set in place by huge cranes. Reinforced concrete sections are used as forms for lockwalls, piers, and powerhouse walls. Where solid concrete is needed, it is poured between the blocks or sections. Thus, the work of putting up and taking down the wooden forms we use is eliminated. They claim that this construction method cuts both building time and building costs about a third.

It appeared to us, however, that Soviet designs do not provide as high a safety factor as do ours. In many of theirs, it was apparent that elimination of spillways and overflow sections (the costs of which are very high) was a factor in making the savings they claimed.

The Russians are still very far behind us, not only in power production, but also in transportation, in housing, in virtually all manufacturing, in agriculture—most noticeably in agriculture.

Clyde Ellis was asked to write the section on Soviet agriculture for our report. He tells us that this is the weakest link in the Soviet economy.

After pointing out that nearly half of Russia's 210 million people are engaged in farming in comparison with 10 percent in the United States, Mr. Ellis says:

"If the efficiency of Soviet agriculture could be brought up to that of the United States, 67 million people could be released from the farms to the factories and other segments of the economy."

And we believe that this is exactly what the leaders of Russia hope to accomplish soon. Although Russian farming is almost primitive by American standards, the country has three times the area of the United States, and the features needed for development—broad expanses that are easy to work with machinery and generally favorable climatic conditions. What is needed is the machinery and rural electrification.

Little more than half of Russia's farms are electrified, in contrast with our 97 percent.

A visit with a farm family in their home in Siberia gave us a close look at housing and farm life.

In discussing the backwardness of much of the Russian economy, however, we must not forget that they are first developing those portions which they believe to be basic and are deliberately holding back other portions.

I believe it would be a mistake for us to believe that the Russian people are greatly dissatisfied with their economic lot. They appeared to be comfortably though not fashionably clothed, and well fed. They are poor by our standards, but they have no means of judging by our standards. What little they have is more than their parents and grandparents had.

Russia, I think, can be compared to a poor student, who, though living on little, is working hard toward his objective and is pleased with both his opportunity and his progress.

No outward evidence of the Russian determination to advance, and of the differences between our countries is more striking than the billboards. In place of advertising items for sale in retail stores, the Russian billboards without exception exhort the people to greater and greater effort to reach the major national goals—raise more food, weave more cloth, build more houses, generate more electricity. The emphasis is all on production, on meeting the quotas of the 7-year plan.

A striking example of progress is the great surge in housing, both multiple and single unit. They may have less than 60 square feet of space per person now, but huge apartment buildings are going up in every city we visited. In some cases whole new cities are being built. Stalingrad, which was leveled in the bitter struggle that is considered the turning point of World War II, has been completely rebuilt. At the site of Kremenchug Dam in the Ukraine we saw the entire new city of Khrushchev going up.

The Russians have a burning desire to build like the West, especially the United States. You all remember Khrushchev's many references to the fact that Russia was already, or would soon, be building things comparable to almost everything he saw in this country.

I can see no reason to believe that the regime cannot successfully continue to take the great bulk of Russian production for industrial uses so long as it allows the standard of living of the people to rise, however slowly.

The revolutionary leaders of Russia early recognized that the greatest difference between their country and the West lay in the ignorance of their people. From the beginning, education has received the highest of priorities. From a country that was 80 percent illiterate, they have produced one

that is 100 percent literate. Today, everyone in Russia can read. The schools we saw were clean and well managed. From the fifth grade on, all students take at least one foreign language, in some cases, two. In Stalingrad I addressed a fifth grade class and had a 12-year-old girl translate my remarks. As you can imagine, it was most impressive.

Mathematics and the sciences are stressed, as we know only too well. Once a student begins a particular science, he is expected to follow it through. Students who are chosen to go to college are paid and are paid more if they do well. We were told that Ph. D. candidates receive almost as much as beginning instructors. The Russians say that have 50 million people—one-fourth of their population—in school. We noted that many of those attending Moscow University were above middle age.

Everyone in Russia is reading, even the taxicab drivers as they wait for fares. Books are subsidized. Well-printed and comprehensive volumes—engineering and technical publications of all kinds (not the lurid-cover novels we see everywhere here) sell for a fourth of our prices.

Taxes are almost nonexistent because the Government monopolizes enterprise and uses price fixing both to channel most of the gross national product into industrial and military production, and to push buying of some products—books for example—and to discourage others such as automobiles which are priced at near the equivalent of $6,000.

In addition to many production incentives in industry, there is also some free enterprise. Farmers who are members of a collective may be alloted 1 or 2 acres of land, and after they have worked their 8 hours in the collective's fields, may work their own tracts. The produce is then sold on the free market. Outside regular hours, doctors may treat patients. Lawyers have some private practice, particularly in divorce cases.

We were invited to a number of luncheons, usually by project engineers and construction executives. We had occasion there to exchange observations, and these all indicated that the Soviet people have little conception of what we mean by freedom, independence, or liberty. They do not understand the freedom which we have to express our views, to have newspapers that may oppose the Government, and the related rights which are so precious to Americans.

There can be no question that the Russian people long for peace. Even recognizing how the regime is pushing the peace question, we should realize that their sufferings in the war were intense. They know at firsthand the devastating effects of war, and the one thing they discuss most frequently, next to the desire to catch up with the United States, is for peace with us. We have no way of assessing finally how far the Russian leaders are prepared to go to achieve the goal of world communism. I believe we must remain strong. But I am sure that the better the people of Russia get to know us the more they will see that we desire nothing for them but to see them prosper in peace.

Russia is today producing the generation and transmission facilities to bring abundant power to that enormous area. The leaders of today have not forgotten Lenin's dictum: "Communism is Soviet political power plus electrification of the entire country."

We are far ahead of them. We have established the enviable record of bringing electricity to 97 percent of America's farm homes.

But we still have 200,000 family units without electricity, and rural power loads are doubling every 5 to 7 years. Providing abundant power for America's future will require full development of all our resources.

Let's Get on the Record With Our Spending Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution providing that—

Resolved, That rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"7. No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

This resolution translated into plain English as understood in Marion County, Ind., means simply that every Member of the House must stand up and be counted on the record when he votes to spend the people's tax money. Surely the people have the right to know how their Congressman votes on spending bills. Strangely enough, they usually do not get this information.

Since January we have voted to spend in excess of $6 billion on different bills. We voted to spend about $27 million for the District of Columbia, about $760 million for the Commerce Department, $543 million for Interior, $4,795 million for Treasury and Post Office, and an extra $23 million for NASA. Not one of these spending bills has been recorded by a rollcall vote. Every bill has been rammed through on a voice vote and the people have not the vaguest notion of how I or any other Member voted.

Frankly I am amazed at the sight of some Members screaming about economy knowing full well that they can vote for billions for pet subjects and never get their votes recorded. They will make a great hullabaloo about bills that amount to a fraction of 1 percent of our total spending, and then let billions pass through this Congress without a murmur. In southern Indiana, where I grew up, they have a saying, "It helps to save pennies, but not very much." It does not make much sense to save pennies and fritter away dollars.

All of us know that the income of the United States will be around $82 billion to $83 billion in this coming fiscal year. Most of us agree that we should save part of that income to cut the debt. We disagree on where and how to spend the rest.

I intend to vote for less than the total the President asked, but in some individual instances I will vote for more than he asked. Surely my voters should have the chance to decide first of all—did I vote to spend more than our income; and secondly, do they agree with the places where I voted to spend their money?

They cannot find that out from the record today. They could if this resolution were adopted and all of us were forced to stand up and vote on the record when we spend money.

Governors Were Talking of Roads To Curl the Hair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a forceful editorial entitled "Governors Were Talking of Roads To Curl the Hair," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of February 20, 1960. This is a great newspaper that stands guard for the public interest. Its editorial policy is a clarion call for the growth and development of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS WERE TALKING OF ROADS TO CURL THE HAIR

The five Governors who assembled in Washington in an effort to restore highway allocations reduced by the Eisenhower administration may not be rewarded with success.

But at least they already have succeeded in dramatizing a deficiency in administration thinking which persists and which threatens the Nation's security as well as its progress.

Consider the shrinking posture of a President who insists the Nation cannot afford to meet its own highway commitments, cannot afford to improve its schools, cannot afford to make capital investments in national resources; yet who blandly terms removal of the interest ceiling on Federal bonds the most pressing issue ever to come before his administration.

Mr. Eisenhower's devotion to the budget is perforce spasmodic. When constructive spending programs are proposed, he worries about the curl in Mr. George Humphrey's hair. Only when increases are needed to pay off past obligations at a higher rate of interest does he seem to recall that hair curling can be a relative thing.

Before Mr. Eisenhower claims that the Governors, like his defense critics, are politically motivated, it should be noted that the 5 were representing 50. And that among the 50 are both Republicans and Democrats. Before he contends that he knows more about highway needs than almost anyone in the country he should recall his own words of a few days ago with respect to school construction—that local officials know more about local needs than the Federal Government.

This leaves the President only one of his favorite rejoinders against those who find fault with his policies: He can claim that these 50 chief executives, like his generals, have a perpetual yearning for more money.

To determine whether they need more money for roads, it might be in order to sug-

gest that the President come down from the clouds and drive the clogged roads of the States—States like Tennessee. It might give him a more realistic view than he can obtain from the Columbine or one of his helicopters. And it can certainly portray road needs in more graphic terms than a trip to Canaveral can suggest defense needs.

Economic Facts of Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 20, 1960:

ECONOMIC FACTS OF HEART DISEASE

All of us, at one time or another, have been face to face with the economical and emotional crises that overwhelm a family when heart disease strikes. Such experiences are not readily forgotten. They explain why new volunteers are constantly joining the vast army of men and women who freely give their time and energy, year after year, to the heart fund drive.

The heart diseases not only cause untold human suffering but they also affect our community's economic welfare. They are as much a threat to the well-being of the economy as they are to the security of the family. To understand this fact, we have only to gage the impact of heart disease on those in the most productive years—the years between 44 and 64 years of age.

Most of us in that age bracket are at the peak of our skills—whether we are salesmen, industrial executives, machine workers, factory workers, physicians, lawyers, or newspapermen. In many instances we have advanced, after costly years of training, into key company positions.

Our responsibilities as mature heads of families make us perhaps the largest single segment of the American market for most goods and services. But, as a group, we are also one of the prime targets of the cardiovascular diseases which, as most Americans now know, are not essentially diseases of old age. The fact is that more than 50 percent of all deaths, from all causes, among persons 44 to 64 are due to the heart diseases. South Carolina leads the Nation in deaths from heart and vascular diseases, among white males, 44 to 64 years of age.

On the industrial balance sheet, the heart diseases cause the loss of 69,200,000 manhours of production each year. The cost of this loss is estimated at a billion dollars. Additionally, our Government is deprived of $133 million in Federal income tax revenue on lost earnings which must be recovered from other tax sources.

In the face of these facts, every businessman obviously has a vital stake in the fight against the heart diseases. Each forward step of medical science in controlling these diseases through improved diagnosis, and more effective methods of prevention and treatment reduces industry's risks.

Some of the business leaders of Gaffney have recognized their responsibility and have volunteered to conduct a "Heart-Days for Business" drive here. They will help collect contributions for the Heart Fund from their fellow business and professional men in the commercial sections of town. Have the economic facts of heart disease firmly in mind when a volunteer calls, and give liberally in the interests of employees, associates, business and the economic well-being of this community.

Federal Aid for Education Contributes to Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that the Senate recently passed a bill, S. 8, to provide additional Federal aid for improving our educational system throughout the country.

As all of us are aware, there are wide differences of opinion on Federal participation in our educational programs. The questions, among others, include: How much should Uncle Sam spend? For what educational purposes should the money be earmarked? Upon what formula should it be distributed?

Today I was pleased to receive from Prof. Burton W. Kreitlow, of the University of Wisconsin, a thoughtful, detailed letter outlining the way in which Federal funds have helped to speed up research at the University of Wisconsin.

The specific research project, entitled "Long-Term Study of Educational Effectiveness of Newly Formed Centralized School Districts in Rural Areas," has been speeded up by Federal grants.

As we consider legislation—particularly of a controversial nature—it is always helpful to know just how such funds are utilized to help accomplish objectives at the operational level—in this case in realistic efforts to find ways and means to improve our rural school programs.

Reflecting a constructive contribution of Federal assistance in the field of educational research, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter by Professor Kreitlow printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, February 23, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On April 1, 1958, a grant was made to the University of Wisconsin by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, on a research project entitled "Long Term Study of Educational Effectiveness of Newly Formed Centralized School Districts in Rural Areas." This initial grant is to run until June 1961. These funds from the U.S. Office of Education have been aiding a project which was begun in 1949 and which moved ahead each year on the basis of minimum funds provided by the University of Wisconsin and maximum energy provided by those of us with a real concern for the improvement of schools for rural village and farm people. A considerable backlog of material was awaiting analysis at the time the Federal grant was made. This financial assistance from the U.S. Government has made it possible to speed up the progress of this research considerably and this year I am particularly aware of the contribution that Federal aid to education has made when granted for research.

The study deals with the effectiveness of different kinds of school districts in rural areas. It deals with two basic types, first, the reorganized district which is a single district including grades 1 through 12 in both the village and the farm service area of a community and secondly with a type which I describe as nonreorganized. The nonreorganized represents the more traditional Midwest pattern of many small one- and two-room schools in independent districts and a village high school and often a separate village grade school.

The tentative conclusions that come out of a long-term study which looks at the same youngsters as they move from first grade through high school and beyond, give considerable support to the reorganized type school district that has sufficient size and financial stability to develop a comprehensive curriculum from first grade through 12. This is a critical time in Wisconsin to have these kinds of data available and it is my judgment that without the help that the U.S. Government gave to this project, the results of this research would not now be available.

Let me give you an example of the extensiveness of interest in this particular project at this time. During the course of the last legislative session all Wisconsin legislators were provided with copies of the results of the study to date. Governor Nelson has kept in close touch with the results of the study and action last year by the assembly and senate and by the Governor has provided that all areas in Wisconsin be in a high school district by the end of June 1962. I believe that at least some small part of this progressive action in Wisconsin is a result of the knowledge provided by this study which was aided by your support in the Senate in Washington.

The results of this study were recently reported in an afternoon session during the annual University of Wisconsin Farm and Home Week, in addition, a booth identifying the results of the study was on exhibit in the exhibit space provided in the stock pavilion. Several weeks earlier I reported on the results of this study to the State School Boards and School Administrators Convention in Milwaukee. On February 17, I reported on the results of this study at the American Association of School Administrators meetings in Atlantic City and on March 21, a somewhat similar report is being made at the Great Lakes Conference on Rural Life and Education being held in Chicago. Following the report in Chicago the delegates will spend the better part of the afternoon looking at the implications of the findings for school improvement in the Great Lakes States.

As an active researcher at the University of Wisconsin and a person whose research work has been aided measurably by aid from the U.S. Government I have written this letter to let you know that Federal support makes a difference in the speed with which research can be accomplished. Thank you for your past support in the field of education. I am sure that the education of Wisconsin's children will be better because of it.

Very truly yours,

BURTON W. KREITLOW,
Professor of Education.

Tiso and the National Catholic Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a newspaper item, which has been sent to me by my friend and constituent, George P. Baluh of Farmington, Pa. He is an active member of the Jednota—the First Catholic Slovak Union—in Fayette County. He informs me that a large number of the members of Jednota concur in the views expressed by Philip A. Hrobak, who is editor of Jednota and president of the Slovak League of America. The item follows:

TISO AND THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC SHRINE—FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN ACTION

The Evening Star (Washington, D.C.) of December 8, included a letter by one John Bowler which smeared Tiso and with him all Slovak patriots and promoters of freedom and independence among nations. "Buried in the account of the dedication of the beautiful Catholic Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Catholic University," Bowler starts out, "was the announcement that a flag of Monsignor Tiso of Czechoslovakia had been installed near one column and dedicated with some ceremony, attended by the Slovak-American Catholic hierarchy of the United States."

"By enshrining the militant symbol of a flag of a controversial figure, whose very name brings sorrow and division to the Czechoslovak people," Bowler snorted, "the American Catholic hierarchy has done a disservice and has sown an element of disunity."

Now, we have tried to verify this part of Bowler's story with several Americans of Slovak descent who attended the dedication. Nobody seems to know anything about Monsignor Tiso's flag being dedicated with or without "some ceremony" by the Slovak-American Catholic hierarchy of the United States, which was not present at the dedication. Mr. Bowler either knew or did not know what he was writing about. We know that he did not. His letter reveals that he knows not the truth about Tiso and the Slovak people. It reveals, too, that he is against Slovak freedom and independence. No matter, though, what Czech propaganda and Mr. Bowler say, the fact is that Monsignor Tiso is forever enshrined in the hearts and minds of the Slovak people everywhere. His stature is growing with the years. He gave his life for his church and his people. Who did or could do more?

Having received a clipping of Bowler's letter, I wrote the Evening Star on December 14 in rebuttal thusly:

BOWLER WAS "BRAINWASHED"

DECEMBER 14, 1959.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
The Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

For the edification of the readers of the Evening Star, I take my pen in hand to reply to John Bowler's letter, which was published December 8 under the title "Monsignor Tiso's Flag." I state at the outset that Mr. Bowler is either terribly ignorant about what happened in Czechoslovakia in 1938–39—and in Slovakia during the presidency of Monsignor Tiso—or else he is knowingly distorting facts. In the first place, Monsignor Tiso made no pact with Hitler by which Slovakia was severed from Czechoslovakia. Secondly, Tiso and the Slovak Parliament never found themselves "in a state of war against the Government of the United States." Thirdly, "Slovak separatists" did not "dispatch Slovak as well as German troops, on August 29, 1944, against American personnel and weapons parachuted into Slovakia from Bari, Italy, to aid in the uprising against the Nazi." Fourthly, the implication that President Tiso or the Slovak Government of the independent Slovak Republic killed "American cousins" during the uprising is both vicious and malicious and utterly without foundation. And, finally, by confusing the Slovak banner with the Nazi banner, Mr. Bowler gives evidence of his prejudice and his hostility to Slovak freedom and independence.

Furthermore, Mr. Bowler's unwarranted slur against the American Catholic hierarchy was uncalled for. He should ascertain the facts and apologize for his gross insult.

The great and fabulous democracies of our time were not in a position to stop Hitler in 1938–39, but, according to Bowler, little, defenseless Slovakia, with a population of 3 million and no army, was in a position to do so. What did Dr. Edward Beneš, President of Czechoslovakia, do at the time? He capitulated to Hitler at Munich without even consulting the Czechoslovak Parliament, even though he had a well-equipped army of 2 million men. Then he resigned and fled to London. Who did more for Hitler in 1938?

Monsignor Tiso, like the Slovak apostles, the Sts. Cyril and Methodius, is being persecuted by the enemies of the Slovak nation. Bowler is overwhelmed with sorrow for the nonexistent, fictitious Czechoslovak people, for whom he presumes to speak, but he has absolutely no sympathy for the Slovaks who have sought and fought to free themselves of alien domination for over 1,100 years. What kind of an American and what kind of a Christian is he? To me it is quite obvious that Bowler has been brainwashed.

PHILIP A. HROBAK,
President, The Slovak League of America.
MIDDLETOWN, PA.

My letter was not published: evidence of brainwashing under the guise of the freedom of the press. This is nothing new to us. The American press, generally speaking, never was friendly or even fair with the Slovaks and their centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence. Old man Masaryk's slogan "Truth Prevails" is still in operation, spreading malicious and vicious lies about the Slovaks and their political and religious leaders. With the help of the American press, of course.

P.A.H.

International Payments and Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a recent newspaper report on the likelihood of a "major overhaul" of our present system of international payments and reserves attracted much interest. I raised the question with William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and requested his reaction. His response dated February 19 deserves the consideration of all of us concerned with international fiscal policy.

I find Mr. Martin's opinions reassuring, but it seems clear to me that the keys to the viability of our international financial and commercial position remain expanded foreign trade and the increased productivity of our industrial complex. Reserve policy must conform to these national demands, and it is our job to see that they do, for in the final analysis, the Reserve System was created by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report in the New York Times of January 31 by Edwin Dale, Jr., and Mr. Martin's letter to me commenting on it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD PAYMENTS MAY BE REVISED—TREASURY STUDYING SYSTEM AS EXPERTS CITE PERIL IN GOLD AND DOLLAR RESERVE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—A number of officials and experts in finance have concluded that the present system of international payments and reserves needs a major overhaul to avert serious trouble.

Others believe the present system can continue to work, but even these relative optimists are thinking hard about the problem.

This includes the Treasury. Officials make plain that they are not yet persuaded that anything new is needed. Barring the unlikely event of a crisis of some sort this year, the United States will probably not propose any changes, at least until a new President is elected.

QUESTION IS UNDER STUDY

But studies of the question are underway in the Treasury. This in itself is something new.

Under the present system, which simply grew and was not planned, nations hold their monetary reserves in gold plus dollars (or in a few cases British pounds). A nation's holdings rise and fall with its balance of international payments, which is the difference between the outflow and the inflow of currency. All nations will accept dollars in payment of international bills.

The system rests on the commitment of the United States to give gold in exchange for dollars to any foreign government holding dollars, at the option of the foreign government. Thus dollar holdings are as good as gold, which is why the dollar is the world's reserve currency.

What is the difficulty? Those who believe changes are needed have a fear, amounting to a conviction in some cases, that the present system will lead, possibly soon, to one of three dangerous results.

The first result would be a run on the U.S. gold stock. This is feared as a consequence of continued deficits in the balance of payments, as foreign dollar holdings reach and then surpass the amount of the gold stock. This would be the worst result. It could disrupt the whole world economy.

An elimination of the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments is the second result feared. This would avert a gold crisis, but the consequence would be growing payments difficulties for the rest of the world with a sharp check to world trade. The reason is that it is the only U.S. deficit that has made the rest of the world so liquid—supplied with dollars—under the present system.

A U.S. recession in the near future, which would be allowed to drift into severe unemployment because the Government would be afraid to act vigorously against it, is the last result mentioned. This would come about because antirecession action—chiefly an ag-

gressive, easy-money policy—could bring on the feared run on gold. This country's freedom of action domestically will be limited by the fact that the dollar is a reserve world currency.

VIEWPOINT OF CRITICS

To the critics of the present world monetary system, all of these possible consequences stem from one key feature of the system: The fact that the nations of the world hold their reserves not only in gold but also in somebody else's currency. The somebody else is the United States and, to a lesser extent, Britain.

This has come about almost inevitably because there simply is not enough gold in the world to supply the needs for working capital for international payments. The world as a whole needs more reserves than there is gold, and the needs grow all the time with expanding world trade.

The result is that reserves are held in dollars or pounds. The reserves have grown in recent years, as they had to grow, mainly because the United States has been running a chronic deficit in its balance of payments.

According to the pessimists, the world is now waking up to the consequences of this system. The awakening has come about as world dollar holdings approached the total of the U.S. stock of gold. The potential claims on gold are now nearly equal to the gold stock.

This means, say the critics, that from now on the world under the present system will always be faced with two unpleasant alternatives: a continued U.S.-payments deficit with an ever-increasing threat of a run on gold, or no U.S. deficit with a worsening deficiency of world reserevs.

The International Monetary Fund is something of a buffer against the latter alternative, but an insufficient one in the eyes of the critics.

There are various proposals for changes in the system, ranging from the mild to the radical. The one being most talked about has been made by Prof. Robert Triffin, of Yale University.

Omitting details, his proposal calls for a radical change in the present International Monetary Fund to make it a sort of world central bank, to hold the reserves of all nations, and empowered to create new reserves by its lending. His idea is among those being studied in the Treasury.

The great fear of the pessimist is that nothing will be done to change the present system until there is a crisis of some kind—either a run on U.S. gold or a series of payments emergencies in Western Europe. Either would disrupt trade and could lead to a worldwide depression, it is feared.

I do not believe that these fears are justified.

(1) Is is quite true that a chronic large balance of payments deficit would lead to harmful consequences, both for the international position of the United States and for the working of present international commerical and financial arrangements, which are closely related to the function of the dollar as a world reserve currency. I believe, however, that if we continue to follow correct policies the deficit in our balance of payments will be gradually reduced. Moreover, the experience of the past 12 months has shown that even a large deficit does not lead to "a run on the U.S. gold stock" as long as domestic and foreign holders of dollars realize that the United States is resolved to defend the country's financial stability by pursuing just such policies.

The current expansion of demand abroad and the lowering of foreign barriers against U.S. goods, together with the healthy effects of active international competition upon the design and pricing policies of U.S. producers, are already working in the direction of reducing the deficit in our balance of payments. Monetary and fiscal policies designed to minimize price inflation in the United States have been facilitating this adjustment, and will continue to be an essential condition for successful further adjustment.

(2) The international reserve positions of all major foreign trading nations have improved so much that the achievement of equilibrium in our balance of payments, and the resulting slowing of increases in foreign dollar holdings, need not lead to "growing payments difficulties for the rest of the world." Moreover, the recent increase in the resources of the International Monetary Fund has provided the means for meeting any additional requirements for international reserves that may arise in the foreseeable future.

(3) The international reserve position of the United States is comfortable enough to permit freedom of action in case of a recession. The balance of payments situation in the next recession is not now predictable, because it will depend to a large extent on conditions then existing abroad. A temporary enlargement of the payments deficit, should it occur, need not be a permanent setback to the process of adjustment.

What is needed today is not so much to discuss ways to meet a hypothetical dilemma as to see to it that we continue to follow policies designed to ensure the domestic and international financial equilibrium of the United States, so that the dilemma will not arise.

Since I do not believe that the dangers described in the article are imminent, I do not think that it is necessary at this time for me to discuss the proposed remedies. The Board's staff is currently engaged in studying the relevant problems and proposals, and of course will continue to do so.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 19, 1960.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in reply to your note of February 12, 1960, in which you request my comments with respect to some problems discussed by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times of January 31.

According to Mr. Dale "a number of officials and experts in finance" fear that the present system of international finance will lead, possibly soon, to one of three dangerous results":

(1) "A run on the U.S. gold stock" if the deficits in our balance of payments continue;

(2) "Growing payments difficulties for the rest of the world" if that deficit is eliminated; or

(3) Infringement of "this country's freedom of action" in case of "a U.S. recession in the near future which would be allowed to drift into severe unemployment."

The Case for the Christian Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a radio broadcast by the Reverend John Coleman, D.D., Ph. D., prepared for delivery on the Christian Amendment Hour now being carried by some 100 stations in our country. This is one of a series of 13 such programs, obtainable free in leaflet form from the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. Dr. Coleman's radio message follows:

This broadcast is on behalf of the Christian Amendment Movement. In the 84th Congress the Christian amendment was introduced in the House of Representatives by five of its Members, in the Senate by one. Three of these men were Republicans, and three were Democrats. All introduced the amendment because they believed in it. They believed that the United States needs the Lord Jesus Christ as a Saviour and Ruler.

The amendment reads:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

The subject of this broadcast: "You Might Wisely Support the Christian Amendment, Even if You Do Not Believe Christianity Is True."

Several years ago I was to present the Christian amendment, with the arguments for it, to a college class in political science. Most, if not all, of the students were professing Christians. By the grapevine, I heard that one of them, a good friend of mine, had boasted to his cronies that he was, perhaps for the sake of argument, going to oppose it. I did not know the line he would take, but I looked forward to the debate with considerable interest. A good class discussion is always profitable. He scarcely spoke a word in opposition, and later I learned, again by the grapevine, that when twitted about his silence he answered that I had begun by saying that I was going to assume that Christianity is true, start with that as a major premise; that if any doubted the truth of Christianity they might fight the issue out in the department of religious education; we had no time in a political science class for that debate. The young man had planned to attack Christianity itself; but he said, "If Christianity is true, then the amendment is sound."

There are those in America who do not believe that Christianity is true, who do not believe that there was and is a Lord Jesus Christ who is very God of very God, as the old creed phrased it. Not many of them go so far as the new Soviet Encyclopedia, which denies that Jesus ever lived and declares the whole account of His life and death pure myth. The American unbeliever in general holds that Jesus was merely a man, a good man, it is true, but only a man. He, they say, apparently died on the cross, but did not rise the third day, did not ascend into heaven, is not sitting on the right hand of the Father, has not been given all authority in heaven and on earth, and will not come to judge the world—men and nations—at the last day.

Though we do not agree with them, we do not question the sincerity of those who make these negatives the articles of their faith, or lack of faith. They certainly would not pledge themselves, without qualification, to the Constitution with the Christian amend-

ment in it, and the amendment itself has a provision for them in its last section—that Congress may provide a modified oath. Here in that section:

"Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

Now I am going to make a strange assertion. There may be, and there should be, among these unbelievers many who might wish to have the Christian amendment added to the Constitution. I am going to repeat that: There may be many among these unbelievers who might wish to have the Christian amendment added to the Constitution.

I have been told of a prominent science professor in an eastern university who was an atheist. He did not believe in any god, but he declared that the woman he married must be a Christian who would rear her children in the church. He would even help support the church. The woman who is a Christian he felt would be a better wife and mother and the children, trained in a Christian home and church, better children. He might have gone further: If Christianity has such a good influence on the home, why not on the community, why not on the Nation? So why not adopt the Christian amendment?

Another illustration: Some years ago Dr. Henry C. Link, a psychiatrist, brought out a book that had gone through several editions: "Return to Religion." Like the science professor just mentioned, Dr. Link was not a believer in orthodox Christianity; frankly said so, though he did not give particulars. But for his mentally disturbed patients he prescribed church attendance. They might not believe in Christianity any more than he did, but he found that this regular contact with Christian teaching helped to clear their minds of fears and worries, to restore their poise, to adjust them to life. With some he even added attendance at the midweek prayer meeting, even though he himself did not believe that God answers prayer. Dr. Link found also that working constantly with the neurotic had a disquieting effect on his own mental processes and decided that what was good for his patients might be good for their doctor, and began to attend church himself, thus maintaining his own equilibrium.

Another illustration: We have over a million alcoholics in America, and several times that number of drinkers who are on their way to becoming alcoholics. An organization, the Alcoholics Anonymous, has had notable success in reclaiming such men and women. The Alcoholics Anonymous make it a major factor in their work to get the man down on his knees in prayer, to persuade him to constant church attendance. Whether or not there is a God who cares for broken men and women, whether or not the worship of this God is ever heard in Heaven, the man's prayers, his worship, his fellowship with Christian people, all seem to, they do, have a profound effect, and that effect is good.

My non-Christian friend, would not the Lord Jesus Christ, brought into your life, brought into your home as a constant guest, bring with Him a healthier, sweeter atmosphere, something that you have felt was lacking and craved?

The Gospels tell of a man who brought his son to Jesus for healing. Jesus said, "All things are possible to him that believeth." The man, humble in his extremity, answered, "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief." His son was healed. Jesus is the Great Physician for all the world's ills. I say again, is the Great Physician.

In these days when broken homes are increasing so rapidly, in these days when juvenile delinquency is almost constantly on the front page, and when detention homes and reformatories are overcrowded, in these days when juveniles are graduating into adult criminals; in these days when gambling absorbs much more money than our schools; in these days when vice and gross immorality are viewed with an almost amused complacency; in such times as these, we as a people, we as a mighty but humbled Nation, we on our knees should bring our civilization, that is on trial, to the Great Physician, pleading, "Lord, we believe, help Thou our unbelief." And in such a spirit we should adopt the Christian amendment.

Editorial Support for Revision of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, two constitutional amendments recently adopted by the Senate have drawn strong editorial endorsement from the Troy Times Record, of Troy, N.Y. In a fine editorial this outstanding newspaper emphasizes the importance of the anti-poll tax and District of Columbia vote amendments in the context of our democratic society.

I am hopeful similar vigorous support from all over the country will help speed action in the other body on these two important changes in the Constitution. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Troy Times Record, Feb. 4, 1960]

REVISING THE CONSTITUTION

Two subjects that are usually highly controversial went through the Senate this week with a minimum of difficulty. In a revision of the Constitution, the Senate voted to outlaw the poll tax and to grant suffrage to the voteless residents of the District of Columbia.

There was little opposition to the poll tax measure for various reasons. It is outmoded, with but five States still using it. It is no longer very important in the South as a means of barring the Negro from voting. The rabid segregationists have devised newer techniques.

Senator KEATING had no difficulty to get backing for his amendment to permit residents of Washington to vote for President and Vice President, and for Delegates in the House of Representatives. Wiping out of disenfranchisement for Washingtonians has been a delicate matter in the past. Because more than half of the residents of the District of Columbia are Negroes, there has been considerable southern opposition to it. Yet for years most Americans have felt that the residents of this area should have a right to vote. They represent a substantial population and why should anyone be disqualified in a true democracy. It is rather ironical that the people closest to the core of the democratic wheel be barred from having a voice in government.

The Search for New Knowledge About Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, while on a plane from Dallas, Tex., to Atlanta, Ga., a few weeks ago, I was privileged to talk with Katherine Barnwell, a feature writer for the Atlanta Journal and Constitution Magazine. She had been to Ardmore, Okla., to get a story about a cancer research center. On January 10, 1960 the article appeared in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution Sunday Magazine and I was greatly impressed when I read her report of the Ardmore research center. Because of the tremendous toll that cancer takes in the lives of the people of our Nation and the world, it is my belief that this article will lend comfort to many because it reveals the extent of cancer research in an area of which the general public may not be aware.

Miss Barnwell is an experienced reporter of medical events and research programs. Her thorough and expert description of the Ardmore project, which follows, is excellent testimony of that fact:

(By Katherine Barnwell)

On the plains of southern Oklahoma, Indian territory until 1907 and one of the last frontiers of the Old West, is an unusual, ultramodern facility for cancer research.

Here a team of scientists is trying to unravel some of the mysteries of cancer—and of life itself. Far from any big city medical center, they are working in completely equipped laboratories in a million-dollar group of buildings, surrounded by farmlands where cattle graze and grain grows abundantly. The laboratories, located 2 miles east of Ardmore, Okla., are in a section rich with oilfields which still yield vast quantities of "black gold."

Scientists at the research facility, known as the biomedical division of the Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation, are trying to find answers to these questions:

What causes cancer?
How does it grow and spread in the body?
How does it affect the body's organs?
How does it kill?

I visited the Noble laboratories recently and was impressed by the dedication of the scientists there. Their research is fundamental or basic—the slow, arduous, painstaking kind. They are not working with human patients as clinical researchers do. But they are studying what goes on when the individual cancer cell develops in rats and mice, multiplies wildly and destroys body tissue. They are comparing the normal cell—the tiny unit of living matter responsible for health and growth—with the uncontrolled cancer cell.

The scientists are studying the nutrition of both malignant and normal cells, and they have turned up a few clues which they hope will be of value. But they believe more basic knowledge is needed before the key to cancer, the Nation's No. 2 killer, can be found.

"How can we find the cure?" one asked, "when we don't know the cause"?

Although the research labs are about 700 miles from Georgia, they are closely linked with Atlanta. One of the members of the board of trustees of the Noble Foundation is a 31-year-old Oklahoman-turned-Atlantan, Edward Everett Noble of 3201 Lenox Road NE., the man who created the giant Lenox Square Shopping Center on Peachtree Road.

Mr. Noble, now president of Lenox Square, has lived in Georgia for the past 3 years. He is a son of the late Lloyd Noble, a wealthy Oklahoma oilman who founded the Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation for educational, scientific, and religious purposes in 1945 in memory of his father, Lloyd Noble, once a teacher in a one-room school, acquired a large fortune through his oil drilling and producing companies before he died in 1950—but he was always a firm believer in the tenet that wealth should be used for the benefit of mankind. He left the bulk of his estate to the foundation.

"The accumulation of economic wealth and power in itself is not important," Lloyd Noble maintained. "Future generations will assay individuals and organizations strictly on the basis of what they have done with that wealth and power."

Ed Noble said the Noble Foundation, a nonprofit, privately endowed corporation has the controlling interest in Lenox Square—and profits from its ownership will be used for the foundation's program, particularly cancer research. Heretofore, the foundation received most of its funds from two large enterprises—the Noble Drilling Corp. and the Samedan Oil Corp.—but trustees decided several years ago to diversify its investments and assure long-range income for its research program by building a regional shopping center. After a nationwide study of possible sites for the shopping center, Atlanta was selected.

Thus Georgia dollars are helping finance cancer research in Oklahoma—and it is hoped the results will benefit all humanity.

The foundation's current operating budget is $780,000 a year and three-fourths of that amount goes to the biomedical division which conducts the cancer studies. The other fourth is used for an agricultural program.

"One advantage of our independent research program—not dependent on funds from the Government or other sources—is that we have a minimum of redtape," Mr. Noble pointed out. "If one of our scientists gets a new lead, he can change direction and follow it without making a formal application to somebody to get the new project approved."

The Noble group studying cancer includes about 45 people—biochemists, biologists, chemists, bacteriologists, general scientists, and their assistants. One of the laboratory research technicians is Wilbur L. Whittle from Cordele, Ga. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur Z. Whittle of Cordele. Two physicians from Wichita Falls, Tex., visit the laboratories once a week to conduct pathological studies.

Thousands of white rats and mice are used in the research. Malignant tumors can be induced in the rats and mice, and they can be transplanted from one animal to another to insure a continuous supply for experimental work. There's a mouse maternity ward at the Noble Foundation where 50 to 75 animals are born each month. In addition, the foundation buys some 400 mice and 600 to 1,000 rats monthly.

Like people with cancer, rats and mice with malignant tumors often lose their appetites. So the scientists force feed them through tubes to their stomachs. In many experiments, the scientists want the rats to have the same food intake both before and after cancer develops.

When a rat or mouse undergoes surgery for removal of a tumor or some infected organ, rigid aseptic techniques (including ultraviolet lights to destroy airborne bacteria) are used to prevent contamination of the tissues being studied. The scientists in the operating room wear sterile masks, caps, and gowns. In other words, the mice are protected from the men—instead of vice versa.

Dr. Thomas A. McCoy, director of the biomedical division, said the scientists are trying several approaches in their studies of cancer at the cellular level. "We believe one reason we don't have a drug to destroy cancer," he said, "is that we don't know exactly what goes on when the cancer grows."

One approach is the tissue culture of malignant cells in test tubes. Scientists then study the substances required for nutrition of these cancer cells—compared with normal cells.

"We found that many of these tumors require a substance known as asparagine, a component of protein, for growth. In other words, certain types of malignant cells won't grow without this substance. If we could find some chemical antagonist (an agent that would counteract the effects) of asparagine, we might be able to inhibit the growth of certain cancers."

Dr. McCoy said the Noble group is working with a chemical company in Buffalo, N.Y., trying to synthesize an antagonist which would knock out asparagine. Such a chemical would not necessarily be a cancer cure but it would be valuable as a research tool.

In the course of their nutritional studies, scientists were able to induce two new strains or mutuations of cancer cells by a depletion of asparagine. The parent tumor cells required asparagine, but these new variants did not.

"It's a well-known fact that many cases of leukemia respond to drugs for a while so that the patient improves—but then the malignancy becomes immune to the treatment," Dr. McCoy said. "We believe it is possible that a nutritional variant resistant to the drug has been induced. We want to find out how the tumor cell acquires this resistance."

Dr. McCoy said his group of scientists also would like to determine why some tumor cells have an increased ability to synthesize a sugar amine—hexosamine—which is intimately associated with a connective material that holds cells together. Usually tumor cells in a highly specialized organ—such as the brain, heart, or liver—lose part of their important functional capacities. For example, tumor cells in the liver lose their ability to produce urea. But, surprisingly, the cells' ability to produce hexosamine is actually elevated by cancer.

"Why" asked Dr. McCoy. "We don't know, but this is a lead which must be pursued."

In studying the nutrition of cells, the Noble scientists found a difference in the requirements of single cells and those in massive tissue culture. All cells need amino acids, vitamins, salts, sugar, and a fraction of blood serum. But three keto acids not required by a large group of cells are needed for growth by the single cell. Dr. McCoy said this may be important in metastasis, the spread of cancer cells.

The Noble scientists use radioisotopes to study the growth of cancer cells and their reaction to various drug compounds. "We administer a drug to the animal," Dr. McCoy explained, "and we also give him a radioactive substance orally or by injection. By tracing the radioactivty, we can find out what a drug does during the growth process.

"There are several hundred chemical compounds that will inhibit the growth of one experimental cancer or another. But there is no magic bullet which will cure all of the diseases. We are trying to find out the mechanism of action of certain drugs in order to get a better insight into the whole problem."

In these drug-action studies, the living rat is used as a kind of test tube. He is placed in a "metabolic cage" for 8 to 36 hours so that scientists can determine exactly what his body is doing with a drug. They make a chemical check of his breathing—what he inhales and exhales—and his excretion.

"Also, we are trying combinations of drugs," Dr. McCoy said. "For example, if you inject a tumor in a mouse, he may live 12 days. If you give him drug A, he may live 18 days, and if you give him drug B, he may live 14 days. * * * But if you give him both A and B, he may live 45 days or longer."

Scientists at the Noble Foundation are studying the precancerous period of cell growth. They feed rats a chemical or dye for 90 days to induce cancer. Then they give them a regular diet. In about 18 weeks or 120 days, the animals have cancer of the liver. Before the tumor shows up, the scientists can study the enzymatic changes in the precancerous liver. This project is a wonderful tool, giving researchers some idea of what happens when a normal cell becomes a malignant cell.

Another approach is a study of the effects of tumors on the body. How does the cancer affect the body metabolism and the various organs? "Anemia is one of the most common effects of cancer," Dr. McCoy pointed out. "Why does the presence of a tumor cause anemia? Everybody is trying to stop the tumor. If we could alleviate some of its systemic effects, we might be able to stop it from growing."

Dr. McCoy said one of the most popular theories in cancer research right now is the virus theory. "They have never been able to isolate a virus associated with a malignant tumor in man," he said, "but there is no doubt in my mind that many tumors are caused by viruses.

"There is a tremendous effort going on in the virus field. I think they have demonstrated that many experimental tumors probably are viral in origin. If they can isolate the virus, they have a pretty good chance of making an effective vaccine. However, many tumors arise which I don't think could be caused solely by a virus. Skin cancer, for example. The incidence varies with the earth's latitude and the intensity of the rays of the sun. There is much more skin cancer in Georgia and Oklahoma than there is in North Dakota.

"We are not conducting research on viruses here because so many other laboratories are studying the virus theory. We don't want to duplicate their efforts."

A three-man biomedical advisory board serves scientists at the Noble laboratories. Members are G. Burroughs Mider, associate director in charge of research at the National Cancer Institute and former board member of the American Cancer Society; Dr. William J. Darby, chairman of the department of nutrition and biochemistry at Vanderbilt medical school; and Dr. Max S. Dunn, associate dean of the graduate school, UCLA, who has been on the board of directors of the American Cancer Society since 1944. These men visit the laboratories periodically and advise scientists on various projects.

Research information obtained by the Noble group has been published in many national and international scientific journals. They had 17 articles published last year in such periodicals as Cancer Research, Journal of the National Cancer Institute, and Proceedings of the Society of Experimental Biology and Medicine.

Dr. McCoy recently was asked to write an article for the first volume of a series, "World Review of Nutrition and Dietetics," being published in London, England. Editor of the series is Dr. G. H. Bourne of Atlanta, head of the department of anatomy at Emory University.

In his article, Dr. McCoy reviewed research data on the role of nutrition in cancer. He points out that obesity in man has been correlated with a higher incidence of cancer. Citing records of leading insurance companies, he pointed out, "Overweight men (50 pounds or more in the 30–44 age group) showed a subsequent mortality from cancer of 37 per 100,000; normal weight men, 32 per 100,000; and underweight men (25 pounds or more) had a mortality rate of 24 per 100,000."

In summary, Dr. McCoy said it is incorrect to assume that a diet can cause or prevent cancer, but certain dietary conditions may be related with the incidence of cancer.

Much of the equipment used in the Noble laboratories is made in the wood, metal, electronics and glassblowing shop. Those working in the shop not only maintain and repair delicate scientific instruments, but they also manufacture new ones. For example, an apparatus for the extraction of ozone, a highly volatile gas, was built for about $200, whereas it would have cost about $1,000 commercially.

James Johnson, the shop's manager, makes glass instruments of all sizes and shapes to meet the scientists' specifications. "I've been blowing glass about 5 years," he said. "Like playing the piano, it takes a lot of practice. You heat the glass until it starts to turn red and begins to soften. Then you blow to make it the desired shape."

The foundation also has a large dispensary and stockroom, where equipment and supplies are stored, and a research library, where scientists can keep abreast of information published by other cancer researchers around the world.

Directing the work of the Noble Foundation is a seven-member board of trustees. Besides Ed Noble of Atlanta, these include his brother, Sam Noble of Ardmore, Oklahoma; his sister, Mrs. David R. Brown of Oklahoma City, and four longtime business associates of the late Lloyd Noble. One of them is James E. Thompson, president of the foundation.

Mr. Thompson recalled that Lloyd Noble was a man with many facets to his personality and character. He said, "Along with his financial success, he developed the philosophy that no man accomplishes anything worthwhile by himself—only through the help and cooperation of others.

"This foundation," he pointed out, "was a result of his desire to do something with his wealth to help his fellowman."

In the beginning the foundation was primarily concerned with agricultural research. But as scientists studied the relationship between soil fertility and human health, they became increasingly aware of the lack of adequate knowledge about the human cell. Their studies evolved into a comparison between normal and abnormal cells—and into the field of cancer.

Mr. Thompson observed that each of Lloyd Noble's children is independently well off, but they contribute their time to the Noble enterprises so that the giant research program can continue. He explained that a research program requires steady, foreseeable income for sound planning.

One of the men who has worked for the Noble Foundation from the beginning is Ray O. Dyer, director of the agricultural division. "The unique thing about this foundation," Mr. Dyer said, "is the dedication of the people working here. When we think of Lloyd Noble and what he made possible, we begin to hero-worship him. But he wouldn't want that. He wasn't a saint; he was a fighter. As happy as he would be with our program today, he wouldn't be completely satisfied because he was a perfectionist. So we are constantly trying to improve our research programs."

Dr. McCoy is optimistic about the control of cancer in the future, but he would not predict when that will be. "I don't think the answer will be like the polio vaccine," he said. "There are many types of cancer, so I doubt we could get one cure for all types."

The cure for cancer probably won't be found in one laboratory, but it will be the result of research in many laboratories. Scientists at the Noble Foundation are contributing valuable information in the worldwide quest to solve the cancer mystery.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Sound' Rights Bill Pledged; What's Gained by Dodging? "published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean of February 17, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND RIGHTS BILL PLEDGED; WHAT'S GAINED BY DODGING?

(By Edward D. Ball, editor)

Having promised to help get sound civil rights legislation passed this year, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON has acted on the assumption that the best way to proceed is to proceed.

The Texan's commitment was generally approved by southern Democrats, though some who look with alarm upon civil rights, in any and all of its aspects, may have had their doubts.

In view of the trouble of prizing any civil rights measure out of the Eastman committee, it was expected all along that Senator JOHNSON would use some minor bill as a vehicle for amendments. And this he has done.

The Texas veteran is giving his party leadership to dispel the idea that it is afraid to let any rights legislation come before the Congress. As a matter of fact the Democrats did not find themselves imposed upon when new legislation was passed in 1957, with Senator JOHNSON in the forefront, after some of the Eisenhower administration's objectionable provisions had been soundly beaten.

Voting rights constitute an issue that calls for reasoned consideration, and strangely enough those who would belabor Senator JOHNSON for recognizing this fact will be found, in many cases, to be hysterical supporters of Vice President NIXON whose advice and consent was sought and given on Attorney General Rogers' referee plan within the Federal judicial system. Such schizophrenia is rampant.

There is no chance that southern elements can keep the issue of civil rights from coming to a vote, and there are many advantages in getting it settled with as little delay as possible.

Not only is Senator JOHNSON wise in trying to get this issue settled soon, he is also being realistic. For he knows full well that there is going to be an adequate rights plank in his party's national platform and that any Democratic candidate who hopes to be elected will subscribe to it.

As things now stand, he is the only man from the South with any chance to win the Democratic nomination. In a sense, he may be taking a calculated risk in doing what he promised last year to do. The discreditable thing, however, would have been failure to live up to that reasonable pledge.

He has not, of course, endorsed the Nixon-Rogers-Eisenhower lack of consideration for southern tradition in handling its own elections, State and National. He does not stand in the way of attacks upon the constitutionality of such a program devised for political advantage in this election year. He has only said, in effect, that since these issues are going to be pressed, the Senate should not run away from the responsibility of giving them the attention they require.

An opportunity will now be given to sift the bad from the good in civil rights amendments, and what could be more democratic?

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is not afraid of leadership, in which the Nation has been notably lacking. That, in itself, is a heartening sign.

Pending Applications for Federal Grants Under Federal Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, of all the vetoes which the President has rendered on important and necessary legislation his veto of the water pollution bill probably was the most ill considered.

While piously noting that the rivers and streams of our country are a priceless national asset, his veto message calmly relegates the solution to the immense pollution problems to the local level.

And the President's primary answer to these problems is the calling of another national conference.

Mr. President, there are no facts which can be developed at any such conference that are not already well known.

These facts are that our local communities are finding it impossible to cope with the sewage and pollution problems being brought about by our increasing population, industrialization, and urbanization.

The calling of a national conference on water pollution will not alter the needs in the least.

It simply would be another excuse by the administration to delay and to duck its responsibility for solving a national problem.

In case the President has not been made aware of the scope of the problem—and I gather from his veto message that he obviously has not—there are 558 pending applications for Federal grants under Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. These are projects in nearly every State and there are an additional 500 applications now in preparation.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of Michigan applications be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask that a telegram on the subject from Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, also be printed.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Backlog of applications for Federal grants under Public Law 660

Applicant	Estimated total project cost	Estimated amount grant requested	Congressional district	Applicant	Estimated total project cost	Estimated amount grant requested	Congressional district
Michigan:				Michigan—Continued			
Lathrup Village	$237,500	$71,250	18	Stephenson	$87,000	$26,100	11
Milk River District	6,621,000	146,616	----------	Greenville	295,180	88,554	8
Woodland	122,108	36,632	4	Cadillac	685,500	205,650	9
Southeast Oakland	4,145,140	250,000	18	Richmond	282,000	84,600	8
Oakland County	2,796,235	250,000	18	Rochester	292,000	87,600	17
Detroit	7,162,000	250,000	17	Lawton	58,000	17,400	4
Pontiac	3,049,000	250,000	18	Charlevoix	57,500	17,250	11
Linden	261,400	78,420	6	Bridgeport	504,900	151,470	8
Ypsilanti Township	535,000	160,500	2	Buchanan	218,450	65,535	4
Paw Paw	354,000	106,200	4	Delhi	288,000	86,400	2
Ypsilanti	903,357	250,000	2	Not identified by name (4)	7,692,722	819,576	----------
Springfield	1,021,788	250,000	18				
Utica	313,500	94,050	7	Total	38,216,579	3,913,792	----------
Chelsea	233,290	69,989	2				

LANSING, MICH.,
Thursday, February 25, 1960.

Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Sentiment here strongly favors overriding President's veto of House bill 3610. This urgently needed legislation has been recommended by the President's Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Council and also by the State and Interstate Water Control Administrators. This bill will make available to Michigan annually about $2.8 million for the next 5 years to assist local communities in the construction of sewage disposal plants compared to about $1.4 million the State has been receiving. During the next 5 years 85 communities throughout Michigan must construct sewage disposal facilities at a cost of almost $100 million. To date and even with the increased funds under House bill 3610 local communities will still have to bear almost 90 percent of the cost of construction. Congressional hearings held last year revealed that not only Michigan, but the entire Nation is faced with the problem of providing adequate water and sewage facilities to meet present needs brought about by population and industrial growth and urbanization as well as those which are to occur in the future.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Early Action Needed on Amistad (Formerly Diablo) Dam on the Rio Grande; South Texas Chamber of Commerce Approves Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, nothing is more important to the growth and development of Texas and the great Southwest than securing adequate and long-lasting sources of water supply.

One of the most vital flood control and water conservation projects now under consideration is the Diablo Dam project on the Rio Grande 9 miles north of Del Rio, Tex., recently renamed Amistad Dam.

Recently the south Texas Chamber of Commerce, an organization with membership covering 52 of Texas's 254 counties, passed a resolution urging early construction of Diablo Dam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce entitled: "Diablo Dam."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it know that, whereas the principal objective of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce is the conservation of water, the storage of water and the building of the economic resources of south Texas through the development of adequate and long-lasting sources of water supply; and

Wheras the 1944 International Treaty between the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America agreed upon the construction of three international dams on the Rio Grande River for the purpose of flood control, water conservation, and the preservation of human life and property; and

Whereas the construction of one (Falcon) of the three international dams as provided in the treaty of 1944 between Mexico and the United States has been accomplished, and the results of that construction have materially aided in the development of that area below that dam known as the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas through the providing of constant supply of water in times of drought and through the impounding of waters which formerly flowed into the Gulf of Mexico and through the harnessing of flood waters which in the year 1954 caused millions of dollars in economic loss in those areas, both in Mexico and Texas above the aforementioned dam, and further would have caused additional millions of dollars in economic loss to the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, excluding the loss of life in both areas; and

Whereas the site has been selected for the second dam in the series of three to be located approximately 9 miles north of the city of Del Rio, Tex., near the confluence of the Rio Grande and Devils River, and detailed plans and construction procedures has been agreed upon by both sections of the I.B.W.C. on said site as the most ideal location for Diablo Dam; and

Whereas the International Boundary and Water Commission has completed the feasibility report of Diablo Dam and said feasibility report has been presented at public hearing on the Board of Water Engineers of the State of Texas, said report unquestionably justifies the need and feasibility of the construction of Diablo Dam, and said Board of Water Engineers has approved the feasibility report; and

Whereas the population of the area between that point above the city of Del Rio to that point where the Rio Grande River enters the Gulf of Mexico, both rural and urban, are completely dependent upon the river as a means of life and economy; and

Whereas an urgency exists to prevent a recurrence of another disaster such as that in 1954 by flooding in the Rio Grande which resulted in the loss of many human lives and millions of dollars in property damage, and records show that a devastating flood on the Rio Grande occurs on the average of every 4 years, and whereas there now exists at this date another disastrous flood rendering hardship and great loss to our fellow Texans and Mexican neighbors below Falcon Dam; and

Whereas if said Diablo Dam were constructed it would alleviate and eliminate those dangers as well as stabilize our rapidly diminishing water supply in a recurring drought-stricken area by providing a large storage basin whereby orderly release of stored flood waters would add materially to the agriculture areas along the Rio Grande; and since construction of Falcon Dam, the water level has fluctuated from minimum to maximum, and without construction of other upstream dams, this uncertain situation will continue to prevail forever; however with Diablo, the water in Falcon can be stabilized within limits, and at all times allowance for major floods can be made; and

Whereas the storage basin provided by this dam being approximately twice that of Falcon would create a new source of water by the reduction of water loss due to evaporation and uncontrolled seepage and runoff, and whereas in the October 19, 1958, flood, at $2 per acre-foot, approximately $44 million has been lost, which Diablo Dam could have saved, in addition to flood damages on both the Mexican and United States property adjacent to the Rio Grande (14,000 people homeless as of October 19, 1958, as 7 villages and 80 percent of the land between the levees in the 150 miles between Rio Grande

City, Tex., and a point 10 miles north of Brownsville, Tex., have been inundated by the waters of the Rio Grande); and

Whereas the life of the existing dam known as Falcon would be doubled due to the retarding of the silting action which is annually lessening the economic usefulness of Falcon as a storage basin; and

Whereas the communities of Del Rio, Eagle Pass, Laredo, and Zapata, representing the major population areas located above the originally constructed dam and below the Diablo Dam site have reached a common agreement upon the need for the construction of such dam in order to stabilize the economy of the entire river basin; and

Whereas at the 31st and 32d annual conventions of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce, in session at Corpus Christi, Tex., on October 20, 1957, and Laredo, Tex., on October 20, 1958, adopted and urged earliest possible action on early construction of Diablo Dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, on this 12th day of October, 1959, at the 33d annual meeting of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce, its officers and board of directors, its water resources committee and general membership, endorse the earliest possible construction of an international dam and reservoir near Del Rio, Tex.; and an immediate appropriation and authorization for its construction by the U.S. Congress, and in order to stabilize, protect and increase the basic economy of the entire south Texas area, in order to save lives and properties, now and in the future, the South Texas Chamber of Commerce urges every citizen of south Texas to join with us and immediately and urgently wire and write all of our Congressmen, Senators, Gov. Price Daniel, and congressional committees, requesting immediate action and earliest possible construction of Diablo Dam.

J. H. BLACKALLER,
Chairman,
Water Resources Committee.
W. E. COOK,
Acting Chairman,
Diablo Dam Committee.

A Patriot Looks at the Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the editorial which follows. It is the work of Don Raihle, writing in the Wanderer, national Catholic newspaper of Minneapolis. Mr. Raihle takes a definite position in favor of present loyalty oath requirements in the National Defense Education Act. His article follows:

"Caltech tries to make available to students all possible loans from private and public sources. We have adequate private sources of funds for those who prefer not to sign the disclaimer affidavit required for Federal loans."

Background: The foregoing comment was made by President Lee A. DuBridge, of Caltech University in California. He refers to the loyalty oath required of students applying for loans under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This disclaimer clause was inserted into the Federal-aid bill by South Dakota Senator KARL E. MUNDT when he found out that outright Communists had received Federal grants-in-aid for education through the Atomic Energy Commission in previous years. The liberals and leftwingers, together with the American Civil Liberties Union, have been screaming against that provision ever since.

An attempt to recall the loyalty oath was defeated in a Senate rollcall on July 23, 1959, 49 to 42. Leading the opposition to the loyalty provision were pink-tinged members of the American Association of University Professors and liberals in the Senate led by JOHN F. KENNEDY, who is now an active candidate to become the next President of the United States.

Let's see if this loyalty oath is really bad. This is what it requires of students: (1) To swear allegiance to the U.S. Government; (2) affirm that he does not believe in and is not now a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. That's all there is to it. Any American citizen with loyal red blood coursing through his veins should be willing to take such an oath every morning before breakfast.

Some schools have publicly opposed the oath and refused to cooperate. These have been listed by Time magazine as being: Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Antioch, Princeton, Reed and Swarthmore. Other schools demanding repeal of the oath provision are: University of Wisconsin, Emory University, Harvard, Yale, Bates, Bowdoin and Colby. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming (of doubtful cranberry fame) lent his prestige to the antioath movement by also backing repeal of the provision.

Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey and Yale President A. Whitney Griswold teamed up to withdraw from the Federal student loan fund as a final protest against the loyalty oath. Thus, the two universities relinquished almost a half-million dollars that would have allotted to them during 1960.

What these educational protesters seem to be saying, in effect, is that they are more interested in giving aid and comfort to the Communist Party, the American Civil Liberties Union and assorted Reds and Pinks who protest against any and all kind of loyalty oaths than they are in properly educating American youth.

It is not the students who must sign the loyalty-oath disclaimer who are waging this active cold war of anti-Americanism, but, instead, college presidents and professors and their assorted followers of many different hues. Some observers have expressed speculation as to how long it will be before free-economy industrialists and corporations which contribute so heavily to the support of such private institutions as those mentioned above, and who likewise provide scholarships and loans for those schools, question how long this Nation will endure under the prevailing ideology of some of our educational leaders. In the future benefactors may do well to consider whether or not they are acting in their own best interest as well as that of their country.

We can be certain that the concentrated howls against the "loyalty oath" in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will be heard again shortly in the Halls of Congress. Another effort will be made for its abrogation. If you feel that the "loyalty oath" is good, advisable, and fair to all, you are requested to so write to your Representative in the House and your Senator. Make your wishes known. Your elected officials want to know what your opinions are in matters such as this.

It seems that in today's upside-down thinking that it is at times not only unpopular to be patriotic, but it is actually dangerous. If you act like a patriot, chances are you will be the recipient of snide remarks in some circles. It is about time that we put a stop to such silliness and forcibly assert our patriotism to the United States of America.

International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, praiseworthy editorials and columns concerning IDA—International Development Association—continue to appear. This looms as another constructive achievement in the remarkable career of the junior Senator from Oklahoma, MIKE MONRONEY. The Democratic Party could well take a good, favorable look at him and his record. No finer man or record of public service can be found. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several articles and editorials, published in various newspapers, as follows:

A Peter Edson column distributed by the Newspaper Enterprise Association, appearing in the Washington Daily News on February 4, 1960.

An editorial from the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, February 4, 1960.

An article by Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor, February 2, 1960.

Because the Senate was not in session when the Governors of the World Bank approved IDA last October, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several earlier articles:

A column by Victor Wilson in the New York Herald Tribune of October 7, 1959.

An editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) World of Monday, October 5, 1959.

A feature story by Allan Cromley in the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Times of August 27, 1959.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 4, 1960]

IDA IS THE NAME

(By Peter Edson)

"IDA"—a unique, billion-dollar international E-Z money lending institutions, is being organized here without a staff or a home it can call its own. Its full name is International Development Association.

Before IDA can open for business its articles of agreement—just announced by the World Bank—must be ratified by governments subscribing 65 percent of its capital.

For the United States this means a treaty ratified by the Senate and an appropriation by Congress for the U.S. share of the capital fund—$320 million. But if the United States and five other nations—Britain, Canada, France, Germany and Japan—subscribe $650 million before September 15, IDA will be able to open the doors and figuratively pass out carnations to new customers like any other new bank.

IDA's father is Senator A. S. M. MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma. Several years ago he got the idea there should be an interna-

tional bank which could make easier loans, repayable in soft currencies of the world's underdeveloped countries.

IDA's mother—and its guardian angel and boss—will be the World Bank—The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to use the full handle.

The World Bank's president, Eugene R. Black, will be IDA's president. The World Bank's governors—finance ministers of its 68 member countries—will be the same, if they all ratify IDA and join up. The same goes for the World Bank's 18 regional executive directors, its other officers and the entire staff. It is by this device that IDA will get by as a big bank without a staff or home of its own.

Best example of what IDA can do that the World Bank can't do is illustrated by the Aswan Dam hassle. In 1955 the World Bank worked out a deal to loan Egypt $200 million as a starter. This was the most the bank thought Egypt could repay, on a sound commercial loan basis. So the bank asked the United States, Britain and a few others to make foreign aid grants of another $200 million to get it going.

Then President Nasser made his arms deal with the Communists. The United States backed out of the Aswan Dam deal. Subsequently Russia moved in and is now financing it.

If a project of this kind were to arise today, World Bank could advance the first $200 million as a repayable loan. Then the bank's officers could put on their other hats as executives of IDA and see if the other $200 million couldn't be advanced in soft currency loans. So IDA will operate as a back window to the World Bank.

Over the past 10 years the World Bank has had to turn down many applications for loans to finance good projects in underdeveloped countries that couldn't finance them. It is expected that many of these applications will be dusted off and resubmitted, along with many new ones. IDA expects to lend about $150 million a year for the next 5 years.

Perhaps the greatest benefit to the United States will be that as IDA's business increases, demands on this country for foreign aid grants may be reduced.

The fact that the World Bank runs the store is a guarantee that it will be well managed. For World Bank is perhaps the most successful of all the international agencies set up at the end of World War II.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, Feb. 4, 1960]

THE NEW WORLD BANK FOR SMALL CUSTOMERS

The World Bank has announced that the framework of its new affiliate, the International Development Association, has been completed. When the structure is finished, the IDA will be able to reach with its loans underdeveloped nations with which the World Bank itself could not do business.

The United States is now, and always has been, the generous uncle that has supplied the World Bank with much of its working capital. In an important sense the IDA will create a new trade-aid policy for which, again, the United States will do a large share of the underwriting.

The United States will provide $320.9 million in capitalization for the new banking affiliate of the World Bank (the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), and other industrialized members will put up a total of $442.7 million. There are 68 members of the World Bank, but not all are industrialized nations. Some of them are small underdeveloped nations that are themselves in the market for development loans.

The World Bank makes loans only in hard currencies that are convertible in the world money market. Several years ago Senator A. S. MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, proposed that an affiliate of the World Bank be set up to make loans that could be repaid in local currency. That plan has been approved by the directors of the World Bank and by Congress. It is possible that by next September all 68 members of the World Bank will have ratified the plan and that a new lending policy which the United States sponsored will be in operation.

Some of the small underdeveloped nations that cannot exchange their currencies for dollars, or pounds sterling, in the international market do possess potential resources for industrialization, if they could get the hard currency for the financial foundations. In the files of the World Bank there is abundant proof of this fact.

Russia is eager to aid the underdeveloped nations and to furnish them technical assistance. But there are Moscow strings to that aid, as the underdeveloped nations know. Now small nations most in need of loans to put them in the stream of world trade should soon be able to get them from the IDA with no obligations imposed except those of a banking proposition that looks like a good thing for all parties concerned.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 2, 1960]

WORLD BANK PLANS "EASY" LOANS

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Add IDA to your list of international lending agencies, IDA stands for International Development Association.

The charter for this new lending institution, more or less an appendage of the World Bank, has been approved by the World Bank's directors.

All it now needs is approval by member governments—and contribution of funds in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

The difference between the World Bank and IDA is that the parent organization only makes "safe" loans, principally repayable in "hard" currencies. The new IDA is authorized to make "easy" loans in "soft" currencies.

MONRONEY PUSHED PLAN

The need for IDA became apparent some years ago—but it took some time for the White House to warm up to it. Credit for the arrangement that makes it possible to lend underdeveloped countries sizable sums for development projects goes to Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

For some time Senator MONRONEY has urged that the United States shift from a program of aid to one of loans—with particular ways being found to put to use the accumulating Public Law 480 funds (soft currency) the United States has accumulated.

Then last year at the annual meeting of the World Bank's directors, Robert B. Anderson, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, threw Washington's weight behind the proposal for IDA—and the scheme was assured.

PATTERN BLUEPRINTED

The reason is that the United States is down for about one-third of the total—or $320,290,000. Other industrialized countries—Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, Japan, to mention a few—make their contributions in "hard" currencies; i.e., in gold or freely convertible currencies. Other member countries—such as India, Egypt, etc.—would put up 10 percent of their contributions in gold or convertible currencies and the rest in their own money.

Loans would go for a variety of development projects of the kind the World Bank could not finance—that is, nonrevenue producing. And repayment could be not in hard currencies spent but in soft currencies of the countries borrowing.

In other words, the IDA makes it possible for the members of the World Bank to do what the charter of the World Bank itself does not permit them to do. It is designed to meet the demands of the changing international picture without altering the sound fiscal rules of the World Bank.

Before the IDA can actually open for business at least 45 of the 68 members of the World Bank have to approve, and countries have to subscribe, at least $650 million of the $1 billion.

It is understood President Eisenhower will send the proposal for U.S. participation to Congress in March, in plenty of time for both Houses to approve. Their approval is necessary as funds have to be provided to cover the contribution of the United States.

Under the IDA charter, however, only 23 percent of any nation's subscription has to be paid in the first year of membership, with an additional 19.25 percent in each of the next 4 years. Thus all the United States actually would have to put up this year would be $73,300,000. But that would have to be included in the administration's budget for the fiscal year starting July 1.

FUNDS UNFROZEN NOW?

There is one particular clause in the charter that especially interests the United States, the one permitting member nations to contribute "soft" currencies in addition to its own "hard" currency quotas. This means that the United States will be able to put to use the huge accumulations of Public Law 480 funds, which may total $5 million this year.

These funds are the repayments in soft currencies which underdeveloped countries have made to the United States for U.S. surplus crop shipments. Since these cannot be used by the United States, they constitute a frozen fund that the IDA charter now thaws—at least legally.

With the IDA joining the international lending family, there now are:

The World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), a multination group which grants loans repayable in dollars and pounds.

The Export-Import Bank, a U.S. institution, which makes similar loans.

The Development Loan Fund, which is the United States own soft currency lending version of IDA.

The Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) a U.N.-sponsored organization including Communist members.

The new Inter-American Development Bank, geared only to Latin American needs.

REINS RESERVED FOR BLACK

The management of the IDA would be the same as that of the World Bank. Thus the president of IDA would be Eugene R. Black, an American.

What it amounts to is that the World Bank is opening a new "window" at its elaborate offices in Washington—a "window" where underdeveloped countries might go for help if they cannot meet the more rigid financial requirements of the World Bank itself.

It is not expected that these soft loans will automatically turn into grants—but rather that while borrowing countries will be able to repay them, repayment would be able to be made in the hard currencies spent. The scheme is obviously a means of meeting the needs of the underdeveloped countries without lowering the lending standards of the bank itself.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 7, 1959]

THE WORLD LOAN PLAN STORY

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Though it doesn't happen too often, sometimes the story behind the story of a major international event gets lost in the shuffle here in Washington.

Something like this occurred in the creation of the International Development As-

sociation (IDA) during the meeting here of the 68-nation World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

IDA, with a proposed billion-dollar "kitty," is designed to provide long-term loans at low interest rates to underprivileged countries which want to develop their internal resources. This is practically impossible now under the harder terms of the World Bank.

Though a 2-day debate preceded unanimous adoption of the IDA idea, proposed by the United States, there is no record that the name of the man who dreamed it up was even mentioned.

Let the record show, therefore, the name of Senator ALMER STILLWELL MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who calls himself "Mike." For 3 years MIKE MONRONEY has been preaching, peddling, and pushing IDA.

One result of all this effort was that IDA was called "MIKE'S Piggy Bank" from one end of Washington to the other. But another, and decisive, result was that the idea took hold in important minds—President Eisenhower's, Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson's, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's, and Under Secretary C. Douglas Dillon's.

Perhaps the most decisive action came from the President when, in October 1958, he wrote a letter to Secretary Anderson, proposing that Mr. Anderson place the IDA plan before that fall's meeting of the World Bank at New Delhi, India, for study and future action.

The unanimous vote for IDA here is a tribute to Mr. Anderson's sales ability.

As luck would have it, Senator MONRONEY wasn't even in Washington when his "Piggy Bank" idea won out. He was at Bonn, West Germany, conferring with like-minded Americans and Germans on how to keep world peace.

It was during another Monroney trip—to a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Bangkok, Thailand, in November 1956—that Senator MONRONEY decided to go all out for IDA. (He concedes that others had thought earlier along the same lines. The World Bank itself operates on similar lines at a higher level. And Governor Rockefeller proposed a somewhat similar plan when he was an aid to President Eisenhower in 1955.)

During the intermissions of the 1956 Bangkok sessions of the Interparliamentary Union, Senator MONRONEY went out to see Thailand. The Thai, bursting with pride, showed him a $53 million dam on the Chao Phya River, which irrigated 2 million acres, and raised their annual rice production by half a million tons.

Their pride stemmed from the fact that it was their very own project—they had borrowed $18 million from the World Bank, and put up the rest of the money themselves.

Then the Thai took the Senator to inspect an outright American gift project—a $21 million road driven through rank jungle to the Lao border. The road was badly needed, and thoroughly practical. But the Thai were rather shamefaced about it. The gift had offended their pride.

Senator MONRONEY learned that most Oriental peoples feel that gifts or rewards should be expected only for performance of deserving acts by themselves. Thus the Thai custom of purchasing caged birds at the marketplace and freeing them to return to the jungle. The Thais feel that this pleases Buddha, who will then reward them with good fortune.

Said MIKE MONRONEY after this experience: "We have erred in trying to fit the size 12 Marshall plan shoe to a size 5 Asian foot. And, we've used too much of the 'papa fix' approach."

Back in Washington from Bangkok, Senator MONRONEY tried to drum up support for his IDA idea. An important feature was that after a poor country made an IDA loan, it could pay back, at least part, in its own currency, money usually so "soft" it would be virtually worthless in world channels.

But most influential Washingtonians—Democrats and Republicans—thought his idea was the mad scheme of a starry-eyed liberal which would upset the world monetary applecart.

Then, in January, 1958, Messrs. Herter and Dillon, and Eugene R. Black, president of the World Bank, were persuaded to take another look at IDA. Mr. Herter then was Under Secretary and Mr. Dillon a deputy for economic affairs.

Senator MONRONEY meanwhile introduced a resolution to put the Senate on record for IDA. At subsequent Banking Committee hearings, Secretary Anderson said the idea, with some fixing, was feasible. In July 1958, the Senate, by a bipartisan 62 to 25 vote, supported IDA. Then came Mr. Eisenhower's decisionmaking letter to Secretary Anderson.

IDA still is not out of the woods. Its charter must be drafted—it could be watered down—and ratified by member governments. But Senator MONRONEY'S "piggy bank" is off the drafting boards and into the realm of reality. Even he couldn't ask for more.

[From the Tulsa Daily World, Oct. 5, 1959]

MORE UNDERWRITING

Underdeveloped nations will be in line for a financial booster shot now that the World Bank has ordered creation of the International Development Association, to make loans on easy terms to poorer countries.

As usual, the United States will contribute the major share of funds needed to underwrite the new program of benevolence. This Nation has agreed to put in $320 million, although Congress must approve U.S. adherence and provide the money.

U.S. assistance in foreign regional development is not an overnight decision. It has been going on, in one way or another, since the close of World War II.

The three great free world international banking agencies—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Monetary Fund—agreed that something was missing in their setup—the creation of an agency which would make long-term loans at low rates of interest, which would be at least partly repayable in local currencies. No international agency now makes such so-called "soft loans."

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, took the initiative in mobilizing support for such a development association, proposed originally in 1951 by Nelson Rockefeller, now Governor of New York State. Under MONRONEY'S prodding the Senate last year adopted a resolution urging study of the possibility of creating the new agency. The plan is nonpartisan and has received strong support from President Eisenhower.

The World Bank's affiliate will probably be capitalized at $1 billion. The World Bank reflects a $21 billion financial background.

We don't know how long or how far this helping hand will be extended to the rest of the have-not nations. One good point: the new agency will help distribute to other countries the more hazardous type of foreign aid lending, the burden of which so far has been carried almost entirely by U.S. taxpayers.

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

MONRONEY'S BRAIN CHILD IS COMING OF AGE

(By Allan Cromley)

WASHINGTON.—It doesn't bother Mrs. Mike Monroney at all when her husband mumbles in his sleep about someone named "Ida."

Mrs. M. knows that "Ida" is really "IDA," which is an abbreviation for "International Development Association." The Senator has been promoting IDA since 1956, and it appears that his efforts are about to end in international matrimony.

It's reportedly possible that the Board of Directors of the World Bank will perform the ceremony when they meet in the United States September 27–29. Monroney's IDA will then become a subsidiary of the bank and, he hopes, a vital part of the free world's program of assistance to underdeveloped nations."

REPORTER CONVINCED

Although he has a former newspaperman's ability to put complicated subjects in one- and two-sylable words, MONRONEY has found it difficult to introduce his brain child to Washington bureaucrats—to say nothing of the general public.

He introduced this reporter to IDA over about 2½ cups of coffee. It can't be said that the reporter completely understands IDA, but he is convinced that MONRONEY does.

So hold your breath and keep reading. You may gain good conversational material with which to deflate bores at receptions.

LIKE A FARMER

MONRONEY'S IDA is designed for backward countries which would like to get loans from the World Bank but can't pass the credit risk test.

They're like the farmer who goes to the country bank. He wants to buy a good piece of land for $10,000 but can't quite float it at 6 percent over a 20-year period.

So the banker says, "I'll loan you $7,000. Now you go to our trust department and see if they'll take a second mortgage."

The farmer does, and they do—in this manner: The trust department says, "We'll lend you $3,000 at 2 percent over a 40-year period, except that $1,500 of it will be in cash and $1,500 of it will be in wheat, which you can convert to cash."

So the farmer gets his loan and everybody lives happily ever after.

Mike's IDA would be the "trust department" of the World Bank. Let's say India comes in with plans to build a $100 million dam which would obviate its water dispute with Pakistan.

The World Bank agrees to lend $70 million in dollars or other money, such as the pound, with worldwide respectability. These are called "hard" currencies.

The loan will be for 20 or 25 years at 5¼ to 6 percent. Then India goes to IDA and gets a "second mortgage" $30 million loan for 40 years at 2 percent.

However, IDA says, "We can't give it to you all in dollars, or pounds or Mexican pesos. We will, however, lend you $15 million in one of those hard currencies and $15 million in soft money, such Italian lira, Japanese yen, Peruvian pesos, and Brazilian cruzeiros, which we have a lot of and are otherwise worthless.

OTHERWISE IMPOSSIBLE

"Now you go out and see what you can scrounge with the soft currencies. Perhaps you can buy Japanese earth-moving equipment with the yen, Peruvian zinc with the pesos, Brazilian rubber with the cruzeiros, peddle the rubber and zinc to some other country for other needs * * *" etc., etc.

So, India gets the loan, contends MONRONEY, that otherwise would have been impossible.

The IDA, like any bank, would have to be financed to start with. The beginning sum would be $1 billion, of which the United States share would be $350 million. Other hard currency countries would come in for their share.

VIRTUALLY WORTHLESS

In addition, everyone would chip in soft currencies, of which the United States has

accumulated $3.5 billion in its worldwide disposal of surplus commodities.

It's MONRONEY's contention that our dollars would eventually be paid back, with interest, and the "soft" currencies are virtually worthless to us the way things stand now.

When borrowers begin to shop around the world market with currencies they get from IDA, they will feel more like the farmer we talked about and less like someone who has taken a handout, believes MONRONEY. This, he says, is a step toward closer ties between the United States and underdeveloped countries.

BORN IN 1956

Whose idea was IDA, anyhow? Did MIKE just dream it up, or did someone with an ax to grind plant it in his ear?

He thought of the scheme in 1956 during a meeting of the International Parliamentary Union in Bangkok, Thailand, he said.

The Thai had built a $53 million irrigation project with their own funds, supplemented by a $18 million World Bank loan. They were "bursting with pride" over it, but were not so enthusiastic about a $21 million highway financed with U.S. defense support funds.

"My impression was that they felt they had lost face and suffered an implied loss of sovereignty in accepting the highway," MONRONEY says.

REPLY IS QUICK

All well and good, comments his interviewer. But what do you say when someone asks, "What's in all this international folderol for Oklahoma?"

His reply is quick:

"Do Oklahomans want the 67 other member nations of the World Bank to take on a bigger share of the load of helping underdeveloped countries?

"Do Oklahomans want us to make use of the currencies we have received for sale of agricultural surpluses abroad?"

REPUBLICANS PERSUASIVE

"Do Oklahomans want to take the 'papa fix' out of foreign aid, which has caused it to boomerang against the United States?"

MONRONEY has been just as persuasive with the Republican Eisenhower administration. Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson has done "tireless work" in behalf of IDA, according to MONRONEY. As a member of the World Bank's Board of Governors, Anderson has promised to recommend IDA's adoption.

What Shall We Do With the Telephone Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress adopted legislation to provide for the termination of the telephone excise tax effective June 30 of this year. In his budget message President Eisenhower, however, urged the Congress to rescind this action and to continue the tax for an additional year.

At the same time, in my State of New York, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has appealed to the President, and also, as I understand it, to Members of Congress, to go through with our decision to abandon this tax so that the State may authorize its reimposition at the State level after June 30 for educational purposes.

Because I believe that members of Congress, particularly those from New York State, may be interested in the reactions of citizens to these proposals by the President and by Governor Rockefeller, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the Cherry Valley News, Cherry Valley, N.Y., on January 28, 1960. The editorial follows:

TOSSING THE BALL AROUND

Governor Rockefeller had planned to grab the 10-percent tax on telephones which the Government had voted to drop as an unfair tax and discriminatory one. Rockefeller wanted the revenue to be used as additional aid to New York schools. Today's press carries an announcement Eisenhower plans to keep the tax if he can.

Why in the name of blazes should we users of the telephone be forced to continue payment of what was considered a luxury tax in the first instance? Why in the world would Rockefeller want to load business with another tax, and thereby become the second only State in the Union with such a tax? Rocky has his department of commerce working day and night, spending thousands and thousands of dollars to induce new business to the Empire State, and yet he is willing to make it less economical for business by adding a phone tax.

Already the phone company must take 30 cents out of each dollar paid for service, for taxes. This tax is four to five times more than the taxes on most other things consumers buy. This appears to be most discriminatory, indeed.

Bounce this tax around as you will, Rocky and Ike, but in the end, in fairness to all concerned, we hope you drop the ball and lose it entirely. Taxes are necessary, but don't single out a single utility to extract several millions.

Support Grows for Padre Island National Seashore Project: Houston (Tex.) Democratic Woman's Club Strongly Supports It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public approval of the plan to create a massive new national seashore recreation area on Padre Island continues to grow. Seldom has there been such widespread agreement on the need for such a project.

Following recent hearings on the project, which were conducted by the able and distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Houston (Tex.) Press editors headed one of their stories—"15,000 for, 3 against" the Padre Island project.

Almost daily additional organizations in Texas and across the nation are officially endorsing the Padre Island National Seashore plan. One of the most recent to pass such a resolution is the large and extremely active Houston Democratic Woman's Clubs of Houston, Tex., which has adopted a perceptive resolution.

A story concerning the overwhelming public support for the Padre Island seashore plan appears in the current issue of National Parks magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the following:

The article from the February 1960 issue of National Parks magazine, entitled: "Little Opposition at Padre Island Hearing," and, the resolution passed by the Houston Democratic Woman's Clubs on January 21, 1960 headed: "The Need for Padre Island National Seashore."

There being no objection, the article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE OPPOSITION AT PADRE ISLAND HEARING

Flagged in the Houston (Tex.) Press as "15,000 for, 3 against," the December 14 Corpus Christi hearing on the proposed Padre Island National Seashore was apparently the smoothest and speediest hearing on a park proposal seen in a long time. Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth was quoted as saying "It makes me nervous. It is too easy."

Some 40 witnesses appeared to speak personally in favor of the project, while 100 sent in telegrams, letters, or prepared statements and over 15,000 signed petitions welcoming the new seashore area. The three protests were registered by a landowner and two attorneys for landowners on parts of the 110-mile-long island extending from Corpus Christi to near Brownsville.

Most determined opposition was voiced by David M. Coover, who spoke for the heirs of Albert R. Jones and P. F. Dunn. Coover told Senate subcommittee member FRANK MOSS, of Utah and RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, together with Congressman JOHN YOUNG, of Corpus Christi, that since the two families had never been approached by any agency with a definite plan for a park, they were forced into the position of opposing any plan. The Jones family owns approximately 44,000 acres or one-third of the island and the Dunns own the largest oil and mineral rights which Coover estimated at $75 million. Milder opposition came from Dallas attorney John D. McCall and Padre Beach developer J. L. Tompkins.

Senator YARBOROUGH, whose bill was the basis of the hearing, led off with a vigorous demand for a minimum of 100 miles. Opponent Tompkins urged a restriction to 50 miles of shoreline. The National Park Service felt that 88 miles of the islands 110 were "unspoiled and suitable for preservation." Significant, perhaps, was a statement entered into the record on behalf of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate: "We should not only encourage a park on Padre Island, but by showing the committee the advantages which will accrue to present and future generations by having a large part of Padre preserved in its natural beauty, we should encourage Congress to embark on a general program of shoreline park development * * * Padre Island should set the pace and lead the way."

Clarence Cottam, Director of the Welder Wildlife Foundation and member of the board of trustees of the National Parks Association, presented a statement for NPA (see p. 12 of the July 1959 National Parks magazine) which indicates the association's belief that "Padre Island is of national significance and of a quality suitable for inclusion in the system of reserves administered by the National Park Service." The statement further urged that "the entire island between the present county parks at the north and south ends of the island" together with "the Laguna Madre and the coastal

lands up to the Intracoastal Canal" should be included.

Speaking as an individual, Dr. Cottam also made an eloquent plea for the project as a means of preserving wildlife. Emphasizing its biological significance, he said, "This general section is a most important thoroughfare in continental bird migration and a great many individuals of a surprising number of species winter here. If the area were developed industrially and for homesites or beach cottages, much of its attractiveness for wildlife and the opportunity for study and observation would be materially lessened, if not largely destroyed."

RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSTON (TEX.) DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CLUB

"Whereas in this changing world, in which values are increasingly difficult to maintain and preserve, it is essential to uphold the physical as well as spiritual essence of the American way of life; and

"Whereas, with scientific and industrial development and progress steadily altering the characteristics of the world in which we live, it is more and more vital that effective steps be taken to preserve the scenic attributes and beauties of the land that God has given us, without which steps the America we love and hope to pass to future generations will eventually be transformed into a coordinated mass of complicated and impersonal apparatus and machinery, steel, concrete, and chemicals, serving a useful purpose but not gratifying the spirit; and

"Whereas it is our bounden duty as citizens embued with a deep sense of responsibility to bequeath to our children and others who come after us the God-blessed land that was bequeathed to us; and

"Whereas Padre Island, stretching for 117 miles along the Texas gulf coast from Corpus Christi on the north almost to Mexico on the south, the longest island or barrier beach along the shores of the United States, affording the greatest stretch of undeveloped seashore remaining in America, and recognized for more than 20 years as one of the Nation's foremost potential seashore recreation areas, with outstanding and incomparable features and opportunities, of national rather than sectional significance and worth, presents our last chance to add to the national park program and area, for the benefit and pleasure of present and future generations, its natural characteristics and condition making it ideal for development as a protected recreation area, secure in perpetuity: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Houston Democratic Women's Club, of Houston, Tex., on behalf of its members as American citizens and itself as an organized public service body, do petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States and officers of appropriate agencies of the executive department in support of all constructive and public-spirited efforts to obtain Padre Island in its entirety for the express and sole purpose of converting it into and maintaining and preserving it as a national park, and officially and formally commit and declare itself in such support in the passing of this resolution, the original whereof, duly signed and attested, being transmitted to U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and copies thereof being spread across the permanent records and incorporated in the archives of the club in testimonial thereof."

In witness whereof the undersigned officers of the Houston Democratic Women's Club do subscribe themselves, and cause the seal of the club thereunto to be affixed, this 21st day of January A.D. 1960.

MRS. MARY WELLS,
President.
MRS. NEAL PICKETT,
First Vice President.
CHATTIE SLAYTON,
Secretary.

People's Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal American, dated Monday, February 15, 1960. I wholeheartedly approve of the mayor's protest against the shortchanging of New York City in State aid, and I trust as a result of this editorial a great number of New Yorkers will follow the suggestion and send their personal protest to Governor Rockefeller:

PEOPLE'S CRUSADE

With the fighting spirit that indicates he will accept no bogus compromise, Mayor Wagner has sounded a call to all citizens to join the battle against the shortchanging of New York City in State aid and fiscal home rule.

This is not merely a fight between two branches of government, the Wagner Democratic administration in New York City and the Rockefeller Republican administration in Albany.

This is a fight against a fiscal noose which Republican upstate bosses, scornful of our growing needs, have been drawing tighter and tighter around the city's neck.

It is a fight to give the 8 million or more residents of New York City a fairer share of the taxes they contribute to the State government and which the State, in turn, apportions to all of the cities, towns, and villages.

It is a fight for some degree of fiscal equality, comparable to that granted upstate communities. It is a fight against rigid, obsolete State aid formulas which deprive New York City of a just share of State aid for schools, hospitals, teacher salaries, youth programs, and other human needs.

MAYOR'S CALL FOR ACTION

It is for these reasons that the Journal-American whole-heartedly endorses the Mayor's call for action and makes available its facilities for arousing citizens support. Appended to this editorial is a coupon which we urge our readers to send immediately to Governor Rockefeller as a protest against the continued discrimination against New York City.

The use of the coupons provides a means by which the voice of the people can make itself heard at the top levels of government. The coupons proved tremendously effective in the Journal-American's campaign against a proposed 4-percent local sales tax and also against the inflationary trend in Congress.

With the continued cooperation of Journal-American readers, they can be equally effective in the fight to win New York City equal treatment in State aid.

Let this be a people's crusade.

In an angry attempt to rebut the charges, Governor Rockefeller has accused Mayor Wagner, without using his name, of being "unfair and deceitful in implying that, for political reasons, the State is in any way attempting to shortchange the city." The governor says the proposed $7 million cut in State aid for New York City is dictated by established formulas. Curiously, these same formulas provide a huge windfall for Republican communities outside the city.

Is it not time that these formulas were modernized to reflect present needs in a more honest and realistic manner?

We would like to remind Governor Rockefeller that the State is guilty of an even greater injustice by arrogating to itself certain tax revenue sources which properly belong to the city and for which the city performs virtually all of the services. The Journal-American will list these glaring examples in the days to come.

You, who are required to foot the bills, can do your part in stopping the financial inequities imposed on the city by the upstate bosses. Clip, fill in and mail the following coupon to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, the Capitol, Albany, N.Y.

Dedication of the Southeastern Radiological Laboratory at Montgomery, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on February 11, Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney dedicated the Southeastern Radiological Health Laboratory at Montgomery, Ala. The laboratory is one of two now established under the direction of the Public Health Service with the purpose of expanding a program to guard the health of our people against ionizing radiation.

The work to be done at Montgomery and at Las Vegas, Nev., will help our Government determine proper standards of measurement and control to protect the present and future generations of Americans from overexposure to radiation of any type, whether natural, industrial, medical or from military testing of nuclear weapons.

One vital purpose of the Montgomery laboratory is to provide assistance to Alabama and to other States in developing their own radiological health program. In order to better carry out all goals under the new program, the Public Health Service will train professional personnel to man key research measurement and control posts across the Nation. The Montgomery center will play a part in training such personnel.

Man has in the last half century let loose in the world forces which we do not yet completely understand. We do not know fully either their potentials or their hazards. The radiological health program which the Public Health Service is now undertaking promises to give us many answers of vital importance to the health and welfare of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech made by Dr. Burney in dedicating the laboratory at Montgomery be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING NEW HAS BEEN ADDED

(By L. E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Doctor Gill, Colonel Wright, ladies and gentlemen, the dedication of this un-

usual new guardian of the public health, here in Montgomery, is an auspicious occasion. It is auspicious for the Public Health Service, for the State health departments whose leaders are here to help us launch it, and for the American public in general. The last-named may not fully realize, as yet, the significance of such a highly specialized atomic age installation, but that realization will surely come—perhaps soon. Public interest is intense, these days, in nuclear radiation, its hazards, and the swiftly expanding measures that are being taken by the Government for protection of the public against these hazards.

It seems particularly appropriate that this Southeastern Radiological Health Facility should be located in the capital city of Alabama, a State which has traditionally been among the leaders in public health. Alabama has been most fortunate in its State health officers—both my very good friend Dr. Gill and his distinguished predecessors. The State has also been the scene of pioneering work in a variety of public health fields, including milk sanitation, venereal disease control, and the training of public health workers.

This Southeastern Radiological Health Facility, with its sister installation at Las Vegas, Nevada, and a third to be opened in Maryland this summer, will be a key member of a sophisticated intelligence network which will, from now on, keep a watchful eye on the levels of radioactivity, nationwide, in air, water, food, and milk.

The Las Vegas and Montgomery facilities will analyze and test environmental and biological samples collected by Federal, State, and local health officers. The third, in Maryland, will work on health problems arising out of the use of medical and dental X-rays.

Because the training of technicians to high levels of skills in radiological health procedures is one of our most urgent needs, the facilities will train selected State and Federal laboratory workers in the complex instrumentations and techniques of this demanding work.

They will develop equipment for improved laboratory techniques.

They will provide extensive laboratory services to the 50 States, aid in fostering the development and continued expansion of the States' radiological health programs, and help expand the national milk surveillance network from 12 to 60 stations.

They will make important contributions toward determining and refining the standards of measurement and control necessary to protect present and future generations from overexposure to ionizing radiation from any source.

The coordinated activties of these facilities will constitute one major component of the Public Health Service's assistance to the States in the field of radiological health, under the requirements of the massively augmented responsibilities recently assigned to the Service by the President. The importance of this modern-day environmental monitoring is increasing stride by stride with the continually enlarging uses, by industry, medicine, and the military, of radioisotopes, which, natural or man-made, are all sources of radioactivity—that miracle of the spontaneous emission of energy by matter, still only partially understood and partially exploited.

I wish the senior Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL, could be with us today. He would be as gratified to be here, I think, as we would be by his presence, for he could look on the new-born Southeastern Radiological Health Facility with the appreciative eye of a father. It was Senator HILL'S amendment to the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill in the last session of Congress which made possible, among other advances, our programing of the three new radiological-health facilties whose mission it will be to better guard the health of the American people against ionizing radiation from all sources.

It is well known to Alabamians that Senator HILL is the son of one of the South's foremost physicians, the late Dr. L. L. Hill, of Montgomery. And the Senator's decades of creative preoccupation with public health and other forward-looking legislation are well known throughout the country.

Suffice it to say that Senator HILL has long been known as the dean of American health legislation—most recently so described in a New York Times article cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

I should like to pay special tribute, also, to another distinguished Alabamian who has made important contributions to the health of the Nation. Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama's Fourth Congressional District, as chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate Commerce Committee and as sponsor and active supporter of public health legislation, qualifies as a leader of national stature in the public health field.

Senator HILL stated on the floor of the Senate last year: "Man in the last half century has let loose in the world forces which we do not as yet fully understand. We do not fully know either their potentialities or their hazards."

He was referring, of course, to ionizing radiation, as related to his major concern in life: the public health.

Being in favor of health isn't as easy as it used to be. In the days only recently past, when the public health profession was concerned almost exclusively with the communicable diseases, being in favor of health was as uncomplicated as being opposed to sin. In dealing with microbiological enemies, the ultimate goal is total eradication. Every gain toward that end is a gain for everyone.

But today, we in the public health field face a new kind of challenge, in which total eradication cannot be our goal. Perfectly pure water in our streams and totally undefiled air over our cities are impossible of achievement without completely denying to ourselves the many benefits of our industry and technology. We would not do it even if we could. What we must do, in relation to these modern environmental challenges to health, is to strike a balance which permits maximum development with minimum danger.

In such fields as air pollution and water pollution, attaining such a balance is complicated by the nature of the menace: the accumulation of minute quantities of toxic substances over a long period of time. With radiological health, which is in many ways parallel to these other environmental problems, we must deal not only in terms of lifespans but in terms of generations.

Thus, in our unceasing efforts to create and preserve a safe environment, we have moved from the stark, simple black-and-white world of communicable disease to a new spectrum in which we are confronted with shades of gray. Contaminants of air, water, and food—be they chemical or radiological—are often byproducts of indispensable activities which are inextricably woven into the fabric of our modern civilization. I need hardly add that in the field of ionizing radiations, the stature and perhaps the survival of our Nation is one of the factors which must be weighed in the balance.

Eradicate ionizing radiations? Impossible. Natural radiation, from earth's rocks and from outer space's cosmic rays, is and probably always will be ineradicable. And so, today, is the man-made ionizing radiation that is becoming more and more a part of man's worldwide environment. Nuclear physics' immutable laws decree that this hazardous by-product results from all atomic activities. Therefore our accelerating crusade against the short- and long-range biological ill-effects of inonizing radiation must be directed not toward eradication but toward control.

It is one of the most complex and challenging missions ever to confront the Public Health Service and the entire public health profession. It and the problems connected with it stretch out into the whole foreseeable future. We must call upon all the skill and ingenuity and dogged persistence within our command.

Our past, radiologically speaking, has had its share of problems, too. Health workers became aware of the hazards as well as the great value of radioactivity in the years following the discovery of X-rays by Wilhelm Konrad Roentgen in Germany in 1895. An important development in the history of radiological health, in which the Public Health Service participated, was an investigation of the radium poisoning of clock- and watch-dial painters. In 1940, the Service reported on radium and X-ray hazards in hospitals, and during World War II, research data provided by the Service were taken into account by the Manhattan District when the then secret agency was establishing standards of human tolerance to radiation.

In 1945, the fission bomb literally exploded into the awareness of the general public, and the environmental health problem of ionizing radiation started its swift enlargement. The fusion bomb followed. It may surprise some of you—it surprised me—to learn how many announced nuclear detonations, fission, and fusion, were made by the United States, Great Britain, and Russia from July 1945 through November 1958. The number is 227, as summarized before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy last May from data supplied by the Office of Meterological Research of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Despite this startling statistic, the radiation exposure of the public resulting from international nuclear bomb detonations has, so far, been far outweighed by that from the diagnostic and therapeutic use of X-rays, operation of nuclear reactors and particle accelerators, and the use of radioisotopes by industry. Industry, as you know, has been growing steadily more aware of the versatility, economic implications, and production improvements made possible by using radioisotopes in gaging, radiography, tracing and in countless other ways. And under the heading of industry, we must of course, place the development of nuclear power stations: an infant activity now, which will one day be a colossus.

During this postwar period of rapid development in nuclear technology, the Public Health Service conducted various activities directed toward solving the health problems created by ionizing radiation. These efforts were fused together by the formation, in July 1958, of the Division of Radiological Health within our Bureau of State Services. This action provided a springboard for a dramatic expansion of our operations. The Division's budget request for fiscal year 1961, totaling $6,219,000, represents a 10-fold increase over its appropriated budget for fiscal year 1959.

During August 1959, there were several regulatory developments of great significance to our radiological health efforts.

On the 14th, the President, by Executive Order, established the Federal Radiation Council, to be composed of the Secretaries of Defense; Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Council's mission is to deal with the various problems of the Atomic Age, of which that of protecting the public from the hazards of ionizing radiation is one of the most important.

On the 22d, the President designated Secretary Arthur S. Flemming as the current

chairman of the Council. The President further directed, on the 22d, that DHEW "intensify its radiological health efforts and have primary responsibility within the executive branch for the collation, analysis, and interpretation of data on environmental radiation levels, such as natural background, radiography, medical, and industrial use of isotopes and X-rays, and fallout, so that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may advise the President and the general public."

On August 26, Secretary Flemming assigned to the Public Health Service the grave responsibilities of carrying out this mission, and the Southeastern Radiological Health Facility, opening its doors today, is one of the first generation of technological tools we will be using for that mission.

On September 23, the Federal Radiation Council, which the President had created by Executive order, was written into Public Law 86-373, adding the Secretary of Labor to its roster.

On present appraisal, then, the radiological health activities of the Public Health Service stand buttressed and bulwarked, with extensive projects in operation and underway—and an expanding program for the future on a forced-draft schedule.

All of our activities in the field of radiological health will, of course, be carried on within the classic Federal-State relationship which has been so successful in meeting other challenges to the public health. Ionizing radiations pose a many-dimensional problem demanding the cooperation of many disciplines and groups. I am confident that our Federal-State partnership in health will work efficiently and effectively in this as it has in other fields. This Southeastern Radiological Health Facility is designed and intended as an instrument to strengthen this partnership. It is at the service of the States.

I would like to stress again that the problem posed by ionizing radiation is an environmental-health problem: not only the newest, but also one of the most intricate, we have ever faced. As I said earlier, the pattern is not stark black and white, as in the case of illness versus health. Clues to the courses of action we must take in radiological health come to us with alternatives heavily disguised. Long-range detriments may present themselves to us as highly attractive short-range boons; and the product may not prove worth the price, unless and until we identify and control the threats that may lurk behind the appealing facades.

In short, there are limits to what we can accept as progress, especially in the new age of the atom, and these limits are imposed by the conditions necessary to human well-being. Nor can we wait for exact quantitative knowledge of the biological effects of radiological contamination of the environment. If we wait until we have proved the danger beyond reasonable doubt, or established precise safety boundaries, or observed statistically significant examples of radiologically impaired human health, we shall never catch up.

Rather, corrective radiological-health action for the public safety must be taken whenever reasonable cause, based upon accumulating evidence, is found.

The work of the Southeastern Radiological Health Facility and its sister installations will be directed toward such assistance. They will analyze and interpret environmental levels of radioactivity throughout the United States, contributing significantly to our accumulating knowledge which will enable both the Federal Government and the States to take suitable actions.

Something new has been added to our environment. A new health hazard has developed from a miracle of nature more ancient than our planet, more ancient than the stars, as ancient as the cosmic elements out of which the stars were formed. And something new has been added by man to combat and control this hazard. A whole arsenal of new weapons is, in fact, being added to the many we have used in the past to fight for improved national health. The Southeastern Radiological Health Facility is one of these new weapons, and we dedicate it here today with confidence that it will fulfill its mission well.

I dedicate this Southeastern Radiological Health Facility to serve the people of Alabama, the Eastern States, our whole country, and the world. May the people who work in this laboratory add to our knowledge, and the application of that knowledge, for the benefit of all mankind.

Revenue Law Is Inequitable—Farm Co-ops Escaping Fair Share of Tax Load

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News under date of February 19, 1960.

REVENUE LAW IS INEQUITABLE—FARM CO-OPS ESCAPING FAIR SHARE OF TAX LOAD

If a group of people form a corporation to conduct a business, any profits it makes are taxed at a rate up to 52 percent. When the remainder is distributed as dividends it is taxable as income to stockholders.

A group of farmers can form a cooperative to engage in marketing, manufacturing, processing or other business. Its earnings are exempt from taxes. The members may get a certificate noting their share of the profits, but because these certificates have no exactly determinable value, they are not taxable as income. Cash returns are subject to income tax.

One farm cooperative starting with a capital of $30,000 now has a net worth of $40 million. It has absorbed a number of privately owned businesses, unable to survive under the tax disadvantage. Business and industry naturally resent the competitive handicap.

This is the nub of the perennial struggle to revise the Revenue Act which is again being agitated in Congress. Both the need for revenue and the desirability of tax equality are sparking the drive to change the tax status of the co-ops.

Spokesmen for farm groups deny that they want special privileges. What they have done is to take advantage of the law as it stands. To call it a "loophole" is misleading, since the exemption of co-ops was deliberate.

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in effect concedes the discrimination by arguing that the co-ops merely want "to avoid compounding the national error of double taxation which plagues business—and which should be removed."

Mr. Shuman thus contends that corporations should also be exempt from taxation on earnings distributed to stockholders and taxable to them. He agrees that cooperatives' earnings should be taxed, either to the co-op in the year earned, or to the member in the year received, but not both.

Business has taken the same position against double taxation, and undoubtedly would gladly settle for Mr. Shuman's formula as a means of eliminating the present inequality. Even if this were politically possible, which it isn't, the need for revenue would block the change.

A main difficulty is the nature of the patronage dividends returned to members by the co-ops. It could be required that these be of such a nature as to be includible in gross income and thus taxed.

This would still leave undistributed earnings of the co-op untaxed. Men are very ingenious at finding ways to avoid taxes. If a co-op did not distribute any earnings, presumably its shares would increase in value correspondingly, giving the holder, when he finally disposed of them, the tax advantage of a capital gain.

The case for equal treatment of business enterprises is conclusive whether this be achieved by ending the present double taxation of corporate earnings and dividends, or extending it to co-ops. The issue may be too hot for an election year, but the position of the Farm Bureau Federation leaves no doubt where equity lies.

Interesting Editorial Comment on the Clean Elections Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, provocative editorial comment in newspapers all across the country has underscored the importance of the clean elections bill which recently passed the Senate. Thoughtful views on this measure were recently set forth by a significant newspaper in Winston-Salem, N.C., the Twin City Sentinel.

In response to this editorial I wrote a letter to the editor of the Sentinel. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial and my response printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Twin City Sentinel, Jan. 29, 1960]

STATES MUST CONTROL CAMPAIGNS OR FACE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The Senate's version of a bill widening and tightening controls over Federal elections—the so-called clean elections bill—includes what amounts to a self-defeating provision.

This is the amendment that applies the law to primaries involving Federal office as well as to general elections.

Indications are the House of Representatives just won't buy that provision. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, reflecting the views of many southern Congressmen, has said, "I don't think the Federal Government ought to get into the regulation of primaries." And Chairman OMAR BURLESON of the House Administration Committee, to which the Senate bill will be referred, has said that while he favors raising campaign spending limits, the amendment on primaries is "an invasion of States rights." Mr. BURLESON is a Texas Democrat.

The reasoning behind the primary amendment was stated by Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, one of the sponsors: "It is a well-known fact that in roughly one-third of our States today success in a primary is tantamount to election." And he added that in such States primaries are the only important part of the election process, and to permit such elections to proceed without the same Federal regulations which govern elections in other States is both unjust and unfair."

The New York Senator's comments were directed chiefly at the South, where "tantamount to election" is a hackneyed but applicable phase to describe victory in Democratic primaries.

Realism compels acknowledgment that in strong one-party States a corrupt practices act applying only to the general election is of little consequence.

Unless primaries are included, the other desirable features of the bill such as those requiring more detailed reporting of campaign contributions and requiring reports from local and State committees become less meaningful.

To be sure, some States—North Carolina among them—have corrupt practices acts that regulate campaign spending and require reports on contributions. But many States in which the primary is the controlling election do not have them. And in many that do the penalties for violations are too weak to be much of a deterrent.

The States can rightfully lay claim under the Constitution to the right to control election machinery. But when the States neglect their responsibilities and allow abuses to creep in, they play into the hands of those who advocate more and more Federal control of elections. The current movement to impose Federal registrars on districts where voting rights are denied is a good example.

The provision to include State primaries may stymie a clean elections bill this year. But it is bound to come up again. And the best defense against it would be for the Southern States to be able to show that their election house is in good order rather than to stand on principle alone.

FEBRUARY 5, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT F. CAMPBELL,
Editorial Page Editor,
Twin City Sentinel,
Winston-Salem, N.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Your editorial of February 2, concerning the inclusion of primaries, and nominating conventions and caucuses in the elections bill which recently passed the Senate, has been read with great interest. You have certainly analyzed correctly the fact that it would have been hypocritical to call this a clean elections bill if we left primaries unscrubbed.

As you point out, applying regulatory procedures to general elections in one-party States is "of little consequence," unless primaries are included. I could not agree with you more strongly that the other laudable features of the bill, such as the reporting requirements, are "less meaningful" if this vital segment of the Federal electoral process is not covered.

I hasten to add that one-party States are not limited to any particular section of the country. For example, there are many congressional districts in our great Northern urban centers or great Midwestern rural areas, where nomination almost certainly means victory when the ballots are counted. Also, I want to emphasize that this amendment was not intended in any way to impute that there actually are irregularities in those areas where victory in the primary or convention or caucus means automatic success on election day. I merely felt that if the bill were to carry out its intent, all phases of the Federal electoral process had to be covered.

While it is certainly to be hoped that efforts will be continued to prevent abuses at all stages of Federal elections, it does not seem to me that such actions completely meet the issue. The statutory and constitutional bases for Federal regulation of Federal elections, including primaries, are clear and in point. If we are to make our democratic system work at its optimum, certain restraints must be imposed—even if they are never invoked—at all levels. That was the purpose and the final effect of the clean elections bill recently approved by the Senate.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Newburgh-Beacon News of New York, on February 20, 1960.

A very nice point is brought out in this article; namely, Will this Federal aid for education be another step on the long road of penalties for the strong, and robbing thrifty Peter to pay shiftless Paul?

It is also interesting to note that out of 35,000 school districts only 270 could be identified as in need of more classrooms.

So, the next question is, Is the $2 billion in the Senate-passed bill going simply to create another giant bureaucracy which will educate American youth from Washington, D.C.?

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

The flaw in plans to have Uncle Sam help school districts put up new buildings lies in the horrible injustice they all would do to those districts which have faced up to their responsibilities and paid for their buildings, usually by the sale of bonds.

What about these districts? Will they have to continue to pay off their bonds and at the same time cough up to Uncle Sam to pay for the schools which other districts have failed to build?

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming, who favors Federal aid, has disclosed significant figures obtained in a department survey of State school commissioners.

The 45 States responding could identify only 270 districts (out of 35,000) which have classroom shortages and lack the credit to correct them.

In other words, only 270 districts are actually unable to fill their needs, even under the notoriously strict limitations of some States on debt.

This is far from a $2 billion proposition, as proposed in the Senate-passed school aid bill.

Unless, that is, the Congress is going to reimburse those districts whose taxpayers have shown a readiness to build schools or unless Congress wants to help any district that asks for aid.

Any plan that would penalize those who have accepted their responsibilities should be buried, but deep.

Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Age, February 1960 issue entitled "Loyalty Oaths":

LOYALTY OATHS

The National Defense Education Act of 1959, which authorized loans on liberal terms to needy college students also requires those students taking advantage of this Government generosity to subscribe to two affirmations. First, they must promise that they will bear true allegiance to the United States and will support and defend its Constitution and laws against all enemies. Seecond, they must swear that they do not believe in, and are not members of, and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or any other unconstitutional means. This double requirement has been the cause of a great deal of controversy.

A vast majority of our colleges and universities have taken part in the loan program, but a number of the larger private institutions of learning, such as Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Bryn Mawr, Amherst, and Swathmore, have allegedly refused to join. Others have protested the requirements but have participated. The American Association of University Professors and a few other educational groups are reported to have openly and vigorously opposed the use of the affidavit disclaiming membership in or support of any subversive organization. These hold that it restricts "academic freedom" and is an unwarranted interference with freedom of belief. Aside from the claim that the requirement hampers "academic freedom," whatever that may mean, the most frequent objection made seems to be that it singles out a particularly needy and defenseless group for suspicion and discrimination while others not subject to the same requirements receive Federal loans or gifts without any similar demand.

The answer to this objection does not lie in the abandonment of the requirements of the act but rather in a demand that all recipients of public grants or loans be bound in the same manner. Virtually all Government employees must take a loyalty oath before their names can be included on the payroll and none have objected or claimed that they are the victims of discrimination.

It is difficult to find justification for the claim that the requirement interferes with freedom of belief. Applicants for assistance under the provisions of the act are free to choose between pledging their support to the Government that aids them or doing without that aid. The Government makes them an offer under a condition which they may accept or reject; it forces nothing upon them. It is as simple as that. While it may perhaps be true that the affidavit and oath would be of no use in the detection of subversively minded applicants, it could be useful in making the signers liable for perjury if they were found later to have made false statements. This could be cause for cancellation of their privileges.

The American taxpayer, who furnishes the money for carrying out this project, has the right to know how his funds are being spent. He also has the duty to use every means at his disposal to prevent it from being used to promote subversion or assist subversives in any way.

Schenectady County Citizens for Decent Literature Fight Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 24, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, vigorous and imaginative movements are being launched all over the country to combat the scourge of obscene literature. This is a heartwarming response to this great challenge which confronts old and young people alike.

I have noted with particular interest the creation of a Schenectady County Citizens for Decent Literature group. This citizens organization seeks to awaken the community to the evils of pornography and to encourage public officials to enforce existing laws in this field. Among the leaders in this activity are: Mrs. Kenneth Bradt, chairman; Martin D. Gibbons, vice chairman; Mrs. Carl Koble, secretary; Mrs. James Hawkins, treasurer; and Joseph Saccocio, chairman of prominent citizens committee.

Mr. President, I salute these citizens and their associates in Schenectady for the emphatic manner in which they have responded to the threat of filthy literature. It is typical of the fine community spirit of Schenectady. Community efforts, bolstered by modernized Federal laws in this area, will in the long run put the barons of obscenity out of business.

In the hope others will be inspired to follow their example, I ask unanimous consent to have an outline of the objectives of Citizens for Decent Literature printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objective, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS FOR DECENT LITERATURE

What it is:

Citizens for Decent Literature is an organized group of citizens of Schenectady County whose objective is to arouse and pursue an effective attack on the sale and distribution of obscene literature and pornographic material. CDL is composed of private citizens, and represents many civic, church, fraternal, educational, and professional organizations interested in a united effort to eliminate obscenity, and thus its effect on our community.

How does CDL accomplish its objectives:

1. Educate all citizens, especially parents, to the evils of this trade and to its magnitude in our community.

2. Encourage public officials to enforce the existent laws on obscene material.

3. Promote plans to develop worthwhile reading habits in our youth.

4. Encourage the distribution and sale of good literature.

CDL does not employ boycott, or censorship. Underlying the entire program is a complete guarantee that no action of CDL will ever infringe upon anyone's freedom of speech or press, nor will it deprive anyone of due process of the law. The Supreme Court has specifically pointed out that obscenity may not parade under the guise of freedom of speech or press. CDL does not say what is obscene, that is left to the courts.

CDL, by making the community aware of the problem, and by encouragement of enforcement of the laws, tries to upgrade the contemporary community standards. This latter point is especially important because of a recent decision of the Supreme Court. Legally, material is obscene when to an average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to the prurient interest, i.e., material having a tendency to excite lustful thoughts in the average person in the community.

CDL PLAN OF ATTACK AND ORGANIZATION

First. Prominent citizens of the State and community are given an explanation of the aims and methods of CDL and are asked to lend their names as sponsors to guarantee the dignity and judgment of the group. Most CDL groups list among their sponsors the Governor of the State, Congressmen, businessmen, labor groups, PTA federations, ministerial groups, Catholic bishops, fraternal organizations, and law-enforcement agencies.

Second. A small (about 10 persons) executive committee of devoted persons of outstanding leadership and unquestioned judgment is set up to direct the organization.

Third. A larger group of volunteer workers, mostly parents with growing children, aid in secretarial work—telephoning, interviewing, and any other duties assigned them.

Fourth. A speakers' bureau is set up. This is composed of persons who have read the magazines they condemn; who know the laws in both their strong and weak points; who know the findings of congressional investigating committees on pornography and juvenile delinquency; who have read widely in the psychological implications of a sex-obsessed society; and who are trained speakers armed with magazines and other literature to show to those who have not stopped at a newsstand to examine the material that is available to their children.

Fifth. A file of names of individuals and organizations that have declared their sympathy and support to the aims and methods of CDL is maintained as documentation of public interest in decency. These persons and groups are encouraged to write letters to law enforcement agencies praising them for their efforts in enforcing obscenity statutes and assuring them of support in their efforts.

The Bank of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest examples of free enterprise development in California is the history of the Bank of America, which in the short span of 54 years has grown to be the largest bank in the world.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a short summary of that history:

BANK OF AMERICA

Since its first day of business in 1904, Bank of America's management has believed in California's future and participated actively in the State's economic life. That this faith has been sound is evident in California's growth as well as that of the bank, whose resources have grown from $285,000 to more than $11.5 billion during the past 56 years.

The bank's activities of the past decade emphasize its traditional desire to be of increasing service to people. In that period, total deposits nearly doubled to $10.6 billion in 7.4 million accounts. At the same time, the bank increased the number of its services from 50 to 59 and the number of its branches throughout California from 525 to 664.

To broaden its scope in world banking, the bank organized Bank of America (International), a wholly-owned subsidiary with home offices in New York. Today parent and subsidiary operate branches and offices in 21 countries throughout the world.

Bank of America has pioneered in bank automation, developing Erma—the electronic recording method of accounting—for automatically processing commercial checking accounts and being the first to use electronic computers for processing real estate and installment loans.

As encouragement to California's youth during the past decade, Bank of America recognized the scholastic and agricultural attainments of more than 50,000 California students by awarding scholarships, cash prizes, and trophies under its High School Achievement Awards, Junior College Business Awards, Future Farmers of America, and 4-H Club programs.

Summing up other activities of this period, the bank participated in bids on nearly 5,000 public bond issues, purchasing 46 percent of them for a total amount of $3.3 billion. It loaned $5.6 billion for construction of 600,000 California homes, and $4.1 billion for purchase of 3.1 million automobiles. It paid $624 million in taxes, $778 million in interest to depositors, and $414 million in dividends to its more than 200,000 stockholders.

Legislative Program of the American Legion Department of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, today held its 16th annual breakfast in compliment to the New Jersey congressional delegation in the Hotel Congressional, presenting their legislative agenda which is incorporated in the following statements:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. MCKINLEY, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMAN, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY

Ladies and gentlemen, it seems difficult to realize that we meet this morning at breakfast for the 16th year. Time surely moves on.

The American Legion's rehabilitation program for this session of the Congress will be formally presented to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on March 1, next. There will be included therein a number of items calling for legislation—most of them amendatory in character. At this time, there is no really major item of legislation developing.

We, therefore, propose to make certain general observations and comments for your information and guidance.

The enactment in the last session of Congress of Public Law 86-211—the pension bill—concerns us much because it is being interpreted far differently than ever was intended. And, mind you, the law is not yet

operative and does not become operative until July 1 of this year.

Nevertheless, our service officers are already deluged with apprehensive inquiries from veterans and widows who either are now receiving pensions or who are eligible or soon will be eligible for pensions. There is considerable misunderstanding concerning this new law and what it proposes to do.

Basically, from our present observation, there is trouble brewing because of inequities, disparagements, and distinctions between those presently on the pension rolls and those who will come on the pension rolls under the new law. Much of this difficulty stems from the new philosophy concerning veterans' pensions that seems to prevail in government thinking on the subject. This is the philosophy of the Bradley report and can be summed up generally as: (1) Most veterans and widows of veterans are cheats and chiselers; (2) practically all such applicants have concealed estates; and (3) the only veteran or widow entitled begrudgingly to a pension should first become a pauper.

The proof of this is the much-lauded sliding scale system of pension awards and the legalistic structure called the corpus of the estate.

Both these structures in the law are designed to catch the chiselers and prevent the wealthy and opulent from imposing on the Government.

What it will cost the Veterans' Administration in future years to superintend pensions as required under the sliding scale and corpus of the estate will certainly be fantastic, considering some 14 or more categories of income limitations and thousands upon thousands of so-called estates involved—each of which must be reviewed each year to be sure that there is no chiseling.

Why all this?

Because the underlying philosophy of this law is to be found in the statement of the Bradley commission that military service in time of war or peace is merely the obligation of citizenship and not considered inherently a basis for government benefits.

This philosophy now being dinned into the ears and minds of all who have to do with veterans' benefits is in contradiction to the historic position taken by the Congress since the Revolutionary War. This historic position may be summed up as follows:

So long as we maintain our Armed Forces, so long as we call them defenders of the country, and so long as we subject them to the necessary disciplines and deprivations which an adequate Military Establishment must demand, we have created for them special obligations, duties, hazards, or responsibilities which set veteran soldiers apart from the role which they play as citizens alone.

All veterans benefits—compensation, pensions, medical care and other privileges—have been based upon this latter concept. If we now at this late date change our thinking to the form of the Bradley concept—then it will not be long when the whole structure of the law and regulation concerning veterans benefits will tumble in upon us and confusion and chaos will prevail.

As we move into the operative area of this new law, greater effort is made to establish a preconceived notion that social security has become an adequate substitute for veterans pensions. This mirrors the long noted antagonism of certain sections of the administrative branch of the Government to veterans pensions—antagonisms first revealed in the biased sections of the first and second Hoover reports and their associated staff studies. All of these fell because they failed to demonstrate any sound basis in logic or in fact.

We question that social security is a substitute for veterans pensions. We ask that proponents demonstrate clearly and factually, that, without damaging the contractual rights of present participants, social security, in its actual working and design is in fact a program that would and does offer to the Nation's veterans—in recognition of their war service—the same security and the same special consideration for special services rendered to the Nation in time of national danger, that the pension program has provided.

The American Legion's advocacy of a pension program has always contended the special nature of the service performed as the basis of a claim for pension. The American Legion has never advocated extension of pensions to the obvious wealthy and opulent veteran fully able to care for himself. We have acknowledged and endeavored to interpret a need factor as a guide.

But in this new law, and in the interpretations now being given to it, need is paupery.

I do not emphasize these ideas so much as concerns this new law which is not yet in full effect—but rather to put you of the Congress on notice in considering future legislation.

I am informed that several new studies are now being conducted into other areas of veterans benefits which carry the theory of paupery into more extensive effect.

New attacks are being formulated against the nonservice connected hospitalization program and, more ominously, an attack upon the low rated compensable service connected disabilities. The general theory is that if this principle of paupery can be made to stick in its application to pensions—it can be successively extended to all other veterans benefits.

There has been introduced in the Senate a bill (S. 1138) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963. This bill proposes benefits to peacetime veterans.

It is inconsistent for the American Legion to support this legislation. We believe that if the Congress should enact this program it should not be given to the Veterans' Administration as a further task of management and, further, that the costs of such a program should not be charged to the present field of veterans benefits.

We repeat our previously expressed opinion that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be given the same powers to regulate interest rates on GI loans as is enjoyed by the Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority.

Finally, in closing this discussion of veterans' affairs, we most earnestly invite the attention of our Senators to the need for a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate. We urge that they use their good offices to establish such a committee. We believe such a committee would materially aid and dispatch problems in veterans' affairs as they come to the Senate.

STATEMENT OF EDMUND G. LYONS, CHAIRMAN, AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Ladies and gentlemen, I realize that time is at a premium and brevity is a necessity; therefore, I will present our legislative requests in the field of Americanism and foreign relations in capsule form.

SUPPORT HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE AND THE SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

We are aware of the good work that is being done in the interest of our national security by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. We urge the Congress to continue these committees and to make available, adequate appropriations for their operations.

SUPPORT FBI AND J. EDGAR HOOVER

Realizing the part played by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, in maintaining a secure nation and alerting our citizens to the dangers that beset us, we speak out against those who are trying to discredit this great organization and its leader. We urge the continued support of our congressional delegation of this great instrumentality of democratic government.

UPHOLD IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

The American Legion has always supported the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and once again we reaffirm our opposition to any legislation that would repeal, weaken, or nullify the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

LOYALTY OATH AND AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Recently we were shocked when spokesmen of a small number of institutions of higher learning announced that their schools would not participate in the student loan provisions contained in the National Defense Education Act—Public Law 85-864. Mind you, our legislators in Washington saw fit to call this the National Defense Education Act. I am sure in their wisdom they felt this legislation was necessary and in the interest of national defense.

We were heartened when we read in the public press recently that students in 25 colleges had recently organized in defense of the loyalty oath and the accompanying disclaimer and that they planned to spread their organization to colleges all over the country.

We feel sure that the students who would benefit from the loan provisions are not opposed to the Loyalty Act and Affidavit and are ready to stand up and be counted and to proclaim publicly their allegiance to our country and deny association or affiliation with any organization opposed to our form of government.

Much more could be said on this subject; however, in the interest of time, may we urge your opposition to S. 2029.

URGE RETENTION OF CONNALLY AMENDMENT

In 1946 the Connally amendment was added to a measure accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The Connally amendment reserved to the United States the determination of whether a case is of purely domestic nature and thus outside the International Court's jurisdiction.

Recently a great deal has been heard from those in and out of Government about repealing the Connally amendment. Their cry is the World Court would not assert jurisdiction over domestic affairs. If this be true, then the repeal of the amendment would serve no purpose.

With the Connally amendment in force, then the United States has insurance that the Court—no matter how composed—could not interfere in domestic affairs.

The amendment envisioned by Senator Connally should be supported and retained so that America can have the protection we need in our future relations with foreign countries.

CONTINUE POLICY OF NONRECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

The Communist government of Red China continues to demonstrate to the world by her words and deeds that she is not entitled to the respect or confidence of civilized freedom-loving people. We reaffirm our opposition to any attempt to diplomatically recognize the Red Chinese government by the

United States and in addition are unalterably opposed to her admission to the United Nations.

REJECT FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The American Legion advocates that under our system of Government each State is, and should be, vested with complete, sole and final power, authority, direction and control of public education within its borders and accordance with law.

The American Legion is opposed to Federal financing of schools to replace local and State financing. The genius of the American public school has been in its closeness to the people. Our structure of Government in its historic development has placed the authority, responsibility, and control for financing of public education upon the States.

We respectfully request that you support the position of the American Legion in connection with the legislative matters I have discussed with you this morning.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. DOYLE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Ladies and gentlemen, with the interest in National Defense at the present time centering on the missile and space programs and so much conversation on the missible or deterrent gap and in view of the swiftness with which Congress is moving, it is likely that the less dramatic aspects of the national defense program, principally the need for maintaining a balance in defense with adequate conventional forces, backed up by large Ready Reserves, will be given less attention than it deserves. This could work against the best interests of our overall national defense program, and it would seriously affect both the Army, the Army and Air National Guard of the United States, as well as the U.S. Army Reserve. It is imperative, therefore, that action be taken again to impress upon each of you present the important of providing for the continuance of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard and the Army Reserve at present levels of authorized strength and mobilization readiness as was done by the Congress last year in writing the language into the appropriations legislation.

The fiscal year 1961 national defense budget submitted by the President provides for an Army National Guard strength of only 360,000 and an Army Reserve strength of only 270,000. This marks the third successive year in which the national defense budget seeks a 10 percent reduction in the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. A reduction of 10 percent in that strengtht in fiscal year 1961 will necessitate reducing the strength of many units to a point below that which is considered the minimum for the conduct of efficient training. In other words, any forced reduction of strength below existing levels will reduce the combat readiness of Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve units. This budget provides for an input into the 6-months training program of the Army National Guard of only 28,000 men.

The Department of the Army favors for fiscal year 1961 maintaining the Army National Guard at its current 400,000 strength and providing sufficient funds for an input of 62,000 nonprior servicemen into the 6-months training program in order to sustain the Army National Guard at the 400,000 strength level.

Reorganization of the Army National Guard in the pentomic structure which has been accomplished during the last year is based upon the strength of 400,000. In order to maintain the Army National Guard at the 400,000 strength level and provide for 62,000 man input into the 6-month training program, it will be necessary to to increase the appropriation for National Guard personnel—Army—by $31,700,000 over the amount of funds requested in the President's budget.

We are again in favor of the Congress writing into legislation on the appropriations that the Army National Guard be mantained at 400,000 strength level, the Air National Guard at a 70,000 strength level, and the U.S. Army Reserve at a 300,000 strength level. If this language is not included in the Act, it could be anticipated that the Department of Defense will be directed to withhold funds which may be voted by the Congress over and above those necessary to support the 360,000 strength and the 270,000 strength requested by the President.

Silent Shipyard Soon To Be Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an article written by John P. Callahan and appearing in the New York Times of February 21, 1960. His article shows the sharp decline in recent years in the shipbuilding industry of the United States, and of the terrible plight that the shipbuilding industry of our country is now in. Some action should be taken by the present administration to put our country, now in eighth place among the nations of the world, back to the position that it formerly occupied. Furthermore, the shipbuilding industry of our country is an important part of our national defense.

The reason for the decline of our country in the shipbuilding industry should be a matter of survey or investigation by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

The article follows:

SILENT SHIPYARD SOON TO BE SOLD—THREE BIDS MADE FOR INSTALLATION AT VANCOUVER, WASH., A HUB OF THE WAR EFFORT

(By John P. Callahan)

On the north bank of the Columbia River in Vancouver, Wash., the wind blows wild through the giant steel and wood skeletons of a silent shipyard. Its ways, down which great ships went to war, have been empty for years; the echoes of the riveter's gun died with the Axis surrender in the summer of 1945.

The yard, one of four maintained in reserve by the Maritime Administration, is for sale, with the minimum price set at $2,700,000. When bids were opened Wednesday the apparent high bidder was the Steel Construction Co. of Oregon, which offered $3,279,000.

Plans for sale of the Vancouver yard followed the recent decision of the Defense Department that it was no longer needed for defense purposes. Another reserve yard, in Alameda, Calif., has also been declared surplus, but no announcement of its sale has been made.

The two other reserve yards, in Wilmington, N.C., and Richmond, Calif., will continue to be maintained because of their strategic coastal locations.

BUSINESS IN DOLDRUMS

Meanwhile, the shipbuilding industry looks askance at the idea of anyone wanting to buy a shipyard. Few of the 15 major yards throughout the country have any future business to talk about, and most of them complain that there is not enough current business.

Statitsical support for this indutsrywide view appears in the fact that the industry entered 1960 with contracts for the construction of 60 vessels—a drop of 15 below the number of contracts on hand at the beginning of 1959.

Of the 60 ships on order, 31 are scheduled for delivery this year, 22 are expected for completion in 1961 and 7 are planned for completion during 1962.

An ominous note on the outlook for shipbuilding is that December was the third consecutive month in which no new contracts were reported. The United States ranks eighth among the nations with ships under construction.

While shipbuilders see no reason for purchasing Vancouver or any other shipyard, the Maritime Administration points out that it would not necessarily be used for the construction of ships. In its offer of the yard, the agency, a division of the Department of Commerce, says it could be used for ship breakage or as a warehouse depot.

But the Maritime Administration has also specified in its offer that the yard may not be altered in any way that would change it from a shipyard, and that the Federal Government will retain the right to take the yard over for shipbuilding on 30 days' notice in case of a national emergency.

Officials of the Maritime Administration said the proposed sale of the Vancouver reserve shipyard was the climax to a chapter in the Nation's maritime history that began in 1937. In that year, there were 10 shipyards throughout the country capable of building oceangoing vessels. By the end of 1941, there were 40 such yards, strategically located on the three coasts and the Great Lakes.

Department of HEW Admits Need for Health Care of Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, in a report submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, dated April 3, 1959, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, dealing with medical care and other problems of the aged, it was admitted that there is general agreement that a problem exists.

The report states:

The rising cost of medical care and particularly of hospital care, over the past decade has been felt by persons of all ages. Older persons have larger than average medical care needs. As a group they use about 2½ times as much general hospital care as the average for persons under the age of 65, and they have special need for long-term institutional care. Their incomes are generally considerably lower than those of the rest of the population, and in many cases are either fixed or declining in amount. They have less opportunity than employed persons to spread the cost burden through health insurance. A larger proportion of the aged than of other persons must turn to public assistance for payment of their medical bills or rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. Because both the number and the proportion of older persons in the population are increasing, a satisfactory solu-

tion to the problem of paying for adequate medical care for the aged will become more rather than less important.

Excerpts from the report follows:

In our society the existence of a problem does not necessarily indicate that action by the Federal Government is desirable. Briefly, the following are some reasons why the Federal Government should act:

1. A decision against Government action at this time would merely postpone an effective solution. Since medical costs are a high-cost, high-risk group for the aged, Government is in a better position than private industry to distribute the cost burden broadly and equitably.

2. A publicly supported program of hospital benefits for the aged could provide more extensive and more adequate protection than has characterized much of the private insurance available to aged persons.

3. The OASDI mechanism provides a ready and equitable method of spreading the risk and cost of hospital care for the aged over the entire working population. A small increase in the present social security taxes would provide immediate protection for those now eligible for benefits. Persons now at work would in turn become entitled to the same protection when they reach retirement age.

SOURCES AND AMOUNT OF INCOME AND ASSETS

1. In June 1958, 1 in every 5 persons 65 and over had a paying job.

2. In both 1956 and 1957 60 percent of all people 65 and over had less than $1,000 in money income. Only 20 percent had more than $2,000.

3. In June 1958 there were 8.8 million persons who were drawing benefits under OASDI—this accounted for 58 percent of all aged persons.

BENEFICIARIES IN THE FUTURE

1. With seven-tenths of our aged population now eligible for benefits it seems reasonable to assume that beneficiaries today are fairly representative of beneficiaries in the years ahead.

2. It is estimated that over three-fourths of the aged population will be eligible for benefits in 1970, and over 80 percent in 1980.

USE OF HOSPITALS FOR HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE BY AGED PERSONS

The success of modern medicine in preventing epidemics and in curing or controlling diseases once usually fatal has brought chronic illness, particularly the illness of old age, to the fore as a health problem. In part because of these new developments, older persons have greater need for hospital and other medical services than younger persons. They may require more elaborate types of care than younger persons and their recovery is likely to be slower.

1. The figures from the National Health Survey reveals that the aged spent at least twice as many days per capita in general hospitals as the population as a whole.

2. Also that acute conditions occur less frequently among the aged and chronic conditions more frequently than among younger persons.

3. Persons who have health insurance enter hospitals more frequently, but have more short-durations than those who are uninsured. Older persons with more serious medical needs, and those who fear the costs postpone getting medical and hospital care until the need is overwhelming.

4. More than 80 percent of all beneficiaries incurring medical costs assumed responsibility themselves for all the medical costs they incurred during the year. (HEW page 28).

TRENDS IN COSTS OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE

The medical care component of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price index reflects the rising price trends in the United States.

1. Over the longer period from 1938 to 1958 the "price" of medical care as measured by the Consumer Price Index increased only slightly more than the average for all goods and services—43 percent.

2. However, the price of hospital care rose 300 percent as compared to 105 percent for the entire index.

INSURED AGE GROUP AND ORGANIZED METHODS

1. About 121 million persons—72 percent of the total population—were covered by some form of hospitalization insurance as of the end of 1957.

2. Study by Public Health Service and other groups show that between 36 percent to 39 percent of the aged 65 and over have some type of health insurance (1957).

3. About 24 percent of the aged population or 4 million persons had surgical expense insurance in September 1956.

4. The Census PHS survey found that half of the aged population still in the labor force had hospitalization insurance while only about a third of the aged not in the labor force were insured.

5. The HIP–NORC study showed that of those persons aged 65 and over having health insurance in 1957 about 56 percent first obtained their insurance through a place of employment. (HEW p. 45).

EXISTING VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE MECHANISMS

1. General categories of medical insurance underwriters can be classified under the following headings: Blue Cross, Blue Shield Surgical Plan, group insurance companies, accident and health companies, and independent plans.

2. The differences of the health insurance coverage of the aged and that of the younger population lie mainly in the area of (1) benefits available, (2) premium costs, (3) sources of financing.

EXTENT OF COVERAGE

1. A program of hospital benefits for persons eligible for old-age survivors, and disability insurance would protect a little over 70 percent of the aged population in 1960. By 1970 it would reach an estimated 76 percent and in 1980 a little over 80 percent of the persons then aged 65 or over.

2. Cost per day of hospital care—the report decided to use as a basis for the projections a cost of $21 a day for the aged and disabled, and $23 a day for younger widows and children as of 1956.

3. The estimated costs of hospital service benefits for persons who will be eligible for OASDI in 1960 are shown in table I, these costs with a 30-day limit would be around $800 million. If the benefit covered 90 days of hospital care in a year, the cost in 1960 would be about $990 million.

4. Long-range costs, it would appear, would run 5 percent of payroll for 60 days up to 1970. The percentage of taxable payroll for the 1960 estimates was 4.2 percent.

5. There is very little experience on which to base an estimate of the cost of a nursing home service benefit, whether such a benefit were limited to skilled nursing home care as a subatitute for hospital care or applied broadly to nursing home care of all types. (HEW p. 83).

METHODS OF PROVIDING HOSPITAL BENEFITS OTHER THAN THROUGH USE OF THE OASDI MECHANISM

1. Stimulation of voluntary health insurance through pooling, reinsurance, regulation, or checkoff of premiums for OASDI beneficiaries.

2. Federal subsidies to private carriers to cover above-average risks or to supplement premiums from persons of low income.

3. Federal grants to the States for medical care for the indigent and medically indigent (HEW, p. 90).

REASONS ADVANCED AS TO WHY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT TAKE ACTION

1. The proponents of a "wait and see" position feel that more people of the aged class are covered today through some type of health insurance than ever before. They feel that it is reasonable to expect that the proportion of the aged population covered by voluntary insurance will increase.

2. A compulsory program to provide insurance would undercut voluntary efforts to meet the particular need. A decision to initiate a compulsory insurance program would be virtually irreversible.

3. Fear that pressures would develop for extending a hospital benefits program to include other components of the medical care bill.

4. It is difficult to estimate with any accuracy the future cost of medical care.

5. Pressures would also develop for extending insurance against the cost of hospital and other medical care to the working population and their dependents. Workers who were paying social security taxes might object to waiting until they reached retirement age to get such protection.

6. Federal action would result in a diminution of responsiveness to varying individual and local situations and the fear that this type of legislation would lead to a displacement of local and private arrangements by centralized governmental programs.

Pacific Missile Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the February 15 issue of the New Leader there is published a fine article by the junior Senator from Montana, MIKE MANSFIELD, entitled "Pacific Missile Mess." In it, the assistant majority leader demonstrates, through his usual cool and constructive analysis, the inadequacy of the administration's policy, or lack of policy, with respect to the use of the high seas for the testing of nuclear weapons and missile systems.

The article makes clear that the principle of freedom of the seas, which has been a cornerstone of American foreign policy for longer than the life of the Constitution itself, is involved in these tests. It calls for an urgent effort to obtain international agreement to minimize the risks and provocations incident to them.

I think such an effort should most certainly be made, Mr. President. I ask that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC MISSILE MESS

(By MIKE MANSFIELD)

It has been said that any American criticism of the recent Soviet missile tests in the Pacific is akin to the "pot calling the kettle black." The very use of the analogy is tacit recognition that there is something amiss in the way the Pacific is being used for the testing of dangerous scientific and military devices. Black on the American pot, if such

there is, hardly serves as a detergent for the black on the Soviet kettle.

The administration's position on the Soviet tests is to close its eyes to any discoloration on either vessel. It merely holds that since the tests which we have conducted are perfectly valid under our interpretation of international law, we can hardly protest the Russian experiments. In short, what we may do so may they.

This position is undoubtedly in accord with the spirit of Camp David. But can the same be said for the recent Russian tests? Consider for a moment the circumstances in which they have taken place. The Pacific is a vast ocean and the Russians have been looping missiles into its remote northwestern stretches for some time. Indeed, they have been using parts of the Arctic in the same fashion. These earlier Soviet activities, which were scarcely publicized, involved little, if any, interference with international shipping, fishing, or air transport. In short, they took place without causing any worldwide ripples. In that respect they were not too different from our present employment of the Vandenberg missile range, which goes out several thousand miles into the desolate southeast Pacific from California, or the Canaveral range, which extends from Florida into the south Atlantic by arrangement and agreement with most of the nations along the line of fire.

In the recent shoot, however, the Russians chose an impact area astride a region through which pass major American lines of communications with allied nations in the Western Pacific. It is a region of considerable importance to world commerce and Pacific fishing. It is the same region in which some of our earlier nuclear tests were conducted. The Russian test actions began after a brusque 10-day advance announcement which had the effect of putting up a "no trespassing" sign on 27,000 or more square miles of ocean. The impacting of the Soviet missile in the test area was the signal for a worldwide publicity campaign on Soviet prowess in this field.

The recent Russian tests may well have had valid scientific purposes in the sense that they could be forerunners of further explorations of space. Regardless of ultimate scientific objective, however, can there be any doubt as to the immediate political and propaganda purposes of these tests? The manner, place, and timing of the undertaking were clearly a demonstration of advanced Soviet military technology to the entire world, and to Pacific nations—notably Japan—a pointed indicator of a Soviet nuclear missile capacity to cut Pacific supply lines. This, to say the least, was hardly an appropriate prelude to the first summit conference for the purpose of easing international tensions.

Perhaps this Nation would have been in a better position to deal with these disturbing implications of the recent Soviet action had we ourselves given more consideration in the past to the long-range problems involved in any one nation's use of the oceans for military and scientific tests. Some of us in Congress have long been concerned with these tests, despite the fact that every precaution has been taken to safeguard the rights of other nations and prompt consideration has been given to those who were inadvertently injured by them.

As early as 1955, I suggested a summit conference to deal with the single question of international agreement to end dangerous nuclear testing on a multilateral basis. It was not until years later, after Adlai Stevenson was pilloried for a similar advocacy during the 1956 campaign, that the administration came to the point of recognizing even the respectability of such a position. Now it embraces this position. In the same fashion, as early as 1954, the Government was urged to give full recognition to its moral responsibility to the inhabitants of the Marshall Islands who were inconvenienced by the Pacific nuclear test series of that year.

In retrospect, it would appear that fascination with our own scientific achievements has led us to overlook a grave problem to which these achievements, along with those of other nations, are giving rise. There has been building for some years a challenge to one of the oldest and most fundamental doctrines of American foreign policy. Since the beginning of the Republic we have been powerful advocates of the basic concept of free and responsible usage of the high seas by all nations on the basis of equality. We have fought for this principle and we have pressed constantly for the development of international law which would safeguard it. Just recently we signed four conventions on the law of the sea which advance this principle to a new high point of universal acceptance.

Yet these conventions are completely silent on the problem of usage of the sea for scientific and military tests. Nevertheless, when they are not an outright danger to the nationals of other countries these tests can be a source of jeopardy to their equal right to navigate and to fish the high seas. We may well ask why this country has failed to press for recognition of this growing problem and at least the beginning of international action to deal with it. When the conventions were before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 20, 1960, this question was put to Arthur H. Dean, an eminent authority on the law of the sea and this country's principal negotiator at the conferences:

"Mr. Dean, do you not see in the present almost complete national license to use the seas for dangerous and sometimes destructive tests, a possibility of a grave challenge to both of our basic concepts of the law of the sea—that is, to the concept of freedom of the sea and responsible usage of the sea?"

Mr. Dean: "Yes, I do, and that is why I sincerely hope that something along these lines will be done. * * *"

Further conferences at Geneva will consider some of the questions which are posed by nuclear tests. It is not far-fetched, however, to consider what will happen if something is not done soon about all forms of testing on the high seas, missile no less than nuclear. Already the Soviet Union, the United States, and the United Kingdom have staked out large areas of the Pacific at various times and labeled them Mare Nostrum for the duration of test series. Soon other nations will begin to follow suit. There have been protests raised against this practice, particularly by the Japanese, but the protests have gone unheeded.

The fact is that international law on this practice is virtually nonexistent. As we interpret the law, it would now be perfectly legal for the Russians to conduct tests on the high seas within sight of San Francisco or for us to do the equivalent off Vladivostok. To carry the absurdity a step further, suppose by pure coincidence both the United States and Soviet Russia announced at the same time that they were cordoning off the same area of the Pacific at the same time for the purpose of conducting scientific experiments. What then? Who would defer? What of the questions of national prestige which would be involved in the backing down of one side or the other? What of the possibilities of accidents or grave incidents if both decided to test in the identical area?

It is clear that if we have not already reached it, we shall very soon be at a critical point in the matter of use of the high seas for the testing of scientific and military devices. It is no answer to this problem to say, as has been said, that if we do it so can they. One would hope that regardless of the the degree of black on the pots and kettles, the accumulated experience of the postwar years would urge us to take the lead in dealing with the problem. One would hope that the recent Soviet tests might provide such a glaring revelation of the way in which the world is headed in this matter that it will prompt a strong American initiative in our own interests as well as in the interests of all nations.

What is clearly needed is an urgent effort to obtain international agreement not to stop essential scientific testing on the high seas, but to see to it that this practice by any nation is so pursued as to minimize its provocations, and the risks and inconvenience to which it may subject other nations. The challenge of the Soviet missile tests is a challenge to act in order that the Pacific and, indeed, all oceans remain mare omnium rather than a collection of national maria nostra.

California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO Doubles Number of Scholarship Awards

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do I am pleased to bring to your attention and to the attention of my other distinguished colleagues a letter dated February 15, 1960, from the secretary-treasurer, Mr. C. J. Haggerty, of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, together with the text of the announcement of the 10th annual scholarship program of the California Labor Federation.

In that announcement you will note the names and residence addresses of the contest winners for the last 9 years, together with the significant beneficial reading material and the committee of judges.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and all the Members of this great legislative body join me in complimenting the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO on this significant, timely, and effective educational program.

CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION,
AFL–CIO.
San Francisco, Calif., February 15, 1960.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a folder announcing the 10th annual scholarship program of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO. As you will note, the federation is offering six $500 scholarships to senior high school students in California, in both public and private schools. This represents a doubling of the number of awards offered in previous years.

The contest is a permanent part of the federation's educational program, and is indicative of the historic interest shown by organized labor in advancing the cause of education in this Nation.

Here in California we have long fought for the building of an ever greater school sys-

tem and for proper recognition of the all-important role which our school system must have in a democratic society.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. HAGGERTY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

TENTH ANNUAL CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL–CIO SCHOLARSHIP AWARD—SIX $500 SCHOLARSHIPS

Six college scholarship awards of $500 each are being offered to senior high school students in California who will be attending college or university during the coming academic year. The awards are being presented by the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, to assist outstanding students in obtaining a higher education and to promote a better understanding of the American labor movement.

Three of the six scholarships are being made available in cooperation with the following affiliates of the federation: one offered by the Los Angeles Building and Construction Trades Council; one by the California Legislative Board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; one by the Painters District Council 36 of Los Angeles, to be known as the Roderick Mackenzie Scholarship Award.

All awards will be issued in accordance with the rules which follow.

BASIS OF THE AWARDS

1. Senior high school students in public, private, or parochial schools in California who are planning to attend a college or university anywhere in the United States are eligible to compete in the examination. No distinction will be made as to sex, color, or creed. The award may be used to assist the student in any field of knowledge, and is not limited to those interested in labor alone.

2. An award will be made to each of six candidates on the basis of the candidate's score in the special examination and his 4-year high school academic record. A check for $500 will be deposited in the student's name at the college he has chosen.

3. A 2-hour examination will be held on Friday, May 20, 1960, in each high school where applicants have filed. The federation must receive from the principal of the high school, not later than April 18, 1960, the applications of students who will be participating. The federation will then mail out the specified number of examination questions. Following the examination, the papers will be returned to the federation office for grading by competent personnel selected by the committee of judges.

The school records and examination papers of the 50 highest students will be examined personally by the committee of judges which will make the final selection.

4. The aim of the examination is to evaluate the student's knowledge and understanding of labor and industrial problems and his ability to present his information. The student should show his factual knowledge and comprehension of past and present social and economic conditions affecting labor and management.

SAMPLE TEST QUESTIONS

I. What factors contributed to the rapid growth of labor unions during the 1930's? How did these factors influence the form of the growth?

II. Indicate briefly the significance of two of the following events in American labor history:

(a) Haymarket riot.
(b) Pullman strike.
(c) Nineteen hundred and thirty-four west coast maritime strike and San Francisco general strike.

III. Give a brief description of the following:

(a) Union security agreement.
(b) Lockout.
(c) Jurisdictional dispute.

IV. Identify the following five labor personalities of the past and present:

(a) Samuel Gompers.
(b) Walter Reuther.
(c) Eugene V. Debs.
(d) George Meany.
(e) Terence Powderly.

V. Review the role of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in labor-management relations.

VI. Describe the relationship of local unions to the following:

(a) National or international unions.
(b) AFL–CIO.
(c) State federations of labor.
(d) Local central councils.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Books

Barbash, Jack, "The Practice of Unionism," Harper, 1956, 465 pages.

Dulles, Foster Rhea, "Labor in America," Crowell, 1955, 402 pages.

Faulkner, Harold and Starr, Mark, "Labor in America," Oxford Book Co., new and revised edition, 1957, 330 pages.

Hardman and Neufeld, "The House of Labor," Prentice-Hall, 1951, 555 pages.

Lester, Richard A., "As Unions Mature," Princeton University Press, 1958, 171 pages.

Myers, James and Laidler, Harry W., "What Do You Know About Labor?" Day, 1957, 301 pages.

Taft, Philip, "The A. F. of L. in the Time of Gompers," Harper, 1957, 508 pages.

"The A. F. of L. From the Death of Gompers to the Merger," Harper, 1959, 499 pages.

U.S. Department of Labor Publications

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Brief History of the American Labor Movement," 1957, 85 pages.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "American Labor and the American Spirit," 1954, 66 pages.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "American Workers Fact Book," 1956, 433 pages.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "A Guide to Labor-Management Relations in the United States," 1958, 31 reports.

"Supplement No. 1," November 1958.

"Supplement No. 2," July 1959.

Scholarship committee of judges: Frederick A. Brier, Ph. D., assistant professor of economics, University of San Francisco, San Francisco; Leon F. Lee, Ph. D., director, institute of industrial relations, San Jose State College, San Jose; Arthur M. Ross, Ph. D., director, institute of industrial relations, University of California, Berkeley.

CONTEST WINNERS

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine

Sandra Lee Miller, McCloud High, McCloud.

Allene Margie Downey, Westmoor High, Daly City.

Donald Manka, Live Oak Union High, Morgan Hill.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight

John L. Dolan, Hillsdale High, San Mateo.

Barbara Woth, Redlands Senior High, Redlands.

John F. Peterson, St. Ignatius High, San Francisco.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven

Estelle Gershgoren, Fairfax Senior High, Los Angeles.

Patricia Jacobsen, Eureka Senior High, Eureka.

Heidi Stohler, Berkeley High, Berkeley.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six

Rochelle Leiter, North Hollywood High, North Hollywood.

Peggy Bosworth, St. Mary's High, Stockton.

Eldon R. Clingan, Merced Union High, Merced.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-five

Eleanor Rosch, San Fernando High, San Fernando.

Lester O'Shea, Lowell High, San Francisco.

Paul Wadsworth, Westchester High, Los Angeles.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four

Donna Hardesty, La Jolla High, La Jolla.

Richard Kirk, Christian Brothers High, Sacramento.

William D. Mathewson, Stockton High, Stockton.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three

Karen Brock, Culver City High, Culver City.

Richard R. Bolton, Monrovia-Duarte High, Monrovia.

Salvadore Pusateri, Willow Glen High, San Jose.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two

Armen Tashdinian, Sacramento High, Sacramento.

Alex Woycheshin, Christian Brothers High, Sacramento.

William Wittenberg, Susan Dorsey High, Los Angeles.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one

Carolyn Wood, Willow Glen High, San Jose.

Robert Edwards, Hayward High, Hayward.

Merrill Francis, Woodrow Wilson High, Los Angeles.

Education Committee, California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO: Thomas A. Small, chairman, San Mateo; John A. Despol, San Francisco; Wilbur Fillippini, Santa Barbara; Max J. Osslo, San Diego; Edward Shedlock, West Covina; Pat Somerset, Hollywood.

Agricultural Featherbedding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, where, in the great crusade for the economic justice and stability of farmers, is the interest of the consumer protected?

One of the legislative findings on the wheat surplus is that such surpluses result in disastrously low prices of wheat and destroy the purchasing power of grain producers for industrial products.

No one seems to concern himself with the poor consumer and taxpayer, who are one and the same and who pay for this whole featherbedding business.

Did it ever occur to anyone that the consumer could also use that same purchasing power to a much greater advantage? And a more reasonable use could be made than buying $10 billion worth of agricultural commodities which he does not need, and that should not have been produced in the first place, and then paying to transport and store this vast surplus now rotting in bins—while throughout the world at least 1 billion people are on the verge of starvation.

Everyone admits that the farm program is an economic monstrosity bordering on a virtual shambles; yet is allowed to rumble along, creaking and groaning

upon the taxpayers' backs, until it will collapse from its own sheer weight.

Family type farms are giving way to industrial type agricultural production, or factories in the fields. In spite of this inevitable trend, we still find the Government making vast sums of money available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material. And, in spite of the gigantic size of these farm corporations, we find the Government in the insurance business covering crops destroyed by floods, hail, wind, lightning, or tornado. Taxpayers and consumers are subjected to the same hazards from these acts of nature and would suffer just as greatly if subjected to them, as would a farmer. The only difference is that urban or city folk have to buy their insurance from private corporations with good hard-earned dollars. They are not protected by paternalistic Uncle Sam.

We have spent $22 billion on the farmers during the past quarter of a century with the net result that we have made farmers the wards of the Government under the dole system, which is an accurate description of the farm subsidy.

The time has come for a new farm program which will gradually ease the price-control featherbedding from under the farm economy. Let the farmer produce for the marketplace rather than the Government storage bin so that the economic law of supply and demand can redound to the benefit of both the producer and the consumer of our agricultural bounty.

Paramount (Calif.) Journal, 23d Congressional District Editorializes Lncoln's Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an editorial in the Paramount Journal, a newspaper published in the important city of Paramount, Calif. This city and newspaper is located in the great 23d district which I represent, this my 14th year, in this great legislative body.

And while our congressional observation of Lincoln's birthday is a few days passed, this editorial was written and published the day previous to February 12, 1960. I commend its reading to each and every colleague.

I know you and all the Members join in congratulating the editor, Mr. Kee Maxwell:

LINCOLN'S JUSTICE
(By W. Kee Maxwell)

One of the strange things about a great life is the variety of angles from which it appeals to various individuals. Go into any public library of average equipment and count the volumes dealing with the life of Lincoln. Every phase of his remarkable career would seem to be covered. One would assume that the mine of Lincolniana had been exhausted. Yet every year brings new books whose theme is this man of humble birth and unpretentious living. Men cannot cease writing and reading about him. Immigrant children from overseas know the story of Lincoln better than the stories of their own national heroes. There is a universality about him that has appeared in no other figure of history since Jesus.

One fundamental trait of Lincoln's greatness was his ingrained sense of justice. It is erroneous to think of true justice as relentless and inflexible; it is a libel on justice to regard it as incompatible with sentiment and mercy. Indeed the very fault of justice as it needs must be administered on an abstract basis and in strict accord with legal forms in its very inflexibility— its incapacity to adapt itself to the case of the individual. Lincoln's justice was not mawkish nor soggy with cheap sentimentality; but it had that element of human sympathy and understanding which enabled him to see both sides of a question at issue and to put himself in the place of the weak and erring.

A true balance in justice requires certain basic characteristics. It is incompatible with the egotism which places self-interest or pride of opinion in the foreground. It requires self-detachment—the ability to stand back and look at even one's own case from the viewpoint of disinterestedness. It requires mental integrity that scorns sophistry and self-deception. It requires, above all, the poise which comes from the domination of the material nature by the spiritual.

Those persons who profess to find parallels between the life of Lincoln and the life of Jesus may note that the recorded instances of eruptive wrath in both lives are extremely limited. They may note further that neither the Great Teachers nor the Great Emancipator is recorded as having indulged in outbursts merely as a resentment against personal outrage or abuse, but that these outbursts were called forth in both lives by outrages and abuses of helpless humanity or vital principles.

In a time when blatant extremists are seeking to expropriate the name of Lincoln as a shelter for excesses against law and government, it is worth while to remember Lincoln's expression of an ideal of social justice:

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another; but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Compare it to the doctrines of envy and class hatred and malicious destructiveness that professed apostles of progress are preaching today. Compare it to the self-seeking of the groups and blocs and factions who are striving to make the government of all the people a means of enriching their particular element at the expense of the whole. Compare it with the dog-in-the-manger policy of the petty ones who regard success as a crime and honest gain as an affront to society.

But Lincoln's admonition applies to other fields than sociology. It is an ideal of sane justice that ought to fit itself to the ethical and moral phases of life as well. It is no greater crime in morals, after all, to tear down another's house than to tear down another's character. It is no more sinister a form of envy that covets a fellow being's possessions than that which begrudges a fellow being's happiness.

Respect for the rights of others is the keynote in this simple but powerful expression of social justice. The right to possess one's house in peace implies the same right to possess one's opinion sand beliefs in peace. And the admonition to recognize and remember the right of the other man as assurance that one's own rights shall be safe from violence applies with the same force to matters of politics and religion and morality.

Justice, like charity, begins at home—its source is the individual himself.

Let us not tear down the other fellow, but build up ourselves.

Life is short enough to keep us busy on the building process alone—if we undertake and execute any decent sort of job.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend the 13th national award luncheon of the "Voice of Democracy" annual broadcast script-writing contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association and State associations of broadcasters in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the Statler Hotel, February 24, 1960.

Fifty-one fine high school students were there—one from each of the 50 States and one from the District of Columbia, each State winners.

Four previously selected finalists gave a portion of their winning script and Richard J. (Rick) Smith was announced as the national winner.

The four presentations were heart-warming and give assurance that our schools are doing a commendable job.

Scripts of the four finalists including the national winner follow:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Richard J. "Rick" Smith, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., national winner of the 1959-60 Voice of Democracy contest)

Men have come and gone on our earth. They have come and gone, lived and died, and but for a handful, have been forgotten. But for every man who ever lived, there was a dream. A dream so holy and so beautiful that it seemed almost impossible to realize. Men lived and died—but that dream never did die. It lived; and it grew; and it spoke. At first it spoke in a whisper—but now its voice is deafening. Shouts shiny with newness and still tarnished with the shadows of the dark, dim, distant past—but still crying out for the dream as old as life. Men hear it and they feel wings stir on their shoulders. They hear it and they feel shackles fall from their feet. They hear it, and they call it democracy.

The Voice of Democracy cannot be shut out. It cannot be kept from the senses of men by all the barbed-wire barricades in this world, for the voice comes from within, and not from without.

It comes from a man's hands; hands free to write his thoughts as he thinks them.

It comes from a man's lips; lips free to pray to any God by any name.

It comes from a man's eyes; eyes free to read any book or Bible, pamphlet or poster, slogan or signpost that he may wish.

It comes from a man's ears; ears free to listen to anyone else's ideas, unbesmirched by the bigotry of a despot.

It comes from faith; faith in man's eternal dignity, and faith in the land where that dignity is the very foundation of our social order.

It comes from a man's mind. A mind that is free to think and believe and consider; to reason and reject that which is false, and accept that which is truth—the truth that will keep him free.

The voice does not fall upon deaf ears. It brings its message of hope to the hearts of men the world over. Its message of equality and freedom and liberty and democracy knows no boundaries. There are no walls so thick, nor fences so high, nor prisons so deep, that the voice cannot be heard.

You can hear the voice, just listen. You can hear it in every sound that issues up from our crowded, noisy streets. You can hear it in the low, mournful tones of a Negro singing, "Swing low, sweet chariot * * *." You can hear it in the train whistle as it floats out across the Kansas prairie. You can hear it in every bustling, impatient movement in our land, full of the promise and the hope that America offers to anyone to come and take a part to make his own. Yes, you can hear it—the voice that has made us and kept us free.

The grandest thing that men possess is this heritage of liberty. People, all people, are born free; freedom is their birthright. Many times men have died to defend that most precious of rights. Men have died, that their fellows might be free to speak, be free to vote, be free to stand. Free to stand apart or in a crowd, to stand in agreement or in opposition, to stand in support or in defiance; but free to stand. These men knew that to take away these rights was to take away a person's reasons for existing.

Yes, men have lived and men have died—but each one, in living, has built the monument to freedom just a little bit higher. And some day that monument will be high enough that every man on earth can see it, and hear the voice that cries out from every stone in it.

That voice will never be silent because of the very nature of its origin. As long as there are people on earth who desire freedom, as long as there is one place on earth where people are free to vote, read, write, speak, and pray as they choose, the Voice of Democracy will not be stilled.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Philip J. Smith, Cordova, Alaska, one of four finalists, 1960)

I speak for democracy—from the bottom of my heart, I speak for the form and the essence of democracy as it is typified and practiced in the United States of America. I speak for the lazy summer afternoons spent fishing for catfish in a broad muddy river. That is part of America. I speak for the squalor and filth of another "catfish"—the Catfish Row that is also part of our America and of our democracy. I speak for the elegance and splendor of Fifth Avenue and the tree-shaded serenity of a country town or an equally tranquil fishing village nestled at the foot of towering mountains in the wintertime—waiting for Christmas. I speak for the happiness of the country doctor who is called out early in the morning to take care of one of his townspeople and the equal happiness of the scientist who has perfected a new lifesaving antibiotic. I speak for the farmer and the fisherman who have their seasonal duties to perform—and the storeowner whose duties are never completed. I speak for a muddy, boggy road leading to a farmer's fields—and for the broad superhighways leading to a different kind of happiness—and sometimes oblivion. I speak for the Congressman who guides his country's destiny, and for the councilman who shapes the future of his town—for the harried business executive—and the humpbacked newsboy who hands him a daily newspaper he doesn't have time to read. I speak for the young toughs on the corners of dirty city streets and for the healthy youths who scamper in the snow and ice of a clean, fresh, star-studded winter eve.

But perhaps you ask why I speak for the unhappiness, the filth, the degradation in America? I speak for it because it, too, is part of America, part of our democracy—a portion of the life we ourselves lead—part of the reason we exist. If we had nothing low and base to overcome in our lives, there would be no reason to alleviate these conditions. Our lives would be pointless, and the ultimate achievement—the achievement of excellence—would go unrewarded. There would be no ideals to uphold, no goals to strive for, and no personal glow of a job well done.

Democracy is humanity in action. The expression of the will of the majority—the amazing willingness with which the minority complies with this will. Democracy is all the imperfections, the perversions, and the degradation to which fallen man is subject. But to a much larger extent—it is the nobility and dignity of the true democracy which towers over our fallen man.

We have established the fact that man is subject to various shortcomings. If he can do nothing about them, he is lost. His life has lost its purpose. In America's democracy, he can do something about his shortcomings. There are no political restrictions on self-development—in fact aid is given those who require and desire it. The individual and his ideals are respected as under no other form of government. Our country doctor, harried businessman, our farmer and fisherman—all are democracy in its truest sense. You too, and I, a mere student, are democracy.

Therefore, I speak for the college student, studying beneath a massive oak on campus or lost in the hysteria of Saturday afternoon's football game. And for the blind saxophonist playing for pennies on a crowded street—and the concert pianist, performing for a crowded hall. For the clear-eyed country lad who grew to be the leader of the greatest nation on earth, and for the wealthy son of a wealthy father who was a bum at the age of 21. I speak for a sleek ballistic missile hurtling skyward, protecting our Nation—and for the two-bit popgun delighting the future scientist—and for the high school teacher delving into the intricacies of nuclear physics with his class—and the young mother teaching her child the equally intricate mechanics of his first words. I speak for democracy—its accomplishments, its present, and its future. I speak with the humility born of inherent pride, for I am of and for America's democracy—as America's democracy is of and for me.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Mike Phillips, State of Iowa, one of four finalists, 1960)

I am a student, in a high school, in the midwestern part of America. I, like any other student of this day, am engrossed in the things around me. The recent school exam, and the possibility of victory in the next ball game, are examples of the topics which enter into my conversation, with my friends, every day. Jim's new sportscar, and the complete answer to the latest chemistry experiment, along with a million and one other such things, dominate the verbal exchange between every class.

After school, I have a job working in a retail store. There, I handle money with all the responsibility that that entails, while trying to satisfy customers with the quality of the products which I sell.

My home is nothing extraordinary—except, maybe in the fact that it is a real home: One which is so hard to find in the world today.

My family is, I think, ideal. My parents are good, loving, and God fearing. My brother and sister, both younger than I, are mischievous and playful, but when you really need them, they are always willing to help.

But why, you may ask, am I giving this seemingly irrelevant information in a talk on democracy? The answer is simple. This is my democracy. The fact that I can go to any school and take the courses I want, with nothing to fear, except maybe the ever-watchful parental eye.

The fact that I can express my ideas to my instructor and my classmates without being labeled a "radical" or a "revolutionary" or an "enemy of the state."

The fact that I can work and take on responsibility, on my own initiative, without being considered as just one more of the "masses." These are the reasons why I speak for democracy.

Not long ago, I visited the U.S. Capital for the first time, fulfilling a promise I had made to myself, many years before. Words have not yet been invented that could acurately describe the first moment I saw the dome of the Capitol Building. I remember it as if it were just yesterday.

It was late in the evening and the city of Washington was just falling asleep. I was on a streetcar, with some friends of mine, all of us alive with the excitement of the big city. Gazing out into the darkness, someone pointed to a great light hovering over the treetops. In a very short time, the car stopped and we got off, our eyes still fixed to this strange illumination. Then, coming into a clearing, I saw it, the Capitol of the United States—tall, and stately, with its immaculate dome looking over Washington, and over all America.

An experience, such as this, is not easily forgotten. I have not forgotten it. It made me realize, as I had never realized before, just what democracy really is. As I stood there, almost dumbfounded, in the simple beauty of what I saw, the grasp of patriotism pulled me forward. In the spotlessness, of this, her temple, I saw America's martyrs—their red blood adding to its glow. Supporting her great white dome, now above me, I saw her gigantic pillars—the principles of her existence. As I went forward, my eye caught sight of the three largest and most noticeable of these pillars, freedom, truth, and justice.

Standing by her pillar of freedom, I could hear her proclaim to the world the God-given right of liberty.

Seeing her pillar of truth, I knew the strength of her land, the source of all truth, God.

Moving on, to her pillar of justice, I heard her say, "All men are created equal."

There I realized that without those three great pillars, that temple would surely fall, as have so many temples before, because they lacked them.

This, then, is the framework of the democracy in which I live. Because my Government recognizes that I am an individual, created by a higher power and given certain basic rights which no power can take from me, I am able to live, speak, and worship, in the manner ordained by my conscience.

This is to me the best form of government yet devised by man, because it recognizes the fatherhood of God.

This is why, I speak for democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By John Forssen, Keene, N.H., one of four finalists, 1960)

I

Where once there was a land of barren rock and stone,
There flourishes now a city from the seeds of freedom grown;
Where once there was the darkest night that hell could e'er create,
There is now the light of freedom that no man shall desecrate;
Where once the lifeless bodies of freedom's champions lay;
There is now—a sacred paradise to commemorate their day.

They came upon this land of ours to have true freedom reign,
To free themselves from stagnant powers and snap the tyrant's chain;
They suffered through a living hell—simply to survive,
And leave us a democracy—very much alive;
They shed their blood on Bunker Hill and many more besides,
To keep this freedom flowing in unrelenting tides.

II

Where once existed false ideas and everlasting fears,
There now exists what truth reveals * * * all men are seen as peers;
Where once there was the weak man attacked by all above,
There is now the strong man tasting freedom's love;
Where once there was the order of the scoundrel potentate,
There is now democracy * * * we all should consecrate.

They built upon this land of ours a state where all are peers,
A state to keep the freemen free and hold the tyrant's fears;
They built a state forever to withstand life's constant blows,
They built a state forever to defeat democracy's foes;
All around us sits the enemy set to pounce upon the prey,
Let it be within our power to forestall the judgment day.

III

Where once there was but one great church attended by all,
There stands now a host of churches answering sinner's call;
Where once the schools were open to only rich and proud,
There are now accommodations for the lowest of the crowd;
Where once a man would spend his time on survival alone,
There is now some time for other things and a family of his own.

They came upon this land of ours to their private faiths profess,
To worship without fear of man, their sins to God confess;
They wanted education free from wealth and class,
So—they made a set of standards needing brains alone to pass;
They wanted time for families and things besides survival,
So they conquered despotic mires and defeated freedom's rival.

IV

Where once the battles for our cause made rivers run with red,
There stands a living monument of freedom by our dead;
Where once the widows sadly wept for families lost in war,
There is naught but gay rejoicing for freedom evermore;
Where once the ravaged souls of men prayed long and hard for death,
There is everlasting springtime from their last eternal breath.

They fought throughout the blackening night to keep our flag unfurled,
They fought throughout the blackening night for freedom o'er the world;
They fought until death claimed them and laid them in the grave,
They gained for us the title "land of the free, home of the brave";
They suffered in the prison camps and on the racks of hell,
And sealed the crack forever that deadened freedom's bell.

For freedom and equality our fathers bravely died,
To keep democracy flowing in an unrelenting tide;
It is our turn now to sacrifice, to fight or lose the cause,
To hold our own forever amidst our human flaws;
Their work is done forever and forever will they sleep,
If we carry on where they left off, their covenant to keep.

I am an American—and for democracy I speak,
Let us carry on where they left off, their covenant to keep.

Wittenberg Endorses Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the impression has been gained because of a rather concentrated propaganda effort that the majority of students and college faculties are oppose to the loyalty oath. The facts are to the contrary.

Wittenberg University from my State is one of the country's fine educational institutions. I am herewith calling to the attention of Members of Congress an article from the Wittenberg University Torch which reveals that a campus poll indicates that a great majority of people at Wittenberg favor the loyalty oath:

CAMPUS ENDORSES LOYALTY OATH IN POLL

(By Gail Baldwin and Bill Schmidt)

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I do not believe in, and am not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

So is stated the affidavit which students must sign, along with a loyalty oath, when applying for a national defense student loan.

Approximately two-thirds of the Wittenberg student body and the majority of the Wittenberg faculty members have given their approval to this affidavit and oath in a recent poll conducted by Torch staff members. In view of the fact that several schools participating in the national defense student loan program, part of the National Defense Education Act, have withdrawn because of the oath and affidavit, the Torch staff decided to find out how students and faculty on the Wittenberg campus felt about the issue.

One hundred students and 20 faculty members were chosen at random from the new student directory. One student name in every 15 was selected and 1 out of every 6 faculty members was contacted.

SIXTY-SEVEN PERCENT APPROVE

With 90 of the 100 students being contacted, 60, or 67 percent, expressed approval of the provisions required by the oath and affidavit. Students opposed to the provisions numbered 27, or 30 percent. Three students had no opinion on the issue.

The faculty was more evenly divided as 11 of the 20 faculty members interviewed, or 55 percent, said they had favorable reactions toward the provisions of the loyalty oath and affidavit; 7, or 35 percent, were opposed. No opinion was expressed by two of the faculty members.

The National Defense Education Act presently provides loans for needy college and university students in 1,370 schools and institutions. To obtain a loan from one of these colleges or universities, a student must sign both an oath of allegiance to the United States and must also swear that he is not a member of, does not believe in, and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government.

Eleven universities and colleges, including Antioch, Harvard, Yale, Oberlin, and Swarthmore, have withdrawn from the loan program in protest of the provisions of the oath and affidavit. Wittenberg received $47,695 as its share of the 1959–60 program. There are 104 students at Wittenberg now with national defense student loans, these loans averaging $450 to $500.

IN FAVOR OR OPPOSED

In order to plumb public opinion at Wittenberg regarding the controversial issue, Torch pollsters read the provisions of the program to students and faculty members and then asked them if they were in favor of the provisions of the oath or if they were opposed to it. Those contacted were also asked to give reasons supporting their beliefs. Some of the statements selected from the poll and representing both sides of the loyalty oath question can be found on page 2.

When questioned about the issue, Dean Robert O. Long, dean of students, said: "As my personal opinion, it is our responsibility to make national defense student loans available for those of our students who need and want such assistance. I do not believe that I should dictate that a student should or should not sign a loyalty oath and affidavit—that is a matter for the individual student to decide. Students who do not wish to sign such an oath and affidavit can expect to be helped from other student aid funds to the extent that the size of these funds will permit."

According to Dean Long no Wittenberg student applying for a national defense student loan has refused to accept it on account of the loyalty oath and affidavit.

Recently the president and the administrative members of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology expressed strong personal disapproval of the loyalty oath clause, but gave no official position for the institute. President Stratton said he could not speak for the entire institute community but cited a resolution passed by a committee of the institute last May, which reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That the institute committee feels that the National Defense Education Act should not be accepted or rejected by the administration of this institution on the basis of its loyalty oath provisions. Any qualified student who is willing to abide by the provisions of the act should not be prevented from so doing by action of the administration of his educational institution."

FUNDS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE

This in essence is also the feeling of Dean Long who, although he personally feels there is no reason for the oath, stated it would be "dictatorial" to keep such funds from being available to students who need them.

Typical arguments against the oath and affidavit in the NDSL run much like those of MIT President Stratton, who termed the affidavit an instance of the "distrust of the intellectual," stating that to his knowledge, farmers and businessmen did not have to take similar oaths in obtaining Federal loans. President Stratton said the affidavit was also contrary to our "fundamental rights of free thought and opinion."

Arguments for the provisions of the oath and affidavit include those of Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who said: "What about the boys at West Point? They held up their hands. They do not seem to mind doing it. * * *" And South Carolina's Senator JOHNSTON, a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, who says the provisions are needed to protect the student, for the Communists "who use the students within the college to further their purpose" will keep away from the known loyal student.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have an able Governor in South Carolina, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings. The following are excerpts from his great message to the South Carolina General Assembly on January 12, 1960, in our capital city of Columbia:

This march forward has been in step with our agricultural economy. Mechanization on the farm and the Federal program of soil bank and quota have made able and willing farmers jobless. Rather than complaints, South Carolina has provided solutions. First, we provided 13,386 new jobs in 1959. Next, the rural development program was expanded throughout the State. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, who instituted this program in private life, personally visited Columbia and briefed agricultural, industrial and civic leaders. The development board followed up this kickoff with a team in the field which is now coordinating communities into rural development programs. Communities need this program because it puts to work their dormant resources. While restrictions on productivity have caused the farmer to be the first to join the ranks of the underemployed, the worker of modern day industry, with its short hours, finds that he is also underemployed. Many of these workers have taken to farming in their spare time. A new society of farmer-worker is emerging. The rural development program will satisfy the needs of this society and give stability to our industrial program. Other needs of the farmer are being met daily with research and revision. New agricultural products, as the honeydew melon, have been developed, and South Carolina leads the Nation in its percentage increase in beef cattle production.

* * * * *

Now, for our opportunities. To keep pace with our economic and industrial expansion, the research programs of the University of South Carolina and Clemson should be expanded. An economic research center should be instituted at the university, as provided in the budget report. It is intended that this activity be carried on jointly with the State development board. This will furnish established industry expert economic studies and data needed for expansion or development plans. This is an extremely important facet of industrial development. However, another important feature is that it will furnish the basis for a topflight business school at the university. The need for business executives, personnel managers, plant superintendents, is growing every day. While we have excellent schools in architecture, forestry, textiles, chemistry, engineering, and other fields, little emphasis has been placed on a superior business school. We should have this at the university.

In this same vein, I recommend an immediate study by the West committee to report at this session of the general assembly, a program for industrial training. Years ago our total economy was in agriculture and we instituted the finest agricultural research program, with experimental stations and agricultural training in the public schools. This program continues, and should continue. However, the revolution in our economy since World War II, resulting in employment of over half our workers in industry, has not been realized or provided for in our educational system. While all modern day industries readily institute training programs for particular employment, they need as raw material young people who have been grounded in elementary industrial skills. Mr. T. J. Ault, president of Saco-Lowell Shops, emphasized this at the dedication of his research center when he stated, "As I see it, further industrialization of South Carolina requires industrial training programs in the schools of the State to teach youngsters the skills of industry."

We no longer can represent that we are ripe for development when we have no industrial training. Certainly it would be a sham to our people to continue in this fashion because rather than create jobs for them, as is the intent, the industry that locates will be required to bring their employees as well, only to the detriment of our own people.

A yearly average of 24 tourists a day is the equivalent to our economy of a new industry with a $100,000 annual payroll. Tremendous growth in tourist travel is predicted because of greater leisure, higher personal incomes, and speedier transportation. This business benefits every phase of our economy but statewide we have been missing the boat. I commend an accelerated travel promotion program under the development board to attract additional tourist income.

Our forests, which bring an annual revenue of $300 million, are producing only half of what they are capable of producing. I recommend planting some 45,500 acres of State-owned lands now worthlessly idle. This program could be financed on the proceeds from the planting. In addition to the commercial value, reforestation will develop our wildlife resources. Our vital wildlife assets must be nurtured and conserved.

More and more each year I am convinced the greatest natural resource we have is water. It is important to all segments of our people and economy. Since we have an abundance, there has been no need for regulation. However, experience indicates that when the need arises, it is too late to regulate without extreme hardship. Ordinary foresight could be exercised by this legislature in instituting a fair and firm water policy. In order to facilitate this, the director of the water pollution control authority has been designated to hold hearings and make recommendation to the general assembly so that a good water policy can be adopted.

In Support of Peacetime GI Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, presently the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs is holding hearings and considering peacetime GI legislation. I believe the committee should be commended for holding hearings early in this session, and I am pleased that this opportunity has been offered to me to express my views in the matter.

On February 23, I submitted a statement in support of a program that will aid and assure, among other things, higher education and vocational training opportunities for many young men who are now serving in our Armed Forces during peacetime.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 23, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is most gratifying that you have chosen to consider early in this session an inquiry into peacetime GI legislation.

I appreciate the opportunity to go on record in favor of a program that will aid and assure, among other things, higher education and vocational training opportunities for many young men who are serving in our Armed Forces during peacetime.

I do not believe the basic issue is one of offering educational aid to wartime veterans vis-a-vis peacetime veterans. Rather, I believe it is one involving the question: Should we or should we not have a comprehensive approach and a single standard in dealing with the education of young men who serve in our Armed Forces? This question is equally valid applied to other aspects, namely, vocational rehabilitation and guarantee and direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes.

If one concludes that there should be a uniform or single standard in dealing with veterans, then it follows that support should be given to enacting legislation to cover our young men who have been drafted or have voluntarily enlisted for military service.

There is another overriding consideration. While this committee cannot concern itself with the entire area of what should be done to develop a sound, a comprehensive and a needed national blueprint to achieve optimum use of manpower through education, I believe it important to stress such a national approach. To the degree that we assure greater educational opportunities—to that degree do we assure greater national advance and security. Additionally, and of paramount importance, the opening of such opportunities assures a meaningful measure of greater self-dignity and happiness to the individual who wishes to broaden his horizon. Thus, every approach to this problem is another step forward in resolving today's need to act positively in offsetting the Soviet challenge in education and to perfect our democratic concept that an enlightened people will be a free people.

It is my firm conviction that the peacetime veteran who would participate under a peacetime GI bill, if enacted, would contribute materially to and be an active citizen of his community, State, and Nation. Such results would more than repay the investment in his education.

The facts, I believe, bear this out if one is to evaluate the results of the World War II GI bill and the Korean GI bill. There is no reason why such favorable results would not likewise be forthcoming if we offer educational opportunities to post-Korean veterans.

In this connection I would like to make reference to a press release issued on June 22, 1954, by the Veterans' Administration. Issued on the 10th anniversary of the World War II bill, this release underscored some salient facts, and I quote:

"Through the GI bill, World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

"Because of their training, they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam.

"At this rate, GI-bill-trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years."

During the hearings in the other body, conducted by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, a spokesman for the Veterans' Administration stressed the national values which derive from the veterans' readjustment training programs. He stated the programs, in addition to assisting Korean and World War II veterans in making satisfactory adjustment to civilian life, "also raised the educational level and technical proficiency of the Nation by imparting greater knowledge and skill to millions of veterans. Thereby, the Nation has been placed in a better position to cope with the difficult and challenging problems facing it."

The VA spokesman also testified to the excellent record of Korean veterans and noted that: "A comparison with World War II trainees discloses that a greater proportion of the Korean trainees have taken courses in the scientific fields or other fields which require the most extensive training and knowledge."

With facts and figures available on this subject—and not just from the aforementioned agency—there is no doubt in my mind that this worthy record will be continued by post-Korean veterans if the opportunity is afforded them.

In view of this, it is difficult for me to understand—both from the viewpoint of national policy and economic considerations—why the administration looks with disfavor on a peacetime GI bill. Proclamations which I have heard in recent days by Administration's spokesmen declare that we are not nor will we be "second best"—these proclamations mean very little if the Administration's position does not, in fact, reflect its lofty pronouncements.

The committee is, of course, apprised of the department reports and the reasoning and position contained therein. However, I do wish to make note of a certain observation made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In opposing such legislation, and in pointing out that the "Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of these bills would not be in accord with the program of the President," Mr. Fleming makes the observation that "we believe that broad Federal programs in the field of education should be broadly conceived to serve the needs of all our young men and women and to strengthen education in the national interest."

I heartily concur in this concept. To say this is what you are for, however, and then to oppose any workable effort to progress in achieving a declared goal is merely playing with words in order to skirt the issue and to rationalize one's opposition.

Approval of a program for post-Korean veterans would be another advance in this overall objective to which Mr. Fleming has referred. No one supporting it would claim, I am sure, that it is the perfect answer to a broad national problem and challenge, but certainly it can help to minimize further the educational problems we do face.

Mr. Chairman, to the dollar-minded administration there seems to be no connection between balancing the human budget and the national budget. This disasssociation cannot overtake our thinking, for if it does, then we, as a nation, and as representatives of a culture, are headed for trouble we can ill afford.

The times demand of our Nation, through its leadership, new answers based on new and provocative world challenges. How we act on the resolution of these challenges will determine whether or not we are a first-rate or second-rate power. Words alone will not determine the outcome.

Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence that you and the members of the committee will consider the pending legislation with the seriousness you have given to other measures also affecting our national stature and interests.

Reflections While Standing Before the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the quiet majesty of the Lincoln Memorial has inspired countless thousands of people from all over the world, who come to gaze silently at the magnificent Daniel French figure of Lincoln and to read the immortal words of the Gettysburg Address and the second inaugural.

One's first visit to the Lincoln Memorial is a powerfully impressive experience; one's thoughts and reflections at such a time are not easily reduced to words.

In a nationwide contest for essays on the theme, "Reflections While Standing Before the Lincoln Memorial," conducted recently by Broadcast Music, Inc., in cooperation with the American Association for State and Local History, and in association with This Week magazine, Miss Nancy A. Potter, of Voluntown, Conn., received first prize in the nonprofessional writer category. Judges of the contest include such public figures as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Dr. Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations; President Allan Nevins of the Society of American Historians; the author and Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Mark van Doren; and the able and distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

In this centennial year of Abraham Lincoln's election, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues Miss Potter's prize-winning essay:

REFLECTIONS WHILE STANDING BEFORE THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

(By Nancy A. Potter)

Every day of the year, Americans make pilgrimages here, alone and in groups, school children and retired businessmen, scientists and politicians, farmers and steelworkers, soldiers and sailors, housewives and diplomats. We come with separate purposes and thoughts, but finally all of us measure our time against yours, trying to learn what you would think of our century and our way of life.

Parts of our worlds coincide. Across the years we can share many things: The smell of white pine and freshly turned sod, of growing corn and harvested apples; the touch of rough bark, the thin pages of a loved book, and the hardness of workworn hands; the taste of cold spring water and sun-drenched plums. Lilacs go on blooming in the same dooryards, and the thrush sings the same song. Spring awakens the country we love with the same freshets in the hills and blossoming trees in the valleys; we linger through slow rich summers and golden autumns, and we chill with the tightening of winter.

Our personal joys and sorrows are echoes of yours too. We love the weariness that follows honest labor, the release of holidays, the size and variety of our country, and the freedom to move about it and to come back home again. We like to recite the fables of the land, to boast of regional heroes, to champion one State over the others, but we are faithful to the entire Nation. We share most of your fears and concerns. Like you, we have dreaded the sound of marching feet, the scars and pain of war, but, like you, we hated persecution and slavery more. Like you, we have loved the quiet years of peace, but like you, we have despised intolerance enough to fight well when freedom and rights were lost. Like you, we have been unhappy with dissension and weary of tedious argument, but we realize that both are sometimes the necessary behavior of a democracy.

We come here to tell you of the changes in our patterns of life and to contrast our values with yours. There are new States and larger cities, greater harvests and bigger machines, more leisure and greater speed. We have harnessed the power or rivers, mastered the elements in the earth, and crossed the reaches of the sky. We pride ourselves on having mixed the best of the Old World together to gain a vigorous culture. We have assured ourselves longer and generally healthier lives, built ourselves larger houses and great universities, and guaranteed greater material security to our citizens. Our assurance is doubled by the abundance of resources and our belief in our way of life. The scenes from this daily life are those we wish we could share with you.

You would understand the spread of personalities across our continent and the vitality of a still-growing nation. You would delight in our mixing of backgrounds, our continual scrutiny of our Government, our educational opportunities, our role in international politics. You would worry about some of the difficulties that still stand in the way of our being a perfect republic. You would hope that the sensitivity of our hearts might match our increased technical skills and our knowledge of the material world. You would hope that somehow we might have become better people as a result of our physical progress. You might believe that we would have been able to destroy all human fears in order that we might spend ourselves upon higher concerns, but instead we have often exchanged the old fears for new ones. We find ourselves constantly struggling to fulfill responsibilities thrust upon us by the progress it is impossible to deny.

Our speed and growth have diminished the forests and plains you knew into a tidy patchwork of alfalfa fields and towns and factories, all linked by concrete bands which we cross to visit the mountains, the coasts, and the ranch lands. News travels among us with the speed of wind, but answers to

our problems sometimes come more slowly. We are aware of new situations, people, and places, but these are only variations of the ones that concerned you. Many of us are richer materially than you could have dreamed we would be. We have traveled more miles on what seems to be a smaller world, but it is doubtful that we can match your comprehension of the human heart. The years have magnified your abilities and clarified your singular importance to us.

That is the reason why we have come to this place. We need to measure our decisions against yours and in our short reflection here remember your life, work, and manner. Here random lines from your addresses ring through our minds, and vignettes from your life pass before our eyes, for yours is the most familiar of all American stories. In schoolbooks and legends and memory we trace your career from New Salem to the White House, from Bull Run to Gettysburg, through the 56 years from a winter day in a Kentucky clearing to a spring evening in Ford's Theater. There are the tales of the honest storekeeper, the thorough surveyor, the gaunt young lawyer, the trusted Congressman, the thoughtful husband, and the suffering President. The youngest schoolchild knows the details of your biography, and the newest citizen has a strong impression of your personality. To every American for a century your name has summoned up a series of pictures which are the same no matter where we live or how old we are.

We see you patient in the general confusion, thoughtful of the smallest detail, and always sensitive to the destiny of a united nation you had to leave at the moment of its rebirth.

We see you solicitous with the soldiers and the widows and kind to the weak and unfortunate, gentle with the stubborn and willful. Yet beneath this simple goodness and this homely charm lay a sturdy and lasting courage and a strength that helped the country torn apart come together again into a seamless whole. We have always drawn a double picture of you from the stories of the private man and the legends of the great American. We try to learn from the pattern of your life your virtues, your gentle self-reliance, and your dignified patience. We tell our children of your nobility and bring them here to see a statue, but, more than that, to feel a presence.

When sometimes we worry that we are in danger of losing the directness, clarity, and honesty which you practiced, we seek your counsel here and hope for your sympathy. It is fitting that this quiet place should exist in the heart of our Nation and that here we may thoughtfully pause to reflect upon the debt we owe to you and the virtues we may still learn from your life. We hope for more statesmen with your conscience and devotion to the whole country. Often we hope for the perspective of intelligent wit which you used to reduce the monumental fears of the minute to reasonable proportions. We wish for the quiet humility which still could vow that the possession of right would provide the means to establish it firmly.

You gave us the unsated need to establish justice and honesty where we can. Where we fail and your shadow stretches far beyond ours, our humility reaches toward it. One hundred and fifty years after Tom and Nancy Lincoln's son was born in Hardin County, we dedicate ourselves to his unfinished work.

CONTRIBUTORS TO "THE ABRAHAM LINCOLN STORY"

Paul M. Angle, William E. Baringer, Roy P. Basler, Howard K. Beale, Kenneth A. Bernard, Bruce Catton, Henry Steele Commager, Norman Corwin, Richard N. Current, Olive Carruthers, Irving Dilliard, Paul H. Douglas, Clifford Dowdey, Lloyd A. Dunlap, Joseph T. Durkin, S.J., Otto Eisenschiml, Avard Fairbanks, Johnson E. Fairchild, Margaret A. Flint, Shelby Foote, John Hope Franklin, Arnold Gates, Richard P. Graebel, Norman A. Graebner, Ulysses S. Grant III, Wood Gray, Sherrill Halbert, Robert S. Harper, Richard B. Harwell, Carl Haverlin, William B. Hesseltine, Robert L. Kincaid, Willard L. King, Leo A. Lerner, Lloyd Lewis, Mort Reis Lewis, E. B. Long, R. Gerald McMurtry, Robert D. Meade, Roy Meredith, Earl Schenck Miers, Justin Miller, Herbert Mitgang, Jay Monaghan, Marianne Moore, Roy F. Nichols, Allan Nevins, Ralph G. Newman, Sterling North, David M. Potter, C. Percy Powell, Marion D. Pratt, Ruth Painter Randall, James G. Randall, Donald W. Riddle, Carl Sandburg, Dore Schary, Fred Schwengel, Louis M. Starr, Philip Van Doren Stern, Adlai E. Stevenson, William G. Stratton, W. A. Swanberg, Wayne C. Temple, Walter Trohan, Randle B. Truett, Frank E. Vandiver, Mark Van Doren, Clyde C. Walton, T. Harry Williams, Albert A. Woldman, and Ralph W. Yarborough.

HISTORICAL ORGANIZATIONS COOPERATING IN THE LINCOLN ESSAY CONTEST

Arkansas History Commission, California Historical Society, State Historical Society of Colorado, Florida Historical Society, Georgia Department of Archives and History, Idaho Historical Society, Illinois State Historical Society, Indiana Historical Society, State Historical Society of Iowa, Kansas State Historical Society, Louisiana Historical Association, Maryland Historical Society, Michigan Historical Commission, Minnesota Historical Society, State Historical Society of Missouri, Historical Society of Montana, Greater Omaha Historical Society, Nevada Historical Society, New Jersey Historical Society, New York State Historical Association, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Ohio Historical Society, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oregon Historical Society, Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, South Carolina Society, South Dakota State Historical Society, Texas State Historical Association, Utah State Historical Society, Vermont Historical Society, Washington State Historical Society, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and Wyoming State Archives and Historical Department.

Agricultural Featherbedding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the further one plods into the jungle of agricultural featherbedding, the more perplexing and amazing the subject becomes.

For example, in looking over a list of crop price support loans, I note an amount of $1,216,699.80 based upon 7,326 bales of pledged cotton produced by Delta & Pine Land Co. The amazing part of this item on the list is that the Delta & Pine Land Co. is a British-owned corporation with farming operations in the State of Mississippi. Items such as this make one wonder as to whether we ought to reevaluate our definition of just what is a "farmer." I further wonder where the obligation of a U.S. taxpayer to a foreign corporation starts and ends, and I conclude from this that a large number of corporations are getting a free ride on the protection of investment capital by hiding behind the overalls, and using the label of "farmer" to tap the public tills for their own profit gains.

A perplexing paradox that begs for an explanation in this agricultural mess is the deep concern for the well-being of farmers and their families, and the alleged impending economic misery of this particular group. Yet, on the other hand, I find an almost complete lack of concern for the economic misery of the 3 million agricultural workers, who are excluded from almost all beneficial legislation provided for other workers. These substandard conditions are fostered, protected, and promoted by the very same farmers who demand that the taxpayers provide them with the economic security that they themselves are unwilling to provide to their workers.

AMA Opposition to H.R. 4700 Not Based on Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, it is generally known that the American Medical Association has opposed my bill, H.R. 4700, which provides insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Under our form of Government opposition is encouraged to bring a problem into proper perspective and to eliminate any impassioned appeal beyond reason or practicability. I cannot, in good conscience, say that the AMA is acting bona fide in its pressure, propaganda, and distortions.

Immediately after the 1958 hearing on this measure the AMA hired a public relations firm to work for the defeat of the Forand bill. A questionnaire was sent to physicians in every congressional district. Why? I believe that anyone who has read the AMA propaganda and now reads the questionnaire will readily find the answer to my question.

Here is the questionnaire:

1. Who is the person or persons in each ward or county in the congressional district who is most influential with the Congressman? List names, addresses, and business or profession of each.

2. Who is the physician who knows and can work with each of the above?

3. Who are the four or five men in the Congressman's district who really influence him? List their names, addresses, and business or profession.

4. Who are the principal contributors to his campaign?

5. What contacts does the medical profession have with officers or leaders of such organizations as Blue Cross-Blue Shield,

dentists, hospital boards of directors, chambers of commerce, Farm Bureau, and Grange? Who are the doctors who can talk to these leaders?

6. Who is the Congressman's personal physician? At home? In Washington?

7. What contacts does the medical profession have or who knows the Congressman's top secretariat on his Washington staff?

8. What are the Congressman's hobbies? Favorite charity? Boards, organizations, church?

9. What newspapers in the district supported him in his last campaign? What is their present attitude toward him?

10. What contacts does the medical profession have with any or all of these newspapers? Either directly with the editors or through other influential citizens or advertisers?

11. How big a factor is labor in the district?

12. Do any of the local labor organizations deviate from the national labor organizations and for what reason?

13. How big a factor are "old folks" in the district?

14. What contacts has organized medicine or individual physicians made with the Congressman?

15. What was his general attitude?

New York City Administration Backs $1.25 Minimum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that unless the Congress enacts legislation raising the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, millions of our marginal earning citizens will become a permanently depressed and distressed class. Our failure to act at once on this vital matter will have serious consequences. Under the leadership of Mayor Wagner in my own city of New York, the administration, cognizant of this problem, has begun discussions to spur the State and Federal Governments into action.

A most significant report on the statements made in the city council appeared in the New York Times of February 19, 1960. The article follows:

ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE CENTS MINIMUM PAY IS BACKED BY CITY—MAYOR AND DUMPSON URGE RISE IN UNITED STATES-STATE FLOOR

(By Stanley Levey)

A Federal-State minimum wage of $1.25 an hour would save New York at least $1 million a year in welfare costs, Welfare Commissioner James R. Dumpson said yesterday.

His estimate was given at the opening session of a city council hearing on the causes of low wages in many local industries. Mayor Wagner and James McFadden, first deputy commissioner of labor, also gave their views at the hearing.

All three placed the Wagner administration behind an increase in the present minimums. Under Federal law employers in interstate commerce must pay not less than $1 an hour. There is no present State minimum, but Governor Rockefeller has called for a $1-rate and the retention of minimum wage orders in 10 industries.

The commissioner said that under a schedule prepared last June by his department, it was estimated that the weekly net income needed for a family of two was $52. For a family of three $63 a week would be required, and so on up to an income of $161 for a family of 12.

Mr. Dumpson explained that a rise in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour would mean weekly pay of $50 for many workers instead of $40. But even this higher wage, he declared, "would be $2 lower than the amount required for a family of two; $13 less than that required by a family of three and $24 less than the sum required by a family of four."

The commissioner said that at present 250,000 persons in 70,000 families of two or more were receiving assistance from the city. He figured that for every person on assistance there were three persons not on assistance whose incomes were below public assistance standards.

Mr. Dumpson said that the heaviest weight of low wages fell on Negroes and Puerto Ricans. He added that of 61,138 persons receiving home relief, 27,084, or 44.3 percent, were in families whose wages were being supplemented by the department.

Raising the minimum wage would directly affect these persons, Mr. Dumpson said. Grants to these families would be reduced by the amount of additional wages coming in, thus cutting welfare costs.

PLAN HELD CONSTRUCTIVE

"Here," he said, "is a constructive way to reduce public welfare expenditures."

Mayor Wagner declared that unless the gap were closed between rising living costs and established wage minimums, "we are going to face the spectre of a permanent depressed class in this country—a class of workers, who though they are employed, are chained to a standard of living that consistently falls behind the standards enjoyed by the great bulk of American workers."

Mr. McFadden, speaking on behalf of Labor Commissioner Harold A. Felix, disclosed that the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Federal Department of Labor would conduct, at the mayor's request, a study of low wages in three major New York industries. He did not say what they were.

All three witnesses were asked by Stanley M. Isaacs, the council's only Republican, whether they favored having minimum wage laws apply to employees of nonprofit agencies, such as voluntary hospitals. The three said they did.

Another council hearing is scheduled for next Tuesday. Earl Brown, Democrat of Manhattan, is chairman of the investigation.

Slovak Home for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, legislation, no doubt, will be considered in this session of Congress to expand social security and provide medical and hospital care for our needy pioneer citizens.

Mr. John C. Sciranka, of the American Slovak Journal, has forwarded an article to me from his paper recounting the outstanding accomplishment of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union of America in constructing a million dollar home for the aged in the Cleveland Catholic Diocese. This charity is a magnificent contribution to the American way of life without costing the taxpayers one cent.

The Most Reverend Andrew G. Grutka, first bishop of the Gary, Ind., diocese, was elected honorary president of the union at their recent convention at Atlantic City last September. Mrs. Helen Kocan, of Whiting, Ind., is supreme president of the union, having served in this capacity since 1933. Mrs. Anna K. Hruskovich also of Whiting, Ind., has been supreme trustee of the union for many years. They, along with other officials of this union have given generously of their time and services toward the many charities and contributions this organization has made to its membership and the country in general since the union's organization almost 70 years ago.

The article follows:

[From the American Slovak Journal, Feb. 12, 1960]

MILLION DOLLAR HOME FOR AGED OF FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK LADIES UNION

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Saturday, January 2, 1960, a noteworthy event took place without much fanfare at Beachwood, quiet suburb of Cleveland, Ohio, where Auxiliary Bishop John J. Krol, of the Cleveland Catholic diocese dedicated a new $1 million Villa Sancta Anna Home for the Aged, built by the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, a fraternal organization, which was founded in 1892.

The day of the dedication was selected so close to the New Years for the reason that it was on January 1, 1892, when Mrs. Anna Hurban, Slovak woman pioneer in the field of fraternalism gathered around her the first women in Cleveland, Ohio, where they founded the first branch of this union, which now has a membership of 90,000 and assets close to $30 million.

The first nine Slovak women who founded this, now the largest Slovak women's fraternal organization in the world, went into history although they did not make much fanfare of their action just like their humble followers 68 years later. Their names are preserved for posterity and they were paid due homage and tribute on the above-mentioned day of the dedication of this $1 million institution, which is a credit to American fraternalism in general and Slovak fraternalism in particular. The first nine women were: Anna Hurban, Elizabeth Degro, Mary Onda, Margaret Ruzinsky, Elizabeth Pesta, Mary Mihalcik, Barbara Susa, Mary Sabovik, and Mary Sotak.

Mrs. Anna Hurban, who spearheaded the first society, sought the aid and guidance of Rev. Stephen Furdek, who was then a prolific writer, poet, and organizer. It is no wonder that on August 10, 1892, the first convention was called to St. Ladislaus Parish hall in Cleveland, Ohio, with women delegates from six organized lodges in five States, namely: Cleveland, Ohio; Minneapolis, Minn.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Johnstown, Pa.; Terre Haute, Ind., and Yonkers, N.Y.

Besides Father Furdek, well known organizers like Father John Martvon, Father E. E. Gelhoff, and Father Raymond Wider encouraged the pioneers to continue in their worthwhile undertaking.

The 6 lodges were represented by 15 women delegates. George Onda, first president of the First Catholic Slovak Union, now with 102,000 membership in United States and Canada, which was organized in 1890, was at this first women's convention to give help and advice.

Mrs. Ilona Ratkovic, of Pittsburgh, Pa., was elected first supreme president and Rev. John Martvon, who later labored for over 60 years in Johnstown, Pa., and lived to be 96, was chosen as first spiritual director.

The organization prides itself with being the first one among the Slovak fraternals which organized and maintains its Junior Order, which was founded in 1905 at the national convention in Bridgeport, Conn. The late Reverend John Stas of Scranton Diocese and Mrs. Anna Strunak of Cleveland, Ohio, are given credit for organizing the first youth branches.

Since its inception in 1892 it had the following women as supreme presidents: Ilona Ratkovic, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Anna Vojna-Strunak, Cleveland, Ohio; Rozalia Hozeny, Yonkers, N.Y.; Pauline Doerl, Baltimore, Md.; Anna Ondrej, Cleveland, Ohio, who headed the organization for 17 years, and Frances J. Jakabcin of Reading, Pa., was responsible for many modern reforms. She was president from 1920 until her death in the spring of 1933. Since that year the organization is headed by Mrs. Helen Kocan of Whiting, Ind., who proved to be a very outstanding leader, able administrator, and remarkable organizer.

The organization had very capable supreme secretaries; namely, Mrs. Anna Strunak, Mrs. Mary Slifka of Youngstown, Ohio, the late Mrs. Mary E. Grega of Cleveland, Ohio, and presently Mrs. Susanna Matuscak of Cleveland, Ohio, who has held this responsible position since 1940. The Junior Order was administered most ably by such capable officers as Mrs. Anna B. Russell, Mrs. Susanna Matusçak and presently by Mrs. Frances L. Mizenko, formerly of Perth Amboy, N.J.

The late Reverend John M. Liscinsky of Cleveland, Ohio, was the first editor of their official organ Zenska Jednota (Ladies Union), which was founded on January 1, 1914. He was succeeded by Mrs. Anna Husek, Rev. Ivan Kramoris, OSB., and Rev. George Luba, OSB., who is editor since 1931.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Victor Blahunka, first American monsignor of Slovak origin who died recently in Chicago, Ill., was the organization's supreme chaplain after the pioneering years, followed by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Kocis of Youngstown, Ohio, and Rev. Michael Tondra of Campbell, Ohio, who has held the position since 1933.

The organization named the new $1 million Villa Sancta Anna for its aged in honor of its foundress, Mrs. Anna Hurban and its patroness St. Anna, mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Mrs. Hurban was a humble person, who was born in the town of Gbely, Slovakia, known as the Tulsa of her native country on account of its rich oilfields. Her centennial birthday was observed on Sunday, July 22, 1956, at Villa San Bernardo, the mother house of Slovak Vincentian Sisters, Bedford, Ohio, where the supreme officers and members decided to build the modern home for their aged.

The new three-floor home has accommodations for 75 residents and 9 sisters, the Daughters of St. Francis from Lacona, Ill. The community was founded in Slovakia. Soon after World War II, and before the Communists enslaved Slovako, 16 sisters received permission to come to the United States of America. They established a mother house in Chicago, which since has been moved to Lacona, Ill. The Slovak nuns, trained nurses, operate institutions for children, as well as a hospital in Mountain View, Mo. The order's U.S. superior is Rev. Mother Boleslava. Superior at the Sancta Anna home is Sister Milada.

It accepts guests from among the aged of the Cleveland diocese and aged members of the organization or their relatives.

It is one of the few old folks' homes in the country with accommodations for married couples. Six 2-bed rooms, each with private bath, have been designed for occupancy by husband and wife. Other rooms, now intended for use of men or women, can be used for couples if the demand is great enough.

Guests' rooms, with built-in dressers and closets, are finished in different colors to provide a homelike rather than institutional atmosphere.

The structure's central facilities—dining room, kitchen, heating equipment—have been designed to service future additions which will increase its capacity to 300. The chapel, designed by John W. Winterich and associates, seats 100. It has seven stained-glass windows, six of them depicting events in the lives of St. Ann and the Blessed Mother; the other, in the sanctuary, symbolizes the Holy Trinity.

The main altar is of Botticino and Portoro marble imported from Italy, and the rear sanctuary wall is finished in an imported Venetian mosaic.

The brick and limestone structure was designed by Architect Stephen E. Butzko. It is set back 500 feet from Chagrin Boulevard, on 35 acres of lawns, fields, and wooded areas. The structure has 53,346 square feet of floor space. Besides central service facilities, the ground floor houses a clinic and infirmary for four patients requiring short-time care; pharmacy, library, recreation room, and barbershop. On the first floor are administrative offices, directors' meeting room, chapel, and quarters for three employees who will live at the home, and rooms for guests. The second floor has more guestrooms, a lounge, and gameroom, and balcony opened onto the chapel for those confined to wheelchairs. Oak-paneled solariums, built for all-weather use, are on each end of the first and second floors. The home has a large hospital-type elevator. The third floor has the sisters' quarters. Dunbar Construction built this $1 million modern home.

Indeed, the organization is to be complimented for erecting such a wonderful structure for its members and friends, where it will continue to perpetuate the ideals of this fine fraternal union which was founded by nine Slovak women in Cleveland, Ohio, and has grown into a 90,000 membership—and no doubt it will continue to grow, for fraternalism never failed its members and our American public. The committee, headed by Mrs. Helen Kocan, Rev. Michael Tondra, Mrs. Susana Matuscak, Miss Anna Yasso, and Mrs. Frances L. Mizenko, supreme officers who guided the building of this modern home, are to be complimented for their excellent taste in architecture and design. May it continue to serve the present and future generations and inspire them always to remember the generosity and benevolence of its founders and successors.

Nixon or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the opening statement by Ralph de Toledano, taking the affirmative on the question of "NIXON or Not" on the National Review Forum debate broadcast from New York, December 3, 1959, as follows:

The question, "NIXON or not," is of course a loaded one. I am not quite certain, however, whether the gun is pointed at me or at my opponent. For to say "No" to NIXON at this time is a declaration of advocacy which can give aid and comfort only to the liberals.

I hope not to be merely an advocate tonight—but an analyst. In this I am somewhat handicapped by having first-hand knowledge of the man and the issues under discussion, as well as direct experience as an observer of what is laughingly called practical politics. That's a glib word—politics—and one which few people bother to understand. Politics has been called the art of the possible, but it is far more than that. If I may offer a further definition, politics is ideology in context. And it is with this in mind that I inted to approach the question, "NIXON or not."

Let me first take up the negative aspects of the question. There are several reasons proposed why RICHARD NIXON cannot, or should not, be the Republican presidential candidate in 1960.

One: It is charged that Mr. NIXON can't win. This theory is one advanced by Mr. NIXON's Democratic opponents, who always show touching solicitude for the Republican Party as every election draws near. The simple fact remains that as of now, Vice President NIXON shows more strength with the voters than any candidate of either party—by any test available short of the ballot box. This does not mean that the Vice President is a shoo-in, but certainly it cannot be taken as evidence of popular weakness.

The second argument: That NIXON will win. I do not say this in jest. The possibility that the NIXON forces will win nomination and election for their candidate seems to have struck terror in the hearts of certain Republican conservatives who have elevated masochism to a political principle. The late Senator Robert A. Taft has posthumously taken all responsibility for his defeat at the 1952 Republican convention. But I think it is demonstrable that what contributed substantially to his defeat was the cozy little death-wish of so many of his followers. It was often said that Republican conservatives felt that it was better to lose with Taft than to win with Eisenhower. I submit that what many of them wanted was to lose—period.

The third negative aspect—that NIXON is too liberal. The primary basis for this charge is Mr. NIXON's stand on civil rights. Now, the Vice President feels no need for apologizing here, nor will I do so for him. It follows both morally and politically that if one believes in the fatherhood of God, one cannot ignore the brotherhood of man. If these are general terms, the Constitution of the United States has implemented them in the 14th amendment which forbids the States to "make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of of the United States * * * nor to deny any person within its jurisdiction to equal protection of the laws." Perhaps it is too liberal, for some conservatives, to grant the privileges of education, voting, housing, economic opportunity, and decent treatment to men because of their religion or the color of their skins. If this is so, then Mr. NIXON will have to do without this kind of conservative support. But I propose to these so-called conservatives the question recently asked of Governor Faubus at a dinner party: "Governor, what will you do, once you have entered the Pearly Gates, if you discover that God is not white?"

The fourth argument used is that Mr. NIXON is too conservative. This is one which, I am sure, my opponent tonight will not make. But it has been raised by others and requires exploration. Let's look at the record.

Mr. NIXON helped write the Taft-Hartley Act. He has maintained an intransigently anti-Communist position. He believes that it is far better to have a tax structure which encourages venture capital, stimulates productivity, and creates jobs, than one whose aim is simply to "soak the rich." To exacerbate private industry in order to soothe the carbuncles of Karl Marx, Americans for Democratic Action, or Mr. Walter Reuther is—Mr. NIXON would assure us—bad economics and bad politices. The billion-dollar public works program urged by many Democrats and some Republicans during the last recession—a program calculated to put a deficit in every pot and a post office in every garage—was opposed both publicly and within the administration by the Vice President. Mr. NIXON believed that the economy could best be aided by a tax cut—if drastic aid became, in fact, imperative. These positions are neither too conservative nor too liberal. They simply make sense.

There is one last negative point which I should take up, if only because it must plague my opponent. Politics are not lived in a vacuum. Ideology, to paraphrase Edmund Burke, must inhere in some sensible object. Therefore, a negative to the question, "NIXON or not" is meaningless until a rag, a bone, and a hank of hair has been found for it to inhabit. Will my keen and passionate opponent suggest an alternative? Does he favor Governor Rockefeller? Senator Kennedy? Senator Lyndon Johnson? Mr. Adlai Stevenson, Mayor J. Bracken Lee? Senator Thurmond? Or does he propose that we all join him in some political never-never land where to be ag'in is an end in itself?

Now let me take up briefly the positive points in Mr. NIXON's favor.

Though the Vice President cannot carry his supporters on what "National Review" has called a solid gold bandwagon, or what has been elsewhere described as a gilded steamroller, the Nixon vehicle is jet propelled by the keenest political mind, the most penetrating understanding of the political process, and the widest knowledge or contemporary government possessed by any of our political figures. It is a truism in Washington that Mr. NIXON is the best informed man there today. But it can be argued—and convincingly—that intellectual equipment and practical knowledge, when not coupled to a sound philosophy, are useless.

I am willing to accept this hypothesis—and then to apply it to the most critical subject to be considered—Mr. NIXON's foreign policy posture.

Last September, the day before Premier Khrushchev arrived in Washington, Vice President NIXON outlined some of his views in a speech before the ADA—ADA, let me hasten to add, in this case standing for American Dental Association.

"There are those," said Mr. NIXON, "who see this visit itself, clearly apart from any results which might flow from it, as being the opening of a new era of sweetness and light, and as indicating a basic change in the attitudes and policies of the Communist leaders. This kind of thinking"—and I am still quoting Mr. NIXON—"is incredibly naive and completely fails to take into account the character of both the man who is visiting us and the ideology which he represents. The differences between the free world and the Communist world are not the result of misunderstanding; they are the product of a deliberate Soviet policy of expanding Communist influence and domination by every possible means in all parts of the world." End of quote.

Of Premier Khrushchev, Mr. NIXON said: "I found that in private conversation * * * he was a cold, calculating, tough-minded advocate of his point of view. * * * He does not need to be convinced that the Government and people of the United States want peace. On the other hand, the danger is that he may believe that we want peace so much that we will pay any price to get it, including surrender at the conference table." End of quote.

These words were uttered by the Vice President at a time when the State Department—and much of the Nation's press—was admonishing us not to be beastly to the Soviets. The remarks so infuriated Premier Khrushchev that he urged President Eisenhower to get rid of Mr. NIXON. Those views continue to be Mr. NIXON's, now that many of the major candidates edge toward joyful and unconfined appeasement. It is also a sad fact that Vice President NIXON is perhaps the only contender for the Presidency who categorically opposes the recognition of Red China. The others have shifted guardedly from statements that the American people should develop tolerance toward Asia's Murder, Inc.—to semiovert suggestions that the time has come to clutch Mao Tse-tung to our bosoms.

The most ominous formulation of the new appeasement can be found in a book tastefully entitled "America the Vincible." The author, Emmet John Hughes, has removed his hat from the White House rack and now hangs it in Governor Rockefeller's mansion. Mr. Hughes looks longingly to the day when the "hard" policies of the Dulles team have been replaced by a flexibility which will allow an understanding with Red China, a withdrawal of American bases in Europe, and the destruction of our defensive alliances.

Because Vice President NIXON is one of the few men in official Washington who has a thorough knowledge of Communist strategy and tactics, he has favored policies which, paradoxically, are suspect to the more doctrinaire conservatives. For example, he concurred with the administration in its decision to invite Premier Khrushchev to the United States. Now it is my belief, after an admittedly brief stay in the Soviet Union, that if we could get Cyrus Eaton to finance visits here by several thousand Soviet subjects each year we would be advancing the cause of freedom and peace. And it would do many Americans considerable good to see for themselves the incredible drabness of Russian cities, the joylessness of Soviet life, and the pathetic manifestations of youthful revolt which crop up. It was Mr. NIXON's belief that, no matter how tightly Premier Khrushchev shut his eyes to America, he would still cheat a little and peek a little. Mr. NIXON was right—and I believe Nikita will never be the same. He knows, if we don't, that all those luniks are phonies, but he has seen the American standard of living.

There was, moreover, one other vital factor in Mr. NIXON's thinking:

Whatever may come to replace it, the cold war as we have known it since 1946 is over. The conflict between East and West, between communism and the open society, is destined to take another form in the years to come. There is a new grouping of forces taking place, creating an atmosphere of even greater peril to the world. During this era of transition many things can happen—not the least of which is nuclear war. Now there are many in this audience who have talked blithely of a "showdown" with the Soviet Union, of the unquestioned might of our Strategic Air Command, and of the Soviet hoax of stockpiled Russian ICBM's with nuclear warheads. I myself am guilty of such talk. But it is the Vice President's view—and on sober reconsideration my own—that all-out war today is unthinkable. We must stand firm, but we cannot invite Armageddon. As a consequence, it is Mr. NIXON's position that it is better to debate than to obliterate. Not Soviet arms, but Soviet propaganda, have pushed the Communists ahead. If we have not convinced the world of our moral, political, and social superiority over the Communists, the fault is our own. The outcry against the Khrushchev visit came, let us face it, from people who do not know how to counter Soviet words. Mr. NIXON does.

However, if it is the opinion of this audience that "preventive" war and nuclear holocaust are the only answers to the Soviet challenge—and I know my opponent believes this—then Vice President NIXON will have to do without such support.

As I have said, the question, "Nixon or not," presupposes alternatives. Both in Moscow and at home, the Vice President has demonstrated his belief that to talk to the Soviets does not mean surrender to them. There is strength and strength. Of the candidates my opponent may propose, who has been so forcefully on record for increasing American military strength? On May 6, 1950, just before the outbreak of the Korean war, Mr. NIXON—then a Congressman—warned:

"There is ample evidence that Soviet Russia is directing a great percentage of its resources toward the development of new, modern weapons of warfare * * * We cannot, in the interest of security, afford to lag behind (them) in weapon research and development." For those who have forgotten, 1950 was the year in which the United States was spending all of $21 million—$21 million—on the procurement and production of guided missiles, as compared to the $3 billion we are spending today. And the Vice President has urged still greater efforts on our part, even as he has warned that our entire knowledge of Soviet space achievements comes strictly from Soviet sources—unchecked by American scientists who, sadly, are predisposed to believe what they are told by the Kremlin.

Of the entire galaxy of Presidential hopefuls, there is not one who can claim a more consistent record on defense than Mr. NIXON. Among the candidates that my opponent will presumably propose, there are those who would cut the military budget to the point where missiles would suffer, those who would favor scuttling one branch or another of the service, and still others who believe with the poet Horace that virtue is its own defense.

I do not say that RICHARD NIXON is some sort of political Sir Galahad, that he in infallibly on the side of the angels, or that conservatives should agree with him on every issue. Politics is ideology in context—and there were many conservatives who disagreed violently with Senator Taft's defense of Communist teachers.

I do say that a President will be elected in 1960, and that it is the responsibility of all conservatives to throw their support to the man whose record on domestic and foreign policy issues is the soundest. This is a decision for each conservative to make, and I would presume if I attempted to force any commitment. If my opponent offers an alalternative candidate who more straightly walks the razor's edge of conservatism, then it is your right and duty to follow him. But of the alternative answer to the question is ideology in a vacuum, then conscience and good sense should make your choice plain.

What Private Power Companies Are Doing With Their Federal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I have previously inserted in the RECORD a listing of the sub-

sidies the private power companies have received in the form of tax reductions under the accelerated amortization program.

The question occurs, what is happening to this accumulated income tax subsidy? Well, many power companies are now distributing these income tax reserves to their stockholders in the form of dividends and, believe it or not, these dividends are tax free. As a matter of fact several power companies are paying all of their dividends from this income tax reserve fund and, therefore, their dividends are 100 percent tax free. The stocks of these companies are, of course, greatly enhanced in value, especially to those in higher income tax brackets who would like to decrease their own income taxes; and brokers in utility stocks have been quick to point out this advantage to possible purchasers. For example, in the December 3, 1959, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly the reader is advised:

It appears likely that the dividends on California-Oregon Power will remain fully tax free in 1959 and 1960, but after 1960 the percentage may decline and it is uncertain whether any part of the dividends will be free of income tax after 1960 when accelerated amortization will run out * * * and; Pacific Power & Light preferred and common dividends * * * will probably remain fully tax free for about 5 years, due to accelerated amortization in connection with the company's large hydro projects.

I insert here a list of some eight power companies whose dividends are entirely or almost entirely tax free because they are paid out of the income tax deferral reserve funds. These eight private power companies paid out $72,548,754 in tax free dividends to their stockholders in 1958 and presumably about an equal amount in 1959. It is quite likely that most of the stock was held by stockholders subject to income tax rates of 50 percent or more. Thus, having originally reduced the taxes of the power company by some $150 million in those 2 years the rapid amortization program may now provide a further reduction of anywhere from $50 to $75 million in taxes to the fortunate stockholder of these companies. Thus, we see how subsidies proliferate other subsidies.

Company	Dividends declared 1958	Percent tax-free	Amount tax-free
California Oregon Power	$3,663,202	100	$3,663,202
Detroit Edison	25,543,546	100	25,543,546
Pacific Power & Light	8,403,585	100	8,403,585
California Electric Power	3,600,971	79	2,844,767
Hartford Electric Light	5,035,046	78	3,927,336
Niagara Mohawk Power	26,650,562	77	20,409,283
Portland General Electric	4,230,000	78	3,299,400
Washington Water Power	5,008,579	89	4,457,635
Total	82,135,491		72,548,754

The above are by no means the only private utilities who are paying out these income-tax windfalls to their stockholders. Only a few weeks ago the Federal Power Commission supplied a list of 23 power companies "whose 1959 common dividends may be fully or partially exempt from a Federal income tax," which I append below with an estimate of the percentage of their dividends that will be tax free.

Company	Percent dividends tax-free, 1959
California Electric Power	62
California Oregon Power	100
Central Louisiana Electric	56
Central Maine Power	41
Connecticut Light & Power	30 or 35
Detroit Edison	37
Gulf States Utilities	36
Hartford Electric Light	60
Idaho Power	45
Interstate Power	8
Maine Public Service	13
Niagara Mohawk Power	67
Oklahoma Gas & Electric	30
Pacific Gas & Electric	30
Pacific Power & Light	100
Portland General Electric	100
Public Service of Indiana	50
Public Service of New Hampshire	40
Southwestern Public Service	14
Union Electric	50
Utah Power & Light	19
Virginia Electric & Power	10
Washington Water Power	55

The Federal Power Commission has approved these bookkeeping reserves of income tax deferrals and their distribution to stockholders in dividends. Not all private utilities want to treat this tax subsidy in this way. The Niagara Mohawk Power Co., indeed, is presently in a little trouble with the Federal Power Commission in regard to these tax savings. Niagara Mohawk listed their tax reduction as income and credited it to unrestricted earned surplus. This, of course, was a very frank admission that these tax savings would constitute a windfall and would never have to be repaid. By doing this Niagara Mohawk increased the equity of the common stockholders and this, of course would make it possible for it to ask for higher rates in order to provide for the usual return on the total equity invested in the company. If this were allowed, the tax savings provided by this gigantic subsidy would be used to increase the power rates to the customer and thus he would in effect be paying those taxes, or a portion of them, all over again.

The Federal Power Commission was not unanimous in its ruling on the treatment of these tax savings by the private power company. Commissioner William R. Connole protested the decision of the Commission and I insert herein a report of his protest given in a speech before the Electric Consumers Information Committee on June 9, 1959, in Washington, D.C., as reported in News for Electric Consumers:

JUNE 12, 1959.

FPC COMMISSIONER SAYS UTILITIES SHOULD PASS TAX SAVINGS ON TO CONSUMERS

"I see no reason for permitting utilities to charge you and me for costs which will never be paid," said Commissioner William R. Connole, of the Federal Power Commission, recently.

Predicting that State regulatory commissions will swing away from the misuse of liberalized depreciation, Connole declared that "enlightened electric utilities have done what they should do without being told" on this issue.

Connole spoke at an ECIC luncheon meeting June 9 in Washington, D.C., on the subject of liberalized depreciation under section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This section permits companies to write off more of the cost of a plant in the early years of its life for tax purposes. The result is a lower tax bill for the company.

But while using liberalized depreciation for tax purposes, some utilities have used normal depreciation—and consequently normal taxes—in listing costs for ratemaking purposes before State regulatory commissions. Some 17 or 18 State commissions have permitted this double standard, with this result:

Consumers pay rates based on the utility's normal tax bill. But the utility, using liberalized depreciation, pays only part of the tax money it collects from consumers. The utility keeps the remainder of tax money for its own use, a subsidy.

Consumer groups have long urged that the tax saving which the utility enjoys under liberalized depreciation should be passed on to the consumer—the one who pays the tax bill—in the form of lower rates. About five State commissions have recently agreed with this view. The issue is pending in other States.

The private electric companies are divided on the issue. At a recent meeting of the National Conference of Electric and Gas Utility Accountants in Chicago, opinions ranged from keeping the tax savings for the company only to sharing them with consumers. In the middle, some companies espoused compromise, while others urged outright repeal of section 167.

One company agreeing with consumers and Connole on this issue is the Hartford Electric Light Co. Said John B. Madigan of this firm at the industry meeting:

"Management has an obligation to keep all operating costs as low as possible. Certainly this obligation should extend to the area of one of our largest items of expense, namely, taxes." Madigan noted that his company cut its tax bill by 14 percent in 1957 and 30 percent in 1958 by using liberalized depreciation, and then asked:

"If it were possible to effect a saving as large as this in any of the other categories of expense, would we hesitate to do so? If a regulatory commission treats us fairly in most respects, as ours happens to do, we cannot object if they believe that these tax reductions should be used for the benefit of the customer."

In endorsing this position at the ECIC meeting, Connole pointed out that "enlightened electric utilities" pass the savings on to the customers "primarily because there is nothing more embarrassing than huge amounts of reserves in the company's balance sheets. And when they follow the practice of liberalized depreciation, reserves will accumulate unless they are written off in lower rates to the customer."

Connole countered the prime argument used by commissions and utilities in favor of the double standard—namely, that at sometime in the future, at the end of the writeoff period, the company will have to pay more taxes. This just isn't so, said Connole.

"Liberalized depreciation is a tax reduction, not a tax referral."

He explained that by its very nature an electric utility is an expanding dynamic business. Even if it just replaces what it wears out, without adding a single new customer or new foot of line (which is virtually impossible), its tax liability will always be less at the end than at the beginning of its operation.

Connole concluded: "There is no need, therefore, to deduct from reserve for taxes. Although the tax liability will be forever reduced for the companies, those favoring normalization (keeping the tax savings themselves) say that they want to set up a tax reserve.

"I see no reason for permitting utilities to charge you and me for costs which will never be paid."

Furthermore, not all States are going along with the theory of the private power companies that the stockholders rather than the customers ought to benefit from this very generous Federal subsidy. The public utilities commission of several States are taking the position that these tax savings should be passed on to the consumer in the form of lower power rates.

We note in many magazines the expensive advertising by the private power companies charging that public power is subsidized. These charges are always made in the vaguest and most general terms and never substantiated in dollar and cent figures for a very simple reason—because there is no substantiation for this charge. But, as the figures in regard to these tax reductions indicate, the private power companies themselves are cashing in on one of the most generous subsidies any group has ever received from any government.

The Honorable Richard J. Daley, Chicago's Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday evening I had the pleasure of being toastmaster at a banquet in Chicago sponsored by the Chicago Polish Daily News, at which Mayor Richard J. Daley was named Chicago's Man of the Year.

I am calling the attention of my colleagues to this great honor bestowed upon Mayor Daley because in recent weeks the national press has extensively reported the tragic situation which developed among an infinitesimal segment of Chicago's police force and has reflected adversely on the reputation of that great city.

In choosing Mayor Daley as its Man of the Year at a time when a great effort was being made to carrect the abuses within Chicago's police department, the Polish Daily News joined the other metropolitan newspapers of Chicago in professing a deep understanding of the entire situation.

Selection of Mayor Daley for this distinguished award last Sunday demonstrates how profound a respect the people of Chicago have for Mayor Daley's unprecedented contributions toward making our Midwest metropolis the greatest city in the world. The distinction bestowed upon Mayor Daley at the same time demonstrates that his unyielding dedication to the principles of good government, his devotion to duty, and his bold program of saving Chicago from dangerous deterioration caused by slums, a malady which today is afflicting all great American cities, totally eclipses the criticism which has beset one department of his otherwise successful administration.

Mayor Daley's decisive program of action in Chicago during his last 5 years as mayor has indeed attracted the attention of city administrators throughout the world. While he has devoted his greatest effort toward rebuilding his own Chicago during this period, Mayor Daley's name has become an inspiration for urban administrators throughout America. I know of no single individual who has a more profound grasp of the varied problems which confront our Nation's urban communities, in which 73 percent of America's population now lives, than Mayor Daley. It is understandable, therefore, why, despite the adverse publicity about one segment of the Chicago community, the mayor of that great city should have been selected as Chicago's Man of the Year.

The good judgment of the Polish Daily News was corroborated last Monday when Mayor Daley announced the appointment of Dean Orlando W. Wilson as Chicago's new superintendent of police. Dean Wilson has directed the criminology school of the University of California in Berkeley and will bring to Chicago a vast background of experience in police administration.

When the police scandal was disclosed in Chicago and was reported by the press throughout America and the world, Mayor Daley moved swiftly, decisively; and proclaimed an unyielding determination to correct the situation with a program which would give Chicago the best police department in the world. The press of Chicago has reacted to the mayor's selection of Dean Wilson by lavishing the mayor with high praise for his selection.

It gives me great pleasure, for the benefit of my colleagues who have been following the Chicago situation during the past few weeks, to include in my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of Februry 24, 1960. I am also including an editorial from Chicago's American of February 19, which clearly demonstrates the high regard the people of Chicago have for Mayor Daley. Finally, I am including an article published on February 21 in Chicago's American which illustrates the high respect the businessmen of Chicago have for Mayor Daley.

I trust that those who would be quick to degrade the great city of Chicago, more on its past and ancient history than on the latest development, will today reflect on the indisputable fact that great things are happening in Chicago and that its Mayor, Richard J. Daley, is determined to make good his pledges to make this Midwest metropolis the greatest city in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am also enclosing the remarks made by the Rev. Peter Fiolek, C.R., chairman of Sunday's Man of the Year banquet as the opened the program. I believe Reverend Fiolek's words reflect the high regard all of us in Chicago have for Mayor Daley:

Very Reverend Father Provincial, Reverend Fathers, Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago and Man of the Year, distinguished guests and friends, it's wonderful to have faith and more wonderful to know that it was not in vain.

When the selecting committee of our newspaper nominated the chief executive of Chicago as the recipient of the Truth and Charity Award, at that very moment ominous clouds of scandal were casting shadows on our city. Like the proverbial influence of the moon they gloomed the judgments of some who wagged their heads.

WE BELIEVED

But we believed, that the greater number of our people, that the greater number of Chicagoans were of nobler stature and capable of honest thinking. We were even willing to bet on the success of this evening, and won through your cooperation.

So, it's an exceptional pleasure for me as chairman of the Dziennik Chicagoski's Man of the Year banquet, to bid welcome to this imposing gathering. God bless you and love you all.

We are indeed pleased and humbly grateful that you chose so willingly to join us in honoring the mayor of Chicago. By your enthusistic response, by your cooperation, by your letters and words of encouragement you confirmed our belief and gave evidence that this year's award fell upon one who richly deserves it.

AT RIGHT HOUR

And it came at the right hour. It would be the lowest ingratitude on the part of Chicagoans if in an hour of darkness they were to be blinded, never to see the many bright days when under his dynamic leadership, his sincerity to duty, his honesty of purpose Chicago gloried and throbbed with good living.

This very aspect is brought home with an emotional impact in Allen Drury's current bestseller "Advise and Consent," a story of the pressures and forces, the counterpressures and counterforces which dominate the political life of the Nation's Capital but which are true in every big city.

The essence of "Advise and Consent" lies in the feeling that the vision of greatness will somehow be attained by the greatness of men and faith in God.

TRUTH AND CHARITY

Ideals of human beings so often come in conflict with the ambitions of human beings; the glorious visions of human beings so often come in conflict with the baser desires of human beings and yet through some magnificient providence of Almighty God, the ambitions and desires so often end up serving the purposes of the visions and ideals.

All you need is the truth and charity, and these qualities our mayor possesses in blessed degree. I think we're all happy to be a part of this evening, so let's be about the business.

It's my privilege now to present the toastmaster of the evening. So from the Nation's Capital to the Nation's greatest city we call upon a Member of Congress, a native Chicagoan.

Mr. Speaker, the articles follow:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 24, 1960]

THE MAN

Orlando W. Wilson's selection as Chicago's superintendent of police was page 1 news in the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, and other leading newspapers around the country. As this city's police scandals have been a focus of national interest in these past weeks, so now the man with the new broom and the new job are going to be watched by the whole country. We don't doubt that shrewd bookmakers are calculating the odds: the character and ability of the man against the size of the job. Can he do it?

Orlando W. Wilson looks like a good bet to us, and we congratulate Mayor Daley and

his five-man selection committee on the choice. It should bother no one that Wilson was himself a member of the committee. He was put there because he knew his business; he was nominated as superintendent for the same reason.

Neither should anyone be concerned at the proposal to pay Wilson $30,000 a year for the job. One factor in lifting the Chicago school board out of the muck of scandal-ridden politics was the decision to hike the superintendent's salary (now $40,000). The top police job is not less important.

Like any other man who could have been chosen, Wilson, on his record, has his strong and weak points. In our judgment the strong outnumber the weak.

He is one of the Nation's top experts on police administration—a quality of prime value as he faces the job of restructuring the police department.

As an expert consultant to many big-city police departments he is a seasoned troubleshooter; he knows where to look for the causes of inefficiency and corruption and what it takes to cure them.

Wilson's practical experience as a police chief has been limited to small and middle-sized cities; his longest span as chief was 11 years in Wichita, Kans. It's a long jump from Wichita to Chicago, and it's a long jump from the ivory tower of a university dean (Wilson's present job) to the street-level rough-and-tumble of the Chicago police department. Wilson himself has acknowledged this with a humility that springs, we should judge, from a levelheaded assessment of what he calls "the greatest challenge confronting law enforcement in the United States today, perhaps the world." At least he's not underestimating the job.

At 59, Wilson does not plan to make a career out of the superintendent's job. He has agreed to devote 3 years to reorganizing the department, taking it out of politics, and getting it onto a basis to serve the people of Chicago instead of the whims and business interests of the "bosses." If he can do this the way will be open to make the department's top job once more the reward for outstanding service within the department. We believe that Wilson will give Chicago that kind of department if he has the kind of support he needs—the kind of support discussed in the editorial below.

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 9, 1960]

PILING ALL THE BLAME ON DALEY

It's time to apply a little objective good sense to this police scandal. It's a disgraceful one, but not unique; all big cities have police scandals, and they all involve collaboration between policemen and criminals.

But this one has produced a hysterical campaign designed to hold Mayor Richard J. Daley personally responsible for the scandal, and this is so obviously unjustifiable that we want to inject some facts into the discussion.

We very seldom use page 1 for the presentation of editorials. We use it today because we consider it important to Chicago's future to end the hypocritical effort of many Chicagoans to shift full responsibility for the scandal to one man. The creation of moral conditions in Chicago that made this scandal possible is everybody's responsibility—including this newspaper's. We accept our part of it. That's why we're publishing this editorial.

Blaming Daley for the fact that certain policemen secretly went over to the side of the criminal enemy is a good deal like blaming George Washington for Benedict Arnold.

The thing that has happened is plain: The police department, commanded by Timothy J. O'Connor, a man who didn't steal but was neither as alert as he could have been in keeping check on those who might steal nor as energetic as he should have been in enforcing high standards of conduct, slid into a state of slack discipline.

In this lax atmosphere, honest cops stayed honest because of their consciences, but cops who weren't honest (and never should have been cops), finding that nobody in authority was paying much attention to what they did, obeyed their instincts. Some became protectors of burglars for a share of the loot. Some went into the practice of burglary themselves.

Naturally the conspirators made every effort to conceal this betrayal from everybody, including Mayor Daley.

Could he have prevented it?

It is reasonable to say that, as mayor, he is responsible for the police department. But he does not personally manage the police department; that is a job he has to delegate to someone else. Clearly, he made a mistake in entrusting it for so long to the honest but ineffectual O'Connor.

But this was an error in judgment. It was not a failure of the personal integrity for which Daley has been distinguished throughout his life.

Because we believed in his integrity, we supported Daley in his campaign for mayor in 1955. Chicago's American was the only daily newspaper that endorsed him.

In March 1955, we said editorially that we favored the election of Daley because he had an unbroken record of exceptional public service as a legislator, as Governor Stevenson's director of revenue, county clerk, and as leader of the Democratic organization.

We said: "It is our conclusion that in Chicago's interest Richard J. Daley should be elected mayor."

In March, 1959, we said editorially: "Now 4 years have passed and Mayor Daley's performance has more than justified our 1955 judgment that he was the right man for the office."

So we said Daley should be reelected, and the other three Chicago dailies, which had opposed him in 1955, joined in supporting him this time.

The mayor is still advancing with the vast and complex project of rescuing Chicago from the rot that has beset all great cities in America: The deterioration of inner areas while more and more people abandon their neighborhoods and retreat to the suburbs.

Under Mayor Daley's leadership, Chicago's fight against obsolescence has been so largely won that informed people have stopped talking about the inevitably of decentralization. They see now, through Chicago's example, that cities can recreate themseles.

Leading that kind of movement is a task for a man whose mind and heart are set on making a better life for people. Daley's success as leader of this miracle of regeneration has been made possible by his dedication to the idea of building the finest metropolitan community humanity has ever seen.

Can you believe for a minute that such a man would be conniving with dishonest political schemers to corrupt the police force?

We can't and don't.

If we had reason to think he had lost the integrity that has guided him through his life, we would be using this space to tell you so. But we can't imagine such a change in his character, and we don't think anyone can honestly imagine it.

Daley now has made a swift, sound, and practical start toward rebuilding the police department. He has appointed a board of five highly informed and able men to select a new commissioner of police.

The next thing to be done is to make sure that the new commissioner and all his subordinates shall be set free from the influence and interference of politicians. Daley already has told his five-man committee that the next commissioner will have a free hand in running the department.

Captains must be sent where the commissioner thinks they can do the most good in protecting the public.

Promotions must be made under a system that will provide civil service examinations at regular and frequent intervals. That will call for reorganization of the civil service commission's procedures.

Candidates for appointment as policemen must be thoroughly examined for moral fitness.

In bringing about these changes Daley will find his dual position as Democratic Party leader and as mayor no hindrance, but a substantial help. A good many people, mostly politicians with partisan motives, have declared Daley should resign as Democratic leader.

As we have said before, when you have an honest mayor and an honest party leader embodied in the same man, the public is especially well served. There is no crippling struggle over policies between the leader and the public official.

In taking politics out of the police department, Daley the party leader will be in a particularly strong position to make politicians understand why, as mayor, he must keep the police force absolutely free to function without interference from anybody.

The sooner the mayor tells the public his plans for bringing about reforms in the police force the better it will be, we think. The people of Chicago want to be assured that the police department not only will be cleaned up, but that the strongest possible measures will be taken to see that it stays clean. We don't see any reason why Mayor Daley shouldn't announce, even before the new commissioner is found and appointed, what he intends to do to accomplish these things.

We are absolutely confident that he will accomplish them.

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 21, 1960]

SCANDAL HYSTERIA EDITORIAL PRAISED

Chicago business leaders today said they agree with the editorial published in Chicago's American, Friday, which said that "a hysterical campaign" to blame Mayor Daley for the police scandal is unjustified.

Comments included:

Joel Goldblatt, president, Goldblatt Bros., Inc.: "I gave three cheers when I read the editorial. It expresses my beliefs. Many people are too fast to knock when something goes wrong and too slow to praise constructive actions. No business has a smaller percentage of wrong people than the Chicago Police Department. Chicago, with Mayor Daley's leadership, will emerge from these disclosures a better city."

OPEN TO CRITICISM

Elmer T. Stevens, chairman Charles A. Stevens & Co., and chairman of a civic committee which developed a reorganization plan for the police department in 1933: "I agree with the editorial. Any attempt to make a whipping boy out of Mayor Daley is unfair, unwise, and unfortunate.

"Of course, he is open to criticism. He should have known of the situation some time ago. No one knows this better than the mayor himself, and no one is in a better position to solve the police problem than Mayor Daley is right now.

"The situation is so bad and so revealed that an opportunity of a lifetime confronts the mayor.

"I am confident of his integrity. I believe he has the necessary know-how. He, more than anyone I know, can make what seems

to be a disaster into one of the brightest spots in Chicago history."

Col. Henry Crown, chairman Material Service Corp., division of General Dynamics, Inc.: "I agree with your editorial. It should be kept in mind that unfortunately dishonesty creeps up in many places, even in a corporation. No director would think of blaming the president if an office boy turned up as a thief.

"The city has a great many departments and employs about 43,000 persons. In such a large number of persons you're bound to find some incompetents and some dishonest people.

"I thoroughly disagreed with Aaron Kohn when he said that 90 percent of the police are dishonest or incompetent. I think it was an irresponsible statement."

John T. Pirie, Jr., chairman and chief executive officer, Carson Pire Scott & Co.: "Your editorial is the most constructive statement yet issued. I am in thorough accord with the ideas and sentiments expressed. I am sick and tired of people who criticize and do not come up with constructive suggestions.

"As I have pointed out to Mayor Daley, it is easy to criticize. I am looking for people to help in this crisis. The editorial is extremely timely."

Meyer Kestnbaum, president Hart, Schaffner & Marx: "It is inevitable, it seems, that the chief executive is held responsible. But blanket condemnation is very unfair. "However, Mayor Daley has a very real responsibility to find a remedy.

"Hysterical denunciation is not justified and wouldn't do any good. Besides, this is the time when responsible citizens should take an interest and help work out a program.

"There should be no political condemnation, but a calm and sane approach to a solution.

"Citizens expect a constructive solution. And if this requires a separation of police from politics, then the citizens have a right to get such a separation.

"This is the mayor's responsibility, and it is incumbent upon him to see that it is done.

"It is very important that interest in this scandal does not die down. I am 100 percent in agreement with your editorial, but there is room for a further editorial pointing up the responsibility for seeing the job through.

NOT REASONABLE

General Robert E. Wood, a director of Sears Roebuck & Co.: "I agree with your editorial. If it is not reasonable to put the blame on Mayor Daley."

Willis Gale, chairman, Commonwealth Edison Co.: "I could not agree more wholeheartedly. Mayor Daley has said he will solve this problem. In other matters he has proved himself a man who gets results.

"I am in favor of giving him a chance to do so in this case. Citizens should continue their active interest, but their approach should be constructive."

Arthur Rubloff, president, Arthur Rubloff & Co.: "Your editorial is very good. How anyone can blame Mayor Daley for this scandal escapes me. The mayor will make a cleanup his main job. He's conscientious. We must give him the opportunity to work it out.

"The situation is something he has inherited. It was going on long before Mayor Daley came into office. The big question is, 'Why didn't someone do something about this before?'

"There is nothing that has bothered the mayor more than this police scandal, and he will give his best to give Chicago the fine police force it is entitled to."

The Panama Canal and the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's best known editors and a recognized authority on foreign affairs, William R. Mathews of the Arizona Daily Star at Tucson, Ariz., has written a penetrating editorial regarding the course of action for the United States in the Panama situation. Its insight should be helpful to the Congress and the administration in protecting our stake in the Panama Canal.

The editorial follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Should the Government of the United States entrust 1 of its vital arteries of national defense to an inter-American police force of 100 men and a possible inter-American committee?

A report prepared at Northwestern University for a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs makes such a recommendation and much more. It suggests giving the nations of our hemisphere a say in the administration of the canal now owned and controlled by our country. It goes as far as to suggest inter-American institutions as a court of international justice and an international university. In particular it wants to regionalize the canal administration by putting persons connected with the Organization of American States on the board of directors, and selling stock to various American nations, and would make the Organization of American States an advisory commission.

This report bears every evidence of being made by some sincere college professors, and some lawyers who have full confidence that international differences can be solved by finding the right legal formula. As such it ignores numerous fundamental facts.

The Organization of American States already has shown its impotency. It did nothing while Fidel Castro of Cuba was trying by military invasions to set off a series of armed revolutions in various Central American countries. It has done nothing to command the respect of the American people. Castro has defied it openly.

This proposal overlooks entirely the fact that the various nations of Latin America do not get along as amicably as many suppose. They barely work as a unit. They are intensely jealous of their own sovereignties. For anyone to assume that Panama would approve of such a plan, ignores the fact that Panama would probably be even more resentful of a group of Latin American States taking over on something that she sees as her own sovereignty.

The same fundamental difficulty would remain. The plan amounts to suggesting that the United States of America shift something that is her own responsibility to a powerless committee. That kind of evasive conduct on a matter of vital defense of our country does not do credit to the people of our country. Our people are not that slippery and cowardly.

Instead of seeking to evade our necessary responsibility we should assume it with new vigor and without any apologies. We should let Panama know that we are there to stay, that behind the few troops we have there is all of the might and power of our country, and that we will not brook any interference in the administration or operation of the canal.

Once we stop bowing to continual political blackmail, the chances are there will be less trouble with Panama. If, to the contrary, we continue to be meek and apologetic of our position there, there will be endless trouble. Sweet reasonableness is too often considered an invitation to continue troubles, which can always be found.

Panama should have the right to share in the prosperity of the canal. Such arrangements should not be hard to negotiate, but we should not propose for one second to lessen the responsibility we have assumed there for more than a half century.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war known until that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see the human carnage stop and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some peoples 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them a prize for which they had been fighting for generations and even for centuries. In that year they regained their national independence, and the Estonians were among them.

These people had settled in their historic land long before the beginning of modern times. There, in the northernmost outpost of Europe, they led a quiet and contented, but strenuous and hardy life. They were one of the smallest ethnic groups in Europe, and they succeeded in maintaining their national identity and freedom. Then in 1710 they were subjected to Russia's oppressive czars. For more than two centuries they endured that detested regime, but they always wanted their freedom and were prepared to fight for it. Toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they felt free and on February 24 proclaimed their independence.

That was exactly 42 years ago, and today, unfortunately, independent Estonia is no more. After the happy and joyful two decades of interwar years, the country was one of the early casualties of the last war and the unhappy Estonians were its victims. Since then, for 20 years, these sturdy Estonians have been suffering under Communist tyrants, but they still cherish, ever fervently, their freedom and independence. Their friends in the free world observe their Independence Day, and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, February 19, the Democrats of Virginia held their annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. The Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina, was the speaker of the occasion.

Congressman DORN is one of the outstanding Members of this House and is one of the great orators of the Nation. He delivered a magnificent address, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AT THE ANNUAL STATEWIDE VIRGINIA JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RICHMOND, VA.

"Democratic institutions exist by reason of their virtue. If ever they fall, it will be when we have forgotten the past, become indifferent to the present, and utterly reckless as to the future."

These words of a great American, spoken many years ago, epitomize the spirit of this magnificent occasion.

Mr. Chairman, as Democrats, we gather tonight in this critical hour in the history of our Democratic Party. Our party is at the crossroads. We either unite and move forward to a November victory or we flounder in defeat on the plane of agitation.

Governor Almond, Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON, Congressman SMITH, my colleagues in the Congress, and my fellow Jeffersonian Democrats, it is thrilling to see this vast assembly of Virginia Democrats. You have more than 1,200 Democrats filling every space in this great hall and adjoining rooms. This is testimony of your fidelity to and faith in the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson.

Congratulations, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, and all of you. You have made this occasion one of the most outstanding in the history of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, the mother of Presidents. I see here as everywhere evidence of that superb school in political leadership—that great institution, our national House of Representatives.

It was my honor to serve in the House of Representatives with your distinguished Gov. Lindsay Almond, with your great former Gov. Tom Stanley, and with your able Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON. It is now an exceptional privilege to serve under the wise counsel of your former Gov. William Tuck.

Judge SMITH, the dean of your delegation, is our leader in the great fight we are now waging to save the United States and its constitutional form of government. We honor, admire, revere, and love Judge SMITH.

Senator BYRD, patriotic Americans everywhere are grateful to you for your magnificent efforts to preserve the economy of our beloved country. I am proud that my grandmother was Betty Byrd, whose people came to historic Edgefield County, S.C., from Virginia following the Revolution. In tribute to her and to you, I have named one of my daughters "Byrd."

Mr. Chairman, I dedicate my remarks to your Democratic congressional delegation. There is not a more loyal, patriotic, capable, and devoted delegation in the Congress of the United States.

In the early history of our country, as now, there were those who believed in a powerful central government. There were those then, as now, who worshipped at the shrine of Federal power. It would have been easy for Thomas Jefferson the aristocrat, easy for Jefferson the classical scholar, to become a political conformist and drift with the Federal tide. Jefferson was a man of principle who had great ideals and faith in the people. Jefferson was humble, honest, and considerate of the opinions of others. Jefferson was a student of people. He believed in the dignity of the individual. He believed in the individual's ability to govern himself at the local and State level. Thomas Jefferson believed "The least governed are the best governed." Jefferson's philosophy was one of special privileges to none, but equal opportunity to all. Thomas Jefferson abhorred sectionalism.

Thomas Jefferson's idealogy was pitted against that of the Federalist. A heated political campaign developed for the Presidency in 1800. Jefferson became the target of hatred, vilification, and false rumor. Even the election was deadlocked and thrown into the House of Representatives. There a bitter battle raged against the philosophy of Jefferson.

When finally elected by the House and inaugurated, Jefferson, as President, did not follow a policy of vindictiveness, factionalism, or sectionalism. He used his influence and prestige to promote unity, harmony, and the general welfare. He never forgot the man on the frontier, the citizen in the log cabins nor the little shopkeeper and the small businessman. He never lost faith in the men at the grass roots. Under his quiet, unassuming leadership, the United States became a Federal Republic of sovereign, indestructible States. Under his guidance, jealousy between the former colonies disappeared and a great Nation emerged—a Nation respected throughout the world. He inaugurated a period of unprecedented prosperity, internal improvements, and trade and commerce. The Nation grew in population and wealth. It became a vastly expanded territory with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

Jefferson launched our great Democratic Party as the party of the people. He led the people to a better understanding of themselves and their role in a democratic society. Jefferson educated the people to their duties and responsibilities. He led them to realize they were a part of America. They began to look upon the Government as their agent—created and supported by themselves. They became self-reliant and independent. They had confidence in themselves and local institutions. They became accustomed under Jefferson to a minimum of Federal Government. They revolted against the very thought of Washington paternalism.

The firm foundation upon which the Democratic Party was launched and built by Jefferson carried it through the administrations of James Madison, the father of the Constitution, and James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine.

After Monroe, the Democratic Party entered a period of complacency, indifference, and partisan wrangling. The first product of Jefferson's philosophy emerged upon the national scene in 1828. Andrew Jackson was living proof of Jefferson's belief in equal opportunity. Andrew Jackson was the first to prove a log cabin frontier boy could go to the Presidency of the United States without the aid of powerful political machines and monopolistic wealth. Old Hickory, a native of the Carolina hill country and son of Tennessee, breathed vitality and courage into the Democratic Party. He attacked the evils of the day with alacrity and decision. He demonstrated the people's ability to think for themselves. Jackson was the first "typical American."

The people Jefferson and Jackson loved and led were often cold, hungry, and poor. Jefferson and Jackson gave these people hope and dignity. They pointed out to them the road to success and even fame. These frontiersmen came to know and to love liberty, to cherish freedom. They became the rank and file of our Democratic Party. They struggled to preserve opportunity. They looked to tomorrow with optimism and hope for their children. They knew they were a part of America's progress and our Nation's march to a world power. They added morale to our armies in time of war. They fought for the right to go from "rags to riches."

The Democratic Party was firmly launched by Jefferson and Jackson as the party of the people. The Democratic Party became a symbol of States rights and individual freedom. Through lean dark years, it could always be revived again by a return to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, and Woodrow Wilson revived and rallied the party time and again to the old standards.

The Democratic Party has traditionally championed opportunity, sound currency, a minimum of government, a balanced budget, and the Bill of Rights. Jeffersonian Democrats became liberals because they believed in the liberties of our people. In the South today, we are the true liberals. We believe in individual liberty, States rights, and local government. Jeffersonian Democrats became a symbol against centralized bureaucracy, excessive taxation, and stark Federal power. As long as the Democratic Party upheld these basic and fundamental principles, it grew stronger and stronger through the years. It withstood the frontal assaults of other great political parties and political combinations. The Democratic Party would go down in defeat, but, on principle, it would arise again. It would meet its enemies in open conflict and go on again to victory as it did in 1932. This was because the Democratic Party adhered strongly to the sound doctrines of Jefferson and Jackson. Principles never change. They are the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In the overwhelming Democratic victories of 1932 and 1936, we adhered to the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. The platform was one of sound money, States rights, balanced budget, reduced Government spending, and reduction in Government bureaucracy. On this platform, the Democratic Party was victorious. We were united on principle. We rejected political expediency; but oh, my friends, in these latter years we have fallen upon evil days. There is a division in our great party. There are those who would usurp the title of liberal and under it parade the infamous idealogy of national socialism and fascism. This division in our party has been caused by those who seek special privileges—privileges of the few as against the people; by those seeking gains they have not earned—selfish interests and personal power at the expense of liberty.

The National Chairman of our great party has become the tool of these special interests, these pressure groups, these Machiavellian exponents of Federal dictatorship. Were Jefferson and Jackson alive today, they would flatly reject such a philosophy. They would oppose the powerful political machines with bloc voters, political slush funds, and ward bosses. They would be shocked to see some so-called Democrats controlled like sheep and cattle by pressure groups for the personal gain and greater glory of their leaders. This philosophy is not the philosophy of Jefferson, but of Mussolini. It is not the philosophy of Jackson, but more like the philosophy of Hitler and Lenin. This national socialist clique is dedicated to a wel-

fare state. They believe all planning and thinking for the American people can best be done in Washington. They are conformists who are trying to brainwash the rank and file to their conformity. They have no confidence in the people's ability to govern themselves at the local and State level. They advocate every measure which will further regiment our people and destroy the rights of the States and local gocernments.

These powerful sources behind the National Chairman are seeking to divide and conquer. They have left the party of Jefferson and Jackson. They do not believe in Jeffersonian Democracy. They have adopted demagogy, intimidation, vindictiveness, and sectional discrimination. Their real purpose is to form a splinter party—to create a third party, a national socialist labor party.

The late Congressman Vito Marcantonio outlined this plan to me many times. He said that we want all of you Jeffersonian Democrats and conservatives in one party, while us leftists and believers in Federal socialism should be in another party. Someday our party will come to power and America will be launched into complete socialism with only one political party. This is the goal and objective of those using our national chairman. They have no hope of victory this year. They hope to promote another 4 years of the present administration. Then, the time will be right for them to launch America into socialism.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill warned me about the danger of a conservative and a liberal party. After a liberal administration there is nothing a conservative administration can do to restore free enterprise. It is simply too late. The Prime Minister warned that there must be strong conservative elements in both political parties.

With a united Democratic Party we can win the Presidency this year. We can win with the platform of 1932 and a candidate pledged to that platform. We can win with a candidate pledged to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. We can only win with a united party and united effort in a common cause.

The Jeffersonian Democrats are willing to meet in the middle of the road on the basic fundamental principles and issues. We in the South are not asking all elements of the party to join us on the right. We only ask the national chairman to meet us halfway. We will never abandon our convictions and go all the way to the left. We do believe there is room in the middle. There is a common meeting ground. There are mutual objectives.

The South is going to Los Angeles in good faith. We are not going to run out or back out before the firing starts. We are going to be there and fight openly for the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. We will seek to nominate candidates pledged to the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. We do not expect to be thrown out nor do we intend to throw anybody else out. The South will be heard from when the platform is written. We will oppose vindictive planks in the platform. We will oppose the platform being written by pressure groups, racketeers, or those claiming to speak for minorities. We are going to reject and oppose sectional discrimination. We will fight for harmony, unity, and a middle of the road platform. If radical and fascist elements gain control at the convention and throw certain Southern States out of the party, we will meet that tragedy when it arises with plans already formulated. We are determined to preserve the party of Jefferson and Jackson. We are determined to make every effort to preserve the freedoms of our country.

Eight of our first 12 Presidents were from the South. Since the election of Zachary Taylor in 1848, no Southern leader has even been nominated for the Presidency by either major political party. The South has been discriminated against for more than 100 years by the Democratic Party in its choice of presidential candidates. President Harry Truman in his "Memoirs" in volume 2, page 494, said, "DICK RUSSELL * * * had the ability, integrity, and honesty. He was one of the best informed men in the Senate * * * Senator RUSSELL was always able to present any problem in a clear and straightforward manner. * * * I believe that if RUSSELL had been from Indiana or Missouri or Kentucky, he may very well have been the President of the United States.

It is difficult for Jeffersonian Democrats to believe that real Democrats anywhere could vote against a southern nominee because of a place of residence. This attitude is undemocratic and even un-American. The South has never been guilty of such rank discrimination. The South was solid in its support of Grover Cleveland, John W. Davis, and Franklin Roosevelt of New York. It was solid in its support of William Jennings Bryan, a native of Illinois and resident of Nebraska. The South has time and again supported men like Woodrow Wilson from New Jersey, Jim Cox from Ohio, and Al Smith from New York. The South and the border State of Missouri gave Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, his only electoral votes. Those in the Democratic Party who would run out because of a Southern nominee are guilty of demagogery, discrimination, and prejudice. They do not belong in the same company with Jefferson and Jackson. The charge that a Southern Democrat could not be elected is a smokescreen to prevent one from being nominated. This year, a southern Democrat is our only hope for victory. With a middle-of-the-road platform and the solid South behind him, such a candidate would win millions of independent voters and conservative Republicans. He could be elected. We cannot win with fancy jokes and five-syllable words. The Democratic Party cannot win with the 1952 and 1956 platforms of agitation and prejudices—platforms forced on the party by pseudo-liberals and pressure groups. If we nominate a radical or egghead liberal with the same phony platform, our nominee again will be defeated. This socialist clique in our party was overwhelmingly rejected by the American people in 1952 and 1956.

If the Democratic Party is to survive, it must continue to champion the rights of the people. Yes, it must oppose monopoly and exploitation. It must oppose selfish interests and privileges to the few. The selfish interests are no longer just Wall Street and business monopoly. Selfish interests today are those gangsters and despots who exploit labor—those ruthless agitators who for personal gain exploit minorities. The special interest of today is big government. The Nation is threatened by bureaucracy, inflation, Government spending, and centralized power.

The once sovereign citizen is being crushed today by burdensome taxation, confiscation, and loss of freedom by big government. Inflation has wiped out the lifetime savings of our people. Social security cannot pay the house rent. Unemployment insurance and bank savings have depreciated causing hardship among the aged and the poor. Inflation has destroyed the purchasing power of the dollar. Our people live in constant fear of Federal gestapo. They spend anxious days and sleepless nights worrying about the tax collector. They often pay the Government more than they should through fear and complicated tax forms. The Democratic Party must meet this challenge. The Democratic Party should champion the cause of sound money, a balanced budget, and economy. We must give the people of America tax relief, tax revision, and simplified tax forms. We must make it possible for our aged and crippled to face the future with confidence and serenity. The small businesman must be freed from unbearable taxes, Goverment regulation, and red tape. I might remind my fellow Democrats that liberty in Germany was lost because of inflation. In 1923, the German housewife carried a basket of paper money to buy one loaf of bread. America is on that road today. We are on the road to bankruptcy, dictatorship, and a collapse of our economy. If William Jennings Bryan were alive today, he would be saying, "Do not crucify mankind on a cross of inflation. Do not bear down upon labor this crown of unbearable taxation."

The national leaders of both parties are in a cold war with each other. They have shocked the American people with promises to spend more. They only offer more fiscal irresponsibility and inflation. While this hayride to the left continues, the international situation is deteriorating. Our national defense is inadequate. Our highly touted bipartisan foreign policy has become one of censorship, spending, empire building, and failure. The Communists continue their fantastic gains.

The Democratic platform of 1960 should be positive. It should be forthright. It should put first things first. The greatest single issue before the American people today is one of survival. The Communist menace overshadows all others. It is a threat to the United States militarily, through subversion and through economic war. The Kremlin believes the United States will destroy itself by excessive spending and inflation. The American people are alarmed by this administration's apparent confidence in Khrushchev. This administration seems to forget that Khrushchev is a murderer, a ruthless killer of innocent people and is dedicated to world conquest. The great J. Edgar Hoover testified a few days ago before a Senate committee that the Community Party in America, aided by the recent visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, is now "more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic * * * the recent visit of Khrushchev has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans."

Khrushchev is being permitted to establish a base in Cuba, 90 miles from our coastline. His agents have incited riots in the Panama Canal Zone, threatening this vital link with Western commerce. The Communists have infiltrated Venezuela, thus threatening the all important Caribbean from the north and the south.

The Democratic platform must offer to the American people a clear-cut and forthright foreign policy. We must reject appeasement and compromise. We must meet the Communist threat with the courage of Andrew Jackson. We cannot coexist with those sworn to bury us. We must warn our people of the utter hopelessness of summit meetings with those responsible for the crimes in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. We must remember the pathetic Chamberlain and Daladier at Munich.

Our Democratic platform should call for the best defense in the world with a new world strategy geared to the missile age. If we are to survive, we must retain control of the skies and conquer space. Until the missile gap is closed, of course, our strategic air command should be partly airborne at all times. This is elemental and plain commonsense. Had our fleet at Pearl Harbor been seaborne, this disaster would have been averted. Billions can be saved in our national defense program by a consolidation of our missile program, a consolidation of our various air forces and a common supply system.

The Democratic platform must offer hope to industry and labor from excessive unfair foreign imports. We must return to the trade concepts of Cordell Hull. The trade program of Cordell Hull has been malad-

ministered and sabotaged. We have lost our favorable trade balance through a flood of unfair imports from low-wage countries. Many of these countries have no wage and hour legislation. Some use child and even prison labor. Free trade is impossible with nations having no social security, no unemployment insurance, and wage scales as low as ten cents per hour. These imports can undermine our wage and hour legislation passed during Democratic administrations. It can undermine social security and our child labor laws. It is creating vast unemployment and could well wreck the economy of the United States. Russian automobiles are being permitted to enter the United States. Textile mills are being built in Russia with American money, setting the stage for a flood of Communist goods made with Siberian slave labor. We must, as Democrats, meet this threat head on, establish a trade policy that is truly reciprocal and save the American worker and American farmer from slave competition.

The Democratic party platform must promise to eliminate waste and extravagance in foreign aid. We must reduce foreign aid. We owe more money than all of the rest of the world combined. Our gold reserves have poured abroad. We are in a precarious fiscal position. While creating inflation at home, high taxes and an ever increasing national debt, we are building up competition abroad with our own workers and farmers.

The Democratic platform should contain a plank to free our farm families from Government control and depressing prices caused by these stupendous surpluses. The cattle farmer is relatively prosperous only because of a minimum of Government controls. Our farmers are forced to plant less and less while surpluses grow larger and larger. The family-sized farm must be preserved. Rural people have always furnished balance and stability to representative government. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were largely products of rural philosophy.

The Democratic platform must deal with the stupendous annual interest on the national debt, the national debt itself, and a balanced budget. We must offer some encouragement to the youth of our country by reducing the national mortgage on his future.

The Democratic Party platform must offer tax revision on a fair and equitable basis. We can offer a tax revision that will encourage incentive, initiative and the willingness of businessmen to take a chance, employ more workers as well as expand and grow.

The Democratic Party can offer to every American the prospect of a raise in salary through sound money and curbed inflation.

The Democratic Party must reaffirm its faith in our capitalistic system of free enterprise. We must reaffirm our faith in the opportunity system that gave to America the highest standard of living ever known to man. We must guarantee to business less Government interference.

The Democratic Party, as always, must uphold constitutional government, States' rights and individual liberty. We must protect our people from an ever more powerful Executive, and over zealous Supreme Court and now a World Court. Even minorities who constantly run to Washington cannot find in the Executive, in the Attorney General or a Federal Gestapo the fullest measure of protection or equal consideration. They cannot find in concentrated Federal power the avenue to more freedom and opportunity. This can only come through the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, States' rights and free local government. Centralized power can and will become the machine of intimidation, persecution, and liquidation of minorities. It can never become so on a nationwide basis as long as we have sovereign States and free local government.

With a candidate pledged to Jeffersonian democracy and this platform, we can win. Only 51 percent of the American people eligible to vote cast their ballots in the presidential election of 1948; only 60 percent in 1956. With this platform, the unemployed glass workers, the chemical workers, and the coal miners of West Virginia and Pennsylvania will go to the polls. The textile workers and shopkeepers of New England will have an incentive to vote. The curtailed autoworkers of Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois will take heart. Millions of farmers and small businessmen in the West and Midwest will vote for the first time in many years. They will vote Democratic. The housewife will be out on election day to protect her family from cheap money. The Democratic Party cannot win with a me too platform. We must and can give the American people a clear-cut choice. We can win with the 45 million people who did not vote in 1956 because they had no choice.

One of the most glorious chapters in the history of our Republic was written by the magnificent Commonwealth of Virginia. The story of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights is largely a Virginia story. Four of our first five Presidents were nurtured by the soil and environment of the Old Dominion. Four of the five greatest military commanders in the history of the Western World were Virginians. We cannot imagine the American Republic without Patrick Henry, George Washington, and George Mason. Your Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our great Democratic Party, is revered and loved by the whole free world. The visitors to our Nation's Capital from the remote places of this earth pause at the beautiful Jefferson Memorial to pay homage to the memory of a Virginian dedicated to freedom. Millions from throughout the world read in hushed silence, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Citation to Milton S. Kronheim, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last night, the National Conference of Christians and Jews bestowed upon Milton S. Kronheim, Sr., its annual brotherhood award.

Mr. Kronheim is a kind human being, who has never hesitated in lending a helping hand to any person or cause in need. He is constantly furthering the cause of brotherhood among mankind, and this country today is a better place in which to live because of men like Milton Kronheim.

I can think of no one more deserving of this award, and I ask unanimous consent that the citation given to Mr. Kronheim by the National Conference of Christians and Jews be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

The National Conference of Christians and Jews acclaims for his devotion to national and community service in the field of interreligious and intercultural concern Milton S. Kronheim, Sr. a man who anticipates a need and acts upon it without waiting to be summoned; a man who quietly and without ostentation seeks opportunities to serve and assist his fellow men; a man who has implemented a dream by sponsoring Interfaith Day in the National Capital area; a man of humility, of honor, an outstanding citizen of his community, his Nation, and the world, who by his deeds has brought closer the realization of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Suwannee River Regional Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that libraries are one of the greatest blessings of humanity. If men are to remain free, they must read. They must also be able to discriminate between truth and error. I am very pleased with the great progress we are making in the Eighth District of Florida in the development of our libraries, made possible by the Library Service Act passed in 1956. In this connection I am pleased to enclose an article entitled "Suwannee River Regional Library," by the director of the Florida State Library, Verna Nistendirk, from Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

The article follows:

SUWANNEE RIVER REGIONAL LIBRARY
(By Verna Nistendirk)

Dreams do come true, especially in the Suwannee River Regional Library area. When the Library Services Act was passed in 1956, the small Suwannee County Library interpreted LSA to mean "Let Suwannee advance." The county library could not meet the requirements of the State plan for a grant because it had only $6,312.75 income, the yield of one-half mill of the nonexempt tax valuation, and a population of 17,500. So the library board approached the Women's Club at Mayo, county seat of adjoining Lafayette County. With their help, the county commission agreed to appropriate one-half mill, only $1,182, to establish library service in little Lafayette County, population 3,400. This was October 1957.

By January 1958, the two county library boards had formed Suwannee River Regional Library, with $28,204 in funds. Of this amount, $9,595 came from local funds and $18,629 from grant funds. But their problems were not over. No qualified librarian could be found. A consultant from the State library was loaned to them to administer the region until a librarian was employed. The 3,100 book collection rapidly grew to some 10,000 titles, some loaned from the State library. A bookmobile was ordered and put on the road. By September, each of the counties had appropriated money for the next year's operation and a librarian, Henry J. Blasick, was on duty. The second and final year of the grant was about to begin.

The headquarters library at Live Oak and the community libraries at Mayo and Branford were attractive with fresh green paint and new furniture. They were air conditioned and on the shelves were brightly jacketed books. Personnel on the small green bookmobile and in the branches were

alert and friendly. The people from all over the county responded to the good service. Residents ranging from the county commissioners to the schoolchildren talked about books and libraries.

On December 2, 1958, a select group of citizens representing key organizations and officials from six adjoining counties were invited to Live Oak to talk about library service. The State senator, county officials and library board members and staff as well as State library personnel explained the program to the visitors from the five counties that responded. At the close of the program those counties were issued an invitation to join the region if they were interested.

The response was immediate. The bookmobile visited all these counties; the librarian, board members, and the public library consultant from the State library talked to groups all over the counties. On February 14, 1959, Gilchrist County voted to join the regional library system and to provide funds for its support. In March, Hamilton County officially moved to join the region. During the first week of May, Taylor, Columbia, and Madison Counties joined in that order.

These north Florida counties are not unusual. They are tobacco-farming, pulpwood-producing counties with some furniture manufacturing and other small industries in the towns. No town had a population of over 10,000 and there are no wealthy residents. There is a new junior college in Madison but no other college or university in the area which has a total population of 75,695. All except Taylor County are on the beautiful Suwannee River. The region reaches from the Georgia State line to the Gulf of Mexico, roughly 90 miles north and south and about the same distance east and west. Traffic is no great problem on most of the excellent roads.

Gilchrist, Hamilton and Lafayette Counties had no public library of any sort within their boundaries. Columbia and Taylor Counties had very small popular-donation Woman's Club libraries with no visible support. Madison County Commission provided less than $1,000 per annum to be divided among the two small libraries at Madison and Greenville in that county. Only Suwannee had made real effort toward library support previously.

The next stop was to organize the region and get ready for service at the beginning of the new fiscal year on October 1, 1959. Each county had a five-member board. The 35 members are the full regional library board. They meet quarterly, rotating their meetings from one place to another. Normal attendance is 23 to 25 persons. Matters of policy and all-over procedure are of concern to this group. Details for any county are taken up on the county level and any county board may meet on call. The regional librarian attends all county meetings as well as regional meetings. The assistant librarian serves as secretary to the board.

The seven county boards sign a regional library contract and each county signs an individual contract with the State library board when it receives its rural development grant funds. The regional board employs the head librarian. They approve his employment of the rest of the staff. Each county board helps with decisions on bookmobile stops, publicity and public relations to acquaint the area with the library and with plans for raising the budget, promoting State aid and raising the caliber of service.

On July 1, a trained assistant librarian was employed. A second bookmobile was ordered and many more books were processed to prepare for the new service area.

Suwannee and Lafayette Counties had completed their rural development grant periods but each would receive a small bonus for bringing other counties into the program. Altogether, for 1959–60, the local libraries would provide $36,094 and the rural development grants would bring $38,997 to the area.

Actually, each county provides more than the equivalent of one-half mill. The city of Trenton built a lovely new red brick building to specifications to house the Gilchrist County Library. Madison and Mayo use discarded jails but they are freshly painted and there is attractive furnishings. Lake City in Columbia County was once police headquarters and a floor covering display room. It has been completely remodeled with donated work by interested citizens. When all the donated paint was not exactly the same color, they poured it all together and the exterior turned out to be a lovely medium green. The Hamilton County Library in Jasper was once a department store warehouse. The owner donated air conditioning and the city of Jasper pays the rent. Interested citizens provided furniture and drapes. The Woman's Club building in Perry houses the Taylor County Library. The communities pay for all utilities and have often made other nice gifts. By next summer, all nine community libraries will be air conditioned.

October 1959, was a big month for the region with formal library openings at Trenton, Perry and Jasper. Lake City Library was opened a little later. There are 9 community libraries and 2 bookmobiles with 127 stops serving the 7 counties. The headquarters at Live Oak is open 50 hours weekly, Perry and Lake City are open 40 hours, Mayo 24 hours, Madison, Jasper, Trenton and Branford are open 20 hours weekly and little Greenville's station is open 10 hours. All have access to telephone service for reference and renewals.

From a small collection of 3,100 books in 1957, the region now has 23,500 books of which about 3,000 were the gift of the Miami Public Library. These are good titles no longer used at Miami's branches or gifts which are duplicated in sufficient quantity in their collection. The Suwannee region has approximately 4,500 books on loan from the State library. Between 7,500 and 8,500 books are in circulation from the various outlets at all times.

Most of the current book budget of $13,271 has been expended and the region has far too few books. Many basic titles are not available with this small sum. Demands range from scholarly to the most ephemeral. Even with the constant use of interlibrary loans, all demands are not met. The Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award is just like manna from heaven. Reference materials, duplications of good titles, and some needed new material will be purchased. Every book will be well used. Most popular material will be rotated from library to library on a quarterly basis.

Don't Drink the Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Salt Lake City Tribune of February 16, 1960:

DON'T DRINK THE WATER

A recent warning of widespread stream pollution in Wyoming by an official of that State's health department should be heeded by other States in the region.

Sanitary Engineer David Green said that the tourist industry, second richest in Wyoming, was in danger of being destroyed by failure to safeguard the health of visitors.

While the number of persons using campgrounds is growing fantastically, only a few of the 55 roadside picnic areas, municipal and private campgrounds, and 145 Federal camp areas in Wyoming are supplied with safe water, Green warned.

While the ordinary person would not think of using water from a stream running through an urban area, many tourists mistakenly believe that the clear sparkling water in mountain streams is safe, he said. In many cases it is diluted sewage, the sanitary engineer warned.

The large number of campers using the scenic areas with insufficient sanitary facilities is contributing to the disease problem, Green said.

"Don't drink the water" signs are being placed in several of Wyoming's vacation areas, but clearly this is not enough. Alleviation of stream polution, more sanitary facilities, and a larger staff of sanitarians are needed.

Some of the States with the richest potential in expanded tourist business may be "killing the goose that lays the golden eggs" by failing to cope with pollution.

For the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column of Ed Sullivan entitled "For the Record" New York Daily News, February 19, 1960:

FOR THE RECORD

(By Ed Sullivan)

Marines died at Iwo Jima and Guadalcanal for the common good of Americans.

For the common good, Air Force kids under Doolittle died over Japan. Navy men died in many oceans.

In World War II, 291,557 American youngsters died and in the Korean war, 33,629 died—all for the common good.

You wonder if Hollywood producers Stanley Kramer and Otto Preminger aren't so bemused by individual rights that they've forgotten the larger goal of the common good.

Hollywood writers Dalton Trumbo and Nedrick Young were well within their individual American rights in seeking refuge in the fifth amendment, which wisely was designed to protect each of us from testifying without a lawyer, without the right to confront accusers in open court and without the right of cross-examination. Lacking the protection of the fifth amendment, individuals might say something that easily could incriminate or degrade them.

But in the clear and present danger to our country that is posed by Russia, the common good becomes the issue of greater importance. Individual rights become subordinate to the common good.

Stanley Kramer, of course, is well within his rights in engaging Nedrick Young. Just as Otto Preminger is well within his rights in employing Dalton Trumbo.

Equally the American Legion is well within its rights in directing the attention of Americans to the fact that these two writers

refused to answer questions of the House committee that called them before it. The American Legion is well within its rights in proposing to call further attention to the issue and to discourage attendance at the pictures in which these writers are involved by peacefully picketing theaters where these pictures will be shown.

Kramer says that he will vigorously fight against picketing.

Well, the American Legion can go back to May 12, 1948, when I played the Roxy Theater as the companion stage show to Director William H. Wellman's "The Iron Curtain."

We were picketed by Commie sympathizers for 4 weeks because this picture, starring Dana Andrews and Gene Tierney with June Havoc, Edna Best and Nicholas Joy in support, dramatized the spy network established by the Russian Embassy in Ottawa, spreading all over Canada. Kate Cameron, in reviewing the Roxy attraction, called attention to the screaming, jeering Commie picketeers.

The night before we opened, the Commies held a mass meeting at Madison Square Garden and marched from the Garden to the Roxy and staged a tremendous demonstration. For the 4 weeks we played there, the Commies continued their noisy opposition.

At that time, I heard no voice out of Hollywood protesting the right of Commie sympathizers to picket us. Certainly I heard no sound of protest from Stanley Kramer or Otto Preminger.

To refresh memories, let me point out that the Commie opposition was so violently vocal that the Roxy Theater could not persuade any headliner to appear on the stage. So I agreed to the date.

During our Roxy run, the doorman at the adjacent Taft Hotel, a big rawboned Irishman by the name of Ryan, pointed out to the police that many of the Commie picketers around the theater were employees at the Taft Hotel.

The Commies, by exerting pressure on the hotel management through Commie dominated hotel unions, forced the hotel to discharge the doorman Ryan.

This column exposed the story of Ryan's discharge. Immediately, bellboys and personnel from other hotels rushed to Ryan's aid by picketing the Taft. Their ranks were swelled by American Legion and Catholic War Veteran picketeers.

The Hotel Taft reengaged Ryan. So picketing often is in the common good.

Medical Progress: A Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the Beth Israel Hospital dinner at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Boston, Mass., on November 29, 1959:

MEDICAL PROGRESS: A LOOK AHEAD

It is a genuine pleasure to join with you this evening as you reflect upon the many accomplishments of the last half century and look ahead to the challenges of the future. Beth Israel's record has been one of inspired service and steady growth since the early dispensary days of the Mount Sinai Hospital which led to the creation of this outstanding teaching institution. I have long been aware of the vital role of such institutions, and I heartily congratulate Beth Israel upon its long and distinguished service.

During the past score of Beth Israel Hospital's 30 years of progressive teaching, research, and healing activities at this site, I, too, have been deeply concerned with the serious matter of building our Nation's United States, where health issues have alprivilege to serve in the Congress of the United States, where health issues have always been my primary concern. After these many years of close association with medical scientists and educators, as well as with those who determine Federal policy, I welcome opportunities such as this to look ahead toward further medical progress.

Foremost in the advances of the last few decades of life-saving progress in medicine has been the application of research findings from the medical and biological sciences. This period has been the most fruitful one that the world has ever seen with respect to scientific achievement, and we are indeed fortunate to be living in these times. As a layman, I cannot presume to discuss specific details of medical research. However, without enumerating the thousands of developments including antibiotics, heart surgery and all the methods and materials for diagnosing, treating, and preventing disease, I wish to express my profound appreciation of them.

I am particularly pleased with the part that hospitals such as this have played in bringing health benefits to the public. Research training for our young doctors in real hospital situations, with real patients and with the supervision of senior physicians has proved itself, as you all know, a keystone in the whole national health picture. Our ablest medical investigators and practitioners continue to come from this background. The Nation looks to your institution and others like it for both the development of our physician potentials and the evaluation and application of new research findings.

Because of my interest in medical and health research, I am aware, as I'm sure you are, that this is the shining hope of the human race for a healthier, happier future. In my role as chairman of the House subcommittee receiving the testimony of medical scientists in connection with appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I do a sizable amount of "homework" myself, reading over the testimony and the reports that sketch the progress of research and its probable application to practice.

From this "homework," I gather that our medical researchers now think that we can look forward perhaps—and I know that they stress the perhaps—to such advances as the following:

1. Solution to the present question of whether some or many human cancers are caused by viruses, with all that this implies for possible prevention or treatment.

2. Better, or perhaps complete, understanding of the artery disease which medical men call atherosclerosis. From such understanding would come methods that physicians could advise for prevention or treatment of this major cause of death.

3. Better drugs or other means for treating high blood pressure, resulting from an understanding of its cause and, with this understanding, development even of a rational method for its prevention.

4. More and better vaccines for control or prevention of infectious diseases, including tuberculosis and the common cold.

5. New knowledge in the field of mental and emotional disease, not only of environmental factors concerning or causing mental illness, but also of the role of drugs and, most importantly, of the chemistry and physiology of the brain.

Perhaps from advances in this last area will come the most striking changes in the practice of medicine. I have been told that physicians in the future—and I hope it will not be a too distant future—will be applying much new knowledge in the field of mental health to both individual patients and to community groups. Through such an approach we—you as physicians and supporters and I as a legislator—may be able to help in achieving a more intelligent social environment, so that each of our younger and our older citizens can better make his total contribution to his community and his nation.

A major concern of everyone in the health professions today, and an even greater concern for the years ahead, is the growing proportion of elder citizens in our population. We have much to learn about the basic processes of aging, to say nothing of our joint responsibilities to this group which the increasing longevity brought by medical progress assures that most of us will join. As many of you may know, the bill which I introduced and sponsored for a White House Conference on Aging became law last year. With careful groundwork throughout all the States paving the way, the Conference is scheduled for January 1961. I know that this audience will need no urging to consider and to act upon the recommendations of this important meeting when they are promulgated, and I hope that they will represent a real platform for progress against the aging problem.

I know that you here today look forward especially to such future advances, as I do, and I can assure you that as our scientists show us, through their research, the way to improve the health of individuals and of communities, I as a legislator, stand ready to help in every appropriate way to implement the improvements. Furthermore, I am confident that your staff is keeping closely tuned to the scientific pulse, eager to relay the very latest research results from the laboratories to medical practice.

Now, let me talk a few minutes about some of my hopes in the broader area of world health—the area of international medical research. Probably some of you here this evening have studied or worked abroad. Certainly many of you, while students, interns, and residents, established friendships with men and women who, students or interns then, are now your colleagues in medicine in other lands. Such associations have undoubtedly shown you what a strong common bond medical science forms between world powers.

This summer, I was fortunate enough to attend the World Health Assembly with some of these dedicated health workers from all over the world. As in several previous assemblies, I was one of the official delegates and, as before, the meeting was an encouraging one to all those who have high hopes for medical progress and its role as an aid to world peace.

A major concern of the Assembly this year was the advancement of medical research. In my opinion, no subject could be more important, or more timely, for deliberation by the Assembly.

On my way to and from Geneva I visited medical and health workers in London, Dublin, and Rome. Everywhere I went, I found these men and women in agreement with me on the importance of expanding medical research. They feel, as I do, that expanding research and disease control around the world is one—perhaps the one—truly global effort in which all nations can and will join as real partners.

As I visited various healthworkers, and talked with others at Geneva, I gained fresh, firsthand knowledge of some of the health problems of the world, some of the potentials, some of the programs and their costs. These matters may be familiar to

you. Yet, perhaps, the pace of modern business and the demands of daily practice have prevented you from keeping fully informed of worldwide—as well as our own—needs for research, for more trained medical manpower, for health facilities, and for better education and information dissemination. I can assure you that the needs are many and great, but, equally, I am certain that we are entering a new era of greater interest than we have ever seen, on the part of more people everywhere, in doing something really progressive to meet these needs.

World interest and participation in medical research is at a high level, a fact which is reassuring because our total current medical knowledge has been derived from all quarters of the globe. You know better than I that the roots of most great medical discoveries lie in scientific findings contributed by many investigators over the course of many years of work.

An all-important segment of any medical research program is that of clinical investigation. It is common knowledge that careful observations at the bedside and in the clinic—such as the men and women in general and special practice and in hospital practice make every day—have often pointed the way to important advances in the control of disease. This hospital has done a good share of this kind of work and I'm certain that it will multiply such activities in the coming years.

In today's newer hospital facilities we can observe several significant trends in addition to research orientition. City hospitals are moving toward the suburbs—and it has been predicted that probably most of them will be in or beyond the suburbs within 50 years. Closely related to this movement is the trend of hospital architecture toward more spacious and appealing, even motel-type, accommodations, intended to foster more personalized care.

Along with the blessings of increased medical knowledge, we must expect that only the larger hospitals will be able to offer the full range of expensive diagnostic and treatment services and equipment. Each such major institution may be affiliated with a number of smaller hospitals, clinics, and community centers which might perform their supporting functions more effectively in an integrated health care structure of this kind.

Many communities are approaching this kind of medical care organization today, I understand. To all communities, I would recommend that they look ahead 5 to 10 years, or more, to assess their anticipated population growth and the extent of their expected resources and every other foreseeable, related factor. Now is the proper time for community leaders to determine how their present institutions may contribute to future medical care, and what must be done to offer the latest discoveries of medical science to the community.

Increased medical services will most certainly be accompanied by increased costs. Since hospitals must compete in today's labor market for medical care personnel, wages must rise. The necessity for more tests, personalized care, and more complicated equipment can only mean higher costs. A few factors will help to offset increased costs, but experience shows that costs will inevitably go up.

Integrated care planning should reduce costs by eliminating duplication of complicated equipment. Then, too, a concerted effort to shorten patient stay at the hospital will help to ease individual burdens. Increased outpatient service would also result in reduced burdens plus more effective use of available space, but obviously such measures cannot overcome manifold economic pressures.

However, I don't believe that there is any likelihood of a swing to socialized medicine. Present trends suggest that a vast extension and stabilization of prepaid medical and hospital care plans of various kinds will absorb much of the cost to the consumer. Most Americans still have a strong independent nature characterized by the desire to pay their just debts, and there are bound to be solutions to the problem of adequate medical care for all if we all will work hard enough together to find them.

In complex medical financial problems of national scope, the Federal Government will take action, as it has in the past. We are all well aware of the appropriations which have been made in the interest of national health and which have been continually, rightfully, and needfully on the upswing. I can assure you that we in Congress are making every effort to see that the taxpayer's dollars will be appropirated and spent only when they are urgently needed and only where they can do the most good for the advancement of the people's health.

In a moment, I would like to mention some of the current pressing medical problems which are being deliberated in many places today, and which influence any looking to the future. First, however, I want to set forth a few of the basic, general considerations which I follow in judging between the many competing needs for Federal funds:

1. The most vital factor in the strength of a State or nation is the general health of the people. Poor health can sap the nation's strength and undermine its productivity.

2. Medical science needs to learn much more about the basic laws of human health and illness. We must have more medical research in order to increase our healing resources.

3. Much of the medical knowledge which is already in our hands is not being applied as widely as it should to fight disease and relieve suffering.

4. Money wisely spent on health is by far the greatest bargain anywhere in the economy.

These are among the truths which I hold uppermost in my mind in presenting national medical issues to the Congress and the President. During the past year these principles led me to call attention to problems which seriously threaten to impair the progress of medical science * * * and its application as well. If you will allow me to quote from a letter I wrote to the President this summer, it will highlight, I believe, the medical manpower problem's practical contents and those closely related problems affecting our hopes for the future progress of medicine: the needed research and teaching facilities and the current care needs of our people which compete for our tax dollars.

My opening paragraph to the President read as follows: "The Nation is facing a shortage of 3,000 physicians and 4,000 dentists over the next 10-year period. This prospect imperils the maintenance of our present health standards and precludes the expansion demanded by our growing and changing population. It will deny needed improvement in the level, quality, and distribution of the Nation's health and medical care services."

I went on to explain in some detail that these estimates were based on highly predictable population trends and the ration of physicians and dentists to population. I also pointed out that the medical schools admitted that they could do but little about increasing the current rate of graduates.

The President's reply to my letter stated that this problem required still more investigation to substantiate what I believed to be well-supported estimates of the needs. Naturally, I was more than pleased when, just a few days ago, eminent consultants reported similar findings.

The report of the Consultant Group on Medical Education to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service concluded that probably the greatest immediate obstacle to expanding the Nationu's medical education capacity is the problem of financing needed physical facilities, particularly those for teaching as contrasted to research and hospital construction which have been federally aided, as you know, quite substantially.

Thus we see that right now, in the face of aroused awareness of the continuing need for more research and research facilities, we must consider the practical need to staff our laboratories of the future as well as to increase our future supply of practitioners and teachers. Medical knoweldge has progressed tremendously in the last few years, but to be realistic we should liken present-day understanding of health and disease to an iceberg, the true dimensions of which are still hidden from our view.

Now, as we pay tribute to those who foresaw the need for this institution at the turn of the century, and those who underwrote its start as a teaching institution 30 years ago, we too must plan for the future. We must look ahead with the full appreciation of the past roles of voluntary organizations and federally supported agencies, knowing that both are essential to medical progress in this country.

Teaching hospitals like this are the essential places to which the medical graduate looks for the final refinements of his education, much as the telescope mirror looks to the polishing rouge to make it effective in focusing on our environment. These training grounds for our budding medical scientists and practitioners have a fundamental responsibility to increase their capabilities. As the population growth soars, your leaders must anticipate the needs and devise effective means to expand, but they may also anticipate greater Federal endorsement in accordance with the trends of increased medical appropriations in recent years.

It is time to seek out the means for the needed expansion, and I'm sure that this audience can be as resourceful, if not more so, as the Beth Israel leaders were in the early thirties.

It is time, too, to be reexamining the hospital's position in relation to the other health facilities in the city. How much larger can it and should it grow? What additional functions it can undertake and what services might better be done elsewhere are questions which I'm sure you answer every year. I only urge that these answers be derived in proper perspective to your overall community health organization.

Finally, since you have such a vital interest in the graduates of the Nation's medical schools, it is time to consider your own roles, both as a teaching unit and as individuals, in fostering basic medical education.

These are just a few thoughts to bear in mind as you look ahead to ever greater medical achievements. I'm sure you will have many more ideas.

The road ahead may not be an easy one. No doubt it will take more of the persistence, knowledge, patience, and hard work that paved the way to accomplishment in the past. But, with your continued vigor and enthusiasm, I promise that the results will surpass your highest expectations.

Further Concentration in the Food Industry Noted in Article by Ed Wimmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed Wimmer, of Cincinnati, is known and recognized throughout the United States as an outstanding advocate of small business. His efforts in this direction are unrelenting. They are especially effective for they reflect his wide knowledge and understanding of the problems facing the millions of small business concerns striving to maintain their competitive strength despite the high degree of concentration resulting from increased mergers and corporate acquisitions.

Ed Wimmer, who is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, writes a column each week for the Cincinnati Enquirer. Recently, he wrote about the plans of one of the large national chains to expand its operations, to buy out a number of existing retail stores. I ask unanimous consent that his article which appeared in the February 8, 1960, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL TEA TO INVADE OHIO VALLEY: CONGRESS STUDIES TREND

(By Ed Wimmer)

The National Tea Co., billion-dollar food chain headquartered in Canada, has announced plans to invade the Cincinnati and Dayton, Ohio, market. Says an official of the company:

"We may acquire existing outlets or open new markets."

Giant National Tea was acquired by Garfield Weston & Associates in 1955, which tied the chain to George Weston Ltd., Toronto, distributor of many food products throughout Canada, which, in turn, operated Weston Biscuit Co. with seven plants in the United States. The Southern Biscuit Co., Richmond, Va., American Biscuit & Cracker Co., Tacoma, Wash., Loblaw Groceterias with 150 stores in Ontario; Loblaw, Inc., with 146 stores in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio; the Council Oaks chain with 87 supers plus other small chains in Tenessee and Mizsissippi, plus H. A. Smith Wholesale Grocery Co., Detroit, Mich.

Announcement of new invasions by officials of this huge conglomerate followed closely on the heels of a Federal indictment charging National Tea with monopolistic practices similar to those brought against several other chains. It also comes at a time when various congressional committees are studying means to halt or unscramble the biggest combines in all retail fields, among which are three bills by JAMES ROOSEVELT, which seek to:

"Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit vertical integration in the food industry; amend Packers and Stockyards Act to get the chains out of the meatpacking business and keep packers out of the retail business, and amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to require notification of any merger involving a company worth more than $10 million."

A subcommittee headed by ROOSEVELT held hearings in numerous areas last year, and members expressed considerable alarm over trends to monopoly in the chainstore field. Figures were given out which showed the three biggest chains in control of "30 percent of all retail food sales in the United States, with three chains accounting for 47 percent of food sales by chains." In most of the largest cities a handful of giants were in virtual control, and their greed for more stores, factories, and other enterprises is without parallel in American history.

Certainly, no community is bettered and the whole country is greatly harmed by such trends. Students over the United States no longer look to the retail field for opportunities to become independent, accountable citizens. Furthermore, all student polls show a growing belief that all big businesses and banks should be taken over by the Government, many saying their chances of becoming a "free, creative, moral, individual personality" are too slim with monopolistic trends what they are.

It was America's most illustrous historian, Charles Beard, who proposed a system of "domestic cartels, operated by a planning commission controlled by labor, industry, and Government" George Romney, American Motors president, says that such controls are just around the corner if the Bigs are not broken up, and press opinion all over the United States is swinging to this view.

Every time a chain buys another chain, an advertiser disappears. Brokers, wholesalers, salesmen, advertising men—everyone—is harmed, and fewer employers mean more power built up in bigger unions, giving collectivistic trends in agriculture, finance, and government, another spurt.

A policy statement of the Committee For Economic Development sets forth that "no free society can survive on any foundation other than one which guarantees a maximum of individual enterprise, and a minimum of power in the hands of the few."

Here you have the key to a program of decentralization that could unlock the greatest period of spiritual, economic, and political regeneration in the history of the world.

Boys Town Jerusalem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in bringing to the attention of the Congress a report of the progress of a most worthy project, Boys Town of Jerusalem. This undertaking, which has done much to foster our good relations with the State of Israel, has been nurtured and maintained by the voluntary contributions and efforts of a dedicated group of Americans whose purpose is not only to guide young Israeli boys on the path of education and democratic ideals, but to foster by example, such a spirit throughout the world. At its fifth annual fundraising dinner, it honored Henry L. Schenk, one of New York's leading philanthropists. The organization is under the guidance of Ira Guilden, president; Samuel M. Elowsky, chairman of the board; and vice presidents, Max Abrams, Mortimer Edelstein, Samuel Herskowitz, Alexander P. Hirsch, Henry Hirsch, Morris Kavy, Marvin Kratter, Samuel S. Schneierson, and Isaac Sholom.

The address of the evening was delivered by Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, president of the City College of New York. Dr. Gallagher's talk is of such national significance that I herewith place it into the RECORD:

It is a great honor to be permitted to stand here tonight to pay tribute to a man, an institution, and a nation. And because the man is a distinguished leader in business and philanthropy like Henry L. Schenk, the institution is Boys Town Jerusalem, and the nation is Israel, this honor is for me a personal pleasure as well.

And this personal pleasure, coupled as it is with warm congratulations to those who provide the funds for the upbuilding of Boys Town Jerusalem, ought to give to my words tonight a special quality of appreciation and meaning. Indeed, that had been my intention, as I thought about what I should say tonight. But in the weeks which have intervened between the day of my acceptance of the invitation to speak and this night of my appearance, other concerns have crowded in upon us. Tonight we see the bright picture of educational philanthropy against the somber backdrop of recent events. My words of warmth and congratulation must, therefore, be spoken with a heart that is heavy and a spirit not untroubled.

Fourteen years after the brutal inhumanities of nazism had been halted, and 12 years after Israel became a free nation, the ugliness of anti-Semitism reappears and the uneasy peace of the Near East teeters uncertainly. This fifth annual dinner of Boys Town Jerusalem convenes under a gathering cloud of worldwide proportions, a cloud which has not yet shut out the sun, but one in which the gathering storm is forecast.

There are those who would dismiss recent events with a shrug, insisting that there is no organized pattern to indicate a world conspiracy. They are probably correct in asserting that there is not at this moment a worldwide organized conspiracy, but they are wrong in shrugging off what is happening. For if there is no organized movement, then we are witnessing something far more sinister and dangerous, the recrudescence of bigotry and hatred and inhumanity, without an organization to call it forth. Swastikas painted on a German synagog have been matched by paint daubers and window breakers and cemetery desecraters in England and Italy and the United States of America. Not only in Cologne, but also in Brooklyn. Not only in London, but also on Staten Island. Not only in Rome, but also in Manhattan. And in Atlanta and Chicago and the Bronx and Queensboro. If nobody organized it, and all these things only happened by spontaneous imitation, then the truth is that the world is peopled by a humanity which everywhere carries within its breast the dark sentiments of hatred, contempt, and bigotry.

To be sure, there have been abortive attempts by older teenagers to set themselves up as junior-size Hitlers. Here in New York City, every arrest connected with the vandalizing of religious edifices has been of persons not yet in their majority. It might be said by some that this is only a form of juvenile delinquency. It is delinquency, all right; and its identified practitioners are juveniles—but it is no innocent passing fad like rock and roll. It is not just another hula hoop craze. It is the crazy contagion of vicious example. And when a judge characterized it as treason, an offense punishable by death, he was technically outside the law but actually well within the spirit and meaning of it. For this is the contagion

which sent 6 million emaciated bodies to the ovens. This is the contagion which kills the body and poisons the spirit of man. It is a contagion far older than the Black Plague of the Middle Ages, far more destructive in its ultimate potential, far more to be feared.

This is the disease with which Hitler infected a desperate Germany; and in the fevered flush of that sickness a whole continent was laid waste.

This is the sickness with which the lords of the Kremlin have infected the people of the Soviets; and in the sullen obstinance of that disease, Jewish culture has been smothered.

This is the nauseous malady with which the white citizens councils infect America; and that is what put the bullet-riddled body of a Negro truckdriver into the muddy waters of a Mississippi river.

This is the curious pathological state of mind which will not let Jew and gentile live in the same housing development, which sets black against white in the mutual destruction of homes, which says the U.S. Supreme Court has gone communistic when it outlaws segregation in the Nation's schools, which permits the U.S. Government to follow the path of expediency rather than of principle as it allows discrimination against Israel to fix this Nation's policy in awarding naval contracts and to control the assignment of our forces overseas.

It is all very well to jail young hoodlums caught as swastika painters and Hitler-apers; but these actions mean little to the forces of anti-Semitism as long as they can rest secure in the knowledge that the United States of America acquiesces in the discriminatory practices of its own Armed Forces and permits its own Navy to flout the principles of justice and equity.

Now, this resurgence of anti-Semitism and its accompanying racism, comes at a peculiarly difficult moment of world history. And these difficulties have, as one of their principle foci, the complex of countries in the Middle East. Recall what has happened. Following the armistice in 1948, even though tensions remained high and angry words were spoken, actual conflict decreased. Border clashes became less frequent. For half a dozen years, little Israel held her own against her surrounding enemies and labored mightily to build herself. Then something happened. The calculating forces of communism began deliberately to exploit the negative potential of the Near East. Arms and propaganda were poured into that troubled part of the world. Tonight we have no way of knowing whether tomorrow's sun will light a world at peace or a world at war.

And since we know, on the public record, that it is Communist arms and money and propaganda which have given new strength to the anti-Semitism of the Near East, there are those who believe that there is something more than coincidence in the fact that anti-Semitism which is known to be present in Soviet Russia has not expressed itself in East Germany while it has again broken out in West Germany. It may be that this is the real manifestation of germ warfare—to plant the infectious virus of bigotry and hatred, and strike down the minds and spirits of men while preserving their bodies for future exploitation.

Talk about genocide, the killing of whole races of men. This is far worse. It is psychocide, the murdering of men's minds and the slaughter of their spirits.

Thus it comes about that on this night of February 10, 14 years after the end of Hitlerism, as we gather to do honor to an educational effort in Israel, we do so under a black cloud which carries in its belly the poisonous fallout of man's inhumanity to man. It is not for us tonight to assess the blame and point the accusing finger. History and the god of history will take care of that. It is rather for us to look to ourselves and our own Nation, knowing that we, too, stand under the judgment of God.

If, then, we remember these things, we are permitted to consider with real satisfaction the things which, in God's name and spirit, men are doing constructively during these critical days. We are permitted to take deep satisfaction in the growing strength and increasing stability of Israel. We are permitted to look with pleasure on efforts such as Boys Town Jerusalem.

When I was in Israel 2 years ago, Max Dushkin, an old City College graduate who was building the Israeli educational system, acknowledged to me that the greatest weakness was not at the university level nor at the primary school level—it was in between these two, at the high school level. And it is precisely at this intermediate level that Boys Town Jerusalem makes its contribution. Be assured that the work is needed. And be assured, also, that if the work of this school is brought to the levels of achievement which are already described in the dreams of its founders and the labors of its builders, Israel will be strengthened in her efforts to help not only herself but many of the newer nations as well. Already the technicians and scientists and traders have gone out from Israel to nations like Ghana and Burma, and to countries like Nigeria not yet emerged into full freedom, carrying to these sister peoples the benefits of Israel's experience and the wealth of her intellectual and moral zeal.

And this is as it should be:

For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
salem.
And He shall judge among the nations,
And shall rebuke many peoples.
And they shall beat their swords into plough-
shares
And their spears into pruning hooks;
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation;
Neither shall they learn war any more.

The Garret, N.J., Mountain Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey has many beautiful and interesting areas in unexpected places. An article in the March 1960 edition of the Ford Times tells about one of which Passaic County residents can well be proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARRET MOUNTAIN RESERVATION—TWENTY MINUTES FROM BROADWAY

(By Arthur J. Barbour)

A scant 12 miles or about 20 minutes' driving time from Times Square, almost in the shadow of New York City's skyscrapers, is Garret Mountain Reservation, a green oasis in the asphalt desert of the northern Jersey industrial community. This 575-acre mountaintop park lies on the boundary of the city of Paterson, N.J., which is itself distinguished as the Nation's first industrial center, envisioned by Alexander Hamilton.

Looming on the eastern slope of Garret Mountain is a pretentious brownstone and granite structure known as Lambert Castle. Built in 1892 by Catholina Lambert, a millionaire silk manufacturer of Paterson, the castle with its parapets and balconies seems mutely to relate the rags-to-riches and back again story of its builder. From the battlements of the castle and from the adjacent 70-foot-high observation tower which stands some 500 feet above sea level spreads a sweeping view that takes in the New York skyline and New York Harbor to the south, and the ascending ridges of Ramapos and Watchungs to the north and west.

Lambert lived for 30 years in the picturesque castle which he had constructed primarily to house a fabulous art collection amassed during his climb to the top of the social and economic heights. When the strike-ridden silk industry began to decline, however, Lambert's fortune declined with it, and before his death in 1923 he was forced to sell his art treasures at public auction. In 1928 Lambert Castle was taken over by the Passaic County Park Commission which restored it and now maintains it along with the spacious surroundings.

In addition to housing the offices of the Park Commission, the spacious drawing rooms and salons of the ornate castle serve as the headquarters and museum of the Passaic County Historical Society. The museum is open to the public without charge, and visitors to the historic park may also climb the observation tower for the spectacular view it offers. Long ago this mountaintop provided a perfect lookout for the Leni Lenape Indians in the days when they roamed the region, and later it served the same purpose for scouts of Washington's Continental Army.

The southern end of Garret Mountain, an area referred to as the Notch Roads, boasts a colorful historical background dating back to Colonial days. During the Revolution a signal and lookout station was maintained at the most southerly point from which the lower bay in New York Harbor, Sandy Hook, Amboy, and Newark were visible. From here a guard on duty at the Acquackanonk (Passaic) Bridge could be signaled. During World War II, because of its position overlooking land that encompassed nearly 12 million homes, a point at the northerly end of the mountain became the site of antiaircraft installations, one of the major defense points of New York City.

The main artery through this section is the Rifle Camp Road—a name that sparks the imagination. The reference dates from Revolutionary times when a group of soldiers encamped under the command of Major Parr were equipped not with the older style 4 foot musket having a straight smooth bore but with a shorter gun or rifle whose bore was spiralled; thus the area was called "Rifle Camp." The modern black macadam road, which in those days was hardly more than a cow pasture lane, weaves and bounds over rough, rugged mountain terrain, twisting and lacing its way through rich, earth-colored masses of buffalo grass, broken at intervals with black volcaniclike rock structures jutting skyward.

Deep into these formations left by the glacial tide, mines for extracting traprock and sandstone have been gouged out, leaving immense amphitheaters with sheer walls of solid rock. Some of the quarries have long since been abandoned, and nature already has begun to heal the wounds, creating with erosion and plantlife small wonderlands of intrigue and mystery. Throughout the various quarries geodes of amethysts and other crystalline cores have been unearthed by amateur seekers of semiprecious gems.

Recently traprock from the quarries was used in the construction of a superhighway leading into Pennsylvania which in places supersedes the almost obscured bed of the

Morris Canal, a main artery of New Jersey in the 1830's. This canal connected the Delaware and Lehigh Rivers with the Passaic River and the sea at Newark Bay.

The highlands of Garret Mountain with their variety of blossoming trees and wildflowers indigenous to the region lend themselves to many kinds of recreational activity. The hiker finds it easy, yet invigorating, to keep to the pleasant woodland trails, and the horseback rider can enjoy a stimulating ride along scenic bridle paths. Barbour's Pond calls to the fisherman from early spring to late fall and to the ice skating devotee during the winter months. In this season the slopes of the mountain are a great attraction to skiers and tobogganers. Throughout the summer the broad lawns, studded with cool pines and accented intermittently with white birch, provide a perfect background for evening picnics, with young children running freely. Fireplaces in four picnic groves are available for cookouts.

These are the attractions of Garret Mountain Reservation. Next time you find yourself in Times Square, think of this lovely green mountaintop just a 20-minute drive away.

Two Rails Seek ICA Approval for Barge Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the February 21 issue of the Chicago Sunday Tribune under the byline of Nick Poulos:

TRANSPORT DIVERSITY STIRS TWO-FRONT BATTLE—TWO RAILS SEEK ICC APPROVAL FOR BARGE DEAL

(By Nick Poulos)

Hearings on a railroad case which could prove to be a major turning point in the history of American transportation will be opened by the Interstate Commerce Commission March 15 in Washington.

At issue is a request by the Illinois Central and Southern Pacific railroads that they be permitted to buy the John I. Hay Co., Chicago barge line, for $9 million and operate it in competition with other inland waterway carriers.

Seven barge lines and the American Trucking Association have announced they will make a strong fight against the proposal. Their main argument in opposition will be that granting of such a request would lead to the creation of a railroad monopoly over inland waters transportation.

CONGRESS ACTION POSSIBLE

There is the possibility, however, that Congress in its next session will enact laws permitting railroads and truck, barge, and air lines to engage in other forms of transportation at their own discretion.

The ICC presently has the authority to permit a railroad to control a bargeline and to coordinate services, but the governing regulations are quite restrictive. There is no corporate rail-barge operation of any consequence in the country today.

The Illinois Central and Southern Pacific have at least a fair chance of being granted permission to acquire the Hay Co., mainly because of the sympathetic climate the railroad industry presently enjoys.

What is the transportation relationship between the Hay Co. and the two railroads which seek to buy and operate it?

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED MILES OF ROUTES

The Hay Co.'s barge operations extend over more than 2,500 miles, principally on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. These water routes connect Chicago, Milwaukee, and Gary on the north and New Orleans, Houston, and Brownsville, Tex., on the south.

A glance at a map of mid-America shows that the Hay Co. serves the same general area as the two petitioning rail systems. With a fleet of 6 towboats and 90 barges, the Hay Co. is one of the 10 largest barge operators on the inland and coastal waterways.

The Illinois Central and Southern Pacific view their proposed purchase of the bargeline as an investment.

MILLIONS FOR EXPANSION

The two railroads plan to spend millions of dollars to expand the Hay fleet to provide more frequent sailings and additional equipment for the benefit of users of the water carrier service.

They contend the barge industry does not have the financial means to meet the growing requirements of waterway traffic and that the water route improvements being made at the most of millions of dollars should be utilized to their fullest for the benefit of the public.

The Illinois Central and Southern Pacific said they will set up through rail-water and truck-water rates. They have been unwilling to do this in the past because "there are limits beyond which the railroads are unable to go in prerate adjustments and improvements in service."

TO SEEK NEW INDUSTRIES

Plans also include inducing new industries, for whom water transportation provides an inherent advantage, to locate along the Hay Co.'s route.

The petitioners assert their purchase of the barge line would increase competition along the waterways and that the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation would be preserved. The new Hay operation would be under the jurisdiction of the ICC.

There is not the slightest validity to the argument that permitting railroads to engage in other transportation operations will lead to a monopoly, the two roads assert.

They argue that water carriers are protected by certificates of operating authority and that effective protection against monopoly is afforded by the antitrust laws and public policy.

Dumb Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit Times of February 18, 1960:

DUMB POLITICS

Michigan again is being made a political pigskin, kicked around in a mire of slurs by politicians who apparently believe it clever to besmear the whole State in order to daub mud on their selected targets.

The newest assault is by a recalcitrant minority of Republican Senators in Washington who brand Michigan a "privileged sanctuary" for union hoodlums—a kind of no-law-land from which emerge miscreants to prey upon adjoining States.

Such attack is rightly interpreted as a "get Reuther" effort by a few of the Senate labor rackets committee who have been unable to pin misdeeds upon the UAW–CIO president.

Indirectly, the mud pies are aimed at Governor Williams and the Democratic Party. They have the same noxious odor that abounded in the smear-Michigan attack, originating last year within the State, against our tax structure and labor standards.

Williams and Senator HART, among others, have arisen in flaming protest against this new assault from Washington.

Their ire is understandable. But as a matter of practical politics, the Democratic protesters might do better if they gave our assailants all the rope they want—with the proverbial result.

Only the day before the mud was slung from Washington, Vice President NIXON visited Michigan and made a hugely popular appearance. Most people he met liked him and the things he said, regardless of individual politics.

With the kind of spirit both sides can applaud, he promised a fight to make this State GOP in the next election.

Closely associated with the Vice-Presidential party was Paul D. Bagwell, a liberal Republican who was candidate for Governor in 1958 and who, even in losing, brought new support to his party.

As of Monday, things were looking up for Michigan Republicans, longtime losers in the election booths.

We doubt if the shrewdest Democrats could have contrived a scheme to diminish the gains of NIXON's visit as neatly as that furnished free and postpaid from Washington.

Once more a few Republican reactionaries have identified their party with a smear-Michigan campaign.

Once more the Democrats grab the fumbled ball.

It's an old story.

When kicking a political football, watch out for the way it bounces.

The Christian Amendment Movement—The Question of Union of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, and upon request of a representative of the Christian Amendment Movement, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD the fifth of a series of thought-provoking radio messages delivered by the Reverend John Coleman, D.D., Ph. D.:

When the relation of church and state is under discussion, the thoughts of American students of history go back to Roger Williams, founder of the colony of Rhode Island. Williams was a brilliant young Englishman, educated at Cambridge University. He was not in agreement with the English established church and fled to Massachusetts to escape persecution. There he disagreed with the Massachusetts established church

and campaigned for its abolition. He again avoided arrest by flight.

With some of his followers he went to what is now Rhode Island, purchased land from the Indians, and built what was in later years to become the city of Providence. Williams gave that name to the little settlement in honor of the God who he believed had cared for him and his companions. In Providence all denominations were free to carry on their own worship and none were supported by the government.

Because of this many have supposed that Roger Williams wanted a government that was secular, one that ignored the whole question of religion. This is far from the truth. Immediately upon fixing their abode, the settlers subscribed to the following compact or constitution:

"We, whose names are underwritten, do hereby solemnly, in the presence of Jehovah, incorporate ourselves into a body politic; and as He shall help, will submit our persons, lives and estates unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the king of kings and the lord of lords, and to all those perfect and absolute laws of His given us in His holy word of truth."

This sounds like the first section of the Christian amendment. I will repeat it:

"This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God."

The second section of the amendment has been added to make sure that there will be no misunderstanding on this matter of church and state, to give assurance that the religious and other liberties of man, whether Christian or non-Christian, will not be interfered with because of this amendment. This second section reads:

"This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage."

What is an established church? It is the kind we had in some of the colonies, and they still have in Western Europe. An established church is one for which the government pays the bills, makes the laws and appoints the officers. All these features are found today in Great Britain: For example, when the bishops wished to bring in a new prayerbook, they had to request permission of the British Parliament, and the Parliament, under the leadership of David Lloyd George, the Prime Minister, who was himself a Welsh Baptist, refused the permission.

No, the Christian amendment does not propose the establishment of any church. It definitely declares against it. If adopted, so long as the Christian amendment stands, no church in America will have its expenses paid by the Government, its laws made by Congress, or its officers appointed by some political authority. Under the amendment church and state will be legally separate, neither controlling the other, but both under the Lord Jesus Christ, both seeking to obey His will. Thus each would strengthen the other. Two men marching in step make marching easier for both of them; the church and state marching in step would both be more effective. Neither would be in control over the other, but the popular mind would not be confused by one pulling one way, and the other pulling contrariwise.

It is this issue of an established church that contributed largely to the state of mind that led the Constitutional Convention to give us a Constitution that recognizes neither God nor His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. In several of the States the issue of an established church was a burning one. In Virginia, where the Episcopal Church had been established by law, the legislature, in 1775, passed a bill to suspend the payment of the Episcopal clergy by the colony, and 2 years later voted to end such payments. There were some, like Patrick Henry, who wanted to have two established churches, the Presbyterian and the Episcopal. Complete religious freedom was not achieved by law in Virginia until 1786, just a year before the Constitutional Convention. So the question was in the air.

In Connecticut the established church continued on a township basis until 1818, and in Massachusetts until 1833. In these States the people determined by vote from what denomination their presiding clergyman would come. This was possible under the National Constitution because the first amendment, forbidding an established church, applied only to the National Government. It begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." It was not until the adoption of the 14th amendment that the prohibition of an established church was made to apply to individual States.

This agitation concerning an established church created a nonreligious bias in the Convention that drew up the Constitution. The Convention did not begin its first meeting with prayer, or any subsequent meeting, this despite the fact that Benjamin Franklin at one point made a most eloquent plea for prayer. Alexander Hamilton opposed Franklin's motion, saying that to have prayer would lead the people to think that they were not getting along very well at their task. Then after some discussion someone made a motion to adjourn and it was carried. The motion for prayer was never voted on. Franklin sadly notes in his diary that few of the members were interested in his proposal.

The Convention, and the Constitution which it produced, were alike secular. Secular means "without God." Certainly there were other factors that brought about this tragic situation, but the problem of an established church had its part. Men were so accustomed to identifying the Christian religion with an established church that, when they were breaking the connection between the church and the state, apparently they thought this must involve the omission of all religious acknowledgments such as were found in the charters of most of the Colonies, of some of the States, and, to a degree, in the Declaration of Independence. They did not seem to realize fully that the State might have a relation to the Lord independent of any and all churches, such as the poet Dante visioned centuries ago, such as Roger Williams and William Penn put into practice. It is this relationship that the Christian amendment affirms.

The issue of an established church is now of the long ago, but its influence remains in the great defect of our National Constitution, the lack of a confession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the national Saviour and Ruler, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God. Let me repeat: The Christian amendment carefully guards against the revival of the issue of church and state and the problem of an established church. The church and the state are to be the earthly arms of the Lord Jesus who is head over all things. Neither arm is to control the other, both are to obey the head.

The Problems of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we read much these days about juvenile delinquency and the problems it causes throughout the world. Recently we took action here to create a Federal program which would help local authorities deal with local conditions.

There are many ways to attack the question, and prevention is certainly the best way. But we must also consider rehabilitation of those who have offended. In New Jersey we are particularly fortunate in having a pioneering pilot institution to deal with this aspect of the problem. An editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of February 2 describes recent progress at this station.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN HAVE AS MUCH REHABILITATION AS WE LIKE

The success of the Highfields experiment and its broad values in establishing productive techniques have never been in doubt. But reassuringly corroborative is the report that over a period of 2 to 3 years 77 percent of the delinquents released from the Hopewell institution have successfully adjusted to the life of their community.

The Highfields experiment, involving as it does a concentrated form of group psychiatry, some individual therapy, and other forms of individual attention in a minimum-security environment, is an expensive program as budgets go. Yet clearly Highfields shows that by such treatment and cash outlay a boy can be readjusted before he gets into a position of having to be reclaimed. The State Home for Boys at Jamesburg is no conventional penal institution, and is in its way a progressive adaptation of prison attitude and care; it is not an inexpensive operation. But the Jamesburg record of conduct during detention and after release cannot compare with the Highfields statistics.

Demonstrated is that we do at last have an effective program. Existing is a going plan of reclamation limited to a population of 20 boys. It works. There are many questions left, but they are not up to Highfields to answer.

Fargo, N. Dak., Designated All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that Fargo, N. Dak., has been selected an All-America City in a contest jointly sponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. Fargo was one of nearly 100 cities to enter in the competition and one of 11 winners. The field was gradually narrowed to 22 finalists, who then presented their cases orally to a jury of experts. Foreman of that jury was Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am proud to include the following account of Fargo's unusual efforts to solve major community problems. This summary appears in the current—March 1—issue of Look magazine:

FARGO, N. DAK.

This northern plains city of 50,000 was saddled with problems. It had a 50-year-old city hall built when the population was only 13,000. Its residential districts were becoming slums. Then civic-minded residents formed a citizens for city planning organization to work for improvements. Over strong opposition, they won approval for a major bond issue to provide the needed funds. Now, on the site of a 17-acre slum area, a new civic center is rising. Already completed are a modern city hall and an auditorium. Other public buildings will follow. Displaced families from the slum area have been relocated without resorting to public housing, and the State's first urban-renewal project has moved into the final stages.

Modernizing a city is expensive. The tax bill of a man with a $15,000 house is around $325 a year. Yet citizens of Fargo have made voluntary contributions to a school for retarded children, another for teaching deaf children, and similar community enterprises. In addition, hundreds of women volunteers give many hours a week to social work. Fargo is a town whose community spirit is so ablaze that there are 8,000 paid-up members of the PTA for a school population of 7,776.

Private Power Companies Cashing in on Their Share of $15 Billion Federal Subsidies From Rapid Amortization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that during World War II the Congress passed legislation to provide accelerated amortization of defense plants. When we were faced with the great war emergency we needed tremendous expansion in manufacturing plants capable of building the arms and armaments needed for our defense. Private industry was understandably reluctant to make these very large investments in defense plants because in many cases they were highly specialized and would have little usefulness for civilian production.

The rapid amortization program provided that the cost of a defense plant could be amortized over a 5-year period instead of over its longtime useful life as then provided by income tax laws. The rapid amortization was, of course, deductible as a business expense for income tax purposes, and thus this program reduced the taxes of defense industries. In effect, the cost of the new defense plants was largely met by the Federal Government in the form of reduced taxes.

Now certainly this program was well justified in the case of aircraft, ordnance and other highly specialized defense plants of little or no use for civilian goods. A few accelerated amortization certificates had been granted to public utilities during the war and during the Korean emergency where an expansion of power was imperative to serve a critical defense industry, such as the Atomic Energy Commission. But shortly after this administration came into office, the Office of Defense Mobilization began to issue accelerated amortization certificates for ordinary expansion of power facilities and within the next few years practically every power company in the country benefited from these accelerated amortization certificates. The Office of Defense Mobilization issued some 22,000 certificates granting over $30 billion in rapid amortization to all industries. The electric power utilities received fewer than 5 percent of these certificates but they were allowed $3 billion worth of 10 percent of the total accelerated amortization.

This program of accelerated amortization has cost some $15 billion in lost taxes of which the private power companies alone have accounted for $1½ billion. As a result of this program the private power industry became possibly the greatest beneficiary of a Federal subsidy that was ever enjoyed by any nondefense industry.

It will also be recalled that many of us objected strenuously to this generous subsidy for the private utilities and one of the most constructive achievements of the 85th Congress was the repeal of that portion of the law which had permitted the granting of rapid amortization certificates to private power companies.

When we debated this matter in considering the repealing legislation we, of necessity, spoke in terms of estimates of tax losses and some spokesmen of the private utilities denied that this represented a subsidy and that the companies would benefit from it. But today we do not need to estimate or to guess—we now have on the record the facts from the books of the power companies themselves regarding the way this unprecedented subsidy has operated for the benefit of the private power companies and particularly their stockholders.

Keep in mind that the rates charged by private power companies include a portion which will be paid in taxes to the local and Federal governments. Actually private power companies are not taxpayers they are tax collectors. In substance and under the terms of the rate structures approved by State and Federal regulatory agencies, the consumers of a utility pay the taxes in their power bills and the utility in turn transmits the taxes to the local and Federal governments. Now let us see what has been happening under the accelerated amortization program. The private utilities have been collecting the same taxes from their customers that they did before or that they would collect without rapid amortization. But, they paid far less in taxes to the Federal Government than they collected from their customers. To account for this excess of taxes they have collected from their customers most private utilities have set up what they call "accumulated income tax deferral reserves." These deferral reserves represent the actual tax savings of the power companies. As of December 31, 1958, the latest figures available from the Federal Power Commission, the private power companies have now accumulated some $700 million in these accumulated income tax deferral reserves. In other words as of January 1, 1959, they had already received some $700 million of subsidies in the form of reduced taxes. This is only the beginning. Although the accelerated amortization has been repealed the private power companies will continue to enjoy the benefits of these subsidies for some years to come and eventually the subsidy will amount to a total of $1½ billion. I insert herein a list supplied by the Federal Power Commission of the private electric utility companies with their accumulated amortization reserves as of December 31, 1958. From this list you can see how much tax reduction your power company has admitted receiving as of January 1, 1959.

Accumulated income tax deferrals arising through the accelerated amortization of emergency facilities and the use of rapid depreciation methods permitted under sections 168 and 167, respectively, of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code

ELECTRIC UTILITY COMPANIES, BALANCE AS OF DEC. 31, 1958

Alabama Power Co	$16,028,000
Appalachian Electric Power Co	21,253,000
Arkansas Power & Light Co	13,637,000
Atlantic City Electric Co	2,369,000
Bangor Hydroelectric Co	115,000
Black Hills Power & Light Co	----------
Boston Edison Co	4,947,000
Boston Gas Co	----------
Brockton Edison Co	----------
California Electric Power Co	2,262,000
California-Pacific Utilities Co	----------
California-Oregon Power Co	8,791,000
Cambridge Electric Light Co	----------
Cape & Vinyard Electric Co	----------
Carolina Power & Light	9,120,000
Central Electric & Gas Co	----------
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp	1,742,000
Central Illinois Electric & Gas Corp	1,120,000
Central Illinois Light Co	1,841,000
Central Illinois Public Service Co	750,000
Central Louisiana Electric Co	2,552,000
Central Kansas Power Co	572,000
Central Maine Power Co	5,970,000
Central Power & Light Co	6,110,000
Central Vermont Public Service Corp	562,000
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co	13,105,000
Citizens Utilities Co	107,000
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co	20,797,000
Colorado Central Power Co	101,000
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co	1,373,000
Commonwealth Edison Co	1,320,000
Commonwealth Edison Co. of Indiana, Inc	55,000
Community Public Service Co	----------
Connecticut Light & Power Co	5,436,000
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc	21,044,000
Consumers Power Co	13,285,000
Dallas Power & Light Co	5,816,000
Delaware Power & Light Co	3,221,000
Detroit Edison Co. and subsidiaries	27,203,000
Duquesne Light Co	1,649,000
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Maryland	39,000

Accumulated income tax deferrals, etc.—Con.	
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Virginia	----------
Edison Sault Electric Co	----------
El Paso Electric Co	$1,596,000
Ellenville Electric Co	----------
Empire District Electric Co	1,058,000
Fall River Electric Light Co	----------
Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light Co	----------
Florida Power Corp	5,712,000
Florida Power & Light Co	9,752,000
Florida Public Utilities Co	----------
Georgia Power Co	18,307,000
Gulf Power Co	4,959,000
Gulf States Utilities Co	2,137,000
Holyoke Water Power Co	----------
Home Light & Power Co	----------
Houston Lighting & Power Co	8,569,000
Idaho Power Co	4,388,000
Illinois Power Co	6,749,000
Indiana & Michigan Electric Co	14,819,000
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	5,740,000
Iowa Electric Light & Power Co	1,821,000
Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co	135,000
Iowa Power & Light Co	4,746,000
Iowa Public Service Co	1,449,000
Iowa Southern Utilities Co	1,007,000
Kansas City Power & Light Co	4,285,000
Kansas Power & Light Co	2,804,000
Kentucky Power Co	172,000
Kentucky Utilities Co	2,338,000
Kingsport Utilities Co	10,000
Lockhart Power Co	----------
Long Island Lighting Co	11,916,000
Louisiana Power & Light Co	6,851,000
Maine Public Service Co	237,000
Marietta Electric Co	19,000
Michigan Gas & Electric Co	6,000
Minnesota Power & Light Co	4,518,000
Mississippi Power Co	2,961,000
Mississippi Power & Light Co	8,272,000
Missouri Edison Co	----------
Missouri Power & Light Co	----------
Missouri Public Service Co	753,000
Monongahela Power Co	5,705,000
Montana-Dakota Utilities Corp	1,093,000
Montana Power Co	243,000
Montaup Electric Co	----------
Mt. Carmel Public Utility Co	54,000
Nantahala Power & Light Co	2,043,000
Nantucket Gas & Electric Corp	----------
New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co	----------
New England Power Co	3,324,000
New Orleans Public Service Corp	----------
New York State Electric & Gas Corp	7,963,000
Niagara Mohawk Power Co	17,832,000
Northern Indiana Public Service Co	156,000
Northern States Power Co. (Minnesota)	7,877,000
Northern Virginia Power Co	20,000
Northwestern Public Service Co	----------
Ohio Edison Co	16,106,000
Ohio-Midland Light & Power Co	----------
Ohio Power Co	26,429,000
Old Dominion Power Co	----------
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	5,348,000
Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc	2,769,000
Pacific Gas & Electric Co	34,449,000
Pacific Power & Light Co	11,273,000
Patchogue Electric Light Co	106,000
Pennsylvania Electric Co	9,707,000
Pennsylvania Power Co	2,040,000
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	18,430,000
Peoples Utilities, Inc	----------
Philadelphia Electric Co	19,839,000
Plymouth County Electric Co	----------
Portland General Electric Co	2,783,000
Potomac Edison Co	2,151,000
Potomac Light & Power Co	412,000
Public Service Co. of Colorado	6,248,000
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc	10,961,000
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	3,499,000
Public Service Co. of New Mexico	$2,501,000
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	7,477,000
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	14,036,000
Rochester Gas & Electric Corp	----------
San Diego Gas & Electric Co	----------
Savannah Electric & Power Co	----------
Sierra Pacific Power Co	----------
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	955,000
South Carolina Generating Co	3,154,000
South Penn Power Co	36,000
Southern California Edison Co	15,036,000
Southern Colorado Power Co	----------
Southern Nevada Power Co	984,000
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co	1,790,000
Southwestern Electric Power Co.[1]	2,774,000
Southwestern Public Service Co	10,906,000
St. Lawrence River Power Co	98,000
Power Co	----------
Tapoco, Inc	217,000
Texas Electric Service Co	7,127,000
Texas Power & Light Co	10,858,000
Toledo Edison Co	5,137,000
Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co	----------
Union Electric Co. of Missouri	13,680,000
Union Light, Heat & Power Co	77,000
United Gas Improvement Co	----------
United Illuminating Co	1,928,000
Upper Peninsula Power Co	33,000
Utah Power & Light Co	483,000
Virginia Electric & Power Co	21,840,000
West Maryland Power Co	—
West Penn Power Co	4,926,000
West Texas Utilities Co	2,769,000
Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc	1,936,000
Western Massachusetts Electric Co	1,314,000
Wheeling Electric Co	352,000
Total	703,662,000

[1] Formerly Southwestern Gas & Electric Co.

NOTE.—Balances shown relate to electric operations of the companies only. Companies allowing the tax reduction to "flow through" without restriction or crediting it to depreciation reserves are not included in the listing.

(Source: Federal Power Commission.)

Seventy-fifth Birthday of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 24, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz was honored throughout this country and in many overseas areas on the occasion of his 75th birthday. Fleet Admiral Nimitz began his brilliant naval career 59 years ago when he was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy from the 12th Congressional District in Texas in 1901. His actions in the Pacific during World War II will live in history forever.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz was ordered to duty as commander in chief, Pacific Fleet, with the rank of admiral effective December 31, 1941. He was presented the Distinguished Service Medal by the President, awarded in the name of Congress, with the following citation:

For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a duty of great responsibility as commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet since December 31, 1941. At the most critical period of the present war in the Pacific he assumed command in that area and, despite the losses at Pearl Harbor and the tragic shortage of vessels, planes and supplies, organized his forces and carried on defensive warfare which halted the Japanese advance. As rapidly as ships, personnel and material became available, he shifted from defensive to offensive warfare and, by his brilliant leadership an outstanding skill as a strategist, enabled the units under his command to defeat the enemy in the Coral Sea, off Midway, and in the Solomon Islands; and to capture and occupy the Gilbert and Marshall Islands.

He was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal by the Navy Department, for "Exceptionally meritorious service as commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet." The citation states that—

His conduct of the operations of the Pacific Fleet, resulting in successful actions against the enemy in the Coral Sea and off Midway Island was characterized by unfailing judgment and sound decision, completed with skill and vigor.

On October 7, 1943 he was redesignated commander in chief, Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas. By act of Congress, approved December 14, 1944, the grade of fleet admiral of the U.S. Navy—the highest grade in the Navy—was established, and on the next day the President nominated and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed Admiral Nimitz to that rank.

In September 1944 Fleet Admiral Nimitz was one of the signers for the United States when Japan formally signed the surrender terms aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo bay.

On October 5, 1945, which had been officially designated as Nimitz Day here in Washington, Admiral Nimitz was presented a Gold Star in lieu of the third Distinguished Service Medal by the President "for exceptionally meritorious service as commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, from June 1944 to August 1945." The citation further states:

Initiating the final phase in the battle for victory in the Pacific, he attacked the Marianas, invading Saipan, inflicting a decisive defeat on the Japanese Fleet in the First Battle of the Philippines and capturing Guam and Tinian. In vital continuing operations, his fleet forces isolated the enemy-held bastions of the Central and Eastern Carolines. With reconnaissance of the main beaches on Leyte effected, approach channels cleared and opposition neutralized in joint operations to reoccupy the Philippines, the challenge by powerful task forces of the Japanese Fleet resulted in a historic victory in the three-phased battle for Leyte Gulf. Accelerating the intensity of aerial offensive by pressure exerted at every hostile strongpoint, Fleet Admiral Nimitz culminated long-range strategy by successful amphibious assault on Iwo Jima and Okinawa—finally placed representative forces of the U.S. Navy in the harbor of Tokyo for the formal capitulation of the Japanese Empire. He demonstrated the highest qualities of a naval officer and rendered services of the greatest distinction to his country.

On November 23 1945, his nomination to be Chief of Naval Operations was con-

firmed by the Senate. He hauled down his flag at Pearl Harbor, where he had hoisted it in December 1941 on board the submarine *Grayling*, in a harbor littered with wreckage of American warships, and on December 15, 1945, relieved Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King as Chief of Naval Operations.

On December 15, 1947, he was detached as Chief of Naval Operations and ordered to San Francisco for duty as directed by the Secretary of the Navy. Since then he has acted as Special Assistant to the Secretary in the Western Sea Frontier, and serves in an advisory capacity, assisting in other matters pertaining to the Navy when called upon to do so.

Fleet Admiral Nimitz has truly brought honor and distinction to his country. It gives me great pleasure to add my most sincere congratulations to Admiral Nimitz on the occasion of his 75th birthday.

Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of the House that yesterday, February 24, marks the 42d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

It does indeed seem cynical that when so many new nations are recognizing independence and self-determination throughout the world that those countries of Eastern Europe which were once independent still remain in captivity. Among this number Estonia, of course, must be included and, with her Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Lithuania, she does not even have the fiction of independence as do the other captive nations. Indeed the history of these three small Baltic countries constitutes one of the most flagrant and outrageous violations of international agreement on the part of the Soviet Union that the world has ever seen. Ever since these three countries were absorbed by the Soviet Union, Communist policy has dictated the eradication of any vestiges of nationalism and is attempting to completely absorb them into the U.S.S.R.

It is, nevertheless, heartening to realize that the people of Estonia still retain their burning desire for freedom and independence in spite of the tortures and slavery which they have undergone now for nearly 20 years. This display of courage on their part, however, must continually be nurtured by evidence of interest in their behalf on the part of the free world and above all by the United States of America who is rightly regarded as the guardian of hope for their ultimate freedom. That is why expressions of interest on our part, in addition to commemorative meetings on this solemn occasion, will help to remind the captive peoples, including the Estonians, that they will never be forgotten in the hearts and minds of freemen everywhere.

I trust we will all join in observing this national holiday of Estonia and in once again expressing the hope that the day will soon come when these brave people will be able to observe their own national holiday in a free land. Meanwhile, our Government rightly pursues the policy of refusing to recognize the forced annexation of Estonia and are continuing to recognize the representatives of its government in exile. This is the policy to which we should all continue to give our undivided support.

Private Voluntary Insurance and H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, almost the complete insurance industry along with the American Medical Association has taken up the cry of "socialism," "governmentation," and many other words they use to create an image of a monster—H.R. 4700. The truth is that private insurers are not insuring the aged for medical, surgical, and hospitalization. The one fact they admit is that this group is a high-cost, high-risk group, which has been completely avoided until very recently.

The argument is made that private insurance companies have made great strides in the voluntary health contracts. It is true that more people today are able to buy better health insurance than at any previous time. However, these policies are usually offered to that segment of the population under the age of 65 or even 60. The cost for a reasonable plan for the aged would be higher than the average person on a pension could afford.

The coverage offered our aged population on policies in existence today is limited to a benefit rate that would have been proper or feasible back in 1940. These policies are in an experimental stage, and the natural conservatism of the industry is holding the benefits down to a minimum. The possibility always exists that, when it is found financially unwise to issue this type of policy, the companies will decline to renew, under their so-called cancellation clause.

The following three policies are the best the insurance industry has to offer the aged today. In reading through these policies ask yourself this question, Is this policy adequate for our aged today?

INSURANCE COMPANY A

Hospital: $10 per day for a maximum of 60 days.

Nursing home: $5 per day for 55 days. (Benefits payable under hospital and nursing home shall not exceed the combined total of 60 days for any one period of confinement.)

Renewal agreement: Company may refuse to renew when renewal is declined on all policies of this form.

Additional benefits: Such things as X-ray, oxygen, operating room, etc. The company will pay 80 percent of all cost over $100 with a maximum of $1,000.

Surgical: Governed by rate schedule; $225 maximum.

Cost: $8.50 per person, per month; annual, $102.

Policy: Form 4HSO; limited to persons over 65 years of age.

INSURANCE COMPANY B

Hospital: $10 per day for a maximum of 31 days.

Surgical: Governed by rate schedule; $200 maximum.

Additional expenses: Miscellaneous hospital expenses; maximum of $100.

Renewal agreement: Company may cancel if it cancels all within the State.

Cost: $6.50 per person, per month; annual, $78.

Policy: 65 plus policy (form No. OA 37).

INSURANCE COMPANY C

Hospital: $12 per day up to 200 days maximum of $2,400.

Surgical: Governed by rate schedule; $300 maximum.

Nurse: If accidental injury requires special nurse while in hospital, this policy pays up to $10 a day, up to 5 days, for any one accident.

Additional expenses: Certain of these expenses have no limit such as surgical dressings, iron lung, hypos. Others carry a maximum of from $10 to $30.

First-aid benefits: Accidents not requiring hospitalization, up to $10.

Renewal agreement: Company cannot cancel policy but may change premium rates.

Cost: $7.30 per person, per month; annual, $81.10.

Policy: LAHO–120; hospital and surgical expense policy; 65 years of age and over.

Rocky Mountain Farmers Support Additives Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, attempts are being made to create the impression that farmers in general are opposed to the Food Additives Amendment of 1958, and, in particular, to Secretary Flemming's enforcement of it. Editorials in farm journals have misrepresented the amendment in an attempt to mislead and confuse their readers and various trade papers read by farmers have joined the cabal.

It is heartening, therefore, to know that the American farmer retains his independence of judgment and is not easily fooled by the propaganda of those industries which would place financial gain above the protection of the public health.

The following letter from the assistant to the president of the Rocky Mountain Farmers Union and the resolution adopted by the union show that at least

one segment of our farm population has not been influenced by this propaganda:

ROCKY MOUNTAIN FARMERS UNION,
Denver, Colo., February 15, 1960.

Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY,
Congressman, New York, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DELANEY: At the 51st annual convention of the Rocky Mountain Farmers Union in Denver, Colo. on February 3, 1960, a strong resolution was passed in support of the principles of the Delaney amendment to the pure food and drug law.

The resolution had the unanimous support of all delegates representing 18,750 farm and ranch families of Colorado and Wyoming.

Farm folks are deeply concerned with the growing problem of moving pure food to consumers without having it endangered with chemical additives or preservatives that have not been proven entirely safe for human consumption.

The resolution follows:

FOOD PROCESSING AND CHEMICAL ADDITIVES

Due to the increased use of chemicals in processing and insecticides, we insist that it is in the general public interest that the burden of proof of the nontoxicity of such products be placed directly on the manufacturers of same. In effect, the Pure Food and Drug Administration now has only ex post facto power. It should be given authority to prevent the marketing of such products unless they are certified as safe.

This same approach should be used on food products which contain additives. The public should be assured that products containing additives are safe and nontoxic, just as farmers should be assured that products purchased to benefit their crops or livestock are not harmful to the eventual consumer of those products.

If the Government agency responsible requires more funds or personnel to do this, we urge the Congress to provide the funds for this purpose.

Sincerely,

GEO. L. BICKEL,
Assistant to the President, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union.

Jim Bond: Super Dallas Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in Dallas, Tex., the Linz Award is bestowed each year upon a citizen who has distinguished himself in civic endeavor in that great city. The award for 1959 has just been made. It went to a man named James H. Bond.

Mr. Bond is a Federal Government employee. He is a living refutation of the charge we sometimes hear that Government employees isolate themselves from the life of the community.

An editorial in the Dallas Times Herald sums up better than I possibly could the scope of Jim Bond's contribution to the Dallas community. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, paying deserved tribute to a man who works unselfishly for his fellow men, be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JIM BOND: SUPER DALLAS CITIZEN

When people think of Jim Bond, as the 1959 Linz Award winner is known to his thousands of admiring friends, they think of a warmhearted champion of the crippled, the blind, the sick, the troubled, the poor.

James H. Bond's main job is being regional director of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But here his service to his fellow beings only begins. He has been a leader or worker in virtually every volunteer health, welfare, and civic program that has been undertaken in Dallas in the past 20 years.

Even a partial listing of Jim Bond's accomplishments causes ordinary mortals to gasp in amazement. He is immediate past president of the Dallas Council of Social Agencies, a board member of the Greater Dallas Planning Council. He is associated with humanity-serving organizations ranging from the National Association for Prevention of Blindness and the American Cancer Society to the National Association for Mental Health, National Multiple Sclerosis Society and the Dallas Committee for "Employ the Handicapped."

Specifically, Mr. Bond was cited for his efforts last year in putting into action a Dallas County youth study. But his other accomplishments, somehow packed into busy days and weeks, are in such diverse areas as the Boy Scouts, Dallas Television Education Foundation, and the committee for rehabilitating West Dallas.

The Linz Award judging panel faced a tough task of selecting one from a large number of worthy nominees. But Dallas has no abler or more useful citizen than Jim Bond. The Times Herald, cosponsor with Linz Jewelists of the annual award, adds its congratulations to the many others that are showering upon Mr. Bond and his family.

Keep Slim and Trim on a Potato Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, hanging in my office is a large, colorful poster which depicts a lithe and smiling lady who holds a generous serving of Irish potatoes and offers us this advice: "Here's how I keep trim and slim."

There is an acre of truth in this counsel, and, in fact, I offer the following article from the February 20 issue of the Packer to prove that our poster pal is one who really "knows her potatoes":

GROW THIN ON DIET FEATURING HALF POUND OF POTATOES A DAY

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J., February 19.—Whatever else they may learn at Douglass College this year, 12 girls will not soon forget that they can eat a diet featuring a half pound of potatoes a day and grow thin.

They know because they did it.

The girls were volunteers in an 8-week demonstration conducted by the Douglass home economics department and financed by 11 State and national organizations of potato growers.

Growers and Rutgers nutritionists have been concerned of late because figure-conscious consumers have been shunning the vitamin-and-mineral-rich spud on the grounds that it's fattening. They don't mind the public's being figure conscious but they don't like the potato to get the blame for the bulges.

IT'S THE GRAVY

It's a known fact that it's the gravy that runs up the calorie count, they keep saying.

To prove their point, the nutritionists called for plump volunteers among Douglass students, girls who would be willing to stick to a diet in agreement with the traditional Douglass-honor-system spirit.

Response was tremendous, but one by one the group was whittled down to an even dozen young women whose excess weight ranged from 15 to 100 pounds.

Eligible dieters had to be at least 10 percent overweight, and they had to agree to eat everything set before them and nothing else, except for occasional snacks of celery and carrots.

One girl didn't like eggs and another never ate pork, so they were dropped. Invitations to college house parties eliminated others. One of the final 12 turned down a weekend invitation to another college in favor of the diet table.

Dr. Miriam K. Brush, of the Douglass home economics department, who was in charge of the project, reports that when the girls sat down to their first low-calorie meal in the department's research laboratory, their weights ranged from 128 to 228 pounds.

When they weighed in at the end of 8 weeks, the girls had lost an average of 14 pounds each. One was 25 pounds lighter.

Girls who have not yet scaled down to their ideal weights plan to continue with low-calorie foods selected from meals in the college dining hall.

SATISFYING AND FILLING

"The girls say they found the potatoes satisfying and filling," Dr. Brush reports. "Potatoes were served in many different ways to give variety to the menu, and dishes often included butter borrowed from some other part of the meal."

She said the demonstration also proves that a reducing diet can be inexpensive, similar to what most families eat anyway, and need not include special sweeteners or exotic foods.

Girls started the day with 4 ounces of orange juice, two-thirds cup of cooked or dry cereal, one slice of bread, a half pat of butter, 6 ounces of skim milk and black coffee.

TYPICAL LUNCH

Typical lunch consisted of potato salad made of one-half cup of potatoes, three strips of carrots, one medium egg, lettuce, celery, and one tablespoon low-fat mayonnaise per portion; one slice of bread, one-half pat butter, 6 ounces of skim milk, and medium serving of grapes.

Typical dinner: One-half cup boned chicken, one medium-size potato, one-half cup green beans, one slice of bread, one-half pat butter, 6 ounces of skim milk, and four halves of apricots.

"WE TOLD YOU SO"

A day's calorie count ran between 1,150 and 1,300 calories, depending upon the size of the girl. Results after 8 weeks were 12 prettier, healthier, and happier girls, and a Nation of potato growers who can say, "We told you so."

Red River Valley potato growers of Minnesota and North Dakota cooperated in the diet study by contributing funds to finance the project.

Dr. Grayson Kirk Urges Removal of Disclaimer Provision From Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Education Act is a most important and far-reaching law. However, there is contained therein a section which in my opinion must be deleted at once if the beneficial and progressive purposes of the legislation are not to be vitiated. I refer to what is known as the disclaimer provision.

Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, located in the district which I have the honor to represent, has urged the immediate repeal of this section. Dr. Kirk's views are shared almost unanimously by leading educators representing their institutions of learning throughout the country. We should and must heed his knowledgeable statements. I submit herewith a significant article which he wrote in the Graduate Faculties Newsletter of Columbia University in May 1959. The article follows:

LOYALTY, SECURITY, AND COMMONSENSE

Title X of the Defense Education Act contains one provision that has aroused widespread comment—and much criticism—from educators throughout the country. The text is as follows: "No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'"

The second part of this provision is merely the standard oath of allegiance. It is much like the oath required by the State of New York of all faculty members in all colleges and universities in the State. In itself, it cannot be regarded as objectionable because it is no more than a public declaration of an obligation that is incumbent upon all citizens.

Although objection has been made to the entire oath provision of the new Federal act, the chief criticism—for reasons that will be indicated presently—has been directed toward the first part. This is a disclaimer of any belief in, as well as membership in, any organization that advocates the forcible overthrow of our Government. Many a citizen reading this requirement might regard it merely as a declaration to which no loyal American could or should object. Such an individual might, therefore, be perplexed over the fact that it has provoked such an uproar—and by persons whose loyalty is beyond suspicion. What are the reasons for this barrage of criticism?

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

First of all, members of the teaching profession object because they are aware, as all citizens should be, of the utter futility of such oaths. Does any rational individual believe that a person who is either philosophically committed to, or a member of, any organization advocating violent revolution would hesitate for a moment to perjure himself by taking such an oath? It is absurd to believe that such an oath requirement would actually screen out any subversive person. Since this oath is directed toward adherents of communism, and since everyone is familiar with the Communist principle that ends justify means, then the oath is meaningless because all such persons would cheerfully take any oath no matter the degree to which it might be an actual falsification of the truth.

Therefore, such an oath is useless as a practical measure. Actually, it is even worse than useless because through perjury an individual might gain a dangerous immunity from investigation of his activities simply because he had taken the oath. A false sense of security is perhaps the most perilous of all putative assets a country can have.

PHILOSOPHIC IMPLICATIONS

Philosophically, the provision requiring a negative statement of belief is objectionable because loyalty is in itself a product of positive, even passionate, belief. It is not merely the residue after negative eliminations have been made. While no loyal citizen, in or out of the teaching profession, will support the violent overthrow of our Government, such a person may quite properly insist that all efforts to limit freedom of thought, as distinct from action, are inherently dangerous to freedom. Social control over the placing of any belief into action is permissible and, on occasion, necessary. Social control over the mere holding of an intellectual belief is not. The first amendment to the Constitution implies this position clearly. The most serious breach of our defense against communism will have been made when we decide that we can defend ourselves only if we undertake to limit freedom of thought.

Thus it may be concluded that these oath requirements are of no value as a practical screening device. We may also conclude that they are open to grave philosophical objections because they violate the inner essence and meaning of loyalty. Our young people who are preparing for a career in teaching and research should not be told at the outset that we do not trust them, that we do not have confidence in them. Our society is built upon confidence with respect to all our citizens. Coercion of ideas is both futile and, in the long run, dangerous.

Hawaii's Territorial Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, with the admission of Hawaii to statehood, a new concept of the territorial sea came into being. For the first time in history our Nation finds itself faced, not only with broad areas of international waters separating the States, but separating parts of a State. Dr. G. Etzel Pearcy, geographer, Department of State, has prepared a thought-provoking article entitled, "Hawaii's Territorial Sea," which is printed in the November 1959 issue of the Professional Geographer. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to have Dr. Pearcy's article included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HAWAII'S TERRITORIAL SEA

(By G. Etzel Pearcy, Department of State)

The territorial sea of the new State of Hawaii comprises 3,069 square miles of water, an area about five-eighths as great as the land surfaces which it encloses. These statistics take into account an offshore zone of sovereign waters 3 miles in breadth as traditionally recognized by the United States. Actual measurement is effected by constructing a line which at all points is 3 miles distant from a normal baseline extending along the coast at the low water mark.[1]

Before the territorial sea of Hawaii could be plotted it was necessary to determine precisely which islands make up the State. The new State and the old territory are not coextensive; some of the more widely dispersed isles and atolls have been excluded from the State. The language of the act establishing Hawaii as our 50th State is only partially definitive in delineating the area:

"The State of Hawaii shall consist of all the islands, together with their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, included in the Territory of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this act, except the atoll known as Palmyra Island, together with its appurtenant reefs and territorial waters, but said State shall not be deemed to include the Midway Islands, Johnston Island, Sand Island (offshore from Johnston Island), or Kingman Reef, together wtih their appurtenant reefs and territorial waters."[2]

No identification of what would comprise the "Territory of Hawaii on the day of the enactment" is provided in the above statement.

A recent search through official documentation, facilitated by conversations and communications with Washington and Honolulu agencies, has yielded what appears to be a sharp delineation of the State.[3] Put in somewhat simple terms, Hawaii, except for Midway, is made up of the chain of islands extending in a general ESE–WNW direction. Our new State extends for about 10 degrees of latitude north of 19° N. and about 23 degrees of longtitude west of the 155° W. Even Texas does not span so many parallels and meridians. Eight major islands—most easterly of the chain—account for 99.72 percent of the land surface of the State of Hawaii. The Leeward Islands, as the western part of the chain is termed, have a land area estimated to total no more than 14 (nautical) square miles.

Several scattered islands lying generally to the south and west of Honolulu, such as Kingman Reef and Johnston Island were never firmly established as being or not being part of the territory of Hawaii. Sources, including legal opinions handed down since 1893, were frequently contradictory. Fortunately for the sake of clarity four of these southerly islands under question have been eliminated by the act establishing the State of Hawaii. It is doubtful that other of the outlying islands were ever seriously construed as belonging to the territory—Jarvis, Howland, Christmas, Malden, and others to the south of the main chain.

Another problem has been reference to a number of shoals, reefs, and banks as being in the Hawaiian group. For example, Dowsett Reef appears in lists as officially belonging to the city and county of Honolulu.[4] However, no land area can be identified, as the reef is awash in places and is nearly al-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ways covered by breakers. Without the existence of a low water mark for cartographic reference there can be no territorial sea established. Moreover, it follows that such an area could not fall within the sovereignty of any State unless it chanced to lie within the territorial waters of a body of land possessing sovereign status in its own right. Five other areas of shoals and reefs described in conjunction with early voyages fall into the same category, including three very difficult to locate, if, indeed, they exist at all.

Territorial waters of the State of Hawaii

Islands	Area [1] (nautical square miles)	Baseline (nautical miles)	Area of territorial sea (nautical square miles)
Hawaii	3,032.0	260.50	762.23
Maui and Kahoolawe	582.0	152.00	506.97
Maui	548.8	----------	----------
Kahoolawe	34.0	----------	----------
Oahu	454.0	107.50	366.25
Kauai	418.0	82.75	274.31
Molokai	196.0	85.50	286.52
Lanai	106.0	42.00	157.27
Niihau	54.0	40.00	154.49
Laysan	2.3	4.50	37.12
Kure	.6	3.00	33.77
Nihoa	.6	2.75	33.48
Lisianski	.6	2.75	32.72
Necker	.5	1.75	31.41
Kaula	----------	1.75	48.84
Pearl and Hermes Reef	----------	----------	133.41
French Frigate Shoals	----------	----------	154.08
Gardner Pinnacles	----------	----------	28.27
Maro Reef	----------	----------	28.27

[1] Area for 5 of the smaller islands or groups of islands not available or inconsequential.

With but few exceptions each island or cluster of rocky islets and atolls in Hawaii has its own territorial sea, separated one from another by areas of high seas. Each of the 17 islands or groups of islands listed in the accompanying table is surrounded by an independent area of territorial waters except Pearl and Hermes Reef, which has two such areas. In this low-lying island group there are individual islands sufficiently far apart to prevent the territorial waters from coalescing. In contrast Maui and Kahoolawe have a common territorial sea because they lie within 6 miles of one another. Situated between these two islands the small rocky islet of Molokini adds slightly to the area of the territorial sea by virtue of its own baseline from which to measure.

The arrangement of the 8 main islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago is such that 9 channels separate them one from another. Examples are Alenuihaha Channel between Hawaii and Maui, and Kaiwi Channel between Oahu and Molokai. Since only Maui and Kahoolawe are within 6 miles of each other, 8 of the channels are sufficiently wide to span the zones of territorial waters on either side and be traversed by areas of high seas. In some instances these narrows between territorial seas are less than 2 miles in width. The one of greatest breadth, Kauai Channel, lies between the islands of Kauai and Oahu where the high seas have a minimum extent of 57 miles.

Contrary to the situation found in most archipelagos, the principal islands are relatively free from small fringing or outlying islands. Except for Molokini, as mentioned above, only an occasional rocky islet lies offshore, and that only a matter of yards, or at most fractions of a mile. They do not add appreciably to the area of the territorial sea, and in no case do they extend U.S. sovereignty into interisland channels. Two examples are Mokuania and Mokumanu Islands off the northern coast of Oahu. Measuring the territorial seas of the Aleutian Islands, the Philippines, or the Fiji Islands is much more complicated than around the eastern Hawaiian chain.

West of the main group the Leeward Islands are not only much smaller in area but far more widely scattered. They stretch for more than 1,100 miles along the main axis of the archipelago whereas the 8 main islands cover a distance of but 350 miles. As a result, water expanse between the tiny islands or groups of islands are much broader, averaging 110 miles if, for the sake of illustration, Midway (U.S. sovereignty) is included. These stretches of water between relatively insignificant islands are without names, hardly to be considered as channels.

Palmyra Island, 870 miles distant from the nearest point of the main chain of the Hawaiian Islands, was not accepted as a part of the new State. Had it been otherwise, a stretch of 864 miles of high seas would separate two component parts of the State of Hawaii. Belonging to the city and county of Honolulu by virtue of the Land Registration Act of the Territory of Hawaii, 1925, Palmyra made Honolulu the most extensive city in the world, even exceeding Los Angeles. Recognition of this farflung municipality, county, and territory presumably could not be condoned as feasible for statehood, though future incorporation of Palmyra into Hawaii is not an impossibility.

One of the arguments against statehood for Hawaii reflected the noncontiguity of sovereign territory from one island to another. The existence of high seas between islands (and their territorial seas) was construed to imply a weakness in defense. However, concrete evidence on how the cleavages in sovereignty imperils our security was never brought forward. The same type of situation exists off the coast of California, Florida, and Rhode Island where offshore islands lie more than 6 miles from the mainland and have their own territorial seas, which in turn are surrounded by high seas.

Measurement of the territorial sea around small islands brings about land-water ratios far different than for measurement along a mainland coast, or even along the coast of a large island. It is safe to generalize that the smaller the island, the greater the proportion of territorial water to land surface. Examples of a geometrical nature abound in the Hawaiian Islands wherein size and shape set a pattern of offshore sovereignty highly disproportionate to the land area from which it is measured. Assuming an island to be circular it must cover a surface of 165 square miles to have a territorial sea of equal area. If larger, the island would exceed its territorial sea in size; if smaller the territorial sea would be greater. Gardner Pinnacles, two rocks in the Leeward Islands projecting above low water with an area of only a few square yards, have a territorial sea encompassing 28.27 square miles (or slightly more). This figure is nothing more than pi r^2 with $r = 3$ miles. Given a scattered group of such rocks and the exaggeration may be multiplied many times. In the case of French Frigate Shoals, a crescent-shaped series of atolls, a total land area of only a few acres, has a territorial sea of 154 square miles.

The larger the island the smaller the proportion of sovereign waters offshore, but even Molokai with its 196 square miles has a territorial sea of 286 square miles. In this instance the extenuated shape of the island adds to the area of its territorial waters. Largest of the islands, Hawaii, exceeds its territorial sea in area by a ratio of about 4 to 1. To carry the principle even farther, the relation of continental United States (excluding Alaska) to its territorial sea is 131 to 1.

Nevertheless, to return to the basic issue in the face of such fancy geometric examples, every point along the shores of Hawaii is exactly 3 miles from the high seas, and a vessel must steam (or sail) through just that much sovereign water to reach terra firma—or the outer limit of internal waters.

If the breadth of the territorial sea were to be extended to 6 miles by international law, land-water ratios among the Hawaiian Islands would be even more out of balance. A circular island would have to cover a surface of 660 square miles to be equal in area to its territorial sea, rather than 165 square miles as in the case of a 3-mile territorial sea. In the fragmented Leeward Islands even the smallest rock or atoll could have a territorial sea no smaller than 113 square miles. Thus, the sovereign waters around Gardner Pinnacles would be multiplied fourfold. Further, the islands of Maui, Molokai, Lansi, and Kahoolawe would possess a common territorial sea, leaving four open (high seas) channels separating the main Hawaiian Islands, whereas with a 3-mile territorial sea there are eight. It also follows that a 12-mile territorial sea would further increase the proportion of offshore sovereign waters to land areas. No island could have a territorial sea smaller than 452 square miles—4 times larger than that of a 6-mile and 16 times larger than a 3-mile territorial sea.

---

[1] For detailed discussion of the principles of determining the extent the territorial sea in accordance with international law see: G. Etzel Pearcy, "Geographic Aspects of the Law of the Sea," annals, AAG, vol. IX (March 1959), pp. 1–23.

[2] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 1st sess. on H.R. 29, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1957.

[3] Especially valuable help in defining Hawaii as a State was given to the author by Dr. John L. Taylor, Consultant on Territorial Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

[4] Described in an "Index to the Islands of the Territory of Hawaii, 1931," prepared by the Surveyor, Territory of Hawaii (in manuscript).

Report From a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress approaches its tremendous task of rewriting agricultural legislation it might be well to read the comments of a constituent of mine who is in the rice business in Matagorda County, Tex. He is Billy Halfen of Collegeport. It may be that some of his facts and figures are subject to question but certainly his thinking is perfectly clear. He knows what he wants and I suspect that there are many farmers who will agree with him. The letter which appeared first in the Bay City Tribune follows:

To the EDITOR:

I wish to make this report in rebuttal of Secretary Benson's report to the Congress and trust that the gentlemen will do me the same honor of listening to this report.

The Secretary reports to the Nation and to the Congress that all is rosy in the realms of agriculture. I, as a grassroots, down-to-earth, dirt-scratching, dirt farmer wish to report on matters as I really find them. As one who has had to suffer for the mistakes made for me, plus the ones I make myself, I wish to report that things are not so rosy.

Let us review the things that this administration set out to do for the farmer. First, the President was not satisfied with 90 percent of parity for farmers but felt they should have 100 percent (a thing that all farmers were in accord with—whatever parity is). What the farmers got, in about 7 years of slow death, was about 50 percent of parity. Now, if you are supposed to get 100 percent of something, whether you know what it is or not, you feel cheated if you only get 50 percent of it.

We got this 50 percent of parity after being assured that if we took acreage cuts (amounting to 50 percent in my case) to hold down production, the Government would hold parity price at a high level on the balance of our acreage. You can begin to see the squeeze we are in. First our overall income was cut 50 percent by reduction in acreage. Then the price we were supposed to get for the balance of our acreage was cut to approximately 62 percent of parity. The administration's program has broken the American farmer from an honest, hardworking, God-fearing individual to a second-rate non-bill-paying, disillusioned citizen worth, as our Government feels, only 50 percent parity. Needless to say, no one likes to be regarded as only half a citizen by his neighbors, or to be regarded as a statistic by his Government.

Our woes are directly attached to the low parity price supports. These prices are, in effect, a ceiling rather than a floor price, the price which a legitimate buyer will not exceed but uses as a target to see how much he can undercut the support prices. He knows that if he fails to buy from the farmer he can always pick it up from the CCC in a few months time at support price or less. The Government could at least protect us in the marketplaces by making the buyers pay the costs of storage and handling of such commodities. The Government should raise the support prices to a high level, as they said they would, or take off controls entirely. They should adopt the policy that, "If we can't help, we won't hinder."

Mr. Eisenhower is right when he warns of public indignation, but most of it is mistakenly directed at the farmer rather than at the present administration which is responsible for the situation. I, for one, say that the Government has a dollars worth of goods for every dollar it has loaned the farmers. The farmer himself has cost nothing. The cost to the taxpayers has been from the mismanagement of the various farm programs and the personnel used to mismanage them. The Department of Agriculture is a vast octopus that reaches from Washington to every county in every State. It is a gigantic bloc of votes for whichever party is in power. There seems to be no chance of ever voting out controls. The people who control the farmers are more numerous than the farmers. Mr. Eisenhower says, in his agricultural report, that our plight is due to a number or years of Federal interference, and he is perfectly right.

Farmers are in the position of being unjustly penalized and criticized for doing their jobs and doing them well. We were asked to do such a job during the last war. People were very proud that we could feed the world and, in reality, it is the only thing that we have proven good. Our stockpile of food seems to me a blessing and one which every other country in the world would like to have. The thing which all the hungry nations of the world are fighting for is food, and this is something we have. Hunger is the primary motivating force behind atom bombs and rockets and all other weapons. Since it apepars that we have lost the arms race, it may be that we should try to win the food war, a war in which the much-criticized farmer will play an important part. The present administration spends some $40 billion a year for defense and we seriously doubt that we can defend ourselves. There is no doubt that we can feed ourselves and therefore we think that some of the criticism should be transferred from the farmers to the defenders of our country. No one ever thinks to question the professional soldier or rocketeer as to whether they are doing a good job or whether they are doing it as economically as possible, or as to whether it is more necessary than the growing of food. I suggest that there is more than one way to die and starving to death is one of them. We should be thankful that starvation is not one of our immediate problems as it is in half the world.

The money put into agricultural products is not wasted or lost. What we have is a vast grocery store in reserve, its food or fiber still usable. On the other hand, the subsidies put into the aircraft industry are stacked up in junk depots all over the country, practically a total loss. We have all seen the enormous waste of material and manpower of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We see the waste of money and the costly bungling and stumbling of our Government. The fact that it costs $1 million a year to run one Texas Senator's office is evidence to me that we are not getting our money's worth. I have been unable to find $1 million worth of legislation with his name attached to it.

Here are a couple of things that the Government can do to help the farmer:

1. Raise parity prices to 100 percent or take off controls and stand back out of the way to let the farmer do what he can to help himself, a thing which he is powerless to do with the strangulatory controls now on him. Remember that a farmer was never a problem to anyone until the Government began to help him.

2. Quit telling the taxpayer how much money the farmer is costing him and put the blame where it belongs. Let them know what Government control of farming is costing and explain to them why Government controls are necessary from the Government's standpoint instead of from the farmers'.

3. Take the control of agriculture away from the State Department and let us sell our crops where and when we can instead of letting the State Department use our commodities as a political football as they have done in the past.

I have no answers for agriculture as a whole but I feel that these things would help me in the business of raising rice and would once again make it a profitable business and one that I can be proud of.

This report is not meant to be a parody on the President's report nor on Secretary Benson's. I feel that once in a great while Congress should hear from someone actively engaged in agriculture so as not to lose touch with the common farmer.

I wish to thank you for listening to the reading of this report and for your consideration of the same.

Yours very truly,

BILLY HALFEN.

COLLEGEPORT.

Pollution Problem No. 4: Water Development Needs Boost in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of December 30, 1959.

The article follows:

POLLUTION PROBLEM NO. 4: WATER DEVELOPMENT NEEDS BOOST IN GEORGIA

(By Luke Greene)

Georgia has much on the debit side when it comes to an overall program for the conservation and protection of one of its most valuable resources—water..

In fact, the State's policies, laws, and organizations relating to thfs important commodity are somewhat limp.

DEDICATED WORK

Such a statement is certainly not intended to reflect on the dedicated work of those individuals and agencies that have tried to do their best with the limitations imposed on them.

Because of overall growth in population, expansion of industry, and the trend toward heavy concentrations of people and industry, it's important that we reappraise our acts and attitudes on stream pollution and the many other aspects of water conservation.

There's a need for gathering up the loose ends and making sure that we get maximum benefit from our efforts to eliminate pollution and protect our sources of water.

Through the years the main burden of regulating water has just naturally fallen on the State department of health.

This came about largely because in the early days there was great concern about the spread of disease germs through drinking water. Typhoid was a great scourge and cleaning up the water became one means of attacking it.

As time passed typhoid became less of a problem. But the regulation of water remained primarily a health function.

And it remains so today.

A few years ago Georgia set up a water laws revision commission. Its study resulted in passage of the Georgia Water Quality Control Act which serves as Georgia's principal guide as far as water supervision and control are concerned.

This act created a water-quality council, consisting of the heads of several State departments as ex officio members and a representative from each of several fields, such as municipal government, soil conservation, and the pulp and paper industry.

This council is responsible to the State board of health, a policymaking body with primary interest in the field of health.

The State department of health also has a water-quality division, consisting of three men who devote their full time to carrying out provisions of the law, mainly through technical assistance and education.

In its annual report the division describes its missions and objectives in rather broad terms. Maintaining a high quality of water and keeping surface streams in good condition seem to be the two main jobs.

But its limitations are reflected in this paragraph of the annual report:

"That the objectives of the program are being attained is attested by the absence of actual or suspected waterborne disease over a long period of years from the 635 water supplies of Georgia."

The Water Quality Control Act represents a bundle of compromises. Many think it falls far short of the job that needs to be done in Georgia.

Some effort was made in the last general assembly to firm up the water situation but the bill now rests in committee.

GOVERNMENT INTEREST

Other State government interest in water is concentrated mainly in the game and fish commission, which seeks more and better fishing, and the department of mines, mining and geology, which assembles basic water data.

To do the whole job properly, some think the State should have a water resources commission, possibly with tighter laws to prevent pollution.

Other States have such commissions that are proving effective in promoting all phases of water development, and seeing that conservation is more than an idealistic byword.

Georgia, facing as it does a great industrial future, shouldn't allow itself to fall behind in this field.

Eisenhower Appointee Endorses H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, among the witnesses appearing before the Ways and Means Committee last July in support of my bill, H.R. 4700, was Mr. Charles I. Schottland.

Mr. Schottland was Commissioner of Social Security from July 1954 to December 1958, having been appointed to that position by President Eisenhower. He resigned from that office to become dean of the Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University. Prior to that time Mr. Schottland was director of the California Department of Social Welfare.

Because of his wide experience and background in the field of social welfare his testimony on the question of health insurance is, I believe, worthy of the most serious consideration.

So that all members may have the benefit of his views I include a summary of his testimony as a part of my remarks. It follows:

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY OF CHARLES I. SCHOTTLAND, FORMERLY COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 14, 1959

The problem: The problem of medical care for the aged stems from three factors. First, the number of aged in the United States is increasing rapidly. Every day there is a net increase of approximately 1,000 persons over 65 years of age. Second, the 15½ million persons over 65 have the usual diseases of age and senility—diseases which are long in duration and frequently require expensive medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. Third, the aged by and large do not have the income to pay for medical care. In 1956 and 1957, three-fifths of all persons 65 and over had less than $1,000 in money income. Almost one-half of the total income of the aged in the United States comes from income maintenance programs, primarily social security and other public programs. A study in 1957 indicated that among aged couples, 52 percent had medical bills of more than $200 a year. The problem, therefore, is clear—the aged in the United States do not have sufficient income to meet the mounting costs of hospitalization or other long-term medical care.

The solution: The United States has developed one of the highest standards of medical care in the world, but medical care in the United States is just like any other commodity—it is available to those who have the purchase price. Since many aged do not have the funds with which to purchase medical care, they are denied access to such care.

The traditional method of paying for medical care, namely, that of payment through the individual's resources, will not take care of the rank and file of the aged. Voluntary organizations and private hospitals cannot foot the bill for the 15½ million aged, nor should the aged be forced to go on public relief merely because they cannot afford medical care.

Voluntary insurance has made tremendous progress in the United States through voluntary prepayment plans. However, voluntary insurance cannot finance, without extremely higher premiums, the many millions already aged and receiving medical care.

Social insurance: It seems to me that the solution of this problem is clear. We have developed in the United States a method of insuring against widespread social risks. We have insured against industrial accident through workmen's compensation; we have insured against old age through old-age, survivor's and disability insurance; we have insured against total and permanent disability through this system and we have insured against the contingency of death of the wage earner. We have also insured against the contingency of unemployment through unemployment insurance. In four States of the Union, we have insured against temporary disability or sickness. All of these have been done through the mechanism of social insurance.

The social security program has become thoroughly accepted by the rank and file of the people of this country as it has by the rank and file of the people of practically every western industrialized country in the world. It is a sound method of insuring against certain risks and it is in the tradition of American values in that it provides for saving during a person's working and productive years so that when the contingency insured against arises, the person will be able to take care of his problems.

The Forand bill (H.R. 4700) sets forth a program based upon this principle of social insurance. I believe the principle embodied within this bill is sound. Here is an opportunity through a relatively small payroll tax (a tax which I believe the American people are willing to pay) to finance the program contemplated.

Conclusion: In my experience I have run across numerous tragedies among the aged because of the high cost of medical care. I have seen persons who saved for their old age, who owned their homes and had substantial assets, reduced to destitution because of prolonged illness; I have seen persons go on relief who had always been self-supporting until they reached their seventies and eighties and medical costs forced them to seek public assistance. I do not believe that a society such as ours, conscious of its medical needs, cannot afford good medical care without such hardship and humiliation. In the distant past men frequently resigned themselves to such a situation. But today our people have made the discovery that there is a way to insure against various social risks; namely through the device of social insurance—a device that is now keeping millions of Americans from the hardships and poverty which otherwise would have come because of unemployment, old age, death of the wage earner, disability or industrial accidents. The problems of medical care for the aged are national problems in which all citizens have an interest. The Congress has it in its power to make a contribution to the solution of the financial aspects of these problems through H.R. 4700. This bill utilizes the machinery of social insurance which has proved successful and which has been administered soundly, efficiently, and economically in connection with old-age, survivor's and disability insurance. In other democratic and free countries, the extension of this principle to medical care has been found successful. It does not involve any fundamental change in the physician-patient relationship. It would be the beginning of a solution to this very vexing problem, and I respectfully express the hope that the members of this committee, after due deliberation and the weighing of all of the testimony and evidence, will give to this approach to the solution of the medical care problems of the aged, the same favorable consideration which they have given to other social insurance programs which have originated in this committee of the Congress.

Economic Development in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last September, at the gracious invitation of the Italian Government, several Congressmen of Italian origin visited Italy. As the result of our visit we were able to see with our own eyes the great industrial, economic, and social progress Italy has made since World War II.

Included in our visit was the new World Trade Center-Permindex in Rome. The Honorable Ferenc Nagy, the president of the center, addressed our group. Because of the interesting points made by Mr. Nagy in his speech, I am including its text in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am certain that all of the Members of this Congress will find it interesting reading.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY FERENC NAGY

Congressman FINO, distinguished Member of the American Congress, ladies and gentlemen, kindly permit me to extend the heartfelt greetings of the World Trade Center and the Permindex Co. to you, Members of Congress of Italian descent, as well as to your families. You, the Members of Congress of Italian descent, have come to Italy to visit your relatives here on the one hand, and on the other hand to acquire knowledge and experiences about those developments which have taken place since you or your parents have left Italy. Upon your return to the United States you may be justifiably proud of the development which has occurred in Italy during the last decades, but especially that which has occurred since the Second World War. Italy has become an exceptionally important factor in the European Community, and the economic development which has taken place in Italy is especially noteworthy. As you have had the occasion to observe, Italy has developed into a great industrial power. The older industrial concerns are carrying on their activities at a greatly increased and expanded pace; in addition scores of new businesses have been organized to strengthen the economy and industry of Italy, all of which has increased the standard of living for the Italian people.

The international commerce of Italy does not lag behind that of other European countries, and I am firmly convinced that the organization which we have founded and

brought to Italy—the World Trade Center-Permindex—will in a large degree, contribute to making Italy one of the most important centers of world commerce.

During the course of the diversified program in which you participated during your visit to Italy, you are now the honored guests of the World Trade Center-Permindex, and as its president I want to extend our heartfelt greetings to you. Now that you have visited our wonderful exhibition buildings, which cannot be matched anywhere in the world, allow me now, here at the dinner table, to outline for you the program and aims of the World Trade Center-Permindex.

The World Trade Center was established in Rome in order to promote international commerce. You can justifiably wonder why there was any necessity for establishing another trade center. If one pays close attention to the development of international economic life, several very interesting conclusions can be reached. The first is that industrial production all over the world is growing day by day. Innumerable factors force world industry to increase its products. One such factor is that investments in industry are ever increasing; another factor is that technical advances and knowledge present new and newer discoveries to industry; while a third factor is that we find industry employing new production methods; for example, that of automation. These factors taken all together force world industry to increase its production. However, it is natural and worth while to increase industrial production only if industry can profitably sell its products on the world markets. It is regrettable that world markets are not growing in the proportion to the growth of industrial production; and present commercial methods are not completely adequate for immediately finding new world markets for the growing number of products, or for placing these products into new world markets.

That is, while automation promotes the increase in industrial production, we cannot see a similar automation in international commerce. A characteristic, but at the same time sad symptoms of international economic life, is the fact that while in certain industrial countries overproduction creates recessions from time to time, which in turn causes unemployment and a business decline, in other parts of the world, but especially in the so-called underdeveloped countries, hundreds of millions would like to share in the blessings of industrial production, and raise their living standards, as well as becoming consumers of the industrial products of the world.

If we do not apply new and modern methods in international commerce in order to distribute the products of world industry into all parts of the world, the situation in the future can well become more serious. Nowadays there is ever-increasing mention in international politics of disarmament. We do not know when a partial or a possible total disarmament will become a reality. But if we assume that in the coming years the great powers will succeed in agreeing to even a partial program, this will result in world industry manufacturing, instead of armaments, capital, and consumer goods. Production of these goods will increase supplies to such an extent that, without a corresponding increase in markets, this could well create a serious economic world crisis. For this reason, we feel that new methods, modern, dynamic methods are necessary in international commerce in order to properly regulate the great questions of supply and the lack of demand in world industry.

In general, the World Trade Center-Permindex is known to international public opinion as another industrial exhibition, which differs from other exhibitions only by the fact while those are temporary, this exhibition plans to become a permanent one. We do not want to add to the number of exhibitions. We are organizing the World Trade Center in order to aid international commerce by using new and dynamic methods, through sources which extend all over the world. We want to carry on our activities permanently, but we can do this only if, in addition to the Trade Center, we can organize a permanent show window for world industry, a permanent exhibition where world industry will have the opportunity of presenting those new products which it wants to introduce into other parts of the world. This is why a permanent industrial world exhibition is necessary.

Obtaining the exhibitors is only one part of our activities. The major part of our energies will be expended in trying to insure purchasers for products which will be shown at our exhibition. For this reason we are in touch not only with the Western countries, where we are gaining the participation of export-import companies, the purchasing commissions of various governments, of buyers for the large department stores, and the trading companies, but we have also expanded our activities to include the so-called developing areas, since it is our firm conviction that in the coming years the mass consumers for the industrial products of the world will be those who have been shut away so long in underdeveloped areas from becoming possible consumers of the industrial products of the world. We have connections with practically every country in Asia, as well as the African countries, not only those countries which have already begun their lives as independent nations, but with those nations which will achieve nationhood and independence in the near future. We want to bring together these countries so that they can effect their business transactions for their countries through the exhibition in Rome.

We are well aware that our goal is a very ambitious one. We know that we have planned a monumental program, but we also know that we are living in times when such programs are necessary.

Naturally an effective, worldwide international commercial activity can only be carried on if we are completely informed about the economic situation all over the world, and if we bravely face those problems which constantly present themselves in present international economic life.

We must know how long world industry can exist on the present markets. We must know the methods which must be used for expanding the world market in order to increase the consumers of industrial products by hundreds and hundreds of millions. We must know to what degree we can proceed with the industrialization of the so-called underdeveloped countries without causing an economic recession. We must know how to solve those financial difficulties which, in many instances, create barriers in international commerce between individual countries. In order to analyze all these questions on the highest possible plane, it is our plan to organize an Economic World Council, consisting of outstanding experts in the world, a council which would convene from time to time to analyze the great problems of interantional economic life, and which would advise us in the making of decisions for planning our work program.

One of the distinguished members of your group posed the question to me while we were inspecting the buildings: How could this group of American lawmakers aid the World Trade Center-Permindex in its task of strengthening international commerce to become most effective? I believe, gentlemen, that you could best help us by convincing American economic circles, industry and commerce alike, to participate in the commercial activities and the exhibition of the World Trade Center and Permindex in Rome. American industry is more reluctant to turn to foreign markets than the industry of the Western European countries, or even the industry of Japan. The American market is a local market, which so far has served as a suitable basis not only for continuing its activities but for expanding its industrial plants. But American industry must understand that this situation can not last forever. Even the American markets have a point of saturation. American industry will be increasingly forced to export part of its production. And we, here in Rome, believe that we are presenting first-class possibilities to American industry for offering its industrial products from a central location to consumers in every part of the world. You, whose constituents are in part Americans of Italian descent, represent chiefly the industrial areas. You doubtless have connections not only with the workers but also with the local industrial concerns. I believe that any encouraging word on your part to American industry would be a great help not only to our organization in realizing its aims, but would also further the economic life of America.

I again extend the sincere, heartfelt greetings of our organization and thank you for visiting the World Trade Center-Permindex.

Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Dean Clarence Manion is one of the greatest Americans of our time. His statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate is superb and timely. I urge every Member of this great body to study earnestly this excellent statement by Dean Manion.

STATEMENT OF DEAN CLARENCE MANION ON BEHALF OF FOR AMERICA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, CONCERNING SENATE RESOLUTION 94, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Clarence Manion. I am a practicing lawyer of South Bend, Ind., a member of the St. Joseph County Bar Association, the Indiana State Bar Association, and of the American Bar Association.

For 25 years, I was professor of Constitutional Law as the University of Notre Dame and for 11 years, I was dean of the Notre Dame College of Law.

I am appearing here today and submitting this statement on behalf of "For America," a national committee for political action of which I am vice chairman.

In my judgment and in the judgment of the people I represent here, it would be a grave mistake for the U.S. Senate to approve of the pending Senate Resolution 94, and thus repeal and delete the so-called Connally reservation that was added to our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

We believe, in other words, that it is critically important now for the United States to continue to determine for itself what matters are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of this country. We do

not believe that the International Court should be permitted to decide that question by itself.

I have read much of the testimony that has been presented to this committee in opposition to Senate Resolution 94 and I subscribe to practically everything that has been said against the resolution by these witnesses. This is particularly true of the testimony given here by Robert H. Kelley, of Houston, Tex.; by George Montgomery, Jr., of New York City; and the statements submitted respectively by Frank E. Holman and Alfred J. Schweppe of Seattle, Wash.; and the statement submitted by Emilio S. Iglesias, representing the American Legion.

Deliberately therefore, I shall attempt to refrain from repeating the factual statements and able arguments of these distinguished lawyers. I do this to conserve the time of this honorable committee and to direct the mainstream of my own brief testimony to the clarification of certain misrepresentations that are expressed in or easily implied from statements made here and elsewhere by those who favor the adoption of Senate Resolution 94.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

First of all, the attitude of the American Bar Association has effectively, been misrepresented by some of those who favor the repeal of the Connally reservation. The American Bar Association has taken no official action on pending Senate Resolution 94 which was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY in 1959. I submit that in view of the record, it is misrepresentation to cite the action taken on this same subject by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association in 1947, as equivalent to the attitude of the American Bar Association today.

Since 1947, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association has gone on record at least five times with expressions and resolutions at variance with its World Court resolution of 1947. By resolution in January 1949, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association urged the U.S. Senate not to ratify the pending Genocide Convention until a full study of the impact of that convention upon the domestic jurisdiction of American courts and upon the constitutional rights of American citizens could be made.

In September 1949, the house of delegates officially resolved that the Genocide Convention should not be ratified by the United States. The debate on this resolution showed clearly that the September 1949 resolution was a clear remonstrance against the possible invasion of American rights and of the domestic jurisdiction of the United States by international bodies that were then being spawned by the new United Nations Organization.

In February 1952, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association proposed that th Constitution of the United States be amended in order to protect private rights, States rights, and the internal affairs of the country from possible interference and invasion by the provisions of treaties betwen this country and foreign nations.

In September of 1952, the same house of delegates extended its resolution of February 1952, by urging that the proposed constitutional amendment include protection against executive agreements as well as treaties. This succession of actions by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association shows a rapid and complete change of its official attitude from one of faith and confidence in the new international organizations in 1947 to a position of official apprehension and emphatic distrust in 1952.

The internationalists were greatly disturbed by this series of official actions and they made a determined drive within the bar association to have the organization reverse itself in its 1953 national convention at Boston. To assist the internationalists in this effort, Secretary of State Dulles addressed the 1953 Boston convention and stressed his opinion that the constitutional amendment then known as the Bricker amendment, which the association had urged as a protection against treaties and executive agreements, would have a calamitous effect on the conduct of our foreign relations.

While Mr. Dulles' speech was still reverberating, a resolution was introduced to put the convention on record upholding the contention of the Secretary of State and condemning the Bricker amendment. That resolution was defeated by a majority of nearly 4 to 1.

This recital of events from the official records of the American Bar Association is made here now to show that if there is such a thing as the principle of "repeal by implication" in statutory construction (and every lawyer knows that there is such a principle), then the vote of confidence in international organizations generally, and in the International Court of Justice particularly, which was passed by the American Bar Association in 1947, has been officially, emphatically, and repetitiously repealed in the intervening years.

It is true that prominent members of the American Bar Association are now and have always been opposed to the Connally reservation. Nevertheless, for the past 12 years, the internationalist counsel of these lawyers has been consistently and officially rejected by the American Bar Association as a whole, and it is gross misrepresentation now to attribute the eccentric views of these individuals to the organized bar of the United States.

As Mr. Holman has already pointed out to the committee, the proponents of world government are militantly on the march again both within and without the American Bar Association, but it would be a mistake for the Senate of the United States to conclude that these internationalists have already convinced the American people that they should gamble with the sovereignty of the United States. Whenever they have a chance to vote on the subject, both the lawyers and the people of this country have and will always vote overwhelmingly to preserve our American independence from foreign intervention.

THE ATTITUDE OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94

The debate over Senate Resolution 94 has likewise developed confusion that could, in fact, be misrepresentation of the views of Vice President NIXON on the subject of the Connally reservation.

It is true that in New York City last April 13, the Vice President voiced with approval a prediction that the Eisenhower administration would soon make recommendations for a closer relationship between the United States and the International Court of Justice. That prediction came to life when President Eisenhower recommended adoption of Senate Resolution 94 in his state of the Union message to Congress in January of this year. However, in the meantime, Vice President NIXON had made another speech, this time in Chicago (October 5, 1959), in which he said this: "There are some who suggest that the only answer (to use of force or threats of force as a means of settling differences between nations) is that nations should agree to submit all their differences to some new, all-powerful world tribunal. However well intentioned such proposals may be, they are completely unrealistic in the present world context. As the distinguished Washington correspondent, Arthur Krock, said to me recently, great powers will submit details to arbitration, but never their basic interests." Then after an interval, the Vice President continued: "The United States should affirmatively explore ways in which its controversies with other nations can be submitted to and decided by the International Court of Justice at the Hague."

Is this a recommendation for the repeal of the Connally reservation? Or does the Vice President's agreement with Mr. Krock's statement, namely, that great powers will never submit their basic interests to arbitration, mean that we should reserve the right to judge for ourselves not merely domestic questions but all matters, domestic and international, which involve our basic interests, such as for instance, our basic interest in the Panana Canal, the Monroe Doctrine, our expensive military bases in all parts of the world, and so forth?

The general misunderstanding of the Vice President's position on the question of our relationship to the World Court was evidenced by another distinguished Washington correspondent last Sunday, February 14, (Chicago Sun-Times, February 14) when Walter Lippmann wrote: "The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on a resolution which, curiously and remarkably enough, was introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and has the ardent support of Vice President NIXON. This, as Mr. K. might say, is an instance where a shrimp has whistled." Is this a misrepresentation of the Vice President's attitude on the Connally reservation?

In view of his present and prospective responsibilities in the premises, the confusion about Mr. NIXON'S position on this proposal should be clarified by an unequivocal statement for the information of the country and for the records of this committee.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION IS NOT A SELF-JUDGING PROVISION

An even more important misrepresentation of the Connally reservation is the frequently repeated charge that it is a self-judging provision. In this connection, we are solemnly charged to remember Sir Edward Coke's maxim that "no man should be judge in his own cause," and told that in the Connally reservation the United States is reserving the right to judge its own case. This is a grave misrepresentation of fact. The resolution of our adherence to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court repeats the jurisdictional competence of the Court word for word, as set forth in paragraph 2, article 36, of the statute of the International Court of Justice with this proviso added:

"That such declaration shall not apply to (a) disputes, the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals * * * (b) disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

That is the language of the resolution before the addition of the Connally reservation. Thus it is the uncontested part of our resolution of adherence that withholds from the jurisdiction of the International Court all disputes involving domestic questions. Please observe too, that the uncontested part of our resolution of adherence, significantly excludes the following language from article 36 of the Court statute:

(6) "In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

This exclusion was deliberately made in and by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate before Senator Connally proposed his reservation which is now the subject of the Humphrey resolution. I submit therefore, that if there is any substance to the charge of self-judgment, the offense was not committed by the Connally reservation. It was committed by the Senate when that body deliberately knocked out the section of the World Court statute above quoted, which spells out the right of the International

Court to decide for itself all jurisdictional disputes of every kind and character.

Thus the Connally reservation was merely a positive restatement of what was already declared; namely, that, as far as the United States is concerned, the International Court should not have the right to settle any dispute about the Court's jurisdiction in any case. The Connally reservation merely underscored that Senate declaration with specific reference to matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of this country. If the advocates of the Humphrey resolution are sincere in their professed effort to purge the resolution of what they call its self-judging characteristics, then they must do more than repeal the Connally reservation. They must go further and move to reinstate the significantly deleted paragraph 6 of article 36 of the Court statute.

One does not "judge his own case" when he denies the jurisdiction of a particular court to try that case.

In fact and in truth, however, the United States is not attempting to "judge itself" or "decide its own cause" when it withholds from this International Court the right to be the final arbiter of its own jurisdiction. There is no court in our entire judicial system that has such a sweeping prerogative. By the Constitution of the United States, the original jurisdiction of our own Supreme Court is restricted to two types of cases and any or all of its appellate jurisdiction may be withdrawn from it at any time by the Congress. An omnicompetent court with self-determined jurisdiction over all things and everybody under all circumstances would be the very definition of tyranny. In our concept of law and justice there is no branch of government—executive, legislative, or judicial—that has the right to define the limits of its own jurisdiction. There is certainly no reason why we should confer upon an alien body powers that we deny to our own legal institutions.

A litigant does not "judge his own case" when he challenges the jurisdictional right of a particular court to sit in judgment on a particular lawsuit. Such a plea to the jurisdiction is always in order in all stages and areas of our jurisprudence. Coke's maxim is violated only when one is a plaintiff or a defendant and judge in the same lawsuit.

The statute of the International Court itself plainly states that submission to its jurisdiction may be made conditionally, unconditionally, or not at all (art. 36, par. 3).

BAD WORDS FOR GOOD CAUSES AND VICE VERSA

The misrepresentation of the Connally reservation as a self-judging declaration is an effective application of the tactical formula which condemns a good cause with a bad word. This formula also works in reverse. That happens when a bad cause is beautified with the attribution of a pious phrase.

AT PRESENT THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS WORLD LAW

This brings me to the final and most fundamental of all the misrepresentations advanced by the proponents of Senate Resolution 94. Secretary Herter told this committee in substance that the Connally reservation is obstructing the attainment of a "working rule of law in the world," which would displace the "rule of force." In his commendatory letter to Senator HUMPHREY last November 19, President Eisenhower likewise linked the repeal of the Connally reservation with the President's expressed hope for "the rule of law in the world." Systematically for the past 2 years the melodic phrase "world peace through world law" has been made to resound throughout the country as the bright alternative to our selfish addiction to the Connally reservation. There has been righteous and repetitious assurance that a peaceful and legally ordered world will surely follow upon our trustful and unqualified submission to the International Court of Justice. The cold light of stark reality shows that all such promising prediction is sheer fantasy.

In the presently deranged state of mankind there is little prospect for world peace and there is no such thing as world law. Under present conditions, therefore, an unconstitutional submission of our disputes with other governments to the International Court of Justice would only serve to betray our own vital National interests and give immeasurable aid and comfort to our vicious, ruthless and implacable Communist enemies.

In his testimony before this committee, Secretary Herter quoted the late Secretary Dulles as follows:

"We in the United States have had from the very beginning of our history insisted that there is a rule of law which is above the rule of man—Thus since its inception our Nation has been dedicated to the principle that man, in his relationship with other men should be governed by moral or natural law."

That is self-evident truth. The moral, natural law proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence has been codified in and projected through our American constitutional system. Here in America therefore, as Mr. Dulles implied, government is man's agent for the protection of God's gifts. Its unique federated powers are limited to the service of human rights and its processes and decrees are enforced with moral as well as legal sanctions. This is what Americans understand as "law."

On the international plane such law loses its legal enforcing arm. An international Court cannot send a sheriff to levy an execution against the property of a sovereign state. Neither could it order the arrest of a criminal nation without starting a war which it is the very purpose of an International Court to avoid.

On the international plane, since legal sanctions are impossible, moral sanctions are imperative. Such moral sanctions are the only hope for what we call "International Law" because on the international level, law must depend solely upon international morality for its preservation and enforcement.

In how much of the world today is morality and the natural, moral law recognized as the motivation of governmental action? One-third of the earth's surface and much more of the world's population is now ruthlessly tyrannized by a self appointed materialistic hierarchy of professional Atheists who deny the existence of morality and worship the iron rule of force, deceit and conspiracy.

This cult of cruel conscienceless coercion continuously threatens violence against all mankind. It is from this entrenched conspiracy that shooting war may be expected to proceed at any moment that is propitious for its purpose and it is because of this materialistic plunderbund that the whole world trembles fearfully on the brink of nuclear destruction. This is the frightening war potential from which the "world peace through world law" advocates now derive their popular emotional appeal. We are asked to give the International Court unreserved jurisdiction over all of our American affairs because of the good influential example that this surrender will provide for the cause of world peace. Although the Communist plunderbund has refused to submit itself to any part of the jurisdiction of the International Court, it has nevertheless placed two of its judges, so called, on the 15 judge International Court, where they are now ready and eager to sit in judgment upon the right of the United States to retain its naval base at Guantanamo, Cuba, to keep the American flag flying in the Panama Canal Zone and to protect its expensive ring of military bases in half a hundred countries of the world. Prima facie at least, there are international questions subject now without the repeal of the Connally reservation to the judgment of the International Court where we have one judge and the Communists have two judges. The Humphrey resolution would add to these present exposures such subjects as immigration, tariffs and the immunity of Soviet spies now inside of our country.

THE ISSUE IS SELF-PRESERVATION

Senate Resolution 94 is more than a proposal for the elimination of a reservation in a treaty. Senate Resolution 94 calls, in effect, for the surrender of our sovereignty. There is no law to govern the decisions of the International Court of Justice with respect to the scope of its own jurisdiction or anything else.

When and if Senate Resolution 94 is passed, any country on earth can hail us before the bar of this tribunal for any reason whatsoever and we will be powerless to resist the Court's assumption of jurisdiction in such a case. In the presently precarious state of our National Security, now is certainly not the time to expand the right of our deadly enemies to pentrate our vital defenses under color of law.

Let us face it: Neither peace nor law is possible for a world that is locked in a death struggle between freedom and Communism. We can think about "world peace through world law" only after the diabolical menace of the Communist conspiracy has been swept from the face of the earth. In the meantime, we will have all that we can do to preserve this country and its freedom-protecting constitutional system from complete destruction. This is no time to let down our guard. Senate Resolution 94 should be defeated.

Resolutions Adopted at the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 10 and 11, 1960, the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association met in their annual convention in Kansas City, Mo.

At that meeting resolutions were adopted of great importance, and if adhered to will bring untold benefits to our grain and livestock producers in every section of the United States, and hence to all the people over the long pull.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call special attention to resolution No. 2—"Incentive Payments on Hogs"—which is a clear-cut statement in unrelentless opposition to such bills as have been introduced in Congress. I commend the association for adopting these well-considered, forthright resolutions, and which were submitted to me by Mr. Clark A. Brockman, for which I am most grateful.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped the respective committees of Congress will take heed and act in harmony with these resolutions, and at an early date.

Mr. Brockman's letter and the resolutions follow:

CLARINDA, IOWA, *February 16, 1960.*

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Enclosed find recently adopted resolutions of The Corn Belt Live Stock Feeders Association. This name has now been changed to National due to the expanded feeder area that now exists.

While there was no resolution passed in regard to it, there was quite a bit of discussion, and it was general opinion that, the chainstores today have entirely too great an influence on the price of livestock.

It was general opinion that the packer consent decree should be modified to permit the large packers to open retail outlets.

The livestock interests would especially like to see enabling legislation to permit a checkoff on the live animals for promotion and advertising.

They do not look very kindly on the proposed Iowa checkoff, as they wish to join in a national effort along this line, and also have a voice in choosing the men to administer it.

There are already in existence beef, hog, and sheep councils on a national scale.

Very truly yours,

CLARK A. BROCKMAN.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY CORN BELT LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, KANSAS CITY, MO.

RESOLUTION 1. LIVESTOCK LOSS PREVENTION

Whereas the association has previously resolved in favor of an industry program that would reduce losses in livestock, meat and livestock products from bruises, diseases, parasites, and other factors; and

Since losses to the industry from these factors and conditions still involve millions of dollars annually: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our support of Livestock Conservation, Inc., under its realinement and do everything possible to assist it in its program of livestock loss prevention.

RESOLUTION 2. INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ON HOGS

Whereas there are bills in the U.S. Congress which would provide for incentive payments to hog producers under certain conditions, more particularly when the price of live hogs is below a given price per hundredweight and provided that producers sell their hogs for slaughter at weights from 175 pounds to 190 pounds; and

Whereas since such a program, while possibly bringing temporary relief on occasion, would stimulate rather than discourage pork production, would set the stage for artificial price-production relationships from which the industry might never recover, and might eventually lead to the establishment of production controls thereby creating an unhealthy situation; and

Whereas since the sale of hogs at the weights specified would be undesirable, impractical, and uneconomical: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association continue its unrelentless opposition to the bills under consideration and any other measures of a similar nature that would make incentive payments or subsidy payments to livestock feeders and producers, and threaten the freedom of operation of the entire livestock industry.

RESOLUTION 3. PACKERS CONSENT DECREE

Whereas three of the four large packing companies now bound by the restrictions of the consent decree of 1921 are now seeking modification of this decree; and

Whereas since we believe that the consent decree is discriminatory against the packers affected because all other packers are not restricted from entering other lines of business, if they choose: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the association approves the attempt of the three packing companies to modify the consent decree and instructs its officers to render any possible assistance to the packers involved.

RESOLUTION 4. PURCHASERS BOND

Whereas it is not now required that all purchasers of slaughter livestock be bonded so payment for the livestock they purchase is guaranteed; and

Whereas since there have been notable instances where purchasers of slaughter livestock have suddenly gone out of business in such a way as to make it impossible for order-buying agencies and selling agencies to collect amounts due them thus causing them to sustain huge losses; and

Whereas since order buying agencies and selling agencies so injured could find it impossible to continue operating thereby affecting outlets for finished livestock: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association recommends a regulation to the Packers and Stockyards Administration requiring all purchasers of slaughter livestock to furnish sufficient bond to cover their normal purchases.

RESOLUTION 5. PAYMENT FOR LIVESTOCK

In recent months there have been instances where individual packers have delayed in their payments for livestock purchases at some markets, even though rules of trading may require payment to the selling agency by noon the next day; and

Whereas should this situation be allowed to continue and payment requirements are relaxed, selling agencies might eventually be forced to delay their remittances to shippers, which would mean that feeders could eventually be in the position of partially or even completely financing some packing operations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association is in favor of a regulation that requires all purchasers of slaughter livestock to make payment within 24 hours for all such livestock purchased at all points.

RESOLUTION 6. THE PENCIL SHRINK PRIVILEGE

Whereas the Packers and Stockyards Administration has considered imposing a regulation that would eliminate the privilege of using a "pencil shrink" in livestock transactions and would require that all trading take place on actual weights of livestock; and

Whereas though we are aware of certain beneficial aspects of such a regulation, it nevertheless would render it impossible in many cases for buyers of feeder cattle to obtain the shrink in weight to which they are justly entitled; and

Whereas since this practice has long been established and appears to be generally acceptable in the trade: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the association oppose any regulation that would prohibit the use of a "pencil shrink," and that the association prevail on the Department not to impose it.

RESOLUTION 7. LABELING OF FOREIGN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Whereas though all meats and meat products offered for importation into the United States are inspected by an agency of the Federal Government as carefully as is possible to insure the wholesomeness of the products and protect the health of the Nation; and

Whereas since it is deemed highly desirable and necessary to not only inspect the meat from animals slaughtered domestically, but also to examine the nonedible portions and organs at the time of slaughter for the purpose of being absolutely certain that the meat and products are safe for human consumption; and

Whereas since foreign meat and meat products are not processed under equally rigid inspection at time of slaughter, and we believe that the American people are entitled to every measure of precaution in connection with the food they consume including notice that there may be some difference in inspection procedures with respect to meat from domestic slaughter and meat from foreign slaughter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the association favors a requirement that all meat and meat products processed from foreign slaughter, and domestic products containing meat or meat products from foreign slaughter, be clearly stamped or the package labeled at the time of sale to American consumers giving notice that they are, or contain meat and/or meat products, of foreign origin.

RESOLUTION 8. QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF MEAT, MEAT PRODUCTS, AND LIVESTOCK

Whereas the association recognizes the necessity of some trade between countries, and realizes that the United States is exporting certain quantities of meat and meat products, and further realizes that imports of larger quantities of meat, meat products, and livestock under certain conditions of production in this country may not be injurious to our domestic industry; and

Whereas since imports of meat, meat products, and livestock have risen sharply in the past 2 years and it is indicated that imports of these products will continue at levels higher than previous percentages of domestic production, even though our domestic production is increasing and our price levels have declined: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the association is in favor of flexible quotas on imports of meat, meat products, and livestock based on domestic supply and domestic prices; and be it further

Resolved, That the association urge the U.S. Tariff Commission to institute an investigation immediately under the escape clause, section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951, as amended, to officially determine whether present rates of imports are injurious, or threaten to cause injury, to the domestic industry.

RESOLUTION 9. MIDWESTERN REGIONAL BEEF COUNCIL

Whereas the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association has previously endorsed and supported a program of meat promotion to be financed by a voluntary deduction from the proceeds of livestock sold and is still attempting to inaugurate an advertising and promotion program for red meats in line with the policies and requirements set out in resolutions of past years; and

Whereas since it appears that a beef promotion program would be best facilitated by the operation of a midwestern regional beef council rather than through individual beef councils in each State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the association generally approve the objectives of the midwestern beef council and urges its members to actively support it; and be it further

Resolved, That the association instruct its officers to continue efforts to draft the mechanics of a deduction program in a manner that is harmonious with the National Livestock and Meat Board and to seek enabling legislation to permit the deduction provided it is necessary.

Our First President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in times of grave crisis such as the United States

faces in the world today, our leaders would do well to look back to the founders of our Nation for examples to emulate, particularly that great Virginian, George Washington.

Though there is little new that can be added to what is already known about the achievements of that illustrious statesman, it is always refreshing to read thoughtful editorials citing Washington as a standard for appraising aspiring men for high office.

One such editorial in the February 20, 1960, issue of the Tablet, Brooklyn, N.Y., emphasized Washington as a yardstick for this purpose.

The editorial follows:

OUR FIRST PRESIDENT

On Monday, February 22, our Nation celebrates the birthday of our first President. In this year of decision when, once again, the American electorate will select a Chief Executive, the ideals and the virtues of the man who was "first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen" need careful remembering.

George Washington was, first, last and always, an American. He had a high concept of the destiny of the American Republic as a harbor of hope, of freedom and of opportunity from the storms of tyranny which swept the world. His public addresses and his last farewell to his Countrymen breathed a spirit of Americanism which insisted that our first concern should always be the integrity, the security and the welfare of our Nation. He warned against foreign entanglements and their debilitating effect on the strength of our Republic. He was convinced that a strong United States, physically, morally, culturally, politically free and rugged, would always be and remain the shining hope of the oppressed peoples of the world. How far we have wandered from this concept of our first President is all too obvious today. Certainly with Senate Resolution 94, placing our sovereignty on the bargaining block and permitting international groups to pass judgment on what belongs solely to the American people, shows how far we have departed from the teachings of the Father of our Country. There is crying need to go back to the fundamental Americanism of George Washington.

Our first President was a man who believed in Almighty God. He was humble enough to get down on his knees and pray in the hour of need. His was more than a political lipservice to religion and to the name of God. In the face of the threat of militant atheism, our Republic needs men who, like Washington, live their belief in God and know the power and the strength that come from humble reliance on the providence of Almighty God in sincere and humble prayer.

George Washington spoke the truth. He was no dissembler. He did not deal in doubletalk. He spoke his mind freely and frankly. He was not concerned with political advantage. His countrymen knew just where he stood on every issue. He was not given to name calling for mudslinging. He held every American's right to speak and to express an honest opinion as sacred and worthy of respect. He would have had nothing but contempt for campaign oratory. His word was his bond. He did not give a pledge lightly.

The dedication to our Republic is as necessary today as it was in Washington's time. We need men of Washington's integrity to make that dedication effective in a lying, loose-tongued, double-crossing, cynical political atmosphere.

George Washington was a man of great dignity. There was nothing cheap, common, or mediocre about him, either in his private or public life. He held the office of Chief Executive to be one which demanded by its nature the reverential respect of all citizens. He lived with a consciousness of the dignity and of the personal integrity which the highest office in the land required of its occupant. Both because of the office itself and because of the world leadership which goes with this office now, we need a return to the dignity and the integrity of George Washington.

During this year when several leading citizens will offer themselves as candidates for the office of Chief Executive of our Nation, voters can do no better than to remember our first President and to use his character, his ideals, and his virtues as a yardstick by which to appraise the men for whom they may be asked to vote.

Education for Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 20 joined by Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, NEUBERGER, and YARBOROUGH, I introduced two bills to help improve the educational opportunities for our Nation's migratory workers and their children. I now ask unanimous consent that Senators CLARK, MURRAY, MCCARTHY, and HUMPHREY be listed as additional cosponsors of these two measures.

Mr. President, I am very gratified that these bills have gained the support of the distinguished Senators I have mentioned, and I sincerely hope that, despite the short session anticipated, there will be time to give consideration to this vital area of concern.

I hope too, that the statement made with respect to the consequence of the hearings held so far by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, by Dr. Donald Thomas of the University of Wisconsin, will also hold true for these bills—that they will serve a remedial function rather than just a therapeutic one.

It is, perhaps, hard to grasp the actual human impact on the individual migrant child who is deprived of an adequate educational opportunity, or, conversely, who is treated to an educational experience not expected or hoped for.

As Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell said just a year ago:

Look beyond the screen of statistics at the child behind in school, in poor health, housed in a coop, whose father works for 131 days a year for 50 cents per hour. That child hasn't much of a chance to develop his talents, to be useful to himself or his country. This is the ugliest kind of human waste.

I am sure the Members of this body will be interested in a look behind the screen of statistics at the benefits achieved from the good educational systems for migrant children that have been started in a few areas across the country.

Recently I received a letter from the superintendent of schools, Mr. Brautigam, in Dowagiac, Mich., reporting on the experimental school established there for the migrant children, which included the impressions of a teacher who had participated in the program.

Here was a teacher who had come face to face with the problem of educating migrant children and who discovered that there wasn't a "nicer group of children to work with. For the most, they were smart children, eager to learn, appreciative, and loved books. Somewhere they have either learned good work habits in school or just that eager to learn."

That the children did indeed appreciate their educational opportunity can be seen in a heartwarming letter written to the teacher by a migrant child, Mary Ann Castilleja. "You are still the goodest teacher I've had and you all ways will be," she writes.

In reading over the hearings held in the Midwest last fall, I came across another report, written by Mrs. George Cnudde, chairman of the Bay County Farm Bureau Citizenship Committee in Michigan, which describes the operation of a 5 weeks' demonstration summer school there. Mrs. Cnudde was much impressed by how anxious migrant children are to learn, and how very anxious their parents are to have them attend school to get an education that most of them did not have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters I mentioned, together with the statement by Mrs. Cnudde, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM TEACHER

I consider the experience and knowledge gained from teaching the migrant children who attended the Hill School, both valuable and gratifying.

It took great courage that first day to face the challenge of a mixture of children in nationality and geographical locations.

I have never found a nicer group of children to work with. For the most, they were smart children, eager to learn, appreciative, and loved books. Somewhere they have either learned good work habits in school or just that eager to learn.

They thoroughly enjoy getting together in September, away from their so-called homes and the fields—this, perhaps, their reason for being so attentive in their school work. Many were constantly reading or looking at books. The school was very well supplied with many interesting books for them. They also enjoyed more than most children the clay, games, puzzles, bats and balls, to which they had free access.

From their conversation it was very evident they were happy with the opportunity to go to such a school and also to be able to ride to and from school in the bus.

There were many problems, too. Most families were large ones, especially the Mexican families, who took great care of each other, showing a natural family tie. The Arkansas children were great fighters among themselves, with sisters and brothers, for their own rights and supremacy. The differences in the parentage was apparent. Another problem developing was the lunch and food. During the peak of the grape and apple season, all had adequate lunches. As that neared the end, some were not having enough or any lunch at all. Those who had more than they wanted shared with them. It was still not enough lunch.

From this large group, I learned from the children, only one mother was dissatisfied with the migrant school. She wished for other and different associations than migrant children for her three daughters. However, the little girls were happy. When asked, they said, "We like it but mother doesn't."

We are very fortunate the families move to warmer climates during these winter months. A huge problem of food and clothing would develop.

Somewhere these parents should learn to spend their money in the right direction. When some of the children needed a lunch, they would appear without one, wearing a new, frilly, net petticoat under a shabby dress on an empty stomach, or a pair of lovely white galoshes on a sunny, dry day knowing they were headed for warmer climates.

It was a lonesome time the last of October at the little school, when they began to leave. We had worked together, learned more about each other, I had become very fond of those children, realizing there was much to be done for them. They left suddenly without much warning, especially the Mexican families, taking quite a group at a time. They leave early to avoid cold weather problems.

I sincerely feel it was a successful 2 months for these children. I am convinced in many ways that they liked it, also from the letters I have received from them. They write they are very anxious to return to the "best little school of all."

NOVEMBER 17, 1959.

DEAR MRS. WALSH: Just a few lines to say that I am missing you all a lot. I hope you all still remember me. I hope you all are well just the same as we are thanks to God Our Lord. I have started school already but I don't like it as much as I liked that school over there. Sammy Ramirez and all the others are over here already and from Al down, they started school. Al, Adam, Zeke, and Charles said hi and of course me, Connie, Paul, and Ruban. Ruban hasn't started school over here because they don't admit him yet, until he is 7 years old. So he always asks us when are we going to Michigan so he can go to school. Demitrias family are over in Emlay City. Say hi to Mr. Clough for me if he knows who I am. I hope we get to go to the same school; of course you know which school I'm talking about Hill school. I hope you all are having fun over there because we are having lots of fun over here. We got here safe and so did the Ramirez, Sammy's parents. We have a little black dog and he is a mean one. We named him Fatso because he is real fat and sometimes we call him tub of lard. My teacher over here is Miss Price and every day she buys a can of candy from Laura a girl that I knew for $1 but you didn't buy us any but you are still the goodest teacher I've had and you always will be. Well I guess that's all for now. By-by, hope you get to come over here where it's warm. Goodby.

Your friend and yours truly,

MARY ANN CASTILLEJA.

ELOISE, FLA.

STATEMENT BY MRS. CNUDDE

What is different about this school is the fact that it teaches only the children of migrant workers who come to Bay County with their parents to help in the fields. It was the only school held in the State of Michigan this year. There were 57 children enrolled. This school was financed through the National Labor Committee plus a contribution from the Essexville PTA. They had two teachers, one of Spanish descent, plus two teenage girls who donated their time. A special bus picked up and returned the children.

The parents of these children are very anxious to have their children attend this school and get the opportunity to get an education that most of them did not have. The migrant child's education is sadly neglected for many reasons. He moves so often that he would have to go to three or four schools a year; his clothing is inadequate; his language handicaps him and puts a barrier between him, the teacher, and other children. He feels unwanted because of his color or because his home is so poor. And so he grows up with a second- or third-grade education and has little opportunity to better his lot in life.

I was privileged to attend this school on three different occasions. The morning started like any other school with a salute to the flag, a prayer and singing America, lunch, reading, writing, Spanish, arithmetic, government, health, music, and art.

Teachers, Mrs. Irene Burns and Mrs. Cristine Manker, gave me an opportunity to help with these children when I was there. I have never seen children so anxious to learn. When they needed help with their work they either raised their hands or came to me so quietly that they did not disturb the other children.

A very delicious and nutritious meal was served at noon with members of the different PTA's helping the cook.

The children were delighted to have their picture taken, so I have a good supply of colored slides that I hope members of the Farm Bureau Citizenship Committee will get a chance to show to their groups.

The children are so warm and lovable that it is very easy to get emotionally involved. The second time I visited the school they started calling me the nice lady who took pictures. One youngster came up to me and gave me a little paper bag that she had made in art class to hold her crayons, saying something to me in Spanish.

One of the other children said, "She wants the nice lady to have this as a present."

I'll cherish it always.

School lasted 5 weeks and during that time three family nights were held. The parents and older brothers and sisters were invited to come to the school and see the work of the children. They were then entertained with movies, singing, and dancing. Later a lunch was served by the members of the Farm Bureau Citizenship Committee with 44 cakes and over 400 cookies donated by farm women.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a number of schools similar to those described are just now beginning to spring up in several States across the country, and last year at least four States took encouraging official action to promote the education of the migrant children.

In Oregon, $50,000 was appropriated to set up a pilot program for the education of such children. Ohio passed permanent legislation to establish standards and regulations for educating migrant children and appropriated $175,000 to reimburse the local school boards for the cost of providing this education for the next 2 years. New York put its heretofore experimental summer school program for migrant children on a permanent basis and appropriated additional funds. And, in my own State of New Jersey $25,000 was included in the budget of the migrant labor board for the State's migrant education program.

In addition, a number of valuable studies are underway to determine the best methods for dealing with the special educational problems borne by these children as they follow the crops from State to State. Colorado has a 3-year study underway, financed in part by the U.S. Office of Education. There is also an interesting Texas-Wisconsin study project in progress to find a feasible way of determining the educational needs of each child while the child is still in his home district, and transmitting that information to another State, so that the schools in Wisconsin, for example, can have a suitable educational program ready when the child arrives.

I would also like to mention a special migrant education demonstration program that has been started in New Jersey by the National Child Labor Committee, in conjunction with the department of labor and industry.

This program was initiated in January of last year to develop methods for providing the best schooling possible for the migrant children which would also serve as a model and stimulus to other States with the same problem.

A survey is being conducted to determine vital statistics on such matters as the number of school-age migrant children who are actually enrolled, the total number of migrant children or potential enrollment, their location, the degree of educational lag and nature of their educational needs, the local schools affected, and the prevailing enrollment and attendance practices in the State.

There is an auspicious note in the fact that the advisory committee that has been established for the project, represents 18 educational, grower, labor, religious, social welfare, civic, and governmental groups.

It will be extremely helpful to have specific illustrative facts on these migrant children to complement the generalized information now available.

For example, the National Child Labor Committee has found that more than 50 percent of the estimated 100,000 school-age migrant children are from 1 to 4 years behind in school by the time they reach the age of 14.

Testimony received from the hearings held so far show how serious the problem is, both with respect to actual attendance and the degree of grade retardation.

A study of migrant workers in Oregon in 1958, for instance, found that of about 800 children under 12 who accompanied their parents, 27 percent were working rather than going to school. Among the 14- and 15-year-olds, the percentage jumped to 40.

A nine-county survey in Ohio found that 51 percent of the migrant children attending school were in grades below normal for their ages.

The National Council of Agricultural Life and Labor conducted field research in four areas in Florida, Virginia, Illinois, and Texas, and found that one-eighth of the migrant children did not enter school until after their eighth birthday. One-third more did not enter school until they were 9 years old or over. The degree of backwardness for 75 percent of the children after their ninth year in school was from 1 to 5 years.

In Michigan, Dr. John F. Thaden, professor emeritus of Michigan State University, testified that 75 percent of the migrant children in Bay County, Mich., were in grades 1 to 6 years behind normal, according to a study made in 1954

by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction.

In Wisconsin, Dr. Thomas stated that in the 1951–52 school year, it was found that nearly twice as many migrant children were not enrolled in school as were.

I think these studies demonstrate very conclusively that a serious educational problem exists for these children. And, I think it is equally, as the mid-American conference on migratory labor concluded not too long ago in recommending a program of Federal assistance, that "the influx of large numbers of children in some school districts places an unusually heavy burden on school budgets."

As Governor Meyner of New Jersey so well said, in his statement to the subcommittee:

Local school districts, which usually have overcrowding difficulties of their own, are hard put to accomodate this influx of migrant children.

"In addition, the local schools may not be able to provide the unique educational services required by children who may be slow learners or misfits because of their unfortunate economic and social backgrounds.

The cycle of the migrant's work season is such that a child may lose time from both ends of the normal school semester. Because of the interstate character of the problem, Federal assistance for educational facilities for migratory workers in various States is obviously essential.

The Aged Can Afford To Pay Their Own Medical Bills, Says the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the AMA News, official newspaper of the American Medical Association, in a recent article again took up the cry in opposing H.R. 4700, a bill I introduced that would provide medical and hospital insurance to America's retired workers.

Since the introduction of this measure this newspaper has concerned itself with more of FORAND than it has with matters of medicine. With the testimony of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare still reverberating in the Ways and Means Committee room, concerning the plight of the aged and their inability to meet their medical costs, the AMA released a study which attempts to prove that more than 90 percent of those persons over 65 can afford to meet medical bills of $500.

Along with many others, the industrial union department of the AFL–CIO has disputed the statistics of this research group.

I submit for the RECORD an article that appeared in the February issue of the I.U.D. Bulletin. It follows:

FORAND BILL PRIMARY TARGET OF AMA PROPAGANDA WAR

The American Medical Association is back at its old stand opposing legislation that would make the Nation's health a matter of congressional concern. Just as the AMA rallied its forces to defeat former President Truman's national health program, it is now fighting to block enactment of the proposed Forand bill.

If passed, the Forand bill would provide medical and hospital insurance to America's retired workers.

To the AMA such objectives are synonymous with socialized medicine, a war cry that effectively blocked Truman's program. While the association has not come up with any proposals of its own to provide better care for the Nation's elderly, it is determined to fight any suggestion that—it believes—will eventually lead to Government intervention in the field of medicine and limitations on a patient's freedom to deal with the doctor of his choice.

It is this freedom of choice that is the cornerstone of the AMA's basic philosophy. Translated into economic terms, this freedom means the right of the doctor to charge fees on the open market, select the patients he desires to treat, and reject those unable to pay the bills.

Although the Forand bill provides for the freedom of choice between retired workers and doctors cooperating with the program, the AMA is convinced that any Federal legislation dealing with health insurance is "only a foot in the door."

To buttress its case against the Forand bill, the association has started a campaign aimed at providing that the vast majority of social security recipients can well afford to pay their own medical health costs.

Using a study released by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago, the AMA News attempts to prove that better than 90 percent of those persons over 65 can afford to meet a medical bill of $500.

Closer study of the University of Chicago survey indicated that the News was guilty of twisting the facts to strengthen its own position. While the survey did report that only 9.6 percent of those interviewed knew of no way to finance a $500 medical bill, another 8.2 percent said they would get the funds from public assistance or charities, 14.6 percent said they would have to rely on children or other relatives, 7.2 percent said they would have to mortgage their homes or other property, and 40.2 percent reported that they would be forced to dip into life savings.

The AMA News also failed to point out that the survey did not cover older people in hospitals, county homes, and other institutions or that more than half the 1,734 persons interviewed owned real estate.

Another statement contained in the survey, but ignored by the association, asserted that the yearly money income of persons 65 years and over "is less than any other segment of the adult population," averaging $1,390 annually.

Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with any educator, student, or citizen who would object to taking a loyalty oath to the United States. I took an oath of allegiance when sworn in the Army, the National Guard, and when I took office here in this House. I wish we could take the oath again every day. It does us all good to pledge allegiance to the flag—the more often the better.

Mr. Speaker, patriotic students all over the United States are coming to the defense of the loyalty oath. The following letter from Donald Brand, a student, appeared in the Daily Texan, the University of Texas student newspaper:

[From the Daily Texan, Feb. 5, 1960]

LOYALTY OATH

To the EDITOR:

New moves are expected in Congress soon to repeal that part of the national defense education program which calls for affidavits from applicants for Federal aid stating that they do not believe in, belong to, or support any organizaiton which teaches illegal overthrow of the Government. (Public Law 85–864, title 10, Miscellaneous Provisions, section 1001, subsection F.)

"The provision has brought protests from many leading colleges, universities, and religious groups. And it has caused 20 colleges—including some of the Nation's best-known ones—to boycott the program." (From the San Antonio Light, Sunday, Jan. 31, 1960.)

Because we do not believe that these protests represent the opinion of the great majority of American college students, merely the voice of an articulate minority, and because we do not believe that it represent the voice of Texas students, in any case, we would like to see the following paragraph put into a petition and circulated, by some student organization, perhaps, on the University of Texas campus or its environs: Texans are not afraid to sign loyalty affidavits.

If I were applying for a Federal subsidy to continue my educatoin, I would have no objection to signing the affidavit stating that I do not believe in, belong to, or support any organization which teaches illegal overthrow of the Government. I realize that education is the little leaven that leavens the whole lump and therefore it is very important that a student applying for Federal aid be able to reassure the American taxpayer that his money will not be used against him.

I realize, also, that there will be considerable prestige value attached to these grants-in-aid, as with any scholarships, and again the American taxpayer has the right to rest assured that he is not opening the way for enemies of our domestic system to penetrate into highly sensitive research areas.

I can see no valid reason why anyone, except a person fearful of perjury proceedings, should find it embarrassing to give this reassurance; in fact I, as a Texan student and loyal American would be proud to be able to do so.

There is a need for action immediately. The time is very short.

DONALD D. BRAND.

The Exploration of Space for Peaceful Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech made by Maj. Gen. L. I. Davis, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Development, U.S.

Air Force, at the dedication of the Electronics Communications Building in St. Petersburg, Fla., January 28, 1960.

I hope that each Member of the House will take a few minutes to read General Davis' remarks concerning the exploration of space for peaceful purposes, in that it is a very fine factual review of our present missile status and significantly indicates the possibility of a substantial breakthrough in the very near future.

General Davis' remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. L. I. DAVIS, ASSISTANT DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, USAF DEVELOPMENT, AT THE DEDICATION FOR ECI BUILDING, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., JANUARY 28, 1960

Mr. Godsey, Congressman CRAMER, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be asked to speak to you today—to help you dedicate this new building. The management of Electronic Communications, the board of directors and Mr. Godsey should be congratulated on their decision to make this investment. It is a vote of confidence in the future of the defense electronics business.

The rapid growth of ECI is a tribute to the ability of the scientists and engineers that this management has been able to assemble. Certainly St. Petersburg is becoming known as an important part of the electronics industry in the South. Maybe the lovely climate of Florida has something to do with it. I am particularly pleased and honored to be asked to speak to you at this time, January 1960. Everyone has something to say on most any subject this month—defense, the space race, military posture and deterrence—you name it and you can find columns on the subject in the Washington papers.

In all seriousness, this is an excellent opportunity to emphasize a couple of viewpoints which have become clear and well established in the past year. Everyone recognizes the rapid growth and advances of technology—it has even been called an "explosion." Sputniks and satellites have headlined this progress. Naturally, we associate these devices with big rocket engines and great advances in propulsion technology. However, electronics is an art and science has paced this progress. It makes possible the automatic controls, tracking radars, television, and above all the telemetry that takes the pulse of the performance of the experimental rockets and tells the engineer how to correct the design deficiencies.

As to electronics and the space age, it seems to me that they are as inseparable as ham and eggs. Electronics are essential to space operations; and, in turn, space offers a real challenge in terms of size, power requirements and reliability; as well as the unknown problems so interesting to the scientist and engineer.

Before we go too far into the fascinating business of space, I should clarify the interest of the military. The President has clearly stated that it is our national policy to explore space for peaceful purposes. The Congress has wisely created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and charged this nonmilitary organization with the exploration job. The same act—the legislation known as the Space Act—clearly reserves to the Defense Department those aspects of operations in space which affect the security of the United States.

We cannot exclude space from our defense considerations. We are already in it in a very important fashion with our IRBM and ICBM weapons. And certainly, the Russian rocket which transmitted television pictures of the far side of the moon could relay back to the U.S.S.R. information of places not so distant. Whether or not such information has military usefulness depends upon progress in electronics—so we are right back again on the importance of dynamic progress in electronics to our defense position.

Early in this talk I mentioned viewpoints which are becoming clear from the discussions on defense matters. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the Congress stated "We now live in a divided world of uneasy equilibrium, with our side committed to its own protection, and against aggression by the other. With both sides of this divided world in possession of unbelievably destructive weapons, mankind approaches a state where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. No other fact of today's world equals this in importance—it colors everything we say, plan or do."

Certainly this is a clear and powerful statement of the problem facing us today. The phrase "uneasy equilibrium" recognizes that modern weapons—ICBM's with nuclear warheads—do not add stability; the so-called nuclear stalemate is a balance such as a man achieves standing on a log—not the positive stability of a pendulum, or the balance a man achieves on ice skates. The latter analogy is better—it implies the idea of moving on—making progress as a part of keeping your balance.

Dr. Bernard Brodie in "Strategy in the Missile Age," emphasizes that modern weapons do not add to the stability. On the contrary, they furnish to a potential aggressor the exact type of destructive weapon that enables him to take advantage of surprise, and to do overwhelming damage with the first salvo.

One aspect of this uneasy equilibrium is the unsymmetrical intelligence and warning situation. A potential aggressor knows the location of our ICBM bases and is forewarned of any actions we may take. We can read in the newspapers the location of our new missile sites and the popular hobby of photography makes the gathering of information a very casual matter.

On the other hand, the Iron Curtain is no venetian blind—it is difficult to obtain similar information about Russian sites and preparation. At the same time, the strategic warning time that enabled us to prepare and to mobilize and win World War II has disappeared. Modern weapons have characteristics that make the initial attack almost a matter of pushing a button. Strategic warning time has disappeared as a factor that can be considered in defense planning.

Inasmuch as technology has brought us to this position, it certainly has a responsibility to find a solution which contributes to lasting peace. A great opportunity to contribute; and perhaps to restore a measure of stability to the defense picture, lies in the military use of aerospace for communication and warning purposes. Before expanding on this theme let's look at some films of our initial probing of the fringe of space.

(Film clips shown: (a) Atlas, first operational launch; Tital launch; Discoverer V launch; (b) motion pictures of earth taken from Atlas nose cone at 700 miles altitude; (c) parachute jump from above 96 percent of atmosphere (75,000 feet); (d) flight test of the X–15 research aircraft.)

It is obvious that our interest in space is not idle curiosity: we certainly are not considering space operations merely for the adventure of going there. The USAF uses the term aerospace to emphasize the continuum that exists from the atmosphere, in which we now operate, to those immediate regions of space that have military significance. As you saw in the film, we have been probing this frontier for years. You also saw some indication of the very reliable operation of our intercontinental missiles. The successful flights of the last 16 production Atlases, and the President's announcement of the accuracy figure of less than 2 miles C.E.P., are evidence of our progress.

Despite all this progress we must keep our thinking straight about using space for defense purposes. We must differentiate between exploration for scientific purposes and use for practical military operations. There are obvious necessary conditions that have to be met for both cases.

First: we must have the proper propulsion—a thrust to weight ratio greater than one, and high specific impulse—efficient fuel and engines which will accomplish the change in momentum necessary to go into orbit. We must have accurate guidance and control; and a communications means to transmit information to and from our space vehicle.

These are necessary conditions for both scientific and military space operations, but they are not sufficient. For practical military operations we must have great reliability and low cost.

Let us use Midas, the proposed attack alarm satellite, as an example. It is an early warning system—if you can call 15 or 20 minutes early warning. Midas satellites using infrared sensors will detect the flames of enemy ICBM rockets as they are launched; and broadcast an alarm. Naturally, we would have to have several in orbit at the same time; and the electronic detection and communication system would have to be very reliable. The electronic payload would have to operate, unattended, for many months.

For a practical military system, great progress must be made in reducing cost and increasing reliability. Present satellites cost about a thousand dollars per pound of payload in orbit. For practical reasons this must be reduced. The degree of improvement necessary is about the same as we have experienced in air transportation. Costs per ton-mile have decreased a hundred times between the first flights of the Wright brothers and the flights of modern passenger airliners.

From a reliability viewpoint, we must make our payload packages as reliable as our telephone systems—perhaps as much so as the electronics part of our transatlantic cables. This may call for two orders of magnitude improvement in mean time to failure—say 100 times as reliable.

The first Midas research and development launchings will begin very soon; the payload will be boosted into orbit by the Atlas.

Another aerospace system is Samos. This is a reconnaissance satellite. It will provide information vital for our defense; obtainable by no other means.

These devices use electronics packages of great sophistication. The problems of space and weight; of power requirements versus power availability; of communication over vast distances; of reliability, are many. The engineers here at Electronic Communications and other engineers in this area—in the plants of Minneapolis-Honeywell, General Electric, Sperry-Rand—are working on them. I am sure that they will find solutions.

While these scientists and engineers are conquering the technical problems; military planners are thinking, and weighing the impact of this new regime of military operations on defense strategy.

We are very conscious that there are necessary conditions to be satisfied in a defense product sense as well as the technical goals of specific impulse, accurate guidance, and reliability.

These new systems must serve a useful military purpose. They must fulfill a role which no other weapon system can accomplish or, if there is a competitor, they must be more efficient on a cost-effectiveness basis. In addition, they must have characteristics which cannot be countered by direct or indirect means. By indirect, I include the case where the enemy can render our counterweapon ineffective by merely building more attacking weapons at lower cost.

As soon as our scientists and engineers have solved some remaining design problems; and industry such as you have here in St. Petersburg has produced reasonable quantities of parts of systems such as Midas and Samos, military operations in space will be practical. At that time the unsymmetrical intelligence situation will be made more equal. We hope that such systems will add stability to the defense picture—make less uneasy the uneasy equilibrium of which the President spoke.

When will this happen? Well, I would like to close with a prediction: It probably will be much sooner than you think.

I believe this; because I believe we are on the verge of a breakthrough into military space operations of considerable magnitude and significance. I base this opinion on two considerations: First, analogy, or history. There are many historical examples. The A and H bombs are examples of a breakthrough. The airplane itself is a breakthrough. Supersonic flight was believed impossible a few years ago; now college students of supersonic aerodynamics needle their professors by saying, "This stuff is easy. What were you old fuddy duds worried about?"

The second consideration is the engineering problem itself. I believe that operation in space is easier than operations in the atmosphere. Once we have reliable power with the proper characteristics in terms of thrust to weight ratio and specific impulse, the rest comes easy.

Look at the aerodynamic problem. To fly faster and faster, at constant altitude in the atmosphere, is nearly impossible. Temperature and stresses become infinitely great. But to leave the atmosphere and fly in the vacuum of space—no problem—even aluminum can stand the temperature and stresses. From a guidance and control standpoint there are no disturbing influences. You have precise spatial orientation from the fixed stars, undimmed by atmosphere.

Of course, there is the probability of encountering meteorites of significant size, but that is much less likely than the probability that an airplane will fall on anyone of you here in Florida.

Radiation is another problem. Shielding will help, but the heavy particles and the unpredictable bursts of radiation from the sun are serious hazards. Consequently, manned military space operations of any duration will await greater knowledge of the environment. It will follow military operations using remotely controlled automatic devices.

In short, from an engineering viewpoint, I view operations in space as operation in a vacuum—stresses and strains and energy perturbations get vanishingly small. And in addition, we have data on 99 percent of excursion from our present operating regime to that of the region of interest.

In short, gentlemen, I predict that 10 years from now we will say: "Military space operations are practical—in fact easier than operating in the atmosphere. What were we waiting for in 1960? There was no bogeyman in the bell jar."

Thank you.

Adult Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to a great event which took place a few days ago in Atlantic City. It was the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, comprising nearly 23,000 school superintendents, administrators, and other educational leaders of our Nation. There were many things said and done at this meeting in which I am sure you will be interested, both individually and collectively, because of our present concern for education as a matter of public responsibility.

But I wish to call your attention especially to one phase of education that came in for considerable discussion at this convention. It was adult education. And I call it to your attention because of its importance today and in the days immediately ahead in preparing us for, and keeping us abreast of the rapidly accelerating changes that are taking place in our Nation and throughout the world.

Dr. Thomas Bailey, superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Florida, made a speech on this subject during the convention at a small preconvention meeting sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. The address was so outstanding that the officials of the association requested him to repeat it to the entire convention.

We in Florida are very proud of Tom Bailey. His outstanding leadership in the field of education has attracted attention to his work throughout the Nation. We are very proud of the recognition given him at this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this address and I consider it so full of facts and suggestions that are relevant to the urgent problems that our Nation faces today that I believe every Member of the Congress would benefit by reading it. I therefore under unanimous consent insert Dr. Bailey's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING AN ADEQUATE PROGRAM OF ADULT EDUCATION

(By Thomas D. Bailey, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Florida)

In her recent article, "A Redefinition of Education," Margaret Mead poses the question:

"Is it not possible that an educational system that was designed to teach what was known to little children and to a selected few young men may not fit a world in which the most important factors in everyone's life are those that are not yet, but soon will be know?" [1]

Dr. Mead, in raising this question, is making the point that our great problem in education is related to the fantastic change in the rate of change in our society, and this, she says, is what necessitates a break with the past—a change from the "vertical" to a "lateral" transmission of knowledge.

Her point is significant, and worthy of our consideration.

All of us, I am sure, have realized that we are living in a period of transition—a period of rapid change. We hear this and we see evidences of it on every hand. Yet, how much are we really influenced by it in the application of our daily efforts? How diligently have we in education sought to understand the scope and magnitude of the unparalleled wave of scientific and technological change which is sweeping our Nation, and how much effort have we made to bring into a clear focus its implications for education?

To help us in considering this matter of the change in the rate of change, I should like to use an illustration given recently by Walter Shaw at a conference on technical education held in Florida. Suppose we say that mankind has had 50,000 years of recorded history. In order to bring this into a comprehensible span of time, let's compress the 50,000 years into 50 years which represents the lifetime of many of us here. If we accept this scale, then you stopped being cavemen about 10 years ago. Five years ago, pictorial writing was invented. Two years ago, Christianity was born. Fifteen months ago, we had the first printing press in western Europe. Ten days ago, electricity was put into practical use. Yesterday, the airplane flew for the first time in the morning, and radio was invented last night. Television came into being this afternoon, and the commercial jet was invented since I started talking.

Now, speed is a good indicator of technological growth, so let's take the speed that a man can travel as an index of our technological progress. How fast could a man travel 50,000 years ago? His top speed was probably as fast as a horse could take him. And the top speed of a horse was the fastest way man could travel right up to the year 1829.

In the year 1829, however, the tempo of things picked up a little. A contest took place in England that year between a steam locomotive and a man on a racehorse. And for the first time in 49,870 years man moved faster in a machine of his own making than he had previously been able to by natural means.

Then in 1910 the U.S. Army let a contract for the building of our first military airplane. The only specification in the contract was that it be able to fly at least 40 miles per hour. Upon its completion it actually flew 42 miles per hour.

In 1925 the winner of the Indianapolis Speedway race exceeded 100 miles per hour. Toward the end of World War II, 25 years later, 470 miles per hour was such a fantastic flying speed that it was kept top secret for months.

Then something happened. For almost 40,000 years man had virtually crawled about this earth with comparatively little change of speed, but now he suddenly "exploded." In 1945 he broke the sound barrier, and within 12 years he had space machines in operation that were traveling at 18,000 miles per hour. His speed graph had suddenly taken a right-angle turn. It was just that sudden. If we traced the history of events in other fields, whether it be missiles or medicine, we would find a high degree of correlation between them and the curve we just mentioned.

Yes; 1945 was the year. That was the year of the big change—the year progress exploded—that was the year that the change in the rate of change really occurred. That was the year somebody threw away the world we used to live in—the world in which we were born, reared, and educated. Our "old" world has literally ceased to exist. Science is rapidly reshaping our entire lives. Automation has created a new technology. Millions of jobs in business and industry which for generations have remained essentially unchanged have suddenly changed completely overnight. Thousands of new kinds of jobs are being created, and thousands of others are being eliminated altogether. And for the vast majority of all of these substantially higher education and training are required. The uneducated and unskilled worker is disappearing from the scene.

When I started to school, the number of common laborers in the American labor force exceeded professional workers by almost 3 to 1. Today the situation is practically

Footnotes at end of speech.

reversed—with more than twice as many professional workers as laborers. By 1975, we are told, only 4 percent of our total labor force will be unskilled laborers. During this same period, craftsmen, operatives, managerial, sales, and clerical positions have increased substantially, both in number and percent of total labor force represented.[3]

The new technology has brought with it phenomenal increases in the volume of things produced. During the period of my lifetime, the total value of all production in the United States has more than doubled, and we are told that by the year 2000 it will have quadrupled. For each living man, woman, and child in the United States in the year 2000, this means an average income of $5,000—or $20,000 for a family of four. For the years immediately ahead, a 24-hour, 4-day workweek is now being forecast.

Not only has the increase in volume of production been amazing, but the kinds of things being produced is equally astonishing. A good example of this is the record of the International Business Machines Corp. According to its 1958 annual report, 61 percent of the total income of that corporation during the preceding year was from products that were unheard of 5 years earlier.

Yes, this is the age in which we live. It is truly an age of change—an age in which people will not live their lives in the world into which they were born, nor will they die in the world in which they matured. Someone commented to me recently that ours is the first generation of parents in recorded history who cannot, with reasonable certainty, tell our children what the future will be like for them as adults.

Now, we could talk of many implications for education which seem to grow out of this, but owing to the limitations of time I shall discuss only one—the one which, to me, seems to stand out above all others. This is the fact that in the age we are entering, no one's education can ever be considered complete. This simply cannot be—things will be happening too fast. Recorded knowledge upon which everyday decisions must be based will change too rapidly for this to be possible. Under such circumstances, systematic, continuing education will be required for everyone who hopes to fulfill his responsibilities and perform a useful role in the community and in society. This is the most important—the most compelling implication I see in the changing character of our society.

Our earlier concepts which regarded adult education as performing strictly a remedial function for those who had little or no formal education can no longer be valid. In these times, adult education must serve both the educated and the undereducated. As a matter of fact, upon those whose responsibilities are the heaviest will fall the greatest necessity for continued learning. The job of the teacher will be particularly difficult and demanding, for instance, for seldom will he be able, as in times past, to teach what was learned years ago. Instead, he will more often be required to teach what was learned yesterday, for only this will be useful and valid.

Robert Blakely has said that the individual whose education in the modern world is not continuous will be a dangerous individual. I want to underscore that. I firmly believe that in the years ahead, any individual, regardless of college degrees or status in life, who has not pursued a continuous education in the broad sense will be a dangerous individual. Moreover, those who occupy positions of leadership and public responsibility will, without continuous education, be the most dangerous of all—more so even than the totally illiterate individual—for the consequences of their decisions and their actions, based upon obsolete knowledge, will affect a far greater number of people.

What I am saying, then, is that in the years ahead, on a scale never before required, continuous education will be the common denominator for everyone's needs. By all odds it will be the greatest single resource for meeting the challenge of the space age. Not only will more education be required, but a new kind of education as well—new in organization, in content, and method. It will have to be organized to serve all age groups in ways and at times when learning for each group is most essential and meaningful. The content of what is taught will be influenced not only by the rapid and extensive changes in substantive knowledge, but also by the increasing sophistication of students of all ages in a variety of fields resulting from the influence of the mass media, particularly television, on their lives.

Community schools must, in truth and in fact, become schools for the community. They must serve the whole community—day and night—winter and summer. They must at last become the "uncommon schools" that Henry David Thoreau[3] proclaimed the need for more than a century ago.

Education for all is a tremendous challenge —a big order, if you please. And it is an urgent one. More urgent, I am afraid, than most of us realize. Geared intimately with it is the prospect (or question) of our very survival as a nation. It is indeed a challenge from which we in public education cannot escape, for the very magnitude of the task is such that the network of community public schools throughout the Nation constitutes the most logical instrumentality by which the job can be attacked.

Let us look briefly, then, at the job before us. In so doing, perhaps we can bring into a better focus our particular responsibilities as public school administrators.

Our first glance reveals an unhappy picture. As we move into the space age, only 10 States in the United States give systematic support to the education of adults; yet we find that more than 60 million Americans, 25 years of age or older, have not completed high school. Forty-four million have not completed the ninth grade. Almost 10 million are functionally illiterate. These are the individuals upon whom the heaviest blow will fall in the years immediately ahead. These, truly, will be our social ciphers, our economic liabilities—unless something is done. And their number is too great for something not to be done.

A second glance shows that despite compulsory school laws and the tremendous improvements we have made in elementary and secondary education over the past years, an appalling number of our young people are still leaving school prior to graduation. Retention studies by the Office of Education show that approximately 40 percent of our youth who enter the fifth grade leave prior to graduation from high school.[4] At the same time, other studies[5] reveal that no organized effort is being made by the public schools in almost two of every three school districts throughout the United States to encourage this 40 percent of our youth to continue their formal education as adults. At a time when the Nation must make the most efficient possible use of its human resources, it is unthinkable that this dreadful waste of our potentialities should continue.

A third dimension of the task before us has to do with the millions of Americans who must be reeducated and retrained as a result of automation and the new technology. During the 1960's, the extent of automation in industry will increase sharply. According to a recent article in Life magazine, more than $7 billion will be invested this year (1960) alone in automated machinery. This means that thousands upon thousands of jobs will disappear from the American labor market. Present holders of these jobs, if they are to remain employed, must move into newly created jobs in the sales, servicing, and distribution branches of industry which will expand rapidly as a result of the increased volume of production made possible by automation.

This transition—the switch from manual to automated production—will take place rapidly in the years ahead—the displacement and realinement will be extensive and sudden. And this suddenness makes the problem acute. To survive this change, the vast majority of the thousands of workers involved in it must receive more formal education as well as new kinds of occupational training. Evidence of this is already appearing in the current listings by the Department of Labor of jobs which are now in short supply. Of the 60 skills for which there is a shortage of qualified candidates, each of them requires a high school education.

The evidence is abundant and clear that education and job skills are the keys to steady employment. Records of the Labor Department[6] show that the rate of unemployment among unskilled workers in industry is more than five times that of professional and technical workers.

Concurrently with the dramatic changes occurring in science and technology, and tied in closely with them, have come equally rapid and extensive changes in longstanding patterns of home and family living in America. Child-parent relationships, relationships between individuals and groups, between institutions and government, and between the citizen and the community are becoming increasingly complex. The same individuals who find themselves caught in the swirl of technological revolution and who need reeducation as workers also find themselves increasingly in need of reeducation as individuals, as parents, and as citizens as well. This, then, is the third dimension of the educational task ahead. Happily, we know that industry as well as other community agencies and organizations will help greatly with it through stepped-up programs of in-service education and training. They are already doing a great deal of this. But the nature and scope of the problem are such as to make it a public responsibility; the welfare of manifold thousands of individual citizens requires this; the Nation's economy demands it.

Many other aspects of this problem are crying for better statesmanship than we have hitherto given them, but time permits me to mention but one other. This has to do with the changing composition of our population and with the aged who constitute an increasing percentage of it. In my early childhood, when the total population of this country was 76 millions, the number of people over 65 years of age was slightly more than 3 million. By 1950, the total population had doubled, but the number of people over 65 had more than quadrupled—to over 12 million. Today, the number of people over 65 exceeds 15 millions and is increasing at the rate of more than 300,000 a year. By 1975, we shall have more than 21 million people over 65 years of age.

Advances in medical science, better control of communicable diseases, improved nutrition, and generally higher standards of living are making us a nation of older and older people. The record of man's life expectancy in the United States clearly shows how this is true. In the year 1800, man's life expectancy at birth in the United States was 30 years. In 1900, it was 47 years. By 1960, it had jumped to well above 70 years. Thus, during our lifetime, man's life expectancy in the United States has increased over 33 years. Many scientific investigators are predicting that by the year 2000 (40 years from now) life expectancy in the United States will be 100 years, and that the normal life span of civilized man may well approach 150 years.

Footnotes at end of speech.

With the encouraging predictions of an ever-increasing life expectancy, and with the prospect of a 24- to 30-hour workweek, it may well be that in the years ahead leisure and not labor will be the chief problem in our lives. The preparation of people of all ages for worthy use of this greatly increased amount of nonworking time and the retention of older individuals in socially useful roles, constitutes a great challenge for education.

Another aspect of this is the fact that down through the years the older group in our adult population has consistently been the less educated group. This is understandably so, and until recent years it was of little public concern.

Now, however, it is a different matter. In an age of change such as we now find ourselves, it is essential that public policy be responsive to and give direction to this change if we are to avoid its hazards and realize the greatest benefit from it as a Nation and as a people. The aged, particularly the less educated, tend to resist change. With a larger and larger proportion of our adult population falling into the older age brackets, it is inevitable that public policy will increasingly be influenced by the older segment of our population. Herein lies one of the greatest challenges of all for American education. Enlightened public policy is a product of an enlightened people. In the space age ahead, neither the young nor the old can expect to be enlightened without continuing education.

The sum total of everything I have said thus far is this: To an extent that we may fail to recognize or be unwilling to admit, many an American citizen is in trouble. In many cases, his occupational skills have become outmoded in a wave of technological change without parallel in human history. He is being forced to live a new kind of life, equipped only with old patterns of behavior. Material splendor and increased leisure time have not always brought him social tranquility or personal peace of mind—they have only given him more time to ponder his dilemma. This, I realize, is not a pleasant picture. But there is entirely too much truth in it for us as educators to remain comfortable much longer.

Mr. Khrushchev, on several occasions recently, has stated emphatically that he intends to outstrip us economically, productionwise and otherwise. The Soviet economy is being geared toward these ends. This is their dedicated and avowed purpose. The Soviet Government recognizes in a very realistic way the importance of education to this purpose. Dr. Robert Luke of the NEA who has recently returned from Russia tells us that they have already stamped out adult illiteracy, and that the education of adults academically, vocationally, and culturally, is now an organized, systematic and determined effort on the part of the Soviet Government. They have a purpose and they know what it is—they want to be the No. 1 world power—and they are driving hard toward that objective.

In a free society which is dedicated to the worth and dignity of the individual and to the growth and development of the human personality, the very process of education becomes an end into itself. This is implicit in our dedication to the cause of freedom. Ignorance and human dignity are incompatible. This fact, in and of itself, should be sufficiently compelling to establish throughout America the concept that continuing education for all citizens, regardless of age, is a public necessity and a public responsibility. The words of Premier Khrushchev add to these motivations the question of our very survival as a nation. This is real. It is crucial. And time is important.

Last year I read a statement by John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp. in which he said: "If we believe what we profess concerning the worth of the individual, then the idea of individual fulfillment within a framework of moral purpose must become our deepest concern, our national preoccupation, our passion, our obsession."[7] I heartily concur in this feeling, and for that reason I think that every State in this Nation should have a legal framework within which adult education can function as an integral part of its public educational system. It is essential that it be given integral status, for only by weaving it into the very fabric of State school law will there ever be a sufficient public commitment to it, and financial support of it, to assure its continuation and the fulfillment of its purpose. Such a step is both logical and inevitable. Adult education is, in reality, the fourth level of public education into which elementary, secondary, and higher education lead. It is the remaining major step that we must take to round out our educational needs as a nation and as a people. Never before in our history has the urgency of this step been so great as it is at the present time. And the first step in that direction is for the profession itself to recognize this fact and get busy. It is both disturbing and difficult to understand reports which occasionally come to me to the effect that progress toward the addition of adult education service to our public school program is being inhibited by professional educators themselves who in their shortsightedness fear that such a step would weaken the public effort toward the education of children to which we have long been committed. On this point, I should like to share with you a recent statement by Gov. LeRoy Collins of our State who has, throughout his public career, demonstrated a strong personal commitment to education at all levels:

"Perhaps we have not been too clear in our understanding of the function of adult education and of its relationship to programs for the education of children. It is the adult population that is immediately facing the problems of adjustment to changing agricultural, industrial, commercial, economic, and cultural conditions. They are the voting citizens and upon their wisdom depends the fate of our political life. Is there not then a possibility that a program of reeducation for them is an economy measure, instead of an expense, inasmuch as it should add immediately to their productivity, health, and effectiveness as citizens? Is it not possible that reeducated adults will give to their children richer cultural advantages which will be reflected in the quality and quantity of learning which our children will obtain in their regular schooling? The relationship between the cultural level of a community and the educational outcomes of schooling is a well-known fact."

My experience convinces me that enactment of the kind of legislation we have suggested, legislation which will make it possible for every community in every State to provide a well-rounded program of education for all of its citizens who desire it and who can benefit from it, depends in large measure upon professional leadership working in cooperation with organized groups of lay citizens. This professional leadership must exist at all levels—national, State, and local—if we hope to get the job done. The chief State school officer in every State is a key individual in this effort. With a strong commitment on his part, and a willingness to voice it, progress will be easier.

These are our larger needs—our overall objectives. What are our responsibilities along the way?

Wherever public school adult education programs are in operation, or wherever new ones are initiated, there are certain responsibilities which a local superintendent of schools has which deserve serious consideration. The first of these has to do with the selection and assignment of competent, professionally trained leaders for these programs. The organization, planning, and day-to-day administration of educational programs involving mature, voluntary participants requires specialized skills which come only through specialized professional training. The effectiveness of adult programs in terms of their fundamental purposes will inevitably be in proportion to the quality of leadership we select and assign to them. For us to foist off on the adult citizens of our communities who seek to continue their education the misfits and the unsuccessful administrators and teachers from other parts of the school system, is not only an admission of weakness on our part as chief school officers in the communities we serve—it is the surest way I know of undermining and weakening public support of our entire school program. After all, these people whose intelligence we insult by assigning to them the castoffs and misfits are the very same people who must vote the taxes to support our schools. It is their children we teach in the daytime. How better can we expect to receive their enthusiastic support of and willingness to pay for a good overall school program than by giving them good school experiences themselves? And how quicker can we expect to lose their support than to make their personal experiences unrewarding?

As school administrators we must unify our efforts toward getting the higher institutions to give greater attention to the need for more highly trained administrators and teachers for these programs. We need more professors in colleges of education who have outstanding abilities as administrators and teacher trainers for the expanding public school adult education programs throughout the Nation. The need is not limited to that of preparing full-time adult education administrators and teachers which is customarily and properly carried on at the graduate levels. Far from it. The majority of the thousands of teachers in adult education are part-time teachers, and most of these are regular, full-time day teachers of our children and youth. They need special orientation and preparation, however, to be good teachers of adults. Is it not logical and desirable, therefore, that in the course of their professional preparation programs at our colleges and universities, they should at least be given a good basic orientation to the particular skills and requirements for this kind of service? Superintendents of schools can exert great influence toward bringing this about.

My observation indicates that local superintendents frequently overlook one of the most natural and effective ways of interpreting their total school program to their communities. This is one of the many ways in which adult education can serve all of education. Through specially arranged seminars, forums, lecture series, discussion groups, and other special activities dealing with educational issues, particularly those with local orientation, the local adult education program can render an extremely valuable service in keeping the public informed about their schools. Professionally trained adult educators are expert at identifying and tapping community resources for education. Here is a means by which the school system can involve as both leaders and learners many citizens of the community, and through cosponsorship of educational activities, it can involve many organized community groups in overall support of the community school program.

An important responsibility of the superintendent of schools, both at the State level as well as at the local level, is that of providing an organizational structure within which adult education can function effec-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

tively. Its organizational setting should be such as will facilitate the development and effectiveness of the program, and give it the visibility and status it deserves as a major segment of the total school program.

The superintendent also has the responsibility for the formulation and establishment of appropriate policies and priorities which serve to guide the development of adult education programs. He has the responsibility for establishing a proper framework of operating policies which will assure an overall cohesiveness and continuity of his total educational program. Staff coordination and planning are essential to these ends, and where adult education programs operate under public school auspices, it is important that the director of this program, as a member of the superintendent's staff, participate in the same manner and on a level of comparable responsibility and status as those of his colleagues representing other levels of the educational program. In addition to this, the superintendent has the continuing responsibility of working with his director of adult education and with advisory groups of lay citizens in the formulation and establishment of adult education program priorities, and in the development of appropriate criteria by which the priority classification and method of financing of specific program offerings may be determined. The superintendent holds the final responsibility to assure that his adult program activities are in the public interest and are characterized by substantial educational content, widespread application, and social usefulness. This is essential to the development of local programs if they are to be truly attuned to community needs and receive community support and participation.

In conclusion, I feel that I must comment on a certain word that appeared in the title of the topic assigned to me this evening. The word is "adequate." We have discussed the changing nature of our society and the demands this places upon individuals of all ages and in all walks of life to continue the systematic pursuit of knowledge. We have discussed some of the apparent dimensions of the task of providing opportunities for continued learning for all of our citizens. We have mentioned certain responsibilities which school administrators have, particularly superintendents of schools, for providing adequate programs of adult education. But what is an adequate program, you may ask.

I would not presume to be able to tell you what constitutes an adequate program of adult education for your community. Such a program is one which must grow out of the needs of individual citizens of the particular community it serves, and at the same time it must provide the kinds of education which our society requires of these citizens for its own growth and improvement. Obviously, the educational needs of individuals vary from one community to another, and also the priorities assigned to specific needs will vary because of variations in the intensity of individual needs between communities. The result is, therefore, that no program of adult education can be adequate unless tailored specifically to fit the community it seeks to serve.

An inherent desire toward self-improvement and a better life is a basic motive of man. As individuals, our preoccupations tend to be those of improving our physical well-being and enjoyment of life, resolving our psychic disturbances, and enhancing our relationships with others. Adult education programs must be geared to these broad areas of human interest and need by providing program activities which are designed to help adults in an educational way to improve themselves as individuals, as parents, as workers, and as citizens.

To meet the challenge of the space age, the curriculum of adult education will have to provide studies in subjects as current as the morning headlines and as old as organized knowledge; as functional as the skills of a new job and as rewarding as the humanities; as vital as pending legislation and as sensitive as human relations; as close as a community problem and as remote as a missile's orbit; as intimate as family living and as public as international peace; as elementary as the three R's and as advanced as the educational needs of the adult community it proposes to serve.

If we are willing to consolidate our resources and put forth the effort, we can make it so.

Have you ever had the experience of seeing a man 60 years old, upon the realization that he could read and write for the first time, stand before you with tears of satisfaction streaming down his cheeks?

I have.

Have you ever attended a banquet of prison inmates who were members of an agriculture class specializing in ornamental horticulture, where the toastmaster was a young man who had been sentenced to death and had served 32 months in the death house before having his sentence commuted to life imprisonment?

I have.

Have you ever visited a class of adults between the ages of 21 and 55—with most of these men having families, but exhibiting the courage to attend school late in the afternoons or at nights to complete third-grade work?

I have.

I would like to paraphrase a statement made by Eddie Rickenbacker, after his miraculous rescue from what seemed certain death at sea during the last World War, when he said, "If you have not had any experience with God in your life, my advice is to get busy and get yourself one."

If you, as an educator, have not had experience with all types of adults in education, my advice is to get busy and get yourself such experience.

Then you will provide adequate adult education in your school system.

---

[1] Margaret Mead, "A Redefinition of Education," NEA Journal, October 1959, p. 16.

[2] U.S. Census, and "1956 and 1975," U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 1956.

[3] Thoreau, Henry David, "Walden," Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1906, p. 121.

[4] Table, "Retention Rates, Fifth Grade Through College Entrance, in Public and Nonpublic Schools: Continental United States, 1953–54 to 1957–58," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Research and Statistical Branch, Aug. 22, 1958.

[5] Olds, Edward B., "Financing Adult Education," Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1954.

[6] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Employment and Earnings," vol. 6, No. 5, November 1959, p. 7.

[7] John W. Gardner, "The Servant of All Our Purposes," the Carnegie Corp. of New York, 1958, p. 5.

ROTC in High Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I introduce an editorial from the Stillwater (Okla.) News-Press of February 10, by Mr. Marsden Bellatti, suggesting the possible expansion of the ROTC program in high schools:

BETTER PLAN

Although there is every valid reason to oppose Federal aid to education there is a way to have the socialistic feature without the socialistic overtones and resulting Central Government control.

If Members of Congress are truly concerned about the youth of the Nation and the lack of proper training there is a readymade program available that can be adapted to serve the Nation's best interests. Too few high schools offer the ROTC program. Congress could enact legislation agreeing to pay rent and upkeep for high school that make the ROTC part of the regular training for high school boys. The instructors could be drawn from the ranks of the Reserve and the men and officers teaching would receive credit for advancement and retirement. Surely men in the Reserve would be glad to give an hour or two a week to a ROTC program in their hometown high school.

The worth of the ROTC has been established beyond a shadow of a doubt but the only trouble is that it does not reach enough of the Nations' youth. A minimum of 3 hours of class work plus 2 hours of drill in a week would do a great deal toward inculcating in the Nation's youth the worth of military defense and pride in Nation. The summer camps could be held on the university campuses with dormintory space that is normally vacant in the summer months.

The cost of the ROTC program in the high schools would not be excessive and the local schools that want to take rent money from the Armed Forces could use those funds as the school boards desired. Probably a great deal of the funds would go into salaries for teachers, and that would be fine just so long as there is no Federal control over school boards and teachers.

Letters Concerning American-Flag Aircraft Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith two letters I have received from one of my constituents.

These letters clearly show the adverse situation in which American-flag aircraft carriers have been placed.

I sincerely commend these letters to the attention of my colleagues:

SARATOGA, CALIF., *January 21, 1960.*

Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GUBSER: I have been an airline pilot employed by Pan American Airways for the past 5 years. During this period, I have witnessed a continuing deterioration of my employer's position in international aviation. In spite of my chat with President Eisenhower a few weeks ago on television, the most reliable source at my disposal informs me that I am to enter the era of the "rosy 60's" without a job.

Had this situation arisen from my company's inability to survive in a competitive

free enterprise system, I would not be addressing you at this time. Pan Am has been a leader in the industry since its inception and its list of "firsts" are second to none. Its eagerness to continue is evidenced by an investment of nearly $300 million in jet transports. My concern over Pan Am's list of "lasts" is motivating this letter to you. Particularly being last after all foreign airlines to receive equitable consideration by my own Government.

A basic precept of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, restated in the Federal Aviation Act of 1959, calls for the Government to "encourage and develop an air transportation system adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense." By any stretch of the imagination, can you reconcile this statement of purpose with the following facts:

1. U.S.-flag airlines carried 73 percent of the North Atlantic traffic in 1947, and carried 46 percent in 1958.

2. Of the airlines that have routes circling the globe, two are allowed to cross the United States from San Francisco to New York—Australia's Quantas and Britain's BOAC.

3. In 1945, nine carriers served Latin America. In 1958, approximately 60 were in the race.

4. Air France, Alitalia, BOAC, Iberia Air Lines KLM, Lufthansa, Quantas, REAL Airlines, Sabena Belgian World Airlines, and Swissair are either negotiating or already flying from coast to coast in the United States while Pan American has been repeatedly denied the right to do so.

Not only does my Government allow and encourage foreign airlines growth at my company's expense, but they do so without regard to an equitable bilateral agreement. An example of this is the concession given to KLM in flying to New York. In 1956, Pan Am's total revenue from Amsterdam amounted to nearly $108,000—KLM's total revenue out of New York for that same period was in excess of $12 million. I've been told that the Civil Aeronautics Board recognizes this inequity and has before its members a proposal to extend KLM's route to include Houston and Los Angeles.

It would be tolerable if all my company had to do was to compete with foreign airlines, largely owned by their respective governments and flown without regard to a profit-and-loss statement. But to have my company compete with these foreign governments plus my own government is absurd.

In the middle of this hodgepodge of international aviation routes we encounter the world's largest airline, the Military Air Transport Service. MATS with its 1,400 airplanes and a yearly operating budget of $700 million does 90 percent of its flying over routes already served by scheduled U.S.-flag carriers. These carriers could assume nearly all of the operations performed by MATS at no greater cost to the taxpayer. Obviously there is a need for a military transport system, but the system has been allowed to grow way out of proportion to the need. Aviation Week magazine, September 21, 1959, describes the overwhelming size of this system. "U.S.-flag carriers handled 6.8 percent of all worldwide international air freight during 1958 as compared with 56.7 percent carried by MATS, 36.5 percent by foreign-flag lines. MATS handled 9.8 percent of all international passenger traffic during that year as compared with 15 percent by U.S.-flag airlines, 75.2 percent by foreign-flag lines."

In view of the above, is it any wonder that to a degree, I hold my Government responsible for the fact that my job is in jeopardy? Fortunately, there is a movement in Washington aimed at taking some of the necessary steps at regaining American prestige in international aviation. Senator MONRONEY is planning to introduce his "Air Merchant Marine" bill during this session of Congress. I urge you to consider and support this bill when it appears.

Any support you can lend to a reorientation of State Department policy in bilateral negotiations with foreign-flag airlines would be greatly appreciated.

I would also appreciate hearing your views and intentions concerning international aviation. I'm interested in knowing if my Government intends to continue its trend of nonsupport to its own flag carriers; if so, my most advantageous move is to join a foreign-flag airline.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ZARONES.

SARATOGA, CALIF., *February 19, 1960.*
Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GUBSER: Thank you for your letter of January 25 and the interest shown toward the pilots of Pan American. Realizing that my individual effort would be greatly augmented, I would appreciate your inserting my letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

During the past weeks, a few items have come to my attention which I believe should interest you.

MATS, in an effort to justify the size of their aircraft fleet, is transporting nonessential and unbelievable cargo by air. An example: MATS No. 80406, C-97 type, transited Wake Island on December 9, 1959, carrying a cargo entirely made up of 94-pound sacks of portland cement.

Japan is engaged in applying Government pressure to inhibit Pan Am's jet operation in the Pacific. The Japanese Government has already approached the U.S. Embassy on this issue. This is the sort of action that in the past has led to Government intervention which has curtailed my advancement and is presently placing my job in jeopardy.

Recently, the State Department denied KLM the privilege of a Polar route operation from Amsterdam to Los Angeles. I believe this is the first time that the State Department has seen the inequalities inherent in such proposed bilateral trade agreements and has taken a definite stand. Now I understand that the individuals involved in the decision are under pressure of attack from various quarters of the political arena. I urgently petition you and your colleagues to support and command such action as the State Department took. A passive position will only allow the United States to be relegated to a secondary position in international air commerce comparable to that of our maritime industry.

I mention these events in order to give you a little more background and inspiration for some corrective action. I deeply appreciate what you are doing at present and hope that you can provide some relief for the frustration being dealt to me by my Government.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. ZARONES.

Health of the Aged—H.R. 4700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter that appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, of February 11, 1960.

It is my belief that the writer of this letter, Mrs. Leah Lachenbruch, views the Forand bill in the proper perspective. The letter follows:

HEALTH OF THE AGED

EDITOR: Our experience bears out the truth of Mr. Kuplan's statement, quoted in your editorial, "Health of the Aged," that "a pitifully small percentage of the aged are covered by any health insurance" and "that a pitifully large number cannot afford to buy the medical care they need."

We believe the Forand bill is the logical extension of the Social Security Amendment of 1956 which provided disability insurance. At present, many persons receiving OASI, when needing hospitalization or nursing home care, must either go without it or apply for public assistance, thus diminishing State and county welfare funds and overcrowding county hospitals and nursing homes.

The Forand bill is not socialized medicine. Under its terms, patients are free to choose their own hospitals, nursing homes and surgeons. In no place does the bill propose establishing Government hospitals or using doctors paid by the Government.

Furthermore, as the cost of medical care of all kinds continues to increase, more and more OASI beneficiaries will be considered medically indigent and entitled to care in county hospitals, etc. It seems to us that payment of medical care out of Government tax funds is more socialistic than the purchase of medical care by beneficiaries with OASI insurance funds.

MRS. LEAH LACHENBRUCH,
Chairman of Legislation, Santa Clara Chapter, Association of Social Workers
MENLO PARK.

Jewish Memorial Hospital Community Mental Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I inform the Congress of the initiation of a new and vital project in the district which I have the honor to represent. Cognizant of the need of service in the field of mental health, two great institutions, supported and maintained solely by the voluntary contributions of dedicated citizens have joined in providing this vital health service to our community. It is an example which could well be emulated throughout the country.

The background and aims of the project were ably recorded in the New York Post of February 12, 1960. The article follows:

UPTOWN Y, HOSPITAL JOIN IN MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

An expanded mental health program that will set a new pattern in community teamwork is being launched in the Upper Manhattan-Riverdale area through the cooperation of Jewish Memorial Hospital, 196th Street and Broadway, and the neighboring Washington Heights and Inwood YM-YWHA, 54 Eagle Avenue.

The project, which provides for use of Y facilities for out-patients of the hospital's

mental health clinic and for referral by the Y of those in need of such services, was announced jointly by Dr. Hans L. Epstien, executive director of the Y, and by Louis Miller, director of the hospital.

The plan for the expanded program was conceived when Jewish Memorial Hospital found it had inadequate room to handle the out-patients who came to its rapidly growing clinic. The board of trustees of the Y offered the use of the adjacent Y building to the hospital, as a service to the community.

BOTH OVER 50 YEARS OLD

Both institutions have been in the uptown community for more than 50 years. The Washington Heights-Inwood Y, founded 51 years ago, which occupies a building constructed 3 years ago, is affiliated with the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Jewish Memorial, a voluntary, nonsectaria institution, observes its 55th anniversary this year.

Space will be made available at the Y for adult and children's group counseling, play therapy and psychological testing. Jewish Memorial's psychiatrists, psychologists, and social service workers will staff the clinic. The services of the clinic will be available to adults and children from the community on a nonsectarian basis.

Dr. Epstein and Mr. Miller observed that this was "the first joint venture in the mental health field involving a hospital and a community center in this area." They regard it as setting a precedent for further cooperative activities among the health and community institutions of northern Manhattan.

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND IN AREA

"This cooperative program," said Miller, "has been developed out of our awareness of the inadequate facilities for mental health care for residents of the big area that Jewish Memorial Hospital serves. As our health clinic developed over the years, we found it necessary to enlarge the space allotted for this program, as well as to devise procedures for making its services more readily accessible in a growing community of over 300,000 people."

Dr. Epstein explained that it has been the practice of the Y to work cooperatively with the Jewish Family Service and the Jewish Board of Guardians in meeting the mental health needs of its people, adding:

"We of the Washington Heights-Inwood Y have long been conscious of the need for people in this neighborhood to have access to mental health consultation and care within the community. This project will enable us to broaden our mental health services in association with a hospital that has long been active in this field."

Information about the new service may be obtained from the social service department of Jewish Memorial Hospital.

New York Mirror's National Outdoor Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an event which is taking place in New York at this time.

The New York Daily Mirror should be congratulated for establishing what has now become a national institution. I refer to the National Outdoor Exposition currently on view at the Coliseum in New York City.

Without doubt this is the finest sports, travel, vacation, and outdoor show ever assembled. It has so many great attractions that it would be difficult to list them all. Not only has one of America's great newspapers taken the initiative to stage this great showcase of the pleasurable facets of the American way of life; but it has philanthropically permitted all the proceeds to go to the Mirror's Youth Welfare Fund which in itself has and will continue to provide a fine public service in an area where assistance is needed most—to guide and mold the youth of our Nation into better future adult citizens of our beloved country.

I sincerely wish that such an exhibition as the New York Mirror's National Outdoor Exposition could be sent abroad to the free countries as well as those behind the Iron Curtain. Our neighbors could then realize that what we live and work for here in the United States is worthwhile and that the kind of enjoyment we earn with the fruits of our labor is one of the greatest dimensions of human freedom.

I invite my colleagues in the Congress to come to New York City over the weekend, the show runs through February 28, and enjoy themselves as much as I did at the National Outdoor Exposition.

This is the perfect place to turn for a respite from the many weighty problems that concern us all.

As the Mirror points out:

Never before have we found ourselves with so much time on our hands. It's estimated we now have 2,229 hours each year in which to do nothing but enjoy ourselves. Every third day for average family is a play day. With incomes at alltime highs, average working hours meshed to the 5-day week and vacations extended to 3 weeks, countless more American families today can afford the leisure they like best.

I am sure each Congressman will find something of his home territory represented in the National Outdoor Exposition. The Mirror has said that the show has something for everyone. It certainly does and if I were to choose the "something" I saw there, I would say it is "Americanism at its very best."

Statement of Attorney General A. S. Harrison Jr., of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee has been holding hearings on certain so-called civil rights bills. In my opinion this is a great misnomer.

On February 5, 1960, the Honorable A. S. Harrison, Jr., attorney general of Virginia, filed with the committee a most forceful and outstanding statement in opposition to the proposal of the Attorney General of the United States to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by providing for court appointment of U.S. voting referees, and for other purposes. The statement points out cogently the many dangers to our people and the sovereignty of our States of the new proposal.

General Harrison is highly regarded and recognized as one of the ablest constitutional lawyers of Virginia.

I commend the statement to every Member of this House and urge that you read it carefully and with an open mind so that you may know what the Attorney General of the United States of America is trying to foist upon the people of this Nation. If enacted, the legislation will result in carpetbag rule not only in the South but in the entire Nation in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of the Honorable A. S. Harrison, Jr., attorney general of Virginia, which is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL A. S. HARRISON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, SUBMITTED TO THE RULES AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1960, IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSAL OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO AMEND THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957 BY PROVIDING FOR COURT APPOINTMENT OF U.S. VOTING REFEREES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, my name is A. S. Harrison, Jr., and I am the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Virginia. I am presently serving a 4-year term which began on January 11, 1958. Prior to that time I was a member of the Senate of Virginia for 10 years. I regret that because of a recent illness I was unable to testify in person before this committee, and thank you for the opportunity you have given me to submit this statement.

On January 26, 1960, the Attorney General of the United States made public the text of a bill prepared by the Department of Justice to deal with alleged racial discrimination in both Federal and State elections. Technically, the bill in question would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by adding a new subsection to 42 U.S.C.A. 1971, as amended. Essentially, the proposed amendment would authorize Federal district courts, acting in voting rights cases instituted by the Attorney General under the provisions of 42 U.S.C.A. 1971(c), to appoint voting referees to determine whether or not certain persons making application to them are qualified to vote in any election and to certify as such all persons found by the referees to be so qualified.

The report of a voting referee, unless "clearly erroneous," would be binding upon the court, which would then be required to issue a supplementary decree specifying that the persons named therein are entitled to vote. In addition, the court is empowered to direct the voting referees, or such other person or persons as it may appoint, to attend any election at which a person named in the court's decree is entitled to vote, and report to the court whether any such person has been denied the right to vote or to have his vote properly counted. Certified copies of the court's original decree and any supplementary decrees would be transmitted by the Attorney General to the appropriate election officials of the State, and any officer who, with notice of such decree, refuses to permit any person named therein to vote at any election covered thereby, or to have the

vote of any such person properly counted, may be proceeded against for contempt.

The legislation proposed by the Attorney General is subject to constitutional objection on two readily apparent grounds. Initially, it should be noted that the bill in question authorizes the voting referees to ascertain whether or not certain persons "are qualified to vote at any election," without prescribing any standards by which this decision is to be made. Determination of "qualified" electors is thus left to the unfettered discretion of the voting referees. It should require no particularized citation of judicial authority to demonstrate that the exercise of legal rights may not be exposed, by so vague and indefinite legislation as this, to curtailment or denial at the whim or caprice of individual public officers.

Secondly, and far more fundamentally, the proposed amendment—to the extent that it authorizes voting referees to determine who are qualified to vote in both State and Federal elections—clearly exceeds the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution of the United States and infringes the rights simultaneously secured to the States by that instrument. The right to prescribe the qualifications of electors and to determine, in light of such qualifications, which of its citizens is entitled to vote in State elections, is one resting exclusively within the province of the individual States. In this connection, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that a State is free to conduct its elections and limit its electorate as it may deem wise, except as its action may be affected by the prohibitions of the Federal Constitution or in conflict with powers delegated to and exercised by the National Government, and that the power of Congress to legislate at all upon the subject of voting in State elections rests upon the 15th amendment and extends only to the prevention by appropriate legislation of the discrimination forbidden by that amendment. *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649; *United States* v. *Reese*, 92 U.S. 214.

It is apparent at a glance that the present bill is not limited to the prevention of racial discrimination in the enjoyment of the elective franchise condemned by the 15th amendment. The authority of the voting referees envisioned by the instant legislation is not circumscribed to determining the narrow question of whether or not a citizen's right to vote has been denied or abridged by a State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. On the contrary, the bill in question authorizes voting referees to investigate the qualifications of electors, to determine—by some unknown standard—which citizens are qualified to vote and to certify to the court the names of all persons deemed by the referee to be so qualified. Manifestly, the proposed amendment infringes the right of the individual States to determine who may vote in State elections and exceeds the power vested in Congress to enforce the prohibition of the 15th amendment by appropriate legislation. Indeed, eminent judicial authority may be marshaled to support the view that an attempt to vest in Congress such broad power over the conduct of State elections, even by means of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, would merit instant condemnation. On this precise point, no less a constitutional authority than Judge Story has observed:

"If a clause were introduced in the national Constitution to regulate the State election of members of the State legislature it would be deemed a most unwarrantable transfer of power, indicating a premeditated design to destroy the State government. It would be so flagrant a violation of principle as to require no comment. It would be said, and justly, that the State governments ought to possess the power of self-existence and self-organization, independent of the pleasure of the National Government."

Contemporaneously with his release of the proposed bill, the Attorney General of the United States issued a statement in which he declared:

"Our bill would not fragmentize the election process. It would leave the election procedures in the States where they have always been. At the same time it would operate within established judicial procedures to prevent discrimination in all elections, as the Constitution of the United States intends."

A mere reading of its provisions discloses beyond cavil that the proposed bill would have an effect diametrically opposite to that claimed for it by the Attorney General. If enacted and made operative, this bill would "fragmentize the election process" by establishing separate agencies to pass upon the qualification of electors and fractionate the electorate into two distinct classes; one class embracing those found qualified to vote by State officials applying State-established criteria governing qualifications for voting, and the other class comprising those found qualified to vote by court-appointed voting referees administering criteria—established by no one—and known only to the voting referee, if known at all. The invidious result of a scheme which establishes such a dichotomy in the electorate is not difficult to imagine. In his speech in the House of Representatives on January 26, 1890, the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker, a Representative from Virginia, commenting upon the then pending bill to amend and supplement the election laws of the United States, denounced its divisive effects in the following language:

"I object to another provision of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe in the supervision feature, as a matter of expediency, looking to the true interests of our State and Federal systems. I think the only logical position for Congress to take in regard to the elections of Representatives, if the time ever comes when under the Constitution it can take charge of the elections, is this: Either to give it absolutely into the hands of the States or absolutely into the hands of the Federal Government. Do not have any mixture of the two. It is, and will be, a source of serious trouble, dispute, and clashing of interests, as well as clashing of authority, if Congress assumes control of a part of the machinery and the States take charge of another portion of it."

Aside from its illegality and its necessarily divisive consequences, the historically demonstrable inutility of the present bill is alone sufficient to deprive it of any fundamental merit. A canvass of the legislative history upon the subject of Congressional elections discloses that, with the exception of some 24 of the 171 years since the National Government was founded, the policy has been to leave the regulation of such elections almost entirely to the States, whose representatives Congressmen are. For more than 50 years after the National Government was organized, no congressional action whatever was taken until, in 1842, a law was enacted requiring Representatives to be elected by districts, thus attempting to eliminate the practice which then prevailed in some States of electing on a single ticket all of the Members of Congress to which the State was entitled. Twenty-four years more elapsed before further action upon this subject was taken, when Congress provided for the time and method of electing United States Senators. In 1870, for the first time, a comprehensive system for dealing with congressional elections was enacted by laws which remained in force until their repeal in 1894.

These laws provided extensive regulations for the conduct of congressional elections. They made unlawful false registration, bribery, voting without legal right, making false returns of votes cast, interfering in any manner with officers of election, and the neglect by any such officer of any duty required of him by State or Federal law; they provided for appointment by circuit judges of the United States of persons to attend at places of registration and at elections, with authority to challenge any person proposing to register or vote unlawfully, to witness the counting of votes, and to identify by their signatures the registration of voters and election tally sheets; and they made it lawful for the marshals of the United States to appoint special deputies to preserve order at such elections, with authority to arrest for any breach of the peace committed in their view.

In *United States* v. *Gradwell*, 243 U.S. 476, the Supreme Court of the United States, commenting upon the history of the regulation of congressional elections and the experience gained thereby, pointed out:

"It will be seen from * * * these enactments that Congress by them committed to Federal officers a very full participation in the process of the election of Congressmen, from the registration of voters to the final certifying of the results, and that the control thus established over such elections was comprehensive and complete. It is a matter of general as of legal history that Congress, after 24 years of experience, returned to its former attitude toward such elections, and repealed all of these laws with the exception of a few sections not relevant here.

"The policy of thus intrusting the conduct of elections to State laws, administered by State officers, which has prevailed from the foundation of the government to our day, with the exception, as we have seen, of 24 years, was proposed by the makers of the Constitution, and was entered upon advisedly by the people who adopted it, as clearly appears from the reply of Madison to Monroe, in the debates in the Virginia Convention, saying that:

"'It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the general Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution. * * * Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the general Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures the congressional control will probably never be exercised. The power appears to me satisfactory, and as unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution.'"

The striking similarity between the principal features of the pending bill and those of the election laws of the United States in force between the years 1870 and 1894 indisputably stamp the proposed legislation as the modern day progeny of the same thinking which fostered the ill-advised attempt on the part of Congress to "purify" Congressional elections by entrusting their regulation to officials appointed by Federal courts. In light of the deplorable results engendered by former Congressional legislation in this field, it is unimaginable that any present day legislative proposal could possibly trace its lineage to a more inauspicious origin. In 1893, reporting on the reprehensible conditions prevailing under the Federal election laws which had then been in force for almost a quarter of a century, the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Inquire into the Supervision and Administration of Election Laws by Officers of the United States in the City, County and State of New York advised the House of Representatives (H. Rept. 2365, 52d Cong., 2d sess.):

"It is assumed by the committee that the administration and results of such laws would nowhere appear more clearly or in a better light than in the city of New York.

"It is believed that in the largest city in the country, where every class of our voting population is fully represented and where the respective parties have for years made their principal headquarters at important elections, and under the constant publicity given by the best organized and most effective newspaper press of the world, the actual workings of these laws and their good or evil results can be more clearly seen and appreciated and more intelligently judged than is possible anywhere else.

"Your committee, after a very careful study of the operations of the Federal election laws before election and on election day in the city of New York, are of the opinion that all of these laws have entirely failed to produce any good results in the direction of the purity of elections or the protection of the ballot box, and have been productive of such serious and dangerous results that they ought at once to be repealed.

"The reasons for our recommendation for the repeal of these laws, based on our study of their operation and results in New York, may be classed under four heads. They ought to be repealed—

"First. Because they result in no conviction of offenders, and are therefore useless to prevent or punish crime.

"Second. Because they cause great expense and are fruitful of constant and continuing frauds upon the Treasury.

"Third. Because they are designed to be used and are used only as part of the machinery of a party to compensate voters who are friendly to it, and to frighten from the polls the voters of the opposing party.

"Fourth. Because under and by virtue of these laws the gravest interference with the personal rights and liberty of citizens occur, and voters are punished by arrest and imprisonment for their political opinions."

This report of the select committee served to bear out with a vengeance the unequivocal prediction made on June 26, 1890, by the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker in his speech in opposition to the then pending bill to amend the Federal election laws:

"In conclusion, let me say, gentlemen, that while this bill in my opinion is unconstitutional, and Congress has no power to pass it, that the provisions of it are hideous, and that they ought not to be entertained by this House or this Congress; that even if it passes it will never accomplish the purpose 'whereunto it is sent.' You may rely upon that. As was said in the discussion here today, if there be fraud and corruption in the country the only way to correct them is by an enlightened public sentiment which will frown them down, so that a man who deals in fraud, bribery, or corruption will not be countenanced in the community."

This forceful statement by the Representative from Virginia upon the proper as well as the improper method of controlling abuses in the conduct of elections was echoed by President Coolidge in language which reflects a philosophy of government fundamentally at variance with that of the sponsor of the pending bill:

"It is too much to assume that because an abuse exists it is the business of the National Government to provide a remedy. The presumption should be that it is the business of local and State governments. Such national action results in encroaching upon the salutary independence of the States and by undertaking to supersede their natural authority fills the land with bureaus and departments which are undertaking to do what it is impossible for them to accomplish, and brings our whole system of government into disrespect and disfavor.

"The Nation is inclined to disregard altogether too much both the functions and the duties of the State. They are much more than subdivisions of the Federal Government. They are also endowed with sovereignty in their own right."

In addition to the objections which may be lodged against the bill in question upon the grounds of illegality and inutility, a canvass of existing law clearly reveals that the proposed amendment is altogether unnecessary. Title 42 U.S.C.A., 1971(a), derived from the Civil Rights Act of 1870, declares that all citizens otherwise qualified to vote in any election shall be allowed to vote in such elections without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 amended this section of the United States Code by adding provisions which declare that no person shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce another for the purpose of interfering with his right to vote in any election in which a Federal officer is to be selected; authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to institute proper proceedings for preventive relief whenever any person has deprived or is about to deprive another of rights secured by section 1971; vests jurisdiction of such proceedings in Federal district courts without requiring an aggrieved party to exhaust State administrative or judicial remedies, and establishes contempt proceedings which provide for the rights of individuals cited for contempt of an order issued in an action instituted under the statute in question.

The existence of these laws lends abundant support to the dissent registered by the Honorable John S. Battle, a former Governor of Virginia, and a former member of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, to the Commission's proposal for the Presidential appointment of temporary registrars. This dissent is couched in language which is equally applicable to the pending proposal of the Attorney General:

"I concur in the proposition that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote but I believe the present laws are sufficient to protect that right and I disagree with the proposal for the appointment of a Federal registrar which would place in the hands of the Federal Government a vital part of the election process so jealously guarded and carefully reserved to the States by the Founding Fathers."

Illegal, useless, and unnecessary, the pending proposal, if enacted, cannot but be productive of incalculable mischief. History has demonstrated in conclusive fashion the detrimental effects upon Federal-State relationships which legislation of this character must produce, without any countervailing benefits to the electoral process. Fewer public interests have a higher claim upon the informed discretion of Congress than the avoidance of needless friction between the Federal and State governments, and a scrupulous regard for the rightful independence of State governments and the smooth working of our federated system should at all times actuate the National Legislature.

An obvious characteristic of the bill in question is its palpable direction at the Southern States, and an even more insidious, but no less inevitable, consequence of its passage will be its reprehensible appeal to long dormant regional animosities. Enactment of the bill proposed by the Attorney General will herald the return of those flagrant abuses of the electoral process which obtained during the period in which congressional elections were conducted under Federal supervision, extend the reach of such abuses to State elections, subvert the independence of State governments by encroaching upon rights reserved to them by the Constitution, disrupt harmonious relationships between the Federal and State governments, resurrect the specter of sectional hatred, and impede rather than facilitate a constructive solution to the problem sought to be redressed.

I know of no statement more suited to the pending proposal than that uttered by Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, speaking in the Senate on January 7, 1938, in opposition to a measure similar in nature. With reference to the Southern States, the Senator from Idaho declared:

"These States are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature."

The situation which the proposed amendment seeks to remedy was in the process of progressive and constructive solution in a spirit of mutual good will and in promotion of amity and concord between the two races. The course which this legislation will shape and direct will destroy much of the salutary gain already made and accentuate and stimulate the gravity and difficulty of a solution in the days ahead.

For the reasons stated, I oppose passage of the legislation recommended by the Attorney General and renew the eloquent appeal made under similar circumstances by the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker to the House of Representatives in 1890:

"I only ask that this House will do no act that will disturb the harmony * * * of the State and the Federal Governments, that beautiful system which, when kept in its perfect symmetry, is the admiration of the world, but when jostled or gotten out of gear will work destruction to the people for whose welfare it was intended."

Respectfully,

A. S. HARRISON, Jr.,
Attorney General of Virginia.

Foreign Aid and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions, I have raised objection to what seems to be more and more an established policy on the part of the administration to the effect that we have enough of everything for foreign peoples but not enough for our own. We have been generous with surplus foods for those abroad, and I think this is the way to obtain good will in a foreign aid program, but our Secretary of Agriculture has refused to put into effect the food stamp plan which the Congress enacted last year to make available surplus commodities to the needy in this country where we have 6 million families with unbalanced diets.

Just a few days ago the President vetoed the pollution control bill which provides Federal assistance to local municipalities in cleaning up water contamination in the interest of the Na-

tion's health wherein the Federal contribution is about one-fourth of the cost, and yet the Congress is being asked to vote for funds to supply the same kind of program to more than 50 foreign countries wherein Uncle Sam picks up the entire tab. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the total in American dollars spent abroad for health and sanitation projects for the fiscal years 1955 through 1959 was $48,539,797.

Further, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that my congressional district, the 17th of Ohio, last year suffered one of the most devastating floods in its history, where money damages ran into several million dollars not to mention the untold human suffering involved, and despite the fact that our President declared a certain part of the flooded area a disaster area, despite the fact that the Army Engineers and the Public Works Committee of the House recommended that flood studies should be made on four different river systems, the Bureau of the Budget has to date not seen fit to include the sum of $32,000 in order that the studies can be made in fiscal 1960. But yet, the Congress is being asked for another recordbreaking foreign aid appropriation amounting to more than $4 billion which includes moneys for flood-control projects of all types in many nations abroad.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a fine editorial from the February 22 edition of the Mount Vernon News, published in Mt. Vernon, Ohio, which I believe is representative of the resentment of our people against the policies I have referred to today:

FOREIGN AID AND FLOOD CONTROL

President Eisenhower spoke out last week with some asperity against those who, as he phrased it, want to make a whipping boy out of foreign aid. Specifically, he was defending his request to Congress for $4,175 million in foreign aid.

The President took the stand that no program is more essential to the Nation's security than mutual assistance to America's allies and to underdeveloped countries.

The President may be right, but the American taxpayer is of the opinion that a great deal of the money which has been spent in foreign aid has gone down a rat hole. For years we have had a steady flow of money wasted on projects which are useless in the nations which they are expected to help. We who pay the taxes are convinced that our foreign aid program can use a thorough overhauling and a hardheaded reexamination. Most Americans probably also feel that the total amount we are doling out to other nations can be sharply reduced without eliminating any really essential works—if the program is planned and administered efficiently.

In defending his aid program request, the President went on to say that everybody who wants a dam built somewhere is making a whipping boy out of foreign aid.

That strikes close to home. Residents of the Kokosing River watershed want a couple of dams built. Not huge and costly affairs, but relatively small and inexpensive headwater dams which will help protect our low lying areas against a repetition of the destructive and costly flood of January 21, 1959.

We as taxpayers believe we are entitled to consideration from our Federal Government in this matter and we believe it is more important than, for example, an agricultural school in Bolivia which is far more elaborate and expensive than the people of the community can possibly utilize; to mention just one recent instance of wasteful use of foreign aid money.

We are not opposed to foreign aid, as such, but we believe that home projects can be just as important.

Positive Action on Arab Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 10580, was one of several similar bills intended to stop our Government from canceling agreements with vessel owners in the event one of their vessels was prevented from loading or discharging cargo in any port by the local authorities because of that vessel having previously traded with Israel. Up until recently the United States in effect has been aiding and abetting in the blacklisting of American ships. Officially this involved the so-called Haifa clause inserted by our Military Sea Transportation Service in its tanker charters. The clause was an outgrowth of an incident in 1957, when port officials in Saudi Arabia refused to load a tanker called the *National Peace* when it was discovered that the same vessel had previously, under its former name of SS *Memory*, traded with Israel. As is widely known, the member nations of the United Arab Republic boycott the loading or unloading of any vessel putting into their ports having operated in trade with Israel.

Those of us who introduced legislation such as my bill wanted to make it clear that the United States does not directly or indirectly, overtly or tacitly, endorse or enforce the Arab boycott of ship operators who trade with Israel.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of Members of Congress having introduced proposed bills and in response to our protests and widespread public indignation the U.S. Navy has rescinded its policy of holding the operators of chartered ships which have traded with Israel responsible for any delay occasioned by an Arab boycott. However, even though the offensive clause in Navy agreements has been removed I would hope the matter is not ended there. As I see it, Congress should indicate in a positive way that we oppose the united Arab blockade restrictions against Israel in the Suez Canal as a national moral obligation since the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip 3 years ago.

Affirmative action on legislation such as H.R. 10580 would demonstrate to the world that the Congress abhors rather than abets the Arab boycott. The sudden recanting of a Department rule is hardly the way a great nation should seek peaceful conformity with international law on nonmilitary cargo. Let us not by our inaction and silence become a partner in the Suez Canal ship transit discrimination. Each day that passes of such official neutralism detracts from our National stature and leadership among the nations of the world.

I hope a hearing on H.R. 10580 can be scheduled promptly.

Bayonne's National Merit Scholarship Finalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a distinct honor has been accorded to my district. Two boys from Bayonne, Robert A. Margulies and Marc J. Roberts, have become the first students from Bayonne High School ever to reach the finals of the national merit scholarship program.

These boys certainly have brought honor to their family, school, and city and are to be commended for their outstanding efforts.

It is a privilege for me to take note of this and I would like to include as part of my remarks the excellent editorial from the Bayonne Times of February 17, 1960, along with an article from the Times of February 16:

[From the Bayonne Times, Feb. 17, 1960]

BAYONNE'S MERIT FINALISTS

It's good that Bayonne people should be critical of educational standards in local schools, and fight at hearings against reduction of school budgets here, because improvement comes from discontent. At the same time, it is good to see that the products of Bayonne schools are doing well in extremely difficult competition. It has just been announced, for example, that Robert Margulies and Marc Roberts of the present senior class at the high school have been named finalists in the national merit scholarship program. This is a very respectable showing, and regardless of the obvious talent of both boys it speaks well for the school where they have received their training.

The same conclusion follows from the experience of other graduates of Bayonne High School. Many of them go on to colleges that have the pick of the country, and they find themselves working in the same classrooms with the best prepared students in the United States. They do well, as they demonstrate by the Phi Beta Kappa keys they win, by the graduate schools they enter, and by the records they make after they win their degrees.

So let's go on believing that Bayonne schools need improvement and need the best support the city can provide; let's continue to criticize any inadequacies we might discover or suspect in our schools, and let's go right on thinking of ways to make our schools better. But in the meantime let's remember Marc and Robert and so many others before them who have combined their own intelligence and industry with what their teachers have brought them in Bayonne schools to make records of which they and the city can be proud. Discontent is excellent and should continue, bringing improvements as it goes. But it is not amiss to pause occasionally for a round of ringing applause.

[From the Bayonne Times, Feb. 16, 1960]

ROBERTS AND MARGULIES IN MERIT SCHOLAR FINALS

Robert A. Margulies and Marc J. Roberts have become the first students from Bayonne High School ever to reach the finals of the national merit scholarship program, Alex O'Connor, principal of the school, said today. Margulies is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Max Margulies, 655 Avenue C, and Roberts is the son of Mr. and Mrs. W. Roberts, 41 West 33d Street.

IN TOP .006 PERCENT

The boys, both seniors, were named as a result of their scores on two tests used in the national merit competition. About six-tenths of 1 percent of the seniors in each State and a total of 10,000 students received the certificates of merit for reaching the finals.

The merit scholars will be selected from these 10,000 and will be announced about April 27. Over 110 organizations join to provide the merit scholars with several million dollars in scholarship aid.

Margulies is cocaptain of the track team, a representative for Boys' State, a member of the National Honor Society, the student congress, and the student ring committee. He is a sports reporter for the school paper, the Beacon, and writes a column for the Bayonne Times.

Roberts is Governor of Boys' State this year, a member of the National Honor Society, treasurer of the New Jersey Federation of Youth Temples, president of the Youth League of the Jewish Community Center, the senior class, and the debating club. He is a member of the student congress and edits the Beacon. Roberts 2 years ago won the American Legion oratorical contest. O'Connor described him as one of the finest boys the high school has every had.

Merit scholars finally chosen will receive 4-year awards carrying stipends that range from $100 to $1,500 a year. The selection of the winners will be made by the merit scholar selection committee, a panel of experts in academic selection, and by special judging teams convened by various donors of merit scholarships. Grades, leadership, citizenship, and extracurricular activities are considered, as well as test scores.

The Importance of Antisubmarine Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Space/Aeronautics magazine for January 1960 contained an interesting and most informative special report on "Undersea Weapons Systems" which is most important to an understanding of our national defense.

The subject of antisubmarine warfare, particularly in the light of Russia's tremendous emphasis on submarines, is one which holds keen interest for all persons interested in our national security.

In view of this fact, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point two of the four parts of this revealing special report on "Undersea Weapon Systems":

UNDERSEA WEAPON SYSTEMS 2—NEW SYSTEMS CONCEPTS DEVELOPING FOR UNDERSEA WEAPONS

(By Victor de Biasi, associate editor and project leader)

Not too long ago, only a few people dared to predict that missiles would ever have the tremendous effect on our defense structure and the aerospace industry that they actually have had. Yet those few visionaries were right. Today, the military and the industry are confronted by a comparable daring new "vision"—undersea warfare.

The full technical potential of undersea warfare is still hard to pin down. But there is little argument about the grave military threat of an attack launched from under the ocean. It is this threat actually that has prompted most of what limited scientific work has been done on undersea-warfare problems.

It is understandable that our efforts right now should be concentrated on better defenses against submarines. But why stop at this point? There is no technical reason we could not develop whole families of underwater attack vehicles and weapons just as we have in the air. And there's a lesson we can drawn from the history of aviation: If we had concentrated on the development of antiaircraft warfare and neglected the aircraft themselves, even the supersonic plane would probably still have to be developed.

It is entirely conceivable that some day missiles and space stations may become so effective that they virtually will put aircraft and surface ships out of business. If that happens, the submarine may be the only other vehicle that can carry out military missions with any success (assuming, of course, that submarine developments stay one step ahead of detection and interception techniques).

So long as a non-air-breathing sub moves quietly, it can remain invisible. Any experienced Navy man will tell you that it is practically impossible to pinpoint an uncooperative, deep submarine—even when you know its general area location.

Their cloak of invisibility gives high performance underwater vehicles an awesome potential. Imagine what a mach 2 bomber or fighter could do if there were no such thing as radar to detect it!

Suppose then that, instead of the submarine as we know it, we had small recon, medium-size interceptor, and giant bomber subs. Suppose we armed them with external missiles or gave them drone escorts. Eventually, they might even be backed up by unmanned satellite stations or ocean-bottom armories to carry out preprogramed missions upon command.

Blue-sky thinking does not solve today's problem, though. The Navy is boxed in by almost overwhelming responsibilities. It has a huge surface fleet to maintain, an air arm, and now an underwater arm of steadily increasing size. What it doesn't have is enough money.

Actually, the Navy has more of a management problem on its hands than a technical problem. It simply cannot keep doing business as usual and meet all its obligations.

Several courses of action are possible. One would be to cut the undersea-warfare branch adrift and let Congress fund it on an equal footing with the traditional services. This approach might work, but it would not make many people happy. You also lose the inhouse effectiveness of integrating the submarine with surface and airborne forces.

Another solution would be to limp along and patch up the present system on the basis of continuously shifting priorities. This stifles technical growth but will work as long as the enemy does the same.

CHANGE ALL THE VARIABLES AT ONCE?

A more drastic approach would be to consider the effects of changing all the variables at once. Analyze the entire Navy's operation as though it were to be set up from scratch and study the implications of possible organizational and operational changes in the light of the latest technological developments. This tack, of course, offers the least chance of success, because the opposition will be fierce. But it might be worth a paper study.

Assume the Navy finds it could carry out its major missions with three basic types of vehicles, all of which actually are already under development; hovercraft, hydrofoils vehicles, and subs. Assume further that each of these three types could be built at minimum cost in three size ranges to perform different missions.

Perhaps we could develop standard integrated control systems, powerplants, weapons, accessories, and support equipment. In short, consider changes not only in vehicles but also in equipment and operation.

Our study might show that we cannot maintain our present equipment and also make the most of new discoveries and developments. In that event, it might pay to deemphasize current production, depend on our allies to hold the line, and go on to the next generation—much the same as the Russians are believed to have proceeded in the case of their missile program.

Many will feel it presumptuous of anyone outside the Navy to make suggestions of this kind. But it should be rather obvious that nothing is more important for us today than finding some way of exploiting whatever technical leads we have at a cost we can afford.

The decision must be made now. By 1965, most of our present ships will be ready for retirement. And 5 years certainly isn't too much leadtime for research, development, and production of new systems.

The aerospace industry's weapon-systems approach may be just what we need if we want to come up with mission-bred, integrated undersea vehicle designs. Right now it takes as many as 116 men to operate subs that carry less of a weapon payload than the B–36. With integrated subsystems and automatic control, it might be possible to cut the crew to 10 or 12 men. One hundred men less make a tremendous difference in payload, size, supplies, cost, and expendability.

Why not design ships so that the entire powerplant can be replaced as a section, much as an engine in a plane? If a sub gets into trouble, why not have the crew "bail out" in a control capsule?

Experienced shipbuilders and Navy oldtimers smile tolerantly at suggestions of this kind. These proposals obviously run counter to the Navy doctrine of self-sufficiency afloat, which says you should be able to repair anything from a fire control system to a leaky head. But there is no reason why this doctrine cannot and should not change.

One thing the Navy's departments will not stand for is having individuals or companies barge in and tell them how to run their shop. If companies in the aerospace industry are to make any contributions in the development of undersea vehicles and weapons, they would be ill-advised to become impatient with the way the shipbuilders and the Navy operate. They must learn to understand the problems of the Navy and to work with the Navy in finding solutions for them.

The Navy is used to working with companies that have had its interests at heart for many years, companies that know the Navy's problems intimately and have an outstanding record of accomplishments. It will take a little time before any "newcom-

ers" are fully accepted—especially since in some Navy quarters they are slightly (and rather unreasonably) resented for "trying to cash in on a good thing."

What are the fundamentals of undersea defense? Surveillance, detection, identification, tracking, intercept, and kill—the same as in air defense. Attack can mean anything from launching long-range ballistic missiles to send up short-range homing missiles.

A number of truly advanced defense systems appears to be feasible. Reportedly, we are already working on lining our continental shelf with transducers to detect oncoming enemy subs at long range. Another idea would be to carry sonar detection sites to the enemy. Skimmer-type hovercraft and hydrofoil vehicles moving at 100-knot speeds could cover a giant grid quite effectively. At the grid site, such a craft would settle in the water and lower a string of transducers to sample several depths. (Over very rough waters, a skimmer could use its air cushion at the expense of hovering endurance.) In this way, you could get a three-dimensional fix on suspected targets. After positive target identification, missile-carrying skimmers and hydrofoil craft would come in for the kill.

SUBS ATTACK WITHOUT LOCAL HELP

Submarine attack in enemy water or under enemy-controlled skies will have to be carried out without local surface help. It seems reasonable to expect that different types of subs will be developed to carry out different missions. Several types could then be teamed to make up a fighting force.

Polaris-type submarines are in a class of their own—they are designed to operate as lone wolves. But you could visualize several small, defensively armed recon subs operating in teams of two well forward of a large missile attack submarine to spot likely victims.

Once a target is positively identified, the recon team would have to reveal its presence by communicating with the missile sub. This might be done by transmitting on a transducer lowered to a preselected deep sound channel or by raising an antenna. In either case, chances are the communication will alert the enemy. But by then he would no longer have time to escape.

Bearing data on the target and a common reference would enable the missile sub to calculate the target's coordinates. The reference might be a sound transmitter released by one of the recon subs in the direction of the missile sub. The transmitter could send out timed pulses, one horizontally and the other bounced off the ocean floor. Meanwhile the recon subs would be sending bearing data on the reference and the target. Knowing the time interval between transmitted pulses and the time delay in their reception, the missile sub could determine the range of the reference and go on to lay out the target coordinates.

In a matter of seconds, a missile could be launched into the atmosphere to land in the general vicinity of the target. During the missile's water entry trajectory, the recon subs would focus active sonar on the target, so that the missile could home in on the reflected energy.

The advantages of such a system are that the recon subs could be small and elusive. They could be built in great numbers and fairly cheaply and they could be as expendable as aircraft. They might even be ferried by hydrofoil vehicles or missile-armed convoys.

The trend in submarine performance is to go deeper and faster. Missiles launched from deeper and faster subs will have to withstand terrific pressures (or else the sub will have to change levels for launching). The same will hold true for any missile designed to seek out these subs. Below certain depths it will probably pay to carry external armament rather than to attempt leakproof openings in the hull. In such an arrangement, the missiles probably will have to be filled with oil to keep them from being crushed under compressive loading.

UNDERSEA WEAPON SYSTEMS 3—CATCHING UP WITH THE SUBMARINE

(By Paul Cohen, Antisubmarine Warfare Section, Sperry Gyroscope Co.)

Nuclear power has given today's submarine endurance and mobility orders of magnitude beyond that of its snorkeling, diesel-powered predecessors. The solid propellant ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead has given it a destructiveness without precedent in naval warfare. In fact, a single Polaris sub can carry more explosive energy than has been used in all the wars of the world.

It's not hard to see that today the submarine threat is frighteningly greater than at any time in the past. And things are not getting better—the rate of technical progress in antisubmarine warfare (ASW) is slow compared to that of the submarine itself.

We cannot blame lack of funds or of talent for the slow development of ASW. The physical effects on which ASW equipment depends have been examined again and again in the light of every little advance made in instrumentation. New information on processing theories and sophistications in circuitry are quickly brought to the attention of ASW engineers. No, the major obstacle to ASW progress is that the physical world itself seems to conspire to protect the submarine.

We desperately need a breakthrough to solve the basic problem of ASW: finding a submerged submarine. Not that this is impossible. A sub creates a multitude of secondary effects as it moves through the water (see "State of the Art: Undersea Detection," p. 57). Someday, measurement techniques may become sensitive enough to seize on these effects, even at a considerable distance, as dependable clues to the presence of a submarine. When that happens, it may easily put the submarine back on the defensive. But it hasn't happened yet. For the present, therefore, the outlook for ASW is gloomy.

The primary defense of the submarine is its invisibility. It can hide under the surface of the oceans, which are very large, very deep, and virtually opaque to all electromagnetic radiation. The immensity of the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth's surface, is the first deterrent to effective ASW. Right now we have no scanning technique giving enough range so that a practical number of scanning vehicles (surface ships, aircraft, submarines) could guard a moderately large oceanic area like the Bay of Biscay, let alone a major ocean.

In World War II, airborne radar could rapidly scan large ocean areas for subs lying on the surface to recharge their batteries. Today, the battery sub can use snorkels to reduce their radar-reflecting surface to a few square feet. In a few years, even these slight above-water projections will be rarely used—nuclear subs, whose powerplants need no oxygen, can stay submerged indefinitely.

OCEAN IS CONTINUALLY IN MOTION

Another natural deterrent to detection is that the oceans are rarely calm. Each of the many forms of bad weather—fog, storm, snow, rain, and so on—in its own way hampers ASW. (Even good weather isn't necessarily good for ASW—brilliant sunshine interferes with infrared detection.)

Weather is a problem even before you get to the actual ASW equipment. If we ignore hydrofoil craft, which have yet to prove their sea-keeping capabilities, a ship must have at least 1,000 tons displacement to keep at sea under a wide range of weather conditions. Winter seas in the North Atlantic, to take an example, average about state 5—about half the time, the waves are 10 feet high or higher. Even if a ship can take this kind of weather, its efficiency as an ASW unit falls off a good deal as the crew tire under successive days of continuous ship motion.

Nor are aircraft much better off. By and large, only the larger ones have all-weather capability. Helicopters, the ideal ASW aircraft, are quite dependent on weather and light conditions.

In contrast, a sub couldn't care less about weather. Submerged below the regions appreciably affected by wave action, it can always achieve its rated performance. This is why, in heavy seas, an 18-knot submarine can outrun a 35-knot destroyer.

Not surprisingly, submarine designers and crews are not disposed to give up the advantages of invisibility. Rather they have what amounts to a phobia about radiating signals into the environment. As much as possible, a sub operates only on passive information in detecting and tracking both surface and submerged targets.

Surface ships, on the other hand, can't hide as easily. If their target is submerged and quiet, only active sonar will reveal it at long range.

LARGEST SONARS COMPARE WITH RADARS

Today's largest sonar transducers and circuits (which include continuous wave, frequency modulation, and Doppler types) can handle about as much average power as can radars. Wavelengths are comparable, but sonar pulses for many reasons are much longer than radar pulses. Some sonars are so large that it almost takes a cruiser to mount them.

High frequency sonars far above the audible range give reasonably good resolution but they have only a short range and are quite sensitive to turbidity. Low frequency sonars have longer ranges but are massive and need such large domes or hydrodynamic shielding structures, that they interfere with the speed and endurance of the carrying ship.

Acoustic transmission runs into lots of problems posed by the ocean environment. Sea water is layered in terms of temperature (which can change sharply within a few feet of depth) and, less commonly, in terms of salinity. The surface and the bottom of the oceans both are irregular and sometimes changeable. The waves of the ocean therefore follow complex paths marked by heavy refraction and reflection that can blank out or distort signal transmission and reception.

The oceans also are full of acoustic noises, both physical and animal in origin, and of nonhomogeneities that sometimes are acute enough to reflect like a target. And on top of all these natural detection problems come those of manmade decoys.

Magnetic detection is effective, but mainly only over short ranges. Most of the ocean is deep enough so that wrecks, which might look like targets, are not a problem. Nor, with rare exceptions, are magnetic anomalies sharp enough to be troublesome.

Countermeasures, such as degaussing, can limit magnetic detection. And, of course, if submarines were to start using plastic, aluminum, or other nonmagnetic hulls, they would be very hard to find magnetically.

SUBS CAN BE ATTACKED IN MANY WAYS

Weapons constitute the only ASW area that is in relatively good shape. As in making a rabbit stew, the problem disappears once you have the rabbit. If you've pinpointed the submarine, you can attack it with a variety of weapons: conventional and nuclear depth charges, torpedoes, and rocket missiles with ranges from a few hundred to many thousands of yards.

Basically, weapons are on hand or can quickly be developed to meet the range capa-

bilities of any reasonably precise detection system we can foresee. Still, we must not forget that submarines, which in World War II could dive to no more than 600 feet, can now be built to reach depths measured in thousands of feet.

This greater vertical mobility adds to the problems already posed by the density of water, which is over 800 times greater than that of air at set level. It is difficult and wastes energy to make undersea weapons move fast. Nuclear subs can already attain underwater speeds that are uncomfortably high compared with those of present ASW torpedoes.

SINKING A 30-KNOT SUB POSES PROBLEM

It is one thing to overtake and destroy a submerged submarine at 6 knots. It is quite another problem to defeat a 30-knot sub that usually knows where the searching ship is long before its own presence has been detected.

ASW undoubtedly has made progress, but the sub is making even faster progress. Helicopters and dipped sonars have increased the effectiveness of surface search (yet not enough to make a basic difference). Sonar ranges have been extended quite drastically over the past decade—in some cases by hundreds of percent. But the faster, tougher sub of the future, which will stick nothing more than a periscope or an antenna into the air, remains a threat that today's ASW techniques show few signs of challenging.

The Challenge of Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enter into the RECORD an editorial that recently appeared in one of the newspapers in my district. I call the attention of Members particularly to the last paragraph regarding the issue of Federal aid. I feel that the entire editorial manifests a realistic attitude toward the educational challenge. It is an attitude which I think we here would do well to emulate.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wallowa County (Oreg.) Chieftain, Feb. 18, 1960]

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR SCHOOLS

The challenge to provide better schools for the Nation's youth is seldom met head-on with bold and practical proposals. Usually it merely stirs up high sounding platitudes and provincial sentiment which is opposed to any substantial change in the small schools which many adults profess to love so much.

But the point may soon be reached when the practical limits of the property tax to raise the necessary funds for a minimum school budget may be reached, and then what? School boards may be forced into further consolidations and into demanding more State and Federal aid. Resistance to change will soon be broken down by the inability to continue the present setup.

But further State and Federal aid may be conditioned upon local districts meeting higher standards which some of our small schools cannot attain either because of a lack of dollars or a lack of students.

With these prospects in the offing the need for some serious thinking to assist the county school reorganization committee in coming up with a plan for a better school organization in Wallowa County is imperative. If there is no serious thinking and no real planning for the time when the present setup can no longer be maintained, a lot of money will have been thrown away in school plants which will have to be abandoned, and we will find ourselves forced into sudden action without well thought out plans.

We might as well forget about opposition to Federal aid for schools. The dangers are more apparent than real, and the need for Federal aid is too acute to leave us any choice. And we might as well get down to a serious study of the best way to effect a more economical and a more efficient school system than the one we now have in Wallowa County, because it is a job we will have to do before long, and the sooner we get at it the better the job will get done. Some of us loved horses and buggies, but they are largely gone now. Some of us may love the independent, small elementary and high schools, but they will soon be gone too.

Prominent Detroit Editor Cited by Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, in Detroit, Mr. John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times, the very well-known daily newspaper, was honored by the Michigan Veterans of Foreign Wars. The plaque with which he was so deservedly presented cited his journalistic achievements and his efforts in behalf of veterans' organizations. This recognition, Mr. Speaker, is certainly a prime example of credit where due. John Manning has for many years dedicated himself to the highest ideals of the journalistic profession and has been singularly successful in the achievement of these ideals. He has been for all this time a civic leader and in his capacity as the editor of the Detroit Times has always kept his watchful eye of the affairs of the city of his birth, as well as the affairs of the Nation and the world. John Manning has long been a leader in the advancement of the interests of the many veterans' organizations in the State of Michigan and in the overall interest of all American veterans.

I should like at this time to say to Jack Manning in front of this body, "Well done and congratulations." I would like also to insert in the RECORD excerpts from the reportorial account of the actual presentation which includes the warm praise he so well deserves as enunciated by Mr. Joseph Mann, past commander of the Michigan Veterans of Foreign Wars who made the presentation:

MANNING HONORED BY VFW

Michigan Veterans of Foreign Wars Saturday honored John C. Manning, editor of the Detroit Times, for his journalistic achievements and his efforts in behalf of veterans' organization.

Joseph Mann, past commander and director of the welfare and service department, presented a bronze plaque to Manning at the VFW's Ninth Annual Service Officers' Conference.

Some 400 officers, at the conference in the Veteran's Memorial, heard Mann say in presenting the award:

"In grateful appreciation of outstanding journalistic achievements benefiting the people of the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan.

"Your editorial policies have been concise and truthful and have been presented in conformity with the best traditions of American journalism."

Mann added: "It seems through the years the Hearst newspapers, more than other newspapers, have been most thoughtful, helpful and considerate to the cause of the veteran.

"Whenever I needed any advice or counsel," Mann said, "I found it readily available from Mr. Manning."

Mann said the first award of this kind was presented by the VFW to William R. Hearst, Jr., last year.

Manning, a native Detroiter, is a World War I veteran.

A major portion of the 2-day conference, which ends Sunday, dealt with a new pension plan, effective next July.

The Foreign Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the United States sponsors exchange programs among students to help bring understanding to Americans and to those who visit this Nation. Usually, I think, we do manage to accomplish just that.

An article in the February 1960 issue of Reader's Digest, however, tells about a person who thought that more should be done. Not only that, he set about to do something himself. His program, which originated at Rutgers—the State university—is one of interest to all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRY MORGAN'S FRIENDSHIP AMBASSADORS

(By Clarence W. Hall)

One day last spring Harry Morgan, student body president at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., listened aghast as an exchange student from Pakistan ticked off his impressions of the United States. Nural Khan's opinions embraced many of the stock criticisms of this country that are voiced abroad—stereotypes gained from newspaper headlines, from American movies and tourists.

These false images—many of them Communist-inspired—picture the United States as the land of disrupted family life, low moral standards, quick discrimination against all people of color. According to surveys made by the U.S. State Department, Americans are believed to be smugly complacent, shallowly religious, politically naive, lovers of gadgets and luxury, frenzied pursu-

ers of the fast buck. They are said to know little of foreign peoples—and to care less.

Harry Morgan was shocked to discover that Nural Khan held these opinions—since the young Pakistani had been living in the United States for 2 years. Nural Khan was slated to return home soon, and would be taking with him these twisted images of his host country.

"Tell me, Nural," Harry Morgan asked, "how much of the United States have you seen beyond this campus? How many Americans have you met?"

Khan admitted that he'd been no farther than New York City. His off-campus contact with Americans had been limited to an occasional visit to a fellow student's home for a holiday dinner.

Harry Morgan did some research into our gigantic student exchange program. He discovered that there were then in the United States 47,245 foreign students from 131 countries. A large majority were here on scholarships provided by the U.S. Government or private philanthropy, representing an investment of more than $200 million. And only a tiny minority ever had a chance to see the country and meet Americans in their own homes and communities, sample their friendliness, grasp their way of life.

Convinced that Americans were getting small return on their whopping investment in good will, Harry Morgan resolved to do something about it. A personable young man of 25, with an easy charm and quick smile, he was not without experience in helping visitors from abroad learn about the United States. For 3 previous years—the first time when he was on leave from the Air Force—he'd brought to the States small groups of average but critical Europeans. Supported by friends who bought "shares" (at $1 each) in his one-man ambassadors-for-friendship program, he'd given the visitors grassroots tours, sent them home singing praises of the United States.[1] In his ambassadors' treasury he had $1,000, and he determined, with the approval of his "shareholders," to use this for a nationwide tour with four foreign students.

Nural Khan, of course, was first on his list. A Fulbright scholar studying for his master's degree in economics, Khan was a leader among foreign students at Rutgers, was committed to enter Pakistan's diplomatic service upon his return home. To find 3 others to join Khan on the tour, Harry Morgan talked with 150 foreign students at Rutgers and New York City's International House. Beyond a warped point of view about the United States, his guests-to-be needed certain qualifications—a winning personality, a sufficient facility in English to communicate to Americans an interesting picture of their own countries and customs, and an ability to interpret to their homelands what they saw of this country. After 6 weeks, Morgan had found his three other young ambassadors for friendship.

Dorio Mutti, a student at Rutgers came from Parma, Italy, a town largely Communist. Dorio was acting as U.S. correspondent for his home newspaper, Gazzetta di Parma—and his dispatches had been bitter.

Jose Aruego, Jr., from the Philippines, a lawyer turned artist, was studying at Parsons School of Design in New York. Jose was doing a series of American-life sketches which he planned to send to a Manila newspaper. Titled "This Is America," the drawings were clever caricatures of New York City's worst aspects.

Hugo Vercelli, from Argentina, was a civil engineer attending classes at Columbia University. Handsome and a fiery speaker, Hugo had been a student leader in the revolt against Peron. He had come to the States, "to learn from Americans how to preserve our democracy," had found little chance to learn about "the real America" save through textbooks. Bitterly he said, "I have could read these at home.

Calling the four together, Morgan explained the all-expenses-paid, 2-month trip for which they had been selected.

"But where's all the money coming from, Harry? Are you rich?"

He replied, "Yes. Rich in friends, many of whom I haven't even met." He showed the students the long list of his shareholders who had financed his previous ambassadors-for-friendship tours.

His tentative itinerary covered 38 States. "We'll see a lot of natural beauty," he said. "But mainly we'll meet people, the kinds who make America what it is. You've got your ideas about them. Let's find out of you're right."

When they had examined the itinerary, he asked, "Anywhere else you'd like to go?" One said, "How about Little Rock?" Harry promptly added it. Nothing was to be off limits on this tour.

Needing a car for transportation, Harry wrote to George Romney, president of American Motors. Back came a wire: "What color?"—and a few days later a new red and white Rambler station wagon was delivered, inscribed with the words "Ambassador for Friendship" and the name of the countries represented by the students. From the Hilton Hotels Corp. came a letter offering hospitality in any city where the Hilton organization had a hotel. From friends of former tours came offers of hospitality in their homes, more than Harry could ever use.

After 4 days' briefing on facets of American life by history professor George Frick, the young ambassadors set out to see how the facts fitted their notes. The first leg of the itinerary took them to Washington, D.C., to see the U.S. Government at work, thence to Williamsburg, Va., shrine of the American heritage. Among the first private citizens they met were Harry Golden and Carl Sandberg, in North Carolina.

Golden, author of the bestseller "Only in America," took the boys to his home, talked for hours of his experiences as "a poor kid with all the strikes against him, member of a minority group, growing up in all the wrong places, doing most of the wrong things, but—thanks to the understanding encouragement of Americans of all creeds and colors—managing to snatch a measure of success out of it all."

The day spent with Sandburg at his home was, as one of the students expressed it, "like a visit with Lincoln himself." Sandburg received them warmly, recited for them his poems in praise of America and excerpts from speeches by Lincoln "who gathered the feel of the American dream and saw its kindred over the earth." They left the great poetic interpreter of America's spirit with his words ringing in their ears: "We need your understanding of America. We need you to help us understand your countries. Let's weave the strands of understanding from both ends. Only so can we truly join the family of man."

Sandburg's parting shot: "From here you go to Little Rock. You'll find members of the family of man there, too."

To their surprise they did. At no other place on their tour did their image of what's wrong with America undergo such a sharp change. Harry Morgan saw to it that they met representatives of every shade of opinion on the issues and events that have given Little Rock an ugly reputation around the world. They talked with school board members and teachers, with white and Negro students. Harry S. Ashmore, Pulitzer Prize-winning editor of the Arkansas Gazette, spent an afternoon with them, reviewing the segregation problem from the Civil War to the present.

Nural Khan was fearful at first that his own dark skin would cause trouble. His fears melted fast. Standing on the street the first day in Little Rock, he was approached by a man who, with hand extended, said, "You're one of the foreign students I read about in the paper? As just an average citizen, may I welcome you to my town?"

Hundreds of other average citizens displayed equal eagerness to correct the unhappy image of Little Rock projected around the globe. After every press mention of the students' presence, calls flooded in: "Please give us a chance to entertain these boys in our homes. We'd like them to hear the other side of the story."

"We got the humbling reminder that the U.S. South has no exclusive corner on prejudice," Nural Khan said. "When I get home and hear someone mention Little Rock, I must remind him that we Pakistanis have not entirely banished our caste system." Dorio Mutti wrote home, "Before we condemn Little Rock, we should remember that Italians are not bereft of their prejudices toward Ethiopians."

Everywhere across the country Harry Morgan showed his students how average Americans live, work, play, worship, think. He took them to church clambakes, and ball games; to PTA meetings, women's clubs, and political rallies; to factories and industries to see how management and labor get along; to courts to see how U.S. justice works.

While traveling through the West, one of them said, "Look, Harry, how about the American Indians? Don't they hate the Government for taking their land, herding them into reservation?"

Harry replied, "Let's look up some and find out."

In Arizona they visited a section of the Hopi reservation. The chief took them on a tour of a village, introduced them to members of the tribe, told how they spent their time hunting, building homes, working together to make a better life for all. "My people are happy," said the chief. "They are free to pursue their own life and culture as they wish."

Most stops during the trip were impromptu—depending upon where nightfall caught them. "We'll take potluck with American hospitality," Harry told them, "spontaneous and unrehearsed."

Passing a farmhouse at day's end, Harry Morgan would drive up, explain the purpose of the tour—and invariably the whole group would be invited in. They would be fed a huge farm supper, then made comfortable for the night in spare rooms or invited to spread their sleeping bags in a barn.

At an Oklahoma farm, one such stop was extended to 3 days when a farmer and his neighbors insisted on giving the boys a taste of American farm life and themselves an experience in international understanding. The students got up at 4:30 in the morning to do farm chores. Just before they left, a community dinner was organized, and farmers and their families came from miles around to hear the boys tell of their experiences in the United States and answer questions about their homelands.

Passing a park in Hays, Kans., Harry spotted a picnicking crowd, stopped to inquire about road conditions ahead. "If you're looking for America, you've found it," said the chairman, who promptly swept them in to share the food and fun.

In Marshalltown, Iowa, one night, they stayed at the home of a truckdriver. His wife cooked up a big chicken dinner, and the guests were bedded down on cots and sofas in the living room.

Amazed at "such friendliness from people I've never seen before," Hugo Vercelli from Argentina commented, "The most wonderful thing about America is its wonderful 'little people.' "

[1] See "Harry Morgan's 'People-to-People' Adventure," the Reader's Digest, February 1958.

Stops were made in national parks—the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, the Grand Tetons—where the boys camped out and cooked their national dishes for casual guests, sat around the campfires of vacationing American families, swapping cups of coffee and stories of their experiences.

Another of their distorted images faded fast: that Americans are provincial, isolationist, selfishly uninterested in other peoples and their problems. Said the boy from Pakistan, "You know, I've just realized where my Fulbright scholarship comes from—not from some Government agency, but from the pockets of people like these."

The notion that Americans generally are "basically uncultured," with little interest in art, literature and music, was quickly debunked as the students were taken to art galleries, museums, libraries; saw overflowing crowds at community-sponsored concerts; observed in humble homes well-stocked bookshelves and stacks of recordings of the world's finest music.

Said Mutti, the Italian, "The thing that amazes me is that Americans don't depend on government, as we Europeans do, to provide their cultural programs. They sponsor them themselves, pay for them themselves."

The Communist-inspired stereotype of the "greedy American capitalist" underwent sharp revision at the home of a wealthy industrialist in Michigan. "We expected to find him huddled over a stock ticker," said Vercelli. "Instead we found him in his basement, in overalls, hammer in hand, repairing a table for a library he'd founded. He talked at length about the educational foundation he had set up, and the fun he was having in giving away practically everything he had."

Areugo added, "Wealthy men in our countries don't do such things."

American family life—formerly pictured for them as "disrupted and spoiled by easy money and easy living"—also was a revelation. Speaking before civic clubs or giving newspaper interviews, they told their audiences, "Nobody is so unjustly maligned in our countries as the American woman." They stated their amazement at discovering "how smoothly she runs her home without servants, all the while serving as wife and mother, cook and seamstress, counselor and chauffeur—yet somehow finding time for community service as a volunteer worker."

As for America's alleged loose living and immorality, one told a reporter, "We've visited towns all across the country; none of them looked like 'Peyton Place' to us." Another demanded, "Why do you allow your movies sent abroad to misrepresent you so horribly?"

Perhaps the sharpest effect was registered by Dorio Mutti's weekly articles on America publised in his Communist hometown's Gazzetta di Parma. His descriptions of Americans (the Iowa truckdriver who can afford to have a TV set in his home and a new car in his garage, or the housewife in Salinas, Calif., who stayed up late to wash and iron our laundry) created a sensation. Parma's Communist mayor told Dorio's father, "Your son is giving us an understanding of America we have never had before."

The tour over, three of the students returned to their studies. Nural Khan applied to the U.S. Information Agency in Pakistan for a job. "I'd like to spread my message about America," he said, "before entering my country's diplomatic service."

Following his graduation from Rutgers University this June, Harry Morgan plans to devote his full time to widespread development of his ambassadors for friendship program in the United States. Next summer he will conduct another tour for students from abroad. As he says, "For generations the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor has been inviting the world to send its tired, its poor, its huddled masses. Today they're sending us their brilliant, their gifted, their leaders-to-be. It takes so little—for an individual, a group, a community—to show these, too, at firsthand what American freedom is."

Essential: Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Hartford Times recently carried an editorial regarding the current discussion in the other House of legislation to reinforce the guarantees of civil rights necessary to all our citizens. This editorial analyzes the contribution made to that great debate by the able junior Senator from Connecticut. I think that speech and this analysis of its main points deserve the attention of all concerned with this issue and I offer it for the RECORD:

ESSENTIAL: VOTING RIGHTS

This session of Congress, as Senator THOMAS J. DODD, has pointed out, will have a potent hand in the issue of civil rights. If it refuses to reform the racial injustices which bar Negroes from the exercise of citizenship in the South, then through inaction this Congress will ratify an unconstitutional system there—a reign of fear, ignorance, and prejudice.

Senator DODD strikes to the heart of the issue when he says that the question of voting rights is the civil rights issue stripped down to its essentials. Men can correct the wrongs done to them if they have a vote. Without it, revolt or vassalage are the only alternatives. Responsible citizens of this country will promote neither.

In a Senate speech studded with specific examples of voting right violations, Senator DODD on Monday asserted that there is a conspiracy which has many faces to bar the southern Negro from the polls. It works in part through the law, in part through legal abuse, and in part by defiance of law. The conspiracy exists by crude violence and subtle social and economic reprisal, as the Senator notes.

Most viciously the conspiracy against human equality in civil rights nestles in a web of false tradition and cultivated ignorance of which most Americans today are ashamed. We do not believe that any man's color implies a nautral inferiority.

Still, there are those who call themselves Americans and who do believe that, and fight in the U.S. Congress for that belief, even in this year of 1960.

To perpetuate their prejudices they have created a maze of State and local barriers against Negro voters. These, Senator DODD proposes, must be stripped down and replaced by ironclad Federal guarantees and protection of voting rights.

Those who oppose such protections mask their real attitude behind the more reasonable sounding but unconstitutional assertion of complete State sovereignty in matters affecting the civil rights of citizens.

It may be that the challenge to Federal authority in the field of civil rights which is now being made cannot be settled except by the most outright and full use of the Federal power. There can be no doubt of its applicability.

Senator DODD referred to this power in his speech when he read from the Constitution that the Congress may at any time make or alter rules for electing Senators and Representatives, and from the 15th amendment which provides that Congress shall have the power to enforce the right of all citizens to vote.

As he explained, "The Federal Government can, if it chooses, take over the entire election machinery for Federal elections or it can leave in the hands of the States, or it can devise a combination of both forms of control.

"The Federal Government can, if it chooses (in Federal elections) man all the polling places in the country with Federal officials, or it can permit the job to be done by State or local officials; or it can impose minute regulations upon State and local officials which take precedence over State and local laws; or it can operate through both Federal and State officials and under the laws of both."

Senator DODD further stated that if the Federal Government chooses it can "prepare and maintain all election records for Federal elections, from the registration of voters to the counting and maintenance of ballots; or it can allow the States to perform this function.

"The power of this Congress, therefore, to work its will on the Federal election process is limited only by its consideration of what is necessary and prudent."

To make possible the enforcement of the right to vote in State and local elections, the Senator would require civil rights legislation this session for the keeping of registration and voting records in all districts and to prohibit State or local governments from concealing or destroying such records. Further, such records would be preserved, open to public inspection for 5 years after being made.

He asks laws to govern the responsibilities of registrars and a program of federally supervised registration with procedures "so simple and machinery so ample as to achieve, within a period of 2 years * * * registering of every qualified citizen."

It seems inevitable that this session of Congress, conscious of its powers, will produce the legislative strength to act in the way which Senator DODD suggests, for the national will demands it.

One would rather have seen the change wrought by the Southern States intelligent realization of facts and by persuasion instead of by this final and necessary bending by power. But there is a time for persuasion, and it has run out.

Pollution Problem No 3: Who Is Spoiling Our Good Water Supply?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Atlanta Journal of December 29, 1959:

POLLUTION PROBLEM NO. 3: WHO IS SPOILING OUR GOOD WATER SUPPLY?

(By Luke Greene)

Streams and bodies of water that form our chief sources of water supply can be easily contaminated nowadays by great concentrations of people and industry.

Expanding industry cannot escape its particular responsibility, and if it takes the long-range view it is bound to see the advantages of strict pollution control.

The wastes from our industries are as varied and complex as American industry itself.

Our technological aggressiveness and the volume of our output have combined to complicate the problems in pollution.

INDUSTRIAL WASTE

Industrial waste, generally consists of oils, acids, chemicals, greases, mineral salts, lignin and animal and vegetable material. Some are virulent, others noxious, and still others merely nauseous, and offensive to the eye and nose.

Some of these wastes are highly poisonous and corrosive. Others can be more damaging to water quality than sewage.

Those industrial plants that don't bother to treat the water used in their production processes before it again is released into streams or lakes frequently are creating serious pollution troubles.

The industrial wastes may kill fish as well as all other living organisms that are so important to nature's balance in water.

This naturally arouses the game and fish commission and the hordes of fisherman who believe our abusive water practices are thwarting their efforts to promote sound conservation of wildlife.

Atlanta recently experienced a pollution problem when large numbers of dead fish were discovered floating in the South River. The trouble was diagnosed as waste contamination by investigating agents of the State game and fish commission.

Perhaps equally frustrating to the water conservationist is the large number of cities and towns in Georgia that still pour untreated sewage into rivers, sometimes near the headwaters of our finest lakes.

The chemical changes that take place might be described as a kind of leukemia in water.

The bacteria in the water (and the raw sewage itself) in time will "eat up" the organic portion of the material and cause its eventual decomposition and disappearance. However, this biologic decomposition consumes oxygen and when the oxygen in water is used up by such a process, all other life that depends on it dies.

Not only does this mean the end of fish, shrimp, crayfish, mussels, clams, oysters, snails, beneficial insects and their larvae, and certain kinds of plant life, but animal and bird life in the vicinity may also disappear.

There is likely to be a foul stench that people for miles around will recognize as the mark of an aquatic graveyard.

Through the years the Georgia Department of Public Health has done a fine education job in promoting construction of sewage treatment plants. However, these plants do not materialize overnight as one can readily see from studying a map of the State showing the large number of cities and towns that still dump raw sewage into watercourses.

Before a municipality can finance and construct a sewage treatment plant, public support for it has to be aroused. Once that happens, there possibly will be a demand to float bonds for the needed project.

But the final decision still rests with the people themselves, and until they realize what they're doing to their streams there may be little action of any kind. Few cities are anxious to spend money if they can get by without it.

SOIL EROSION

One other abuse that has its effect on the streams is land erosion, but fortunately soil conservation programs are helping to lessen this damage.

Judicious use of grasses, cover crops, terraces, and tree plantings will largely reduce silt in the streams, and almost everywhere in Georgia we can see heartening evidences of this kind of improvement.

However, there are still some things that Georgia should be doing to reduce the disastrous consequences of pollution.

Address of John J. Allen, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Before a Meeting of the 15th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Hotel Statler Hilton, Washington, D.C., January 21, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech delivered by my good friend, the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. John J. Allen, Jr., before a meeting of the 15th annual convention of the National Limestone Institute, Washington, D.C., January 21, 1960.

Mr. Allen's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE A MEETING OF THE 15TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., HOTEL STATLER HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 21, 1960

I welcome the opportunity to discuss issues of transportation policy with an important producer group. You are, after all, the customers whom transportation must serve, and communications between buyer and seller are always important.

From your convention program I can see that your interest in public policy is wide ranging, covering construction, agriculture, and industry, who are your customers, as well as transportation and labor, sectors of the economy from whom you buy services. While in one sense I must give you a sales talk as a representative of the broad field of transportation, in another sense I am one of your best customers because of my interest in the highway program. I see, however, that both Ellis Armstrong and the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER are on the program this afternoon, and I can assure you that the highway interest will be well taken care of at that time.

The general significance of a national transportation policy should not be difficult for a producer group to comprehend. Transportation is a collection of producer industries, dedicated to marketing a service which must be produced just as the output of your own group of industries. Transportation producers are faced by the same problems of competitive elements, taxation, labor, and future public need which are the concern of your own convention. These concerns form the proper basis of national transportation policy, and it is to these factors which the subject matter of regulatory legislation and public investment in transportation facilities should conform.

As a producer industry, transportation must expand its capacity to meet the needs of its customers, its services must be priced to reflect costs and service quality, and it must be alert to new technical developments useful in extending its services or increasing its efficiency. The public interest will be served when all these industrial policies are in effect. Public policy in transportation should be dedicated to the encouragement of these producer objectives. Transportation is, after all, a business, just as your own activity is a business, and the objectives I have outlined are held in common with all business enterprise.

Since transportation is a business affected with a public interest public policy is concerned specifically with regulatory objectives. In the minds of many people regulatory policy is the sum and substance of national transportation policy. To many, national transportation policy is put in capital letters and is construed to mean solely the preamble to the Interstate Commerce Act.

I have a somewhat wider application of national transportation policy. Government not only regulates, it promotes transportation. One of its principal methods of promotion is through direct provision of facilities such as highways, airports and airways, and inland waterway and harbor facilities. The investment in these facilities is a concern of national transportation policy in the broader sense.

National transportation policy should also be concerned with the impact of general public policy such as taxation, Government procurement, and labor legislation on the objectives of transportation as an industry producing a service needed by the public.

Public policy problems in regulation, promotion, and impacts of general governmental policies should be analyzed in terms of common principles before decisions and recommendations are made. The most important common denominator is the need of the public for transportation services, both now and in future years. This means essentially analysis of the growth trends in our economy to find out how much transportation will be needed, how much additional investment in transportation facilities will be needed to serve economic growth, and how public policies in regulation should be adjusted to accompany the growing needs of transportation.

Our present knowledge in all these fields is deficient. For that reason public policy development in transportation has groped in the dark. As a result of the public groping, business policy in the transportation industry itself has been affected adversely. Transportation policy has been the victim of social lag; economic growth and technical developments have rendered past policies somewhat unsuitable for present conditions.

This situation is not exactly new. There has been an intensive quest for a revised basis for transportation policy for at least two decades. In this administration we have had the report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization in 1955 which led to a nationwide reappraisal and discussion of the fundamental issues of regulation. The widespread discussion of regulatory isues set the stage for some needed changes in laws affecting common carriers. Following the discussions engendered by the Advisory Committee report and the intensification of the transportation problem, the Transportation Act of 1958 was passed with additional changes in the emphasis on regulation.

The quest for a better transportation policy continues. The President in his budget message of January 1959 directed the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a fundamental study of the entire transportation policy problem. Our study and recommendations are nearing completion. The Congress, through the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is also appraising national transportation policy through a broad study of the many problems. Private groups and foundations are also evidencing concern about transportation problems and the losses they cause to our economy. Only last week President of the National Acad-

emy of Sciences announced to a meeting of the highway research board—which Mr. Burgraff represents here today—that he will sponsor conferences this summer among scientific leaders in the transportation community to formulate a common research program to meet the deficiencies in our knowledge of this vital subject.

Fundamentally, one question rises above all others. Are we denying economic choice to the user of transportation so that he is paying more than he wants to or should? In other words, is there waste in terms of business and economic objectives?

In our society we believe that free economic choice is the foundation of our economic progress. Free economic choice is believed to bring about the most efficient allocation of resources. It provides the incentive for free enterprise to develop the markets which have raised our present standard of living.

Much of our regulatory policy has come to us from a past era when economic choice was not technically possible on the same scale as today. The basis of our present-day transport regulation is stated in the Transportation Act of 1920—40 years ago before we had a modern highway system, before our waterways were built to today's standards, before the airplane was anything but a prototype machine. The shape of our present regulatory laws was cast in the Transportation Act of 1940—20 years ago when we had just emerged from a great depression and we were not so conscious of the opportunities and problems of economic growth.

It is certainly time for a fundamental reexamination of both the shape and the philosophy of our common carrier regulation. Regulation must not be utilized as a means of thwarting the free economic choice of shippers. Regulation must not warp the development of transportation systems in their response to economic change and economic growth. These two principles mean specifically that rate structures must reflect the conditions of cost and service value in a competitive market, and that the control over carrier entry, consolidation, and finance must allow a rational response to the growth and changing character of the national economy.

If free economic choice is reflected in the market for transportation services, it will have its effect on investment in transportation facilities. This means public investment as well as private investment. For transportation is most unique among industries in its reliance upon publicly provided facilities for its basic operations. We have had a serious problem in finding money and in using wisely the money we have found for such things as highways, waterways, airways and airports. The investment in these facilities should more nearly reflect the transportation economy of the Nation.

We must learn better how to program such facilities to take care of dynamic growth. The determination of the choice of the transportation agency to be used by a shipper should be left to free enterprise rather than Government fiat. There must be balanced development of our transport facilities to meet the needs of our Nation—now 50 States rather than 13.

One of the best means of accomplishing a relationship between economic need and public investment is to require the beneficiaries of public facilities to pay their equitable share of the cost. In business we expect that the price we charge will reflect in some manner the cost of doing business. The cost of doing a transportation business should reflect the cost of both the private and public investment in equipment and facilities dedicated to a transportation business. This is generally true today in the highway field which is now almost entirely financed from user taxes. It is not yet true in the field of aviation or inland waterways.

We have found in the highway field that the user groups pay close attention to the scope of the highway programs and insist strongly that highway programs concentrate on the projects of greater value to the users. When it appears that the highway program will require increases in taxes the user pressure for an augmented program is tempered by the realization that this will increase his own costs. This has been very evident in the experience during and following the crisis in highway finance during the last session of the Congress.

If equitable systems of user charges could be devised for other publicly provided facilities, the desires of the user groups would be conditioned by close economic calculations of the benefits they would derive from additional public expenditures. There would be a tendency to encourage the growth of public expenditures in these fields to those actually required to meet the growth of transportation need as reflected in a market of free choices. It is axiomated that people are more careful in demanding things they have to pay for.

Transportation differs from other production industries only in its dependence upon publicly provided facilities and in its relation to regulatory agencies. Both public investment programs and regulation should be administered to preserve the production objectives of transportation. Transportation is produced for a market, it is a part of the complex of economic activities of which your own industry is another vital part. Economic considerations should be the fundamental guide to public policy in transportation as in other parts of our industrial structure.

As a business activity transportation should function in a competitive environment, marketing its service in accordance with the need and demand. Regulation should allow the full expression of this economic objective. Transportation should likewise be free to expand or contract in line with changing economic conditions. True, these freedoms should be subject to overriding aspects of public interest. But public interests should be clearly defined in law, the law should be kept up to date to accommodate basic economic changes, and administration of regulatory programs should be based on expert knowledge of the costs and economies of transportation services.

Continuing review and study of these matters for more than a decade have shown that our regulatory philosophy and form have not kept up to date with our dynamically growing economy. With the prospects for future growth the lag will grow wider.

All American industries will be faced with the problem of supplying the growing markets of the future. The future will be estimated and sources of investment funds will be found to increase the industrial capacity for economic growth. If necessary, public policy will provide encouragements and incentives for rapid expansion.

Transportation has the same problems and the same goals. The need for transport service will grow at least as fast as the growth of the whole economy. Unprecedented loads will be placed upon our transportation systems. The problem will not be, as some would have it, the division of a given traffic among many carrier groups so that the increase of one will be at the expense of the other. The problem will be to find capacity for a vast increase in traffic. All or most forms of transport may expect absolute increases in traffic. Their main problem will be to finance expansion. The extent to which each form of transportation grows should depend on the demand for the service as reflections of the cost and market price structure.

National transportation policy should be thought of as one part of our general national approach to the problem of business enterprise and the expansion of our economy to meet the needs of our people. The problem of transportation can be solved along lines similar to the main concerns of other production activities. It is the quantity of the goods and services and their fair competitive prices that are important, not the words used to describe them. The future of transportation is as good as the future of our entire country. Our policies should reflect this fact and be adjusted accordingly.

The United States in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech I made at the annual communion breakfast of the Grace Church at Manchester, N.H., on February 22, 1960, entitled "The United States in the Atomic Age":

THE UNITED STATES IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Speech by Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW at the annual communion breakfast of the Grace Church, Manchester, N.H., on Monday, February 22, 1960)

GEORGE WASHINGTON IS CHIEF ARCHITECT OF THE REPUBLIC

We commemorate today, the 228th anniversary of the birth of George Washington—general, first President, and Father of his Country. Washington's birthday is always an important occasion for Americans. At this time, we give particular attention to the outstanding and enduring contribution of this great personality not only to his own country but to the cause of freedom throughout the world. Washington towered high above his contemporaries and, as the years have come and gone, men have constantly entertained a deepening appreciation for the mastery of the statecraft and the leadership of our first President whose stature is, I am sure, destined to hold a position of dominance through the centuries.

For the September 1953 issue of the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, I wrote an article entitled "U.S. Leadership in a Divided World." I was much interested to hear President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message on January 7, 1960, say, "We now live in a divided world of uneasy equilibrium, with our side committed to its own protection and against aggression by the other."

In the article to which I have referred, I stated, "Our Republic occupies a destiny-given position of leadership in a sharply divided world." I emphasized past and present critical periods in the history of the United States and concerning the first, so closely identified with the leadership of George Washington, I included two paragraphs which are as apropos today as in 1953 and which will be appropriate for all the decades to come:

"In the beginning years of this Nation, Gen. George Washington, who has been affectionately termed by his own and succeeding generations as the Father of his Country, displayed qualities of leadership and statesmanship not approached by any other individual in the supreme art of statecraft. Washington holds his place in history, constantly growing in stature, achieving immortality in the hearts of millions because

of his unique contribution to his country. For three reasons he towers above other prominent figures in history: as leader of the Revolutionary Armies he won freedom for the United States; as president of the Constitutional Convention, he held the delegates together until they wrote what is beyond doubt one of the greatest documents created by man; and then, as first President of the United States, General Washington set laudable precedents for his successors.

"Truly he was the chief architect of the Republic. Fortunately this leader of leaders had the foresight and vision to lay the foundation making possible the structure of the Republic which we proudly possess in these hours of unprecedented trouble. Washington's work has become increasingly important and is of outstanding significance to the free world in this time of grave peril. The principles which guided his actions are the principles that must be established in the world today if men are to become truly free. Actually the entire free world is indebted to the work of Washington, for had it not been for his foresight and vision and for the ideas which motivated his conduct in public affairs, the United States would not have developed and would not now possess the power and freedom that it has today. No other general, no other statesman, no other diplomat has achieved the stature of General Washington."

We could well ask ourselves on this occasion why is it that no other general, no other statesman, no other diplomat has achieved a similar position in history to that held by General Washington? The answer to this query, I am convinced, is found in his ideas, his ideals, and his philosophy of life plus a most unusual ability to act upon fundamental principles.

No man in history has broken with the past so completely as did General Washington and, at the same time, no man has ever acted upon the principles which human experience had—by ceaseless trials in prior history—found to be applicable to ever-changing conditions which every generation must face. George Washington never sought to maintain the status quo, and yet he did not depart from or discard the ideas and the ideals that had lifted a large and growing portion of mankind from the law of the jungle to the place that civilization had arrived when he had the opportunity to hold for such a crucial period the center of the stage in American history. He so conducted himself that his personality then, as now, commands a central position on the stage of world history and will continue to do so as long as human beings aspire for freedom and a complete release from tyranny in all its forms.

Washington departed from the past in leading the American Revolution. He departed from the past in creating the Constitution of the United States—I say in creating the charter of our liberties because, even though he did not write it, his dominant personality held the framers to their task until it was finished. He departed from the past in setting precedents for his country and in discarding the mantle of power—always so jealously held by dictators—for the sake of making certain that in this country the people—and not the tyrants—should determine our destiny. At the same time, Washington held to, and fought for, the principles of freedom, individual liberty, and the ideas and ideals of democracy which generation after generation from ancient times had succeeded in hammering out on the anvil of human experience.

Now then comes the question, What do we derive from the life and work of Washington that will help us in this second decade of the 20th century?

THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE

We must be familiar with the type of world in which we live in order to evaluate and solve the problems that confront us. This is the atomic age. On July 16, 1945 the United States exploded a fission bomb in Alamogordo, N. Mex. On February 13, 1960, France exploded an atomic bomb in the Sahara. Within this period of less than fifteen years there have been many such explosions. Today there are four atomic powers—the United States, Great Britain, Russia and France.

We have fission bombs; we have fusion bombs; we have nuclear submarines; we have missiles with nuclear warheads; and at the same time we are making rapid progress on the harnessing of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The mind of man has penetrated the hidden recesses of the atom, releasing energy sufficient to sear the earth or to construct a paradise. Therefore, we must solve our social, economic, political and spiritual problems if atomic power is to advance and not destroy civilization.

We live in a divided world with the free nations on the one hand and those enslaved by communism on the other. Millions of men and women live in underdeveloped areas. These people are seeking a better way of life. There is a growing and justifiable desire to receive the benefits of modern technology. The tide of nationalism surges forward, and we need only think of the continent of Africa where there are now 11 independent nations; there are 3 that will achieve independence during 1960; and, in addition, there are 3 in the status of negotiation and will probably become independent during 1960. Asia is in ferment. Explosive situations exist in Latin America. Economic problems beset us. Defense of the free world is of prime importance. The race for missile superiority is ever upon us.

In the presence of world conditions as I have sketched them, are we to maintain our standard of living, our economic power and our position of leadership? How are we to solve the problem of controlling nuclear power? How are we to proceed in the conquest for space? How can man develop a workable disarmament program? How can an international order, which will enable all people to live in peace and enjoy the benefits of technological revolution, be brought into existence?

I am deeply convinced that we cannot meet the issues of the day by a determination to follow the patterns of past procedures or by insisting on maintaining the status quo. I take it that, in both national and international affairs, we must—as did General Washington—break with the past, taking with us only the ideas that have proven to be of value and try to solve the problems of the atomic age with a new and enlightened approach. Such procedure is applicable to all our problems—national and international—and furthermore, there is no sharp line of demarcation between what is domestic and what is foreign.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Nation has expanded since the time of Washington to include 50 States. Economically and militarily, we are the strongest country the world has ever known. Methods of communication and transportation have brought the Nation much more closely together than it was in the time of the Father of our Country. With our rapid advancement socially, economically, and politically, the Federal Government has become involved in a wide variety of activities, and the responsibility has constantly grown.

In the economic report of the President transmitted to the current session of Congress on January 20, 1960, we find these words which are in keeping with the foregoing: "In a free society, government makes its major contribution to economic growth by fostering conditions that encourage and reinforce the efforts of individuals and private groups to improve their circumstances. This includes the preservation and enhancement of competition, the maintenance of a stable currency, the moderation of fluctuations in employment and output, participation in the development of human and natural resources, the enhancement of personal security, provision of a sound national defense, and the maintenance of mutually advantageous ties with other countries."

It is basic that the duties and the powers of local governments must be assiduously preserved. No one denies this but in cases where local governments find that their capabilities and capacities cannot meet the legitimate needs of the people, then the Federal Government certainly has an obligation and a responsibility.

The Federal Government is engaged in many enterprises calculated to improve the general welfare. For example, it is now recognized that social security is as much a part of the national fabric as the free enterprise system. Our efforts must be directed toward the highest possible level of prosperity, health, education, employment and security consistent with the sound principles of government. As we seek to gain these objectives, every care must be taken that the private economy of the Nation is not injured.

As a result of rapid national development in a technological age, there has been—and still is—a growing inability, by virtue of present-day conditions surrounding us on the part of local governments, to meet many of the requirements of 20th century United States. We therefore should not be reluctant and should not hesitate to employ the powers of the Federal Government for legitimate and constructive purposes which aid in improving the welfare of our people.

Be it an amoeba, a galaxy, or an economic system, nothing stands still. I am certain that if Washington were alive today, he would hold that in the light of current conditions the Federal Government must rise to its responsibility in many fields in which prior to the 20th century, it was not engaged. He would, I am sure, not stand for the status quo that existed decades ago.

A BALANCED BUDGET

As we advance in the diversified fields of governmental activity, our goal must be the achievement of a balanced budget, the preservation of the value of the dollar and a check on inflation. I am not disturbed by the magnitude of the Federal budget. For the next fiscal year, the President has estimated that spending will be $79.8 billion which is $1.4 billion above the current fiscal year. He has also projected estimated receipts at $84 billion—an increase of $5.4 billion over the present fiscal year. This gives an estimated $4.2 billion surplus which the President has urged be applied to reducing the national debt which today stands slightly in excess of $290 billion.

In subsequent fiscal years, the Federal budget—which for a long time in our past history was under a billion dollars—may be much larger than it is today. We have seen it increase rapidly and we will continue to see it become even higher as the United States continues to grow. May we not think of the Federal budget as a measure of our growth, our economic activity, our influence throughout the world and our responsibility as the foremost free and democratic power on earth?

I certainly am not for the concentration of excessive powers in the Federal Government, but we are all a part of the Federal Government and if anyone can demonstrate

how we can operate as a nation without being engaged in farm issues, highway construction, improved social security legislation in better health and welfare programs, in the improvement of our educational system, in providing for better housing, in making plans for urban renewal and other programs to cope with problems—too large and too difficult for the local communities to handle—and in the construction of an impregnable defense, then, it would be impossible to explain how we can cut billions from the Federal budget.

SENATOR AIKEN ON THE BUDGET

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, in a Lincoln Day speech delivered a year ago said that Mr. Lincoln had to make a choice between values that were conflicting and he chose the greater values. To quote the Senator directly, he said, "He could have balanced the budget and lost the Union. He could have held down the national debt and perpetuated slavery. * * * I have little sympathy," continued AIKEN, "for those of our party who would cling tenaciously to the status quo. I have no desire or intention of standing still under their leadership."

I do not mean to imply by quoting my good friend, Senator AIKEN of Vermont, whom I have known for over a quarter of a century, that I am opposed to balancing the budget and I am sure that Senator AIKEN is not opposed to balancing the budget, but I have called attention to his remarks to point out that we must always choose the greater values. We must, for instance, be absolutely certain that our military capability is sufficient in every field to deter Soviet aggression, and whatever the cost to get in that position, the cost must be met. As the President said in his budget message on January 18, 1960, "Our national objective remains as before—peace with justice for all peoples. Our hope is that the heavy burden of armaments on the world may be lightened. But we should not delude ourselves. In this era of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles, disarmament must be safeguarded and verifiable."

We must not, by platitudinous phrases, give the impression that we fear change. Positive leadership is required. Progressive leadership is imperative as we seek to serve the legitimate needs of our people, always making certain that our policies are administered in such a way as to improve our national welfare. This, I believe, is what Senator AIKEN had in mind.

There are many problems confronting us with which we must grapple and in the solution of which we must exercise new thinking and new action. As Washington broke with the past in meeting the issues of his time, so must we abandon prejudicial approaches, shun old methods that have resulted more in confusion than in solution, seek new approaches and endeavor to resolve our difficulties—not in terms of trying to maintain the status quo but in terms of moving ahead.

Agriculture

An abiding and controversial problem is that of developing an agricultural program. In the President's recent farm message to Congress, he stressed particularly the wheat situation. He pointed out that the Federal funds tied up in wheat amount to about $3.5 billion and that the cost of stabilizing the wheat bill is $1.5 million a day or $1,000 a minute. The President asked for legislation to meet the farm situation. He suggested three guidelines:

1. Any price support must be related realistically to whatever program the Congress selects in respect to the control of production, pointing out that the higher the support, the more regimented will be the farmer.

2. The "support levels must not be so high as to stimulate still more excessive production" or so high as to increase subsidies necessary to hold the world outlets or reduce domestic markets.

3. We must not give subsidy payments to programs for crops in surplus, and programs which would invite harmful countermeasures by our friends must be avoided. He urged that we "act sensibly and act swiftly."

I am for a drastic reduction of the price support program which, in my opinion, is failing to meet the present problem and challenges us to do something different in the field of agriculture. There are in process now hearings before the agricultural committee, and certainly we must break with the past if we are to prevent the constant increase of agricultural surpluses. The President's budget contains a suggested appropriation for our agricultural purposes of $5.6 billion. A new approach in agriculture is long overdue.

Education

An ever-present and controversial issue is Federal aid to education. Recently, a bill carrying $1.8 billion was passed by the Senate providing $1 billion for school construction over 2 years and $800 million in grants for a 2-year period to help in teachers salaries. As recently as the 9th of February, a House subcommittee tentatively approved a bill limited strictly to grants for construction. The measure calls for $325 million over a 3-year period. No matching funds would be required for the first 2 years but a 50–50 matching basis would be put into effect the third year.

Certainly, something must be done in the field of education since, without trained people, we cannot meet the demands necessary for our security in the missile age. It is time that we pulled ourselves out of the pattern of past operations and actually solve our educational problems.

Civil rights

Although the Civil War ended nearly 100 years ago, we have at every session of Congress the problem of civil rights. I signed the petition to bring the civil rights bill to the floor of the House. Under increasing pressure, the House Rules Committee has now decided to bring a civil rights bill to the floor on the 10th of March. It is impossible to tell what the final legislation will be like, but there have been proposals for a measure containing a referee provision for voting and authorizing Federal assistance to enable Negroes to register in the areas where the courts find a discrimination.

Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves at the time of the Civil War but today we have a continuing fight in making it possible for the colored people to have the rights to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States. There is no area in which there is more urgency to break the status quo and stop looking backwards than in civil rights.

Taxation

Everybody agrees, including Members of Congress, that the tax structure needs to be revised so that loopholes will be closed and the burden of taxation will be evenly and equitably distributed among our people. This must be done as soon as possible. We must break with the past, revise the tax structure and move to the future with a better instrument of taxation than we possess now.

Latin America

To the south of us, Cuba is in turmoil, apparently aided and abetted by the Communists. There is agitation in Panama. Explosive situations are ever present in Latin America. It is essential that we devise programs which will produce positive results in our relations with the nations in this hemisphere.

More attention must be given to Latin America. New policies should be developed. Economic reprisals will defeat our own end just as sending Marines into that part of the hemisphere in the old days made for ill will and disillusionment. Hard, vigorous thinking and programs calculated to relieve tensions in this area is necessary.

Foreign affairs

In a recent report of a Special Study Mission in Europe (in which I participated), we recommended that, in view of the great industrial development of Western Europe resulting from our most successful Marshall plan, "Our NATO partners must assume a greater share of the common defense effort."

We also recommended that "The industrialized countries should give high priority to the development of long-range plans for the assistance to underdeveloped countries." This is what I mean by breaking with the past and yet not discarding what is good. Our aid must continue but we must constantly have more cooperation on the part of the recipients.

Two economic blocs have recently been formed in Europe—one, the European Community or the Common Market, and the other the European Free Trade Association, commonly called the Outer Seven, led by the British. Only recently, Under Secretary of State Dillon attended a conference in Paris with representatives of these two trading areas. Out of the conference came plans for the formation of a new economic organization which is to include the countries of Western Europe, Canada, the United States and possibly Japan. This new organization, which will not be formed for a year or so, is a result of new thinking and new proposals of action necessary to prevent the United States from being discriminated against in the field of world trade. It also is for the purpose of securing multilateral help for underdeveloped countries.

One of the major criticisms of the mutual security effort is the mistakes made in its administration. The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, is now holding hearings on the program for fiscal year 1961. While the mutual security program is the vital instrument of our foreign policy, it is obvious that many errors have been made in administering it. We must break with the past; we must improve the administration of mutual security but we must not discard the policy. To do so would imperil the achievement of our goals.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

International communism seeks to dominate the earth. The issue between the free and the enslaved world is joined around the globe. The United States is the leader of the free peoples since the economic and military strength of the Republic exceeds that of any other nation. Our gross national product is approaching $500 billion a year. Our standard of living, although there remain infinite possibilities for growth, is the highest on earth.

Due to the ambition and aggressive onslaught of international communism, it is essential that we maintain a strong retaliatory position to deter the possible launching of a nuclear attack—thus, for the purpose of major national security, the budget, which the President presented for the fiscal year 1961—and which is now being considered by the Congress—carries expenditures of $45.6 billion. In the President's budget message of January 16, 1957, are these words, "Our nuclear weapons and our ability to employ them constitute the most effective deterrent to an attack on free nations."

On November 13, 1957, in setting forth our military policy for protecting ourselves and the free world from international communism, the President said, "As a primary deterrent to war, maintain a nuclear retaliatory power of such capacity as to convince the Soviets that any attack on us

and our allies would result, regardless of damage to us, in their own nation's destruction." In the President's budget message of January 18, 1960, are these words, "Our aim at this time is a level of military strength which, together with that of our allies, is sufficient to deter wars, large or small, while we strive to find a way to reduce the threat of war."

In response to a question on our retaliatory power, the President said, as recently as February 3, 1960, "I don't believe that anyone today can destroy all of our capabilities for retaliation, and they cannot destroy today enough of them that we couldn't retaliate very effectively to the point of destructiveness to them."

The clear position taken by the Eisenhower administration in building retaliatory capacity recalls to mind a speech which I delivered on December 15, 1947, in the House of Representatives. In that speech, I said, "Any nation contemplating an attack on the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knockout, devastating, retaliatory blow from the air." The only revision I would make in this statement of policy to fit exactly the present situation would be to say, a knockout, devastating, mobile retaliatory blow from the air.

I have lived to see the policy I have been advocating for over a dozen years become the foreign policy of the United States. In the current great debate on the strength of our defenses and on our ability to retaliate as well as to meet brushfire conflicts, there is no disagreement as to the general objective. The objective is to be so thoroughly and so adequately prepared that no one will dare to make an attack upon us.

One of the great battles in the current session of Congress has to do with our missile capability. The generals are not in agreement on how to achieve our overall retaliatory objective. In testimony before committees in Washington, an airborne alert has been urged and an increase in defense spending of $10 billion to $15 billion over the $41 billion in the budget has been suggested. Only recently nearly a billion dollars in additional funds has been recommended for 6 more Polaris submarines—which would bring the total nuclear-powered, underwater craft to 18—and Air Force officials hold that the missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union is greater than the estimates of the National Intelligence Board.

President Eisenhower has said, "What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate. A deterrent has no added power, once it has become completely adequate." I have great confidence in the President of the United States. I also have respect for the opinion of the military men who are urging greater effort. We dare not make a mistake in the evaluation of the missile situation and the intent of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it would seem to me that the proper course of action is for all the experts to get together, be sure that the facts of military life are interpreted and understood correctly and then take whatever steps are necessary to implement the policy upon which we all agree—namely, that we must have sufficient and adequate mobile retaliatory capacity regardless of the cost.

In order to negotiate from a position of strength for the purpose of achieving disarmament, we cannot afford to make a mistake in our defense capabilities. Failure to take into consideration the present military facts of life, failure to realize that mobile retaliatory capacity must be evaluated in terms of missiles and not in terms of past conflicts may well mean disaster. Any course of action that fails to plan carefully for the future is fraught with peril and disaster.

We all know that one of the greatest issues of our time is that of disarmament and here vision and foresight are demanded. To achieve disarmament, we must be in a position to prevent any power from overcoming us by force. Unless we do this, we invite aggression from those who are bent upon our destruction.

Thus, we could go on to discuss area after area of our governmental activities. The issues are difficult and complicated but not insoluble, and, as we endeavor to solve them, we must move from the status quo, break with the mistakes of the past, preserve what is good and always be willing to employ a flexibility of approach.

OPPORTUNITIES EXCEED PROBLEMS

As we prepare for what lies ahead, we must develop ideas and programs that will meet the issues of 20th century America. The Nation George Washington founded is faced with many problems but likewise we are presented with many opportunities. I hold the apportunities far exceed the problems. So, we should be optimistic—not pessimistic; happy and not depressed even in the face of nuclear fission and fusion; thankful to providence for our destined position of leadership; grateful for an opportunity to develop in peace a better world; and confident and determined that we will make our contribution guided by our faith in the ability of ourselves and our Nation.

If we live for today and not yesterday; if we act on the principles to which the Father of our Country dedicated himself; if we develop programs we need in the present century; if we are willing to move away from the status quo and disregard the archaic procedures that have not brought results; then we have nothing to fear as the greatest free republic that the Author of this universe has seen fit to create.

We must remember, in the phrases of James Russel Lowell, "New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth; They must upward still, and onward, who wolud keep abreast of truth"; and we must further keep in mind hat the "Future's portal" will not yield to the "past's bloodrusted key."

So inspired by the leadership, statesmanship, vision, and spiritual dedication of General Washington, patterning our approach to current problems on the methods he used—in achieving a place of prominence not only for himself but more important for his Nation—we will succeed in fulfilling our destined-given opportunity of bringing into being a better United States; also a better world, a world of free peoples.

Costa Rican Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a brief report for the Congress.

Recently five Members of Congress made a hurried, yet rather extensive, trip to the Republic of Costa Rica.

These men were from various areas of the United States and represented appropriations, labor and education, agriculture, as well as the broad subject of foreign affairs, by their committee activities in the House of Representatives. The Members were JOHNSON, California; HAGEN, California; MONTOYA, New Mexico; CONTE, Massachusetts; and DENT, Pennsylvania.

Accompanying this group were two newspapermen, Bernard Yudain, Time-Life, and Syd Yudain, Roll Call.

This trip was not at the expense of the American taxpayer but was sponsored by Costa Rican public and private interests.

For a quick rundown the following pertinent facts may help to place this small but important Republic in proper perspective.

Costa Rica has a total area of 194,700 square miles, which is slightly larger than Vermont and New Hampshire combined. Eighty percent of the total area is in forest, approximately 15 percent is in pastures and range, and about 5 percent is cultivated.

Total population on January 1, 1960, was 1,148,441, of which more than three-fourths is rural. The population is increasing annually at the rate of almost 4.5 percent. There are 408,104 private property owners listed in the public register. An officially estimated 54.72 percent of the total population is engaged in agriculture for a livelihood.

Agriculture exports, principally coffee and bananas, account for 98 percent of foreign earnings. As the volume of coffee authorized for export is now and will probably continue to be limited by agreement with other producing countries, and as banana production continues to be restricted by Panama disease and other factors, the announced policy of the Government is to expand and diversify the production of other agricultural commodities.

Costa Rica is essentially a country of family-size farms. According to the 1955 census, total number of farms was 47,286. Ninety percent of the farms had an annual gross income of less than 25,000 colones—US$3,771. In 1955 there were 13,384 farms producing sugarcane which is 28 percent of the total number of farms reported. Fifty-three percent of the sugar farms had less than 20 manzanas—34 acres—and 90 percent had less than 100 monzanas—170 acres. The Sugar Chamber reports that there are now 27,000 sugarcane farmers, over 2,000 small sugar trapiches, and 30 small sugar mills. Counting the families of sugarcane farmers and employed laborers, it is estimated that at least one-tenth of the population depends on sugar for a livelihood.

Costa Rican centrifugal sugar production in the 1959–60 crop year will be a record 60,000 short tons. Growing conditions have been favorable to date this season and the area in sugarcane has been increased by about 2.5 percent over the 40,000 manzanas—69,200 acres—harvested the previous crop year.

The increase in both sugarcane area and number of mills in operation during recent years has resulted in an output of centrifugal sugar that far exceeds domestic needs and export quotos. Domestic consumption in 1959–60 will probably total about 40,000 tons. Costa Rica has an export quota of 3,616 tons to the United States and 5,000 tons to other world markets. This will leave a stock of about 12,000 tons at the end of

the season which can be neither consumed domestically nor exported.

Last December 14, the Costa Rican Government officially requested an increase in her United States sugar quota to 12,000 tons in 1960 and 14,000 tons in 1961. The note pointed out that although Costa Rica produces more than twice the volume of sugar produced in Panama the U.S. import quotas for both countries are the same. Nicaragua has a U.S. quota of 14,000 tons but produces approximately the same volume as Costa Rica. Government officials frequently stress that as such a large segment of the population is engaged in sugar production it is of vital concern to keep the small producers economically healthy if Costa Rico is to maintain the principles of democratic government.

After reading the foregoing you begin to get a picture of a country that has more than any other so-called republic captured the spirit as well as the title of a democratic republic. Democracy in action has become a mere slogan in most parts of the world, but one can find it actually operating in this small, but responsible nation.

For instance, the Republic has covered its peoples with social security in job security, protection against dismissal from a job without cause; health and welfare security is extended to all persons. Because of the agrarian character of its economy pensions are not the problem they are in our industrial economy.

The ownership of property is one of the outstanding achievements of this country. Approximately one-third of the population are owners of land. Less than 10 percent own more than 200 acres and the largest sugar and coffee plantation is only 3,000 acres. Compare this with an American owned Cuban plantation of over 275,000 acres and you start to realize the basic difference between this kind of a republic and Castro's Cuba.

Another thing that I am sure impressed my colleagues as well as it did me, was the cleanliness of both the peoples as well as the homes, public buildings, streets, highways, and the country itself.

You were not pushed and pulled around by the usual beggars that appear to be a normal feature of so many other countries.

I was shocked to find that this nation has no army. Its only uniformed group is a combination police-fireman constabulary of 1,000 men, neat, clean, and courteous.

This gave me a thought which I expressed and received a good hearing from all who heard it.

I suggested that it would cost the United States less, create a greater atmosphere for freedom, build peace, and certainly turn more of their economy into welfare, education, and peaceful pursuits if this Nation of ours would assume in reality the hemispheric defense of our Latin American countries and would not give foreign aid unless our friends disbanded their armies.

I asked one question which I would like to pose to our membership of Congress, "Who can they lick in a fight, except themselves?"

Why should we give economic aid to Santo Domingo, Panama, Cuba, or any other Latin American country when they spend one-half or better of their national economy on armies and military installations, and so forth.

It makes about as much sense as me giving my children money for shoes and they go out and buy cap pistols and switchblade knives. They cannot hurt anybody but themselves and each other while suffering in their barefeet.

These countries cannot buy guns and schools both. In the final analysis, if they get into a squabble with a power nation, their cap pistols would not be much good against missiles and A-bombs and the United States would have to move in anyway.

I doubt if any deterrent would be more effective on Russia than a hemispheric defense controlled, manned, planned, and financed by the United States with our NATO connections in the European theater.

In fact, does anyone kid himself into believing that we are not financing whatever effective defense there is in this hemisphere right now?

Another point that should worry us is the insistence by our State Department upon changing agrarian economies into industrial economies.

Let me present here a purely agrarian economy and the danger involved to the Nation's people if we insist upon building an industrial economy in this country in the name of "raising the people's standards." You will note that we are their biggest customers as well as their biggest suppliers in imports.

If we follow the State Department's formula we will put production facilities in that will force mechanization of their farm production and also put them into the market to ship their manufactured products into our market, cutting our own employment and creating a serious employment problem for them.

I asked a planter and sugar mill owner who employs 1,500 workers why he did not mechanize his farm and he gave a simple, but sincere answer:

"What do I do with the people who are thrown out of work?" I could only tell him what our formula appears to be.

We would help them build factories to put these people to work and, of course, we would buy their products so that they could have dollar credits to buy more machinery to put more people out of work and to build more factories to sell more goods to the United States and the rest of the world and to put more people out of work and on and on and on.

He replied that he thought they would be better satisfied in getting a just share of the American sugar quota which would allow them to pick up the slack in their economy because of the tremendous growth rate of 5 percent annually in their population.

They are asking for an increase in sugar quota and when you realize that Cuba gets 3 million tons as against their less than 4,000 tons per year, you cannot argue too much, for this nation declared war the very next day after the United States.

They showed their faith in our friendship as well as giving them a chance to expropriate enemy land and commercial interests. They are a pretty smart people.

They have problems, that is true, but I think they are minor compared to what they will have if they listen to some of our advisers that seem bent upon changing everybody's way of life.

The following chart shows a thumbnail format of their economic operation:

Costa Rican population, 1,148,441, Jan. 1, 1960

	Million
Gross national income 1957 (latest available)	$338
Gross national product 1958 (estimated)	442
1958 ordinary revenues	57
1958 ordinary expenditures	57
Public debt June 30, 1959:	
Internal	42
External	25
Total	67
1959 debt service:	
Internal	6
External	3
Total	9
International monetary reserves (September 1959):	
Official	20
Free	2

MAJOR EXPORTS, 1953–58

[Percent]

	Coffee	Banana	Cacao	Abaca	Beef	Millions
1953	42	45	5	2	------	$80
1954	41	42	10	2	------	85
1955	54	41	7	1	1	81
1956	50	38	4	2	2	67
1957	39	39	5	1	3	83
1958	52	33	6	1	1	97

MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS, 1957 AND 1958

[Percent]

	Imports		Exports	
	1957	1958	1957	1958
United States	55	51	52	51
Germany	9	10	24	26
England	5	5	1	1
Holland	4	4	3	2
Canada	3	3	9	7
Japan	3	5	1	2

At this point I want to pay my respects and gratitude to the American Embassy staff and particularly to our Ambassador Whiting Willauer.

I am sure I speak for all of us when I say that his grasp of the situation in Costa Rica, his devotion to duties, his personal contact and friendship which was reciprocated by all Costa Ricans, planters, business and governmental officials was shockingly refreshing to this group.

I cannot praise Ambassador Willauer too highly for giving us a thorough and instructive briefing which taught us more in a few short days than we would have learned in months of probing.

The Ambassador talked plainly, factually and without the usual window-dressing. His knowledge of this country, its peoples and its problems both internally and externally is short of phenomenal.

The kind of representation and statesmanship practiced by Ambassador Wil-

lauer will do more to promote good will, sound friendships, trust and faith in our purposes and above all—will not lead our Latin neighbors down the blind alley of unfulfilled promises, exhorbitant goals and unachievable aspirations.

Although in general, I am a critic of our State Department's diplomacy, I take my hat off to Ambassador Whiting Willauer and his staff.

In passing I want to extend my personal thanks to Bill Rodman, agricultural attaché, who traveled with me from morning till night giving me his unvarnished, practical facts on the country and its peoples as he saw it from his vantage point of daily contacts with the problems of their economy.

I learned that the only other request they have made, besides a legitimate sugar quota increase, is for a loan of $10 million for increased experimentations and research to better their agricultural economy and to save it from the ravages of natural enemies, diseases, plant insects, and so forth.

To show you how the days were spent on our quick tour, I would like to present our itinerary as well as some of the officials—United States and Costa Rican—who took time out to make this trip worthwhile:

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11

11:50: Arrive El Coco. Lacsa flight 621. Met by representatives of the Camara de Azucareros and William Rodman, American Embassy. Reservations at Hotel Costa Rica.

13:00: Informal luncheon, Hotel Costa Rica.

15:30: Depart Hotel Costa Rica for residence of Ambassador Willauer.

16:00: Briefing, American Embassy. Ambassador Whiting Willauer; Roy I. Kimmel, counsellor of Embassy; William L. Rodman, agricultural attaché; Wyman R. Stone, Director, USOM; James R. Johnston, head, Economic Section.

19:00: Reception in the Legislative Assembly, Alvero Montero Padilla, President of Assembly. Speech by Congressman MONTOYA, of New Mexico.

20:00: Reception at the Costa Rica Country Club.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12 (TRIP TO THE ZONE OF GRECIA)

8:30: Depart from Hotel Costa Rica for the Costa Rica sugar mill.

9:45: Depart for La Hacienda La Eva.

11:00: Short visit to the sugarcane field of the La Argentina mill.

12:30: Luncheon at the Cataluna sugar mill.

14:30: Coffee plantation visit tour.

19:00: Reception at the Presidential Palace, President Senor Don Mario Enchande Jimenez.

21:00: Reception at the home of Senor Don Alejandro Pirie.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13 (TRIP TO THE ZONE OF TURRIALBA)

8:30: Depart from Hotel Costa Rica for the Instituto Interamericano de Ciencias Agricolas de Turrialba.

12:30: Luncheon at the Juan Vinas sugar mill.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 14

11:30: Depart Hotel Costa Rica for El Coco airport.

1:30: Depart El Coco on Lacsa flight 620 for United States.

You will note that we attended a special session of the Legislative Assembly. All were pleasantly surprised to hear one of our Members, the Honorable JOSEPH MONTOYA, New Mexico, Democrat, make a short address in response in clear and perfect Costa Rican. The speech follows:

Senor Presidente de la Asamblea Legislativa, Senores Diputados, posiblemente al hecho de conocer yo la lengua que se habla en este bello y hospitalario pais debo el honor, muy grande por cierto, de dirigirme a ustedes para agradecer en nombre de mis companeros congresistas y, desde luego en el mio propio, la forma tan gentil en que hemos sido recibidos por Uds. en este respetable recinto en el cual se debaten con ejemplar espiritu democratico los problemas de la Patria de los costarricenses.

Hace apenas unas pocas horas que pusimos pie en el suelo de Costa Rica y ya hemos podido darnos cuenta de que asiste sobrada razon a los muchos que, mas afortunados que nosotros, han permanecido aqui por largo tiempo y que proclaman las muchas cosas bellas que el viajero encuentra en Costa Rica, tanto en el campo espiritual como en el material. Y seguros estamos de que mientras permanezcamos en esta tierra de maestros, de patriotas y de belles mujeres, cada minuto nos deparara nuevas y agradables sorpresas que viviran eternamente en neustros corazones.

Ustedes y nosotros, todos, sabemos que a la gran staisfaccion de legislar para la Patria, estan estrechamente unidas grandes responsabilidades. Nos toca hacer la ley y la ley por lo general no satisface a todos. Unos nos llenan de elogios y ostros de vituperio; pero ustedes como nosotros, legisladores que somos de dos paises que son ejemplo de Democracia y de respeto a la voluntad de las mayorias, tenemos que sentirnos muy orgullosos de hacer leyes para neustras respectivas Patrias. A veces tendremos la razon y otras veces estaremos equivocados; pero siempre estaremos poniendo nuestro grano de arena en la nobilisima tarea de hacer Democracia y de hacer que neustras Patrias sean trasunto de ese modo hasta ahora insuperado de vivir. Es por ello que mis companeros y yo nos sentimos hoy genuinamente orgullosos de ser recibidos por la Honorable Asamblea Legislativa de la Republica de Costa Rica.

Muchas gracias senores.

There are a few of the organizations and men we are grateful to for their kind and courteous attention to the details while were were in San Jose, the capital city:

Reception committee: Julian Mateo, Ramon Herrero, Gregorio Rojas, Calixto Fabrega, Jorge Dobles Sanchez, Alejandro Pirie.

Junta Directiva de la Camara de Azucareros: Presidente Manuel Jimenez de la Guardia—Licenciado, Vice President Otto Eduardo Kopper Vega, Secretario Arturo Garcia Solano, Tesorero Miguel Monge Echandi.

Junta Directiva de la Junta da la Cana: Randall Garcia Golcher, Camara del Atlantico; Alberto Vega Meroto, Camara del Pacifico; Francisco Amrhein Pinto; Juan Guillermo Brenes Castillo, Asambles Legislativa.

Being a member of the Labor and Education Committee of the House, I was particularly anxious to find out what I could about labor and education programs. I submit a report as I gathered from information provided by Ambassador Willauer and Costa Rican officials.

Comparatively speaking and in generalized terms, Costa Rican labor is superior to that of the other Central American Republics. This is due to a number of factors, among which there might be mentioned (a) a far greater percentage of literacy, (b) a comparatively unmixed inheritance from Spain of habits of industry and frugality, and (c) a long tradition of self-reliance and independence. On the other hand, on the debit side of the ledger there should be mentioned (a) complete absence of any program of apprenticeship training and (b) a tendency to perform work without adequate advance planning and preparation, and in an empiric manner pride in standards of workmanship is beginning to appear, however, there is convincing evidence that with proper training and under adequate supervision, the average Costa Rican can be developed into a skilled artisan, able to perform work which compares favorably with standards maintained in more advanced countries. As an example there might be cited the hundreds of employees of the Inter-American Highway and of the aircraft overhaul shops who have been developed into first-class craftsmen in their various trades and vocations.

In general, there is no shortage of labor, nor is there much surplus. During the coffee harvesting season, there occasionally exists a shortage of labor, but this is as a rule tided over by the employment of women and children. There does exist, however, a constant pressure for social improvement, causing a steady movement from the lower echelons of labor toward better paid jobs. Similarly there is a constant movement from the farm to the city, causing overcrowding and substandard housing conditions in most of the towns and cities.

Traditionally, coffe picking is not considered bemeaning labor in any way. For this reason, many people from above the lowest social strata pitch in to pick the crimson berries which produce a major part of the country's foreign exchange.

By far the largest agricultural operation within the country is that of the United Fruit Co.—bana, cacao, palm oil, et cetera. In round figures the company employs an average of 12,000 persons, a majority of whom are of the agricultural peon class. Within memory, the company has never been confronted with any major labor shortage.

Wages in Costa Rica, compared to the United States, are low. But since productivity of the average worker also is low, the cheapness of the labor is only relative. In general, all wages are based upon the minimum legal rates for agricultural labor on the Central Plateau. Under the law, a National Wage Council revises the minimum wages rates every 2 years, recommending change to the Executive, who as a rule accepts the recommendations of the Council and promulgates them effective October 1 of even years. The current—1957—figures for agricultural labor on the Central Plateau is $6.80—$1.2—going up to

$7.50—$1.125—July 1, 1957, daily, while that for common agricultural labor in the Pacific banana belt is $14 daily. Naturally, in the skilled and semiskilled trades they are higher, running from approximately $2 daily for semiskilled workers to $4.50 daily for skilled artisans. All these are the legal minimum rates and in many instances higher wages than the minimum are being paid.

The 1943 Labor Code, with appropriate amendments, governs in general the relations between employer and employee. It consists of 10 sections, subdivided into a total of 38 chapters and 614 articles. It is all inclusive and, at the time of its enactment was generally considered as too advanced for a small country which never before in its history had any labor legislation. Briefly, it covers labor contracts, collective contracts, working hours and wages, holidays, vacations, protection of workers, insurance and compensation, labor organizations, cooperatives, labor conflicts, special labor jurisdiction, organization and jurisdiction of labor courts, procedure for settlement of labor conflicts, public employee sanctions and responsibilities. In theory it is designed to protect labor. In practice loopholes have been found by unscrupulous employers to circumvent its provisions. Among other things the code provides for advance notice and severance pay which is quite liberal. The cumulative effects of these provisions have occasionally proved a heavy burden, especially to smaller employers.

While both employer and employee today recognize that the code is not perfect, practical experience over a dozen years since its enactment has gradually made it workable. It is still not accented in toto by the more reactionary employers.

Labor has been comparatively slow in organizing in Costa Rica, largely because the labor code regulates labor relations in such detail, and the National Wage Council regulates minimum wages, so there is little apparent incentive for organizing. Out of a total regular labor force of about 150,000 persons, it is estimated that only about 15,000 are organized.

Besides a number of unaffiliated unions, there are three labor centrals—called confederations—in Costa Rica. The most important and largest of these is the Confederacion Costarriconse de Trabaiadores Rerum Novarum—short name CCT, or Rerum Novarum—which is affiliated with the Latin American regional organization ORIT and through it with the ICFTV. It also maintains intimate fraternal contact with U.S. Labor organizations—AFL–CIO and the United Mine Workers. Originally the confederation was organized in 1943 under the auspices of the Catholic Church for the specific purpose of neutralizing the inroads which the Communists were then making in labor. Since that time, however, it has become completely independent from church influence and the name of Rerum Novarum is maintained merely for sentimental reasons.

Second in strength and importance is the Communist-controlled General Confederation of Costa Rican Workers—CGTC—which, besides a few of the old line unions in San Jose—shoemakers, printing trades, and so forth—through its affiliate federation FODA cotrols most of the organized banana workers in the Pacific banana zone. Most of these agricultural workers are not enthusiastic about organizing and only about 20 are organized. Since the Communists, as a political party, have been outlawed in Costa Rica, CGTC has been leading a rather precarious existence. Unlike Rerum Novarum, which has been making slow but steady programs, the CGTC has lost ground steadily during the past several years.

Third and least important is the National Workers Confederation—CNT—formerly affiliated with the Argentine Atlas labor group. Its importance, except in two or three unions in San Jose, is minimal.

Vocational education was started in October 1955 with a survey of the operating vocational institutions which consisted of three private vocational schools but no national vocational schools except a few small woodworking shops in high schools.

A study of 7,444 industrial workers in the central plateau area revealed 55 percent untrained, 37 percent semitrained, and only 8 percent trained, 119 had some secondary education, 20 percent of those graduating from grade school did not enter high school, and 80 percent of those entering high school did not finish.

A Department of Vocational Education was established in the Ministry of Education and at the present time two U.S. technicians, a chief vocational education adviser and a teacher trainer, are providing U.S. consultation in this department.

Two private schools, Heredia, now operating with 70 students equally divided between carpentry, bench mechanics, electrical shop, and sheet metal and welding, and Desamparados, with 130 students in 9 trades, have been converted to national schools and are being expanded with new buildings and equipment. A new school at Golfito with 80 students has just been opened. A 7-year planned program includes combination vocational—trades—and vocational agriculture schools at San Isidro del General, Liberia, Limon, Puntarenas, and Alajuela.

Fourteen teachers have been trained at the Vocational Normal School at Chosica, Peru, and are now teaching at Heredia, Desamparados, and Golfito. Twelve additional teachers have been recruited and trained here. The directors of all these schools have each had 1 year of training in the United States.

All buildings and all but a minimum of demonstration equipment have been provided by the Costa Rican Government.

Space does not permit a more detailed analysis and report, however, I recommend as a beginner in learning more about our Latin neighbors a more exhaustive reading of the political, technical, agricultural, and civic activities of this small, energetic, and respected neighbor and friend in Central America—Costa Rica.

The Sharp Edge of Soviet Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House this very erudite and important article which was printed in the New Leader of February 22, 1960. This article, by a keen analyst of Soviet activity in this field, bears a direct relationship to my speech on the subject of mutual security.

The article follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SHARP EDGE OF SOVIET FOREIGN AID

(By Leon M. Herman)

The Soviet Union has been dispensing economic aid to countries outside the Communist camp for the past 6 years. Its program is designed to enhance the position and prestige of the creditor nation. Accordingly, there is something of a public record of performance, accompanied by official comment on the record, against which the broad objectives of the Soviet Government in this sphere of action may be assessed.

At present, the number of nations to whom the Soviet Union is committed, by formal agreement, to extend economic aid, stands at 12. Five of these are in Asia (Afghanistan, India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon); four in the Middle East (Syria, Egypt, Yemen, Iraq); two in Africa (Guinea and Ethiopia); and one in the Western Hemisphere (Argentina).

The total amount of capital committed by Moscow, i.e., the sum of all credits due to be extended over the duration of the aid program, now measures some $2.2 billion. The distribution by country, of course, varies a good deal: Eight of the twelve countries have received a credit commitment of $100 million or more for development and other national ends. Of these, four recipients—namely, Egypt, Syria, India, and Indonesia—have each received a commitment of over $300 million. The four lesser client-nations (below $100 million) are Burma, Ceylon, Yemen, and Guinea.

It should also be noted that supplying arms plays an important part in the Soviet assistance program. Six of the twelve added nations have received military aid; over one-third of all committed funds, in fact, represent military supplies furnished on credit. Significantly, the four aided nations in the Middle East group received their arms credit ahead of their economic development credits. The two other recipients of military aid are Indonesia and Afghanistan.

One distinctive feature of the Soviet aid program is the absence of outright grants to needy nations. As a rule, Soviet assistance takes the form of a loan extended on terms that are conspicuously favorable. Typically, the recipient nation is granted a line of credit for a stated amount of rubles. This is strictly a tied loan, in the sense that the credit must be spent in the U.S.S.R. for Soviet equipment and technical services. The accounts are kept in foreign trade rubles, a nominal unit equal to one-fourth of a dollar in purchasing power at world market prices. Actual drawing against this credit usually takes place over a number of years, ranging from 4 to 8, while repayment is staggered over a larger span of time, normally beginning 1 year and ending 12 years after the arrival of the equipment.

The dramatically low rate of interest on such loans, 2.5 percent, is another distinctive feature of the Soviet credit package. This compares with a rate ranging between 3.5 to 6 percent at present on the world capital market. One more built-in attraction is that repayment can be made in the form of standard domestic export goods, at prices to be negotiated on a year-by-year basis as each loan payment falls due.

The first Soviet foreign aid commitment of $11 million came cautiously in 1954, to Afghanistan. Considerable momentum was picked up in 1955, with the undertaking to build a steel mill in India and to help modernize Egypt's armed forces. Something of a peak was reached in 1956, following the ceremonial tour of Khrushchev and the Premier Nikolai Bulganin through Asia. The next year the pace was visibly slackened; the keepers of the purse were busy mending economic fences in Eastern Europe. By 1958, however, the Soviet economic campaign outside the Communist bloc was back in full swing: New credit arrangements between U.S.S.R. and the developing nations approached the $1 billion mark. New arrangements for assistance continued in 1959 (with Iraq, Ethiopia, and Guinea), reaching a figure of some $200 million.

As officially reported, Soviet economic aid is supporting some 200 projects. A little less than half of these are industrial enterprises under construction, with the accent on heavy industry. Most important among these are: 13 mining facilities, 12 electric power stations, 11 machinery plants, 9 steel mills, 7 chemical plants, and 6 oil refineries.

Outside of the industrial group the program covers a wide variety of undertakings: irrigation projects, railroads, highways, ports, hospitals, sports palaces and research institutes.

The distribution of development projects by individual nations has been recently summarized in the September 1959 issue of Vneshnaia Torgovlia (Foreign Trade) as follows:

	Industrial enterprises	Other installations
Afghanistan	7	19
India	20	2
Burma		11
Indonesia	4	3
United Arab Republic	39	54
Ceylon	8	6
Iraq	16	9
Total	94	104

A number of unique practices set the Soviet aid program apart from the pattern of economic support followed by the West. In general, the Soviet approach shows more awareness of the psychological impact of the technique of giving. Soviet-supported projects, for example, are more oriented toward heavy industry, serving as a symbol of modernity and a promise of further, self-generated growth. As a rule, too, Soviet aid offers take the more prestigious form of loans rather than grants. The Soviet Union, furthermore, attempts to soothe the sting of indebtedness by representing the repayment process as a new opportunity for the client country to increase its exports to the Soviet market.

The differences in technique have their effect, to be sure, an effect gained largely through watching from the sidelines for several years before taking the plunge in economic assistance. But what gives the present Soviet overture toward the less developed nations the character of a campaign against the stability of the non-Communist world is the grand strategy upon which it is based. This strategy can best be perceived against the background of the Soviet theory on the nature of the class forces at work in the world today.

It is no secret that the Soviet leaders are convinced they alone understand the purpose of the historical process. What is more, they alone know by what force history will reach its ultimate goal, namely through the intensification of the class struggle on a worldwide scale and the defeat of the doomed class. In their view, only hopeless reformists can believe that the struggle between the "haves" and the "have-nots" can be resolved by the peaceful accommodation of existing individual national economic interests. They are not impressed by the sight of an expanding world economy. As the successful heirs of a revolutionary regime, the Soviet rulers are more disposed to believe in the reality of the forces that can be unleashed through the promotion of economic conflict, through the sustained fanning of hatred against a class enemy, real or imagined. The only way to resolve the class struggle, as they see it, is to explode every nation, by means of a civil war, into a better future.

According to prevailing theory, the class struggle is now ready to be turned into a global contest of strength. The capitalist system, it is reasoned, was thrown into a state of general crisis by the outbreak of the October revolution in Russia. Since then, it has been losing one position after another, largely as a result of the expanding international influence of the Soviet Union. At present, world capitalism is officially labeled as passing through the dismal phase of the disintegration of the colonial system. Thus, the time is ripe for a course of effective action designed to speed the collapse of capitalism as a world system. One Soviet authority, V. K. Fedinin, in his "The Collapse of the Colonial System of Imperialism" (Moscow, 1957), states the case as follows:

"The success of socialism in the U.S.S.R. marked a new, radical shift in the correlation of class forces on a world scale in favor of socialism, to the detriment of capitalism. The Soviet Union became a potent political and economic force * * * a weapon for solidifying the toilers of the whole world against world reaction."

Now that Soviet power has extended its base of operations from a single country to a whole system of Socialist states, the chances for influencing the outcome of the worldwide class struggle are more favorable than ever. The triumph of Communist rule over an area containing one-third of the world's population has, as the Kremlin sees it, ipso facto increased enormously the magnetc force of socialism. The growing power of the Soviet camp, as Fedinin puts it, is having the effect of "unleashing the initiative of the colonial people in the struggle against imperialism, of inspiring in them confidence in the victorious outcome of this struggle, making it more stubborn and more successful."

Above all, there must be no sliding backward. While the process of disintegration of capitalist empires is underway, Soviet policy must be aimed, in Moscow's words, at preventing the "imperialist sharks" from involving the newly emergent nations into a new web of colonial exploitation. The new nations must be taught the meaning of "real" independence by their "true" friends in the "anti-imperialist" camp. They must be taught that their full freedom from exploitation will not be secure until they break their economic ties with the West, until they "put an end to the present unequal 'division of labor,' imposed upon them by Western capitalism."

In order to qualify for the role of political bellwether, the Soviet Union must, of course, be able to demonstrate that it, too, has the technical resources to support the urge of the newly established nations to modernize there economic production. It must show that it can provide a flow of industrial equipment on favorable long-term credit, send qualified technicians to help build modern plants and facilities, and train native specialists.

Practical acts of economic assistance, however, are not an end in themselves. According to tested Soviet doctrine, popular economic action becomes purposeful only when used as a means of "awakening the political consciousness" of the people being aided. This applies, in the first place, to economic support extended by the Communist Party to the workers in its own country. Lenin saw no other reason for taking part in the economic struggle against the bourgeoisie ("the enemy class") except in order "to bring political knowledge to the workers." This is equally true in the present international setting, when the former colonial peoples must be awakened, through economic support, to the worldwide political struggle in which they are presumably involved.

There is so much "political knowledge" that the Soviet leaders must bring to the awakening people of Asia and Africa. They must first of all persuade them to recognize the "have" nations as the true enemies of their future economic progress. They must demonstrate, in particular, a number of concrete, educational propositions:

1. That the nations of the West are less interested in general economic development than in maintaining their own monopoly position as exporters of machinery to the less developed nations. This point by V. V. Rymaloy in "On Economic Aid to Underdeveloped Countries" (Moscow, 1957), is as follows: "They [the imperialists] are calling upon the less developed nations to give up for the present their plans for industrialization and at first to develop agriculture, then light industry, and only in the far future—the basic branches of production. Through this device they are counting on dooming the less developed nations to economic dependence and backwardness for many years."

2. That, at best, the West intends to help them develop only within the familiar groove of "cheese-cloth industrialization," i.e., self-sufficiency in textiles and other trivial consumer products.

3. That true industrialization can be attained only by following the stormy, power-oriented method employed by Stalin in the Soviet Union.

4. That the nations of the West are only fair-weather friends, who will one day turn their backs on them altogether. This will happen "inevitably," as a result of the present trend in capitalist technology. Because of the increasing role of synthetic materials, says the authoritative Soviet Institute of World Economics, the Western nations "cannot be counted as dependable markets for the raw materials of Asia and Africa."

As far as public discussions go, Soviet policymakers show no fear that by providing support to the onetime colonial nations, within their present political institutions, they may be strengthening capitalist forces inside these countries. Such a likelihood seems to be ruled out as unhistorical. In the opinion of the dean of Soviet experts on capitalist imperialism, Academician A. A. Arzumanyan, the excolonies cannot solve their problems of industrialization along ordinary capitalist lines. Properly managed Communist economic aid programs, therefore, must have the effect of further undermining the position of the monopolies vis-a-vis the less developed nations. In slogan form, this element in the official strategy has been expressed as follows: "Everything that injures the monopolies alters the relationship of forces in favor of socialism."

As experienced political manipulators, the Soviet rulers know, moreover, that this holy war against the monopolies must be given concrete form as often as possible. Among such targets, Soviet officialdom has found a highly convenient culprit in the form of the international oil companies. They represent a bête noire of the first order because

a campaign against them makes so few enemies and helps to fortify the Soviet pose as the undaunted fighter for justice, the "selfless, true friend of the new independent states of the East."

It is not surprising, therefore, that a major element in the Soviet foreign aid effort is concerned with fostering independence against the oil companies. In several countries (Afghanistan, India, Syria, and Egypt) the Soviet Union is now sponsoring large-scale projects for the exploration of oil and gas deposits. In India, Syria, and Egypt, Soviet technicians are engaged in building large, modern, oil refineries. The Soviet Union has also used its aid program to deliver oil tankers to Indonesia and to build gasoline storage tanks in Yemen and Afghanistan. It has also assiduously used all available forums—including the United Nations—to promote its favorite remedy in this sphere—the nationalization of the oil industry in countries seeking economic development. Even in the Western Hemisphere the Soviet Union has extended a $100 million credit to Argentina for oil equipment, and has offered a similar arrangement to the state-owned oil companies of Brazil and Mexico.

In addition, Soviet dignitaries personally carry the crusade against the oil companies wherever they go, as part of their globe-trotting campaign in behalf of "peace and friendship." During his recent visit to Mexico, for example, First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan felt it his duty to dispel any illusions his Mexican hosts may have harbored about their neighbor to the north. He could think of no more fitting topic for promoting selective friendship among nations than the "sins of the oil monopolies." He came amply supplied with his own calculations. "In six Arab countries," he reported, "United States and British oil monopolies make monstrous profits—$1.3 billion a year—from oil production. This is not counting profits from refining, transport, and resale. During the past 9 years, these Arab countries lost over $6.5 billion worth of oil profits." The Arab countries may be too far away to touch the heart of the average Mexican. But a well-aimed barb against the "oil magnates" to the north should help advertise Soviet sympathy for the weaker nation.

When a Western nation extends help to a less developed country, such an act is generally understood as a token of implicit confidence in the political methods whereby the country is attempting to achieve economic health or maintain its ntaional integrity. It goes without saying that the U.S.S.R. proceeds on very much the same basic premise when it contributes to the economic growth of the countries within the Soviet bloc. But Soviet economic aid outside the bloc looks suspiciously like an act of political speculation. The aid program assumes the character of a practical base from which Soviet policy may take advantage of any future opportunities.

In the long run, however, Soviet prophecies, with respect to the newly liberated peoples may prove no more accurate than the original Communist forecasts about the destiny of Western Europe. The doctrine of the class struggle as a vehicle by which Communist parties could propel themselves to power in the West has been rendered irrelevant by the fact that gradual economic improvement, within an atmosphere of open political accommodation of group interests, has worked. Economic evolution has proven a more dependable means for raising income levels and personal well-being on a mass scale than the method of total social "overturn" favored by Moscow. The moral of this experience should not be wasted. The tools for increasing productivity are well known; they can and must be made available to the nations that are now earnestly seeking economic development. If they are given sincere and sustained assistance by the economically more advanced nations, Soviet-sponsored class warfare can in time be made equally irrelevant on the international scene.

Tribute to Gen. Walter Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of T. W. Crigler, Jr., past commander in chief, Sons of Confederate Veterans, representing the Governor of Mississippi, at the memorial services at Houston, Tex., December 23, 1959, of Gen. Walter Williams, the last Confederate soldier:

ADDRESS OF T. W. CRIGLER, JR., REPRESENTING THE GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES HELD IN HOUSTON, TEX., DECEMBER 23, 1959, OF GEN. WALTER WILLIAMS, LAST CONFEDERATE SOLDIER

Governor Daniels, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, to one who was born loving the Confederacy and all that it stood for as I do, it is with inexpressible sadness that I am here today.

Over 40 years ago I attended my first Confederate veterans reunion, being on the staff of the division commander of my State. Approximately 3,000 veterans were in attendance at that reunion. Even then that was considered a pitiful remnant of those fallant gray thousands that had followed Lee and Jackson, Stuart and Johnson, Longstreet, Hood, Kirby Smith, and many other peerless leaders.

Through the years I have watched this heroic band slowly dwindle away, and today, we are assembled here to pay our sorrowing tribute to the last member of the most gallant army that ever trod the face of the earth.

Nothing that we may do or say here today will add or detract one iota from their valorous deeds on a thousand hard-fought battlefields. Their records are written in letters of fire across the pages of our country's history.

Their achievements so transcended all proportions of means and opportunities that history will never cease to marvel and to wonder at the magnitude and the splendor of their accomplishments.

Twenty million people on one side—9 million on the other; half of them slaves and consequently noncombatants; a great navy, arsenals, factories, railroads; boundless wealth in science and an open world to draw from—and on the other side, little more than a thin gray line of ragged and starving patriots with hearts of steel, devoted body and soul to their righteous cause and who were willing and determined to give their all in defense of their inalienable rights.

Those who escaped a hero's grave, on the battlefield during those 4 terrible years of constant warfare, fought to exhaustion and only gave up the unequal struggle when they had literally been beaten into the earth.

And when that pitiful remnant of a once invincible army returned to their homes—and the one we honor here today was of that number—what did they find?

Their homes, farms, businesses in ruins; their money worthless, their whole economy wrecked, and to add to their multitude of other woes, several million freed slaves were handed over to them to care for whether they liked it or not.

The Confederacy was the most thoroughly defeated nation in the annals of history. And they, in the agony of that defeat, received no assistance from anyone; least of all the victors who thrust them still further into the mire of degredation and despondency by the so-called iniquitous reconstruction, a fate in many ways much worse than a soldier's grave on the field of battle.

This act—this reconstruction of the Southern States—still remains one of the darkest blots on the history of our beloved and reunited country.

In those dark days there was nothing even faintly resembling the Marshall plan; no foreign nations rushed shiploads of food and supplies to the starving and desperate people of the South.

The returning veterans attacked their gigantic problems that confronted them with the same fierce determination with which they had stormed the Federal works at Manassas, Sharpsburg, Shiloh, and Petersburg, and a thousand other hard fought battles.

With desperate energy and enthusiasm coupled with lots and lots of hard and unremitting labor they attacked their seemingly insurmountable problems, and today—if you would see the results of the foundations so nobly laid for their descendants by the gallant defenders of our liberties so long ago, I ask you but to look about you through our beloved Southland.

It is here for all to see and marvel at. The South has made its comeback over the long, long trail, and today we are a land literally flowing with milk and honey.

The heart of every true southerner should thrill with pride at the many things that have been accomplished in such a relatively short time.

And to whom do we owe the all that we have and the all that we are in our beloved Dixie today? Who laid the foundation for our present greatness? To Walter Williams, and to those who returned with him from the holocaust of war. They were the ones who started us on the road to the heights that we have attained today.

We, their descendants, should ever strive to keep alive and green in our hearts the memory of their valorious deeds; of their grim and determined struggles to rebuild their shattered Southland for those who were to come after them, and to pass on to our children and grandchildren a like memory of the bitter struggles and heart rending sacrifices which they made for us. For the countless thousands whose unknown and unmarked graves dot the hills and valleys throughout the length and breadth of the South, and to those other thousands who lie buried near the northern prison camps where they ate out their hearts as prisoners until death mercifully set them free, we should breath a special prayer and to determine that their sacrifices for us were not made in vain.

With the passing of this, the last member of the Confederate Army, we here today are witnessing the end of a splendid and glorious era. The Old South as Walter Williams first knew it is dead and is now but a sweet and revered memory. But from the ashes and rubble left us by Grant and Sherman, Sheridan and Butler, a new and more glorious South has arisen Phoenix-like from those ashes. And we are destined, with the help of God, the brains and the good right arms that He has given us, to rise to newer and greater heights.

My allotted time has been consumed. There are many things that I might say but words are indeed futile things at a time like this.

Walter Williams' immortal soul is now in safekeeping of an allwise and all-powerful God who doeth all things well, and in that Valhalla of those mighty warriors who have

preceded him to that happy land, may he find that rest and peace that passes all undertsanding. Such is my heartfelt prayer.

God bless you all, and may He also bless and keep America, our beloved and reunited country that we all love so much, that produced men as these. Let us thank God if we have outlived their vices. Let us pray to God that we may ever emulate their virtues.

And to the bereaved family—

"May the good Lord bless and keep you,
The Lord to make His face to shine upon you, and be gracious to you,
The Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace."

National Fuels Policy Held Vital in Cold War Production Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the thorough study the Congress is presently making of the need for a national fuels policy as a result of the introduction of several resolutions into both Houses of the Congress, I feel the remarks of Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., made before a meeting of the Mid-West Coal Producers Institute, Inc. in Pointe Vedra, Fla., on February 12, most and appropriate and timely.

The coal industry has a tremendous responsibility toward the economy of our country, and Mr. Moody has stressed the importance of the efficient use of all our available energy resources as a determining factor in our cold war production race with Russia. I commend his remarks to my colleagues, and under unanimous consent, include them in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE NEW IMAGE OF COAL—PRESENTED TO THE ANNUAL MEETING MID-WEST COAL PRODUCERS INSTITUTE, INC., FEBRUARY 12, 1960, PONTE VEDRA BEACH, FLA., BY JOSEPH E. MOODY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.

Your invitation to appear before the Mid-West Coal Institute, again at your annual meeting here at Ponte Vedra, is a great compliment, and one that I appreciate. But more important than that it offers me a forum to say a few things about our coal industry and our country today that I feel need to be said.

The title of my remarks, "The New Image of Coal," clearly describes just what coal and its allied industries are trying to create today. We have joined in a cooperative effort with three great objectives:

To see that the people of this Nation get a new look at coal as the source of energy for our entire civilization.

To emphasize the truth that coal has been the energy fuel which has made our great industrial development possible while other nations, lacking ample coal supplies, have plodded along in a beast-power economy.

To make it very clear that continued availability of cheap coal-powered energy is essential to American safety and her continued growth for many years to come.

In the United States we have coal in almost unlimited quantities. During the last 200 years in which it has been a commercially marketed product, we have moved from a log cabin civilization to the most powerful Nation the world has ever known.

Other nations, as I indicated above, many hundreds of years older, are still living in the log cabin and adobe huts of their ancestors. Often there has been just one major difference—accessible reserves of coal developed for use. Without coal there was no steel. Without steel there are no skyscrapers, no industry, no gas, no oil, no nuclear energy. Yet still—and often because of our own errors and neglect—coal has reached a low degree of prestige and presence in the public eye, in the minds of the administrators of our Government and in prestige and power before our Congress and our State legislatures.

In this great era of big government and economic tinkering by the Government, no industry can long prosper if it does not have a good entree in these areas. In other words, we must be socially acceptable. As a fuel in this country, we are an old industry. Two hundred years of commercial production of coal in the United States is being celebrated this year. The National Coal Association and the National Coal Policy Conference are joining hands to bring this milestone to the attention of the people of the world.

During the last year, we have changed the attitude of some of our competitive fuels from the casual yawn, complete indifference to our efforts, to that of recognition of our determination and to an almost panicky realization that this great giant of coal, slowly, carefully, but with the utmost determination has pulled together the coal industry, and related industries to help, in the severe, in fact, almost vicious competitive situation that exists today.

For the first time we know of, a great powerful industry has gathered together its full strength with those of its related forces for one purpose—to recognize the common ground of the welfare of the bituminous coal industry, regardless of the competitive relationship—hard and tought as it is.

It reminds me in many ways of Paul's letter to the Philippians, in which he reviewed the past and the changes that had happened and then said that he would leave the past behind and would go straight for his goal the Christian church. You will recall that he said that he was not critical that the Philippians had done anything wrong, but only that they hadn't done enough; that they had lacked faith in their own great force; and that in working together for the advancement of the Christian church they were entering upon the greatest unfinished business in the world; that none had arrived—they were only then being made in this process of going toward their goal.

That seems to me somehow what we in the coal industry have done. We have decided to leave many things of the past behind and to forge ahead with evangelical faith in our industry and in ourselves toward the goal of establishing the coal industry as the great servant of this great Nation, as the basis of a self-sufficient, domestic energy source, so that we in the United States can look forward to the tremendous economic growth which will surely come if it is not restrained by any lack of energy, cost of energy, or its ready availability.

Gentlemen, it is a tremendous job that we see before us, and I am glad to be able to say that we are now organized to face it. In the National Coal Policy Conference there are combined the strength and prestige of (1) railroads of this Nation; (2) the ingenious manufacturers of our mining equipment, who seem to be only on the threshold of things far greater than anything we have contemplated; (3) the United Mine Workers of America, the labor organization representing the employees of our industry; (4) major utility companies—those customers of ours who probably have the greatest stake of all in the efficient and low-cost mining of coal and who have joined with us so that a strong, healthy, vigorous coal industry will make it possible for them to produce the tremendous amounts of electrical energy that will be necessary to carry our economic growth to heights never before dreamed of, and (5) our own group of farsighted, clear-thinking coal producers. What a combination.

Alined with us in this fight is, of course, the National Coal Association now representing a broad group of the elements of the coal industry under the able new direction of my good friend, Steve Dunn. For the first time in the history of this Nation, we have true, united national leadership for the coal industry, and those industries with tremendous investments of money and manpower which are dependent on a vigorous coal industry.

Many years ago Adam Smith cynically remarked that whenever a group of businessmen sat down together it could be assumed that they were talking about prices. That may have been true in his day. But I assure you when the group of businessmen making up the aNtional Coal Policy Conference get together they are talking betterment for the whole coal industry—and talking it hard and fast.

We're doing the same kind of talking to the public these days, and I might add it is certainly time we did so. In the past I have had the unenviable experience of being something of a lone voice lashing out against the farcical waste of taxpayers' money involved in our Government's efforts to develop civilian atomic energy, even though it wasn't needed and was certain to be noncooperative with coal and other natural fuels for many years.

I was gratified to read in the Washington Post of January 30 that Mr. David E. Lilienthal, one of the great promoters of the atomic age, had now declared that the United States has been misled by promises that were absolutely impossible of fulfillment and that the whole program of nuclear power, to use his own words, has fallen flat on its face despite appropriations of close to one-half billion dollars in the last few years.

It makes my heart ache to realize that a few million dollars of that half billion, invested in research for coal, might well have given us tremendous advances in the production of power under our private utility system.

One of the great problems that is facing this Nation is its ability to grow faster, to make certain that our economy grows as fast as the families of the generation now coming up. In my generation, as in the case of most of you in this audience, the cry was that the families in the United States were shrinking, and it was officially declared that we would reach a plateau of population and gradually decline. But like the bumblebee that can't fly, the youngsters that came along didn't seem to know that, and in my own instance I find that I'm about to be the grandfather of three new grandchildren—all within a matter of a few months.

I believe it was Toynbee who said that every great civilization is faced with a challenge to which it either responds or it disappears. One of the greatest challenges that we, as a people face now and in the years ahead, is a test of our ability to maintain a competitive rate of growth. Can we do this in our society and still enhance the life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness of the individual, while elsewhere in the world those ideals are subordinated to nationalism and military might?

This is the basic factor that we are discussing. It is the basic reason for the existence of the national coal policy conference.

The major activities of the conference—oh, yes, we have done a good job of drawing attention to coal; making the public talk about coal either pro or con—but back of that we must build a solid structure that will enable coal to contribute its full share to the foundation of this economic growth. One essential to building such a firm structure of national energy is the establishment of a sound national fuels policy. It is vitally important that Congress take a good look at the crazy quilt of controls of every kind that have to do with oil, with gas, with electricity, with the importation and distribution of fuels—today a complete crazy quilt of ad hoc regulations—and evolve a program which will weld them into a sound and logical pattern. Senate Concurrent Resolution 73 asks for a study of this problem and recommendations to the Congress for solution.

We must put the best brains available on a thorough review of the present situation and must determine how our fuels can best be used for this great Nation of ours, and indirectly, for the world as a whole.

One of the questions that has to be answered is whether the defense of the United States is in good order, when a major part of our fuel could be denied us by the whim of a strong and sharply competing nation of the world, Russia.

I recently asked a very good friend of mine, who is a key man in international finance and an authority on the oil-producing Middle East areas, what he figured would be the time factor for Russia to take over one or more of these oil-producing areas if for any reason it was politically advisable for Russia to embarrass us—not necessarily as a matter of outright war or aggression, but by one of their notorious internal coups. His answer was, with rather a wry smile, "Joe, I believe they could take care of it by lunch time," and added, "There is no one, nor anything in the world, that could stop them." And so a part of the breath of life of this great economy of ours hangs on that very fine silken thread—the discretion and good nature of maybe just a single Russian commissar.

In a study such as we are backing, and the resolution asking for a study of the advisability of a national fuels policy, which has been introduced in both Houses of Congress, there naturally arises the question "Is it necessary that the continental area of the United States and its neighbors be self-sufficient in energy and fuel to maintain not only their present energy needs, but also the fuel necessary for growth?"

Our efforts to maintain a stable relationship with other fuels on the eastern seaboard, mainly with residual oil, has been attacked by the great foreign oil-producing companies. Perhaps this is only natural since they profit by millions of dollars from the dumping of imported residual oil in the United States.

It is interesting to note that in the New York Times of January 3, just one of these companies alone indicated a gross revenue in 1959 of $5½ billion. This, of course, is twice as much as the gross sales of all U.S. coal producers. The fact that we know that we are absolutely right that this Nation is dependent on a proper and stable relationship of its various fuels in all areas of the Nation gives us the strength and the force far beyond our financial resources to make our voice heard.

A study of fuels must certainly consider the question of the some $10 billion of railroad equipment, maintained and kept available in order to transport coal to the eastern part and midwestern part of the United States—the heart and soul of our industrial activity. Yet, this essential equipment is endangered by the low level of coal production in the last few years.

One of the things that has been of tremendous interest to me in the National Coal Policy Conference has been the spirit of cooperation which has made it possible for us to apply ourselves quickly, effectively, and almost within a matter of minutes when matters needing quick action arise. The ability to move and attack or confer effectively with elements of government, of the Congress, and of industry, gives to the coal industry a tremendous advantage and an impact that can only enure to our benefit over the years.

Your conference acts as a leader in policy. It acts as a complement and a supplement to the efforts of other organizations—such as National Coal Asssociation or the American Mining Congress. And we find, regardless of the effort in which we are involved, that there is always a tremendous job to do and never time enough to do it.

As a result of the effort to give a new image to coal, I am sure that everyone here has felt a lift in the last year; has heisted up his breeches a bit; stuck out his chin a little more; felt a little quiet stirring of confidence—that is the beginning.

Our job is to carry it far beyond that over the years to come, to a point of quiet recognition in all quarters that coal must be given its proper place in the economy of this Nation—that the 2 million people dependent upon the coal industry have not only rights, but demand those rights as proper recognition of the industry's importance to the welfare of the United States, of the various State governments, and, yes, of the industry of this Nation.

The other day, Walter Lippmann wrote that the critical weakness of our society is that our people do not have great purposes which they are united to achieve. The public mood, he observed, is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not push forward and to create. The danger that is implied here certainly was once true of our industry. We have all too often been on the defensive, many times in a position of negation, but very seldom in a positive position of a forward-looking, creative "let's go" program.

Today we can positively say that the coal industry is not looking backward but is on the march forward. We have faith that our industry is a sound and necessary part of the Nation and the world as far as its energy is concerned.

There can be no question but that, if we are to continue to be a first-rate Nation, we must increase our annual gross national product more than three percent annually. It is going to take five per cent or more just to maintain our present lead, and we must remember that when Mr. Khrushchev, not too long ago, said "I will bury you," he meant that from the standpoint of production. I doubt that there is a man in this room who would not be willing to admit that if Russia does win the economic race, probably the greatest competition between Nations in the history of the world, it will not be necessary for Khrushchev to wage a hot war—the decision will have been made in the cold war.

In "Current Coal Trends" issued by NCA, dated January 1960, there is on page 5 an article indicating coal trends in the USSR. I assume that this article contains conservative estimates based on the best information available. It concludes that—I quote—"both countries' reserves (that is referring to the United States and the Soviet Union), are adequate for hundreds of years," and I quote again "by using modern methods in coal mining, Russia has caught up to and passed the United States in coal production." Some of the technological progress in Russia coal mining cited by this article include:

"1. A new way of bringing coal to the surface through a pipeline system.

"2. Hydraulic mining.

"3. A new air-cooling plant.

"4. Remote-control mining where one operator controls all coal-cutting machinery while watching the entire process on a television screen."

So today we have the new image of coal with a broad solid base made up of the coal industry and its allied industries—the railroads, the public utilities, United Mine Workers of America, and the equipment manufacturers—an image crowned with a tremendous force known as coal power. If you will allow me to be fanciful for a minute. I visualize this crown as studded with a newborn faith in our value to this Nation; with a firm conviction that we are absolutely right in having done the great technological job of modernizing our production capacity; with a real united national leadership; and with determination to meet our opposition head on with full reliance on the merits of our position.

This star-studded crown is not going to be easy for the industry to wear. It is going to take the full application of the energy and good sense of everyone in our industry and the related industries to make it effective, and it is going to take some additional faith to carry on for the length of time necessary, lest we anticipate that a program of this scope can be accomplished in the "near future." It will take time and it will take effort. But it is encumbent upon all of us to make sure that it succeeds.

I thank you, gentlemen.

Human Background of the Civil Rights Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Lewis, a Pulitzer Prize winning reporter in the New York Times' Washington bureau, is a brilliant interpreter of the Supreme Court and its work.

In the Times' Sunday magazine of February 14, 1960, Mr. Lewis presented a penetrating analysis of the human background of the civil rights issue. In view of the need for a sound perspective in the forthcoming civil rights debate, I recommend this article, which follows, to all Members:

HUMAN BACKGROUND OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUE

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—As Congress begins a new struggle over civil rights legislation, it is time to step back and examine the great questions that underlie the political debate but are so seldom illumined by it: How far have we come in solving this country's oldest problem, its treatment of the Negro? How much farther do we have to go? What are the objectives with top priority for the Negro today? Can they be met, and if so, how?

No fair observer can doubt that racial discrimination—and that means chiefly discrimination against the Negro—has sharply decreased within the lifetime of most Americans. The dramatic nature of the change can be shown by looking back to the period just before the United States entered World War II. Those were the years treated by Gunnar Myrdal in his epochal "An American Dilemma"—a book that saw the Negro problem in realistically gloomy terms but said also that there was reason "to anticipate fundamental changes in American race re-

lations, changes * * * toward the American ideals."

Politically, the Negro was totally powerless in the South before the war. He was barred by the white primary rule of the southern Democratic parties from the only election that counted. Fewer than 100,000 Negroes in the South are estimated to have voted in the general election of 1940.

In 1940, 26 unions in the American Federation of Labor had clauses in their constitutions explicitly barring Negro members. Even in the Federal Government, with few exceptions, only menial work was open to Negroes. The Armed Forces were wholly segregated. In 17 States and the District of Columbia the law required—and in 4 it permitted—segregation in public schools. Public colleges and professional schools for Negroes, if any existed at all, were markedly inferior to white institutions in most southern States. A Negro traveling by railroad coach from New York to New Orleans had to transfer to a segregated car when he reached the South.

Twenty years later, those surface manifestations of discrimination are vastly diminished.

A 1944 Supreme Court decision struck down the white primary. Today something over 1,200,000 Negroes are registered to vote in the South. In a number of the large cities Negroes may have the balance of political power.

In today's labor federation, only one union—the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen—overtly bars Negroes from membership. Just last month the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen struck the color bar from its constitution.

A 1941 Executive order by Franklin Roosevelt began the breakthrough for Negroes in Government jobs, and orders by Truman and Eisenhower in 1948, 1953 and 1955 hastened the process. Negro secretaries and professional employees are commonplace in Government offices here today. Desegregation of the Armed Forces began in the Truman administration and was completed, for all practical purposes, during the Korean war.

As for school segregation, its legal basis ended with the Supreme Court decision of 1954, and Negroes have been admitted to some formerly white schools in every southern State but Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, and Louisiana. The first four of those States still have no integration in higher education.

Segregation in interstate transportation was outlawed by the Supreme Court in 1946. Ten years later the Court struck down segregated seating on trolleys or buses within a single State.

It is harder to fix precise dates as landmarks in the important area of criminal law, but the overall trend is toward more equitable treatment of the Negro. In 1900, 106 Negroes were lynched in this country. One case in 1959—Charles Mack Parker—came as a cold shock to the Nation's conscience. The recent conviction of a group of white boys in Florida for raping a Negro coed was a symbol of the change.

Washington, D.C., is a remarkable story in itself. As recently as 1952 a Negro could not have lunch at a downtown drug counter, or enter any but a colored hotel or movie threater. Then in 1953 the Supreme Court found a forgotten Reconstruction ordinance barring discrimination in restaurants and hotels. Open exclusion of Negroes here ended overnight and theaters fell in line under White House pressure.

Nor is the North excluded from the striking changes of the last generation. It would have been impossible 10 years ago to walk into the office of a large New York law firm and be greeted, as the writer recently was, by a Negro secretary-receptionist.

The 1948 Supreme Court decision that racially restricted real estate covenants could not be enforced in the courts has probably had its most significant effect in the North. An NAACP official remarks that 10 years ago most of the association's New York employees lived in Harlem. Today, few do. Negroes live in New York suburbs and a few even in fashionable East Side apartments.

The difficulty with this impressionistic sketch of improvements in the life of the Negro American is that it is too rosy. A closer examination shows what everyone knows—that life remains much harder for a Negro than for a white man of the same talents.

Voting, for example. Only 25 percent of voting-age Negroes in the South are registered, compared with 60 percent of the whites. After a sharp climb from 600,000 in 1947 to 1 million in 1952, Negro registration has barely inched upward. The Civil Rights Commission report last September gave the reasons: physical and economic threats, discriminatory literacy tests, registrars who simply refuse to register Negroes. In 16 southern counties with a majority of Negro population, not a single Negro is registered to vote.

The employment situation is probably worse. Despite the egalitarian professions of the AFL–CIO and the official desegregation of its member unions, the fact is that Negroes face severe union discrimination in such large areas of the economy as the building trades and railroads. Union practices have excluded Negroes from the construction of Government buildings in Washington.

White collar and managerial jobs remain closed in the South and, to some extent, elsewhere; only 12 percent of Negro men in the country have such positions, against 40 percent of white workers. There are Negroes with college degrees working as mail clerks in the Atlanta post office. Negro women do not work as salesgirls in southern department stores, or as secretaries, or as supermarket clerks even in Negro neighborhoods. A sympathetic southern white observer explains:

" 'Do you want a Negro foreman over your daughter?' That's the next question they ask after, 'Do you want your daughter to marry one?' "

Today it is still true that Negroes are likely to be the first workers fired and the last hired. Negro earnings showed a sharper drop in the 1957–58 recession than white. According to official figures for last December, 4.5 percent of the whites and 10.8 percent of the Negroes in the labor force were unemployed.

The job problem is reflected in incomes. Between 1939 and 1958 the median wage or salary income of Negro men rose a phenomenal 477 percent, compared with a 311 percent rise for white men. But the disparity is still stark—$2,652 a year for the median Negro, $4,569 for the white. And most of the jump in Negro income came during World War II.

School segregation is hardly dead. If one looks beyond the Border States, only a few hundred Negro children are attending integrated schools in the South. The Supreme Court has declined to interfere with pupil assignment plans which assume the continuation of separate school systems and put a heavy burden on the Negro family seeking to tranfer a child to a white school.

And aside from the segregation issue, Negroes are at a marked disadvantage in schooling. It is one of the great myths—repeated by President Eisenhower among others—that the South dutifully lived up to the separate but equal interpretation of the Constitution that was in force from 1896 to 1954. Equality was in fact ignored; and despite frantic efforts to avoid integration by improving Negro schools, the gap remains. Average expenditures per pupil in the Southern States, for example, were estimated in 1939–40 as $94.41 for whites and $40.56 for Negroes. Today a rough average is $191 per white pupil, $155 per Negro.

One would have to be blind, too, to believe that Negroes have equal access to housing in the United States. The Civil Rights Commission report details the pattern which tends to hem Negroes into overcrowded, rundown city districts. The North may have more to answer for here than the South. It is, after all, a Chicago suburb whose pathological efforts to keep out a small interracial development have made recent newspaper stories.

Facilities for rest and recreation remain grossly inferior for Negroes in the South. The Supreme Court has said that public parks and libraries and beaches may not be segregated, but in fact not many are open to Negroes. A number of places have closed parks and pools under desegregation orders, and one city recently sold its zoo animals rather than let Negro and white children look at them together.

Discrimination is worse in privately owned facilities, where constitutional restrictions against discrimination ordinarily do not apply. Just across the Potomac River in Arlington County, with a population largely northern in origin, a Negro cannot enter a movie theater or a bowling alley or a skating rink; he cannot get service in a drive-in restaurant, or buy his child a pony ride.

One point that must be kept in mind in appraising the position of the Negro in the South is the vast difference between rural and urban communities.

A visit to Atlanta, for example, is an eye-opener for the northerner. There are miles of attractive, and expensive, Negro homes—some selling for $50,000 and more. There are Negro contractors, bankers, real estate men with fortunes. Atlanta desegregated its golf courses, trolleys, and libraries without incident and could do the same in its schools if the State of Georgia permitted. A Negro is an elected member of the school board.

But Atlanta is a cosmopolitan city with a cultural tradition, with a sophisticated Negro population, with an enlightened mayor and newspapers. And even in Atlanta a Negro may not ride in a "white" taxi or eat in a downtown restaurant or see the touring company of "Sunrise at Campobello" except from a segregated seat.

Yet how different is the rural South. There the Negro is backward because he is kept down—and he is kept down with the excuse that he is backward. A white citizen of Atlanta says of his rural compatriots: "Their image of the Negro is that of the yardman or the servant or the criminal, and so they can't think about the problem rationally." And in much of the South, as in Georgia, the disproportionate rural representation in legislatures helps the rural politicians remain in control.

The picture, then is one of incomplete achievement. What objective should now have top priority? Ask that question of Negro leaders, and the same answer comes back again and again: The vote, jobs, schools—all three together, because they cannot be separated.

A Negro lawyer in Atlanta remarks on how the vote can change even the way criminal law is administered—by electing prosecutors and judges. A Negro minister talks about the effort to get Negroes on the Atlanta Police Force: "We went to see the mayor and he wouldn't hear us. Eight years later we went back, and by then we had a lot more voters. Before we could say a thing the mayor asked: 'How many do you want?' We told him and Negroes went on the force."

But an NAACP lawyer argues that the vote is an empty right without the money

and leisure time to organize politically. And there is no greater enticement than the economic motive to end discrimination. Little Rock showed that race troubles scare away northern business. An Atlanta Negro, noting the growing willingness of banks to lend for Negro homebuilding, says: "Money's money. Money's money. Negroes pay interest."

Better and integrated schools are emphasized by another NAACP lawyer, a woman. "With a better education you get a better job," she says, "you vote more intelligently, you know how to fight for your rights—which is still important." Others agree that many urban Negroes who could register do not because of educational or economic backwardness.

How can these interwoven goals—the vote, jobs, schools—be reached? All those interested in the cause of Negro rights agree that the basic tool will remain the law. They depart, then, from the philosophy President Eisenhower expressed at a 1956 press conference and has repeated many times since: "I don't believe you can change the hearts of men (on the race issue) with laws or decisions."

Men's hearts do change slowly, but there is no more effective device to help them change than law. Even a hasty survey makes clear how much real difference Supreme Court decisions have made in the past 20 years. The law permits those who privately have no great desire for discrimination to end it easily—as in Washington. And the law, compelling people to act without discrimination, at least on the surface, may educate them within. "They learn that the black won't rub off," an Atlanta Negro says.

Another point on which there is broad agreement is that, in the South, advancement of Negro rights will require continued Federal prodding. One of the great southern white voices of sanity, Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, puts it this way:

"There has been no progress in the South that I know of except under pressure from the Federal Government—the courts of Congress or the President."

Many Negro leaders feel it is important that Congress and the executive branch get deeper into the battle, relieving the Federal courts of some of the burden. That was the direction taken by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, in which Congress empowered the Attorney General to intervene in behalf of Negro voting.

Federal leadership could help now on the job problem, it is felt, if the Government itself hired more Negroes for better jobs in the South and advanced them without discrimination. There is hope, too, for more aggressive activity by the President's Committee on Government Contracts to end discrimination by companies with Federal contracts. Civil rights groups also urgently desire Government intervention against school segregation.

But the voting problem presents, today, the most promising area for Federal action. Action there is politically possible. No southern Senator can stand up today and say openly that Negroes should be denied the right to vote. The vote is not a fighting word, as school integration and job equality are.

The vote is the focus of the developing struggle on Capitol Hill. All the civil rights forces seem to be agreed that the emphasis in this year's legislation should be on new devices to encourage and protect Negro voting in the South.

The Civil Rights Commission shook up the whole legislative picture when it proposed, last September, that Federal registrars be appointed by the President to qualify Negroes for Federal elections when State officials will not do so.

Attorney General Rogers, seeing difficulties in the registrar plan, has put forward an alternative. He would continue to rely on the courts but would let judges appoint referees to qualify Negro voters and protect their rights at the polls in both State and Federal elections. The problem at the Capitol is to get the procivil rights forces to agree on a bill.

Bringing the vote to Negroes in rural areas is the challenge. No one thinks the task will be easy, even for the Federal Government. But the attempt itself is vital. "Agitation is a process of education," a Negro minister says.

A Negro who has practiced law in Atlanta for 48 years adds: "If the Federal Government opens the way to vote, it will be up to the Negroes to use that right. There may be violent resistance in the rural areas; the burden will be heavy. A few will have to suffer. But that is the history of the struggle for civil liberties. We Negroes don't expect to be exempt from that fact of history."

Others have said that Negroes in the South will have to be more willing to come forward and demand their rights. The feeling is that, in addition to fear and outright repression, Negro indifference is partly responsible for such a fact as the small number of Negro voters.

Can the goals be reached? The mood of those concerned with Negro rights is optimistic.

A recent authoritative book, Jack Greenberg's "Race Relations and American Law," sees these factors pushing the end of racial discrimination in the South: industrialization; urbanization, bringing with it social anonymity and security; the homogenization of the South and the rest of the Nation through television and other mass media of communication; universal training in unsegregated Armed Forces; the stand of most churches against segregation, and the Negro's growing political and economic strength.

To these should be added the fact that racial discrimination conflicts with the American ideal. What Gunnar Myrdal said in 1944 is true today: "When we say that there is a Negro problem in America, what we mean is that the Americans are worried about it. It is on their minds and on their consciences."

Window Shopping for a Crimeless Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio message given by the Reverand John Coleman, D.D., Ph. D., on the Christian Amendment Hour, which broadcast is sponsored by the Christian Amendment Movement.

Dr. John Coleman, whose record is given in Who's Who in America and who has taught political philosophy in American colleges for over a third of a century, has prepared the following radio program, which is being broadcast on some 100 stations in our country. There is a series of 13 of these programs and I understand they will be sent free on request if you write to the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh 21, Pa.:

My subject is "Window-Shopping for a Crimeless Nation."

Ten years ago I talked on this subject to a number of audiences. I told them that the American people desired a land without crime but were unwilling to pay the price. They were windowshopping; they were ready to look, but not to buy, not to pay the price for a crimeless civilization.

The problem is now more pressing than it was 10 years ago. In the last 5 years the population has increased 6 percent, crime 26.7 percent. There has been an increase in the crime rate every year in the last 7. Ten years ago there was a major crime committed, one that was reported, every 20 seconds, three a minute; in 1952, there was a major crime committed every 14 seconds, more than four a minute. Ten years ago the annual cost of crime was calculated to be $13 billion; the cost in 1954 was calculated at $20 billion. That would pay off the national debt in 14 years. The figures are those of J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI.

Particularly is juvenile crime on the increase, increasing faster than adult crime. More than half of the arrests for burglary are of youths under 18, and of those, two-thirds are under 16. Their crime career does not stop when they are caught; in Philadelphia, for example, 47 percent of the juveniles become repeaters. They become professionals. The juvenile criminal of today will be the adult criminal of tomorrow. It is not only nice old ladies who say: "What is the world coming to?" Social workers, judges, legislators, our Congressmen, find the situation appalling.

Recently Billy Graham said that crime is as great a danger to the Nation as communism. It is a greater danger than communism, for the most part, attacks our Nation from without, crime from within. Nations do not perish through forces from without, but from decay from within. Crime is decay within.

One should not minimize the efforts of such organizations as the Boy and Girl Scouts, 4–H Clubs, Little Leagues, Big Brother associations, the YMCA and YWCA. The school authorities have done what they could. Yet juvenile crime increases, and as it increases, increases again through imitation.

The price of a crimeless nation is high. It requires self-denial as well as money, perhaps more than money. We must reduce, we must eliminate so far as possible, broken homes, slums, gambling, vice, drug addiction, and above all drink. Crime increases as these increase, and these increase as crime increases. As for liquor, we had prohibition once, constitutional prohibition, but Congress appropriated less money year by year for its enforcement, and some States appropriated no money at all. Since repeal more money has been spent in catching bootleggers who do not pay taxes than was spent when they were violating the Constitution. Now in press, radio, television, the liquor business advertises its wares, and at night neon signs of taverns confuse drivers on streets and highways. Intoxicants are sold in ball parks and on airlines. The Nation spends for them much more than for education, public and private.

The issue on this broadcast is "Crime," and no other single factor approaches liquor as a producer of crime. If the Nation is not willing to pay the price of eliminating this, and the other causes of crime, then, I say again, it is window shopping, and any lamentation over the increase in crime is close to hypocrisy.

What will make our Nation take the crime situation seriously? Vital Christianity. Vital Christianity will do two things. It will awaken the Nation to her peril as a Nation. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all nations that forget God" (Ps. 9:17).

Some years ago, during a discussion of this subject, a cynical student said: "All nations in the past have died; why should I worry about the death of ours?" I hope the boy has changed his mind since he has come to manhood. He also must stand one day before the judgment seat of God.

Vital Christianity will, in the second place, arouse the Nation to her great responsibility for her sons and daughters. The eternal Son of God came to earth and died for them, and we, on our part, must create for them a godly environment in which it is easy to do right and hard to do wrong. To create that environment we must deal with the problems of slums, liquor, vice, gambling, and all kindred evils, at whatever cost. These are evils that every self-respecting nation should do away with, and certainly every Christian nation. That which you do away with is the negative side: there is also a positive side.

When, after careful and nationwide deliberation, America adopts the Christian amendment, with a national acceptance of the Lord Jesus as Savior and Ruler, then our children will give to their Ruler the loyalty which the people of every nation give to a great ruler who they believe loves them, and whom they love. They will study Christ's life. His life and words will kindle their imagination; and in every way they will seek to imitate Him. It is not documents or doctrines that rule the world, but personality. The Lord Jesus is the greatest, the most dramatic, personality of all time, and in Him the Christian nation will live and move and have her being. Then will come true the words: "All nations shall call Him blessed."

This will end the secularization of our educational system. Our schools in their beginning were set up that all might read the Scriptures. At first the Bible itself was the reading book; then, when special readers began to be used, many of the selections were from the Bible; then fewer, then none. Our schools were made secular, in many States entirely so. "Secular," as the term is now used, means living and acting as though God did not exist.

For 12 years grade and high school students live in an atmosphere that is almost, or entirely, secular; modified, it is true, by the character of the teachers and by the influences of their homes, their neighborhoods, their churches, so far as they have contact with the churches; and by radio, television, movies, etc. Most of these, perhaps all but the church, are largely secular, without God. Only God's word educates the conscience. The conscience is a policeman with no salary; it is without cost, serving day and night. The conscience guides the thinking as well as the actions.

I would not quibble as to the version of the Bible that should be used; all have in them the word of God, a divine guide for living, and above all have the story of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Recently a man said that every student should have a 1-year course in the life of Abraham Lincoln, just for character education. A greater than Abraham Lincoln is found in the gospels. Abraham Lincoln himself was a great student of the Bible, often quoted from it. He said: "The Bible is the best gift which God has given to man. But for that gift we would not know right from wrong." The Bible educates the conscience.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "Almost every man who has by his life added to the sum of human achievement of which the race is proud * * * based his life upon the teachings of the Bible." The Bible educates the conscience.

And now a little longer quotation from George Washington's farewell address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morals are indispensable supports. * * * Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in the courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. * * * Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

In some schools, the children begin the day by rising and saluting the flag. Recently Congress has added two significant words, "under God." Change that to "the Lord Jesus Christ"—"one Nation under the Lord Jesus Christ." The children, with the Bible in their minds and Christ most real to them, would recite:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under the Lord Jesus Christ, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

For crime we pay, and pay, and pay; pay in money—billions of dollars; pay in fear—fear for our possessions, fear for our persons, the safety of ourselves, our wives, our husbands, our children—especially the children; pay in wasted lives, the lives of millions of men and women, who, in productive employment, would add to the Nation's wealth and happiness; pay in broken homes; pay in souls that are lost. For crime we pay and pay. We cannot afford to window-shop for a crimeless America, we must buy; buy salvation for America from the Lord Jesus Christ.

A Threat to Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a situation which, I believe, is a real threat to our democracy.

Within the shadows of the Capitol of the United States we are being treated to a spectacle so terribly reminiscent of the rise of Adolf Hitler and the fall of the German Republic as to bring shudders to all of us who believe in what our country and Constitution stand for. On the very streets of Washington, on almost every Saturday afternoon, handbills are being distributed that call for the erection of gas ovens to exterminate the Jews. Think of this—these people are calling for the mass murder of some 6 million fellow citizens just as did the infamous Hitler. He openly, and without shame, seeks to pit white man against colored man by open attempts at stark terror. He is endeavoring to stir up bigotry and race prejudice right here in Washington.

I am referring to a man named George Rockwell and his American Nazi Party who are openly advocating the destruction of the very fabric of our national being. There can be no other purpose than that. He who calls for such action is intent upon the destruction of our country and all that it has stood for these 185 years.

Rockwell and his people have been distributing this material openly and without any hindrance on the part of the police officials of this city. The laws of the District clearly state that it is forbidden to act "with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby," to act "in such a manner as to annoy, disturb, interfere with, obstruct, or be offensive to others." If this law has any meaning whatsoever, it means that such highly provocative, insulting, and fighting words uttered in crowded places are outlawed.

Very recently one of our fellow citizens of the Jewish faith, a Mr. Berman, who lives in nearby Virginia, was handed a copy of this handbill, and he responded in the only way that an American could who was being attacked—he attempted to wrest this scurrilous material from the hands of the man who was distributing it. It is ironic to note that this man, Berman, who did precisely what every American has done over the years—replied with force to a threat of force—was placed under charges. A more gruesome miscarriage of justice could not be imagined in the most fevered and deranged mind. Americans are being deprived of the right to defend themselves and their families from the threat of an awful death.

There have already been acts of violence; bombings have occurred in various parts of the country and other acts of lawlessness have been revealed. This Rockwell, the most contemptible of our civilization, is setting an example that can threaten our way of life. This we cannot, and should not, in any way, condone. If we do not put an immediate stop to these acts of terror, we are giving encouragement to the acts of a madman.

The right to free speech, which Rockwell claims, and in which the Washington police seem to concur, hardly goes so far as to protect acts of violence; it hardly goes so far as to protect an act designed to upset freedom of religion. The police power of the state is sufficient to protect itself. The self-serving protestations of Rockwell are not to the point.

It is our solemn duty to use every means at our command to remove this ugly blotch. To fail in that duty would be an act of disloyalty to the half million of our loved ones who gave their all just to stamp out this very thing. It is unthinkable that those of our beloved dead who fought to protect our freedoms have died so completely in vain.

I have indicated at least one approach to the problem in the local law which proscribes an incitement to violence but I believe that there may be others which are pertinent to this. Among the other local laws is one that requires certain formalities from those who solicit contributions. Rockwell has been soliciting such contributions.

The Charitable Contributions Act—and it is grim to think of Rockwell's requests coming under the head of charity—may be the very device which our police force here in Washington can use to suppress this menace.

Beyond a shadow of a doubt, Rockwell is disruptive to the peace and security of our Nation. He is doing vio-

lence to traditions of our country and wishes to overturn them by force. I would maintain that the actions of Rockwell may well be considered by the U.S. attorney in connection with the Smith Act.

The actions of Rockwell and perhaps other of his kind are a cancer on the body of our Nation. We here in Congress would be remiss in our duties if we did not take every step available to us to remove this ugly growth of bigotry and prejudice.

Strong, Decisive, and Realistic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have promised my constituents that as long as I am privileged to serve them I will press for a strong, decisive, and realistic foreign policy. On July 10, 1958, I spoke on the question of peace and disarmament and warned that it was necessary "to come forward with a constructive program of our own" if we were "to retain leadership in the world."

I rise now to protest two recent developments in our foreign policy. First, the administration's ill-advised decision to discontinue our moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, and more recently the President's suggestion that we provide nuclear weapons to our allies.

The entire issue of the spread of nuclear weapons is very serious. What purpose is served by making the techniques of total annihilation the common property of all? It would only increase the risk of nuclear war by accident. It would make the problems of control and inspection, already a formidable task, almost insuperable. It would be catastrophic if a nation in possession of nuclear weapons—supplied by this country—were to fall into irresponsible hands. The future of the world would hang in the balance. Our British allies are rightly agitated by this ominous prospect. Drew Middleton, London correspondent of the New York Times, reports that Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd and Defense Minister Harold Watkinson "contend that West Germany must attain the goals set for it by NATO but that it must be denied access to nuclear weapons."

Our own scientific community is gravely concerned with the dangers inherent in a nuclear giveaway program. On February 4 the Federation of American Scientists called the prospect of such a move "the most dangerous type of shortsighted opportunism," and declared that "supplying atomic weapons to our allies will make inevitable the spread of nuclear technology throughout the world and virtually doom us to the ultimate calamity of nuclear war." And let me remind the Congress that our own hearings in July 1959 revealed that approximately 68,900,000 Americans would be killed or injured in even a relatively small nuclear war.

Moreover, the President's proposal, if enacted into law, would infinitely complicate the possibility of reaching an agreement on a test ban and would serve to accelerate the perilous armaments race. As Norman Cousins, cochairman of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, has warned:

> With each additional nation coming into possession of nuclear arms, the danger of a runway situation increases. Once a nuclear match is lit anywhere the nuclear fires will burn everywhere. The resultant terror will produce not peace, but the worst case of jitters the human race has ever known.

Three out of four adult Americans favor a ban on atomic weapons testing. In December of last year the Gallup poll asked the following question:

> The United States and Russia have made an agreement to stop testing H-bombs until the end of the year. Would you like to have this agreement continued next year or not?

The results:

> For continuation of the ban on nuclear testing 77 percent; against continuation of the ban on nuclear testing 11 percent; no opinion 12 percent.

The Congress and the administration would do well to heed the wisdom of the American people. Creative leadership demands that we successfully conclude agreements to ban nuclear weapons testing and to halt the arms race. To do less is to fail in our duty.

The new approach at Geneva gives further hope that we may have an effective ban on world testing, and that we should go forward in this extremely vital area.

Loopholes in the Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an advertising brochure from Research Institute Recommendations, 589 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

This organization which publishes a reputable tax service for businessmen has come up with a number of ideas, all loopholes in the tax laws, including item No. 15 entitled "Putting a Youngster Through College on Tax Dollars."

The report, which costs $2 a month or $24 a year is obviously not within the reach of those who need assistance most to see to it that their children receive a college education.

Certainly it is not a device available to the youngster who must work his way through school.

It would appear that perhaps ideas like this may be the real reason for opposition by the administration to Federal aid to education. The executives and those in the upper tax bracket are very well capable of putting their children through college and school in part through use of tax dollars while the ordinary citizen must grub around to get the money to do this out of his income after taxes.

It would appear that things of this sort should receive attention from the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the Committee on Education and Labor which is attempting to get a Federal aid to school construction bill on the floor of Congress for a vote.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE RECOMMENDATIONS,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: One year ago an institute tax expert formulated a plan whereby a man could cut his income tax sharply by using a more tax-minded method designed especially for executives.

The tax saving seemed so incredible that several score of taxpayers agreed to put the plan to a test right on their own books, provided we furnished the method without cost or obligation.

If you are not familiar with this more tax-minded method, what follows will seem almost a tax miracle. Here's what it does:

It turns income from dividends, investments, into capital gain, taxed but half. It makes club dues and spending tax-deductible. It unfreezes cash locked in a corporation, tax-free. It pays college tuition with tax dollars, to mention but 4 of the 16 miracles this method performs.

Now that the methods are proved we are printing them up in a special report which we can send you if you return the enclosed card.

Since the cover of the report is already off the presses, we enclose one. Note in particular 4 of the 16 tax savings shown, as these seem to be 4 of the most widely wanted—see the cover:

Item No. 4: Making club dues and spending tax deductible.

Item No. 5: Dividends turned into capital gain, taxed but half.

Item No. 13: How to unfreeze cash from a corporation, tax-free.

Item No. 15: Putting a youngster through college on tax dollars.

This valuable 16-part report—"The Executive's Own Tax Methods"—was worked out by the best tax brains in this country. It was built for those realistic executives who know that if they are going to offset rising prices and a shrinking dollar, it will have to be through taxes.

This special report we send you will help you do that job.

It is offered without charge, to introduce you to the regular weekly Research Institute recommendations—the leading source of business-and-tax advice in this country.

These are the weekly recommendations which over 30,000 executives found will lift part of the taxload off their backs where all else failed.

Frankly, we felt that by offering you the special 16-part report—"The Executive's Own Tax Methods"—letting you see for yourself how it switches dollars from taxes over into net income, you could then see the type of tax-saving help you can get year-round from the regular weekly recommendations.

(Though the recommendations are weekly, they cost but $2 a month, payable annually.)

But it's only fair to tell you—

The last time we made a comparable offer—giving a new and highly effective tax-reduction method with a 1-year trial of the regular weekly Research Institute recommendations at only $2 a month—the demand far outstripped our supply.

Hence, if you want a copy of this proven method, the enclosed card should be returned at once.

Very sincerely,

BARRY C. BRIAN.

[Card not printed in RECORD.]

THE EXECUTIVE'S OWN TAX METHODS

(A special report, Research Institute recommendations, New York, N.Y.)

Contents

	Item
How to eliminate tax on ordinary income	1
An extra deduction for small companies now—when they need it	2
$100,000 tax-free life insurance for executives—no medical	3
The way to make club dues and spending tax deductible	4
The key to converting dividends into a capital gain	5
Money to a widow tax free	6
How to buy tax-exempt bonds	7
A 1-man corporation can have an employee-benefit plan	8
The size of the tax deductions other taxpayers take	9
Save taxes now with gifts effective at death	10
With repairs deductible in full—improvements not—here's your key	11
Your social security may well be worth $100,000	12
How to unfreeze cash from a corporation, tax free	13
Use "family-income splitting" for a sharply lower tax	14
How to put a youngster through college on tax dollars	15
The tax deduction for an office at home	16

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Forand Bill Meets Medical Needs of Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the February 6, 1960, ALF–CIO News, there appeared an excellent article entitled "Forand Bill Meets Medical Needs of Aged" as written by John Beidler of the AFL–CIO's legislative department.

Support, I am pleased to say, is steadily growing for some type of social security program to provide medical care to our older citizens. Last year it was my privilege to introduce a bill to provide hospitalization and nursing home benefits under our social security program to citizens who have reached the age of eligibility under our social security laws, S. 1151. I am hopeful that legislation of this type will be considered and passed by this present Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by John Beidler be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORAND BILL MEETS MEDICAL NEEDS OF AGED—BENEFITS WOULD AVERT DISASTERS OF ILLNESS

(By John Beidler)

Protection of older citizens against the human and financial disaster of prolonged illness is the most pressing social welfare problem in our Nation today.

We have, in the past, reached solutions or partial solutions for many social problems in America.

We have put a floor under wages through the Fair Labor Standards Act.

We have provided a cushion for old age through the Social Security Act.

We have established a system of unemployment compensation, also through the Social Security Act.

But for older citizens, living on small incomes, who suffer lengthy illnesses, we have done almost nothing.

Eleven million persons now draw social security pensions. A little more than a million of them are also covered by private pension plans. But the primary Federal social security benefit (on which most retirees must rely exclusively) averages only $73 a month. The maximum benefit for a retired couple, which only a small proportion of beneficiaries receive, is but $180 a month.

Out of these small sums must come rent, food, clothing, and other necessary expenses. There is no margin for huge medical expenses brought on by a stay in the hospital.

It is estimated that about 40 percent of retired persons have some form of health insurance. But how good is this insurance?

A Federal Government study in 1957 indicated that of all pensioners who had medical expenses, only 14 percent of the couples and 9 percent of the single persons drew any insurance benefits at all.

This tends to prove what the AFL–CIO and other liberal groups have asserted time and again: for retired persons, health insurance costs are unconscionably high and benefits paid by these private plans are unconscionably low.

FREQUENT CANCELLATIONS

Another fault of existing private plans is that in many cases as soon as the insured retiree draws some benefit from his insurance policy, the company cancels.

What happens to these people, and to those who have no health insurance coverage at all, when major illness strikes?

Savings, which have been painstakingly accumulated over the years to be used for some modest comforts during retirement, are lost.

If all funds are gone, the retired person may, by proving his poverty, obtain public assistance.

A final alternative, for many, is to seek the help of children or other relatives who are still employed. Unquestionably millions of these problems are solved in this way.

But none of these alternatives is a really acceptable solution to the problem. The only acceptable solution is a system to which each worker contributes, and from which he draws benefits as a matter of right with the cost distributed over his lifetime rather than depending on private insurance bought a few years before retirement.

Such a system is proposed in the Forand bill.

The Forand bill, named after its chief sponsor, Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, provides for extension of the social security system to provide hospital and skilled nursing home care and certain surgical expenses for all social security beneficiaries.

This means, in addition to retired persons, those covered would include widows with dependent children and persons who draw benefits because of total disability.

Under the Forand bill the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would administer the plan, as he does the existing social security system. Social security records would be used to determine the eligibility of individuals for benefits.

PARTICIPATION OPEN

Any qualified hospital or skilled nursing home could participate in the program. Rates for services rendered to the eligible sick would be set by agreement between the Government and the hospital or nursing home, using the kind of formulas already well developed in many Government and private plans.

The Secretary would be authorized to use voluntary organizations to help administer the program. A special proviso forbids any administering agency to interfere with the internal management of participating institutions or with the private practice of medicine.

The cost of the program would be about $1 billion a year at the start. This would be met by an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the social security taxes on employers and employees, and three-eights of 1 percent on self-employed persons. The tax would apply, as it does now, to earnings up to $4,800 a year, so that a worker would, at most, pay $12 more each year in social security taxes.

The Forand bill was first introduced in 1957, but failed to receive any positive consideration by the 85th Congress.

The bill, however, was reintroduced in the 86th Congress, and extensive hearings were held by the House Ways and Means Committee in July 1959. A large number of witnesses appeared before the committee.

Opposing the bill were:

American Medical Association.
American Dental Association.
American Pharmaceutical Association.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
National Association of Manufacturers.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
Council of State Chambers of Commerce.
Life Insurance Association of America.
National Association of Life Underwriters.
International Association of Accident and Health Underwriters.

Most of these groups also opposed the original Social Security Act.

Those who appeared to support enactment of the Forand bill included:

AFL–CIO.
American Nurses' Association.
National Association of Social Workers.
American Public Welfare Association.
National Consumers League.
National Farmers Union.
Group Health Association of America.
Council of Golden Ring Clubs of Senior Citizens.

A number of prominent physicians also supported the bill.

Dr. James P. Dixon, Jr., former health commissioner in Philadelphia, said the use of the OASI machinery would "minimize papuerism" and would "tend to keep down the ever-increasing cost of health care under public assistance and State hospital aid programs."

The medical directors of four health centers affiliated with the Clothing Workers, serving 110,000 members and their spouses, strongly recommended passage of the Forand bill. They included Dr. Morris Brand, Dr. William S. Hoffman, Dr. Joseph A. Langbord, and Dr. Julius Schwimmer.

In their testimony they declared:

"We know of no adequate remedy for the gap in our medical coverage except an equitable system of national coverage, paid for by the worker during his years of peak earning power.

"In spite of the American Medical Association's official attitude, many physicians like ourselves support the principles of the Forand bill and want it passed."

Dr. Frank F. Furstenberg, medical director of Sinai Hospital outpatient department in New York, said "it does not seem fair" that the aged "should have to be pauperized in order to get medical care," and added that Forand bill passage would make this care available as a matter of right.

The committee took no decisive action on the Forand bill after its hearings. Since the proposal is a tax measure, the Constitution requires that the bill originate in the House. Therefore, proponents of the Forand bill must secure favorable action by the House Ways and Means Committee.

The committee is expected to vote on the bill some time in March. The AFL–CIO has urged all those interested in its passage to request a favorable report by the House Ways and Means Committee.

At its San Francisco convention, the AFL–CIO unanimously approved a resolution which said, in part:

"We urge the House of Representatives to move swiftly to add Federal health benefits for OASDI (old-age and survivors and dis-

ability insurance) beneficiaries so that the Senate likewise will have time to approve this essential program in 1960. The Forand bill, H.R. 4700, provides a constructive basis through which the OASDI trust funds and contributions can be used to pay the costs of hospitalization and related types of health care for the aged and other beneficiaries.

"Through encouraging prompt preventive treatment, good quality of care, and speedy rehabilitation, a new program along these lines can remove one of the most serious causes of insecurity and suffering among our aged citizens and, at the same time, encourage constructive developments in health care."

None of those who oppose enactment of the Forand bill have come to grip with the unanswerable reality that is the core of the problem—the lack of medical protection for the aged is undermining our national goal of dignified, independent, earned retirement.

The way to provide this protection is through the retirement system itself.

Prospects for passage of the Forand bill during the present session of the Congress are complicated by the probability that the session will be a short one so that Members may be free to attend the national political conventions.

This leaves only 5 months for action.

The need for the Forand bill is clear and urgent. Whether you are retired or near retirement, whether you have aging parents whose happiness is your concern; or whether you simply recognize the social and economic importance of this problem, you can and should help to meet the need.

Write to your Congressman and Senators, urging them to support and work for the passage of H.R. 4700, the Forand bill.

The Worst Risk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in Rio de Janeiro the other day the President indicated that the United States "stands ready to devote substantial portions of the savings made possible by disarmament to vast constructive programs of peaceful development." This may be waiting too long to take the risks of peace. A column by Roscoe Drummond in the Washington Post Monday, February 22, 1960, outlines the alternative risks we face with remarkable clarity:

THE WORST RISK—DO WE DO ENOUGH TO WIN PEACE?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When we come to talk about who's taking risks with the Nation's safety, we ought to be sure we don't end up criticizing the wrong people.

Are the dangerous, heedless risk-takers the President, the Secretary of Defense, and other officials of the administration who are being upbraided by the Democratic leadership for not being willing to spend more than $41 billion a year to prevent war?

Or does this serious charge really belong on the heads, of others—those Democrats, who readily condemn the President for not spending enough on the military side of our foreign policy, and those Republicans who, together, set out each year to undercut the economic side of our foreign policy.

What is the paramount danger which faces the United States today? Is it the missile gap or our inferiority in outer space?

Does the paramount risk come from our not doing enough to win the peace?

Does it come from doing too little to win the economic contest through which Khrushchev has vowed he will "bury us"?

It is foolish to pretend that there will not be some risks even if we do everything in all directions at once. There would still be risks. Take, for example, the President's decision not to put the Strategic Air Command on a continuous air alert with bombers in the sky all the time. This is a calculated risk. It is based in part on the intelligence that there is no evidence that the Soviets are preparing to launch an attack. It might be better to put SAC on an air alert; it might be better to put more money faster into ICBM's. The President deems these risks prudent to take.

But the Democrats who are most vociferous in attacking the administration for taking any risks at all, and those Republicans who are prepared to join in trying to hack up the program to help the underdeveloped nations win the battle over abject poverty without resorting to communism—these people are taking the most perilous risk of all.

What is the intelligence on which this judgment is based? It is:

That the Soviet Union has no desire and shows no sign of wishing to jeopardize everything it has by engaging in a nuclear holocaust.

That the Khrushchev regime is convinced that the most effective means of spreading communism is to expand its own economic aid program abroad and to show such spectacular industrial and scientific achievements at home that the case for communism will, as Mr. K. sees it, be compulsive.

That the Soviets are mounting a formidable economic offensive.

I am not arguing that we should let down our guard militarily. I am not arguing that we should not be putting somewhat more into defense and into outer space. What I am suggesting is that if we have to choose between strengthening our capacity to deter nuclear war and our capacity to win the peace, the far greater risk today is to do too little too slowly in helping the newly independent poorer nations to develop their economic sinews.

This year the President is asking Congress to put $4.1 billion into military and economic aid. Already there are those who are reaching for their hatchets and knives. Obviously there can be honest disagreement over whether this is exactly the right figure, but from those who want to spend less instead of more to win the economic contest for keeps to which Khrushchev challenges us, let us hear no more about gambling with the safety of the United States. They are inviting us to take the worst risk of all—the awful risk of not doing enough to win the peace.

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN E. LONG
OF HAWAII
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Leonard Andaya, a senior at Maui High School, has been selected as the winner of the Voice of Democracy contest in the State of Hawaii. Young Andaya is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Alejo Andaya, 80 Kane Street, Kahului, Maui. I ask unanimous consent that Andaya's inspiring speech, which won first place in Hawaii, be printed in the Appendix of of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Leonard Ardaya)

Hawaii, the 50th State, bids Washington, Michigan, Florida, Maine, and all other sister States a fond aloha. When Hawaii finally became part of the grand Union, people thought that the only thing she could contribute was her beauty. This isn't entirely wrong. There is a beauty in Hawaii which pulsates in the heart of every true American and which moved me to speak so praisingly for it.

This is my story, a story of democracy. This is democracy as I saw it functioning in the everyday things that are usually neglected in the telling of something important such as democracy.

My story has neither an outstanding event nor a patriotic happening as a central theme for the constructing of a beautiful picture of democracy. However, beauty appears in many forms. I see the beauty of democracy in the simple things I do from day to day. For example this past week. On Monday I met with my class counselor to discuss the opportunities in the U.S. Diplomatic Corps, the colleges which offer the best preparation for this type of work, and similar questions. My counselor offered suggestions, but I made the final decisions. It was my privilege to choose the college I would most like to attend, and the course of study I would most want to follow. Here, the beauty of democracy is expressed in the idea of being able to use one's own mind and to use it well.

On Tuesday we had our regular student council meeting. Representatives of the student body met to discuss problems and to formulate good policies. These meetings are primarily intended to teach us how to deal with problems and handle responsibilities. Here, a person is encouraged to think and express his ideas and opinions, for the more a person thinks, the better will he be equipped to cope with the problems of our society. Apparent at this meeting were several rights that we enjoy: the right to gather and to discuss problems, and the right of each person to say what he wants to say. This is another interesting beauty of democracy.

On Wednesday I attended a meeting of the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council. In this groups, we discuss our foreign policy and compare the advantages and disadvantages of different political systems. In trying to find solutions to problems facing our Nation today, sometimes our ideas are considered seriously by those who formulate our foreign policy. Here again democracy appears in our everyday affairs. We have the right to question the policies of the government and to know what's happening behind the scenes. But most important of all, we have the privilege of suggesting improvements in policies made.

Thursday, Friday, and Saturday were pretty uneventful last week. Those days I caught up with the latest happenings on the world scene and read the differing comments on the editorial pages of the two daily newspapers. I enjoy the editorial pages very much mainly because I know that the comments were not censored and actually do reflect the thinking of the writer. Our newspapers print the news that they feel would interest the public. They aren't restricted and subject to constant censorship * * * and so speaks democracy.

Democracy is prevalent everywhere, and the acme of democracy, without doubt, is the religious life of the people. Everyday, but

especially on Sunday, I find time to praise and thank this Supreme Being for the many blessings and freedoms I now have. Every Sunday my doubts on the future of our democractic Nation are dispelled because of the way I've seen people put their trust in God. This is the most beautiful part of democracy.

This, then, is my story of democracy. I've seen its beauty through simple, ordinary happening; I've felt its effect on my daily life. Believe me, democracy is beautiful and we, the people of Hawaii, are proud to contribute to this beauty as a showcase for America.

The Questionable Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wall Street Journal of this morning.

I condemn the action taken in the use of the lie detector to ascertain whether or not an employee of the Internal Revenue Department had given information to a U.S. Senator.

I am glad assurance has been given by the Internal Revenue Service that such action will not be taken hereafter but should this occur again strong action should be taken by the Congress to prevent such a procedure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1960]

THE QUESTIONABLE PROCEDURE

Delaware's Senator WILLIAMS is a quiet man who speaks out publicly so seldom that when he does his colleagues sit up straight and listen.

So it was a few years ago when the Senator's quiet way of exposing graft and corruption shook up the whole Internal Revenue Bureau during the Truman administration, and touched not only the Justice Department's Tax Division but the White House staff itself.

Now Mr. WILLIAMS has spoken up again. This time he reveals that the Internal Revenue Service has been forcing its people to submit to lie detector tests in an effort to learn who gave the Senator information.

This happened, the Senator says not under the Truman administration but 2 years or so ago under the Eisenhower administration. He learned about it when one IRS employee refused to take the test on the ground that it was a degrading procedure. The man was fired, and the Senator says that though the man's record shows he was ousted for insubordination there isn't much question why he was forced out.

One irony in this case is that the man who was fired had never given the Senator any information whatsoever. But a greater irony is that the IRS was not employing a highly questionable procedure in an effort to uncover wrongdoing in the service; it was trying to prevent the Senator from uncovering wrongdoing by terrorizing its own employees.

It is true that when higher-ups in the Treasury Department learned what was going on, they immediately put a stop to the lie detector procedure.

But that, it seems to us, is only a first necessary step. The next one clearly indicated is a full-dress investigation into why somebody in the tax collecting service thought it so important to prevent its employees from disclosing information to a U.S. Senator.

Atlantic Community Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the light of the Communist economic challenge on the global front, the necessity of an effective policy for strengthening the national economies of the non-Communist world, becomes an increasingly important factor in our policymaking and planning.

Economically, a closer integration of free-world economies—on a mutually-beneficial basis—will help to present a stronger bulwark against the penetrative efforts of Communists to infiltrate through the trade routes.

Today, the nations of the North Atlantic Community represent a substantial output of the world.

We recognize, however, that adapting policies to create closer economic unity carries with it difficult, complex problems. Each nation has the task of protecting its domestic industries while, at the same time, attempting to cooperate as fully as possible with other countries in expanding trade—the economic lifeblood of the free world.

Recently, the Economic World published an informative article entitled "Atlantic Community Background," outlining the progress among non-Communist nations toward greater cooperation.

Containing also background information on general economic development in the Atlantic Community, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of tahe RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Economic World, February 1960]

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

MARSHALL PLAN SEEN AT ROOT OF NEW MOVES

The new move to coordinate economic policies in the North Atlantic community is the latest chapter in a story that goes back to the days of the Marshall plan. It is the story of more than a decade of steady growth in economic cooperation and integration.

Following is a brief chronology of the establishment of new institutions to deal with the new economics of the postwar world.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight

The Organiation for European Economic Cooperation was established to plan the allocation and use of Marshall plan funds on the basis of joint analysis by all member countries of the needs of each individual country. Original membership was 16 nations—since expanded to 18 with the admission of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Spain. The United States and Canada are informal, nonvoting members.

Benelux was established to bring about a customs union of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Nineteen hundred and fifty

The European Payments Union was established under OEEC to settle multilateral trade balances among member nations to obviate the need for separate balancing of accounts between each pair of countries. This has since been replaced by the European Monetary Agreement.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one

The European Coal and Steel Community was established to pool the coal, steel, iron ore, and scrap resources of France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg to serve a single market without restrictive barriers. It was the first step toward the integration of the economies of the "Six."

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three

The European Productivity Agency was established within the framework of OEEC to conduct research, prepare studies, and serve as a clearinghouse to stimulate increases in output-per-man-hour in European industry and agriculture.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine

The European Atomic Energy Community was established by the Six for the common development of their atomic energy resources.

The European Economic Community came into being to develop a Common Market without tariff or quota restrictions; to develop common agricultural and transport policies; to provide for free interchange of capital, labor, and services; and to harmonize wage rates, social welfare benefits, and fiscal and monetary policies. Subordinate institutions are the European Social Fund to compensate for economic injuries caused by the integration of the six national economies; the European Investment Bank to make development loans within the Community; and the Development Fund for oversea countries and territories to provide supplemental grants for economic growth in the overseas territories. The Community is governed by a commission, an assembly which soon will be elected by popular vote, and a seven-man European court.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine

The European Free Trade Association—the so-called Outer Seven—was established to eliminate tariff and quota restrictions among its members on the same schedule as the Common Market, but without establishing a common external tariff structure and without the other steps toward economic integration which characterize the aims of the six.

AREA'S OUTPUT BIG PART OF WORLD'S TOTAL

The 20 nations of the North Atlantic Community represent the overwhelming bulk of the industrially developed countries of the non-Communist world.

The United States, of course, has the greatest concentration of industry in the world; and the six nations of the rapidly integrating European Economic Community have the second greatest industrial complex producing for a market almost as large as the United States and larger when the oversea members of the Common Market area are included.

When the other Western European nations are added in with the United States and Canada, the economies of the North Atlantic Community between them are producing goods and services at a rate of over $700 billion annually. Together they account for some 70 percent of the steel production of the entire world.

In recent years, the OEEC countries—Western Europe plus the United Kingdom—have been growing economically at an annual rate of between 4 and 5 percent. In the 5 years between 1953 and 1958, industrial output increased by about one-third.

During the same period, national income in Canada expanded by 13 percent—at an annual rate of about 2 percent. Comparative growth in the United States was 7 percent—an annual rate of between 1 and 2 percent.

If the nations of the North Atlantic Community succeed in coordinating their foreign trade policies, their decisions will apply to some three-quarters of the international commerce of the non-Communist world. Based on imports, the OEEC nations together conduct nearly 45 percent of the free world's foreign trade.

The combined population of the North Atlantic area is over half a billion people—less than 30 percent of the population of the non-Communist world, but by far the world's greatest pool of skilled labor.

If Japan is added to the proposed new grouping, this will bring in the industrial, trade, and manpower resources of the only advanced industrial economy of the Far East.

Apart from the activities of the Communist bloc, almost all of the economic and technical assistance which has been flowing to the low-income areas has been provided by the North Atlantic Community.

According to the U.N. and other sources, 11 of the 18 members of the OEEC furnished economic assistance to the low-income world in 1957-58. Their combined disbursements of grants and loans during that year totaled just over $1 billion. At the same time, the United States was making economic assistance expenditures, including defense support, of $1.7 billion and Canada's aid expenditures were about $61 million—making a combined flow of aid for economic growth in the less developed areas of over $2.8 billion.

ROLE OF THE WISE MEN

Special teams of wise men—named to work out specific but thorny international problems—have played an important role at several points in the evolution of Atlantic cooperation since the end of World War II.

Proponents of the wise-men device say it has two principal advantages over traditional international negotiations.

The first derives from the fact that while the wise men are respected nations of the principal negotiating countries, they do not represent governments in their wise men capacities; and therefore are not restricted by official government positions and do not have to defer to the formal machinery of governments on each point of agreement or disagreement.

The second asset claimed for the wise men technique is that members of the small teams are technically qualified to deal with the broad subject at hand but are not required to cope with the fine points that tend to obstruct agreement in normal negotiations between experts of several nations.

The main idea is that the wise men—thus unencumbered—can consult government leaders and technical specialists but use independent judgment in putting their prestige behind an agreement on general principles.

Two teams of wise men currently are at work. The first—appointed by the special economic conference in Paris last month—is preparing recommendations for a new and broader organization to replace the OEEC and provide a forum for the coordination of North Atlantic policy on trade and aid to the less developed world. Members are Randolph Burgess, U.S. Ambassador to NATO; Sir Paul Gore-Booth, Permanent Under Secretary of the British Foreign Office, Bernard Clappier, of the French Minister of Finance; and Xenophon Zolotas, Governor of the Bank of Greece. Their recommendations are to be made to the second session of the special economic conference scheduled to meet in April.

The other team of wise men—appointed by the World Bank—leaves this month for several weeks in India and Pakistan to study the possibility of an international approach to India's need for foreign exchange to finance needed imports during the third 5-year plan now in the final process of formulation, and to help launch Pakistan on the road to rapid economic growth. Members are Allen Sproule, former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank; Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyd's Bank of London; and Herman Abs, head of the Deutsche Bank.

Last use of the wise men technique was to study the energy resources and needs of the European community and recommend a program of atomic energy development for Euratom.

Action Needed in Most Dangerous Period in World History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the congressional concern for peace has been effectively reported by Frederick Burdick, editor of Gist, who writes a report for Congressmen in his recent editorial report—volume 18, No. 4—which said in part:

ACTION NEEDED IN MOST DANGEROUS PERIOD IN WORLD HISTORY

(By Frederick Burdick)

Exhaustive research and analysis of negotiations during the past 14 years for attaining agreement on disarmament progress discloses that the major causes of deadlock have been suspicions, fears, and military rivalries.

The world has been surfeited with floods of peace talk but has witnessed a dearth of peace action. Literally millions of words have been spoken since the end of World War II in legislative halls, around conference tables, and over airways about the blessings and desirability of peace.

However, no major, actual, substantial steps have been taken in the direction of armaments control except hesitant, precarious, uncertain cessation of atomic bomb tests.

Objectively analyzed, the spirit of catching up and other delaying tactics are exceedingly dangerous, unrealistic, ephemeral and evidences of wishful thinking. Instead of time being on our side some authorities admit that the opposite is the case. It is wise to face facts.

Also, the idea of arming former enemy nations with nuclear weapons is extremely dangerous in the light of historical facts. One has but to reflect just a moment about Pearl Harbor and the sudden attacks on Poland, Belgium, and France at the start of World War II, and witness what is happening in other parts of the world to realize how unsafe it is to think that just handing a man a gun guarantees that he will not use it later against the giver.

Who knows which countries could be certain to stand by us in a future war? The very uncertainty of conditions in various nations constitutes one of the most vital and pressing reasons why we should prepare for and advance toward world peace. There also is the danger of war by accident or incident, and by false reports, requiring effective, scientific, objective inspection systems. Day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year and decade after decade the nightmare of war fears have permeated the minds of people. For the sake of ending mental cruelty the cold war inflicts upon millions of mothers throughout the world in particular, an end should be made to war preparations as soon as possible and sincere, persistent efforts made to hasten the dawn of world peace.

Albert Einstein warned years ago that a modern war might poison the earth's atmosphere to the extent that all breathing things would perish. Realistic reasoning and logic warn that the only foresighted and rational course to pursue which will be justified by historians and future generations is to cease procrastination, end the arms race and go to the aid of the millions of men, women and children in many lands who are on the point of starvation, and lack even the rudiments of human comforts.

This world can be transformed into a virtual paradise by actually turning away from the dark, fearsome, threatening, haunting, dangerous highway which could lead to nuclear annihilation for the human race and turn instead onto the road which leads to world peace, progress and prosperity for people everywhere.

Instead of chancing use of pushbuttons which could leave the world in ruins, policymakers should push buttons which will put the peace-preserving machinery of the U.N. into action

The first move should be turn over to the United Nations, as is favored by a majority of American lawmakers, the task of ending the arms race, establishing an effective inspection system and then proceeding, step by step, toward the golden age of peace on earth.

Congressmen returning from their contacts with the people say they are more concerned about the arms race and real progress toward peace than any other issue. It well may prove a vital one in the approaching election campaign.

Turning Point in History?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe a new element of hope has entered the Geneva negotiations on a nuclear test ban. The Russians have declared they will permit international inspectors to investigate a limited number of underground disturbances which cannot be identified with present seismographic devices. This may be a cynical tactic or a propaganda play, but it may be more. We cannot afford to leave a radioactive stone unturned in our quest for genuine arms control with reasonable safeguards.

The Washington Post, and other influential newspapers, have warned us not to let extravagant preoccupation with the remote possibilities of evasion stand in the way of chances for compromise on a system which, if not perfect, would be reasonably satisfactory.

I have constantly maintained that there is no such thing as a perfect inspection system. What we need are reasonable safeguards, safeguards which will disclose any serious cheating. In international affairs, just as in domestic society, inspection is a substitute for trust.

Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau in a letter to the Washington Post, February 23, 1960, says the new Russian concession at Geneva may be a radical change from their former stand, motivated by a new recognition of the horror of nuclear weapons and their desire to survive. I ask unanimous consent that the remarkable letter of this distinguished student of world politics be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet Union has just made another concession in the Geneva negotiations on the cessation of atomic tests. It has declared its willingness to allow international inspection of a limited number of underground disturbances whose nature cannot be identified with the presently available seismographic equipment.

This concession follows a number of others concerning international inspection and control on Russian territory, which together constitute a radical departure from past Soviet attitudes. Speculation is of course rife about the reasons why the Russians are taking this unprecedented attitude, which has been explained primarily in terms of propagandistic and military tactics.

I have been myself consistently suspicious of Soviet intentions and have raised my pen against the spirit of Geneva of 1955 and the spirit of Camp David of 1959 as soon as they transpired. I have but recently in a series of articles advanced the proposition that Khrushchev is more dangerous an antagonist and more difficult to negotiate with than was Stalin. But I have always credited the leaders of the Soviet Union with a sense of reality.

A realistic evaluation of the world scene has convinced me since 1955 that if the nuclear armaments race cannot be brought under control before any number of nations will have nuclear weapons, only a miracle will save mankind. The controlled cessation of atomic tests is a first small step in the direction of the control of the atomic armaments race itself.

If the United States and the Soviet Union cannot agree on this, they will not be able to agree on anything else in this field. We are standing therefore at a turning point in the history of the world. If we fail here we have in all likelihood sealed our and mankind's doom, and the only issue remaining to be settled will be how and when we shall be doomed.

Is it farfetched to assume that the Russian leaders are aware of what most knowledgeable observers outside the Soviet Union know, and that they have radically changed their position with regard to international control and inspection on their territory because they want to survive?

This explanation, I admit, is simple and lacks in that elaborate and improbable sophistication with which some Soviet experts like to make things complicated and hence, unmanageable. But it may well be worthy of some consideration by that unfortunate interdepartmental committee which, for lack of guidance from above, must hammer out as best it can our policy on this momentous issue.

WASHINGTON. HANS J. MORGENTHAU.

Sudden Awakening?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a column written by Jerry Gabriel in a recent issue of the New Era, Reading, Pa.

SUDDEN AWAKENING?

(By Jerry Gabriel)

The Saturday Evening Post (Feb. 6, 1960) with its usual aplomb and dignity (?) editorializes this week on the following: "Why Must Business Leaders in Politics Be so Neutral?" I don't always read the Post editorials, but this heading intrigued me. First, the thought crossed my mind that somebody must be kidding. Since when have business leaders in politics been neutral? I decided to absorb this revelation.

The writer, Charles W. White, points out that he "is one who has been active in typical big-city campaigns in Indiana," which qualifies him (I suppose) as somewhat of an oracle in these matters. At least the Post must think so.

Anyway, he begins by alluding to last year as being one in which the businessman in politics movement fell flat on its face even though it had a most exuberant start. Then he states that the Republican Party "took a shellacking in Indiana as it did in most States."

Now this is significant to me because in his second paragraph he has already contradicted the heading on the editorial. Does he mean that business leaders are "neutral" Republicans? I guess so.

Then he gets to the core of the issue. He quotes a publicity release from a "corporate statesman" (wow) which says in effect that folks should not get the impression that businessmen are out to clobber labor at the polls—all they want is for all groups to be fairly represented. Mr. White then proceeds to point out what he calls the truth, "corporate enterprise does have a legitimate ax to grind concerning labor political domination." Then he proceeds to spank Cope for fighting corporations, for endorsing Democratic candidates, for contributing to their campaign funds and for supplying cars and workers at the polls.

Then he says, "if business fellows were frank about what they stand for and why, they could persuade many workingmen and women to come along." In other words it ain't nice for us to do it but it is OK if they do it. Holy mackerel, I'm crying.

The balance of Mr. White's opus is devoted to eulogizing the political action efforts of General Electric, Republic Steel, Gulf Oil, and the Ford Motor Co.

Here is the "payola" statement. After pointing out the merits of the above mentioned firms in their approach, brother White says, "[this] is a far more sensible approach than stirring up junior executives about politics and patriotism, and then failing to suggest which side their bread is buttered on." In other words, be neutral as heck, but buddy, if you like your job in this outfit you better pull the right lever at the polling place.

Now, friends, with this pitch in mind, I ask you, if all these "businessmen" were put in a paper bag, shook up, then turned upside down, how many "politically neutral" fellows do you think would drop out of the bag? Right. You're absolutely right, and don't forget it when election time rolls around.

National Brainwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by Samuel B. Gach, publisher of the California Jewish Voice, entitled "National Brainwash," dealing with the issue of our Nation's defenses, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the California Jewish Voice, Feb. 12, 1960]

NATIONAL BRAINWASH

(By Samuel B. Gach)

Fantastic is as close an adjective with which, in this historical daze, I can come up with to describe America's present dilemma. Admittedly, the Madison Avenue, soap hucksters did a bangup job in 1952, when the domestic tories commissioned the gray flannel boys to create consumer's acceptance for the product Eisenhower.

So good a job was it that the quiz boys reflexed the minds of simple, naive America to the extent that when the name Eisenhower was read or heard a father image was instantaneously conjured up, with the conviction tagged on that Ike was the omnipotent who knew all and could do no wrong.

This writer most certainly bears the hucksters no grudge, because all they did was, in the strictest sense, a job for which an advertising agency is in business * * * to create a desire in the minds of the public to buy the client's product. The question of veracity, value, idealism has no place in the planning of a national selling campaign when a product is being discussed in the inner sanctum of an ad agency. To some extent they can be excused.

It is an entirely different matter, however, when year after year we are treated to the outrageous spectacle of the degeneracy of most of the national daily press and the slick stock weekly magazines. Not only have they perpetuated the Madison Avenue hoax about the father image, and thrown objectivity into the wastebasket, but they went one step further: In covering for Ike these past 8 years they led the public to believe that with the advent of Eisenhower the infallible, we actually have been privileged to witness the "second coming."

Lack of space prohibits taking apart item by item the mendacious apologia with which the above mentioned purveyors of news and comment hid from public view the fact that Eisenhower was not only a very ordinary man, not overly endowed with brilliance, but rather an easy going, vacation loving, nonreading, ill-informed, and very mediocre Chief Executive.

We shall therefore discuss the most serious of the series of journalistic crimes—their brass check handling of our defense bind, and their attempts to focus blame on politics for our sorry position as second class world power, rather than truthfully place the blame on the man who should have known better, but let us slide for 8 long years.

General Taylor, General Medaris, and a host of other Army, rocket and missile experts, have testified that we are at present in a seriously vulnerable position; that the Soviet is far ahead of us, and that there is little chance for us ever to catch up.

To counteract this damaging evidence of too little too late under the rule of a former great general, the kept press strung smash headlines across their front pages quoting Ike's boast that he knew more about weapons and armaments than any man in this country.

All we can ascertain is that Ike has left all planning and defense to his various Chiefs of Staff and required from them only reports—and brief at that. Of course the ex-general is acquainted with conventional weapons. But they are as outmoded as would be the *Mayflower* against a modern destroyer. The only weapon we know that Ike is thoroughly familiar with these past 8 years is a quail killer. He actually drooled like a boy with a new shotgun when this week the Chief made his first visit to the U.S. missile installation at Cape Canaveral.

And secondly, Newsweek, still covering for Ike, gaily stated in the current issue that the opposing political party hopes to plant a doubt (about our defense) that could grow fast in the public mind and any worsening of the world situation might shake publice confidence in Ike's judgment in general.

Holy mackeral. This, in the face of even Allen Dulles' testimony from Central Intelligence, that Secretary of Defense Gates, who speaks as does Eisenhower, has given the Nation tranquilizing testimony instead of harsh facts.

Free Election for Germany—A Foundation of Western Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the time draws nearer for the upcoming summit meeting, the world spotlight focuses again on the task of resolving the East-West differences relating to ultimate reunification of Germany.

There are, of course, a wide variety of complex factors for which solutions must be found.

Fundamentally, however, the German people must be allowed the right of self-determination in selecting their system of government for the future. This principle has been—and should remain—the foundation of Western policy.

We recognize, of course, that—as in the past—the Soviet Union can be expected to oppose such a proposal. The reason is obvious: that is, that they just can't expect to win a free election.

Nevertheless, I believe the Western Powers must reaffirm their adherence to the principle of providing the people of Germany the opportunity to select—under supervised elections—their own political system. The purpose of a supervisory body of international status—would be to assure noninterference by the Communists in the elective process.

The effort would accomplish the following objectives:

First. If adopted, it certainly would provide the most desirable way of determining the future of Germany.

Second. If Soviet opposition prevents the election, it would put the free world again on record as being in favor of government by self-determination, rather than allowing the superimposing of a system of government by an outside power; and

Third. It would put the Soviet Union again in the position—in the eyes of the world—of being opposed to a free choice of government by the German people.

In view of the growing nationalistic trend throughout the world, it would be particularly timely, I believe, to again acclaim what we historically believe is a birthright—that is, the privilege of a people to select and operate their own social, economic, and political systems.

As the Western Powers seek to find ways and means for making progress toward settling, not only the question of Berlin, but of all German reunification, I believe we certainly cannot overlook this opportunity to reaffirm our belief in the essential value of ultimate free elections in Germany.

Recently, the New York Times published an article by an outstanding writer, James Reston, entitled "U.S. May Urge Plebiscite in East and West Germany."

Reflecting a number of factors involved in the approval of Germany reunification, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1960]

UNITED STATES MAY URGE PLEBISCITE IN EAST AND WEST GERMANY

WASHINGTON, February 23.—The U.S. Government is seriously considering a new proposal designed to break the long stalemate with the Soviet Union over the future of Germany. This is to suggest to Premier Khrushchev at the summit meeting in May that a plebiscite be held in both parts of Germany to determine whether the German people favor the Western plan or the Soviet plan for the future of the country.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter is reported to favor this procedure and has asked Chancellor Adenauer, of West Germany, and the British and French to consider it. It is understood that the West Germans are willing to have the question discussed at the summit.

[Diplomatic sources in London said Tuesday that intervention by the heads of the Western governments or by their Foreign Ministers would be necessary to reconcile Western policies for the summit conference.]

GIST OF THE WESTERN PLAN

The Western plan for Germany's future, put forward in a long series of meetings at the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva last summer, proposes, first, the formation of an all-German Government after internationally supervised free elections. It would recognize Germany's right to retain or abolish security arrangements with the West.

The Soviet plan would arrange for separate peace treaties with Communist East Germany and the West German Federal Republic, establish a demilitarized free city of Berlin, and leave it to the two Germanys to try to settle their future as a neutralized state, strictly limited in national armaments.

U.N. WOULD SUPERVISE VOTE

Andrei A. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, categorically rejected the Western plan at Geneva. Secretary Herter suggested that the title of the Soviet proposal should be "Soviet treaty for the permanent partition of Germany." The British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, called it a device to assure the "enforced neutrality" of Germany.

For the last few weeks, in the preparatory talks for the summit meeting, the Western Powers have been seeking ways to end this impasse. This is why Secretary Herter has suggested the plebiscite proposal.

His principle is that the Germans themselves should have the opportunity to resolve the question of how to proceed especially since Moscow has been emphasizing that the Big Four should sign peace treaties with both Germanys and then leave it to the Germans to settle their differences without outside interference.

Under Mr. Herter's proposal, the United Nations would be asked to supervise the proposed plebiscite and Mr. Khrushchev would be asked to support the principle he defined in his speech at the end of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow February 5, 1959.

At that time the Soviet Premier stated:

"Every nation must decide for itself which social system suits it. When it decides, it is its own business.

"Nor do we object to the so-called free elections that are spoken about so much in the Western countries, if the Germans of the two German states agree to conduct elections without the interference of a third party.

"We can indeed assume that the Germans will at some time want to conduct free elections to abolish the capitalist system in West Germany."

In recent weeks, however, Mr. Khrushchev has apparently drawn a distinction between allowing the principle of self-determination in social and economic systems on the one hand and political systems on the other. He is opposed to self-determination for the latter.

When President Giovanni Gronchi, of Italy, was in Moscow this month, he asked Mr. Khrushchev what he thought of putting the Soviet proposal for a demilitarized free city of Berlin up to the people of that city in a plebiscite.

ADENAUER REPORTED REPLY

According to Chancellor Adenauer, who reported this question to his Parliament, Premier Khrushchev replied that West Berlin could chose the economic and social system it wanted but that the principle of self-determination could not apply to the city's future political status.

The citizens of West Germany and West Berlin far outnumber the citizens of East Germany and East Berlin. This is undoubtedly the main reason why the Russians are unlikely to accept Secretary Herter's proposal.

Nevertheless, the U.S. Government feels that the principle of self-determination should be defended in deciding the future of Germany. The United States did not do so in Vietnam, and Moscow is not likely to accept the idea in Germany, but it will at least provide a new basis for discussion of the question in the preliminary summit talks.

Deductibility of Tuition Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of my intense interest in this matter and my need for reminding the Con-

gress of its obligation in this field, I am placing in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. William H. Vander Vliet, principal, Calvin Christian School, South Holland, Ill., on the subject of deductibility of tuition costs paid by parents to educate their children in church affiliated schools.

The letter follows:

CALVIN CHRISTIAN SCHOOL,
South Holland, Ill., February 12, 1960.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DERWINSKI: The subject of this letter is not a new one, to be sure. It regards deductibility of tuition costs, which are paid by parents to educate their children in a parentally controlled church-affiliated private school such as the one which we operate, from gross income.

We would request your kind attention to the following bases for justification of the above mentioned problem:

1. Private Christian schools perform a service to society.

2. Discrimination exists under the present law:

(a) Parochial schools: Parents pay tuition money to the church and it is, therefore, deductible.

(b) A variety of plans are being used for deduction.

(c) Property taxes (revenue financing public schools) is deductible for all, but only parents who do not have children in a Christian school may deduct contributions to that school.

3. Tuition is technically a sum of money assessed to parents for the privilege of enrolling children in a Christian school.

4. Deductibility meets the spirit and intent of the law.

Since our type of private school is in essence of spirituality, philosophy, and curriculum a parochial school, direct church control excepted; since it derives part of the funds for its operation from the various Reformed churches in the area; and since 99 percent of its student body are members of these same churches; our situation is a rather unique one. Financially, the framework of the organization of our schools is more closely related to that of the parochial schools than the other private schools in our Nation.

On the basis of the foregoing, we would, therefore, submit for your consideration the following possible solutions:

1. Introduction of a bill into Congress similar to bill H.R. 645 which would alow tuition deductibility from gross income.

2. Readjustment of the intent of, or reinterpretation of the law in re the financial structure of our schools.

3. Reorganization of the financial structure of our schools re support.

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions which men like you may have made or will make in our behalf. We sincerely hope that your decisions may always be made for the welfare of our country and to the glory of God.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM H. VANDER VLIET,
Principal.

Wilderness Wish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to introduce into the RECORD an editorial from the Record-Courier of my hometown of Baker, Oreg. This editorial deals with the controversial question of wilderness preservation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier, Feb. 11, 1960]

WILDERNESS WISH

Too many persons criticize the efforts of some to preserve primitive, wild, and wilderness areas without understanding the basic drive which motivates the efforts.

The relaxation and seclusion of spots isolated from the pressures of society are almost a prescription for well-being. Lucky are those who pursue such sojourns often as weekend pastimes. Even fortunate are those who can do so and get escape for a week or two during vacation, summer or winter.

But unaware of the benefit are the million who do not realize that many of the ills of their own bodies and their own impatient and intolerant attitudes and viewpoints in meeting the economic and political problems of the day are due to a failure to relax and achieve new perspective.

Thus we have thousands who realize the value of natural retreats and potentially thousands more. Even doctors are leading the parade of escape from city congestion and innumerable of them are retreating as far from a telephone as they can get 1 and 2 days a week, and there are many workers who operate under greater pressure, so that as time goes on the wish for wilderness will increase.

Also, the critics of this fundamental conservation fail to realize that some of the drive for wilderness principles is motivated by the uncalled-for desecration of our surroundings of daily living. A sense of beauty within cities and towns, highways, and roadways views free of the pollution of man-made billboards, opportunities to breath unpolluted air or boat or swim in unpolluted streams—all of these things mean that man in desperation is seeking some protection from complete annihilation of natural and aesthetic values. The wish for wilderness is growing. It need not be a major threat to any commercial values because sufficient areas are already in reasonably primitive state if their management and administration and permanence can be assured, and if in our hourly and daily living we can also enjoy some of the freshness that we can't drink in sufficiently only 1 week a year.

Federal Legislative Objectives of American Public Welfare Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Public Welfare Association does a wonderful job of defining the welfare needs of the American people. The board of directors of this association has approved a comprehensive list of goals for legislative action in 1960 to meet these welfare needs.

Congress should give very serious attention to this list. It concerns problems affecting millions of Americans directly and ultimately the welfare of us all in the United States.

I am delighted that the Senate has already acted on legislation to help control and prevent juvenile delinquency, as recommended by the association. I hope this Congress will act soon on other important welfare measures listed by the association.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement and list of legislative objectives of the American Public Welfare Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES — AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION, 1960

The American Public Welfare Association believes that the States and their political subdivisions have the primary responsibility for developing and administering effective public welfare services in the United States. The Federal Government has the obligation to develop nationwide goals and to use its constitutional taxing power to equalize the financing of public welfare so that public-welfare services may be available on a reasonably equitable basis throughout the country. The States, their political subdivisions, and the Federal Government, in cooperation, must provide the leadership and the professional and technical personnel to carry out these obligations. The association's legislative objectives are based on these premises and on the recognition of the importance of preserving and strengthening family life, encouraging self-responsibility, and assuring humanitarian concern for individuals and families.

To accomplish these purposes the association believes that—

Contributory social insurance is a preferable governmental method of protecting individuals and their families against loss of income due to unemployment, sickness, disability, death of the family breadwinner, and retirement in old age;

Public welfare programs should provide effective services to all who require them including financial assistance and preventive, protective, and rehabilitative services, and these services should be available to all persons without regard to residence, settlement, or citizenship requirements;

The benefits of modern medical science should be available to all; and to the extent that individuals cannot secure them for themselves governmental or other social measures should assure their availability; and

Democracy has a special obligation to assure to all the Nation's children full and equitable opportunity for family life, healthy growth, and maximum utilization of their potentialities.

These general principles are amplified in other policy statements approved by the Board of Directors of the association. The welfare policy committee of the association has reviewed all of these statements in the light of current needs and has developed specific legislative objectives for 1960. While the following list does not include all of the association's policy positions, it presents in condensed form those immediate and longer range legislative objectives which are most likely to be of current significance in improving public welfare services.

PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAMS

Scope of program

1. The comprehensive nature of public welfare responsibility should be recognized through Federal grants-in-aid which will enable the States to provide not only financial assistance (including medical care) and other services for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children, but also gen-

eral assistance and services for all other needy persons.

2. Federal financial aid should be available to assist States in carrying out public welfare responsibility for preventive, protective, and rehabilitative services to all who require them, irrespective of financial need.

The Federal Government should participate financially in State and local projects which would encourage, extend, or establish programs for self-support, self-care or the rehabilitation of persons receiving or likely to need public assistance.

3. The Federal Government should participate financially only in those assistance and other welfare programs which are available to all persons within the State who are otherwise eligible without regard to residence, settlement, or citizenship requirements.

4. In order to strengthen family life, the aid to dependent children program should provide Federal aid to the States for any needy child living in the home of any relative.

5. Specific provisions should be made for Federal financial participation in the maintenance of children in foster care.

6. Child welfare services in the Social Security Act should be broadened in scope, should specifically include child welfare services for the delinquent child, and the funds authorized and appropriated should be increased in all States sufficiently to extend and improve their programs compatible with the growing child population and the continuing advances in knowledge which make more effective services attainable.

Specific provision should be made for Federal financial assistance to States to stimulate and support programs for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. This should include research and the training of personnel.

7. The category of aid to the permanently and totally disabled should be modified by eliminating the Federal restriction requiring a disability to be permanent and total and by eliminating the age requirement so that all needy disabled persons may be aided under the program.

8. The Federal Government should participate financially in the development of specialized services for the aged, irrespective of financial need.

9. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should study the restriction on Federal financial participation in assistance payments to adults living in public nonmedical institutions.

Methods of financing programs

10. The continuation of the Federal open-end appropriation is essential to a sound State-Federal fiscal partnership in all aspects of public assistance. Since it is not possible to predict accurately the incidence and areas of need, flexibility, and comprehensiveness are necessary in financing public assistance programs.

11. Federal financial participation should be on an equalization grant basis provided by law and applicable to financial assistance (including medical care) for all needy persons, welfare services (including child welfare), and administration.

12. Any maximums on Federal participation in public assistance (including medical care) should continue to be related to the average payment per recipient and should be increased sufficiently to assure reasonable standards of maintenance, comprehensive medical care of high quality and appropriate quantity, and the preservation and strengthening of family life.

Federal participation in aid to dependent children should be increased to a level which will assure treatment of children equitable with that accorded other public assistance recipients.

13. There should be no reduction in the overall Federal proportion of assistance and service expenditures unless and until changes in the scope and adequacy of Federal legislation affecting public assistance and social insurance enable the States to meet needs more effectively.

14. No change should be made in the Federal matching formulas which would result in a reduction in the Federal share of State and local administrative costs.

15. Federal aid for public assistance should be on the same basis for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam as for other jurisdictions. In particular, the annual dollar limitations on Federal participation should be removed.

16. The Federal Government should participate financially in the costs of any State and local civil defense welfare services.

17. Federal legislation should provide funds for American nationals in need of assistance and other services who are repatriated from abroad.

Administration

18. States should have the option to administer Federal funds for assistance and services by categories or by a single comprehensive program covering all needy persons.

19. Adequate and qualified personnel is essential in the administration of public welfare programs. Federal financial participation in administrative costs of State welfare programs should be sufficient to enable States to provide for the adequate administration of all welfare programs.

20. Adequate Federal funds should be authorized on a permanent basis to assist States in training staff for State and local public welfare programs and moneys should be appropriated for this purpose.

21. All public welfare programs in which the Federal Government participates financially should be administered by a single agency at the local, State, and Federal level.

22. Federal, State, and local public welfare agencies should participate in and assist in the administrative coordination of all related programs in which there is Federal financial participation.

23. The administration of the Children's Bureau should be maintained within the Social Security Administration.

SOCIAL INSURANCE PROGRAMS

OASDI

24. The contributory old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, as a preferable means of meeting the income-maintenance needs of people and as a means of keeping the need for public assistance to a minimum, should be strengthened. Among the needed improvements are, making benefit payments more adequate; increasing the amount of earnings creditable for contribution and benefit purposes in line with current conditions; providing benefits for disabled insured persons of any age and for their dependents; extending coverage to earners still excluded.

25. Health costs of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries should be financed through the OASDI program. Arrangements for achieving this objective should take into account the priority needs of the groups to be served; availability of facilities, personnel, and services; and protection and encouragement of high quality of care, including the organization of health and related services to effect appropriate utilization of services and facilities.

26. The funds of the insurance program should be available to help restore persons on the OASDI disability rolls to gainful employment since such expenditures would result in a net saving to the fund and increase the number of persons rehabilitated.

27. To the extent that changes to improve the OASDI program increase the cost of the program, contributions should be increased to insure the financial stability of the program.

28. The membership of the Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, established by the 1956 amendments, should include representation from public welfare and its functions should be broadened to include responsibility for recommending improvements in all aspects of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, with particular emphasis on methods of keeping the program in line with current economic conditions and with changes in levels of living, and as a means of keeping the need for public assistance to a minimum.

29. Adequate and qualified personnel are essential in the administration of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program. Federal funds should be utilized for the professional training of staff in institutions of higher learning.

Unemployment insurance

30. The unemployment insurance program, as a preferable means of meeting the income-maintenance needs of unemployed people and as a means of keeping the need for public assistance to a minimum, should be strengthened. Among the needed improvements are: establishing Federal standards which would assure more adequate benefit payments including benefits for dependents; extension of coverage to earners still excluded; provision for a minimum duration of benefits and appropriate extension of the duration during any period of extended unemployment; provision for more equitable eligibility conditions; provisions for less restrictive disqualification requirements; and an increase in the amount of earnings creditable for contribution and benefit purposes in line with current condition.

Other social insurance

31. Study should be given to ways of improving and extending, on a sound social insurance basis, temporary disability insurance benefits and workmen's compensation programs, with emphasis on planning for effective medical care and vocational rehabilitation.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

32. Federal funds should be authorized and appropriated for research and demonstration projects in all aspects of social security and public welfare.

RELATED PROGRAMS

33. The Federal Government should provide leadership, funds and research for the promotion of health and the prevention of sickness and disability contributing to dependency. Federal health programs should encourage and enable State and local health departments to make a more effective contribution to broad programs of physical restoration. In view of the increasing number of children and the increasing cost of medical service, the amounts authorized and appropriated for maternal and child health and crippled children's services in the Social Security Act should be increased.

34. Public welfare has a responsibility to assure that comprehensive rehabilitative services are made available to persons who require them. In carrying out this objective, public welfare programs have the responsibility to restore individuals to self-care and independent living and to strengthen family life. As part of this responsibility, public welfare agencies are concerned with the availability of adequate vocational rehabilitation services for individuals who can benefit from them.

Since many eligible individuals in the United States still are deprived of vocational rehabilitation services, such services should be strengthened so that all vocationally handicapped persons who present reasonable possibilities of attaining a vocational objective would be served. The vocational rehabilitation program also should be strengthened by permitting States to desig-

nate the State agency which can most effectively administer this program.

35. Federal programs should provide more effective aid to help meet the needs of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

36. The nonquota entry of foreign-born orphans should be limited to children who are placed for adoption in the United States with the approval of authorized social agencies, and to children who are adopted abroad by U.S. citizens residing in the country where the adoption takes place.

37. The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act should be amended to extend coverage and to increase the minimum wage in line with current conditions.

38. Federal programs should provide more effective aid to help meet the needs of migratory workers and their families.

Save a Spot of Beauty for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am always interested in the vigor and the variety of the many conservation movements in our country. Unquestionably, without the enthusiastic work of these organizations, the coming generations of our country would not inherit many of the great natural resources which are their due.

In a recent article published in the January 1960 issue of the Reader's Digest, Mr. William Hard discusses the work of a fine organization, Nature Conservancy, whose executive director is Mr. Donald B. Stough.

The work of the dedicated members of this organization is discussed in interesting detail in the article entitled, "Save a Spot of Beauty for America."

I commend this article freely to my colleagues as an example of the kind of selfless and public-spirited work which goes on constantly throughout our Nation in behalf of the cause of conservation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article from Reader's Digest, "Save a Spot of Beauty for America."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE A SPOT OF BEAUTY FOR AMERICA

(By William Hard)

In 1893 Katharine Lee Bates, of Wellesley College, Massachusetts, wrote her imperishable poem, "America the Beautiful," with its ever-echoing last line: "* * * from sea to shining sea." In every one of the 67 years that have passed since then, America has lost some more of its original primeval natural beauty.

Streams which in Miss Bates' day flowed shiningly clear and clean to the shining seas are now dirtily and poisonously polluted with municipal and industrial wastes. Numerous industrial firms fight all legislation which they fear would oblige them to purify their wastes before discharging them into the flowing waters. And long shoreline stretches of the shining seas themselves are now so polluted that swimming often has to be prohibited.

Meanwhile, on land, residential developers, under the pressure of our exploding population, have changed thousands of lovely landscapes into deplorably crowded human habitation, sundered from nature. And many a logging company and mining company has turned a wilderness area into a scene of scarred desolation. We also have government agencies that will wreck a beauty spot rather than go a few miles around it. The town of Hebron in Connecticut had a lovely village green almost 250 years old. Two years ago the State highway department ran an enlarged traffic route straight through that green and utterly destroyed it.

And consider the case of one of the most hallowed natural areas in America. It is Walden Pond, in Katharine Lee Bates' own State of Massachusetts. More than 100 years ago one of America's noblest and most famous naturalists, Henry David Thoreau, lived on a shore of Walden Pond, in a hut made by his own hands. He came to know the birds, and they would come to his call. He came to know the fishes, and they would glide unafraid between his outstretched hands. In the midst of a settled community he preserved a wilderness.

That wilderness was in time deeded to the State, which in turn confided the care of it to the Middlesex County commissioners. Two and a half years ago, in the name of "recreation," those commissioners brought in bulldozers, destroyed trees, started a hard-top road, tore down part of a slope and tumbled it into the pond—and promised to continue such "improvements" for a period of 15 years. The Boston Globe properly called it "popular disfigurement" to replace a "cultural shrine."

The National Thoreau Society has taken the matter into the courts. It has received contributions for the cost of the court proceedings from virtually all over the world.

But I want to speak here principally of Nature Conservancy. It is a nonprofit membership organization which maintains headquarters in Washington, D.C., and helps local citizens in many parts of the country to establish natural areas which will be kept forever sacred against molestation and "improvement."

A "natural area" is surrendered to nature. City parks are most desirable. But a city park is nature tamed, tended, trimmed, manicured, artificially controlled. A natural area leaves it to uncontrolled nature to accomplish her own growing, changing wonders.

There are quite a few natural areas on the public land of the Federal Government. But they are far away from millions of our citizens. Nature Conservancy wants to help citizens to give themselves natural areas, privately owned, within easy reach of their own localities.

It has helped to do this in localities scattered all over the United States. It raises funds from membership dues and from donations by individuals and philanthropic foundations. It makes grants and loans to local groups and gives them technical advice. But it aims largely at inspiring these groups to be self-reliant and self-supporting. It does not want to be in the business of giving away wildernesses for free. A good example of its efforts can be seen on the Mianus River along the New York-Connecticut line, within 50 miles of New York City.

Here is a gorge with slopes that rise at some places to more than 200 feet. The river as it rushes between them is all fast white water. The slopes themselves have a great abundance of unspoiled wilderness, including some 300-year-old hemlocks that crowd together at a certain spot to form what has been named "The Hemlock Cathedral." A local committee decided some years ago to maintain this area as a protected natural area in cooperation with Nature Conservancy.

The committee has now accumulated 182 acres of land bordering both sides of the river for about 1½ miles. This is home for more than 100 species of birds, more than 160 species of wild flowers and nearly 100 varieties of trees, shrubs and vines. No census seems to have been made yet of the deer, squirrels, raccoons and foxes. No molesting of them is permitted. Scientists come to study them and their ways as they live out their lives, fearless of hunters or trappers.

But scientifically unlearned men, women and children come, too, in enlarging numbers. They must not erect camps. They must not smoke or build fires. They walk a system of marked trails. They listen. They look. They may be surprised to see a fallen broken hemlock. Why isn't it removed? Because this is wilderness forever. Nature will work upon that fallen broken hemlock. Insects. Ferns. Moss. That hemlock was born wild. Its body will change into new wildness. This is a "living museum," producing its own developing exhibits and refreshing our own human nature by reintroducing us to the wildness from which we all spring.

How was the Mianus Gorge conservation committee able to acquire this preserve? It borrowed money from Nature Conservancy. It has paid that money back. It got some of its land by generous local gifts. It acquired the rest by purchase. The total value of all its acquisitions is about $150,000. The number of contributions from local individuals and local organization is now more than 2,000. What a tribute to the zeal of private-life Americans for digging into their pockets to give their own locality an eternal heritage of wild beauty. (And the committee is now seeking an endowment fund of $100,000 to assure perpetual maintenance and protection of the Gorge area.)

Many Nature Conservancy natural areas are smaller and less costly than that at Mianus Gorge. Yet all of them have some special feature worth preserving. You may know of some such natural feature in your own neighborhood.

Got some bogs or swamps? Till lately it seemed to be thought that the only thing to do with bogs and swamps was to drain them to get more land for farming. Now our farmers are producing many basic farm commodities in quantities greater than we can consume. So we can safely preserve bogs and swamps undisturbed in order to enjoy seeing the plant and animal life that they so often possess in profusion. A thrilling example is Corkscrew Swamp in southern Florida.

It is a sawgrass swamp. That is, it exhibits the same sort of grass that at one time covered virtually all of Florida's famous watery Everglades. But Corkscrew Swamp also has great stands of majestic cypresses. Loggers coveted those cypresses, were about to move in on them. Nature Conservancy thereupon joined with the Audubon Society in raising the funds necessary for the preservation of the water and the sawgrass and the trees.

The Audubon Society, one of our oldest and most experienced conservation societies, now controls and patrols the area for the benefit of science—and of tourism. It has built a long boardwalk into the deepest recesses of the swamp so that tourists may see the swamp's plant and animal denizens, including ibises and egrets building nests in the trees to be the cradles of their young.

Or perhaps you know some venerable stands of other sorts of trees? Nature Conservancy has helped to perpetuate an impressive stand of oaks in Minnesota and a unique stand of hollies in Missouri. Or even exceptional growth of flowers. Nature Conservancy has helped to promote a lily-pond

preserve in Missouri. An area does not have to be large in order to be worth while.

Or an island? Lake George, in northern New York State, is beautiful—and historic. It is historic because of battles fought long ago among Frenchmen, Englishmen, Indians, Americans. Among its many islands is an outstanding one called Dome. The glaciers gave Dome Island a striking formation, and it now has a regal crown of trees. For years it was owned and guarded by a devoted conservationist. He then conveyed it, free to Nature Conservancy, which now diligently protects it from molestation. There it stands to be looked at, from shore or boat, with awe and with thanks to the Artist who fashioned the world.

Have you a nearby natural prairie? It is unlikely, because a natural prairie is one that has never been plowed. It exhibits to passerby, in miniature, the boundless and unending prairies, with grasses tossing like waves in the wind, that astonished our first Midwest settlers. Nature Conservancy, through local groups, has helped to preserve two stretches of natural prairie—in Missouri and in Ohio.

I cannot refrain from mentioning one more of Nature Conservancy's projects. It is in northern California, in an area where loggers and roadbuilders have all but wiped out the coast range wilderness. Yet, by happy fate, they have left untouched the whole of the drainage basin of a stream called Elder River. This basin is virginally intact from ridge to ridge. Nature Conservancy is in course of acquiring it.

At the heart of this project is a tract of some 3,000 acres sold to Nature Conservancy by its generous owner at a price that is but a small fraction of its actual value. The conservancy hopes to lease additional tracts of adjoining land. The total project will involve much money. But think what it will bring: the whole undisturbed natural basin of a river, from its source to its mouth.

Our population is doubling every 50 years. Each year we shall have to have more residential space, more industrial space, more connecting highways. I think we must draw this conclusion: now is the time to set aside the largest possible number of areas truly fitted to be called wildernesses. They will constitute but a tiny percentage of the total area of the country; let us save them now from future invasion.

Certainly these wildernesses add nothing immediately to economic progress. They will not give us more bales of cotton, more tons of steel, more kilowatts of electricity. They have a higher purpose, like churches. Materialistic as we Americans may sometimes be, we can still say:

O God, O nature, pray refresh my soul:
Refresh my body, too, and make me whole.

Budget Battle Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the many proposals coming before us daily for more and more Federal projects and programs, I think we should give serious thought to the end result. With each entrance of the Federal Government into a new field of spending, we take away initiative at the local level to perform those services historically carried on by the "homefolks." We must not foster a spirit of "Uncle Sam will do it."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the February 19, 1960, issue of "Life Lines":

BUDGET BATTLE CONTINUES

Our Federal budget is too high. Our taxes are far too high. We shall have to reduce both spending and taxes if we are to press our Federal Government back into the mold the Constitution made for government with freedom. For instance, the budget for domestic welfare spending has been quietly going higher every year. Not much has been said about it. Recently, we have been confronted with a complete change in tactics. Suddenly there is a loud and insistent demand for greater Federal spending for domestic welfare.

One plan is to have the Federal Government lend capital funds to our States, cities, and local boards, so they can step up construction of local public works which they cannot finance by borrowing on their own credit.

The same story is repeated in the demand that the Federal Government supply local financial needs for airport construction, for rebuilding of our cities, for remaking the economic foundations of our distressed areas, for housing, for veterans and other private families. There are dozens of welfare projects, for which the Federal Government is to pay out the costs, from federalized medical care for those who get social security insurance to American contributions to a world scheme for disease prevention under U.N. control.

In some ways, facts about our Government's activities and plans are of no value except as we hold firmly to a body of principles by which they can be properly interpreted. Let us restate, then, the broad principles which we must keep in mind when we come to examine additions to Federal spending.

Our first principle is this—the Federal Government cannot add a thin dime to the amount of money spent for welfare or anything alse. Let us repeat that statement. The Federal Government cannot add one thin dime to the amount of money spent for welfare or any other purpose.

The Federal Government can take the money from private individuals, or from city and State government resources, but it cannot spend one dollar above what would have been spent anyhow.

Our second principle is this—what the Federal Government finances, it manages. So what happens when we change from management by individuals, private agencies, or local government, to management by one gigantic, faraway bureaucracy?

Our third point is this—have we turned to the magic of Federal spending because private individuals and local governments have not done their duty? Have we looked at the very real problems growing up about us, and closed our eyes and said, "We don't like to be bothered. The Federal Government will do the job."

Farm Policies Hinder Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I see where the Committee for Economic Development in its report a day or so ago called for an increase in American exports and making our products better able to compete with foreign goods by holding down costs and prices. The CED study was issued in the interest of reducing our deficit in foreign payments.

CED is an economic research organization supported by certain large business corporations. Its trade-deficits opinions were in a 32-page report entitled "National Objectives and the Balance of Payments Problems."

The situation is that U.S. spending abroad for goods, services, investment, and aid is greater than our receipts from exports, income in investments, and so forth. The deficit was approximately an average of $1 billion per annum from 1950 through 1956. But in the last 2 years this red figure runs to a total of about $7.5 billion.

The report cited the U.S. high price support farm program as the single biggest Government obstacle to increasing our returns from overseas. It said our farm program prices domestic farm goods too high for sale abroad and forces the United States to curb trade.

To this criticism, what solution does the administration and the Congress offer? The Republican administration has long sought legislation to reduce farm price supports. This is in line with the CED study. On the other hand, Democrat agriculture congressional leaders push for higher subsidy supports.

My bill, H.R. 10350, would eliminate all acreage and price controls and cushion the abrupt action by diverting our huge Commodity Credit Corporation surplus to an expanded food-for-peace program on the basis of not disrupting world or domestic markets. Such a plan would serve to remedy our deficit in foreign payments as recommended by CED.

Many of my friends in the House who represent farm areas fear the effect of my bill. On the other hand, many others tell me their farmers favor some such legislation. Meanwhile, Secretary of Agriculture Benson warns that if we are not careful both the good and bad farm programs will be ended. He knows that public sympathy is getting worn thin and that the people won't stand for continuing surpluses and unbearable costs.

I have plenty of evidence that the public is fed up. I don't know how many people worry about the deficit in our balance of foreign payments and the economic issues raised by CED. But I do know Congress better heed such studies, and then in line with strong public opinion call a halt to the outmoded, obsolete, and ineffectual, costly farm support laws. The sparks of indignation are in the grassroots. Let the politicians fail to heed a fanning wind of dissatisfaction on the horizon and there will be some Members of Congress from both rural and urban districts who one of these days, as the saying goes, will show up missing.

Public opinion, by a large majority, favors legislation such as my bill to repeal the farm price supports. The Democrats have quite a majority of this House, but watch out, if President Eisenhower and the administration convince the voters that the Democrats are responsible for not enacting a farm bill to

end this most costly domestic failure in our legislative history.

Some grassroots opinions from my congressional district follow:

I believe that price supports, especially wheat and corn, should be abolished and let these commodities find their own market level. The surpluses of those items and the cost to the Government or taxpayer is ridiculous.

I believe in our system of private free enterprise. That is for everybody. I don't think that the Government should subsidize any person or industry. The farmers that realize most out of subsidy programs do not need them. The small farmers do not get enough out of the program to do them any good.

As for price supports, supports, however low, farmers will simply grow more of the supported article because of the assurance of securing a cash return.

Of all Government programs, this makes less sense than any other, in my humble opinion. I'll admit I'm not well versed in this area, but I don't know of any other line of endeavor where you are rewarded if you do and rewarded if you don't by the Federal Government.

It seems to me that Members of Congress have a terrible responsibility these days not only in serving the people but in protecting them from themselves. It's human nature to want everything, I suppose, but governments, like friends, have their fiscal limitations or eventually go bankrupt—an elementary fact which millions seem to disregard.

Mike DiSalle: Buckeye Governor With Bounce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, an excellent article about Gov. Michael V. DiSalle of Ohio appears in the January issue of Coronet magazine. The article praises Governor DiSalle's fine record as a public servant over the years.

The author of the article, Calvin Kytle, of Columbus, Ohio, has written for some of our Nation's finest publications and in 1957 won the Rosenwald grant for creative writing.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIKE DISALLE: BUCKEYE GOVERNOR WITH BOUNCE

(By Calvin Kytle)

Nine years ago the roly-poly ex-mayor of Toledo, Ohio, came to Washington, took a job that 20 other men had turned down and proceeded to wisecrack his way into the hearts of his countrymen.

"The President," he said, patting his impressive belly, "told me he wanted a man with guts. He got one."

The man was Michael Vincent DiSalle, and the job he took was that of Price Stabilizer under Harry Truman. During the height of the Korean war, he did what smart politicians said was impossible; he kept the lid on prices and ended up as one of the bright hopes of the Democratic Party. He put a ceiling on raw cotton in defiance of the powerful congressional cotton bloc. He stuck to meat controls in the face of stampeding livestock men. He said no, again and again, and he made his opposition like him.

Pressure only brought out the jokes: "Suppose I'm fired. The worst that can happen to me is that I'll have to go back to Toledo. I like Toledo."

Now 51, Mike DiSalle is back in Ohio, but not Toledo, and has just finished a first hectic year as Governor of the State. He's also in a key position to say who gets most of Ohio's 64 votes at the Democratic National Convention in July; Symington, Kennedy, Humphrey, Meyner, and Williams have been courting him actively. Should he go to the convention as a favorite son, which seems probable, he himself could easily get tapped for the Vice-Presidential nomination.

A lot of Ohioans will tell you that DiSalle has changed. That his appearance has changed is undeniable. He's shaved the whimsical mustache. He has also shed 40 of his onetime 215 pounds. No reporter nowadays can honestly call him squash-shaped or liken him to Winnie-the-Pooh. But Ohioans say he's changed in other ways; they point out that DiSalle was conspicuously sobersided on the stump last year. They said that as Governor he is no special protector of the little man. The main reason: his tax measures have added 2 cents to the price of a pack of cigarettes and a like amount to a gallon of gasoline.

DiSalle insists that he hasn't changed at all. "The people who say that I've changed are mostly the ones who never knew me very well."

Until his election as Governor, most Ohioans knew DiSalle chiefly from the publicity he got during his 2 years in Washington. Probably no politician in recent years has been received more warmly by the press or been covered more fully.

To Washington reporters this unpretentious, tubby little man seemed made to order for human-interest stories. They reported his administrative actions, but what figured most often in the headlines was his humor. ("They tell me cotton is not a commodity but a theology," he was quoted as saying after he'd stood up to the southern bloc. "I don't believe it.") His courage, his resilience, his good sense somehow got obscured.

The real Mike DiSalle is, or has been, a fine corporation lawyer and successful businessman; a serious student of political science; a conscientious administrator; and, above all, a passionate believer in the democratic process. The fact that he also has a natural sense of humor is almost incidental.

His humor is spontaneous and he invariably turns it on himself. He is, in truth, a soft-spoken man, whose mildness some people mistake for weakness. He dresses conservatively in department-store suits, generally in need of a pressing, and his shoes are often unshined. "I take my work seriously," he says, smiling, "but never myself."

Since taking office, Mike (everybody calls him Mike) has worked an average of 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. He's up every morning at 6:20, has a light breakfast, and is usually at his desk by 7:30. If he manages to make it home for dinner, he goes back to the office until 10:30 or 11 at night.

Probably the saddest thing in his life is that he can no longer cook or eat the macaroni with clam sauce and the spaghetti he loves. He runs quickly to fat, but the last time he was sick was when he had his tonsils out, 30 years ago. Despite his current Spartan routine, he has never been more cheerful. "I'm doing what I like," he says. "If I get 5 or 6 hours sleep, it's enough."

Friends have suggested that maybe he wouldn't have to keep such long hours if he didn't insist on reading every paper before signing it. When the new cigarette tax act was brought for his signature, he proceeded to read it carefully, even though kidding newsmen kept reminding him that every minute was costing the State $43. Suddenly Mike pointed to a printer's error that had escaped the attention of both the Lieutenant Governor and the speaker of the house. Had he signed it without correcting it, the act would have been nullified.

DiSalle did two things on taking office last January that immediately dramatized his philosophy of government. He introduced circulating cabinet meetings, each meeting being held in the office of a different department. And he opened all these meetings to the press.

"Take the mystery out of government," he says. "That's the way to build public confidence in it. The other day five Democratic senators came in, mad as fury. The newspapermen sat in. It was the most candid discussion I bet they've ever heard. I've invited the press secretary of the opposition (Republican) party to participate in my press conferences. I don't believe that happens any place else.

"In the past the Governors have always issued the orders to the party and the legislature," Mike says. "I'm trying to get us to operate in the open. People tell me, 'It looks bad if you say you want something and you get beat.' I've been beaten before and it didn't hurt long."

Of the several causes that DiSalle lost in his first round with the legislature, failure of his bill to abolish capital punishment undoubtedly disappointed him the most. "As a lawyer," he says, "I've seen an innocent person get the death sentence because a witness who wasn't even there misidentified him. I've seen a simpleton boy get the chair for a sex crime that aroused the community, while organized gangsters went free because they were well financed and well represented."

Working in the Governor's mansion in Columbus are nine convicts, eight of whom have been found guilty of murder. "My family has nothing to fear from these men, even though five of them sleep under the same roof with us," DiSalle says. "I find great doubt surrounding their convictions. I have become attached to many of them. I ask myself, 'What would society have gained if that man had been electrocuted?' I answer 'Nothing.'"

On capital punishment, DiSalle has even been opposed at home. "My wife said to me, 'If some sex maniac attacked your daughter, you'd want to kill him.' I say, 'Yes, but that's what makes it wrong.' I wouldn't become nearly so aroused if it was someone else's daughter. Justice has to have an even hand; it shouldn't be swayed by emotion."

The popular support he might have won by his stand on capital punishment was lost by introduction of his labor reform bill and passage of his various tax measures.

His labor racketeering bill shocked AFL–CIO leaders, who were outraged at the bill's severity; it would, for instance, impose prison sentences of 10 to 30 years for embezzlement of $20 or more. Although the bill would give 10 years to a union leader who accepted a bribe, it provided no punishment for his briber.

DiSalle admits that the bill was tough. "This is not directed against the labor movement but against individual who would take advantage of it. I was with labor in opposing right-to-work legislation, but I wouldn't accept 1 penny of campaign contributions from labor. I didn't want anybody to be able to say that my position was a bought

position; nor did I want anybody to be able to come to me later and say, 'You should drop your fight for labor reform because we financed your campaign.'"

Actually the labor reform bill was so extreme, it had almost no hope for passage. Now DiSalle will have time to work out a bill that labor will accept.

At no time during the storm did he lose his sense of humor. When he appeared before a house committee to testify on behalf of his labor reform bill, the chairman asked members to be brief with their questions and not "tax the Governor's time."

"That," said the Governor, "will be the only thing we haven't taxed."

The day after his sales-tax bill passed, the Columbus Citizen ran an 8-column, page-1 streamer: "Mike's Got to Go." Mike, however, is confident that voters will return their support once they understand that the $311 million increase in revenue was absolutely necesary to get the State out of the red (he says he inherited a deficit of $10 million to $15 million) and to provide minimum services.

DiSalle also has been criticized for bypassing the experienced, smooth-working delegation from Cleveland's Cuyahoga County in favor of two relatively untried assemblymen as speaker of the house and Senate majority leader. The result was to antagonize a faction that represented 25 percent of the State's voters and to make it extremely difficult to exert party discipline. DiSalle's intention, however, was quite clear. This was the first Democratic legislature in 11 years. He simply did not want it and the party stamped with Cleveland's brand of boss politics.

Ever since he was first nominated for Governor in 1956 (he lost to Republican C. William O'Neill by 427,885 votes), DiSalle has been trying to rebuild the Democratic Party. He appointed his own State chairman and began to build from the grassroots. Some evidence of his success: in 1958, Democrats ran for offices that had been uncontested for years. Only 5 seats in the lower house were uncontested whereas in 1956, 20 seats had gone by default.

He does not scorn the use of patronage. "Right after the election we called party leaders from all over the State into an open meeting in Toledo. First time in anybody's memory this had been done. We said we were going to give jobs to Democrats, but they would have to be qualified."

What little time DiSalle has for recreation he spends with his family. He has a boy and four girls, the eldest of whom is 28-year-old Antoinette. Old-timers in the State's employ have observed that under Mike the mansion has come to look more like a home and less like a formal tea party setting.

His only hobbies now are reading and book collecting. He owns 70-odd books by Horatio Alger, mostly first editions, and keeps a couple of people in New York on the lookout for more. "They're very simple books," he explains. "Truth always wins and the good boy always gets along. They remind me of some things I never want to take for granted." He is also fond of contemporary biographies of Presidents, and was especially delighted recently to run across a biography of Millard Fillmore.

"People ask me why I'm interested in people like Fillmore. Well, I learn a lot from them—for one thing that, regardless of background, when a man becomes President, he always tries to live up to the responsibility."

The eldest of seven children, DiSalle was born of Catholic parents on Sullivan Street in New York City on January 6, 1908. His mother and father came from the Italian village of Vasto. His father, Anthony, was a punch-press operator. When Mike was 3, Anthony's factory moved to Toledo, and the DiSalles moved with it. Thrown out of work at the bottom of the depression, Anthony started his own electroplating business in his back yard. Today the firm grosses more than $1 million a year.

Mike didn't speak a word of English until he was 5. "Until I started school there was no need to speak English. You can't imagine what it's like, going to school and not being able to say a word to the other kids. I suppose that's what drove me to the library so early.

"When I was in the fifth grade we were asked to write a composition on what we wanted to be. I wrote that I wanted to be a public official." When he was 25, a fledgling lawyer scarcely 2 years out of Georgetown University, he ran for clerk of the Toledo municipal court and was soundly licked.

In 1937, he ran successfully for the State house of representatives. He was defeated when he ran for the State senate. In 1942, he was one of two Democrats elected to the Toledo city council and was reelected four times. He was twice vice mayor and was in his second term as mayor when Truman asked him to be price boss.

It was as vice mayor in 1946 that he set his precedent for sticking his political neck in the noose of tax reform. Toledo was broke. The voters had rejected ten bond issues to pay teachers' salaries and other expenses. Mike chaired a committee sponsoring a 1 percent city income tax on corporations and individuals. The CIO demanded a $2,400 exemption for a married man with one dependent and forced a city-wide referendum. But the tax was passed and 5 years later Toledo had raised more than enough money to pay off $14 million and to increase services.

In 1949, Toledo was locked in one of the country's bitterest labor disputes. For 7 months, a panel of 18 citizens, 6 each from industry, labor and the public, had tried to bring peace. It looked hopeless until DiSalle asked the labor representatives to write down what they thought management's rights were, and management representatives to make the case for labor. At that moment, the citizens labor-management committee—the so-called Toledo plan—was born. It worked.

DiSalle's experience in State elections has paralleled that of his party. He ran for Congress in 1946 and lost; he ran for the Senate against John Bricker in 1952 and lost; he ran against C. William O'Neill for governor in 1956 and lost. He ran against O'Neill again in 1958 and this time he won.

His wife, Myrtle, has long since stopped trying to get him to give up politics. DiSalle's friends say he won't be satisfied until he gets into national politics—either as national chairman of his party or as a member of Congress or something higher. Mike himself isn't saying. "I've always felt that you can't plan a political career. You've got to live it. There are tides that come in and out that are going to take you one way or the other."

A new tide could sweep Mike DiSalle back to Washington. Till then, he's content to take his cue from Mark Twain: "Always do right. This will gratify some people and astonish the others."

March of Dimes Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like to call attention today to an excellent and highly informative report recently released by the National March of Dimes Foundation describing the vigorous and constructive efforts devoted to the prevention and cure of polio. This report, by Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the national foundation, is indeed an inspiring testimonial to the fine work being done by the national foundation. The National Foundation, like the many other fine and selfless national organizations dedicated to the stamping out of sickness and disease, merits our highest praise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the foundation's report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING A NEW HEALTH PROGRAM

(By Basil O'Connor, president, the National March of Dimes Foundation)

The national foundation has moved vigorously into the task of translating an enlarged health program from paper to action. A good beginning was made in 1958 toward new goals in research, medical care, and training of essential personnel.

Concurrently through the year under review the organization has continued to discharge heavy responsibilities in the field of poliomyelitis. Provision was made for medical care and rehabilitation of thousands of polio sufferers—most of them having been stricken years ago—and research was extended in the area of polio prevention.

It has been a rewarding year—exacting in the volume of work in new ground and the added financial burdens that were inevitable in the transition, but exciting because of the importance of the objectives. A progressive role of greatly augmented usefulness in combating disease and disability has been assumed by your National Foundation, and the close of the year found the organization well on its way toward fulfillment.

BACKGROUND

Your board of trustees, as far back as 1952, was of the opinion that the national foundation, through its long fight on polio, had so equipped itself as to serve eventually as a flexible, dynamic, and highly effective force in America against illness and disability—not only the effects of polio but human damage resulting from many other causes. Underlying the opinion were these facts:

That a unique and highly creative research program, developed in recognition of the overlapping nature of disease problems, had uncovered promising leads to further study and possible prevention of a wide variety of virus and other diseases.

That through the cooperation of local medical advisory committees with informed and dedicated volunteers in thousands of communities throughout the country, a competent system had evolved for providing care to the disabled; and

That a multimillion-dollar program for the training of scientists and experts in the medical and allied professions was in full operation, having long proved of indispensable worth to the Nation in combating acute personnel shortages.

Any one of these facts was a persuasive argument for continuing the work of the national foundation. The combination left no doubt in the minds of your board of trustees nor of expert independent advisers who had been consulted.

Studies were made to determine the most productive course of action, and on July 22, 1958, the national foundation revealed a new concept of its usefulness and announced

to the public the specific initial objectives of its expanded program.

BLUEPRINT

The national foundation was described in that announcement as an organization for medical research, patient aid, and professional education with a program that henceforth would not be restricted to any one disease or condition. It would have specific goals initially but would be flexible enough to meet new disease problems as they arose and to pursue expeditiously the solution of existing one as and when new opportunities to do so were created.

It is conceivable that through its broad-range research program, particularly in the field of the viruses, the national foundation may be enabled to forestall certain potential disease problems before they arise, or before they can become major threats to the well-being of the Nation, and perhaps to produce answers to others that have, up to now, defied solution.

It is a bold concept, demanding the utmost of us and of medical science. But it is also a valid recognition of the capacities of medical research as demonstrated under the sopnsorship of the national foundation, of the interrelated character of disease problems, and of modern medicine's approach to them. In the successful research work that has been done in polio, and in many other important recent findings, we have witnessed only the first impact of this approach. The possibilities are truly tremendous.

BUILDING THE NEW ON THE OLD

In all three main channels of its activity—research, medical care, and the training of experts—the national foundation's work in polio had laid a sound basis of experience and suggested a promising list of projects for a new program. Hence by July of 1958 the organization was ready to go ahead with much work it had already planned or hoped to do.

Research

Knowledge that was essential before a polio vaccine could be created had led scientist-grantees of the national foundation years ago into study of the basic problems of virology. These investigations extended deeply into questions of how living cells grow and multiply, and the role of cells in human illness.

Among the many important and promising projects instituted or continued in 1958 were studies of the mechanism of virus reproduction within cells and the genetics of cells grown in tissue culture, an exciting line of inquiry that may provide clues to the genesis of cancer and other diseases.

Important new knowledge of the causes and prevention of inherited diseases is expected to result from the very considerable stimulation given to genetics through national foundation-sponsored inquiries concerning cells and the complex chemicals they contain.

The year was opportune for studies of the effect of vaccination on the incidence of paralytic polio. These have strengthened the belief that the Salk vaccine, while it protects inoculated individuals from the paralyzing effects of the disease, does not prevent the spread of the virus in the community; hence an unvaccinated person is not safe from infection through carriers who may themselves be immune to paralytic polio.

Other recent studies have indicated that when expectant mothers are vaccinated against polio the antibodies from the mother enter the bloodstream of the unborn child, giving it temporary protection against paralytic polio. Also, it has been established that a single vaccine combining protection against diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough and polio can be given safely and beneficially to infants as young as 2 months.

The possibility of using live-virus vaccine against polio was explored further. Extensive tests of such vaccines are now being conducted, but much more work will have to be done before a live-virus product can be put on the market.

The search was continued for effective antivirus drugs, for quick and reliable diagnostic tests for virus infections, and for the cause and prevention of kidney stones in bed-ridden patients.

Additional work was financed by March of Dimes funds on the nature of the rapidly growing list of known Coxsackie and "echo" viruses—the "camp followers" of the polio viruses—and on the possibility that these and other virus infections may cause disabling illness years after they attack.

The national foundation has made several grants to leading research centers for studies in the two major fields that were added to its program in 1958.

One of these is an approach to the problem of rheumatoid arthritis through the study of autoantibodies—antibodies that are "anti" to one's own tissue. Inquiry was begun into tissue reactions to injuries as a possible cause or precipitating factor in rheumatoid arthritis. Moreover, other scientists are trying to determine the significance of an abnormal protein (rheumatoid factor) present in the blood of persons afflicted with rheumatoid arthritis.

As a beginning of research into the causes of congenital malformations, national foundation grantees have been making detailed investigations and analysis of the aftermath of recent "echo" virus epidemics in Wisconsin and Minnesota. In those outbreaks the spread of infection was wide enough to include considerable numbers of expectant mothers. It is hoped the studies will show whether the virus infections of these mothers resulted in more abnormalities than usual among the babies.

The national foundation's allotment of funds for medical research in 1958 was $3,370,769. This brought the total investment for this purpose since inception of the organization in 1938 to $33,900,000.

Medical care

In the third year of relatively low polls incidence, residual damages of the heavy attacks of earlier years were still running high, still constituting a heavy drain on the national foundation. Most of the 57,700 patients who received assistance from March of Dimes funds in 1958 had been stricken in prior years.

However, there was also an increase in the 1958 cost of care for new patients because of scattered outbreaks of paralytic polio, largely among the unvaccinated. The epidemic in Detroit last summer, for example, cost more than a half million dollars in March of Dimes funds by the end of the year, and will necessitate substantial outlays for rehabilitation for years to come.

The allotment of March of Dimes funds for medical care in 1958 was $19 million as compared with $21,500,000 in 1957.

One of the primary objectives of the 15 respiratory and rehabilitation centers supported by the national foundation throughout the country is to cut down as much as possible the long-term hospitalization even of seriously disabled patients. For many such persons, indefinite custodial care in the hospital without special services for increased independence, means waiting for death, whereas going home, no matter how serious the involvement, is a chance once more to live. To achieve the transition to home care is a costly matter, often requiring expensive equipment and services; but it is a trade of dollars for human life—a kind of transaction your national foundation has ever been ready to enter, to the limit its finances will permit.

The centers, which also function in research for improvement of techniques in the care of the disabled, and in teaching and demonstration, provided 115,376 days of patient care in 1958. Some centers had to be operated at or above their capacities.

The 1958 outlay of March of Dimes funds for the support of the respiratory and rehabilitation centers was $2,342,951.

The bright record of these centers was a factor in leading your board of trustees to approve the establishment, beginning in 1959, of a new nationwide network of regional centers for the observation, evaluation and treatment of arthritis among children through the age of 18 years. Another such system to be devoted to the subject of birth defects is planned.

Manpower for health

A very large expansion of the available supply of trained personnel—larger than any now provided for—is a crying need in the health field today. Without it, modern medicine may be prevented from large-scale application of the improved techniques already developed.

In the face of this serious shortage, the national foundation in 1958 made significant advancements in its program of professional education, already the largest in the country conducted by a voluntary organization. New steps were taken to strengthen and broaden the appeal to young people to enter upon health careers; the effort was advanced to make more productive existing facilities and methods of this vital branch of education; and national foundation awards of fellowships were continued for advanced training in research, clinical medicine, and teaching.

A new 10-year $12 million national foundation college scholarship program was launched in October 1958. The purpose is to stimulate interest of young Americans in education in five health areas: medicine, nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and medical social work. During the next decade at least 515 scholarships will be offered annually, each of $500 per year, renewable for 3 years at the same rate.

Through this program the national foundation, for the first time, will reach students in high school and their early college years. For the first time, too, support for 4 years of study is offered in these disciplines. Still another first is the way the program is to be conducted—that is, as a community service performed through the local chapters rather than as a completely centralized program.

This shift in primary responsibility from national office to local chapter is actually a reflection of basic approach. The national foundation hopes to encourage understanding by local communities of their own health problems, and to offer opportunities for each community to exercise its own initiative in meeting those problems.

As in previous years, grants were made in 1958 to colleges and universities as contributions both to the quantity and quality of teaching for the health professions.

There are experimental patterns in education just as in research. The national foundation is deeply involved in the experiments going on in medical education today; involved in changing basic attitudes, in raising standards, and in helping to develop curricula in medical schools and schools of the associated professions to train the kind of people needed for its expanded program and for modern medical care generally.

The Korean Section of the Conlon Report on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Conlon Associates, Ltd., of San Francisco, Calif., have prepared exhaustive study of U.S. foreign policy in Asia at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This study, fifth in a series being issued on American foreign-policy problems by the committee, was published November 1, 1959. The Korean section of the report was authored by a distinguished political scientist from the University of California, Prof. Robert A. Scalapino. He has written an objective and very thought provoking analysis of the problems of this wartorn country. Although it is possible that his conclusions with regard to American policy needs will not be shared by all experts on the subject, I think the report is of sufficient importance to warrant its inclusion in the RECORD for the attention of the Members of the Congress and the public. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

I am advised by the Government Printer that the insertion will run beyond the two pages permitted, and will make three pages, at a cost of $243. I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding the additional cost.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA

Korea stands today as the symbol of free world cooperation against Communist aggression, the remarkable courage of a stalwart people, and the American determination to save a frontier state. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the South Korean Government has not acquired the type of respect from the broad community of free nations or the degree of contact with them that would lend it greater strength. Except for its contact with the small states of Taiwan, South Vietnam, and the Philippines, a few European ties, notably West Germany, and its close relations with the United States, the Republic of Korea has been largely isolated from the non-Communist world.

The reasons for Korean isolation and free world misgivings over Korean politics are complex. The fault does not lie wholly on one side. In addition to its difficulties in projecting a satisfactory external image, however, the South Korean Government faces an increasingly serious political crisis at home. The viability of democratic institutions in Korea is on trial and political instability is a threat. Arbitrary decisions by officials and police-state suppression appear to be keeping pace with mounting political unrest. And in few areas of the world is American prestige more closely tied to the internal developments of a foreign state. Whether justified or not, the United States will be held responsible for what happens in Korea.

In many respects, the Republic of Korea lives on borrowed time. The Communists anticipated an easy victory in 1950 and came close to achieving it. For brief periods, they controlled almost the whole of the Korean peninsula. In retrospect, one substantial advantage emerged out of the war for the non-Communists along with the obvious tragedies. Usually, the appeal of communism is that of the unknown or the untried versus that of the government in power. But large numbers of Koreans now in the south lived under communism, at least for a short period, and therefore have some personal basis for judgment. The Korean Communists have not fared well in this competition. In the great natural "elections" produced by events in Korea, when people voted with their feet, the Communists suffered resounding defeats. The overwhelming flow of refugees was from north to south. The sizable leftwing movement in South Korea was also reshaped by the war and Communist actions. The "fellow traveler" element was sharply reduced. To the extent that the "left" plays a role in current South Korean politics, that role is essentially on behalf of Democratic socialism. Behind this lies the fact that the great body of Koreans, including the intellectuals, are genuinely anti-Communist today, partly as the product of wartime experiences.

These advantages, however, might be only temporary. The Republic of Korea cannot count permanently upon Communist failures of the past. Memories are often shaped to fit current discontents. More importantly, a younger generation is now growing up in Korea who are mainly aware of the present. Within a few years, this group will represent a significant portion of the electorate. There are also external factors that argue against complacency. The rise of Communist China as a major power will produce increasing pressures upon non-Communist Korea that can only be resisted through a combination of internal strength and external support. The route to internal strength does not lie merely through a large standing Army. It must also include the vitality of the nation and the morale of its people. In order to protect its future, the Republic of Korea will have to meet these latter requirements.

1. THE KOREAN ECONOMY

The Korean economy has been and continues to be heavily dependent upon American aid. Without that aid, it would collapse. The period of postwar reconstruction, however, is ending. Presently, a transition from mere survival to expansion is taking place. Accelerated economic growth for South Korea is now possible and likely, but the degree of progress is contingent upon a wide range of factors. Many serious problems exist.

Few societies, if any, in the modern world have undergone the travails of modern Korea. Colonialism, segmentation, and intensive war followed one upon the other. Japan contributed much to economic progress in Korea but it also shaped the overall economy in a typically colonial fashion, bequeathing to independent Korea a sharp economic imbalance. That imbalance was compounded by the artificial division of the country at the 38th parallel into the so-called "agricultural" South and "industrial" North. Five years later, Communist aggression cost Korea 1 million lives and damages estimated at $3 billion. Perhaps the real miracle is that this series of tragedies has not utterly destroyed the morale of the Korean people.

The current situation, however, holds promise along with problems. Industrial and mining production in South Korea have registered substantial gains in recent years. Progress in agriculture has been slower, but some advances are now being registered. In early 1957, the Korean Government, with the support of the American aid mission, undertook an austerity program. For the first time since the Korean war, inflation was brought under some control. In general, the signs indicate that the Republic of Korea is entering a phrase of more rapid economic development. Perhaps it is between the crawling and the walking stage at present.

Many stubborn problems remain. Inflation must still be considered a threat. The Korean production system has various weaknesses. It is characterized by a high degree of unevenness: highpowered and ultramodern equipment furnished by ICA and a small number of skilled workers coexist with antiquated methods and tools, sometimes in the same industry. Modern entreprenurial talent is scarce and its growth is inhibited by nepotism, the continued influence of the oriental family system. The interaction between business and government is extremely close, and marked by an unfortunately large amount of personal favoritism and corruption.

The problems of credit and investment are also difficult. Credit is both scarce and expensive; interest rates may run from 7 to 10 percent per month. Government investment in economic development must be limited as long as military expenditures remain so large. Private investment is also limited by a complex of factors: low savings proclivites, hoarding, and the channeling of funds into forms of investment other than industry. Moreover, conditions in Korea have not made it attractive to private foreign investment.

Living conditions in South Korea have greatly improved from the low point of wartime misery, but the Koreans are still a poor people. Some 75 percent of the people are engaged in farming and fishing, with per capita production estimated at not more than U.S. $50 per year. In proportion to cultivated acreage, Korean rural population density is the second highest in the world. That population is rising, moreover. The total population, swollen to over 22 million by northern refugees, is increasing at a rate of 1.6 percent annually. Urban living standards are rising faster than those of the rural areas, but the problems of underemployment and unemployment are grave.

South Korea has relatively meager natural resources, especially of the type required for industrialization. Indeed, the questions of how much and what kind of industrialization is economically sound for this state are critical questions that have never been sufficiently studied, since they are also questions highly fraught with political dangers.

Many of the problems noted above are common ones in the so-called late-developing societies, and there are no simple solutions. Tax reforms, an expanded credit system, and a rigorous campaign against corruption, waste, and inefficiency are all needed. What responsibility does the United States have? Since 1953, aid to Korea has totaled some $1.7 billion, the overwhelming proportion of this coming from the United States. A strong case can be made for the thesis that these funds have not been used as efficiently as they should have been, that American interests and objectives in connection with their use have not been sufficiently defined and defended, and that our generally weak position has created serious problems. The charge is common that American aid has created too many Korean millionaires and sustained too many corrupt practices.

There is some validity in this criticism. Basically, we have had a weak policy toward Korea in terms of stipulations, controls, and supervision. We have usually invoked the time-honored maxim "noninterference in the internal affairs of another state," despite the fact that massive aid obviously is interference and our responsibility for overall trends in Korea—and its ultimate defense—cannot be avoided. Clearly this is a complex and difficult matter, and one not confined to Korea by any means. It is one of the truly urgent problems in connection with eco-

nomic aid to late-developing societies. In Korea, the difficulties were doubtless compounded by the rivalries and divisions of authority that have prevailed among our separate diplomatic, economic aid, and military missions; recent administrative changes may bring some alleviation. But the broader elements of the problem will remain, and need to be faced squarely. These issues must not be used as the basis for underestimating economic assistance as a major weapon in the worldwide struggle against totalitarianism. But our techniques of aid, and our responsibilities in connection with aid, need to be basically reassessed.

2. KOREAN POLITICS AND SOCIETY

Korean democracy today stands in precarious condition. Some progress has been made, and, considering the events of the last decade—indeed, the last half century—perhaps the miracle is that any semblance of democracy exists. Nevertheless, democratic institutions face a very great trial in the immediate future, with the outcome unpredictable.

It can be argued that democracy has made fairly significant progress in the Republic of Korea since 1945. After a lengthy period of colonialism and authoritarianism, Korean politics have been marked by surprising vigor and intensive competition, a tribute, in part, to the independent character of the Korean people. A two-party system exists, with the Liberal and Democratic Parties both conservative in their general philosophy. The leftwing Progressive Party has now been outlawed; it had garnered relatively few votes except for the presidential election of 1956 when the Democratic candidate died prior to the election.

The Liberal Party, dominated by Syngman Rhee, maintains absolute control of the national government at present, with a strong majority in the National Assembly. Since the Korean political system is strongly centralized, this also gives the Liberals extensive control throughout the provinces. Both the popularity of President Rhee and that of the Liberal Party have dropped sharply, however, and the election of 1960 is in doubt, providing it is fairly conducted. The Democratic Party has steadily gained strength, especially in urban areas, such as Seoul, where it has won a series of overwhelming victories. Competition in Korean politics has never been more intense.

There is also evidence to indicate that the Korean people are participating in public politics on a larger scale and with more vigor and intelligence than at any time in their history. Their participation is marked by the growing exercise of individual free will, the hallmark of a democratic society. There is no blind worship of a national hero on the one hand, nor meek obedience to the orders of the village headmen on the other. Increasingly, even the rural electorate appear to consult their "self-interest" when they cast their ballot. In some rural areas, to be sure, the influence of traditional elements remain strong, but new groups, such as the Korean war veterans and the modern educated class, vie with the old centers of rural power. Korean society at present is extremely complex, and in a state of great flux and transition. The historic conservatism of this people, especially the peasantry, is being moderated by rapid socioeconomic changes. Thus, the political landscape of Korea is being substantially altered.

The force of provincialism in Korean politics is also receding, a force of enormous historic importance. The effect of modern war and massive dislocation has aided in this process. Some traces of the old order still exist, of course. There is a tendency to hire men from one's own district when convenient. The northerners now in the south have banded together to some extent and help each other when possible. Certain political groups show regional proclivities. It is often said, indeed, that the present national government is dominated by men from central Korea; similarly, the Chang Myun faction of the Democratic Party is known to include many northerners, although some of Chang's key advisers are from the south. Increasingly, however, regional differences and loyalties have been subordinated to a sense of Korean nationalism.

Each of the above factors in its own way indicates the progress of democracy and the Korean state. Yet the darker side of the picture demands at least equal attention. Throughout its brief history, the Republic of Korea has been marred by political violence, acts of flagrant suppression, and certain police-state tactics. And today, as the election of 1960 approaches, the Liberal administration is engaged in successive acts that can only be regarded as assaults upon basic democratic rights. The Democratic Party is being intimidated, its leaders threatened, its press restricted, and its general rights violated. The charge of "treason" is being used loosely to justify these actions, and laws such as the national security law are being rammed through the National Assembly over bitter opposition to give them legal sanction. At the same time, the Local Autonomy Act was amended to make the offices of mayor and township head appointive rather than elective, thereby greatly augmenting the power of the central government in what is obviously an attempt to make it impregnable at election time. Perhaps Korea does not have a two-party system, but rather a 1½-party system, with the opposition party intimidated and discouraged.

As has been noted, such tactics are not new. In 1952, for example, the Korean Army was deeply involved in the elections; in 1956, it was the police who served the political purposes of the administration. It has been less easy to apply these pressures in major urban centers; hence the relative strength of the opposition in such places as Seoul, Taegu, Pusan, and all larger cities. But in the rural areas police interference has frequently been extensive. The degree to which this type of pressure upon the electorate will continue and be effective is uncertain. Some evidence suggests that future pressures may be more subtle and that Liberal leaders will also resort increasingly to such tactics as public works and similar benefits to win votes. Perhaps neither the military nor the police can be utilized for coercive purposes in the immediate future since many within these ranks suspect that political changes will soon occur. The task of supervising the next victory may be handed to some new group such as the Anti-Communist Youth Association which the Liberal Party has been grooming. In any case, however, the signs are very disturbing.

Syngman Rhee has had many of the qualities of a successful leader, and he has acquired, not unjustly, the symbol of "father of the country." His popularity among the Korean people has been very high at points, but now it appears to be declining. In the elections of 1952, Dr. Rhee received approximately 72 percent of the popular vote, but his percentage dropped to 56 percent in 1956 despite the death of his leading opponent just before the election. One factor involved is his advancing age, another the desire for a change, and the feeling that one group has been in power too long. But Rhee is a revolutionary before he is a parliamentarian, and he has been a revolutionary for most of his 85 years. He will not give up power easily, and he and his supporters may not be willing to give it up at all, whatever the cost of staying in office.

Perhaps a case can be made for benevolent despotism in Korea. Democracy may not be feasible in a society with the internal problems and external threats faced by the Republic of Korea. At the very least, some tempering may be necessary in the initial stages, some tutelage during the period of transition. In these regards, Korea, despite its differences, shares certain problems in common with many late developing societies. But irrespective of these problems, the immediate issue in South Korea is one of political stability or instability, and the degree to which a people's confidence in their institutions and leaders is won or lost.

The Korean political future is obscure. If President Rhee were to die before the 1960 elections, the Liberal Party would probably continue in power by some means, preventing Chang Myun, the Democratic Vice President from taking office. In the long run, however, Rhee's death or retirement is likely to produce some important party realinements among the conservatives. Both conservative parties are loose coalitions at present, with various factions jockeying for power. The two main Liberal factions have been labeled the "Extremists" and the "Moderates," with the former still seemingly in control. Within the Democratic Party, men like Chang Myun and Cho Pyong Ok each have substantial numbers of followers. The differences separating factions in both major parties are not basically questions of policy or ideology, but questions of office and power. Hence coalitions are always complex and changes unpredictable. Probably Cho will be the Democratic nominee for President if Rhee remains in office until the 1960 election. Should Rhee pass from the scene, conservative party ranks would almost certainly undergo a process of regrouping, with elements of both major parties forming new units.

The indications are strong, however, that some conservative coalition will hold the reins of political power in Korea, at least for the immediate future, irrespective of Rhee's tenure in office. The left-wing, as represented by such groups as the now outlawed Progressive Party, is still relative weak. This is due to many factors: The continuing force of Korean conservatism, the impact of the Korean war upon the leftwing, and the control policies of the Government, among other things.

The leftwing may not remain weak permanently, however. As noted earlier, the younger generation is increasingly restive, and even among the older groups substantial sociopolitical changes are taking place. There is considerable danger that in Korea, as in some other parts of Asia, an "intellectual proletariat" will develop, a younger educated class finding insufficient outlet for their talents and energies. This problem has a special facet in Korea, as it did once in Japan. The opportunities for the talented children of poor families in civilian universities are very limited, due to meager scholarship funds. If they have any chance for higher education, it is usually via military schools. Thus, a number of bright young officers from the lower economic classes are emerging, filled with resentment against "special privileged" civilians and politicians. This could be explosive.

In a broader sense, it is legitimate to ask whether Korea will follow a pattern set elsewhere, and replace civilian parties with military rule? This is possible, but the odds seem somewhat against it, at least for the present. Currently, no military man has great political prestige or organizational strength in Korea. Within the army, there are many ambitious men. But up to date the military have been instruments rather than masters of civilian government. This is partly due to the skill with which the Liberal administration, and particularly President Rhee, has handled the army. Potential rivals have been sidetracked; strong, independent-minded leadership has been discouraged. Under the circumstances, factional disputes and attempts to gain the President's favor have flourished. If party government fails completely, military rule at some point is a definite possibility, but it is not likely to happen in the near future.

Thus, the prospects are for the continuation of conservative civilian rule in the Republic of Korea, irrespective of the lifespan of President Rhee and the outcome of the 1960 elections. This cannot negate the fact, however, that Korean democracy is on trial, and that the events of the next few years may well determine the support which democratic institutions can expect from the Korean people in the longer range future.

3. KOREAN FOREIGN POLICY

Korean foreign policy also faces a major challenge. Since 1945, the Republic of Korea has been strongly attached to the United States, and the Korean-American alliance is very likely to continue for many reasons. At the same time, however, Korea will probably make increasing attempts to lessen the isolation that has characterized her position in Asia and add new dimensions to her diplomacy.

The historic Korean problem has been that of a small nation wedged in between major and often aggressive powers. It is an obvious advantage to have a firm alliance with a major distant power like the United States which has no territorial ambitions. Put simply, Korea has less to fear and more to gain from American aid than from that of any other major power, and most Koreans are aware of this fact. But increasingly Koreans are also aware of the need for other friends and allies. There is a natural, growing desire for greater interaction with non-Communist societies other than the United States. One evidence of this is the newly found enthusiasm for West Germany, especially among many of the younger people. In intellectual circles, moreover, hope is rising that Korea can now have more meaningful contact with other Asian-African societies, especially those to the south.

Hostility toward Japan is substantial, especially among the Korean elite. Given political trends in Asia, close relations between Korea and Japan are important, perhaps imperative to the welfare of both societies. Yet the obstacles are formidable. Bitterness and racial prejudice exist on both sides, and are not confined to a tiny group. The roots of the problem are deeply imbeded in history, including recent history. For some 40 years, Japanese imperialism dominated the Korean peninsula. The Japanese did much to advance Korea in a technological sense, and provide law and order, but they could not destroy Korean nationalism, and their generally condescending attitude toward Korean culture created many barriers. Recollections of the past have been fortified by problems of the present such as fisheries and repatriation.

There are some rays of hope. Many Koreans have personal ties to Japan, either of respect or friendship, and most of the common people are not anti-Japanese. Moreover, even among those who harbor bitterness, increasingly there is a recognition that relations with Japan should be normalized in the national interest of Korea. There is considerable reason to believe that improvements can be realized, especially when Syngman Rhee ceases to be President, for his personal enmity to Japan is boundless.

The chances of Korean reunification in the near future are extremely remote despite the desires of the Korean people. There is some parallel with the German problem. The Communists cannot support peaceful reunification at present because they know that they would suffer heavy electoral defeats and become an insignificant minority. Nor do they wish to commence another war through any attempt at unification by force. They will be content to wait, hoping for mounting unrest in the south. On the other side, while the Liberal Party has threatened forceful reunification at times, the Rhee government is not likely to defy world opinion, including that of the United States.

Under these conditions, both the Republic of Korea and the rest of the non-Communist world are confronted with the question of how to treat the North Korean Government. Up to the present, the Republic of Korea has treated suggestions or acts of negotiation on any subject with the North Koreans as treason. Thus an isolation much stricter than that between West and East Germany has prevailed. For example, no trade or visits are permitted. Over a period of time, sentiment in the south favoring some relaxation may develop but this is difficult to predict.

Meanwhile, about 8 million Koreans live in the north under a Communist government. The North Korean Communist elite has often been divided into three factions: the "Yenan," "Moscow," and "indigenous" elements. This signifies the diverse background of the Korean Communist movement, and there is no doubt that factional difficulties have existed in the north, although no simple generalizations can be made. Current evidence suggests that a number of purges have taken place in party ranks, and that Russian influence in North Korea is much stronger than that of Communist China at present. Indications are that life has been rigorous in the north, but that, through human sacrifices, industrialization is being advanced.

At present, North Korea does not offer great competition to the south. As has been noted, Communist actions before and during the Korean war turned millions of Koreans against that movement. Up to this point, communism has signified neither nationalist victory, political freedom, nor higher living standards to the average Korean. And North Korean propaganda to the south has been crude and relatively ineffective, although southern propaganda to the north has not been much better.

4. U.S. POLICY IN KOREA

(a) The United States cannot discontinue economic asistance to the Republic of Korea at this time without risking the most serious economic and political repercussions. Neither the Korean people nor the Government is prepared to underwrite economic development without outside help at present. It is important now, however, to reexamine our aid program in Korea with respect to the following questions:

(1) What form of aid is most conducive to stimulating indigenous energies and capital formation?

(2) To what extent should assistance be geared to long-range plans and what should be the American responsibility for checking the validity and progress of such plans?

(3) What is the proper balance between military and economic aid, in terms of the security and welfare of Korea?

This report cannot spell out detailed answers to these questions, but it might be suggested that whatever the form and amount of aid determined most desirable, the present military expenditures of the Korean Government should be reduced. Our treaty obligations for the defense of the Republic of Korea are clear and unequivocal, and they must remain intact. With these, and the recent development in weapons, the Korean Army can safely be reduced to more manageable proportions for the Korean economy.

(b) The United States has too great a stake in the Republic of Korea, and the symbol of Korean freedom for which Americans fought and died, to permit any wholesale destruction of democratic rights without some counteraction. What can be done? First, the American people and the American Congress should be more thoroughly alerted to the facts of Korean political life. Korean leaders are presently convinced that the American people are not concerned with what happens in Korea as long as it remains anti-Communist. The American press should give far greater coverage to the Korean political scene, and more foreign correspondents should be sent to Korea to cover political events, including the forthcoming elections. Some of our public leaders should go to Korea and, while there, reiterate the fundamental requirements of a democratic society. All Koreans should be made aware of the fact that the eyes of the world and, particularly the United States, are upon them.

It should be made unequivocally clear to all Korean political groups that repeated violations of human rights or assaults upon democratic institutions in Korea will have a sharply adverse effect upon American-Korean relations. And means should be used to give this warning effect, if necessary. We have been too weak in Korea, and have not gained the respect of either the Government or the people for this fact. There are means that would be painful without being fatal which the United States could employ to support its own national interests in a situation where we bear such enormous responsibilities.

(c) On the positive side, the United States needs to encourage all types of cultural relations and scholarship pertaining to Korea. Despite our heavy involvement in Korea in recent years, American understanding of Korean society and culture is extraordinarily poor. There are no centers of Korean studies in the United States at present, and almost no American scholars primarily devoted to this area. With such weak cultural underpinnings, it is extremely difficult to build a strong political alliance. Some of the fault lies with the Republic of Korea and its representatives. Nevertheless, both the American Government and private groups and citizens should give high priority to tackling this problem.

(d) It is strongly in the interest of the United States that the Republic of Korea have increased diplomatic, cultural, and economic relations with the non-Communist world. It is especially important that relations between Korea and Japan be improved. This will not be easy, and American pressure or mediation carries obvious risks. But the problem is also critical enough to our general interests to warrant risks. One possible method of slowly bringing Korea and Japan closer together is in the context of international conferences involving other nations or people. Even more formal means can be utilized such as the contacts of oversea student and scholar groups. But the United States must also do some serious thinking about compromise solutions to current Korean-Japanese differences that might be proposed privately to the two parties by us, solutions that might involve some American commitments as well.

(e) There is no feasible method at present whereby Korea can be reunited, and two de facto Korean governments will likely continue for the foreseeable future. Ultimately, recognition of this fact will probably shape new policies, both within the Korean peninsula and outside. The United States may find it in the national interest to work for some general compromise agreement between the free and Communist worlds pertaining to divided states and their representation in international bodies.

The United States can take pride in its decision to uphold Korea against Communist aggression. It is important, however, that in the years ahead Korea remain a growing symbol of freedom, justice, and progress. This is only possible if the United States continues to make a substantial commitment, military and economic, to the Korean people. But it also depends upon Korea itself, the integrity of the political elite and the determination of the Korean people. Korea reveals both the challenge and the limits to American policy.

The Way Trujillo Nipped Plot, Why Church Joined in Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Time magazine of February 29, 1960, by Thomas Dozier, associate editor of Life en Español:

THE WAY TRUJILLO NIPPED PLOT, WHY CHURCH JOINED IN BATTLE

(By Thomas Dozier)

CIUDAD TRUJILLO.—The beginning of the end in Trujilloland may well have been a warm Sunday late in January. On that date in Catholic churches all over Trujillo's island domain priests rose up and publicly read the most telling criticism of the benefactor heard by Dominicans in 30 years. Their warning resulted from the way in which Trujillo had suppressed a plot aimed at assassinating him. It was a plot which the old dictator quickly put down, but in the process he set in motion a chain of events certain to do him no good.

Trujillo's efficient and well-equipped army had easily crushed a comic-opera invasion from Cuba in June, mainly because the invasion was not coordinated with the internal opposition. In September this internal opposition, made desperate by shame and an increasingly difficult economic situation, began to stir itself. A plan was slowly and cautiously evolved. Its simple objective was to kill the benefactor. A place and a date were chosen: the annual livestock show late in December on the grounds of the 1955 International Fair of Peace and Brotherhood of the free world. Trujillo was scheduled to open the show, and the chances were that Brother Héctor, the president of the republic, along with a good sprinkling of other Trujillos, would be in attendance. Bombs would be installed everywhere the benefactor might be expected to show up.

Trujillo's omniscient and omnipresent intelligence service was probably privy to the plan, or at least its general outline, from the beginning. Shortly before the livestock fair was to open, the government announced it had been postponed until January 21. Early in December, the secret police had arrested a young Catholic seminarian on charges of possessing homemade bombs. This arrest was a tactical mistake, and a serious one.

Under the 1954 concordat with the Vatican, Trujillo agreed to special treatment for clergy and religious in his domain. Specifically, the concordat provides that no cleric may be arrested without notifying church authorities. Trujillo's cops failed to observe this requirement. When the church got wind of the seminarian's arrest, the hierarchy was outraged.

The plotters in the meantime had changed their timetable to jibe with the new dates for the livestock fair: if they could not get at the benefactor in December, they would do it in January. But the plotters appear to have lacked both a central leader and a definitive plan for assuming power. Their naiveté and inexperience is indicated by the fact they went right ahead. Nearly all of them were respectable professionals, businessmen, and students from good families; they just wanted to kill Trujillo. They had no army support. They took it for granted that with the benefactor out of the way, the army would step in to enforce order. With the army in control, they reasoned, the way would be open for more moderate forces to assume power.

These January conspirators had no connection with Dominican exiles in Cuba, Venezuela, and Puerto Rico. They were anti-Communists, anti-Castro moderates, many of them extreme political conservatives—anxious to change their country's government before any local variety of Castroism charged in to replace dictatorship with demagoguery.

But the benefactor was still too smart for them. In the dark hours of January 18, 3 days before the bombs were to go off, the khaki-colored Volkswagens of the S.I.M. (security police) buzzed into action. S.I.M. agents descended on hundreds of Dominican homes, hauled away fathers, sons, husbands, brothers—and even some wives and mothers.

Both the numbers and category of those arrested were impressive. At first, the Dominican police announced that 15 or 20 people had been jailed. Later, the government officially admitted to 123 arrests. Of the prisoners 120 were tried and sentenced to 30 years in prison. The best information in Ciudad Trujillo is that the number arrested actually totaled between 1,500 and 2,000. Among them were some very important Dominicans. They included the son of the former ambassador to Venezuela, the brother of the dean of medicine at the University of Santo Domingo, the son of the former ambassador to the Vatican, the son-in-law of the ambassador to Mexico, the son-in-law of the ambassador to Colombia, the nation's top cardiologist and the island's leading gynecologist, who had formerly been personal physician to Trujillo's daughter.

In tackling such people as these, Trujillo must indeed have been desperate, for this class of nonrevolutionary citzentry has provided the main passive support of his regime. But it was not only the quality and quantity of the people he arrested that was to haunt Trujillo; the way the arrestees were treated brought the benefactor into conflict with the most impressive enemy he had yet faced: the Catholic Church.

Trujillo was understandably irritated that so many of his former friends could join a plot to kill him and, when the benefactor is irritated, it is not a nice thing to be in his power. This time Trujillo decreed a compartively subtle form of torment for his respectable victims. Prisoners of both sexes were stripped naked, chained and thrown into common cells. A prominent woman physician was reportedly handcuffed nude to a distinguished lawyer in the same state of nakedness, to their mutual discomfort and embarrassment. The order of the day was indignity rather than the usual electrodes and the fingernail pliers, although there may have been some physical torture too.

The church found such tactics insufferable, especially as they came hard upon the earlier arrest of its seminarian. Monsignor Octavio Antonio Beras, archbishop coadjutor and active head of the church in the Dominican Republic, got together with his titular superior, aging (83), half-blind Archbishop Ricardo Pittini, who as head of the oldest see in the Western Hemisphere holds the imposing title of Primate of the Americas. The bishops of the country were summoned to Ciudad Trujillo, where they drafted one of the most outspoken pronouncements isued in modern times by the Catholic hierarchy in any country: a pastoral letter warning Trujillo to mend his way.

The letter was completed and signed on January 25, the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul. The following Sunday it was read at all masses in all the churches of the Dominican Republic, including the 420-year-old Cathedral of Santa María la Menor, which houses the tomb of Christopher Columbus.

"We cannot remain indifferent to the grievous blow that has afflicted many Dominican homes," said the bishops. "* * * The basis and foundation of all positive law is the inviolable dignity of the human person. Each human being boasts, even before his birth, a heritage of prior and higher law than those of any state whatever." Then the hierarchy listed what the church considers the intangible and inviolable rights of man: the right of life, the right to form a family, the right to work as a means of maintaining the family, the right to commerce and the exchange of products, the right to emigrate to another country in search of better work and tranquility, the right to a good name, the rights of "freedom of conscience, of the press and of assembly."

Congregations listened intently and nervously as the bishops and priests announced an unprecedented action: "* * * We have directed in the exercise of our pastoral ministry an official letter to the highest authority of the country, so that by a program of mutual understanding, excesses can be avoided * * * tears dried, wounds healed and peace restored to so many homes." The pastoral added, with a fine twist of phrase, that the bishops were asking a special boon from God that no member of the Trujillo family "should ever experience, during his lifetime, the sufferings that afflict today the hearts of so many Dominican fathers of families, of so many children, of so many mothers and so many wives."

Within a week the text of the letter was published abroad. In the flurry that followed, the church issued a mollifying statement suggesting that the incident had been unduly emphasized. But in private the churchmen expressed their determination to oppose any further infringement of human rights.

Trujillo on his side turned the whole force of his own personality and his propaganda machine into a campaign to make it appear that everything was rosy. His newspapers published unprecedented reams of religious news; his foreign minister dashed off to Rome for a conciliatory talk with Pope John XXIII. The benefactor himself worked round the clock attending masses, funerals, church weddings, religious processions, being godfather at hundreds of baptisms. El Caribe, the leading daily of Ciudad Trujillo, blossomed with pictures of Trujillo the good Catholic.

Simultaneously, the generalissimo acquired a sudden fondness for foreign journalists. He even invited them to a luncheon at which he joked: "I am sorry I could only invite low-class people today. All the best families are in jail." When I talked with him on the Sunday following the pastoral letter he veritably bubbled over with cheerfulness, joking about stories in the United States that he had fled the country. He followed me out onto the steps of the palace to show a letter from a priest and asked, "Does this sound as if I am having trouble with the church? They still ask me for a military band."

At the same time Trujillo, wanting to cover all bets, was starting a strange double-headed campaign. Its apparent objectives were (1) to tighten his control by reassuming the presidency from his stumbling brother Héctor, or (2) failing this, to turn over the power to somebody else if the going got too rough. El Caribe printed a raft of open letters, paid advertisements, and public statements calling on the benefactor to present himself as a candidate for the presidential elections, still 2 years away. Announcement was made that on February 21 a monster rally and parade, the biggest in the history of the nation, would be held in Ciudad Trujillo to show his loyal people's wish that Trujillo would run for president.

The minister of the interior sent out letters to 80 prominent Dominicans asking them

to form parties of the opposition, presumably to run candidates against Trujillo. Yet no Dominican seemed to want to run against the benefactor. One of the daily features of El Caribe in February was a regular publication of open letters from these unhappy gentlemen, each in turn protesting: "Who, me?"

There are good reasons to believe that Trujillo may really be trying to find a graceful way to retire—that is, get out. Close associates say he is haunted by the vision of sitting in some refuge like Liberia, Spain, or Madeira and reading stories of how an infuriated populace eradicated every memory of the caudillo who imposed his name and personality so forecfully upon them for 30 years. Trujillo hates the thought of going down in history as just another repudiated tyrant. He would like at least some of the 2,000 statues erected to him in the Republic to remain intact. He would like to be remembered for the good things he has done for his small country—and he has done much in the way of physical improvement—rather than for the enslavement of his people. As a result, he was probably serious when he assured a visiting U.S. Senator that he would like to hold free elections and would accept outside observers to guarantee their fairness.

The question remains whether it is not too late for peaceful exits. Cuba's Batista wanted to get out gracefully, too; but he never figured out how to do it. Trujillo has now infuriated a large group of influential Dominicans. He has antagonized the Catholic Church. If he pardons those whom he has imprisoned and tries to conciliate the church, he seems to be leading from weakness. But if he keeps everybody in jail and continues to harass the church he nourishes the bitterness and enmity that inevitably will destroy him. He is damned if he does and damned if he does not.

The best guess holds that Trujillo has about 3 months to adopt a positive course of action. Dominican sources who accurately predicted the January coup 4 months before it happened are now saying that a new plot is being hatched for June. This time, they say, the internal opposition, which so far has operated without help from the outside, will get together with other hemisphere forces dedicated to the overthrow of the benefactor. Next time, who knows? As one bishop remarked ominously, "It may soon be time for martyrs."

Wrecking an Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an enlightening article which appeared in the American Legion magazine for March 1960:

WRECKING AN INDUSTRY
(By George H. Waltz, Jr.)

No one doubts that the first victories in another large-scale war—if it comes—will be won by missiles, short-range, intermediate range, and intercontinental. Some will be launched from land bases, some from high-speed airplanes, and some from nuclear submarines. Billions of dollars are being spent by the U.S. Government to develop and stockpile this deadly kind of nuclear armament.

However, although a single missile may be capable of destroying an entire city, few top military experts feel that missiles alone will win a war. In a statement made before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 30, 1959, General Lemnitzer, the Army Chief of Staff, said: "In my opinion, the introduction of the new [nuclear era] weapons in no way diminishes the role of the ground soldier." Most military men recognize the fact that it will be the foot soldier—the old-fashioned "doughfoot" rigged out in new-fashioned gear including new lightweight, rapid-fire rifles—who will have to move in to hold the ground leveled by a missile attack. And if such a war ever does come, the military and the American people will expect those soldiers' rifles and automatic weapons to be the most modern, the latest in combat arms. They will expect such old-line arms manufacturers as Remington, Winchester, Savage, Marlin, High Standard, and others to be fully geared for a quick switch from the manufacture of sporting arms to military weapons. In past wars there has been a sufficient time lag to allow for research and development, retooling, and production. In a nuclear war there will be no time lag.

Unfortunately (and you can put emphasis on that word), the American people and many Government officials seem to be doing their best—either intentionally or unintentionally; it makes little difference—to throttle the American manufacturers of conventional ordnance, the very manufacturers who have come to our rescue when our national security was threatened. A fine old American industry, one that pioneered in the use of interchangeable parts, is slowly being forced out of business by three forms of harassment, official and otherwise.

As a result, the industry has already lost about one-third of its skilled arms production employees because of layoffs and shutdowns due to dwindling sales. The industry's profits after taxes in 1958 were 99 percent lower than they were in 1956.

Why are sales dwindling?

There are a number of reasons—none the fault of the industry. The most important factor is the unlimited importation of outmoded, surplus foreign military rifles and handguns. Since 1956 the importation of junked military rifles from England, Italy, South America, Austria, Sweden, Norway, and Israel has climbed steadily each year. Imports of surplus weapons increased 20 times between 1955 and 1958. During the same period, domestic gun sales fell off 50 percent. It is a simple case of foreign governments unloading their no-longer-adequate military arms on the American market without import limitations and without even an equitable import duty.

On November 10, 1959, the President of Costa Rica, Mario Enchandi Jimenez, announced that that country was sending all of its surplus arms to the United States in exchange for tractors—with old Uncle Sam playing the role of the man who is beating weapons into plowshares for a foreign country. According to a news story that appeared in the New York Times on November 12, 1959, President Jimenez emphasized that the arms were to be delivered to the dockside in the United States. "Whatever happens to them after that will be the U.S. business," said President Jimenez.

Because of the low cost and low import duty—the average duty on a foreign surplus military rifle is $1.19—these outmoded, antiquated military guns can be sold here for as little as $10.88 in sports shops, department stores, and by mail-order houses, most of them Johnny-come-latelys to the gun business. In the first 8 months of 1959, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, 123,676 foreign surplus military rifles were imported into this country. In 1958 a total of 172,000 old rifles were imported. When the final total is in for 1959, it will probably top 200,000.

In many cases these rifles cost the importers as little as 82 cents each. Add the average import duty of $1.19 and a few dollars for shipping charges, and you come up with a cost price that yields a handsome profit even at the low sales price of $10.88. Some foreign surplus military imports go for as much as $49.50.

With such a margin of markup, the importers have plenty of change to spare for advertisements in newspapers and magazines. The rifles that they advertised, although no longer considered suitable for foreign soldiers, are being foisted on the American public at prices that yield a tremendous profit for the importer. In addition, these prices are far below the cost of American-made, precision-built sporting rifles. Yet if you went deer hunting last year, you know that the woods were full of British Enfields, Swedish carbines, Italian carbines, Norwegian Krags, Belgian Mausers, and other foreign military what-nots.

Sure, they'll shoot, and that is about all a certain type of hunter cares about. However, they are military rifles. Many of them are crude. All have been used under hard service for a good many years, which means that their stocks and barrels are not things of beauty or fine workmanship. Many may be unsafe. None, although some importers try to doll up their foreign military merchandise with so-called sporting stocks (at extra cost to the buyer), are really hunting rifles. But, thanks to low import duties and no import limitations, the price tags are low. Thousands of Carcano carbines, 7.35-millimeter Italian-made army weapons, have been sold in the United States for as little as $14.88 each. Retail prices of American centerfire rifles range from $80 to $130, but these rifles are designed and built for hunting. American rifle manufacturers, harassed by uncontrolled foreign competition, must pay high wages to the skilled arms makers they employ. How can they compete? The answer is that they can't.

The markup that gives the firearms dealer his profit on an American-made rifle is infinitesimal when compared to the profit margin provided by the sale of an old surplus military gun. As a result, the gun dealer or sports shop handling American rifles as well as foreign surplus ones is able to make more on the latter even though it sells for less. And if his primary concern is making a fast buck, he probably will push the foreign military rifle.

This bonanza for the importers and some dealers has, oddly enough, been made possible by the kindliness of Uncle Sam—kindliness not directed toward the American small arms industry. Most of the military rifles that are being dumped on our market by the hundreds of thousands are obsolete weapons that have been, or are being, replaced by more modern weapons, whose cost in many cases is being underwritten by Uncle Sugar's foreign aid program. Foreign aid is fine when it is applied to underdeveloped countries, but when it plays a part in destroying an old American industry—an industry involved in our national security—it should be scanned carefully.

Just recently I saw a British Enfield that had been bought for about $15 at one of New York's largest department stores. Close examination showed the Savage imprint and the words "Property of the U.S." stamped on its barrel. Yet it had arrived in this country as an uncontrolled import and had been sold at a handsome profit to an American who, through taxes, had already paid for the rifle by helping to foot the tab for lend-lease—which turned out to be more give than lend or lease.

The American arms manufacturers have tried to stem this wholesale flood of war

surplus imports, but so far they have met with little success, in spite of the fact that they form the essential backbone of our military arms production. First, they approached the State Department, but received little help.

Last June they turned to the Government's Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization for relief. In their petition they pointed out that the industry is all important to the national security and asked that the importation of surplus military rifles be limited to the average quantity imported annually during the period from 1945 to 1955—about 5,000 guns a year.

This could be done under section 8 of the Trade Extension Act, which was designed to prevent excessive imports from impairing the ability of American industries to meet their mobilization assignments with a minimum of lead time. Unless it is done, according to our principal arms makers, "the domestic firearms industry cannot maintain its economic strength in the face of the present level of imports of surplus military rifles." They also maintained that unless some limitations are placed on the sale of foreign surplus arms, the industry will lose the nucleus of skilled arms experts who will be so necessary to an all-out effort to produce military arms, and it will be unable to carry out the research and development necessary to produce such military arms.

To plead their case, such importers of surplus military rifles as Interarmco, Ltd., of Alexandria, Va., and the Golden State Arms Corp. of Pasadena, Calif.—two of the largest—have organized the American Council for Technical Products. Their bland claims, as reported in the Wall Street Journal, center on the following:

First, that the Army Ordnance Corps carries on most small arms development and manufacture at its Springfield, Mass., armory. The actual facts: For the production of the new M–14 rifle, two arms manufacturers have been awarded contracts to produce 35,000 rifles each. The Springfield armory has a contract to produce 15,000.

Their second claim is that more than half of the surplus foreign military rifles sold go into gun collections or are hung over fireplaces as decorations. In this respect, so the importers claim, they are not in direct competition with American sporting rifle manufacturers.

However, the importers' own advertising and the advertising of the dealers, department stores, and mail-order houses handling their beaten-up foreign wares belie their claim. Most newspaper and magazine ads are illustrated with drawings of men and boys togged out in hunting gear. Even the copy in most cases is written to snare would-be hunters. The copy in a recent advertisement placed in the Wall Street Journal by the Golden State Arms Corp. starts off this way: "Deer hunters, we have at last received a shipment of the rare and prized British Enfield special carbine No. 5, designed specifically for use in the jungle and rain forest."

This is an "over the mantel" gun?

An ad in the New York Daily News, placed by Abraham & Straus, one of Brooklyn's largest department stores, reads: "Preseason hunting event. British Royal 303 Enfield sniper rifle with a 90-day new-gun guarantee."

Do over-the-mantel guns used for decorative purposes need a 90-day new-gun guarantee?

The headline of still another such ad, this one placed in the New York Herald-Tribune by the Hunter's Lodge of Alexandria, Va., read: "Happy hunting * * * a la Italiana." The copy describes a war surplus Italian Carcano carbine.

Just how many Americans would buy an Italian Carcano carbine to hang over their mantel? The company's very name—Hunter's Lodge—gives the pitch. It is after the hunter's trade—the country's largest market for guns.

The American small-arms industry is also feeling a squeeze from the importation of new shotguns and sporting rifles made in Italy and other foreign countries. Because of low labor costs and low import duties, shotguns and rifles with hand-engraved barrels and finely grained and handworked stocks can be placed on the American gun dealer's racks at a fraction of the cost of a domestic gun. One gun dealer showed me a single-shot shotgun that he can sell for less than $40. It was engraved and had a beautiful stock. I asked him why he handled them. His reply: "Frankly, they arrive 'broken' and I have a devil of a time assembling them; but they sell because of their 'ornamentation' and comparative low price. If I didn't carry them, the fellow down the street would."

Cutthroat competition from the unlimited importation of both surplus and new weapons would be to hog-tie the American arms industry. But it also has other troubles. Now the industry is being plagued in a subtler, but just as damaging, way by various groups of do-gooders and pantywaisted men and women who feel that the main solution of the problems of crime and juvenile delinquency is just a simple matter of passing a law. They usually suggest either a law that would ban the sale of rifles, shotguns, or handguns to anyone but certain Government officials and the police forces, or a law that would require citizens to obtain licenses or permits to own and use a rifle or a shotgun and to buy ammunition.

Unfortunately, such a law has never cut down the incidence of crime (New York State is a good example of this fact). All it does is prevent the average law-abiding citizen from obtaining a gun, or make it difficult for him to do so. Criminals, on the other hand, are able to buy handguns from under-the-counter sources.

These groups would like to repeal the second amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

One of the first things that a dictator does when he comes to power is to require the registration of all arms. The next step is the confiscation of all arms. This gives him and his police-state government the assurance that the people will have no weapons to use in revolt.

Last July McCall's magazine joined the ranks of the do-gooders who feel that you can outlaw crime by passing a law. In an article entitled "This Very Day a Gun May Kill You" they fell into step with the anti-rifle, antishotgun, and antihandgun parade. The author, presumably backed by the editors, blamed the sale of arms to law-abiding citizens for many things, including juvenile delinquency, suicides, and crime.

What the article failed to point out was that this very day you stand a much better chance of being killed by an automobile, a mugger with only two bare hands for weapons, or by a garrison belt-slinging teenager than by a gun.

If we were to outlaw the use of all things that killed, we'd be without automobiles, belts, pieces of rope, lengths of heavy chain, umbrellas, icepicks, pocketknives, and bathtubs. Many people are killed every year by a combination of a lost piece of soap and a bathtub.

In the best tradition of the McCall's approach to life, the author deplored the way in which perfectly normal and well-adjusted juveniles became killers once they laid hands on firearms. In the grimmest details, the article told how these youngsters burst the bonds of togetherness by grabbing daddy's rifle or uncle's shotgun and mowing down other members of the family. What McCall's neglected to point out was that these maladjusted children could have used a leadpipe, a kitchen knife, or a bottle of salad oil to vent their childish petulance.

The McCall's article quoted numbers from the National Office of Vital Statistics to show that in 1956 over 14,000 Americans were killed by guns.

However, the statistics were used slightly out of context. The National Office of Vital Statistics report for that year shows that of the 14,220 (if you want to be exact about numbers, which McCall's was not) killed, 7,841 were suicides by firearms or explosives, 4,010 were assault victims by firearms or explosives, and 2,369 resulted from accident by firearms. Actually, the only one of these figures that really counts is the 4,010—the number of people who were assault victims of firearms or explosives. A man or woman intent on suicide can resort to gas, a knife, or the muffler of the family car. He doesn't need a gun.

In point of fact more people, many more than the 2,369 listed as gun fatalities, die right in their own homes—homes without firearms—each year. And these deaths are caused by falling downstairs, slipping on ice, slipping in the bathtub, or tripping over a child's toy, etc. If we are to follow the lead of the editors of McCall's, perhaps we should outlaw stairs and children's playthings.

When you begin to think about it, the whole idea becomes ridiculous. However, this didn't prevent George Gallup of the American Institute of Public Opinion in Princeton, N.J., from conducting one of his famous polls on this subject. Oddly enough, his poll, too, came up with the 14,000 "killed by firearms" figure. And he—like the McCall's article—failed to break down the figures to show the percentages or numbers who were suicides or who were killed by explosives. Letters written to Dr. Gallup by sportsmen questioning the figures used in his poll were, for the most part, unanswered.

Perhaps the best answer to Dr. Gallup, McCall's, and others we have referred to was presented in an editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Law and Order, published by the National Police Officers Association of America. It was written by the association's president, Frank J. Schira, and it said:

"Without appearing to sit on a fence we feel that an American citizen of voting age and of good character should have the right to purchase without restriction a handgun, rifle, or shotgun or a like item without interference by a Government body * * *. Let's not tie redtape around the hammer of the handgun and restrict good men and women from owning firearms." The president of the National Police Officers Association of America should know what he is talking about.

In the event of war, we are going to need our small arms industry. Let's not kill it with unfair foreign competition. And let's not kill it with laws that require the honest citizen to get all sorts of permits and licenses in order to own a gun for hunting or target shooting or home protection.

Most industries are protected by import limitations. Why not the American arms industry?

Democrats and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago

Daily Calumet, a community newspaper in my district, is, I believe, a most interesting commentary on a subject of great concern to us all:

DEMOCRATS AND DEFENSE

Democratic hopefuls seeking the presidential nomination look a little foolish when they in unison go out calling for increased armaments against the Soviet threat and at the same time call loudly for suspension of nuclear tests.

It is these same candidates who are obsessed with the notions that war is unthinkable, that reason will triumph, that our differences with the Communists are negotiable, that Khrushchev needs peace, that coexistence is the prerequisite to survival.

If all these assertions are true and their reasoning logical, why then should we be so worried about a timelag in the missile race of a year or two?

We Need Heart Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of February 23, 1960:

BIRTHDAYS MAKE HEART GLOW, SCIENTISTS FIND—AGE PIGMENTS ACCUMULATE IN LIVING CELLS AND SHINE UNDER ULTRAVIOLET LIGHT

CHICAGO.—Birthdays truly make your heart glow.

The older you get, the more your heart actually will shine or fluoresce if exposed to ultraviolet or black light.

It shines more because more age pigment accumulates in living cells of the heart. This pigment is a strange and perhaps very significant fact in the puzzle of why and how we grow old and die.

The pigment shines with a kind of orange light when the heart is inspected with ultraviolet light.

The age pigment concentrating in human hearts, nerves, brains, and muscles is being investigated for clues to aging.

INCREASES WITH AGE

The story is told in an exhibit to the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Children up to about age 10 apparently have none of the age pigments in their hearts, autopsy studies show.

But the amount increases in proportion to age thereafter, scientists of the gerontology branch, National Heart Institute, and Baltimore City Hospitals find.

In persons of advanced age, perhaps 20 percent of the heart is made up of the age pigment, which is relatively inactive and seemingly useless.

REPLACES SOME TISSUE

But it is replacing some of the contractile tissue of the heart cells. A big question is whether this is connected with the higher death rates that come with age.

The age pigment was first noticed many years ago. Main goals now are in trying to isolate and identfy it, and determine what it means.

Where the pigment comes from and why are also still unknown. It doesn't seem to be correlated with heart failure, or any particular disease.

The research team includes Drs. Berhard Strehler, Albert S. Mildvan, Donald Mark (now in Peoria, Ill.), Daniel Hendley, and Irwin Konigsberg.

Bank of England Stops Supporting Market for Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 26, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 26, 1960, entitled "Bank of England Stops Supporting Market for Government Bonds."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK OF ENGLAND STOPS SUPPORTING MARKET FOR GOVERNMENT BONDS—ACTION IS AIMED AT RESTRAINING BRITISH BONDS FROM FINANCING INFLATIONARY SPENDING

LONDON.—The Bank of England, for the first time in many years, withdrew its market support for British Government bonds, in a Government move to restrain banks in the United Kingdom from financing inflationary spending.

Banks have been selling bonds in large amounts on the open market to raise money for increased loans to customers. Such sales in recent weeks have been estimated at 80 million pounds sterling, equivalent to $224 million.

Until now the Bank of England, anxious not to disturb investors' confidence in government securities, has absorbed these offerings by making purchases at prices considered necessary to maintain a favorable market.

That policy ended late Wednesday, when the Bank of England decided to call a halt to the commercial banks' unloading and discontinued its support buying.

The immediate effect was to send gilt-edged issues tumbling, and the slide continued yesterday, with losses ranging as high as $3.

One financial authority said the Bank of England's move represented "the British Government's firmest disinflationary action since the bank rate was raised to 7 percent in September 1957." Later reductions cut the bank rate to 4 percent, but last month it was moved back up to 5 percent.

The bank rate is the fee the Bank of England charges on credit extended to other lending institutions.

"With price trends uncertain in the absence of Government support, it is unlikely the banks will now indulge in any heavy selling of their remaining gilt-edged securities," one market dealer noted.

The Government action was viewed as a roundabout way of restricting consumer credit without resorting to a further bank rate move or imposing direct controls on installment buying.

The action of withdrawing Government support for gilt-edged bonds in the market hit industrial bond prices as well as Government bonds. In spite of late rallying attempts, the list finished widely lower yesterday. With losses running to the equivalent of a dollar or so.

The Bank of England normally buys and sells gilt-edged bonds in the market to smooth out violent price fluctuations. When such buying develops into inflationary support of the market against heavy selling by commercial banks, the central bank pulls out the stop—a point which apparently has now been reached.

For many months banks have been lending freely to their customers. Reasons listed for the rising credit demand include: Booming trade and increased industrial output, which mean larger inventories of goods to be carried and financed; capital expansions, frequently financed at the start by bank loans in anticipation of later permanent arrangements; increased personal spending, partly in connection with installment buying of automobiles, houses, and appliances; heavy tax payments at this season by companies and individuals.

If the Government's latest action to trim back spending regarded as inflationary fails, further moves are expected. One suggestion is that the new and yet untried device of the special deposit might be introduced. This would be an order by the Bank of England to banks to deposit with it a certain proportion of their cash resources. Money so locked up could not be used for advances to customers.

Such a rule would be similar in a general way to the reserve requirements of U.S. law, under which commercial banks must keep specified portions of their deposits in cash at Federal Reserve banks.

Official quarters indicate there is no immediate intention or need to introduce the special deposit plan or to resort to direct restrictions on installment sales. However, Government sources say they're determined to nip in the bud any new inflationary tendency; one sign of that attitude was the recent hike in the bank rate to 5 percent.

Poll Payola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

POLL PAYOLA

Are public opinion polls a subtle form of "payola"?

This question is not as remote as it may seem. One of the gimmicks utilized in the record business was to create phony "polls" and thereby manipulate the popularity of certain recording artists and spur the sale of records.

If it worked in the comparatively unimportant business of rock and roll, perhaps it will function with even more devastating results in the field of economics and politics.

And if it was "payola" for disk jockeys to artificially stimulate the demand and popularity of certain records, isn't it even more "payola" when a public opinion poll keeps saying over and over again that NIXON is a virtual shoo-in for President?

Private soundings of public temperament may be valid on the grounds they are kept confidential and are the property of those footing the bill. But polls taken for the obvious purpose of influencing, rather than tabulating, public opinion most definitely are guilty of "payola."

We'd like to see a congressional investigation of the politakers in America. It is difficult for us to really believe that the questioning of 2,000 or 3,000 people out of nearly 200 million is a basis for predicting how people will vote.

Samuel Grafton, author and columnist writing in Sunday's New York Times, points out that many an important debate, such as the famous Lincoln-Douglass exchanges would never have taken place if a poll taker had resolved the issue in advance. He cited Rockefeller's withdrawal from the GOP presidential race because of polls as a disservice to American democracy.

Harry Truman proved that a stirring campaign, raising issues and debating them forcefully, can prove the politakers all wet.

When you realize that in the past over 90 percent of the newspapers editorially backed the Republican candidate for President, it's easy to understand how a combination of big business, big money, big press, and big polls can go a long way down the payola road to elect the Nation's No. 1 officeholder.

Senator Vance Hartke Discusses the Unemployment Problem on "The American Forum of the Air"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of December 1959, the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems conducted hearings in four Indiana cities. One of these was the city of La Porte in my own congressional district. The La Porte community has suffered substantial and persistent unemployment in recent years.

The chairman of the Senate committee hearings in Indiana was the distinguished junior Senator from our State, the Honorable R. VANCE HARTKE, who has himself shown a deep interest in attacking the problem of unemployment. Senator HARTKE's able and informed questioning of the many witnesses who testified at this grassroots hearing in La Porte made the visit of the Senate committee to La Porte County unusually valuable and productive.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of "The American Forum of the Air" broadcast of December 1, 1959, on the topic, "How Serious Is the Unemployment Problem?"

Both Senator HARTKE and Dr. Clarence Long, professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University, participated in the discussion. The proceedings follow:

HOW SERIOUS IS THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM?

(Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, and Dr. Clarence Long, professor of economics, Johns Hopkins University; Jim Snyder, moderator)

Mr. SNYDER. This is the "American Forum of the Air," produced by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. in association with Theodore Granik.

Our guests are Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, and Dr. Clarence Long, professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University.

They will discuss "The Unemployment Problem."

When Labor Secretary James Mitchell "ate his hat" a few weeks ago it was one more indication that despite the booming American economy over 3 million people are unemployed. Opinions vary widely on the seriousness of the problem and how it can be solved.

We are pleased to have as our guests on the "American Forum" Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, who is a member of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, and Dr. Clarence Long, professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University.

Senator HARTKE, let's begin by discussing the causes of unemployment.

Now Dr. Long has testified before your committee that unemployment is caused by excessive labor turnover, poor business management, lack of community organizations in depressed areas, and stubborn and shortsighted labor leadership. Do you agree with Dr. Long?

Senator HARTKE. Well, those are some pretty general terms. We have to come back to some specifics. I think possibly we have to take this in the context in which Dr. Long was talking about.

The important thing to me about unemployment is that this is something which deals with human beings. It is something that cannot be dealt with in statistics alone. When you have a man out of work and he has a family to support it is a problem, and when we have this situation multiplied better than 3 million times in the United States, it is more than a problem. And the important thing to the public is that they have to pay in one way or another for these people. They have to pay for them either in unemployment compensation checks, they have to pay for them in welfare assistance or they will have to pay for them in local relief or in charitable donation or otherwise they pay for them in the way which is most inhuman of all, and that is suffering, and this to me is why we must seek the solutions to some of these problems.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, what about the causes of unemployment?

Senator HARTKE. There are a number of causes, of course, but the biggest thing is that you must have an economy which is capable of absorbing a number of potential individual situations. One of them is the supply of labor which is available. This means that it must be qualified and capable of doing the jobs which are required. It doesn't do any good to have a typist apply for a job doing welding. The typist can't weld. Nor can the welder type, and this presents one problem. The other situation, another one of the situations is the case where you have people at work in factory levels, or in the production of goods, and this number of people is not increasing in the Nation's overall economy. It is really at about the same level numerically as it was in about 1919, so we have to find another area where people can go to work.

So to find an answer to this means really finding an answer to our overall economic problem. Involved in this is the one big one which is coming to the front now, and is nothing more than what we have had before, what we call automation. This is the increased productivity of a human being as a result of using intelligent machines or intelligent methods of doing things.

Mr. SNYDER. Dr. Long, do you agree with the Senator on this or do you still feel as you did before you testified before his committee?

Dr. LONG. Well, I certainly agree with a great many things that the Senator has said. I think that one of the interesting things about the behavior of our employment and unemployment problem over the last 13 years is that it presents us with something of a paradox. On the one hand the economy has shown that it has amazing ability to create jobs for enormous numbers of people. We have actually now employed about 8 million more people than about 13 years ago, and all during that time there have been enormous releases of people because of increases in efficiency, so we have absorbed a great increase in the labor force and offset this great increase in technological technology.

At the same time throughout this period we have always continued to have something like about 4 percent of our labor force unemployed. Only briefly, and that was during the Korean war, has it gone below 4 percent. That means somewhere around 3 million unemployed, and I think we have to ask ourselves what is the nature of our unemployment problem, is it a recession unemployment problem or is it a typical or normal peacetime unemployment problem?

And when you examine the total contribution of recession unemployment to the total unemployment problem we have had over those years, you will find that five-sixths of all of our unemployment has been the kind of unemployment that persists even during what we think of as prosperity.

Senator HARTKE. I think that is right, Dr. Long, and this is the problem because now we are talking about so-called increased prosperity in the event that the steel strike is settled, and we don't know about that. If it isn't, of course, this is going to be multiplied and be upon us much quicker than before. Many economists, as you well know, predict a recession in 1961, and this is nothing new, but the point that worries me is when you add to this normal drop of 3-million-plus, these people in recession times, we have something which could be a potential threat not alone to our economic future but to our political future as well. The point that really worries me, and I find in many of these cases we talk about are our educational facilities—you come from an educational institution—I find people who are not educated to do a job.

I was in the hearings with West Virginia and an old man 33 years of age told me, he said, "I'm too old to get a job, but I am too young to claim my old age pension and all I know is coal mining and I don't know anything else."

Dr. LONG. Well, I agree with you. If you take a look at the unemployed you will find they have certain characteristics. One, they are apt to be rather young. There is an awful lot of unemployment among the young people. There is an awful lot of unemployment among colored people. There is a lot of unemployment among the older people. Actually the older people tend to be unemployed for longer periods. There is a good deal of unemployment among people in certain localities and in the case of your unskilled labor, your manual worker, the people in manufacturing and mining and construction, in these industries, you have heavy concentrations of unemployment. And following Senator HARTKE's statement, you have your greatest problem of unemployment among the uneducated people.

Mr. SNYDER. Where does your charge of shortsighted labor leadership apply to these problems?

Dr. LONG. Well, that is only one factor involved here. I wouldn't think that shortsighted labor leadership was the principal factor involved here. I only mention it as one. I think certainly the type of leadership that overprices labor, insists on getting a wage which is greater than what the market can absorb at any particular time, the type of leadership which insists on inflicting outmoded methods of production in the shortsighted effort to preserve a job for a certain period, this raises the costs of labor so high that in many cases people can't afford to buy it, and the workers stay unemployed.

Senator HARTKE. Dr. Long, let me interrupt you for a moment. I don't want to disagree with you, but I would like to pose a question to you in this regard: We talk about shortsighted labor leaders in these regards. Now primarily their responsibility is to their membership as I understand the concept of American economics, and their job is to provide two things for them as far as they are concerned. That is an adequate wage under good working conditions, and if they do this of course then they are serving a useful function in society.

However, whenever you talk about overpricing the labor in a community, how can they overprice themselves whenever they have to deal on a competitive basis with industry?

Dr. LONG. The overpricing consists of adhering to a certain stubborn wage policy which makes it very difficult for the businessman to hire that labor, to cover the costs in the price he charges and sell enough of it to employ all the workers.

I agree with you the labor leader's job is to represent his workers, but he doesn't represent them if he tries to get such a high price or tries to inflict such practices that the workers don't get jobs. I mean only insofar as the worker has a job does his higher wage help him. If the higher wage prices him out of the market, then the worker is not helped, he is hurt by it.

Senator HARTKE. I agree with that. It doesn't make any difference what his pay per hour is, if he doesn't work any hours, that is what you are saying.

Dr. LONG. Yes.

Senator HARTKE. In the coal mining industry, and I was born in the heart of the coal mining area of southern Indiana, we have a situation which makes me wonder, though, about this type of situation. Here are labor leaders who according to industry and labor alike, and even the economists, have contended that they have not stopped automation which of course is the normal process of reducing the labor force. They do have a high labor-wage-scale. They have improved their working conditions tremendously. And yet today in this particular industry they are able to take this coal, mine it in the United States, ship it overseas and deliver it on the banks of the Rhine cheaper and less expensively and at less money than the Germans can mine their own coal and at less price in spite of the fact that the miners in Germany are receiving less money than our people.

Now this is one of the hard hit groups of people in the United States today, and this makes me wonder whether there can be any real charge as to whether it can be laid at the doorstep of so-called labor leaders.

Dr. LONG. I hope I didn't give the impression that I lay this whole problem, Senator HARTKE, at the doorstep of labor leaders.

Senator HARTKE. No, I don't think you did, I honestly don't. I understand that.

Dr. LONG. I started out by saying that it is only one contributing factor. There are a great many other factors. As I say one of the major factors is the nature of the unemployed person himself. In many cases—I think in a bulk of the cases, he doesn't have enough to offer the employer to justify his employment. Consequently, he either doesn't get a job or if he gets it, he loses it and if he loses it, he has a hard time getting another job.

You will find that something like half of all the unemployed suffer something like 85 to 90 percent of all the unemployment in the sense that unemployment keeps coming back to this group all the time.

Senator HARTKE. And we recognize that. Like you mentioned before, certain categories suffer worse than others, and of course with the Negro, he suffers in this. In other words, his problem is not a question maybe so much of civil rights as it is a question of economic rights for the Negro and maybe he would have his civil rights.

Dr. LONG. Precisely.

Now when I say it lies within the worker himself, I don't mean it is always the worker's fault. Obviously if a colored man can't get a job, it is not his fault that he is colored, and we can't change this situation, but what we have to do here is to eliminate the obstacles to the employment of colored people.

Senator HARTKE. The prejudice.

Dr. LONG. Yes, and the prejudice against the employment of older people.

Mr. SNYDER. How large a factor do you think prejudice against the Negro is in employment policies?

Dr. LONG. I think it is quite an important factor in this respect, that the great expansions in the demand for labor are occurring in white collar and service occupations. You will find most colored people are employed in manual occupations. In factory occupations. These are the areas which, as Senator HARTKE points out, are not expanding. Consequently, if there is prejudice against employing a colored person in an office, at a typewriter or doing clerical work or supervisory work, then he is cut off from an important type of demand for his services.

Senator HARTKE. I think that is right.

Let me ask you this, though, in regard to that: Do you feel there is anything being done on an educational level to help in this regard? To me, I think one of the biggest solutions is a real bona fide educational basis, and I am not talking about the three R's now, although I believe in them and have children of my own who are concerned with that, but I am talking about educating people so that they can find their places in society, their little niche in society.

Do you feel that our educational system is geared to do that today?

Dr. LONG. Do you mean are we talking about the colored person now, or are we talking about the larger problem——

Senator HARTKE. I think it will apply to both, but I am particularly interested in the Negroes and whether or not there is any attempt being made to bring them to the place where they will be more acceptable as far as this type of work is concerned.

Dr. LONG. Well, I certainly see efforts, because I see and I think you see colored people doing jobs that 10 or 20 years ago would have been unthinkable. There are all sorts of occupations that have been opening up, but we all know that the pace is very slow and sometimes the problem lies with the fellow workers. Often the employer is willing to hire them, but he finds a great deal of friction in the office so it really gets down to the problem of the prejudices of the individual person and that is of course not easy to deal with.

Senator HARTKE. Dr. Long, this is something that bothers me along the same line. Do you have any particular answer—and I haven't gotten an answer to this—as to why unemployment is so much lower in—take Western Germany and England and France and Belgium and in Sweden, percentagewise, than it is in the United States?

Dr. LONG. Well, I think there are a number of reasons. One thing of course, America is a great continent with very large turnover population. People are moving all the time, changing jobs. A far more dynamic country, and the sheer amount of turnover unemployment I think is greater in this country.

Senator HARTKE. May I stop you for a moment there?

Dr. LONG. Yes.

Senator HARTKE. This bothers me. This dynamic society which is constantly moving around and then at the same time is ending up in second place. This is what gets my goat lately. Here we are, we are in second place as far as missiles are concerned, we are in second place now as far as exporting automobiles—Western Germany has gone ahead of us in the exporting of automobiles—here we have come from a nation which was—this dynamic, mobile labor population—and constantly instead of moving ahead and progressing as we should be, we are progressing and getting a better way of life, but not with the rapidity at which a lot of people would like to see us go.

Dr. LONG. Of course we are a very proud people and we want to be first in everything. It is not very likely that one country is going to be first in everything. Of course in the case of our automobiles, we have produced an automobile which is geared to the American market, and the American price of gasoline, and it is not easy to produce the kind of automobile which the rest of the world wants which happens to be a very small car, so to some extent we are bound to fall behind in that respect.

So far as missiles are concerned, I suspect that we don't lack the intelligence or the ability to produce missiles. It is simply a matter of budgeting. The people who are in charge of budgeting sums of money and planning this a number of years ago didn't think it was important enough.

Mr. SNYDER. I think Senator HARTKE is moving into the area of his disagreement with the Eisenhower administration on certain things.

Dr. LONG. I agree with him profoundly on that one.

Mr. SNYDER. One thing that comes to mind is the problem in depressed areas. What is your feeling on depressed areas, Senator? What do you think should be done about these pockets of unemployment around the country?

Senator HARTKE. Well, we all know they exist, and to recognize they exist and admit it is very important.

The second thing that is very important to me is the fact that right today as yet there is no place in which there is a labor shortage. In other words, there is no metropolitan area which really has an excess of demand for labor over what they can give. They can in certain fields. But in these certain areas where you have for long terms of years a large number of people unemployed, you have seen a changing economy with no one giving enough thought and enough planning on a national level in my opinion as to how you are going to move these people over into a productive way of life and once you have a family which has its roots into a community, you don't move them. You don't say, "Look, you go over to Los Angeles and get a job."

Maybe he doesn't want to go to Los Angeles. He likes it where he is. This presents a sociological as well as economic problem. So it means that you have to have national planning.

I think most local communities in my opinion do not have the finances nor do they have enough of the planning experts and I am talking about people who can really think these problems through—I don't think they have them. Now they may be proud enough to say, "We do," but I think if they will examine their own problems just as we did in one place in Pennsylvania, they will finally come up with the stark realization that they don't have enough money to hire the type of people who can come up with the correct solutions of using these people once they have been taken away from their regular source of employment.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, now in the last session of Congress the Eisenhower administration was willing to appropriate $53 million, I believe, was the figure, for depressed areas aid. The Douglas-Clark bill, the Democratic bill, wanted over $300 million. I assume you were in favor of the larger figure.

Senator HARTKE. As far as I am concerned, $300 million, if you could solve the depressed

areas problem by spending $300 million in Federal money—now I don't say it would solve it, but if you could solve it for that amount of money, the money that the Federal Government would get back in taxes from these people being put to work would come back, I would say, a thousandfold. I mean this is the shortsightedness of spending money. Sometimes you know you can be penny wise and pound foolish in some of these programs. I don't say this would get an answer, but it is high time we get an answer because the depressed area continues to be a blight not only on the area in which it is located but upon the Nation.

Mr. SNYDER. Dr. Long, as a man who didn't have to vote on these depressed areas bills, do you agree with Senator HARTKE on that? Do you think this kind of Federal spending is the answer to the depressed areas problem?

Dr. LONG. I agree if you could solve the problem for even that large sum of money, it would be a real bargain.

I think there is great difficulty in understanding the problem of the depressed area. So many people say, "Well, the way to solve the problem is to get these people out of the depressed areas." I think the Senator is quite right in saying that that is no solution at all.

You know Adam Smith, who is the first eminent economist, who wrote "The Wealth of Nations," once said that of all baggage to move, the human baggage is the most expensive. People don't want to leave these communities. They have their roots there, and as a matter of fact when people leave that even makes the situation of the community worse, because it means stores are left without customers, and the community, to some extent, unless you move everybody out, just moving some people out makes the situation worse rather than better.

The easier thing to do—it is not easy—is to move capital and managerial ability into these areas. What they are lacking to some extent is community leadership and that is why I have said before that one of the problems here is lack of community leadership.

Mr. SNYDER. Senator HARTKE, your Special Committee on Unemployment Problems will make recommendations to the Congress when it convenes in January. Now could you give us a preview of some of the things your committee has come up with to solve the unemployment problem?

Senator HARTKE. Up to this time, Jim, I don't think that would be possible in view of the fact that frankly we will have to have meetings of the committee. Up to this time we have had the hearings in Washington, where we have been accumulating information, accumulating data. We have had some conversations and some general theories. I don't think they are all going to agree. We are going out into the field, conducting hearings in many States, right in the areas themselves, so there is the human element and the local community approach to these things. Some local communities say they don't need any help, that they can do it all by themselves. Some local communities will tell you just the opposite and then you will have disagreement. Some of them are in between.

I think this: I think the overall problem of standardization of unemployment benefits, which doesn't answer the problem but does answer the temporary problem of the unemployed, is probably going to be one element which is going to be raised.

The question also as to what to do in the line of Federal legislation in the field of depressed areas, whether it is similar to the one we had before, or others, will probably come up; but I want one thing to be very clear, and that is that this particular committee is not a legislative committee. It is not supposed to propose any suggested legislation.

The idea is: It is supposed to lay out the problem, to point out what the difficulties are, and what some possible means of solution may be, and one of them quite easily recognized I think by any member of the committee is the question of education for these people.

Maj. Gen. W. E. Potter, Canal Zone Governor, Addresses Mississippi Valley Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and as a Member of Congress from St. Louis, I was interested on both counts in the recent address delivered in St. Louis by the Governor of the Canal Zone and President of the Panama Canal Company, Maj. Gen. W. E. Potter.

Governor Potter, who served in the heartland of America in the Mississippi Valley area for the Corps of Engineers before being appointed to his vitally important position in Latin America, addressed the Mississippi Valley Association on February 8 on the subject "Have Trade, Will Compete." His talk is an excellent presentation of the facts in connection with our situation and status in Latin America, and the need for stronger economic joint efforts there. Coming at a time when there is so much interest in the United States and in Latin America over political relationships in this hemisphere, Governor Potter's speech provided an insight into the economic relationships which his listeners in St. Louis found exceedingly interesting and provocative, and which I know many Members of Congress will want to read.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I therefore submit relevant excerpts from the text of Governor Potter's speech in St. Louis for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

HAVE TRADE, WILL COMPETE

(Excerpts from an address to the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 8, 1960, by Maj. Gen. W. E. Potter, Governor of the Canal Zone and President, Panama Canal Company)

It is indeed an accolade to be asked to occupy this spot in your program. I am grateful for the opportunity to return to the valley which has the most fabulous record of economic development, and which faces the most dynamic growth probabilities of any single region in this entire hemisphere.

As much as I am inclined to do so, I am not going to just talk valley or association. The same kind of coordination your association has demonstrated is needed in the appraisal and approach to a national problem which merits your interest and attention. This national problem is one whose solution has more impact on your association, the valley, and the Nation, than most others that now confront us. I refer to our current Latin American export-import situation, its health, and a prognosis of its future. The subject has no glamour. Few popular books deal with it—worse, it has no sex appeal, and is politically important only at the higher levels. There, I am sure it excites the highest interest. It should excite our interest here, too. It will be a determinant in your internal development and external trade.

In the valley, throughout the Nation, and worldwide, trade is at a historic peak, and the prospects for the 1960's are fabulous; many industries, including construction, petroleum, and natural gas, trucking and chemicals, are expected to expand by at least 50 percent, and others, including electronics, pharmaceuticals, aluminum, airlines, and electrical energy production, will double during the next 10 years. It is amid this healthy economic situation that we must plan against one of the trade crisis of our times. Today we stand at a crucial point in international trade competition for both foreign markets and sources of raw materials. Under the impact of voluminous production and domestic market expansion, neglect of foreign markets and underestimation of the capabilities of foreign producers might spell future economic slowdowns. We must have a strong promotion of U.S. industry. Let us adopt the slogan "Have Trade, Will Compete." We must increase our competition in world markets if we expect to retain our position of industrial leadership.

Over the years the Yankee trader (this may be a dangerous term to use here in St. Louis, but in Latin America all of us are Yankees, believe it or not) has become a world citizen. As an ability to compete for exports has become more and more important, he has kept us in the running and even ahead of our competition. Too, our industrial machine has increasing need of raw materials which we must import and the Yankee trader has discovered and developed sources. But he has new problems facing him today and he will need help from home.

For this international trade, it is vital to our future that we increase our efforts in Latin America. The business communities of North and South America already are closely related. This relationship bears directly upon the future security and well-being of the people of the entire Western Hemisphere. It is with these neighbors that we shall live in the future and as Boss Kettering of General Motors used to say, "the future is where we are going to spend the rest of our lives."

Too often we hear of Latin America merely as a so-called political problem. The internal uprisings and turmoils of the various republics and the problems of international relations with those republics tend to obscure those things that are of vital importance to us. I could perhaps to easily define it by saying this: "No section of the world is more important to the United States than Latin America," and follow it by the corollary: "The United States is of more importance to Latin America than any other section of the world." I include in this importance not only commerce but development, culture and friendship.

During the last 4 years I have been in contact with many people of Latin America. I have talked to heads of governments, to the diplomats, and to the business people who represent varied interests in both South and Central America. These neighbors in many instances face problems in their economic growth and industrial development that are comparable to problems that we have faced and solved throughout the various States which you represent. To most of the republics, with their trade barriers, limited capital, and lack of people with foresight

and willingness to invest in the future of their country, these problems are insurmountable unless they have outside assistance.

Latin America is rich in raw materials for which our demands rise yearly. This raw material demand—the percentage we must import and its rapid growth in tonnage and additional items—is indeed a cause for concern. It is a demand which must be satisfied by daring and willingness on the part of American enterprise to risk its capital. That U.S. industry has been willing is amply evidenced by the fact that in Latin America is the greatest investment of U.S. dollars outside of the United States. No other continent or country has been the recipient of so much of our investment. Thirty-seven percent of all U.S. private investment outside the territorial limits of our country are in Latin America. There we have almost $9 billion invested. It grows at the rate of $400 million a year. American firms pay local taxes in Latin America of over a billion dollars annually. We employ over 600,000 Latin Americans in that area.

This does not mean all is sweetness and light. There are giant problems. The surge of population growth in the countries to the south of us is terrific. We in the United States think we are growing fast. Latin America has a birth rate two to three times ours. Right now its population is just greater than that of the United States and is increasing 2.3 percent a year. That is twice as fast as world population is rising. The most certain thing in Latin America is the continuance of this population increase. By the year 2000 it will be 600 million, or about twice that of the United States and Canada at that time.

Because it is completely outpacing the gross national product, this population growth throws heavy burdens on local governments. Most of the countries have a single-crop economy and, hence, are unduly subject to price and demand fluctuations. Unless agriculture and industrial development are accelerated, they face economic and political disaster.

The present national production compared to population results in low average incomes, I believe in all cases under $400 a year, and this despite the huge U.S. investments that have been poured into many of the countries. In several countries, whether the standard of the education system is high or low, the high-school or college graduate has small chance for a job at a level comparable to his educational qualification. The economy does not produce job openings at the rate the schools produce graduates. The future holds little promise. Also, the graduate's country will be hard pressed to reap the benefits of his abilities, because he will be forced to accept employment which does not utilize his potential. This disheartening situation undoubtedly contributes to the frequent student uprisings in the Latin American countries.

There are at least two solutions to the economic, cultural, and political dilemma that face practically every Central and South American country today. The first and most logical solution is the course that we have followed within the United States: the complete abolition of all trade barriers and the planned utilization and completely free interchange of labor and raw-material resources to obtain optimum benefits for all sections of our nations. Such an arrangement could be established between the South and Central American nations without necessarily surrendering their national identity in a political or ethnical sense. However, it would require international cooperation, confidence, and mutual planning. Such a philosophy would be incompatible with the nationalistic attitude that exists throughout these nations at the present time. A modification of this idealistic plan, and possibly the first step in a direction of industrialization through pooling of resources, might be the formation of a central common marketing plan similar to that which has performed successfully in Europe. Surely these nations will eventually recognize the potential wealth that lies within their grasp if, instead of selling their ores, petroleum, etc., in crude form, they utilize their excess labor in producing finished products for the world's markets. It is my personal belief that even the force of necessity may not bring about this metamorphosis, and I doubt any of us here will live to see the full and complete integration of the industrial capabilities of Latin America.

The alternate and less desirable solution from the standpoint of the nations involved is a continuation of the process of industrialization and development in each of these individual countries through the inflow of capital and know-how from the more advanced foreign powers. This method has brought a degree of economic stability, and some advancement along cultural and educational lines to a few countries such as Venezuela and Peru, but in some cases in the past, the benefits received by the nations as a whole have been minuscule when compared to the value of the national resources exchanged. Too often a few of the wealthy landowners and politicians reaped the reward, while the workers remained in a state little better than serfdom. There are today, however, many examples of American firms that have established fruitgrowing, mining, manufacturing, processing, and assembling plants in Latin America and are paying salaries and wages that permit their indigenous employees to develop some semblance of the dignity that is the characteristic of our workers in the United States. I believe that this situation will continue to improve, and that industrialization will mean the emancipation of the Latin American workers, as well as the economic development of these nations. Unfortunately throughout Latin America today so-called nationalism is a threat that has deterred the investment of foreign capital. I believe that insufficient effort has been made to establish trade relations that assure benefits to investors, the nation involved and the indigenous employee. Proper agreements can do much to eliminate the danger of property confiscation. Our own interests in Latin America are best served by this second plan if U.S. interests are willing to make the investments and to negotiate fair agreements, that are necessary to secure and hold the vast wealth of raw materials, and to supply the undeveloped but vast market that exists in Latin America.

There is, however, far more to the development of our two-way hemisphere trade than normal economic considerations. Into the picture of future economic potential, swelling population, poverty, and unsatisfied ambition in Latin America has stepped the Soviet with a major effort to capture markets, resources, and countries.

Too often when communism is mentioned, especially in speeches, the tendency is to cry wolf. Perhaps this reaction is justified in that many of us in public life tend to emphasize the potential of Communist gains against a picture of complacency on the part of the U.S. public. I bring it up because of its increasing importance in the commercial field in Latin America. Communist principles of subversion are in full play. The present general goal seems to be one of business-getting but the desired result is success in both fields—political and economic.

I believe that we will get a good share of the trade that new economies being developed in Africa and other parts of the world will provide. I am not worried about our ability to compete in any open business proposition, but I am concerned about this new kind of competition that we face. The clever undermining of honorable trade practices, and the desire and ability to subvert the customer; these are things that pose problems of overriding importance to the industrial health of our nation. In this area the Yankee trader needs help.

In 1956 and 1957 the Soviet bloc purchased on the average about $230 million from Latin America. This was only about 3 percent of total exports, although in individual countries such as Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay the percentage was higher. In fact, Uruguay's recent trade with the Soviet Union is larger than with the United States. Compared to the Soviet purchases of $230 million, the United States each year purchased $4 billion from the 20 Latin American countries. This represented more than 45 percent of the total sales for all of Latin America. It is too bad that Latin Americans do not realize that sales to the Soviet Government represent total sales. On the contrary, with the United States, governmental contracts and economic transactions are minor compared to the private U.S. trade and investments in the area.

The problem is this: When the Soviet Government engages in economic assistance, it uses the resources of its entire economy because there is complete identity between the economy and the Government. The Soviet economic penetration in Latin America is pursued as a national policy for the purpose of breaking up Latin American alignment, both political and economic, with the United States. This means that the Soviet can, if desired, subsidize its economic penetration for years, buying items it does not want and does not need from Latin American nations just to create a favorable attitude towards the Soviet Union. Dumping of unneeded items on the world market accentuates the impact.

Throughout Latin America, there is a tendency to feel that each nation should stand alone, that it should demonstrate its sovereign national status against any sense of close cooperation with the United States, the "great imperialist in the north."

The traditional sense of wanting to be independent, of not being tied to the United States economically or otherwise, has been fanned and exploited by Communists. Sometimes they would make it appear that Uncle Sam is an enemy of these Latin American nations despite the very opposite evidence in every one of the countries.

The Soviet Union would like to have Latin American nations build up a big trade with the Communist bloc which, once developed and operative, could leave these nations subject to penalties and rewards according to how they "went along" with Communist policies.

Recognizing that in the Soviet realm of foreign trade the U.S.S.R. can sell cheap and buy dear when politically expedient to do so, let us remember that every advance by the Soviet Union in Latin America, by whatever means, is ruled by political and not economic considerations in Moscow.

Cuba can be examined as a case history that can be repeated and whose final result is even yet not predictable. The incidents of Mr. NIXON's trip to South America are a part of the same pattern, perhaps an opening gun that didn't succeed. I find it less than clear that these events are examples of a poor foreign policy of the United States. True, we may be victims, but the events are manufactured out of whole cloth for the purpose of making Uncle Sam the goat. Our greatest peril is in accepting the status and running. Then we will surely lose.

A current major propaganda target for the Communist is the Panama Canal. Recent events in Panama are but a small part of the large Communist scheme of infiltration but they are surely tied together. The action in Panama clearly illustrated the normal Soviet course of harvesting gains from

local nationalism, fostering that nationalism, and using it as the trigger for greater goals.

I do not believe that most Panamanians realize what is happening, but after observing several riots, seeing the same people repeatedly doing the same job of exciting, the same pattern of buildup (a complete exposé of well-recognized mob techniques), the source of trouble is evident. The fact that Communist financing is relatively small, that only a few persons have come back to Panama from training in Moscow, should not cause us to underestimate the force of the movement. Unbridled nationalism in its most intense phases, especially in Panama where it is constantly fostered by the press and radio, is an excellent basis for violence. When this attitude toward violence has the United States as a target, the stage for eruption is complete.

The U.S.-operated canal furnishes this visible on-the-spot target. A nation relatively poor in natural wealth, Panama's economy enjoys direct benefits of more than $60 million annually from canal activities. These millions are vital to Panama's economic health. They are gained largely through direct U.S. purchases of those products and services which Panama is able to supply and through the employment in the Canal Zone of over 10,000 Panamanians given opportunities and paid at rates well above the going standards in Panama.

For years the Isthmus of Panama provided a famous example of mutual friendship. The recent violence and mob action interjected into the previously normal international climate was totally unnecessary—so unnecessary that it was obviously fostered. In my mind, that fact is clear and sufficiently proven.

Since its completion the canal has been recognized as one of the major engineering feats of all times. To the great mass of American citizens, however, the canal's prominence, even its essentiality in our economic existence, has been overshadowed by its romantic background. A stupendous growth in traffic through the canal is taking place. Of the total volume, 60 to 70 percent is from or to the United States. Today almost 900 oceangoing commercial ships per month are transiting the waterway carrying over 5 million tons of cargo. And by the end of the century canal traffic may double if present trends continue.

Many raw materials necessary to the world's industrial machinery could hardly go to market without the canal. Look at Latin America's international seaborne trade. Several of the South American countries depend on the canal for the major part of their economy. In the case of Chile, 84 percent of all her imports and exports pass through the canal; 72 percent for Peru; 27 percent for Colombia; 85 percent for Ecuador. Supersized vessels, principally carrying ore northbound from Peru and Chile, last year established a new record in the number of transits by big ships.

What greater pinpoint target for the Soviet can be imagined than a Panama Canal whose logistical importance is increasing in the ever-expanding world economy; whose commerce is almost entirely that of the free world; whose traffic consists of those elements on which the U.S. industrial machine depends for its continued growth. It is the Panama Canal upon which the economy of the west coast of South America rests; upon which the flexibility of the exports of most of the Latin American republics is dependent.

Further, the Panama Canal controls a large part of the flow of traffic to the Mississippi Basin ports. To and from the south coast ports of the United States last year there were 8,563,000 tons of products that used the canal. Over 2 million of these tons were to and from Latin America. Were it not for the canal very little of this tonnage would have come to your south ports, and most of it would not have been shipped out. Much of the entire tonnage might have been lost to American commerce. In many commodities—raw and finished—the ability to use the canal is the margin that enables us to stay in a competitive market.

The distinguished historian, Samuel Flagg Bemis, writing in U.S. News & World Report several weeks ago declared, "Scarcely anything, short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO or SEATO, would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt."

I feel it is urgent that all of us realize that Soviet economic aggression has been moderately successful and that it will pose a progressively more serious threat until we effectively counter it. Noting that "Russia has launched an open drive to gain political influence in Latin America," the London Times stated "the thin edge of the wedge is trade." From the start our approach must be, in the words of Alfred North Whitehead, that all good things always stand upon the "razor's edge" between preservation and destruction. Western civilization, the idea of individual liberty and of free minds, did not come to its present development by the road of tranquillity.

Our Government and our private enterprise long has had a deep sense of responsibility for the development of the economies of the Latin American republics. I believe that in the U.S. men and U.S. business we already have throughout Latin America we possess a force which can very effectively compete, both in expanding our trade and our trade relations. Certainly U.S. private enterprise has the sales ability and the marketing techniques to sell goods and, just as capably, to sincerely convince our neighbors that our biggest, most valuable gift to Latin America is not only our good will but also our business. Our businessmen can accomplish this selling job with the approaches and on the businesslike basis necessary to win respect. They can establish that it is through the U.S. trade channels that the Latin American populations are best assured of a good future. Such individual diplomacy undoubtedly could be given impetus through the American societies and businessmen's groups which now exist in the 20 republics and have a total membership of at least 5,700 U.S. citizens who reside in the various countries. Many are from businesses in this valley. It must on reflection seem almost silly to have to admit that in an area where we have had a century and a half of opportunity and where we have many more Americans engaged in business than there are dedicated Communists that we can find ourselves doing a less persuasive job.

Probably there exist no better examples of another bold move, which might well be taken elsewhere to assure our ability to compete, than those unique civic agencies in New Orleans, International House and International Trade Mart. Dedicated to world peace, trade, and understanding, these institutions are each year expanding the definition of aggressive selling. They are known and respected by Latin American businessmen. They are tools of business diplomacy which need repeating all over the continent. If United States Steel, Sears, and General Motors need foreign branches, maybe they do also.

This then is the story. Here in this valley you have fostered a development of untold future. It demands imports. It must export just as any industrial area must. It has its transportation and ports but more and more in the future it must compete and plan for its outside the U.S. sources of raw materials and markets. Some major important part of the future depends on the Panama Canal but a greater part depends on a sensible man-to-man relationship with the Latin American nations. These nations need considerable help in orienting their commercial future.

The solutions to these problems won't appear by magic. They will need the same fostering your own development required. This just means an increasing part of your thoughtful effort must be outwardly directed. Your talents must be divided; in so doing you will be strengthened forever.

A Good Naturalized American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States, the fine generous act of one of our newly naturalized citizens who came to America for freedom.

She has left the full amount of her estate, after taxes, to the U.S. Government in gratitude to this fine country of ours, for our warm reception to her as a stranger within our gates, and in remembrance of the fine life which she led since coming to America.

These people we should certainly remember, so I am giving special tribute today to the late Mrs. Jennie Silverman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., who has given everything to her adopted homeland.

What a wonderful, generous act, and such an enduring tribute to Mrs. Silverman.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 12, 1960:

WILL OF WIDOW SETTLED; UNITED STATES GIVEN $55,000—RUSSIAN IMMIGRANT LEAVES MONEY TO GOVERNMENT FOR GOOD TREATMENT

Uncle Sam is $55,000 richer today, not because of income taxes but because common pleas court finally settled the estate of a Russian immigrant who wanted "to show her appreciation."

Mrs. Jennie Silverman, of 7 Clarendon Place, East Liberty, left her entire estate of $74,150.59, in cash and Government bonds to Uncle Sam. Yesterday the court issued a distribution decree, designating $55,244.19 should go to the Government. The remainder, $19,477.35, will be used to pay State taxes and administration expenses.

Mrs. Silverman, 75, died last March 6 of a heart attack, 1 hour after she was knocked down by a strong gust of wind.

According to Jerome G. Auer, treasurer of the Dollar Savings Bank and executor of Mrs. Silverman's estate, the well-to-do widow wanted to leave her money to the Government because she was "always well treated in this country." Mrs. Silverman and her late husband, Max, a broom and brush dealer, came here from Russia as young people.

Mrs. Silverman left her personal property to a niece, Esther Krakoff, of 199 Lilac Street, Squirrel Hill.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Address by Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont, Before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, held at St. Louis on the 24th of February, and hearing the very excellent and eloquent speech delivered by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the senior Senator from Vermont may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 24, 1960

The greatest satisfaction one can get out of public life is working with people for the good of their country—people who have vision to see ahead—ability to plan—and determination to achieve their purpose.

The members of the NRECA are people of this kind. It has been a great satisfaction to me to have worked with you and your dedicated general manager, Clyde Ellis, throughout the years—to have fought with you again those who destroy the REA program and to have enjoyed with you the fruits of truly remarkable achievements.

This year of 1960 is the 25th anniversary year of the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is also the 17th anniversary of the first annual meeting of the NRECA here in St. Louis.

It was my privilege to be one of the speakers at that meeting along with Senator George Norris and others who had crusaded for the extension of electric light and power to the rural areas of America.

When I found that I was to speak at this annual meeting of the NRECA, I looked up the talk which I gave here in St. Louis at that time.

Except for the references which I made to the war, which was going on in all its fury, I might just as well make the same remarks here today that I made 17 years ago, for they are equally applicable to these times.

At that time I told you, "The hope of America lies in a better rural future."

Since then, we have made progress, great progress. Our soil and water resources have been improved. Agricultural production has increased. Markets have expanded, and we are living in better homes with more conveniences.

The 800,000 farms which were served by the REA in 1943 have now increased to about 2½ million, and the total number of rural consumers served by the REA today has passed the 4 million mark. The expansion of rural electrification is to a great degree responsible for the great increase we have had in our national economy.

Billions of dollars worth of new business have been created for our industries.

In spite of the magnificient gains made to date, however, our job is far from complete.

I doubt if it ever will be complete, for keeping abreast of changing rural conditions, and keeping pace with the progress of technology presents a continuing challenge for greater effort on our part.

The welfare of the Nation today depends on rural America to a greater degree than ever and rural America will prosper or fail according to the extent to which we continue and improve the services which the REA has initiated and thus far carried forward.

The REA has not merely brought light and power to millions of farms and rural homes, it has led the way to many other improvements in rural living including transportation, communication, better health, better education—television.

Its worth cannot be measured by dollars and cents alone, for its contributions to better living and greater security for farm and city people alike does not lend itself to such an estimate.

During all the years of its existence, the REA has fared well at the hands of Congress.

There is every indication that this fair consideration will continue for the forseeable future.

We must not, however, take it for granted that the future will be all rosy.

REA cooperatives and regional and national organizations must be kept strong.

It is important that all local co-ops achieve and maintain financial stability as soon as possible for in spite of our present optimism the unexpected could happend.

However, if you ask me what the present session of Congress is likely to do to affect the REA, my answer is nothing—directly, other than to insure adequate funds for its operation. I look for no changes in basic legislation in this field.

REA members, like everybody else, are of course affected by war and peace—prosperity and depression—health and sickness and so on.

As individuals we feel the effects of competition from others in the same line of business.

In this day and age, however, it is not competition between individuals but group competition that may make or break us.

That is why every important industry or business or social group has of necessity organized those engaged in the same line or seeking a similar objective.

That is why the REA cooperatives 18 years ago organized the NRECA.

Except for the fact that users of REA light and power are organized, it is certain that this great program which has meant so much to rural America and American industry would never have made such a record of achievement and might even be well on its way out today.

The opponents of the REA have one of the best financed and most closely knit organizations in America. The electric light and power industry is potent politically as well as economically. Its leaders are able, astute and good organizers. They are not in business just for their health. They are in business for profit.

They not only seek to stamp out competition wherever they find it but also they support for State and Federal positions those candidates who they feel will see things their way.

The light and power industry has been so successful in the political field that in most States it has no fear whatever of the quasi-judicial bodies which are set up to regulate it. In many States the laws are quite favorable to the corporate utilities and regulatory agencies are inadequately financed.

In the Federal Government it has been so successful that the benefits it has received in the form of tax privileges and in other ways far exceeds any real or fancied subsidy which the REA has ever received or ever will receive. They do not include this fact in their full page advertising.

At this point I wish to compliment the NRECA on its new national advertising. It is constructive and shows positive rather than destructive thinking.

In spite of the great privileges and benefits which the corporate light and power industry has acquired rightfully or otherwise, it still is not satisfied.

So long as REA cooperatives and municipal electric systems operate they may expect to feel the full force of the opposition of the light and power industry.

Were it not for the examples and yardsticks set up by the co-ops, the corporations would be able to extract even greater profits from the public than they do today.

The power industry seeks a complete monopoly today just as it has been doing for decades. Public power systems and cooperatives stand between it and the attainment of this objective.

Monopolies either public or private are bad for a free people. They stifle progress. Totalitarian industry will lead to a totalitarian government.

Seventeen years ago I said:

"I have no quarrel with private industry. I believe in it. * * * But when the time comes that a comparatively small group of men virtually obtains a monopoly over a necessity of life, then it is high time that action be taken to effectively regulate or eradicate such a monopoly * * *."

And I also submitted at the same time a formula for meeting the monopolistic challenge when I said, "Cooperative methods will regulate private industry far more effectively than laws enacted in legislative halls, or regulations promulgated by boards and commissions."

During the 17 years since I made that statement I have had no reason to revise my opinion.

Cooperatives which are themselves a high type of private industry have not only regulated the rates and services of the corporate utilities in many States, but have forced them to serve areas and users which would not have been served to this day had the REA co-ops not shown the way and forced the service.

So when I say that the present session of Congress is not likely to do much to affect the operations of REA directly I do not mean that the cooperatives will not be under attack.

They will be bitterly assailed, not only in Congress but in the press and on the air as well.

Not only will rural electric co-ops be under attack but the war will be carried on against other farm cooperatives as well.

It would be well for members of all farm cooperatives whether purchasing—marketing or servicing to remember that their opposition has been financed in large part by the utility interests.

The opposition which organized farmers face will be rough and tough.

It cannot get support enough in Congress this year to do any real damage but—look out. The boys you are playing against don't play for marbles and they do play for keeps.

In the fall of 1958, a ruling of the Comptroller General threatened to raise cain with existing and future loans of the REA co-ops. That bogey has been laid to rest but there are other gimmicks which can be thrown into the game and don't think they won't be.

One of the most plausible of these gimmicks and one which registers best with the uninformed public concerns interest rates.

REA borrows money for 2 percent. Whether this rate has amounted to a subsidy or not over the life of the program is a disputed question.

Let us assume, however, that 2 percent interest does constitute a subsidy at least temporarily. The next question then is whether a subsidy for the purpose of extending light and power facilities into rural America is warranted.

We might just as well ask whether the economic and social development of our farms and rural homes is warranted at all.

Farm life must be made more attractive not only in terms of income but in terms of living as well.

Already it is getting more and more difficult to secure help for dairy farms. No longer will the hired man take a job that ties him down 7 days a week.

Farmworkers expect vacations and days off like other people and why not?

With the exception of certain specialty farms, the farm unit of today must be economic enough and mechanized enough and efficient enough so that work can be staggered among members of the family or hired employees.

The farm unit of the future must be even more efficient.

How little some people realize the great task confronting the American farmer. And how little they appreciate the extent to which their happiness, their welfare, and their very existence depends on him.

The so-called farm surpluses of today are only a thin cushion of security which separates the American people from want.

A lot of you folks here today will see the time when the soil of the United States will be called upon to produce for 100 million more people than it does now.

At present we are indeed the best fed and best clothed people in the world. Yet that fortunate situation could change in a hurry if the carping critics of our farm programs had their way.

These people magnify the mistakes of a few and condemn as a whole those upon whom they are most dependent.

There are those who say that the REA should no longer be permitted to borrow money from the Government at a low rate of interest. Some say we should not borrow from Government at all because 50 percent of our new members are not engaged in farming.

Certainly many persons now living on the farm or in the country do not depend on the land for their living, or at least all of it.

We know that a lot of people have moved out of the city into rural areas where they have gone into business, manufacturing, or commerce or simply to make their homes and raise their families in a congenial and natural setting.

I am delighted that this is so. I only wish it could prevail in all parts of America to the extent that it does in my own State of Vermont.

I am glad that industry can now locate out in the country and make full- or part-time jobs for thousands who might otherwise succumb to the age of technology and have to give up their farms.

Except for the REA program, however, this adjustment to a better rural living for millions could never have taken place.

Why should the people of a community who had the courage and foresight to organize a cooperative and bring light and power and prosperity to a hitherto handicapped area now be penalized for so doing?

They won't be as long as I can help.

They should instead be thanked and applauded. I unhesitatingly predict that any efforts made to increase interest rates to REA cooperatives will get nowhere at all in this session of Congress.

Interest rates, however, should be a matter of great concern to all of us and particularly to those responsible for the financial stability of our Government and our economy.

Not only do excessive rates contribute to a general inflation, but the interest paid on borrowed money now constitutes the second highest expense of Government.

President Eisenhower has said that our interest bill will amount to about $9,500 million this year. This is about three times the real cost of all our farm programs put together.

The trend to higher interest rates is not confined to the United States alone. It is a worldwide condition and I do not envy those officials of government charged with its control. Yet we do know that unless the cost of borrowed money can be held down to a reasonable level that we are headed for trouble. It is a historic fact that virtually every recession or depression which we have sustained has been preceded by sharply increased interest rates such as we are now undergoing.

I urge that instead of seeking to double or treble the cost of money to REA cooperatives which generate income and revenue that our Government attack with equal energy the important task of holding interest rates for all people at a reasonable level.

The cost of capital is one of the most important factors in the expansion of our national economy.

Rural electrification has plowed the ground necessary to the redevelopment of America and the expansion of this economy.

While country areas were without power and light and telephones there was little inducement for industry to move out of congested areas or for parents to think of raising their families away from good schools, hospitals, and recreational facilities.

Those conditions are now changed. Light and power has made it possible to live in the country and enjoy the advantages of both rural and urban living.

Although we are still badly lacking in transportation facilities we are hardly at any greater disadvantage in this respect than are the people of our great cities.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. Senate is now making a detailed study of transportation with especial emphasis being given to rural areas.

It is possible that we may find it necessary to subsidize certain types of transportation in certain areas, but before talking about subsidies for airlines and railways we have every right to demand and receive adequate service from these carriers.

In other words—no service—no subsidy.

Once a community gets adequate transportation, we can live on the farm and enjoy the benefits of both city and country living. Twenty miles to the high school, hospital, church, or theater on a modern country highway takes no more time, nor gas than it does to travel through 20 blocks of today's city traffic.

We will be shortsighted indeed if we try to crowd our increasing population into already overcrowded cities and industrial areas.

Our economic, social, and military security depends upon decentralizing our population and giving people a fair chance to live and work and breathe fresh air.

Because of the vision and courage and steadfastness of pioneers in the REA field, millions of Americans are already living more complete and productive lives.

As I stated at the beginning of this talk, the work of the REA is not nearly done. I can foresee the time when twice as many families will be members of our cooperative organizations.

It is in the interest of all Americans that rural electrification programs go full speed ahead, preparing the ground for an ever greater nation and a happier and more secure people.

February 20–27 Observed as National Future Farmers of America Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during this week, February 20 to 27, observances have been underway in recognition of National Future Farmers of America Week.

Throughout the years, the FFA program has made a constructive contribution to developing leadership in agriculture for the future.

Currently, there are more than 380,000 members, with 9,000 local chapters in 50 States and Puerto Rico.

In Wisconsin, for example, the membership numbers 14,000 in about 280 chapters.

As we know, the primary aims and purposes of the FFA is developing agricultural leadership, cooperation, and citizenship.

The specific purposes include the following:

First. To develop competent, aggressive, rural, and agricultural leadership.

Second. To create more interest in the intelligent choice of farming occupations.

Third. To encourage members in the development of individual farming programs and establishment in farming.

Fourth. To participate in worthy undertakings for the improvement of agriculture.

And there are a number of other worthy objectives.

Recognizing that we still face serious problems in agriculture, the Nation has a special need for developing imaginative, creative leadership in agriculture to meet the problems of the future.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune contained an informative article relating to the current observances in recognition of National FFA Week.

Reflecting upon the constructive efforts of a splendid program that has contributed much to providing training, experience, and leadership in agriculture for the youth of America, I ask unani-

mous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, Feb. 25, 1960]

FEBRUARY 20–27 OBSERVED AS NATIONAL FFA WEEK

Future Farmers of America members throughout the Nation are scheduling special activities to focus public attention on the work of their organization during National FFA Week February 20–27.

Membership in the FFA is made up of farm boys who are students of vocational agriculture in high school. The organization's activities are designed primarily to help develop rural leadership and good citizenship and to stimulate the boys to better achievement in their study and work toward successful establishment in farming.

The National Future Farmer organization has 380,000 members, with 9,000 local chapters in the 50 States and Puerto Rico. Membership in Wisconsin totals about 14,000.

Future Farmers choose the week of George Washington's birthday each year for the observance of National FFA Week. Although usually recognized as a Revolutionary War general and our first President, Washington's first love was the farm he called Mt. Vernon. He was one of the first in the Nation to practice contour planting, crop rotations, fertilization and other soil conservation and improvement methods.

It was more than a century after Washington's death before general use was made of many of the sound agricultural practices that he advocated.

National Future Farmers of America week seeks to focus attention on the work of the future farmers of today, who will be the successful farmers of tomorrow. In Wisconsin the organization is sponsored by the State board of vocational and adult education.

This Nation must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who die, retire or otherwise leave the farm. These must be men with experience and training, for the successful farmer today is both a scientist and a businessman; he must be a mechanic and a laborer, at the same time capable of leadership in the affairs of his community.

Generally, they must be men who have begun farming at an early age, so that by the time they are ready to marry and start a family they will be firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future.

Vocational agriculture and the FFA constitute the most effective program, say experts, yet developed for training boys to be good farmers and helping them become established in the farming occupations of their choice.

In view of the Nation's need for new farmers, it is fitting that recognition be given these young men who are preparing for careers in farming.

Consulting Engineering in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address, "Consulting Engineering in Government," delivered by Mr. Mason G. Lockwood before the American Institute of Consulting Engineers on January 18, 1960.

The Honorable J. Stephen Watkins, of Lexington, Ky., has asked me to place this item in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSULTING ENGINEERING IN GOVERNMENT

(By Mason G. Lockwood))

In the broad sense, I am going to discuss consulting engineering in government—in a narrower sense, the effort to legislate consulting engineering out of government. By government, I mean the whole complex of Federal, State, municipal, and local agencies which are supported by public funds. By consulting engineering, I mean, of course, private practice engineering.

Prior to World War II, organizations engaged in the private practice of engineering in this country were relatively small in size and few in number. The principals and other personnel comprising the consultants of that day were apt to be extraordinarily able and rather highly specialized engineers. Because of their engineering achievements, these men were likely to be very highly regarded throughout the areas in which they operated.

Such consultants rather frequently supplied certain services to government at local and State levels, and sometimes at Federal levels. The tendency was for the work of this nature to deal with highly specialized problems and studies warranting much mature engineering judgment and experience. Government itself was simple and did not entail vast public works, although, at the local and municipal levels particularly, relatively large and important public works were needed. In these instances, the basic planning frequently was accomplished by consultants, with the mass production of working drawings carried out by engineers employed by the sponsoring agency.

The explosion which set the world powers at each other's throats for a second time in our lifetimes triggered an explosion in the demand for civil, military, and industrial works of the sort which engineers plan and execute. This was only two decades ago. But, in that short time, nearly everything has been turned upside down. During the period of actual hostilities, the demand for engineers in this country increased phenomenally. Many engineers, including consultants, went directly into the military service, where their talents and experience were used, misused or abused according to individual circumstances. Consulting offices not too depleted of trained manpower undertook Government contracts by expanding with the best available nonmilitary personnel. As the war wore on—and, indeed, after it closed—a startling number of new consulting firms appeared. These were supported in the main by public expenditures, in the form of contracts either directly with the Government or with industrial or other agencies subsidized by the Federal Government. On the whole, the consulting engineering fraternity might well have been awarded an Army, Navy, and Air Force "E" for the excellence of their performance during this critical period. Without question, this group made a highly notable and generally unselfish contribution to the victory of the free countries.

The widely heralded and much-feared bust scheduled to follow the close of World War II failed to come off. Instead, American economy and the prosperity swept along by unremitting inflation, the country went on the wildest spree in its history. This spawned more new consulting firms—many tied solidly to activities arising from military expenditures. At the same time, nearly all agencies of Government at all levels which dealt with engineering matters expanded their engineering staffs as rapidly as the supply of men and money would permit.

These and other such factors focused attention on the widely publicized and sometimes wildly exaggerated critical shortage of engineers. Privately practicing engineers all over the country took the lead in persuading the public to permit the raising of salaries of employed professional and subprofessional engineers, as required to attract and keep on attracting to Government service competent men in adequate number. This campaign was successful, in the main. Salaries were notably increased and the prestige of engineering notably raised.

The inherent evil of bureaucracy began to raise its ugly head. As the leveling-off period set in, and engineers became available to Government at the higher inducements, a strong trend for expansion of these engineering staffs started running. It is a well established and historical fact that Government is a ratcheted, unilateral device which, until it collapses, can move in only one direction. It is as incompressible as water, but at expansible as hydrogen. Even able, intelligent and earnest leadership has been victimized by the siren call, "we can do it cheaper." Yet it is safe to generalize that any agent of Government is seldom able to do any kind of engineering at less cost to the taxpayer than the cost under private enterprise techniques.

Unhappily, then, engineers employed directly by Government and engineers employed directly by Government and engineers in private practice find themselves at the threshold of a potentially deadly conflict in competing for that part of Government engineering which can be done and has been done to the public's better advantage by private practitioners.

Out of all this rather suddenly comes a noisy and rising demand that the services of consultants be dispensed with, and that civil service engineers take over virtually all engineering which is paid for with public funds of any kind—local, State or Federal. Many, if not most, of those who are now mouthing this particular brand of "save-the-country" philosophy have been suckered into advocating it for, of all reasons, an economy measure. To any who know the facts—and I believe almost every thinking engineer does, whether in public or private practice—to base this pitch on reasons of economy is a monstrous and maddening outrage.

Consultants never have, to any significant degree, either done or advocated that they do the engineering which public agencies can more economically or better do. They have no right whatever to such work. But in the areas of legitimate interest to consultants, it is a reasonable generalization to say that their work is at least equal in quality and much more economical in cost than civil service engineering.

You are all familiar with the rash of investigations and rumors of investigations pending in Washington, as well as in many State capitals and local seats of government, investigations which seek sharp curtailment or total elimination of private practice engineering on public works—civil, municipal and military. You know that the House Committee on Appropriations has said, for example, that it "is concerned about the increasing practice of contracting survey and design work to private engineering firms * * *" and "that the departments involved will be prepared for extensive hearings in this matter in connection with the consideration of the 1961 bill." The committee ought to be concerned about the use of private engineering firms on public works,

but it appears that it is concerned for the wrong reasons.

You are familiar also with this classic but official comment of the Comptroller General of the United States: "The use of consulting engineers results in additional cost to the States and the Federal Government by reason of the overhead and profit included in the fees normally charged by such firms."

I am not one who sees a Socialist or a Communist behind every bush. Nor, indeed, do I think these attacks on private enterprise are inspired by sinister influences of any sort. Rather, as I have indicated, I think much of this is sincere, but stems from ignorance of the facts. The ignorance factor is present, though, I believe, primarily because this insidious movement is feeding to some substantial extent on the frustrations of thoroughly entrenched engineering bureaucracy. Whatever the motivation, this is a socialization of engineering trend.

I should like to emphasize that it is my belief that the trend in this direction is as strong in many State governments and in many municipalities and other local governmental agencies as it is at the moisier and more publicized Federal level.

If any engineers in private practice think this is a movement that is going to hurt others but touch them little, they might well ask themselves this: To what extent will I or my firm be affected if, during the 1960's, the volume of private practice engineering on public works—Federal, State, and local—is reduced by 25 to 75 percent?

I don't think it is being too extreme to say this could be the beginning of a war for our economic survival. For the consultants, fortunately, it is a sort of holy war. Truth is, indeed, on their side. The engineering work the consultants want to do for government, they can do as well and at less cost to the public, and there is no question whatever about this. The trouble is that only the consultants, and those others who have taken the trouble to examine all the facts objectively, understand this.

It ought to be easy for us to make our case before the public. Government has not found a chink in our armor, a skeleton in our closet. Consultants have some chinks in their armor, and, perhaps, some skeletons in their closets, but the cost of quality of engineering work done for government is not one of them. Indeed, this is one of our greatest and proudest achievements. Were we under attack because some of our work has been a bit inferior, we might have to give a little ground, because the war and postwar boom did spawn a few—but relatively few—pretty sorry outfits. But, so far as I know, we are not being attacked on this point.

One wonders why there hasn't been a little more truth mixed in with some of the charges that are being leveled against us. Colton pointed out, "Falsehood is never so successful as when she baits her hook with truth, and no opinions so fatally misleading as those that are not wholly wrong; as no watches so effectively deceive the wearer as those that are sometimes right."

Our course seems crystal clear to me. We have got to get righteously indignant about these unfair goings-on. I think we ought to consider taking the initiative immediately and start doing a little swinging ourselves. Rather than running from these investigations, or trying to mollify the investigators, we might well be urging legislative bodies throughout the country to investigate the comparative costs to public versus private engineering. The results would be eye popping.

We don't belong on the defensive in this situation. Our posture shouldn't be as witnesses for the defendant wherein we try to convince people that we haven't been stealing any public funds. Personally, I would welcome an investigation of the McClellan or Tom Walsh or Truman committee type at all levels of government, if it would require certain contracting agencies to come and attempt to justify wasting public funds by not having more of their engineering done by private enterprise.

Finally, I am happy to report that this philosophy is catching on. Many of the organized engineering societies of the country are hard at work preparing for the forthcoming battle in Washington. Certainly the Council of the American Institute of Consulting Engineers has foreseen this need and is preparing to do its part. The American Society of Civil Engineers, I know, is very actively taking necessary steps, as is the National Society of Professional Engineers. This is true also of the Engineering Division of the American Road Builders' Association. While I have no specific information with regard to the activities of the other organizations along these lines, I am confident they, too, are preparing to meet this attack head on with the cold facts.

Yes, It's a Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently an editorial was published in the Florence (Ala.) Times entitled "Yes, It's a Race."

Of course, I think everyone could gather from that title that it dealt with this contest in missiles, and matters of that kind. It has been said from time to time that we are not competing with Russia. I have often said that you cannot get that thought through the minds of the American people that we are not competing. This editorial deals with that and the very serious problem involved in the missiles lag, and I believe those familiar with the facts will admit that problem does exist at the present time and probably will grow as time goes along.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YES, IT'S A RACE

Generally, when the U.S. Government answers charges that it is falling behind in the space-missile race, it says two things:

1. Its overall defense posture is sufficiently strong to protect this country and to rain nuclear destruction on any potential enemy.

2. While America's space progress may not match Russia's, our scientists have developed many qualitative superiorities which make our missile work better than it seems.

You can get plenty of argument from thoughtful, informed men as to whether these are reasonable and satisfactory answers from a military standpoint.

But all aside from the military aspect, these propositions obviously do not answer the complaint that Russian space accomplishments have done great damage to America's prestige around the world.

The Government seems to have taken the stand that, whether we are in fact losing or simply appear to be losing the space race, it does not matter so long as our broad defense picture is sound.

Many men have cautioned that grave psychological harm was being done by our evident failure to keep pace with the Soviet Union, and that we could not afford to sit by and watch this happen.

George V. Allen, director of the U.S. Information Agency, now adds his voice forcefully to the warning group. He says flatly that we can't maintain a place of leadership in the world's eyes unless we accept the fact that space exploration is a race—and a race we must win.

There is still another side to it. Not only will our failures hurt us in the world view, thus engendering a correspondingly greater fear of the Russians, but the Soviet leaders are likely to develop a dangerous overconfidence that could spur them into aggressive misadventures carrying the peril of ruinous war.

In Allen's judgment, such cockiness already shows itself in the Kremlin and is affecting the world diplomatic and psychological balance.

Wars are started or prevented by men. Anything that has major impact on their judgments and attitudes is a serious factor in the world power struggle. The prize in this instance is not the Astronautical Engineering Award of 1960. It is the survival of the free world.

It is time we made our moves in full awareness of the psychological as well as the strictly military value they may have.

Tribute to Galileo Galilei

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the great scientists of all times, Galileo Galilei, was born 396 years ago last February 15.

I was reminded of this fact by an eminent American scientist, Mr. Olindo R. Angelillo, who was awarded the Galileo and Curtitone medals by the University of Pisa last May for his pioneering work in hydrology.

Mr. Angelillo wrote a glowing tribute to Galileo in a letter to the editor which was published in the October 15, 1959 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN CAUSE

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

While at the last abode of Galileo Galilei, in Florence, my thoughts surveyed man—his preconceptions, his intolerances, and the enslaved denials of all that which would liberate his mind and emancipate him as the creature of God.

I had experienced the loneliness of one shunned. All I said is that the earth, like any mammal, has an anastomosing system. In the earth these vein channels are an interconnected system of rock fissure aquifers that may be described as subterranean streams of circulating water. These sub-

terranean streams are influenced by any one and all the disturbances experienced at any time at any portion of the earth.

From time to time the stress of a region becomes greater than that particular region of the earth is able to endure. Therefore, it cannot continue to move, rub, squeeze, and contort in step with the unifying rhythm of the whole.

When such a region is out of step it may slip and fall. This slip or fall may at first occasion only a thud, but the added load of the fall may break through and jar the floor, in which case the jar may cause a rupture in the floor. Such a rupture would transmit a varying discordance everywhere, until the quiescent rhythm to which all things respond again prevails and the needed harmonious balance is restored.

The earth, having the spirit of growth like all living things, repeats these growth adjusting experiences and, like any energetic growing child, gets scratches and bruises and walks along paths where it is wont to slip and fall.

All these imperfections are healed again and again after each mishap slip, or fall. Living water, until its youth wanes, is ever ready to dissolve and relieve the distressed and bring to the less distressed that which it needs.

It was in the stillness of the garden within the courtyard of Galileo's home that I was able to appraise and express the nobility we sense in the American cause.

The American cause is founded on "more"; but not more physical things alone. More cars may bring more accidents. More things may mean the more intense the sting of greed. But America truly seeks more of the evangelical love, love, love—that love that knows not the differences of place nor the differences of race, but only the more enduring grace of the oneness of all.

Aboard the plane en route home on May 9, 1959, I composed this pledge, a gift which, with the grace of gratitude, I dedicate to The Christian Science Monitor. I entrust it to your care as a custodian of liberty, whose never-ending task is to bring to the knowledge of all men the hope for more peace founded on more truth—and above all, more certainly that the brotherhood of man is a birthright inherent in the wholeness of creation and of manifest joy to the harmony of God.

In this unfolding spirit of growth I composed this rebinding thought, a thought which, once understood, will not only bring peace, but will merit the respect of all men.

My pledge is this:

I pledge allegiance to our flag and to the dignity of the individual for which it stands—one nation, indivisible, but dedicated to God, in whose oneness, truth, and moral law there is the reverence for life, hope for open-mindness, the peace of inner security, more equitable justice and liberty for all.

OLINDO R. ANGELILLO.

LOS ANGELES.

Ike's Great Latin America Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is a remarkable spectacle to see a man who won fame in the winning of a war now find new honors in the field of peace and international relations. Our great President has been able to serve with distinction both in war and peace and his current effort to observe personally the difficulties in South America, and to seek means of easing points of stress between our friends and neighbors to the south and the United States will be of historic significance. The good wishes and full support of the people of our Nation are with him on this tour.

I have every confidence in the success of this mission. Having observed closely the results of previous trips which President Eisenhower has taken, I am disposed to believe that relations between the Latin Americans and our people will improve sharply at the point of meeting between them and our President.

I listened with attention to the remarks which President Eisenhower made on Sunday evening, prior to his departure. I was struck with the thought that his was a speech to inspire confidence. The President knows that to gain the confidence of the people of South America we must first have confidence in our own strength and ability. I am sure that the people in South America respect the President and have full faith in his reports.

The people of South America realize that the President seeks only to strengthen the ties between our people and our neighbors and that we do not seek political or financial advantage over them. This respect for the President, this confidence which is reposed in him, this faith in his integrity, will bring a full measure of trust, cooperation, and friendship for the United States. Our Nation should be grateful for the great good which will accrue to us through the personal efforts of President Eisenhower in these trying times.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 22, which points out the challenging task which faces the President and how he is undertaking his role to cement friendships with countries to the south of us, while partisan critics with political ambitions contribute nothing but their threadbare, hackneyed carping denunciations of a successful peace program which they envy but which they refuse to praise.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TOURING PRESIDENT

More than anything else, Mr. Eisenhower's address last evening was designed to prepare a favorable climate for his visit to South America. And the effort was successful—to the extent that a speech can achieve such a purpose.

Three things concerned the President: First, he sought to reassure our neighbors to the south in the matter of the U.S. military power. In an oblique slap at his domestic critics, he said that our strength is so great as to command and justify the respect of "knowledgeable and unbiased observers" at home and abroad. He was also at pains, however, to explain why this country had felt compelled to sink so much of our national wealth in military weapons, and to give assurance that our military forces were designed to serve but one purpose—the maintenance of peace.

Next, Mr. Eisenhower emphasized our desire to extend a helping hand to our Latin American friends in bringing about a fuller life for everyone in the hemisphere. Finally, he struck hard at Communist claims that the United States has held Latin America in a colonial relationship.

It may seem strange to most of us here at home that the President should feel any need to stress these points. But sometimes, in our own conviction that we are doing the right and the decent thing, we take too much for granted the readiness of others to share our viewpoint. And this is especially the case, as Mr. Eisenhower put it, when "the lie and distortion" are used as instruments of diplomatic policy. In these situations it becomes necessary from time to time to put the record straight. This is what the President was undertaking to do in his talk last evening, and we hope he will be able to complete the job in the face-to-face discussions he will have with State officials in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay.

Secretary Flemming Calls Admiral Rickover Oversold on Soviet Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 23 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bess Furman in which the New York (N.Y.) Times staff writer told of the reaction of U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick to the criticism of Adm. Hyman G. Rickover of the public school system of our country.

Today, Mr. President, I supplement that material with a news story in the Washington (D.C.) Post of Thursday, February 25 in which there is contained the response of Secretary Arthur S. Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the views of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Staff Writer Erwin Knoll be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEMMING CALLS RICKOVER OVERSOLD ON RED EDUCATION

(By Erwin Knoll)

Secretary Arthur S. Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said yesterday he thinks Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover "has been oversold on Russian education and undersold on our own educational system."

Flemming backed up his Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, who told a House appropriations subcommittee that Rickover's caustic criticisms of American schools are unfounded.

But Flemming conceded at a press conference that "our schools have serious defects that need to be remedied."

He illustrated that point by releasing a new survey of high school science facilities and equipment which showed that many students must work with completely inadequate materials.

The survey, conducted by the University of Toledo under a Federal research grant,

covered 233,000 science students in a representative sampling of 855 high schools in 7 States.

It showed that the average expenditure for science equipment and supplies last year was $2.66 for each science student.

"We can certainly afford to do a better job than this," Flemming said.

"Roughly 6 out of every 10 high schools had annual budgets for procuring science equipment, and about 5 out of every 10 had annual budgets for science supplies," the report noted.

The survey covered public high schools in Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Dakota, Ohio, Wisconsin, and South Carolina. Schools in the Washington area generally have better laboratory facilities and more equipment than the average reported in the study.

The report said there were "many nonacademic programs in the schools visited for which adequate or generous funds were available per student participant, whereas funds for science education were meager and obviously inadequate in the same school."

Flemming said he thought the National Defense Education Act, which provides funds to strengthen science programs, should help improve the situation. He urged schools to take advantage of Government surplus science supplies available free.

Address by Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn at Virginia Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN of the Third Congressional District of South Carolina, which he delivered at the statewide Virginia Jefferson-Jackson day dinner at the Hotel John Marshall, Richmond, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN DORN ADDRESSES VIRGINIA JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

(Portion of the address of Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, principal speaker at the annual statewide Virginia Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, at Hotel John Marshall, Richmond, Va.)

Mr. Chairman, as Democrats, we gather tonight in this critical hour in the history of our Democratic Party. Our party is at the crossroads. We either unite and move forward to a November victory or we flounder in defeat on the plane of agitation. * * *

In the early history of our country, as now, there were those who believed in a powerful Central Government. There were those then, as now, who worshiped at the shrine of Federal power. It would have been easy for Thomas Jefferson the aristocrat, easy for Jefferson the classical scholar, to become a political conformist and drift with the Federal tide. Jefferson was a man of principle who had great ideals and faith in the people. Jefferson was humble, honest, and considerate of the opinions of others. * * *

Thomas Jefferson's idealogy was pitted against that of the Federalist. * * *

When finally elected by the House and inaugurated, Jefferson, as President, did not follow a policy of vindictiveness, factionalism or sectionalism. He used his influence and prestige to promote unity, harmony, and the general welfare. He never forgot the man on the frontiers, the citizen in the log cabins nor the little shopkeeper and the small businessman. He never lost faith in the men at the grassroots. * * *

Jefferson launched our great Democratic Party as the party of the people. He led the people to a better understanding of themselves and their role in a democratic society. Jefferson educated the people to their duties and responsibilities. He led them to realize they were a part of America. They began to look upon the Government as their agent—created and supported by themselves. They became self-reliant and independent. They had confidence in themselves and local institutions. They became accustomed under Jefferson to a minimum of Federal Government. They revolted against the very thought of Washington paternalism. * * *

The Democratic Party became a symbol of States rights and individual freedom. Through lean dark years, it could always be revived again by a return to the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, and Woodrow Wilson revived and rallied the party time and again to the old standards.

The Democratic Party has traditionally championed opportunity, sound currency, a minimum of Government, a balanced budget, and the Bill of Rights. Jeffersonian Democrats became liberals because they believed in the liberties of our people. In the South today, we are the true liberals. We believe in individual liberty, States rights, and local government. Jeffersonian Democrats became a symbol against centralized bureaucracy, excessive taxation, and stark Federal power. * * *

The national chairman of our great party has become the tool of these special interests, these pressure groups, these Machiavellian exponents of Federal dictatorship. Were Jefferson and Jackson alive today, they would flatly reject such a philosophy. They would oppose the powerful political machines with bloc voters, political slush funds, and ward bosses. They would be shocked to see some so-called Democrats controlled like sheep and cattle by pressure groups for the personal gain and greater glory of their leaders. This philosophy is not the philosophy of Jefferson, but of Mussolini. It is not the philosophy of Jackson, but more like the philosophy of Hitler and Lenin. This national Socialist clique is dedicated to a welfare state. They believe all planning and thinking for the American people can best be done in Washington. * * *

These powerful sources behind the national chairman are seeking to divide and conquer. They have left the party of Jefferson and Jackson. They do not believe in Jeffersonian democracy. They have adopted demagogy, intimidation, vindictiveness, and sectional discrimination. Their real purpose is to form a splinter party—to create a third party, a national Socialist labor party.

The late Congressman Vito Marcantonio outlined this plan to me many times. He said that we want all of you Jeffersonian Democrats and conservatives in one party, while us leftists and believers in Federal socialism should be in another party. Someday our party will come to power, and America will be launched into complete socialism with only one political party. This is the goal and objective of those using our national chairman. They have no hope of victory this year. They hope to promote another 4 years of the present administration. Then the time will be right for them to launch America into socialism.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill warned me about the danger of a conservative and a liberal party. After a liberal administration there is nothing a conservative administration can do to restore free enterprise. It is simply too late. The Prime Minister warned that there must be strong conservative elements in both political parties.

With a united Democratic Party we can win the Presidency this year. * * * We can only win with a united party and united effort in a common cause.

The Jeffersonian Democrats are willing to meet in the middle of the road on the basic fundamental principles and issues. We in the South are not asking all elements of the party to join us on the right. We only ask the national chairman to meet us halfway. We will never abandon our convictions and go all the way to the left. We do believe there is room in the middle. There is a common meeting ground. There are mutual objectives.

The South is going to Los Angeles in good faith. We are not going to run out or back out before the firing starts. We are going to be there and fight openly for the principles of Jefferson and Jackson. We will seek to nominate candidates pledged to the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. We do not expect to be thrown out nor do we intend to throw anybody else out. The South will be heard from when the platform is written. We will oppose vindictive planks in the platform. We will oppose the platform being written by pressure groups, racketeers, or those claiming to speak for minorities. We are going to reject and oppose sectional discrimination. We will fight for harmony, unity, and a middle of the road platform. If radical and Fascist elements gain control at the convention and throw certain Southern States out of the party, we will meet that tragedy when it arises with plans already formulated. We are determined to preserve the party of Jefferson and Jackson. We are determined to make every effort to preserve the freedoms of our country. * * *

The once sovereign citizen is being crushed today by burdensome taxation, confiscation, and loss of freedom by big government. Inflation has wiped out the lifetime savings of our people. Social security cannot pay the house rent. Unemployment insurance and bank savings have depreciated, causing hardship among the aged and the poor. Inflation has destroyed the purchasing power of the dollar. Our people live in constant fear of a Federal gestapo. They spend anxious days and sleepless nights worrying about the tax collector. They often pay the Government more than they should through fear and complicated tax forms. The Democratic Party must meet this challenge. * * *

The Democratic platform of 1960 should be positive. It should be forthright. It should put first things first. The greatest single issue before the American people today is one of survival. The Communist menace overshadows all others. It is a threat to the United States militarily, through subversion and through economic war. The Kremlin believes the United States will destroy itself by excessive spending and inflation. The American people are alarmed by this administration's apparent confidence in Khrushchev. This administration seems to forget that Khrushchev is a murderer, a ruthless killer of innocent people and is dedicated to world conquest. The great J. Edgar Hoover testified a few days ago before a Senate committee that the Communist Party in America, aided by the recent visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, is now "more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic * * * the recent visit of Khrushchev has done much to create an

atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans."

Khrushchev is being permitted to establish a base in Cuba, 90 miles from our coastline. His agents have incited riots in the Panama Canal Zone, threatening this vital link in Western commerce. The Communists have infiltrated Venezuela, thus threatening the all important Caribbean from the North and the South.

The Democratic platform must offer to the American people a clearcut and forthright foreign policy. We must reject appeasement and compromise. We must meet the Communist threat with the courage of Andrew Jackson. We cannot coexist with those sworn to bury us. We must warn our people of the utter hopelessness of summit meetings with those responsible for the crimes in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. We must remember the pathetic Chamberlain and Daladier at Munich.

Our Democratic platform should call for the best defense in the world with a new world startegy geared to the missile age. If we are to survive, we must retain control of the skies and conquer space. Until the missile gap is closed, of course, our strategic air command should be partly airborne at all times. This is elemental and plain commonsense. Had our fleet at Pearl Harbor been seaborne, this disaster would have been averted. Billions can be saved in our national defense program by a consolidation of our missile program, a consolidation of our various air forces and a common supply system. * * *

Russian automobiles are being permitted to enter the United States. Textile mills are being built in Russia with American money, setting the stage for a flood of Communist goods made with Siberian slave labor. We must, as Democrats, meet this threat head-on, establish a trade policy that is truly reciprocal and save the American worker and American farmer from slave competition.

The Democratic Party platform must promise to eliminate waste and extravagance in foreign aid. We must reduce foreign aid. We owe more money that all the rest of the world combined. Our gold reserves have poured abroad. We are in a precarious fiscal position. While creating inflation at home, high taxes, and an ever increasing national debt, we are building up competiton abroad with our own workers and farmers.

The Democratic platform should contain a plank to free our farm families from Government control and depressing prices caused by these stupendous surpluses. The cattle farmer is relatively prosperous only because of a minimum of Government controls. Our farmers are forced to plant less and less while surpluses grow larger and larger. The family-sized farm must be preserved. Rural people have always furnished balance and stability to representative government. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were largely products of rural philosophy.

The Democratic platform must deal with the stupendous annual interest on the national debt, the national debt itself, and a balanced budget. We must offer some encouragement to the youth of our country by reducing the national mortgage on his future. * * *

The Democratic Party must reaffirm its faith in our capitalistic system of free enterprise. We must reaffirm our faith in the opportunity system that gave to America the highest standard of living ever known to man. We must guarantee to business less Government interference.

The Democratic Party, as always, must uphold constitutional government, State rights, and individual liberty. We must protect our people from an ever more powerful Executive, and over zealous Supreme Court, and now a World Court. * * *

With a candidate pledge to Jeffersonian democracy and this platform, we can win. Only 51 percent of the American people eligible to vote cast their ballots in the Presidential election of 1948; only 60 percent in 1956. With this platform, the unemployed glass workers, the chemical workers, and the coal miners of West Virginia and Pennsylvania will go to the polls. The textile workers and shopkeepers of New England will have an incentive to vote. The curtailed auto workers of Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois will take heart. Millions of farmers and small businessmen in the West and Midwest will vote for the first time in many years. They will vote Democratic. The housewife will be out on election day to protect her family from cheap money. The Democratic Party cannot win with a me-too platform. We must and can give the American people a clear-cut choice. We can win with the 40 million people who did not vote in 1956 because they had no choice.

One of the most glorious chapters in the history of our Republic was written by the magnificent Commonwealth of Virginia. The story of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights is largely a Virginia story. Four of our first five Presidents were nurtured by the soil and environment of the Old Dominion. Four of the five greatest military commanders in the history of the Western World were Virginians. We cannot imagine the American Republic without Patrick Henry, George Washington, and George Mason. Your Thomas Jefferson, the founder of our great Democratic Party, is revered and loved by the whole free world. The visitors to our Nation's Capitol from the remote places of this earth pause at the beautiful Jefferson Memorial to pay homage to the memory of a Virginian dedicated to freedom. Millions from throughout the world read in hushed silence, "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Study of Export Credit Guarantees Now in Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a number of Government as well as private groups are presently engaged in drafting an export credit guarantee system for American industries participating in foreign trade. It is felt that such a system would significantly stimulate our export trade—and would in this way help to reduce America's increasing and widely discussed balance of payments deficit.

Mr. President, I have always been of the firm opinion that the promotion of exports is one of the most effective and logical approaches to our balance of trade difficulties. Senator JAVITS has taken an active role in this regard and it is my understanding that he intends in the near future to present measures to the Congress establishing an export credit guarantee system. The New York Board of Trade has also played an active part in developing a suitable credit guarantee system. I commend both my colleague and the New York Board of Trade for their leadership in this field.

Mr. President, because this is a complex and intricate subject and is one which has not been widely discussed, I was especially pleased to read a most interesting and informative treatment of this subject in the February issue of Economic World, "A Journal Devoted to the Free World's Search for Economic Progress." In order that others may have the benefit of this fine article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEE SCHEMES UNDER NEW STUDY

Are oversea markets for U.S. products restricted by the lack of credit facilities available to other exporters?

Both the executive branch and Congress are taking a close look at this question as they seek ways to boost U.S. exports and thus help to redress the currently unfavorable balance of overall payments between the United States and the rest of the world.

EIGHTEEN NATIONS OFFER CREDIT

Experts agree that it is much easier for an oversea importer to get short-term credit to buy from other countries than from U.S. exporters. At least 18 other countries have some system for providing 3-to-6 months credit to their own exporters or to guarantee private credit against losses. And though similar systems have been urged on the Congress and the executive branch repeatedly during past years, the proposals have not received serious consideration until recently.

Now it is reported that the Department of Commerce, with some support from the Treasury and the Department of State, is prepared to recommend some means of filling the gap in short-term credit facilities for U.S. exporters. Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, has announced that he will introduce a bill calling for the establishment of such a system; and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold hearings on the subject in mid-March.

Exporters, bankers, insurance executives, private economists, and Government witnesses will be called before the Senate committee to seek answers to these and other questions:

PROBLEMS INVOLVED

To what extent would better short-term credit facilities raise U.S. exports? Estimates so far vary from $50 million to $2 billion annually.

What categories of exporters especially need credit assistance? It has been suggested that small- and medium-sized firms exporting consumer goods suffer principally because neither they nor their importers can afford to finance adequate oversea inventories of so-called shelf items—while private bank credit is hard to come by or too expensive.

Should short-term export credits take the form of direct loans to exporters and importers or should there be a system of credit guarantees? Should guarantees cover normal commercial risks or just political risks? Should they take the form of insurance for the whole range of an exporter's activities or specific guarantees of specific shipments only? Should they apply to exports anywhere in the world or be limited to sales to the less developed countries?

Should a system of export credit guarantees be operated by the U.S. Government, by private institutions, or on a joint public-private basis?

Is new legislation needed or is the existing authority of the Export-Import Bank to

guarantee credits adequate? Officials of the Export-Import Bank are reported to believe that they already have all the necessary authority to guarantee against export credit risks, but are said to be reluctant to make greater use of their authority.

Some expansion of short-term credit facilities for U.S. exporters is now thought likely in the near future. Meanwhile, the Senate committee will be hearing witnesses on other aspects of U.S. foreign trade, including the effectiveness of trade promotion facilities abroad; foreign restrictions against U.S. goods; U.S. export restrictions; the impact of Sino-Soviet trade; and the implications for U.S. trade of the emerging regional markets overseas.

National Economic Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Election Year Politics Plagues Economic Study" was published in the Mobile Register for February 16, 1960. I observe on the floor the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, which has been working very hard and has done excellent work in making an economic study. I assure the Senator from Illinois that the editorial does not apply to the study he and his committee have been conducting but, instead, to the President's committee—or shall I say the Vice President's committee? The editorial tells of the difficult time which that committee is having in arriving at any conclusion, because this is an election year.

Mr. President, I believe that the editorial will make interesting reading, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTION YEAR POLITICS PLAGUED ECONOMIC STUDY

Election-year politics can be counted a prime factor in the trouble faced by the Nixon-headed Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy in agreeing on a national economic policy statement.

It may be denied not only by Committee members but by other sources in the Eisenhower administration that this is the case, but any such denials will be unconvincing.

On this Committee besides Vice President Robert B. Anderson, Agricultural Secretary Robert A. Anderson, Agricultural Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, Commerce Secretary Frederick H. Mueller, Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and W. Allen Wallis, dean of the School of Business Administration at the University of Chicago.

The Committee began some time ago to issue a series of so-called educational papers discussing economic affairs, but has discontinued these reports and shifted its attention to preparing a policy statement that would extend to various fields, including taxes, spending, agriculture, labor, natural resources, and the like.

But the thinking within the Committee is revealed in news from Washington to be divided on the type of statement that should be issued. As one correspondent, Edward Cowan of the UPI, has summed it up, "Some voices maintain the Committee should merely issue a broad general statement on future economic policy," while "others would like it to be more specific."

A clue to the influence of election-year politics can be found in the reported position of Secretary of the Treasury Anderson that a Committee statement should refrain from saying too much about Federal taxes at this time.

"Anderson has been reluctant to discuss tax reform and reduction ever since President Eisenhower in January raised the possibility of a cut next year," Mr. Cowan relates. "He is reported to feel it would be premature and possibly would violate the administration's understanding with Democratic congressional leaders that it would be unwise to try to write a major tax bill in an election year."

In other words, choose the course of softpedaling on taxes because of politics.

The Committee is also believed to be having trouble in at least one other politically sensitive field—agriculture. This is hardly surprising, since the farm vote is always a political battleground in election years, more especially in years when control of both the White House and Congress is at stake.

President Eisenhower created the Committee a year ago under the name of "Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth," with one of its purposes being to search for ways to enhance productivity in the American economy.

Whether the activities of this Cabinet Committee will have any substantial value in any circumstance may be doubted. The odds, in fact, may be against it.

In the meantime, however, it is another disappointment to find that apparently the Committee has an ear tuned to politics in trying to work out a statement of policy with respect to economic matters. A statement strongly influenced by politics would have an obvious serious weakness. Actually, no statement at all would be preferable.

Farm Income of the United States Declines 16 Percent in 1959 From 1958; Drops to $11 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 2, it was my responsibility to speak in the Senate on the shortcomings of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies.

Mr. President, in my campaign of 1958 I predicted a decline in the farmer's prices. In reference to this prophecy—now become fact—I called attention to this problem in my speech of February 2. During those remarks I was joined in colloquy by the energetic Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who indicated that the American farmer is left out of this Nation's general or so-called prosperity.

The New York Times of this date, February 27, carries a news article on page 1 with a headline which focuses attention on the plight of our rural economy. The story, "1959 Farm Income Off 16 Percent," comments on the net income of the farmers of the Nation in a drop of that figure from 1958. Last year the income was $11 billion. This was a drop from 1958 of $13,100 million.

I ask unanimous consent that a part of this news article from the Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE FARM INCOME OFF 16 PERCENT—DECLINE TO $11 BILLION EXCEEDS ESTIMATE—PRICE DROP AND COST RISE BLAMED

WASHINGTON, February 26.—Final figures for 1959 showed today that farmers' net income dropped to $11 billion from $13,100 million in 1958.

DROP MORE THAN EXPECTED

The decline, amounting to about 16 percent, was slightly larger than had been expected. A smaller decline hae been predicted for 1960 by the Department of Agriculture. Last year's returns were about the same as in 1957.

Net income is the amount left to farmers from their farm operations after payment of production costs, taxes, and other expenses.

Income of persons living on farms from nonfarm sources rose about 6 percent between 1958 and 1959. The per capita income of persons living on farms, from all sources, was down 8 percent from 1958 but was higher than in any other year since 1952.

The 1959 decline is expected to be stressed by Democrats in this year's President and congressional campaigns in farming areas.

The decline in income reflected a combination of factors, including a downturn in farm product prices and a further upturn in farm production costs. Total cash receipts from farm marketing last year were estimated at $32,800 million, a decline of 2 percent from the previous year.

This loss in receipts reflected a 4-percent decline in the level of farm prices. This decline was offset in part by a 2-percent increase in the volume of crops and livestock marketed.

SOIL PAYMENTS DROPPED

The Department said farm production expenses rose 3.5 percent last year for a record. Government payments to farmers under crop control, soil conservation, and soil bank programs dropped more than a third because of the discontinuance of the acreage reserve part of the soil bank land retirement program.

Federal Money Should Be for Both Teachers' Salaries and School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 23, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association and former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, addressed the American Association of School Administrators'

annual convention in Atlantic City. Mr. Johnston prepared a brief of his remarks for the Gist, a newspaper especially published for the 20,000 educators who attended the convention.

Because Mr. Johnston is internationally recognized as one of America's foremost citizens, I believe that his forthright analysis of our Nation's educational problems and purposes will be of timely interest to all Members of Congress:

Sometimes it seems to me that almost everybody thinks he can make better films than the filmmakers. But if this is so for us, it's doubled in resounding brass for you. Is there really anybody anywhere who doesn't know he can run education better than the educators?

I'll reverse the trend this morning. I'm not going to tell you educators how to educate. I'm going to tell you what's wrong with education.

What's wrong with education is the shortsightedness of our National and State policies toward education—and not by any means an oversight on the part of our educators.

Today, we are told, we are the happy beneficiaries of the most affluent society in history. We have mass prosperity. We have mass culture. We have mass leisure. And we have a massive opportunity to lead the free world.

The whole world looks to us, we are told. But how do we look to ourselves?

With our historic success in building a free society, do we still cherish freedom above all virtues—and act as if we did?

With our devotion from earliest days to the individual, even to rugged individualism, do we still hold firm to this precept?

I have some positive feelings about the irrational plight of our schools, which ought to be the most truly rational institutions in our land. I shall discuss them in three broad areas.

First, the dollar sign. Second, the sound, fury, and nonsense of some of education's critics. And, third, a question, What are we educating for?

Now for the first, the dollar sign.

The problem can be stated quite simply. Too few teachers. Too few classrooms. Too many students for existing school facilities.

There are a number of solutions. One was proposed some time back by the author of Gulliver's Travels. His proposal, you'll recall, was simply to eat up the children.

I think there's a better solution than that. And that solution is money.

The Federal Government—that's where the money is. And that's where the money must come from. And it must be used not just for school construction—but for teachers' salaries and for more teachers.

Now for my second point. And here I would certainly like to turn off the oratory—because I think it is doing an unspeakable disservice to this country.

I'm talking about those orators who want to turn America's "little red schoolhouse" into a carbon copy of Soviet Russia's "Big Red schoolhouse."

We've made many contributions to the world. Certainly high among these are the theory and practice of universal mass education.

And before we listen to hoots and catcalls for selective schooling or the force feeding of some segment of knowledge, let's recognize that our doctrine of universal education is now emulated wherever possible around the world.

And now I come to the question, What are we edueating for? I have alluded to part of the answer already—that we are educating for a balanced and free and democratic society.

But there is something more. If we look clearly at our predicament of power and promise, I think we will find education's ultimate role—to achieve a world sense of unity in freedom.

Are these large words, hard-to-define words? Of course, they are. Freedom and democracy are never easy to grasp. They require literacy, understanding, basic concepts—all the tools that education supplies.

The kind of world we seek must be based on a sound underpinning of education. The nourishment of men's minds must accompany the nourishment of men's bellies.

South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs Memorial Art Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we have in South Dakota an organization known as the South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs composed of women's clubs from all parts of the State. This dedicated, hard working group of women has been instrumental through the years in countless beneficial programs and activities that have greatly enriched the life of many South Dakota communities.

The latest project of these clubs has been a Memorial Art Center for the State of South Dakota. The need for a center to house South Dakota and Midwest art has long been recognized and the South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs decided to do something about that need. As a result of their efforts such a Memorial Art Center is to be constructed in Brookings, S. Dak., on the campus of South Dakota State College.

Two articles in the current Art Center News published by the federation tell the history of the Memorial Art Center movement and describe the new center's modern, restrained design. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF MEMORIAL ART CENTER MOVEMENT

The South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs has undertaken an immense project—the erection of a Memorial Art Center to honor the pioneer clubwomen of the State, and to perpetuate their work.

For more than 50 years the federation has been influential in movements for the cultural development of its members and the State in which they live. Years ago when the study of art was a common club program, the women began a collection of fine reproductions of paintings and art objects to be circulated and used for study by club members.

This collection, made up of fine prints and some originals has always been housed in Pierre, for a long time in the home of Mrs. S. C. Polley, who with several others, was very active in developing the work. When it became so large that it had to be moved, the free library commission, itself one of the important accomplishments of the South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs, took over the storage. But Mrs. Polley and other members of the Pierre women's clubs still looked after the packing, checking and circulating of the pictures. It would be impossible to tell how much the federation and the State owes to the unselfish work of these Pierre clubwomen.

This collection has grown, and with the interest engendered by it, has been the inspiration for the establishing of a Memorial Art Center. It would keep alive the achievements and personalities of such women as Mrs. Polley and Mrs. Norman of Pierre, Miss Ada B. Caldwell of State College, Mrs. Lyon, the first president, and Mrs. Coombe, both of Sioux Falls, and many others whose devotion, vision and work have given the federation its growth and power.

In December 1948 the Pierre Women's Club presented a resolution to the official board asking that the federation sponsor the erection of a building as a memorial to the determined women who pioneered the women's club movement in the State, and that a room in that building be dedicated as an art center and as a memorial to Mrs. Lenore V. Polley who for many years devoted much of her energies to the development of the federation and the collection of art treasures. The Pierre clubwomen had in mind a building in Pierre to house the free library commission, as well as serve as federation headquarters.

A great deal of consideration was given to the resolution and many different plans were suggested. Miss Gertrude Null of Huron presented the idea of a building, built, owned, and controlled by the federation as an art center, to house the picture collection and other art objects which might be added to it, the location of such a building to be determined by the clubwomen themselves.

Resolutions to establish such a memorial were passed at the convention in Rapid City in October 1950, and a fund for the purpose was started shortly afterward.

It was necessary to select a location and the opportunity was given to towns and institutions desiring such a building to extend an invitation to the federation. Five places responded, Pierre, Huron, Spearfish, Vermillion, and Brookings. Each site offered the ground and landscaping, assistance in drawing plans and in publicity, supervision and maintenance of the building, if it could be used by the college or institution, such offers subject to the approval of the governing board and the legislature.

It was decided that the vote on these sites should be taken by mail, so that every club member would be given the opportunity to express her preference. The constitution of the federation had to be amended to make such a vote legal, and the art commission, Mrs. Hugh Stokes of Flandreau, chairman, felt that a great deal of publicity should be given the project before the final selection was made.

So it was not until November 1954 that a vote by mail was completed. A majority of all the votes cast was necessary for a decision. No one receiving such a majority, another election, this time between the two places receiving the highest number of votes, Brookings and Vermillion, was called in March 1955. The results were announced at the convention in Yankton, April 16, 1955. Brookings had received the majority.

The Regents of Education for South Dakota approved of placing the Memorial Art Center on the State College campus on June 23, 1955. A 2-day meeting of committees from the college and the federation was held in the Union Building. A site was selected and plans made for a fundraising campaign.

The building would be known as the South Dakota Federation of Women's Clubs Memorial Art Center. The federation and college administration would determine details of maintenance and supervision.

MODERN, RESTRAINED DESIGN

The memorial gallery will be one of the most imposing buildings of its kind in the Middle West. Its beauty will lie in the use of the finest and most enduring materials employed in a functional organization of fine proportion and restrained design.

The gallery will have a beautiful site on the State college campus. Pine and elm trees will frame the structure, and it will overlook the parklike "Commons" of the campus. The gallery proper will be a one-story structure of brick, glass, and steel in contemporary style.

Upon entering the building from the west, the visitor will find himself in a spacious foyer. Bronze plaques listing the pioneer families and friends of the gallery will be set in wall niches. This foyer will give direct access to offices, galleries and to a lounge, which is dedicated to the memory of pioneer women who have graced this State and contributed to its cultural heritage.

One large and two small galleries will be arranged as flexible parts of a single unit. Air-conditioning, lighting, and furnishings are being studied to enhance utility and beauty. The main gallery will contain permanent and long-term loan collections of fine painting and sculpture. A smaller room will house the work of South Dakota artists. Still another gallery will be used for the display of traveling art exhibitions, one-man shows by outstanding artists, and student and faculty exhibitions from South Dakota colleges. This room is to be flexible enough in design to accommodate meetings of small groups, recitals, and theatrical productions.

Plans call for a museum garden in connection with the building to be maintained by the State college horticulture department. A changing display of seasonal shrubs and flowers will be a showplace in itself.

The memorial gallery will be the home of the State Federation of Women's Clubs. Provisions are being made for offices, board rooms and kitchen facilities that will best enable the federation to carry on its work.

It is to be hoped that the gallery will be a fitting memorial to the people of our State and to the guests within our borders. The spirit expressed in its conception, and the courage and industry that will make it an actuality should make of the gallery a symbol of the high ideals and vision of a State whose roots are soundly embedded in the soil but whose aspirations reach the stars.

Resolution of Kentucky General Assembly Honoring Memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky honoring the memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley. Also, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, together with the joint resolution, the text of an address delivered by Kentucky State Senator Gates F. Young, sponsoring the resolution.

Augustus Owsley Stanley was six times a Representative in Congress from the Second District of Kentucky. He served as U.S. Senator and was Governor of Kentucky. He was for many years chairman of the International Joint Commission. He is one of the great statesmen of Kentucky.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Joint resolution honoring the memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley

Whereas Augustus Owsley Stanley, one of Kentucky's most illustrous sons, has heeded the call of his Creator ending a life of faithful service which reflected the highest honor upon him and contributed incalculably to the progress of this great State and indeed this Nation; and

Whereas the accomplishments of this statesman and incomparable orator were such that it is deemed fitting and proper that his memory be perpetuated by inscription of his biography upon the journals of the senate and the house of representatives as follows:

Augustus Owsley Stanley, six time representative in Congress from the old Second District, Governor of Kentucky, U.S. Senator, member and for many years Chairman of the International Joint Commission, was born in Shelbyville May 21, 1867, a son of the Reverend William and Amanda (Owsley) Stanley. His father was captain of a company in the "Orhpan Brigade" and also a Judge Advocate General in the Confederate Army, later becoming a minister of the Christian church. After attending private schools, Augustus Owsley Stanley entered Alleghany Academy at Nicholasville, Ky., continued his studies at the University of Kentucky (then State College) from 1886 to 1888, and was graduated with the degree of bachelor of arts from Centre College at Danville in 1889. The degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon him. He was a member of Omicron Delta Kappa honorary fraternity and Sigma Alpha Epsilon social fraternity.

Upon completion of his studies at Centre College he entered upon a career of school teaching, including 2 years at the old Mackville Academy, studying law at night, to the practice of which he was admitted in 1894. He followed his profession in Flemingsburg until 1898, when he moved to Henderson, Ky., where he continued his practice until 1924.

He entered the political arena by being selected a Democratic Presidential Elector from the Second Congressional District in 1900. He was elected to the 58th Congress in 1902 and served 12 consecutive years. During his congressional service he won nationwide attention by his vigorous endeavors on behalf of the tobacco growers of Kentucky, was sponsor of the legislation which brought about the regulation of the giant Tobacco Trust.

His stature locally and nationally was enhanced by his selection for the chairmanship of the congressional committee investigating the monopolistic practices of the United States Steel Co., in its acquisition of large deposits of iron ore in the Northern States.

On April 29, 1903, Congressman Stanley married Miss Sucan Soaper, of Henderson, and to this union there were three sons born—Augustus Owsley Stanley, Jr., William Soaper Stanley, and Marion Shelby Stanley, who, while a student at the University of Kentucky, lost his life in an airplane accident.

In 1915, following nomination by the Democratic Party, he was elected Governor of Kentucky and served in that office until May 18, 1919, at which time he resigned to enter the U.S. Senate, having been elected in 1918. His service in that august body which terminated on March 3, 1925, was marked by the same courage, honesty, and dedication of purpose which was characteristic of his service as a Congressman and as Governor of the Commonwealth. Upon leaving the Senate he entered the practice of law in Washington, the Capital of our Nation, in association with Joseph P. Tumulty, former secretary to President Woodrow Wilson. In May 1930 he was appointed a member of the International Joint Commission, and became chairman of that body on March 7, 1933, in which position he served until 1954.

He was a member of the Christian church, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and of the Pendennis Club.

Augustus Owsley Stanley was a dedicated, unrelenting, nondeviating, and most articulate champion of democracy having upon at least one occasion given voice to his philosophy in these terms:

"Democracy with me is more than a conviction—it is an abiding faith and now I reverently dedicate 'the bitter little that of life remains' to the service and the success of democracy. And when the tale is told and the journey ended, I shall not have repaid the debt to the people I devoutly love and to the cause I shall maintain until my arms are palsied and my tongue is stilled in death."

Truly, it can be said of Augustus Owsley Stanley that he was one of the

"Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog,
In public duty, and private thinking."

And one of those—

"Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions, and a will;
Men who have honor, who will not lie."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That when the senate and the house of representatives do this day adjourn they do so in memory of Augustus Owsley Stanley.

SEC. 2. That the general assembly does hereby extend to the family of Augustus Owsley Stanley its profound and deepest sympathy and does commend the members thereof to Almighty God who is forever near to those who trust Him for solace.

SEC. 3. That the clerk of the senate cause copies of this resolution to be transmitted to each of the Members of the Congress representing the Commonwealth of Kentucky with the request that a copy thereof be spread upon the record of proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives and made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SEC. 4. That a copy of the journals of the Senate and the House of Representatives wherein this resolution is recorded be presented to Mrs. Susan Soaper Stanley, Mr. Augustus Owsley Stanley, Jr., and to Mr. William Soaper Stanley.

Attest:

JOHN W. WILLIS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GATES F. YOUNG SPONSORING A RESOLUTION REVERING A. O. STANLEY, STATE SENATE, JANUARY 14, 1960

Mr. President, in the closing hours of Tuesday, August 12, 1958, the Master Architect, Creator and Builder of the Universe, in His infinite wisdom, called from his earthly associates the soul, and stilled the voice of

Augustus Owsley Stanley, one of Kentucky's most illustrious sons.

In presenting this resolution I not only seek to have the memory of A. O. Stanley inscribed upon our records, but I do honor to myself and refresh the memory of this great Kentuckian in the hearts and minds of some other of "his boys."

I am one of "his boys." He had many others throughout the width and breadth of Kentucky. Among them our present highway commissioner, Senator Earle Clements; our former commissioner of economic security, V. E. Barnes; and our lovable and capable colleague, the senator from Fleming, who served as a page in the house of representatives in 1916, while the incomparable Stanley was Governor. And not the least of them Emerson Beauchamp, our commissioner of agriculture.

Had I the vocabulary of a Webster or Churchill my attempt to pay proper respect to the late Augustus Owsley Stanley would still be feeble and inadequate.

He was one of the great of his time.

Born in 1867, when Andrew Johnson was President, his life spanned three epochal eras. He lived through the service of 17 Presidents of the United States. Thirteen States were admitted to the Union during his lifetime. The new State of Alaska was acquired from Russia. The Southern States were readmitted to the Union. The 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th amendments to the Constitution were adopted. The east and west coasts were tied together with spans of steel by the opening of the Union Pacific Railroad.

Edison announced his phonograph and introduced the electric light.

The first telephone exchange was installed.

The French Atlantic cable was laid.

Brooklyn Bridge was opened; Statue of Liberty unveiled.

The Spanish-American War was fought.

The prohibition amendment adopted and repealed.

The woman suffrage amendment adopted.

U.S. Navy fliers circled the globe, and the North Pole reached by Navy plane.

Yes; during the 91 years of his life, our country abandoned its swaddling clothes and became great, as he grew and became great.

Kentucky has had its Clays, Carlisles, Breckinridges, Bradley, and Morrow, but none excelled Stanley.

God anointed his vocal cords with the roar of thunder; the sharp whiplike clap of lightning; the softness of the coo of contentment of a baby in its mother's arms, and the silver and golden glow of the morning and evening skies.

In public service he fought the battles of the Kentucky tobacco farmer against the Tobacco Trust—the battle of the American steel users against the Steel Trust.

The freedom of the peoples representative in these legislative halls from domination by outside influences.

Courage had no man in public or private life to a greater degree.

He forced the passage of Kentucky's anti-pass law.

He saved the life of a Negro murderer from a mob in one of our western counties with his great persuasive language, thus avoiding a stain upon the Commonwealth's name.

Like an armed warrior, like a plumed knight, he marched through life and threw his shining lance full and fair against the foreheads of his adversaries.

Under the headline "Giant of the Stump—A. O. Stanley Was Last of the Great Orators of Kentucky Politics."

Our own beloved Allen Trout closed his article with this moving and appropriate language:

"From the hundreds of thousands of golden words spoken by Governor Bradley, one short passage was selected to carve above his grave in Frankfort Cemetery, near the graves of Stanley and Morrow.

"This passage is a tingling classic. It is his benediction upon the throng which gathered June 12, 1910, to hear him dedicate the magnificent new State capitol, on an eminence across Kentucky River from the cemetery bluff where he and Stanley and Morrow are entombed.

"May we not now, in fancy, turn it into an epitaph for the fresh-buried Stanley and his two matchless peers, already back to the dust from which they sprang? Here is Bradley's benediction:

" 'May the summer's sun shine brightly, and the winter's snows fall lightly as they deftly weave their white mantle above you. May the tempests abate their fury as they sweep over you. May the springtime entwine its most beautiful garlands above you; and may each of you, reunited with your loved ones in that realm beyond the stars where summer's heat and winter's cold are unknown, where the grass never withers and the flowers never fade, abide in His presence forever.' "

Kentucky's beloved Stanley has crossed the river to the Celestial City. But, the life and deeds of A. O. Stanley linger in the memory and affection of a multitude of Kentuckians.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have just read an article in the N.A.R.D. Journal, published by the National Association of Retail Druggists, reporting an exclusive interview by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover on the subject of "Juvenile Delinquency." It is an excellent article. Mr. Hoover has offered some sound, sensible advice for curbing one of our most serious, current social problems. I recommend its reading to all Senators and to everyone interested in this grave problem. It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent beginning on page 38 and continued on page 42 of the 1959 issue of the N.A.R.D. Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This interview was conducted by Mr. Philip F. Jehle, Washington representative of the N.A.R.D. Most Senators will remember Phil. He served for several years as counsel for the Senate Small Business Committee, later becoming its general counsel. As chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, I had the pleasure of working very closely with Phil. He is an able person and I am sure he will do a good job for the druggists.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON INTERVIEW—J. EDGAR HOOVER DISCUSSES JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By Philip F. Jehle)

Beginning with this issue, Mr. Philip Jehle will be bringing every month to readers of the N.A.R.D. Journal an interview with an outstanding Washington personality. Both the person to be interviewed as well as the topic to be discussed will be carefully selected on the basis of general appeal to the Nation's independent pharmacists.

In this, the initial interview of the series, Mr. Jehle questions Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, longtime FBI chief and one of America's greatest citizens, on the subject of juvenile delinquency, a problem having special significance to drug retailers across the country. As readers will note, Mr. Hoover first contributes a keen and objective analysis of juvenile delinquency and then offers some sensible and constructive advice on how the problem may be dealt with objectively.

We are sure retail druggists will find Mr. Hoover's views on this important subject most stimulating.

Mr. Jehle: "Good morning, Mr. Hoover. It is indeed a pleasure to be here discussing with you a subject of special significance to family pharmacists across the Nation. We appreciate very much your taking time from an extremely busy schedule to visit with a group of small businessmen."

Question: "Would you mind, sir, telling us just how you view juvenile delinquency?"

Mr. Hoover: "A few years ago when one mentioned juvenile delinquency, he meant just that—delinquent behavior on the part of youngsters. This consisted of such simple misbehavior as 'playing hooky' from school, indulging in an occasional fist fight, or engaging in the mischievous vandalism of writing on fences and sidewalks or breaking a window or a street lamp.

"Today's so-called 'juvenile delinquent' commits armed robbery, assault, and murder. His 'occasional fist fight' is now planned, vicious street warfare and in place of his fists he is armed with a knife, a gun, a chain, or any other weapon he can use effectively."

Question: "How serious is the problem of juvenile delinquency?"

Mr. Hoover: "On the basis of uniform crime reports submitted to the FBI by police throughout the United States, we know that the incidence of crime is increasing. In the year 1958, arrests of persons under age 18 increased 8.1 percent over the previous year while arrests of adults in the same period rose only 1.8 percent."

While it is true that youths under 18 represent only 12.1 percent of all persons arrested, they were the subjects of 64.1 percent of the arrests for auto theft, 49.9 percent of those for burglary, 48.5 percent of those for larceny, 30.9 percent of those for receiving or possessing stolen property, and 22.8 percent of those for robbery.

Most alarming is the fact that not only the frequency of youth crimes but the savagery of these offenses is mounting day by day, year by year.

Question: "Has the FBI found that juvenile delinquency is largely limited to any particular area of the United States?"

Mr. Hoover: "The problem of youthful crime exists not only in the densely populated metropolitan centers but in each and every community in the land. And the intensity of the problem in each area is as great or as small as the people themselves permit.

"I am convinced that the community which takes positive and determined action against the juvenile offender—the community which leaves no doubt in the mind of the youngster as to just how far he can go and how much he can get away with—will make the greatest inroads in the juvenile crime problem today and in the future."

Questions: "Mr. Hoover, to bring this problem closer to drug retailers, I have one very important question for you. Are pornographic magazines and other like materials a factor in juvenile delinquency?"

Mr. Hoover: "The peddlers of obscene pictures and writing have so flooded the market with this toxic trash within the past few years that to find a news rack without samples of it is the rare exception. Distribution of pornographic material prepared especially for juveniles is now so efficent that no child is beyond its reach. Blatant displays of sex

and violence, printed filth and so-called comics which glorify crime and dwell upon horror can only create a climate calculated to encourage delinquency.

"Add to this the practice in too many areas of placing increased commercial emphasis on questionable merchandise. For example, entire window displays formed of guns, knives, and other weapons of violence—attractive lures to the immature and inquisitive youth. Surely no one can doubt that this brazen and vulgar trash can do other than degrade impressionable young minds."

Question: "What would you say, sir, is at the root of the juvenile crime problem?"

Mr. Hoover: "I believe that this problem is the result of an abdication of authority in many areas, foremost of which is the home. The prevention of juvenile delinquency lies in the establishment of juvenile discipline.

"Human beings need rules to live by—children as well as adults. The home is the first training arena in the battle between right and wrong, and the success or failure of this training plays a vital role in the child's developing character.

"When we hear of a youthful offender who is described as one of eight children residing with his family in a two-room cold water flat in a tenement area whose parents both work, we do not wonder that he has gotten into trouble. Nor does it seem strange when we learn that the 8-year-old second-story 'man' arrested by police as he attempted a break-in around midnight receives no discipline from his parents and is permitted to roam the streets at will. Likewise, it seems perfectly logical to each of us that the 10- and 12-year-old vandals who break into schoolhouses and private homes commit acts of destruction amounting to thousands of dollars receive little or no supervision or control at home.

"When the home fails, however, we cannot merely shrug our shoulders—help must come from other sources, the church, the school, the entire community. The juvenile delinquent problem we have today is the tragic consequence of such public apathy.

"Equally tragic is the tendency of far too many individuals to treat delinquency with hushed silence, sentimentality, and excessive leniency. Such action, in my opinion, tends to encourage potential offenders. The so-called delinquent of today engages in acts of torture, sadism, murder, and gang warfare. In other words, he is a vicious young criminal and he should be treated as such."

Question: "Is there, then, a 'cure' for juvenile delinquency?"

Mr. Hoover: "There is, of course, no 'cure' for juvenile delinquency, but neither can we permit it to go unchecked. Action can, and must, be taken to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime.

"We have already seen sufficient evidence of the fact that any treatment which encourages the recipient to believe he will not be held accountable for his acts also encourages him to believe he is above the law. If we are to discourage the repetition of such acts, it is high time that we showed these young hoodlums that the consequences of their crimes will be swift, sure, and adequate punishment."

Question: "In the light of your intensive experience, Mr. Hoover, what role can the Nation's independent druggist play in curbing juvenile delinquency?"

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

Mr. Hoover: "I would say that the challenge of crime today is flung squarely in the face of every American. The alert community recognizes the extent of the cancer of delinquency—more properly, juvenile crime, in its midst. If it is fortunate, it will find an individual or a group willing to take the lead in seeking the most effective cure. Your retail pharmacists constitute such a group. What can you do? What will you do?

"You can encourage and participate in religious training and assist churches in setting up leisure-time programs for youngsters.

"You can take the lead in helping to keep your community free of printed filth and thereby help to make a decent environment for children.

"You can lend your support to movements designed to secure adequate salaries for qualified teachers and sufficient facilities for modern school systems."

Mr. Jehle: "Thank you very much, Mr. Hoover."

Rights—With Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, February 27, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Richard A. Devereaux, vice president and general manager, Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has brought to my attention a splendid article that appeared in the September 1959 issue of nwb, the employees' magazine of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. It is entitled "Rights—With Responsibilities," and elaborates on a company policy of Bell Telephone to encourage civic mindedness and civic activities of their employees.

Such programs on the part of organizations and businesses and groups of all kinds should be encouraged. The unbiased search for the right path and true information on the part of wider sections of the public will result in many benefits to our local, State, and Federal Governments and to all of us as individual citizens.

The clear and concise interview printed in this article with Mr. A. F. Jacobson, president of Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., is a splendid outline of the duties and responsibilities of an individual and a business in a democracy. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTS—WITH RESPONSIBILITIES

(In the statement below and in the following interview President A. F. Jacobson gives his views on the responsibility we have, as American citizens, to take an active part in public affairs.)

As citizens of a free and democratic country—and as employees of a privately owned and operated business providing a vital public service—we possess many precious individual rights which carry certain obligations. Preservation of these rights and their continued enjoyment require an understanding of their significance and the responsibilities they impose. A general lack of interest in governmental affairs, failure to exercise citizenship privileges, and failure to assume our individual share of responsibility for the success of our democracy can only weaken it and threaten loss of liberty and freedom.

We Americans face many serious problems both at home and abroad. These require good judgment and decision at all levels of government—national, State, and local. Success in meeting these important problems in a Nation such as ours makes it necessary that people assume responsibility for public and governmental affairs and have the knowledge necessary for sound judgment and action.

For these reasons, we believe that telephone people should be encouraged to take greater interest in civic, political, and governmental affairs. It is hoped that through these measures each of us will become a better citizen and contribute to making this country, as well as our cities and States, a better place in which to live.

I should be clearly understood that the company management undertakes this activity wholly on a nonpartisan basis. The company's principal objective will be to encourage individuals to meet their citizenship responsibilities, to provide information on the functioning of political parties and the operations of Government, and to assist its people in obtaining information on important public issues. The public nature of our business may, on occasions, affect the etxent of our individual participation in some situations.

The company will continue, of course, to take whatever action is proper or appropriate to protect the service and the interests of telephone users, employees, and the owners of the business.

Efforts to encourage and assist employees toward a great interest and participation in public and governmental affairs will include such activities as the following:

Information will be made available to employees on important public issues of local, State, or national interest, where practicable. When significant differences of opinion exist, information on all sides of such issues will be supplied.

The company has no intention of preaching to employees or attempting to dictate what their attitude should be on public matters. Rather, we will strive to make significant information available and encourage employees to make up their own minds. To this end, we will, when appropriate, obtain and make available the views and expressions of individuals not connected with the business whose knowledge and understanding of public issues are well recognized.

Information will be made available as to how governmental and political organizations function, and the activities through which each of us can participate in the political life of the community.

Encourage telephone people to register to vote (where registration is required), to exercise the right to vote, and to support the political party of their choice.

Encourage telephone people to take an active interest in civic affairs and to support those institutions and activities devoted to the betterment of the communities in which we live.

Where it develops that employees might have occasion to become involved as holders of important public or civic positions, it is suggested that they counsel with their supervisor to make sure that (1) the telephone job will not suffer, and (2) the employee's affiliation with the telephone company will not interfere with a satisfactory performance of any public duties.

INTERVIEW

Question: "What do you mean by the term 'public affairs'?"

Answer: "In a very broad sense, I think of public affairs as embracing the wide range of civic, political, and governmental activities through which the society in which we live functions. Such activities are of real and continuing significance to each of us as individuals and to the welfare of the country. These are the spokes of the wheel of democracy in action.

"Fortunately we live in a free country. We have the privilege of participating in the processes of government and of general community activities—a privilege denied to people in more than one-half of the world. The democratic approach to government was designed to give expression to the wishes and desires of all the people. It can succeed in this objective only to the extent that people maintain interest and take action in it."

Question: "Does the action of just one individual count for anything?"

Answer: "That's all that counts. Every action or vote taken is merely the adding up of individual decisions. That's why it is so important in a free and democratic country that there be widespread attention to and interest in public matters. In this way the views of the majority of the people are made known and find expression through our elected representatives."

Question: "As an individual, what should I be doing?"

Answer: "Be a good citizen—by that I mean take real interest in matters of importance to your community, your State, and the country. More specifically, it includes such things as:

"Voting at all special, primary, and general elections.

"Supporting the political party of your choice—working for it—contributing to it.

"Working for the election of and supporting qualified people to represent you in public office.

"Keeping yourself informed on important problems confronting your city, State, or the Nation.

"Supporting worthwhile civic activities."

Question: "Is it contemplated that telephone people may become involved in controversial matters?"

Answer: "There are few, if any, issues that are not controversial to some extent. Telephone people will be encouraged to take part in all political processes, to support the party of their choice and to work for the election of people they believe will best represent them in government. To the extent that this requires taking a stand in controversial matters, such actions are an essential part of the democratic process."

Question: "What does the company mean by its being 'nonpartisan'?"

Answer: "In the first place, corporations are not permitted by law to engage in partisan political activities nor to contribute to political parties or candidates. It must remain wholly impartial. Also, the company recognizes that employees are free to make their own individual decisions on political or public matters. This is a fundamental of democracy."

Question: "What is meant by the statement 'The company will continue, of course, to take whatever action is proper or appropriate to protect the service,' etc.?"

Answer: "Obviously, the company has an obligation to protect the interest of those directly connected with the business—that is, telephone users, employees, and owners. As we all recognize, it is the desire of the company to be a good corporate citizen, to willingly meet its public responsibilities and its fair share of the general tax obligation. However, when it becomes apparent that telephone service is being asked to assume more than a fair share of the tax burden or is being unduly penalized in other ways, the company will consider it a duty to speak out in its own defense and in the interest of those it serves.

"For example, as a company we oppose the Federal excise tax on telephone services because this tax represents an unfair cost burden on the users of telephone service."

Question: "Is the company's interest in public affairs intended to benefit any particular group?"

Answer: "Absolutely not. The primary purpose is to stimulate each of us as individuals to a greater interest and participation in political and public activities. There is no intent to favor or disfavor any segment of society in comparison to any other. The company is confident that this country can be best served by an informed citizenry actively participating in the processes of government. That is the cause we are trying to serve in these efforts."

Question: "Will our emphasis on public affairs be choosing sides on some public issues?"

Answer: "There are, of course, at least two sides to any question that reaches the stage of being an 'issue.' The aim is to present information on these various sides in as conscientious a way as we know how. Generally this information will not 'choose sides' because this is not the best way to help people examine a subject to the point where they can make up their own minds about it. But the pro and con sides of most issues are rarely in balance. In the case of some issues, the objective will be to establish an understanding of the problem and of possible answers to it."

Question: "From a company viewpoint, are there limitations as to the kind or amount of public or political activity in which an individual employee may participate?"

Answer: "Any such decision rests with the individual. It is contemplated that such activities, in general, would be carried on by the telephone person outside of his working hours. They should not interfere with performance of the regular telephone job.

"There may be situations where employees elect to assume extensive public duties where a temporary furlough from his telephone job will be in order. There are legal reason why a company may not permit employees to engage in partisan political activities on company-paid time."

Question: "In what form will information on public issues be made available?"

Answer: "The Northwestern Bell magazine will carry information pieces of this kind. Some will reflect the views of people outside the business who are acknowledged authorities on certain issues. When possible, such articles will present the various views toward a subject. Another avenue for distribution of this type of information is our bookracks. Information on some subjects probably will be presented through a publication solely concerned with public affairs. Employee discussion meetings are still another possibility.

"There are, of course, a great many sources of information on public matters—daily newspapers, magazines, radio and television programs. One of the hoped-for values of this effort is an increased awareness that will encourage telephone people to look more closely and more interestedly at current news."

Question: "Is there more need for interest and action in public affairs now than in the past?"

Question: "Effective citizenship has always required an interest in public affairs. But it is especially important today because many of the problems that face government are bigger and more complex than in the past. This is true from the community level on up to the Federal level. Much community planning—for example, on streets and highways, schools, housing, and conservation—must now be fitted into Federal and State programs. Our Nation's policies and actions must more and more be decided on an international rather than a national basis. Another reason interest of this kind is so greatly needed now grows from the challenge of communism. We have to prove through sound judgment that we value our freedoms enough to think and work for them."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued debate on civil rights.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 3337–3342

Bills Introduced: 12 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3109–3120. Pages 3338–3339

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. 2311, providing for hospitalization at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the D.C. of certain U.S. nationals adjudged insane in foreign countries (S. Rept. 1143). Page 3338

Public Land for School Purposes—Civil Rights: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 8315, directing the Secretary of the Army to lease certain property in Missouri for school purposes.

Pending at recess was Long amendment to first branch of Dirksen amendments (in nature of a substitute for the bill) comprising "Civil Rights Act of 1960." The Long amendment would add proviso that no person shall be prevented from exercising his freedom of speech to advocate separation of races or that forcible integration of races is undesirable and should be resisted by all legal means. Pages 3342–3417

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that Senate will meet at noon Monday, February 29, instead of at 10 a.m. as previously announced, in order that any committees desiring to meet Monday morning may do so. Page 3417

Quorum Calls: During Senate proceedings today five quorum calls were taken, which appear on pages 3340, 3409, and 3413–3414.

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: 2 civilians, including that of Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be member of CAB; 217 in the Coast Guard; and 39 in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Pages 3417–3418

Program for Monday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 5:46 p.m. until noon Monday, when it will continue on H.R. 8315, to lease certain public land in Missouri for school purposes. Page 3417

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, February 29, at 12 o'clock noon, when the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960 will be considered.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Appendix

Meet the New Boss of the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Sunday, in the Star magazine, February 28, 1960, there appears a very interesting article entitled "Meet the New Boss of the Marine Corps," by A. L. Singleton.

In this article we find a brief sketch, a capsule sketch, so to speak, of the new Commandant of the Marine Corps, which I commend to the Senate for reading.

It gives a fairly brief sketch of his background, his activities in the Corps and, in effect, indicates what may be expected of him. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, but that Gen. David M. Shoup, the present Commandant of the Marine Corps, will fulfill the pattern which has been set by his 21 predecessors, and that in his hands the Marine Corps will be ready and fit to go at any time under any circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE NEW BOSS OF THE MARINE CORPS
(By A. L. Singleton)

You hear it said often these days that America's young men are soft—and getting softer.

Maybe. But a man who has the job of keeping 175,000 young men ready to fight for their country at a moment's notice is not worried about their fitness.

"I can't speak for all the young men, of course," declares Gen. David M. Shoup, new Commandant of the Marine Corps, "but in our case, we're turning out a better product than ever.

"Why, there's no comparison between the Marine Corps of 1926, when I went in, and the Marine Corps today. The improvement has been staggering."

General Shoup, a graying, bespectacled man of medium height and stocky build, became the 22d Commandant January 1, the day after his 55th birthday. He was lifted by the President over a number of senior officers to succeed retired Gen. Randolph McC. Pate.

The Commandant lives in a 155-year-old mansion at the Marine Barracks, Eighth and I Streets SE., where he and Mrs. Shoup are just getting settled for a 4-year residence.

One of their two children, Robert D. Shoup, a Commerce Department mapmaker, lives with his own family in Arlington. A daughter, Mrs. Joel Watkins, is married to an ex-marine now studying at the University of Texas.

The Commandant's office is in Arlington's Navy Annex, where he wears civilian clothes as often as a uniform, and seems more a business executive than boss of the Marines.

"His manner is mild," an associate says. "But don't let that fool you. Inside, he's as tough as nails."

The toughness was demonstrated frequently during World War II, in which he won many decorations, topped by the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism in the Battle of Tarawa.

Among his fellow marines, he is known as a firm but fair officer, and a man of few words, a reputation that grew out of proportion during interviews following his appointment as Commandant.

Resulting newspaper stories referred to him as "terse" and "tightlipped," whereas his friends and family consider him softspoken and mild, if not garrulous.

"I admit the reporters got me wrong," he says. "But they asked me such questions as, 'Why do you wear glasses.' And I replied, 'That I may see better.' Now how are you going to be anything but terse when you are asked questions like that?

"Besides, I believe when people need information, they usually don't want a dissertation."

The general was born in Battle Ground, Ind., a coincidence that has not been overlooked during his fighting career. He was graduated from De Pauw University, which makes him not only the sole Commandant from that school, but one of the few Marine chiefs of recent years who did not graduate from the Naval Academy or VMI.

Before a recruiting letter from Gen. John Le Jeune (then Commandant) sold him on the Marines, he was thinking of becoming a teacher. And before he became a Marine, he served briefly in the Army Reserves.

Once in the corps, however, he developed into the kind of leader that caused observers to trot out such timeworn terms as a "a Marine's Marine" to describe him.

It was generally understood within the organization that when a mean job had to be done, "Dave" Shoup was likely to do it—and well.

In his 33 years of service, he has touched most Marine bases. Twice in China, at sea, temporarily with the old Civilian Conservation Corps, and at U.S. posts from Quantico to San Diego, he rounded out his pre-World War II career in Iceland.

In the Pacific soon after the shooting started he saw action at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Saipan, and Tinian, as well as Tarawa, picking up a pair of Purple Hearts in the process.

One of these came with his Medal of Honor. As a colonel in command of the Second Marines, he rallied his troops in spite of the shell-shock and a severe leg injury, and led them across the reefs, through water that ran pink with blood, and onto tiny Betio Island, where he directed counterattacks that finally overran the heavily fortified Japanese in 2 days.

Asked if he thought this was the toughest of his battles, the general replies: "I've never fixed on any one battle. When you talk about tough battles, it all depends on who's talking and what you're talking about. You can say one was rougher than another because more men were involved, for instance, but any battle can be rough for a given fighter."

In postwar years, General Shoup was often deskbound, but never idle.

In 1956, the corps was rocked by the drowning of six recruits at Parris Island, S.C. A drill instructor, Sgt. Matthew McKeon, was charged with leading a death march through a swamp while under the influence of alcohol.

In the wake of the public uproar that followed, General Shoup was tapped for the job of heading and reorganizing, if necessary, all Marine recruit training.

As the corps' inspector general, he carried his campaign to the front lines. He went to the recruits themselves.

"I talked to the boys at rail depots, when they were on their way home from training," he recalls. "They had no idea who I was, because I didn't tell them and I was in civilian clothes."

Within months, recruit training changed.

"But we substituted nothing that was weaker," the general points out. "The really great drill instructors did not rely on knocking people about to get discipline. They stood as personal examples.

"Sooner or later in this life of ours, a man has to learn two things: to recognize and respect duly constituted authority and to get along with others. We teach both these things in recruit training now without physical violence of any kind."

He is convinced that Marine training now, as it has in the past, will produce the kind of fighter the country must have.

"I think there will always be a need," he says, "for men who are able and eager to go, in any transportation available and under any conditions, to meet any enemy, with a built-in will to win. And that's the kind of men we're turning out."

Postal Employees Urge an End to Airlift of First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Spokane branch, National Postal Transport Association. In this resolution the postal employees called for an end to the present practice of airlifting first-class mail on which airmail postage has not been paid.

The authority of the Post Office Department to airlift this mail is most cloudy inasmuch as the Department was authorized by Congress nearly 8 years ago to conduct an experimental program of this type and has since expanded it into a regular part of postal practices.

The House Appropriations Committee recently called on the Post Office Department to cease any expansion of this practice until congressional intent has been established. My bill, H.R. 9488, would terminate the authority of the Post Office Department to airlift first-class mail other than airmail. A num-

ber of other Members have also introduced similar legislation.

I have written to the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Representative MURRAY, of Tennessee, requesting early hearings on these bills, so that Congress can inform the Department of its intent in these matters. The resolution referred to above follows:

Whereas the airlines are now subsidized to a considerable extent at the expense of the taxpayers, although seemingly under the CAA, but still chargeable to the Post Office Department; and

Whereas the airlift mail is subject to the whims of space available and weather conditions, thus open to delays; and

Whereas the railroads must be ready at all times, to take over the transportation of airmails and airlift mails delayed by weather or unavailability of space; and

Whereas airmail facilities are available to those who wish faster service at a price, which gives them preferential treatment as paid for; and

Whereas airmail facilities are as a general rule not located near railroad stations, which is not conducive to speedy transfer in case space is not available or weather does not permit flying, thus contributing to the loss of transient time of 1 to 3 days; and

Whereas the general feeling by persons who use the mail, is that they prefer a regular dependable service in the regular manner, not subject to other delays; and

Whereas the bulk of airlift mail will in all likelihood be flown to outer distribution centers for return by train or truck, a likelihood for further delay and expense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, with due consideration and justice to the taxpaying public, and confusion and loss of morale amongest postal employees, That airlift of first-class mail should not be permitted to be further expanded.

Sound Perspective on the So-Called Defense Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the manner in which the status of our national defenses is being used by some people for partisan purposes was clearly outlined recently by Paul Martin, the astute and able chief of the Gannett News Service Washington bureau. In an article appearing in the Rochester Times-Union and other newspapers, Mr. Martin points out the similarities between the present wrangle over our defenses and that which occurred in 1957.

He also emphasizes the dangers involved in such shenanigans if our potential enemies take literally the pronouncements of self-seeking politicians on this subject. There is good food for thought in this piece, Mr. President, and I hope it will be carefully read by every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBATE OVER DEFENSE IS POLITICAL MATTER
(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is going over the same old ground in the so-called missile gap that it has plowed every year since the Soviets launched their first sputnik in 1957.

The answers are still the same, but the alarm seems noisier this year, since several of the Democratic aspirants for President are using defense hearings as a forum for their political ambitions.

The Washington Star summed it up this way in a headline over its Sunday editorial section: "Debate Over Defense Gap Primarily a Political Matter." So it is.

The purpose is to weaken public confidence in the conduct of national defense by President Eisenhower, and thereby promote the chances of the political opposition for winning control of the Federal Government in November.

These tactics are not unfamiliar in a campaign year. In 1956, the same prophets were predicting a calamity for the United States in a "bomber gap" with Russia, on the basis of "intelligence estimates."

Estimates at that time indicated the Soviets had more than 100 jet intercontinental bombers of a new type called the Bison, compared to only 78 B–52's in the U.S. Air Force. A defense contractor staged a campaign to get the Government to buy more heavy jet bombers.

The Air Force admitted to Congress in 1957 that its calculations on the buildup of Soviet bomber strength were all wrong. The Russians never made more than 50 Bisons, then stopped manufacture of all heavy bombers in favor of ballistic missiles. Nor do the Soviets have a "crash" program going today to make long-range missiles.

Political strategy behind the current defense hearings could backfire if the American people get the idea that this domestic political controversy is giving the enemy a false impression of our military strength, to the point where the Communists might be tempted to do something rash.

Russian and Chinese Communists are rather literal-minded folk. They follow our newspapers and tend to believe what our politicians say. For instance, they believed it in 1950 when then Secretary of State Dean Acheson said that Korea was "outside the defense perimeter of the United States."

Our European allies are not alarmed about Soviet intercontinental missiles and space vehicles as much as they are concerned over the mobility and firepower of our ground forces in Western Europe.

They believe this is the kind of limited-war operation that the Russians might resort to in a showdown over Berlin, rather than a nuclear war which no one could expect to win, and where everyone would lose.

The way hearings have been staged by the Senate Space and Preparedness Committees does not inspire confidence that the real purpose was to inquire into the true status of our national defense.

Instead of starting with Defense officials, the committees called "hostile" witnesses first. They heard other witnesses in closed sessions. Senators came out and gave the press their impressions of what was said, instead of letting reporters judge for themselves.

Finally, the new Defense Secretary, Thomas S. Gates, was put on the stand as a climax. He was followed by the service Chiefs, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They took apart most of the earlier testimony.

A Democratic Senator told this correspondent: "It may sound like heresy to my party, but all we've succeeded in doing is to confuse the public.

"I'm really not alarmed about the situation. In the matter of big missiles, it's like they have a .45 and we have a .32. But we are not unarmed. Considering everything, airplanes, missiles, and the new Polaris submarines which are going to be the best weapons system of all, we have what it takes."

Now that the current episode is drawing to a close in the continuing missile thriller, the significant thing to bear in mind is this:

Defense Secretary Gates and every service chief has declared that there is no deterrent gap in U.S. military strength today, and there will be none in the foreseeable future.

Every one of the service chiefs is supporting the President's military budget for 1961. Each would like, if possible, to have more funds for his own service. But they are unanimous in asserting that the proposed budget is adequate to defend the United States.

President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message:

"America possesses an enormous defense power. It is my studied conviction that no nation will ever risk general war against us, unless we should be so foolish as to neglect the defense forces we now so powerfully support.

"It is worldwide knowledge that any power which might be tempted today to attack the United States, even though our country might sustain great losses, would itself promptly suffer a terrible destruction. But I once again assure all peoples and all nations that the United States, except in defense, will never turn loose this destructive power."

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the four finalists in the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored in cooperation with the National Association of Broadcasters and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, was Mike Phillips, of Burlington, Iowa, a young man whom I have the distinction of representing in the U.S. Congress.

At the awards banquet, February 24, I was pleased when Mike was named as one of the runners-up in the final judging.

His essay on the "I Speak for Democracy" theme speaks out in behalf of one of the bulwarks of the American way of life—the role of the family in keeping alive our basic freedoms and the appreciation of and respect for the heritage which has made this Nation the leader of the free world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call this message to the attention of my colleagues. The essay follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY
(By Mike Phillips, Notre Dame High School, Burlington, Iowa)

I am a student in a high school in the midwestern part of America. I, like any

other student of this day, am engrossed in the things around me. The recent school exam, and the possibility of victory in the next ball game, are examples of the topics which enter into my conversation with my friends everyday. Jim's new sports car and the complete answer to the latest chemistry experiment, along with a million and one other things, dominate the verbal exchange between every class.

After school I have a job working in a retail store. There I handle money, with all the responsibility that that entails, while trying to satisfy customers with the quality of the products which I sell.

My home is nothing extraordinary, except maybe in the fact that it is a real home—one which is so hard to find in the world today.

My family is, I think, ideal. My parents are good, loving, and God fearing. My brother and sister, both younger than I, are mischievous and playful, but when you really need them they are always willing to help.

But why, you may ask, am I giving this seemingly irrelevant information in a talk on democracy? The answer is simple. This is my democracy. The fact that I can go to any school and take the courses I want, with nothing to fear, except maybe the ever-watchful parental eye.

The fact that I can express my ideas to my instructor and my classmates without being labeled a "radical" or a "revolutionary" or an "enemy of the state".

The fact that I can work and take on responsibility, on my own initiative, without being considered as just one more of the "masses." These are the reasons why I speak for democracy.

Not long ago, I visited the U.S. Capital for the first time, fulfilling a promise I had made to myself many years before. Words have not yet been invented that could accurately describe the first moment I saw the dome of the Capitol Building. I remember it as if it were just yesterday.

It was late in the evening and the city of Washington was just falling asleep. I was on a streetcar, with some friends of mine, all of us alive with the excitement of the big city. Gazing out into the darkness, someone pointed to a great light hovering over the treetops. In a very short time, the car stopped and we got off, our eyes still fixed to this strange illumination. Then, coming into a clearing, I saw it, the Capitol of the United States—tall and stately, with its immaculate dome looking over Washington, and over all America.

An experience such as this is not easily forgotten. I have not forgotten it. It made me realize, as I had never realized before, just what democracy really is. As I stood there, almost dumbfounded, in the simple beauty of what I saw, the grasp of patriotism pulled me forward. In the spotlessness, of this, her temple, I saw America's martyrs—their red blood adding to its glow. Supporting her great white dome, now above me, I saw her gigantic pillars * * * the principative of her existence. As I went forward, my eye caught sight of the three largest and most noticable of these pillars—freedom, truth, and justice.

Standing by her pillar of freedom, I could hear her proclaim to the world the God-given right of liberty.

Seeing her pillar of truth, I knew the strength of her land, the source of all truth—God.

Moving on to her pillar of justice, I heard her say, "All men are created equal."

There I realized that without those three great pillars, that temple would surely fall, as have so many temples before, because they lacked them.

This, then, is the framework of the democracy in which I live. Because my Government recognizes that I am an individual, created by a higher power and given certain basic rights which no power can take from me, I am able to live, speak, and worship in the manner ordained by my conscience.

This is to me the best form of government yet devised by man because it recognizes the fatherhood of God.

This is why I speak for democracy.

Wisconsin Farmers Union 1960 Action Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, during recent years, the American farmer has continued to face problems such as—

Lowering prices for farm products, but rising prices for machinery, equipment, taxes, labor and other farm costs;

An imbalance in production of a number of commodities acting as an economic millstone around the necks of the farmers, resulting in stockpiles of surpluses and high costs to the taxpayers.

Overall, the farmers receive a disproportionately small—and declining—share of the growing national income.

Through the years, a number of farm organizations—at the local, state and national levels—have attempted to analyze the problems and crystallize farm thinking to find solutions to brighten the economic outlook in agriculture.

Among these organizations, unfortunately, there have been differing viewpoints and approaches to resolution of the problem. Nevertheless, each has represented a wide segment of the farm economy.

In the light of these dedicated efforts, it has long been evident that it is most worthwhile for us in Congress—who are seeking a sound solution to our economic problems in agriculture—to listen to these "voices" of the American farmer.

Today, I refer particularly to the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

Over the years, I have often been privileged to work together with the Farmers Union in support of legislation felt to be in the best interests of agriculture.

At the same time, I must frankly say that there have been issues on which we have not seen eye to eye. Nevertheless, I continue to respect the viewpoint of this fine union—as, frankly speaking, they have respected mine—as we try to reach objectives which we both seek: that is, a real solution to the complex problems in agriculture.

Recently, the Farmers Union News published the 1960 action program for the union.

Reflecting the dedicated endeavors of this organization to seek solutions to problems affecting, not only the Wisconsin farmer, but also other challenges confronting us nationally and internationally, I believe this action program merits the attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have the program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Farmers Union News, Feb. 29, 1960]

WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION 1960 ACTION PROGRAM

PREAMBLE

The growth and greatness of America is rooted deep in its soil. For over 200 years a basic cornerstone of American freedom has been the opportunity to make a living from the land.

For the victims of Old World oppression, America's land offered both the symbol and the substance of freedom, independence, opportunity, and self-respect. As the tide of national expansion rolled westward, it offered escape from the exploitation of the cities, a new start for the victims of disaster, and opportunity for young people starting out in life.

The land has given America a rich return—an abundance of food and raw material, strong and self-reliant people. It has provided homes for millions of American families to live, work, and grow together. It has fostered rural community life in the highest tradition of American democracy.

But in recent years all this is gravely threatened by growing maladjustment and injustice within the national economy. The greedy hand of monopoly has steadily pushed up the prices of those things which farmers must buy. At the same time the farmers, scattered across the Nation in millions of operating units, imperfectly and insufficiently organized, have fallen prey to their own technological advances. Production has outstripped their available markets, and the prices they receive for their commodities have been falling while their costs have been rising.

Farming now requires greater investments, greater costs of operation than ever before. Yet its return is falling to depression levels. It no longer offers opportunity that measures up to other walks of life. The young people are turning away from it to go into the cities. The future of the land looks dark.

America needs its land. It needs good farmers to care for it and conserve it. It needs its farm families and the strength and meaning they give to American life and ideals. It needs agriculture as a way of life.

The inequality of bargaining power between agriculture and industry is steadily draining away the economic strength of rural America both on the farm and along the main streets of the communities which serve our vast agricultural areas. It is drying up a vital market for American industry and business and thus threatening the future employment of American wage earners.

This is a far-reaching problem of grave national concern. Abraham Lincoln said a century ago that a nation cannot survive half slave and half free. Today it can be added that an economy cannot prosper half fat and half starved, half boom and half broke.

Government without political justice is tyranny. Production without economic justice is exploitation.

American agriculture is entitled to economic justice. The task of restoring a sound and healthy balance between industry and agriculture is a national responsibility, for the present and future welfare of the Nation depends upon its success.

For over a quarter of a century the Farmers Union in Wisconsin has been an organization of family-type farmers leading the fight for the preservation of our cherished agricultural ideas. In this fight we are not

only fighting for the preservation of the family farm, but for the foundations of our rural life, our rural churches, our rural communities. We are fighting, too, for preserving the great rural market so important to the continued prosperity of the industrial segment of our economy. The fight for the family-type farmer is a fight for a better, a greater, a more secure America of the future.

As we enter upon this new decade of the sixties we sound a note of warning to those who dwell upon the rosy promises of continued economic growth and seeming prosperity. Prosperity built upon an impoverished agriculture will not stand. To make the dream of the sixties come true, our first task must be to provide parity of income for agriculture.

We seek no special privilege, no special advantage. We seek only equality of treatment, equality of opportunity for American farm families. We seek economic justice for agriculture.

FOR THESE THINGS WE STAND

We believe that family-type farming is fundamental and basic. It is the cradle of American freedom and democracy.

We believe our economic system can and must be so adjusted to give farm families full opportunity to earn and receive a parity income equal on the average to the incomes of Americans in other walks of life.

We shall support adoption and use of workable combinations of farm commodity income improvement methods such as: loans, purchase agreements, market surplus diversion purchases, parity income deficiency payments direct to farmers limited to family-size operations, regulation of imports, export incentive payments, stabilization operations by farmers and by Government, marketing agreements and orders, other farmers' bargaining devices, marketing premium payments for sale of livestock at desirable weights, other types of marketing premium payments designed to keep supplies in balance with demand, marketing standards and scheduling, cooperative storage and marketing practices, and a system of marketing quotas for all commodities as a whole, for groups of related commodities, or for individual commodities, as needed.

We urge the organization of a centralized and federated nationwide producer cooperative marketing organization for dairy products, and we favor State enabling legislation to develop cooperative marketing organizations which can fit into such federated nationwide cooperative marketing of agricultural commodities.

We favor the expansion of co-op processing, marketing, and storage facilities, including terminal markets, through REA-type loans and technical assistance to farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives.

We favor the elimination of interstate barriers to the free flow of quality dairy products between markets. For this purpose we favor Federal legislation for establishing uniform sanitation standards and practices in the production, processing, transportation and sale of fluid milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce.

We urge consolidation of the conservation reserve with the ACP program and that the total program be expanded. Greater emphasis and attention should be given to the soil and water conservation aspects of the program. The law should be amended to prohibit the placing of entire farms in the reserve. Closer supervision and enforcement should be exercised by the Department and the farmer committees to see to it that land conservation and care requirements are strictly carried out in the conservation reserve and ACP programs.

All possible measures to expand consumption of farm commodities should be undertaken, consistent with good soil conservation, before resorting to production restrictions. We demand that the national food stamp plan as recently enacted be used to supplement the diets of underprivileged persons, and we favor a more aggressive export program to undernourished peoples of the world. We commend the University of Wisconsin and its extension service for its leadership in basic and applied farm research, and urge the State legislature to provide sufficient funds for an expanded program. We recognize that the University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture and its extension service have pioneered in spreading the results of farm research throughout the State, and the university has achieved great success in increasing efficient production on Wisconsin farms. These technological advances on the production side have now outstripped improvements in the distribution of farm commodities. The emphasis in such an expanded research program should be placed upon studies concerned with marketing and new uses of farm commodities.

To demonstrate the practicability of a national dairy food stamp plan and to secure the immediate benefits of such a plan in Wisconsin, we favor the enactment of a State food stamp plan in Wisconsin by which surplus food commodities would be made available to low-income families and the recipients of State and county welfare aids through the normal channels of trade. Such a plan should be supported by a Federal contribution equal to the value of the surplus commodities consumed through the plan's operation. A dairy food stamp plan would prevent the waste of surplus food commodities, insure a more adequate diet of needy persons, save on public storage and handling costs, and channel this trade through the local retail food merchant.

We favor an expanded school lunch and school milk program, and that it be continued on a Federal basis. We favor the use of more dairy products by our Armed Forces.

We favor legislation to establish and maintain stockpiles of storable farm commodities as a safety reserve in the overall program of national defense.

We are opposed to the sale of Government-owned agricultural commodities on the market for less than parity price plus five percent and carrying charges. We believe in rotating the commodities in storage, especially perishable commodities, with new crops to avoid deterioration, but the commodities so marketed should be replaced with an amount equal to that taken out so as not to add to the amount normally marketed.

We demand representation of family-type farmers on all governmental boards and agencies involving agricultural programs.

We advocate a return to the democratic practices formerly used in the establishment and in the authority of farmer committees in the administration of the ASC program.

We oppose the so-called "hard money" manipulations by the Federal Reserve Board, Government and financial monopolies which increase the interest burdens of all people, including Federal debt.

We favor the establishment of a comprehensive farm credit yardstick program at interest rates not higher than the average cost of funds to the Federal Government.

We continue to support the development and use of farmer-owned production credit and farm loan associations and the banks for cooperatives.

We are alarmed over the deterioration of the original principles of the Farmers Home Administration and urge a return to the original and practical purpose of providing needed rural credit.

We endorse the soil conservation district program, recommend an acceleration in watershed protection and flood prevention projects, and commend the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for its contributions in furthering these activities.

We continue to favor the adequate program now operating in Wisconsin for the eradication of brucellosis (Bang's disease); and we support the tuberculosis program work being done by the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture and the College of Agriculture in finding an improved approach for the eradication of actually infected animals.

We favor further development of the REA-financed electrical and telephone programs. We are opposed to legislation which would increase interest rates on REA loans. We protest any discrimination against co-op applicants in making loans for the telephone program.

We urge Farmers Union members to give all their patronage to Farmers Union cooperatives and their Farmers Union insurance program and to build more cooperatives in Farmers Union territory to provide services where they are needed, to fight the rising tide of operating costs. Building the strength of cooperatives also requires the full support of cooperative patrons through membership in the Farmers Union, which carries on the educational and legislative program in their behalf.

We have always taken the position that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. We oppose any proposal for either State or Federal sales taxes.

We are opposed to proposed discriminatory double taxation of cooperative refunds.

We oppose the program to change the method of computing taxes of qualified farm cooperatives.

We favor the taxing of excess profits in corporate income.

We favor the elimination of depletion allowances and accelerated tax amortization, where they are excessive, and other tax loopholes.

We favor an increase in State aid to provide additional funds for adequate schools serving the rural areas, such additional funds to come from taxation in accordance with the ability to pay.

We favor increased Federal aid for education. We oppose the proposal to withdraw Federal aid from vocational agriculture and domestic science.

We favor and recommend that bona fide, working farmers be represented on the governing bodies of the State university and colleges and on the board of vocational and adult education.

We are opposed to any plan which would destroy the segregation of highway tax income. We favor a more liberal policy in classifications of primary and secondary roads in the townships.

We favor a State and Federal program of investigation and regulation of monopolies and vigorous prosecution of all illegal practices.

We recognize and support labor's right to organize and bargain collectively for adequate wages and improved working conditions. We are opposed to the efforts to sabotage these fundamental rights of labor under the guise of so-called right-to-work legislation. Full employment in the cities at good wages is vital to the farmer's market.

We favor a program for better health facilities, and a national health insurance act to provide better medical care, health services, and hospitalization programs for all Americans.

We favor an immediate program to expand facilities for training more doctors and other medical personnel.

We favor adequate appropriations to restore services of the State radio network and we support experimental planning for a statewide television program.

We favor realistic programs of aid for veterans.

We favor a reappraisal of our national defense needs in the light of recent development of new weapons and techniques of warfare, with particular reference to the need for trained manpower. The drafting of young men for military service should not be continued unless it is clearly necessary to the effective defense of our country. We do not favor a permanent system of universal military training.

We believe that in time of national emergency, industry and wealth should be drafted as well as manpower.

We favor further development of a practical civil defense program, with agricultural people being informed and participating in such program.

We favor legislation to protect the water rights of farmers.

We endorse the principle of selective cutting and reforestation. We urge that public works in reforestation and cooperative logging and processing plants be established.

We believe that the use of State marketing orders and agreements should be encouraged and extended to all crops practical, and that wood products be included. We favor close cooperation with the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture in implementing these orders and agreements.

We favor strengthening the United Nations and enlarging its functions for the purpose of peace. We support the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labor Office, U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and the World Health Organization, and the establishment of a World Food Bank. We enthusiastically support the international exchange of farm trainees and urge the continuation and expansion of this program for better understanding among nations.

We favor the basic objectives of the point 4 program.

We favor a National Science Foundation to control all patents developed by public agencies to the general welfare of all people.

We are opposed to the control of atomic energy research falling into private hands or into the hands of the military.

The Wisconsin Farmers Union is opposed to all forms of totalitarian dictatorship, regardless of whether these dictatorships be political, economic, religious, or intellectual in character. We believe in political, economic, religious, and intellectual freedom with justice for all, and we shall oppose the efforts of any group to change this fundamental philosophy with the aim of subverting our program and organization to their ends.

Misuse of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of late on the subject of the misuse of military manpower. In connection with the recently ended winter Olympics, there has been a utilization of marines and soldiers that, in the opinion of myself and others, was more than mere misuse. It was flagrant abuse. In running its own operations, we are told the military assigned personnel to menial tasks of no value for training purposes and of doubtful benefit to others than individual officers and their families. This appears to be misuse in many cases.

At the Olympics something else crops up—private profit. It may be well and good to point out that for the success of the Olympics, it was necessary to have someone eliminate the danger of avalanches, trample snow, and shovel drainage ditches. But how did the promoters, who were interested in the commercial aspects of the games, get the military to do what should have been a responsibility of the promoters themselves?

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Stanley Woodward, which was published in the New York Herald Tribune on February 14, 1960, and a letter to me from William Morris of the Bell Syndicate, Inc., both of which elaborate on this issue:

RIVERSIDE, CONN., *February 14, 1960.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN IRWIN: The enclosed article by Stanley Woodward from today's Herald Tribune fittingly expresses the shock I felt when I first heard that platoons of American marines are being marched up and down hills at Squaw Valley to prepare the snow for the forthcoming Olympic races. You'll find picture documentation of this fantastic boondoggle in the current Life magazine.

Your colleague, Congressman KOWALSKI, has done a good job of bringing to the public attention the misuse of uniformed manpower to walk dogs and wash dishes for the wives of Army brass. Here's an issue that cries out for congressional investigation—one that makes the "payola" inquiry trifling by comparison.

I have been a sports fan all my life—and Stanley Woodward has been just about the most respected sports editor as long as I can remember—but this is more than the likes of us can stomach. As he says: "But how the hell the Olympic promoters can utilize the military forces in preparation of a purely nonmilitary ski area is strictly unclear to us."

Sincerely,

WM. MORRIS.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 14, 1960]

(By Stanley Woodward)

SNOW FUN FOR GI's

A formidable amount of snow builds up on Papoose Mountain. A whistle sounds in the military area and an Air Force gun crew rushes out to man the 5-incher. Boom—a controlled snowslide starts down the mountain. Another shot and the danger of an avalanche which might hurt the winter Olympics is over. All that remains is for a couple of companies of marines to climb up and tread down the snow so that the downhill will be in shape for the skiers.

Torrential rains unfortunately fall. A company of infantry rushes out and starts shoveling ditches so that the Olympic facilities won't be damaged. It was a close call but the Army and a change to colder weather saved the day. By night it is snowing again and all that will be necessary to preserve the skiing in the morning will be a couple of artillery volleys at Squaw Peak and a few hours of treading by the soldiers and marines.

It is understood that the State of California and the Federal Government became involved for $13,490,000 to fix up Squaw Valley for the Olympic games and that we'll all pay our share toward the great show. But how the hell the Olympic promoters can utilize the military forces in preparation of a purely nonmilitary ski area is strictly unclear to us.

NEVADA LURKS IN AMBUSH

An awful lot of nasty stuff is going to come out when the big city newspaper men get to Squaw Valley next week. The repercussions may be violent enough to unseat the California State government and might well have an effect on the Presidential race.

This is the weirdest deal since Teapot Dome. The State of California has gone for $8,990,000, the Federal Government for $4,500,000 and private industry for $2,500,000. The State of Nevada, conservatively slicing the prospective Olympic return to its gambling industry, has pushed in $400,000.

The Nevadans are ready to make the greatest killing since legalized gambling began. Squaw Valley is virtually on the shores of Lake Tahoe which is half in California, half in Nevada.

At the northern end is Calneva, at the southern is Stateline, both Nevada towns which are solid with slot machines and crap tables. For those who get by the preliminary defenses, there is Reno, 42 miles east.

A good many of the eastern newspaper men who will cover the Olympics, including our own Red Smith, will stay at Reno and commute to the rinks and snowy peaks daily by station wagon. Facilities on the scene, apparently operated by the California branch of the Mafia, are paid for in advance and through the nose.

CAL SOLONS WERE HOOKED

The State hopes to get back some of its money but despite the presence of the world's greatest skiers and skaters and the promise of a show to end shows by Walt Disney, advance sales have been slow. In the words of a Sheepshead Bay fisherman, "It don't look as though California is going to get her bait back."

The whole business started when an ex-New Yorker named Alex Cushing who owns a ski lodge in Squaw Valley and operates a lift, persuaded the United States Olympic committee to let him try to get the games for his God-forsaken hole in the mountains.

He went to Paris and bragged of the place to the international Olympians and indicated the whole bill for rigging the terrain would be $1 million. The Olympians gave Squaw Valley the games and the State of California obligingly put up the million, which proved to be a fractional downpayment.

Once in it the California Legislature was trapped and more and more money had to be raised to avoid a blooper which would forever besmirch the fair name of the Golden State.

So now California is in it up to the ears. Nevada is standing by to make a killing and Mr. Cushing, originator of the whole deal, is sitting in his ski lodge waiting for everyone to go away so he can clean up.

It's easy to see how it all happened. But how did the State of California get the services of the troops.

Science in the Advancement of New States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the role of science in the development of new African and Asian states was reviewed recently in two addresses by Hon. Abba

Eban, formerly Israel Ambassador to the United States of America and its Permanent Delegate at the United Nations. Mr. Eban is today Minister Without Portfolio in the Government of Israel, and president of the Weizmann Institute of Science.

The text of these addresses was published in the Jerusalem Post newspaper of Israel. In view of the compelling interest of Mr. Eban's observations on two great movements of our time, I ask unanimous consent to have a digest of these addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest of the addresses was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE IN THE ADVANCEMENT OF NEW STATES

(By Hon. Abba Eban)

Two great movements of history shape the life and destiny of our times—the scientific revolution, with its glittering discoveries and achievements, and the emancipation of new nations, emerging one after the other into the light and air of freedom.

Yet some of the most recent victories of science have done more to increase man's haunting sense of insecurity than to advance his welfare. The longing for peace—the deepest instinct of the human heart—is now suffused with an anguish of unparalleled depth and universality. But science in our time has not only cast a shadow and spread a cloud; it also sheds a great light—nothing less than the prospect of man's redemption from his basic scarcities and disabilities.

Nuclear and solar energy can create new sources of energy, at a time when conventional sources are under strain of increasing use, with an eventual prospect of exhaustion.

Medical science has scored splendid victories in many crucial fields. Methods have been discovered of combating endemic diseases which have afflicted whole nations for centuries.

The advance of air transport and electronic techniques enables many nations to overcome the handicaps of distance and isolation which have hitherto cut them off from contact with each other and with the achievements of science and technology.

The new accessibility of peoples to each other's lives and thoughts enlarges the prospect of international understanding. Clearly, then, science can be the agent of a rich and varied salvation for all mankind. It holds a special promise for those nations which have recently achieved their sovereignty and now find themselves confronted by agonizing difficulties on the road toward social and economic progress.

Yet, despite its theoretical power of liberation, science remains a prospective rather than an actual benefactor of mankind. There is still more vision than reality, more promise than fulfilment. Scientists and statesmen inhabit separate worlds of functional specialization; they have no sharp sense of being concerned with each other.

Justly exalted by the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, scientists are not encouraged to feel special responsibility for the fate of human society, even though it is they who will largely determine man's social fate for good or ill. The leadership of the scientific world rests in the hands of nations which, however, good their intentions, cannot always feel the full and poignant urgency of harvesting the new benefits of science without delay. Moreover, the leaders of nations, especially the young emergent nations, are by experience and background little equipped to appreciate the capacity of science to find a road toward the solution of their most acute national and human problems.

As we look upon the separate worlds of statecraft and science, we are driven by the logic of our times to the clear necessity of building a bridge between them. The need is to reveal and define the possibilities of science as an instrument for the guidance and fertilization of national liberation movements. This view of the interaction between the two major currents of modern history has led the Weizmann Institute of Science and Yad Chaim Weizmann at Rehovoth, Israel, to the decision to convene an international conference in August this year. The participants will be scientists, economists, political thinkers, social scientists and representatives of new nations—particularly those concerned with economic and social planning. The object of the conference will be to explore the capacity of science to advance the life of nations which have not yet reached the full momentum of their development.

The initiative in organizing the conference is not alien to the traditions of the Weizmann Institute. The buildings, laboratories, libraries, and ressearch projects assembled in Rehovoth are but the outer expression of a system of thought and life which our first president, the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann, upheld and exemplified as he pursued his simultaneous course in statecraft and science.

Many regard it as natural that Israel should have a special role in illustrating the relationship between science and the modern movement of national liberation. The pioneering momentum which marks Israel's development in agriculture and science may be instructive for other new states. If a state like Israel can overcome natural scarcity and the limitations of a niggardly geography, surely the courage and self-confidence of other nations in like conditions would be uplifted.

Among scientists of world repute who will deliver papers at the conference in Rehovoth are Prof. I. I. Rabi, physicist and Nobel Prize laureate, of Columbia University; Dr. Farrington Daniels, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, of Stanford; Dr. David Jenkins, noted authority on desalination of sea water, of the U.S. Department of Interior; Dr. Klare Markley, of California; Dr. M. C. Shelesnyak, formerly of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, and now in Israel; Dr. Marshall Brucer, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and Dr. Jerrold Zacharias, of MIT; and Mr. Paul Hoffman, architect of the first U.S. oversea aid program.

The conference is planned as a meeting between science and the national liberation movement of our generation, and participants will include also representatives and delegations of developing countries, particularly from Africa and Asia. I firmly believe that the State of Israel, and especially the Weizmann Institute, are destined to serve as one of the gates through which liberated nations will enter the world of science.

The End of Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a most heartening report which appeared yesterday, Sunday, February 28, on the front page of the New York Times. The burden of this report is that at least for the present, inflation has been brought under control. This opinion is backed by responsible Government officials and fully supported by facts.

Moreover, the Times credits the policies of the Federal Reserve System which we have so often heard attacked in this Chamber, and the $4.2 billion surplus, as entitled to a share of the honors for achieving price stability.

I look upon these facts as the most encouraging news that we could be given at this time, short of a guarantee of world peace. They are, further, a complete vindication for the fiscal and monetary policies which the gentlemen across the aisle have attacked so bitterly, and for which the President and the minority Members in Congress have fought so hard.

Under unanimous consent I include the article referred to in the Appendix of the RECORD.

UNITED STATES NOTES GAINS IN INFLATION WAR—TOP ECONOMIC AIDS DOUBT SERIOUS PRICE RISES—SEE LONG PERIOD OF PROSPERITY

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The Government's high-ranking economic and financial officials believe that major progress has been made on the anti-inflation front.

While some of them expect a slight further rise in prices this year, none foresees another serious wave of inflation such as has characterized most of the period since World War II.

"If we keep Government finances in shape," said one official this week, "the 1956–57 inflation might very well prove to have been the last."

The view in the Government is beginning to coincide with that of Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund. Mr. Jacobsson went out on a limb last fall with the statement that "in all probability the postwar inflation has come to an end."

There is a growing belief within the Government that if inflation is actually under control at last, there is a good chance that the present period of prosperity will run longer than usual before being interrupted by a recession.

"I hardly even want to whisper it," said one official, "but I honestly believe it is possible that this period of expansion could run all the way through 1961. One main reason is the outlook for reasonable price stability.

The present administration, and the Federal Reserve System have long felt that inflation breeds recession.

Officials in the Government do not believe that the whole inflation problem has been solved. Some believe wages are still rising too fast to allow complete price stability, though the rate of rise slowed down noticeably last year.

Others are worried about the condition of the national debt—a condition not now serious but potentially inflationary if the Treasury is indefinitely barred from selling any bonds of more than 5 years to maturity. The ceiling on the interest rate it can pay bars such sales now.

Still others, while believing that the Federal budget is now in better shape than for some time past, fear that it could get out of hand again, in the sense of a big rise in spending and more deficits.

But the general attitude is one of great satisfaction that conditions of lasting price stability are being approached, if they have not been achieved.

PRICE RISE SLOWS

Consumer prices went through their last period of steep increase from early 1956 to early 1958. The increase in that period was 7.5 percent, or 3.75 percent a year. Since early 1958, they have been essentially stable. The increase in the 21 months since April, 1958, has been only 1.5 percent, or a rate of increase of less than 1 percent a year.

Officials have been encouraged by a number of bits of evidence that point to continuation of price stability in the future.

One important item is the performance of wholesale prices for the last year.

The overall index has been almost completely stable. More important, the index of all products other than farm products and processed foods has showed an exceptionally small increase for a period of rising business—less than 1 percent. The farm and food portion has declined.

Furthermore, the various indexes of sensitive raw materials have also showed no signs of impending inflation. They, too, have been stable. They invariably rose in the past in advance of later increases in the broader wholesale and consumer price indexes.

On the wage front, the Government has evidence that last year saw a substantial rise, but markedly less than other years in the postwar period. Wage increases for the economy as a whole are difficult to measure accurately, but the available evidence is that there was a slowing down last year. The steel settlement was less than half as liberal as the average of the previous postwar settlements.

On the financial side, both the budgetary and monetary situations are believed to be in healthier shape than has been typical of the postwar period. The Nation's money supply is firmly in control—a reflection of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy. The budget has a projected surplus of $4,200 million, the largest in more than a decade.

Officials stress that if price stability is essentially achieved, the job of maintaining that stability will be all the easier. There will be fewer extra wage increases based on rising living costs for the workers. There will be fewer upward pressures on various parts of the budget. There will be more savings, at least in theory. There will be fewer spurts of demand by industrial buyers trying to beat price increases.

Low Wages and Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the New York Times pointing out the direct relationship between adequate minimum wages and the tax burden of metropolitan centers such as New York City. This editorial also shows how the minimum wage proposed in the bill which I have sponsored and which is now before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is an absolute minimum bill. The $1.25 an hour which this bill calls for is hardly adequate to support a decent standard of living in most communities throughout the Nation. As this editorial points out, raising the minimum wage would be a singular service to many of the Nation's taxpayers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Times, Feb. 21, 1960]

LOW WAGES AND RELIEF

Welfare Commissioner Dumpson has made a valuable contribution to an understanding of the problem of low wages in New York City and what should be done to deal with it. At least his testimony before the Brown committee of the city council has disposed of the comfortable idea, so widely held, that there is no low-wage problem in this high-wage town. Unfortunately, there are no statistics on earnings in the various occupations and industries in New York and the number of workers in each wage bracket. However, the figures on relief which Commissioner Dumpson cited give us a rough measure of the situation.

There are now some 250,000 people who are actually receiving public assistance. But Mr. Dumpson estimates conservatively that for every person getting it there are one and a half times as many more who aren't getting it but whose income is below the public assistance standards—a bare minimum for health and safety. His estimate indicates a substandard total in New York City now of about 600,000.

Commissioner Dumpson also showed clearly where the low-wage pockets exist—at least in terms of the people involved. Over 90 percent of those whose wages have to be supplemented by home relief are either Negroes are workers who have come to New York from Puerto Rico. They usually have large families and, while the breadwinner gets enough to support himself alone, he doesn't get enough to support all the others and public assistance is needed.

Important, too, are the figures Commissioner Dumpson gave as to the effect of a statewide uniform minimum wage. A floor of $1.25 an hour would raise the legal minimum to $50 a week. But this would be $24 lower than the minimum required for the health and safety of a family of four—leaving many families still in need of public assistance. A $1.25 minimum, however, would be real publis assistance to the taxpayers in town. Mr. Dumpson estimates that the savings involved in the decreased need for grants from his department would save it about a million dollars a year.

All in all, the Commissioner has given the Brown committee some useful base lines for testimony and discussion in the hearings to come.

A False Question Attacks the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner, Monday, February 15, 1960, "A False Question Attacks the FBI":

A FALSE QUESTION ATTACKS THE FBI

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a responsible guardian of the public safety and of the Nation's internal security. So necessary are its functions that, did the FBI not exist, its immediate creation would be necessary. Fortunately it has existed and served admirably in crucial times; for this it has deservedly won much praise.

It is not and never should be sacrosanct. But those in positions of responsibility who criticize it are obligated to know what they're talking about. This obligation rests particularly upon all who help train the young for life in a democratic society.

The obligation was failed by the University of California professors of English who phrased an essay question for students that read:

"What are the dangers to a democracy of a national police organization like the FBI, which operates secretly and is unresponsive to public criticism?"

The Fowler brothers would not have conceded to the authors of this question the competence to be teachers of English, because of their careless use of "which" for "that." However, we are concerned here with an aspect of it somewhat more serious.

The question equates the FBI either actually or potentially with the Nazi Gestapo and Communist MVD. It associates the FBI with summary arrests at midnight, physical torture, secret trials, secret prisons, secret executions—in short, with all the hateful paraphernalia of a political police.

But let us test the question's several parts for truth.

The FBI is not, except in the loosest sense, a national police organization. It has neither general nor local police powers. Its jurisdiction is limited to a mere handful of offenses defined in Federal statutes.

The FBI does not operate secretly. It functions under the wholesome observation of the Federal courts, U.S. attorneys, national and local bar associations, and a free press.

The FBI is not unresponsive to public criticism. Organizationally it is only a bureau within the Department of Justice. It is responsible to the Attorney General and, through him, the President, two officials sensitive to public opinion. It depends for appropriations on Congress, a body very sensitive to public opinion.

Thus we see that all three of the major premises in the question are untrue.

Afterthoughts have been put forward to justify the question. None alters the fact that its authors committed the major academic sin of drawing a conclusion without first establishing the facts. They have not lived up to the academic responsibility that must go with academic freedom.

Needs of a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial taken from the Progressive Farmer, of February.

Over the years, Mr. President, the Progressive Farmer has worked hard and objectively to promote sound farm programs. This publication has especially heeded the needs of family-sized farms.

One of its most recent and thought-provoking editorials was carried in the February 1960 issue, entitled, "These Things a Farm Program Must Have." It commands the attention and most

careful consideration of each Member of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE THINGS A FARM PROGRAM MUST HAVE

President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have proposed a 5-point farm program. There is nothing particularly new about it. And it includes at least one proposal, also not new, that would destroy parity price supports, leaving farmers nothing but disaster relief. Here is a summary of the Eisenhower-Benson proposal.

1. A bigger conservation reserve aimed especially at high-producing crop areas.

2. More research to find new markets and new uses for farm products.

3. More "food for peace"—using more of our surpluses to help friendly foreign nations.

4. An expanded rural development program to help farmers in low-income areas.

5. Price supports based on market prices rather than a percentage of parity.

Experience with the soil bank proves that it is an expensive way to whittle down surpluses. If the Government wishes to lower cost of the farm program in the interest of a balanced budget, it had better forget about a big soil bank program.

Research seeking new markets and new uses is fine. And a vigorous "food for peace" program is also aimed in the right direction. We have long wondered why the United States didn't use more food and fewer dollars in its foreign-aid programs. Food we have in abundance; of dollars, no one ever has enough.

The heart of the Eisenhower program is the proposal that we ditch parity and use market prices for price support. This we should never do. Price supports based on market averages are really not supports; they are merely a brake on sliding prices. This proposal's only virtue is that it would allow prices to fall only 10 percent a year. It would prevent a catastrophic drop in any one year. But such a plan would not prevent farm prices from going down and down year after year regardless of the farmer's cost of production.

So much for the Eisenhower farm program. Congress is not likely to swap parity supports for average market prices. At least, we fervently hope it won't.

What sort of farm program should we have? No one program will fit all farm commodities. The progressive farmer agrees with the National Grange that a commodity approach is best. Fit the program to the commodity. Cotton, for example, has a special problem. It not only has to compete with foreign cotton and other natural fibers but also synthetic fibers. No one has yet been able to create food in a laboratory, but new fibers are continuously coming out of test tubes. This makes it highly important that a cotton program provide for price flexibility in the market—for the sake of competition.

There are certain fundamentals that programs for any and all commodities must satisfy if the program is to be a success. And to us these are the fundamentals a successful program must have:

1. Price and income protection: First of all, a program must give the grower price protection. If it doesn't do this, there is no real need for a program. It should give an efficient farmer a fair chance to make a net income in keeping with his managerial ability and his investment in land, labor, and equipment. Price supports should be based on some yardstick such as a modernized parity that will hold a balance between farm prices and farm costs.

2. Competitive price: Not only must skilled farmers make a profit, but the commodity they grow must be low enough in price to sell for use. This is the reason why it may be necessary with some commodities to allow the market to fall to its natural level, with the Government paying the difference between the market price and a fair price.

3. Free movement in the market: The program should allow the commodity to move freely in the market with the minimum of Government interference—and without piling up in huge volume and for long periods in storage.

4. Fair to taxpayer: A program must not bear too heavily on the taxpayer. It must be in the national interest by permitting growers to produce abundantly and efficiently at a fair profit. The program must be worth the money by helping farmers enough to justify its cost.

5. Production control: No matter what sort of program we have, it must have a device to control production. With their tremendous ability to produce, farmers can soon ruin themselves by growing too much. Moreover, if the Government is to protect the grower's price and income, it must also protect the taxpayer's pocketbook by keeping production within reasonable bounds. The Government can well afford to insure growers a fair price for the farm commodities needed for domestic use. It cannot afford and should not be expected to spend tax money for unlimited farm production, a large part of which must be exported at a tremendous loss.

Radioisotope Uses by the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 25, Dr. Harold J. Rose, representing the Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa., and with 42 years of research and development work on coal and coal products, appeared before the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and testified on the general aspects of the coal industry and pinpointed the potential scale of radioisotope uses by the coal industry.

Dr. Rose's statement follows:

GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE COAL INDUSTRY

To give perspective on the potential scale of radioisotope uses by the coal industry, a few general aspects will be mentioned.

Coal is one of the world's leading commodities, whether measured by tonnage produced, dollar value, or industrial importance. Coal provides two-thirds of this country's electric power generated from fuels, and 100 percent of the coke used to make iron and steel. Coal is an important source of process heat, of comfort heat and of chemical products. Coal forms the world's largest reserve of concentrated organic raw materials, with proven reserves measured in trillions of tons.

In the United States, coal is produced commercially in 26 States. Production in the year just ended was 410 million tons of bituminous coal and lignite, plus 20 million tons of anthracite. The whole was valued at more than $2 billion at the mines. Recently, Secretary of Interior Seaton forecast that in 15 years time 775 million tons of coal would be needed yearly, or nearly twice the present rate of production. This agrees with forecasts by others, so that bituminous coal is looked upon as an industry which should expand considerably in the reasonably near future.

In this era of continuing inflation, bituminous coal has been remarkably stable in price. Although coal mines have received several wage increases and the supplies used by coal miners have increased considerably in cost during the past decade, the average price of bituminous coal in the United States last year was actually less than it was 12 years ago in 1948. This remarkable record has been made possible by large-scale mechanization and automation.

I mention the foregoing to show that the coal industry will continue to make large investments in new facilities, and that it is receptive to new techniques and equipment as they become available.

Radioisotopes are already in successful use by a few coal producers and coal users for various purposes, but some of these applications have had little or no description to date in the technical literature. Many other uses appear to be feasible if the necessary basic research and engineering research are done to establish the technical possibilities. This will encourage the design and use by industry of commercial equipment utilizing radioisotopes.

AEC SURVEY OF RADIOISOTOPES FOR THE COAL INDUSTRY

In accordance with the policy of the Atomic Energy Commission to encourage the use of radioisotopes in the public interest, the Office of Isotopes Development has contracted with Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., to prepare a survey report on the nature and estimated extent of possible applications of radioisotopes and related technology to the mining, transport and storage of coal by the coal industry, and to storage, in-plant handling, and use of coal by major consumer groups.

This project consists of a survey only, and does not include laboratory research, engineering development nor field tests. Following are some of the uses which appear to be possible, provided the necessary research is done.

Underground mining

Great advances in coal-mining performance are being made through mechanization, including continuous mining machines which cut and load coal directly from the seam. The resulting high production rates cause major problems of automatic operation, continuous transportation away from the face, safety, ventilation, dust control, etc., which radioisotopes can help to solve.

Keeping continuous miners in coalbed

The alloy cutters on continuous miners are quickly damaged if they cut into hard roof or floor strata, furthermore the resulting impurities are not wanted in coal. A radioisotope sensing device might be developed to keep the cutting head in coal close to the roof or floor rock but without cutting into it. The gage might operate by sensing density changes by gamma-radiation "scatter," since the associated shales, sandstone, etc., have nearly twice the density of coal. Or the device might be of the reflection type to sense the change in chemical or physical properties where the coalbed meets roof or floor strata.

Machine maintenance

Modern coal mining is based on expensive machines operating at very heavy loads under severe conditions. Machine maintenance is therefore a major problem; in fact, a study of the costs of mechanized mining will usually show that the best way to get a substantial reduction of present costs would be to get a higher percentage of operating time out of the equipment used.

Radioisotopes have many potential applications in preventive and repair maintenance, the selection of best lubricants, etc.

Load-bearing capacity of mine floors

The floor strata of underground coal mines have to bear the weight of hundreds of feet of overburden concentrated on the remaining coal pillars and props. The floor also has to carry very heavy moving equipment. The load-bearing capacity of mine floors containing troublesome clay minerals will vary with the moisture content, and can be checked with radioisotope moisture and density gages.

Ventilation

Many coal mines liberate large volumes of methane gas which can form explosive mixtures with air over a considerable percentage range. Therefore large volumes of ventilating air must be distributed to every working place to dilute the methane to 1 percent or less. Radioisotope tracers are being considered for studying mine-ventilation problems.

Dust control

There are limitations on the coal-dust content of air breathed by miners. Also coal dust can form explosive mixtures with air. Radioisotopes should be considered for the study of coal-dust problems, and to facilitate dust collection.

Signal lights

Radioisotope-energized lights which emit colored light continuously for many years without external power source, have possibilities in mines as direction indicators, markers, safety exit signs, etc., which would function independent of the mine-lighting circuit. If red radioisotope lights of sufficient intensity can be developed, they could find use as warning lights on moving and stationary equipment.

Water problems

The water seeping or flowing into coal mines must be collected and removed, sometimes at considerable expense. To mine a ton of Pennsylvania anthracite, an average of more than 30 tons of water must be pumped out with a high vertical lift. Radioisotopes can be used to trace the source of water entering mines, leading to the control of inflow in some cases.

Coal preparation

Two-thirds of the coal mined in this country, or about 300 million tons annually, is mechanically cleaned. Continuous close control of washery conditions and of quality of product are important. At coal preparation plants, huge tonnages of coal are crushed, screened into sizes, cleaned, dried, and shipped with or without blending. There are many possible applications of radioisotope techniques for continuous testing, automatic control, maintenance, and research.

To date, the chief uses of radioisotopes by the coal industry throughout the world have been in coal preparation. They are already in successful use by a few coal producers and users in the United States for various purposes, such as:

1. Automatic control of the density of heavy-media suspensions used in cleaning coal.

2. Automatic control of the most efficient solids content of coal slurries being fed to filters at cleaning plants.

3. Determining the cubic foot weight of coal at various depths and locations in large storage piles, when making stockpile inventories.

4. To warn of stoppage of flow of damp coal fines from overhead bins to boilers of a large powerplant.

5. As a tracer in the hydraulic transportation of coal in pipelines.

6. Also, research investigators have made various uses of radioisotopes as tracers for studying the chemical and physical behavior of coal and coal products in various processes. Information has been obtained on important process reactions, which could not have been obtained in any other way.

Such uses can be expected to increase as their advantages become better known and appreciated. However, there are many other possible applications where research is needed to establish the possibilities such as:

Controlling the operation of coal cleaning jigs, thickeners, etc., by radiation measurement of bed densities at different levels.

Determining the particle size and settling rates of minus 200 mesh coal slurries.

Using tagged flotation reagents, flocculents, dustproofing, and freezeproofing compounds (which are applied to coal in very small amounts) to determine their selectivity, coverage, effectiveness, and ultimate fate.

Continuously weighing and/or analyzing moving coal streams.

Studying coal crushing and screening procedures.

Transportation and handling

More than 400 million tons of coal are produced annually and each ton is usually handled several or many times before ultimate use. Thus there are many opportunities for the use of radioisotopes to improve coal transportation and handling. For example:

1. Checking the condition of belt carcasses.
2. Automatic loading of cars.
3. Continuous weighing of coal in motion.
4. Applications in the pipeline transportation of coal.
5. Measuring the amount of coal in bins.

Sampling, testing, and analysis

Coal is a natural product that occurs in a wide range of ranks, purities, and types. Coal is produced commercially from some 8,000 mines, and the analysis of coals shipped from a single mine may vary somewhat with screen size and degree of preparation. Therefore, many large coal producers and users regularly sample and test coal shipments.

For several reasons, reliable coal sampling may be rather difficult and expensive; also there are delays in obtaining laboratory test results. Rapid continuous methods for testing coals are needed, which can be applied to the whole coal stream or to an aliquot portion, in order to obtain immediate test results by the use of radioisotopes. They also have important potentials for saving time and cutting costs in coal laboratory procedures.

Coal uses

About 80 percent of the coal used in this country is burned direct in many types of equipment, for power generation, process heat, and comfort heating. Most of the remainder is carbonized in coke ovens and the products used for metallurgical and chemical purposes. Coal utilization processes provide opportunities for many of the above* mentioned and additional uses for radioisotope techniques, but time does not permit itemizing such uses here.

Irradiation of coal

Limited studies made during the past several years have shown that coal is quite resistant to neutron and gamma-ray bombardment, but small effects have been found. However, research should be done on the possible effects of radiation while coal is being processed, for example, during carbonization and gasification.

Other coal researches and development uses

Present and potential uses for radioisotopes in coal research, for example, tracer techniques, are too numerous to list here. They have already provided important information on the nature of coal-processing reactions, that was obtainable in no other way.

Possibilities include basic research on the principles and reactions involved, the best engineering design of equipment, and the evaluation of performance, for most every phase of coal mining, preparation, handling, use, and the control of air and stream pollution.

Estimating coal reserves

Data on American coal reserves are still far from complete. Coal bearing formations cover about one-seventh of the area of the United States, and multiple coal beds are typical. For example, the West Virginia Geological Survey has reported a sequence of 62 minable coalbeds plus 55 unimportant coalbeds, or 117 in all, in that State. Since any coalbed may vary locally in thickness and quality, borehole logging is of great importance for assessing coal reserves.

Core drilling provides detailed information but is too expensive for generalized use. However, tens of thousands of boreholes are being or will be drilled through coal-bearing formations for other purposes, such as petroleum, natural gas, salt, and other minerals, deep water wells, etc. Radioisotope logging could provide at little additional cost, valuable information on the depth, thickness, and approximate quality of the coal beds penetrated.

Coal beds could be located and measured in boreholes by probes which measure (a) density by gamma-radiation scatter, or (b) total hydrogen by slowing down fast neutrons, or perhaps (c) oxygen by neutron bombardment activation. In each case there would be a large difference in the readings obtained from coal beds and from other strata encountered in boreholes. Besides measuring the location and thickness of coal beds, the quality could be evaluated to some extent.

COMMUNIST COAL RESERVES AND RESEARCH

Soviet Russia has now become the world's largest producer of coal, with the United States in second place. Red China is in third place and gaining rapidly. Based on recent intensive geological explorations, each of these Communist countries now claims coal reserves which far exceed the present official estimates of U.S. coal reserves. That is one reason for a more realistic study of U.S. coal reserves, since coal is basic to the Nation's prosperity and security.

From the best available information it appears that the Communist countries now have more persons engaged in coal research than the rest of the world combined. Published scientific and technical articles show that they are making very extensive use of radioisotopes, geophysical and electronic devices, etc., in their drive to surpass the Western world.

CONCLUSION

Radioisotopes are already in limited but successful use for several purposes in the coal industry. Such applications can be expected to increase as the advantages become better known.

However, most of the numerous possibilities for radioisotopes which I have mentioned are still only ideas or suggestions. Much basic research and engineering research will be required to definitely establish the technical possibilities. This is due to the fact that coal is a natural product which varies greatly in rank, type, and purity in various deposits.

Not only is there a wide variation in the composition of the organic content of various coals, but there is an even greater variation in the amount and nature of the mineral impurities which are present. Some of the minor and trace impurities have a large effect in nuclear reactions.

Therefore, systematic research will be required on the response of various coals to different kinds and intensities of nuclear radiation, in order to develop the basic facts of radiation as applied to coal. If such results are to be obtained within a reasonable time,

it appears that most of such research must be sponsored by the Federal Government.

Once the basic facts are available, the manufacturers of nuclear and standard equipment should be expected to design and market radioisotope equipment which offers definite advantages to coal producers and users.

It is believed that the survey report now in preparation for AEC, when completed and released, will stimulate much interest in the subject. If this is promptly followed by laboratory research to explore the technical feasibility of the many possibilities cited, this should greatly reduce the timelag for widespread coal industry acceptance of suitable radioisotope techniques.

Not All Is Food That's Sold as "Groceries"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, when consumers complain about the increasing cost of their groceries and blame it on farm subsidies, they are often overlooking the fact that much of their grocery dollar goes for nonfood items sold in the supermarkets.

This point was effectively made in a recent roundup broadcast by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

I ask unanimous consent that the Grain Terminal Association's observations on this point in a radio broadcast on February 23 over 16 midwestern stations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT ALL IS FOOD THAT IS SOLD AS GROCERIES

We stood by a supermarket checkout counter the other day and watched the customers roll up with their carts loaded to the brim. The girls behind the counters punched the cash register keys with practiced speed and skill. And while the carryout boys staggered out to the cars with heaping boxes the customers paid their bills, $20 and $30 at a crack more often than not. And it seemed to us that most of the customers paid by check.

But as farmers, you surely would have noticed the same thing that we did. About one-quarter of the items that went into those boxes were not food at all. They were light bulbs, cigarettes, aspirin, tissues, and paper towels, pots, pans, magazines, even cosmetics. You can buy just about anything in the modern supermarkets and people are doing it.

But here's the point we want to make and that you should point out to your city cousins. Most every person who buys in these great variety stores called supermarkets walks out with the preconceived notion that all the money he spent went for food. He doesn't stop to think of all the nonfood items he bought. He spent, say, $20 to stock up for a week. So it cost $20 to eat. It's natural to think that way, we suppose. But it would help the farmer's cause a lot if these supermarket patrons realized that they are spending $20 to run the house, and only part of it is actually spent for food.

The next time you are in a supermarket stop and watch the checkout counters for a few minutes. You'll see what we mean.

It is important for consumers to understand the big bargain they are getting in the food they buy and eat.

Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today in the House of Representatives a House concurrent resolution proposing the printing of a booklet on "Our American Government."

For many years, the Congress has caused to be printed and distributed a document entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?" The last revision was authorized by the House April 30, 1958, and by the Senate May 21, 1958. It was House Document No. 366 and contained 171 questions and answers—"a comprehensive story of the history and functions of our American Government interestingly and accurately portrayed."

The revised edition will contain 175 questions and answers if authorized as as submitted. In view of the two new States—Alaska and Hawaii—a number of new questions and answers have been added. There are other questions and answers that have been brought up to date.

As an illustration of some of the additions that have been made, I am inserting at this time proposed questions and answers from No. 142 through 145:

142. Which States were most recently admitted to the Union?

Alaska and Hawaii. By the issuance of presidential proclamations, Alaska, the 49th State, formally entered the Union on January 3, 1959, and Hawaii became the 50th State on August 21, 1959. These were the first admissions since 1912 when Arizona and New Mexico were accepted.

143. What geographical circumstances distinguish the two newest States?

Neither Alaska nor Hawaii is contiguous to the mainland of the United States; i.e., neither State directly borders on any of the previous 48 States. Although a peninsula of the North American continent, Alaska is separated from the rest of the States by Canada and the Pacific Ocean. The southernmost tip of the 49th State is some 500 miles distant from the State of Washington. In area, Alaska is the largest State, the northernmost State, and the most westerly on the continent.

Hawaii is completely separated from North America by the Pacific Ocean. It lies 2,020 miles southwest of San Francisco. The islands comprising the State extend a distance of 1,900 statute miles. They are closer to Tokyo than to Washington, D.C.

144. What was the status of Alaska and Hawaii before admission?

Organized incorporated territories. Hawaii was the last such territory. There are, therefore, no delegates serving in the House of Representatives at the present time.

145. How does the admission of Alaska and Hawaii affect the composition of Congress?

Each State being entitled to two Senators, the Senate is now increased to a membership of 100. The acts of admission assigned one House seat to each new State, temporarily increasing House membership to 437. After the 1960 census, under the provisions of current law, the size of the House will return to 435 and that number will be apportioned among the 50 States.

The index of the proposed booklet is inserted herewith. It is as follows:

INDEX

(Citations refer to question numbers)

Act: difference between bill and act, 81.

Alaska: admitted to Union, 142; previous status, 144; area, 143; number of Representatives and Senators, 33, 145.

Amendment, to the Constitution: "lame duck," 13; number repealed, 11; procedure, 10; time permitted for ratification, 12.

Apportionment, 31–32.

Attorney General, 104.

Bills: appropriation, 140; "dead," 136; deficiency, 141; difference between bill and act, 81; engrossed, 84; enrolled, 83; first reading, 111; introduced by Senator, 89; largest number introduced in a single Congress, 86; Presidential ceremony upon signing, 134; public, 88; rider, 138; sent to General Services Administration, 134; stages in House, 82; tax, 139; total number introduced since March 4, 1789, 87; veto of, 128–133.

Bill of Rights: explanation of, 8; rights enumerated, 9.

Cabinet, 162–166.

Commissioner to Congress from Puerto Rico; committee assignments, distinguished from Congressmen, pay, voting rights, 27–28.

Commitees: Committee of the Whole, 113; conference, 110; hearings, 104–105, 114; House Rules, 120; in House, 99, 102–103; joint, 108–109; records, 106; select, 107; standing, 95–98; steering, 79.

Congress (also see House of Representatives; Representatives; Senate; Senators): adjournment by President, 24; constitutional status, 18; facilities for press, 50–51; hours of meeting, 25; majority and minority leaders, 73–74; rules of procedure, 80; services available to Members for legislative duties, 43; session defined, length, 20; special sessions, powers, 22–23; term of, 19; visitors, to, 49.

Congressional districts: how determined, 31.

Congressman. (See Congress; House of Representatives; Representatives; Senate; Senators.)

Congresswoman. (See Congress; House of Representatives; Representatives; Senate; and Senators.)

Consent: unanimous, 121.

Constitution: as supreme law of land, 6; Bill of Rights, 8–9; how amended, procedure, 10; "lame duck" amendment, 13; number of amendments repealed, 11; preamble, 1; provision for electors, 14–15; provisions for "separation of powers" in the Federal Government, 7; time permitted for ratification of amendment, 12.

Delegate to Congress: distinguished from a Congressman, pay, voting rights, 27–28; number in House, 144.

Democracy: and its American sources, 1–5; a pure, 3; representative or indirect, 4–5.

Eisenhower, Dwight D.: birthplace, 160; Middle East Doctrine, 168; number of bills vetoed, by, 132.

Elections (also see Electoral college; Presidents): of Senators and Representaives, 29–38.

Electoral college, 14–17.

Executive departments, 146–168.

Filibuster, 122–125.

Government: essentials of a republican form, 2; United States as a representative democracy, 5.

Hamilton, Alexander, Secretary of Treasury, 162.

Hawaii: admitted to Union, 142; previous status, 144; area, 143; number of Representatives and Senators, 33, 145.

House of Representatives (also see Congress; Representatives): apportionment, procedure, 35; calenders, 112; customary proceedings when meeting, 78; limitation on debate, 93; officer presiding, 69; officers, of, 68; "pairing," 117–118; previous question, 119; power to choose Speaker, 71; quorum, 94; recognition of Representative who desires to speak, 92; Rules Committee, 120; rules of procedure, 80; size, 31; 33–34; steering committee, 79; voting, 115–116; wearing of hats by Representatives during sessions, 52.

Impeachment: of Members of Congress, 44.

Jefferson, Thomas, Secretary of State, 162.

Judiciary, 169–175.

Knox, Henry, Secretary of War, 162.

Laws: published in one book, 137.

Legislative Reference Service: services to Members of Congress, 43.

Mace: what it is, significance, 56.

Marshall, Thomas: remark, 67.

Monroe Doctrine, 167.

Parliamentarian: duties, 77.

Postmaster General, 164.

Presidents (also see Cabinet; electoral college): appearance before joint sessions of Congress, 161; born west of Mississippi, 160; Cabinet, 162–165; courses open on bills, 126–127; date of commencement of term, 149–160; elected after service in Congress, 45; addressed, 148, oath, 147; pensions and allowances to widows of, 158; power to adjourn Congress, 24; power to convene Congress, 22–23; qualifications, 146; salary and allowances, 156–157; State producing largest number, 159; submission of resignation, 155; succeeded by Vice Presidents, 64–65; succession, 161–164; veto power, 128–133; Washington's first Cabinet, 162.

President pro tempore, 58–61.

Press: facilities for, in Congress, 50–51.

Puerto Rico: Resident Commissioner to Congress, 27–28.

Randolph, Edmund, Attorney General, 158.

Rayburn, Sam, Speaker, 72.

Representatives (also see Congress; House of Representatives): at large, 32; addressing of communications to, 46, 48; Congresswoman, how addressed, 47; definition, official title, 26; distinguished from Delegate and Commissioner, 27–28; filling of vacancy, 38; how elected, 29; impeachment, 44; number from each State, 33; payment of income tax, 42; participation in party caucus and conference, 57; qualifications, 39; salary, 41; seat assignments, 53.

Resolutions: types, 85.

Secretary: of Agriculture, of Commerce, of Defense, of Health, Education, and Welfare, of Interior, of Labor, of the Treasury, 164; of State, 164, 166.

Senate (also see Congress; Senator): introduction of bills by Senators, 86; limitation on debate, 91; officers of, 58; officer, presiding, 59, 61; recognition of Senator who desires to speak, 90; rules of procedure, 80; wearing of hats by Senators during sessions, 52.

Senators (also see Congress; Senate): filling of vacancy, 37; how addressed, 46; how elected, 29–30; impeachment, 44; number from each State, 33, 36; payment of income tax, 42; qualifications, 40; salary, 41; seat assignments, 53; "senior," meaning of 55.

Seniority rule, 100–101.

Separation of powers: under Constitution, 7.

Sergeant at Arms: powers and duties, 76.

Speaker of the House: officer of the House, 68; Presiding Officer, duties, 69–70; House powers to choose, 71; Sam Rayburn, longest tenure, 72.

States: largest in area, 143.

Supreme Court, 169–175.

"Supreme law of the land," 6.

United States: as a representative democracy, 5.

Veto, 128–133.

Vice President: elected by Senate, 63; presiding in Senate, 59; salary and expenses, 60; vote in Senate 62; who resigned, 66; who succeded to the presidency, 64–65.

Washington, George: first Cabinet, 162.

"Whips": of the House, 75.

A Place Where Uncle Sam Doesn't Play Fair—Payments in Lieu of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on another matter, Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, who is the executive director of the National Association of County Officials, made a speech before the Federal Bar Association here in Washington last September concerning S. 910, which is the bill for payment in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government. As a cosponsor of this bill I recognize that the Federal Government is not paying its fair share in many of the areas of our country. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Hillenbrand may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLACE WHERE UNCLE SAM DOESN'T PLAY FAIR—PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand)

With respect to payments in lieu of taxes to counties and other local government units with Federal Government hasn't been fair. Uncle Sam owns vast tracts of land and other large real estate holdings to which local governments must provide services and which are exempt from local taxation. In our efforts to seek a remedy from the Federal Government, we feel a little bit like the man in Lincoln's famous story. He had just been tarred and feathered and was being run out of town on a rail when someone jeeringly asked him how he liked that. "Well," he said, "if it wasn't for the honor of the thing I'd just as soon walk."

It has long been the position of the National Association of County Officials and similar groups that the Congress should authorize Federal agencies to make payments-in-lieu of taxes to local governments on these Federal holdings. More specifically, we have enthusiastically endorsed a measure now before the U.S. Congress called S. 910, a bill to provide payments-in-lieu of taxes.

BILL ANALYZED

S. 910 recognizes that the complex holdings of the Federal Government constitute a burden on local governments and authorizes payments-in-lieu of taxes on the following types of holdings.

1. Business and commercial property acquired since June 30, 1950 (roughly the beginning of the Korean war). Thus the Federal Government would make payments-in-lieu of taxes on its real estate holdings which are presently used for nearly every purpose imaginable and range all the way from manufacturing rope to use by private enterprise to manufacture of automobile parts.

2. Property held temporarily by the Government on conditional sales contracts or on property acquired by the Government temporarily for such causes as default on Government loans. At the present time this property immediately becomes tax exempt when the title reverts to the Federal Government.

3. Federal agencies would also be authorized to contribute their fair share of the cost of special assessments levied for curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street lighting, sewage, and other facilities financed through special assessments. These improvements, of course, increase the value of Federal as well as private property, and this bill would authorize the Federal Government to pay its fair share. In other words, if a community finances a street curbing project by assessing abutting property owners, insofar as the improvement abutted Federal property the Federal Government would pay its fair share of the cost of the improvement which would, of course, increase the value of the Federal holding as well as the private holdings which would pay a similar amount.

Under the terms of S. 910 agencies would be authorized to make payments in only those cases that were approved by a special board created to administer the program. No payments would be made to any county, school district, municipality or any other local government unless they could prove that the Federal installation constituted a hardship. The payments would only be made on Federal real property and there is no provision in the bill to make payments-in-lieu of taxes on personal property. The payments would be adjusted upward to reflect the actual cost to the local government unit for any special service provided to the Federal installation which was not provided to general taxpayers. Accordingly, the payment would be adjusted downward to reflect the cost of special services provided by the Federal installation at Federal expense when these services were provided to the general taxpayer. In other words, if the Federal installation had its own fire department and did not use the services of the local government fire department, their payment would be adjusted downward accordingly.

It would be the duty of the board to conduct extensive studies of the entire problems of large Federal holdings and they would be required to periodically report back to Congress with recommendations for further legislation.

STATUS

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced S. 910 and we are happy to report that the measure has 35 U.S. Senators as cosponsors. These Senators are pretty evenly distributed throughout the United States and reflect a growing awareness of the seriousness of this problem in areas outside the West. The Senate held hearings and the Senate Government Operations Committee favorably reported the bill and it was on the Senate calendar for action when the Senate adjourned without getting to the measure. It will be the first order of business when Congress reconvenes in January.

Similar bills have been introduced by approximately 12 Congressmen in the House of Representatives.

EVALUATION

Even if S. 910 does pass it will not in itself be adequate. It is recognized that it will deal with only the greatest cases of hardship and will not in itself come to grips with the total problem of payments-in-lieu of taxes. The payments in any individual case will be relatively small. One estimate is that the total payments in the whole United States will be $53 million or less.

Nonetheless, this measure does have the support of the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conferences of Mayors, the National Association of County Officials and the Council of State Governments, largely

because it will, for the first time, give congressional recognition that the problem does exist. It will provide a form upon which local governments can document the need for comprehensive legislation in this area. More important, it will give us concrete experience through actual payments in how to administer the larger program that must surely follow.

ATTITUDE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

It is important to note that S. 910 was a compromise measure that was actually drafted by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget in cooperation with the Congress. It was originally endorsed by the administration, and as a matter of fact, as late as a few weeks ago the Treasury Department wrote a favorable recommendation and urged the passage of S. 910. They reported that their favorable comment had the approval of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. This was later followed, however, by a message from the Budget Bureau noting that they changed their mind and were not supporting S. 910, but rather would support legislation which called for further study of the problem.

Actually, the Federal Government has had the "slows" in this whole matter of payment-in-lieu of taxes. We suspect they are now using S. 910 as a lever to upset the effect of recent Supreme Court decisions in the Michigan tax cases. The net effect of these decisions was to open the door for States and local governments to tax the possessory interest of private individuals using federally owned property. The courts have held that when private interests use Government factories and other Government owned property under leases and other arrangements, and engage in manufacturing and business operations, that the local governments have a right under certain circumstances to tax this interest in Federal property.

It would appear that the Federal Government wants to negate the effect of these decisions by incorporating a provision in the S. 910 bill which would remove this possessory interest from local taxes.

Actually, the whole Federal position is preposterous. They propose to incorporate in a bill which deals only with Federal real property, a provision which would remove Federal personal property from local government taxation. In dollars and cents they appear to want to swap the $35 million that they would pay out under S. 910 in exchange for maybe several hundred millions of dollars of taxation which would accrue to local government units under the terms of the Michigan court decision. At the present time Michigan is a State most deeply involved in possessory interest matters, but we understand that Utah and several other States have, or hope shortly to have, legislation which will also allow them to tax this possessory interest under the terms of the Supreme Court ruling.

Unfortunately, one of the facts of life that we in local government must deal with is the realization that the States are in fierce competition, one with the other, to attract new industry and to get Goevrnment contracts. Apparently this fact has already, or will in the future, prevent many States from enacting legislation to take advantage of the Michigan decision. In other words, at the threat of losing Government contracts or discouraging new industry from being attracted to the State, most of the States apparently will hesitate to enact legislation taxing possessory interest.

FALSE NOTION

Most discussions of payments in lieu of taxes gives rise to a great deal of nonsense. We in local government have been accused of everything under the sun because we have championed this legislation. Here are some of the charges and our answers:

1. Local governments are trying to get a pipeline into the U.S. Treasury: False. In the past 25 years there have been a dozen or more impartial groups that have studied the problem of Federal holdings which now include 20 percent of the entire land surface of the United States. In every single one of the studies by outside experts the conclusion has been that the Federal Government should consent to payments in lieu of taxes on certain types of holdings. Each group has discovered that these Federal tax exempt lands do constitute a hardship on certain communities. Obviously, if all the Federal installations were evenly distributed throughout the entire United States there would be no need for an in-lieu-of-taxes program. Each community would bear its share of the cost and a payments-in-lieu of taxes program would be unnecessary. We have never proposed to have the Federal Government make payments in lieu of taxes on post offices and other installations which are uniformly distributed throughout the United States and which confer equal benefits on all of the people in the area.

The records are filled to overflowing of individual cases throughout the whole United States, of real hardships caused by Federal tax-exempt holdings. Many communities, because of local geographical factors, are completely cut off from future industrial and economic development because the only logical areas in which to expand are preempted by the Federal Government.

Anyone who wants an exercise in futility might try sometime to get the Federal Government to relinquish its control of property or buildings. As soon as one agency decides that it does not need a parcel of land, or an installation, all other Federal agencies are given a crack at it and by the time this several years clearance process is completed the original agency will find some excuse for retaining the property.

In all our testimony before the U.S. Congress we have insisted that each individual agency make payments in lieu of taxes on their own property and that it not be administered by a single, central agency. Our objective, of course, is to force each of the Federal agencies to go before the Congress and justify their need to continually hold some of these installations and Federal property. Indeed, up until about 3 years ago the Federal Government had no idea at all of how much land they owned or how many installations or the value of their real property or personal property. Even now the final report from the Federal Government has statements indicating that they may have lost a few million acres of land here and there in their accounting, or a few billion dollars worth of property that they didn't know they owned.

2. Local governments are forever trying to attract new Federal installations and once the Federal installation is established they complain about local hardship: It is true that local governments do try to attract business and industrial development in their community. This is for the very excellent reason that in order to provide an adequate level of services in the community it must have business and industrial property. Those of us who are familiar with the property tax (which is the overwhelming basis of support of most local government units) are familiar with the fact that no community composed solely of private residential development could possibly have a tax base adequate enough to provide modern education and the other services required of modern local government.

An example: One California city was considering annexing a high rise apartment house development. These were first-class luxury apartments already constructed with roads, sewers, water supplies, street lighting and all of the local government facilities already in place. An analysis revealed, however, that the number of school children concentrated in the apartment house which would require educational facilities would far offset any gain in taxes realized through adding this property to tax base. In other words, even this first-class residential development without commercial and industrial development property, could not pay its way in providing an adequate level of local government services.

You will find that every State, every county, city township, and other local government unit is well aware of these facts and hence the fierce competition to attract new business and industry. And it should be noted that when the new business and industry does locate in a community it is taxed.

3. Federal installations do confer benefits on a local community through increased payrolls: It is true that there are increased local payrolls incident to a Federal installation, but as everyone knows, in most cases, the only way you can get at this wealth is through an income or sales tax—both of which are for the most part preempted by the State Governments or the Federal Government or both. The localities still depend mostly on the property tax and these local payrolls do not directly benefit the local government financial base.

4. The Federal Government already makes payments in lieu of taxes in a great number of cases and what is the need for expanding the program: It is true that in the case of certain housing developments, certain Federal dam properties, and a great number of other instances the Federal Government has in specific cases consented to make paypayments in lieu of taxes. This, perhaps more than any other factor, would indicate the justice of our position. However, the Federal Government does not have a general policy on payments in lieu of taxes and hence a tremendous number of communities do suffer hardships since they do not come under any of the specific categories for which payments in lieu are already made.

5. The Federal Government makes Federal grants-in-aid to local communities which, in total, comes to many hundreds of millions of dollars: This is true. It should be remembered, however, that in every single instance of a grant-in-aid, the Federal Government participates only to the extent that the Federal Government has determined that there is a natural interest. Take the airport program for an example. The Federal Government has determined that it is in the national interest to have a national system of airports. They have determined that the Federal responsibility is approximately 50 percent of the cost for runways and other airport facilities. The idea is that the National Government does need a sound airport program and that localities are to be encouraged to construct the needed facilities. In other words, the purpose of the Federal aid airport program is to stimulate those communities to construct airports who might otherwise put their local funds into schools or some other purpose and thus, without Federal aid, we would not have a uniform developed system of national airports.

We think that if you examine almost every one of the grant-in-aid programs you will find that this same type of reasoning prevails and that the National Government does participate because there is a national interest and does participate financially only to the extent of that national interest.

6. Payments in lieu of taxes would cost Federal Government money and we are trying to economize nationally: It should be remembered that we are not asking for a handout. What we are proposing is a matter of right. When an installation serves a national purpose, the national taxpayer should pay the bill. We are talking about fair dealing. To the extent that localities must service tax exempt national holdings they are being put upon by the National Government. It is just as unfair as if cer-

tain communities were asked to individually support the cost of constructing an aircraft carrier or a fleet of tanks. National defense is a national responsibility and it should be paid for by the national taxpayer.

CONCLUSION

In the early days of the Republic, Federal holdings were relatively simple and, I suppose, caused only very minor local problems. With the tremendous expansion of the National Government and with the complex industrial defense and commercial and business activities of the Federal Government, the traditional immunity of Federal property from local taxation must be modified to meet the realities of the situation. What we have proposed we think is fair and equitable, it represents a very great deal of thought, not only on the part of local government officials but by a great number of outside impartial observers. We think that the time has come for the Federal Government to demonstrate its real interest in preserving good strong local government units by starting on a program to remedy what in many communities is a most serious problem. We are sure that the Federal Government is not intentionally doing this, but in many cases the Federal Governmnt's very size and the relative smallness of the individual community problem, we think often causes the Federal Government to be rather indifferent to local government problems.

The time has come now to act and we hope that we will have the support of other groups as we have now the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and a great number of similar organizations.

In the recent past, particularly since World War II and with the Korean conflict, the Federal Government has been increasingly involved in activities that once were the sole province of private enterprise. This caused a great number of problems for localities and very definite hardships. Now, more recently, the Federal Government is taking this property constructed at public expense and leasing it through various arrangements to private profitmaking organizations and now want to extend the Federal Government immunity to these operations.

In the words of William R. MacDougall, the manager and general counsel of the County Supervisors Association of California, and I quote: "Not only has the Federal Government been a freeloader in the boardinghouse of local government but now they have entered into a new era, where they not only eat free but bring along a lunch pail to fill up to take to their friends."

Arguments For and Against Further Raising of Interest Rates by Passage of the Bill To Lift the Interest-Rate Ceiling on Long-Term Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the very great pleasure of reading a statement prepared by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], setting out the arguments for and against passage of H.R. 10590—the bill which repeals the interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds without exactly saying so.

This statement provides an analysis which is both excellent and brief. I will insert it in the RECORD for the attention of the other Members who may wish to consider the arguments on this question:

Consideration by the House in the immediate future of H.R. 10590, a bill relating to interest rate restrictions on bonds of the United States, will require a major decision by all of us on the monetary policy of our Government. The arguments and counterarguments on this issue are not simple but in what follows I have tried to present the basic points at issue.

What does the bill propose? Its proponents label it a reasonable compromise. The facts are that the bill would in effect give the administration what it wants—twice. Under its first section, relating to refinancing, it would furnish unlimited authority to refund the Federal debt at any rate of interest through the transparent subterfuge of discounting. In addition, under its second section, the limit is openly repealed for new issues of up to 2 percent of the total outstanding debt which is subject to the statutory limitation—this means for as much as $5 billion a year, which is considerably more than the long-term bond market is likely to absorb in any one year.

Is the action sought necessary? Proponents of the bill argue that it is necessary to allow longer term financing of the debt. Related arguments say that present reliance on short-term securities are inflationary, that they complicate management of the debt. The facts are that the administration has had every opportunity to shift the debt to longer term securities under the present interest ceiling and has refused to do so. Note the figures below:

TABLE 1.—*Market yield on taxable U.S. bonds (percent per annum)*

1952	2.68
1953	2.94
1954	2.55
1955	2.84
1956	3.08
1957	3.47
1958	3.43
1959	4.08

Source: Economic Report of the President.

TABLE 2.—*Percentage of long-term U.S. bonds outstanding (10 years or more)*

1953	19.1
1955	9.6
1957	7.0
1959	5.6

Sources: Annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and Treasury Bulletin.

While promising to "stretch out" the debt, the administration has actually "shortened" it during a period when long-term bonds could be sold at well below the 4¼-percent ceiling. They paid lipservice to countering inflation, but at the same time channeled money out of the long-term market into the short-term market. The purpose of the ceiling is to require that long-terms be sold in periods of low interest rates rather than periods of high interest rates. Now, when their policies have made the ceiling more necessary than ever, they ask us to abandon it.

Will the action counter inflation? Proponents of the bill argue that it is necessary the fight inflation. The facts are that reliance on monetary policy (interest rate adjustment) alone to counter inflation has proved to be a "one-legged stool" and the administration has "sawed off the other two legs." While steadily working to raise the cost of money, they have failed to utilize fiscal policies that would more effectively counter inflation and have negated any possible remedial effects which higher interest rates might have. The Eisenhower tax law of 1954, with its gaping loopholes for upper income recipients and big business, was, for example, one of the most inflationary measures that could be devised.

The Joint Economic Committee has found that the tight money policy hasn't countered inflation, it has aggravated it. Note the figures below:

TABLE 3.—*Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)*

1951	111.0
1953	114.4
1955	114.5
1957	120.2
1959	124.5

Source: Economic Report of the President.

Higher interest rates are reflected in the cost of virtually everything the consumer buys. Example: An FHA loan for a $10,000 house in 1952, repayable in 25 years, would carry an interest charge of $5,840. The same loan today would carry an interest charge of $8,840, or $3,000 more. Higher interest rates are hitting public agencies and school financing too. Look at the figures on high-grade, tax-exempt municipal bonds.

TABLE 4.—*Market yield on high-grade municipal bonds (percent per annum)*

1951	2.00
1953	2.72
1955	2.53
1957	3.60
1959	3.95

Source: Economic Report of the President.

Aside from these costs to the American people as consumers and local government taxpayers, the tight money policy costs them dearly as Federal taxpayers, in added interest costs on the Federal debt. The increase in interest rates since 1952 is now costing the taxpayers at least $2.5 billion a year in added expenditures. This item alone could mean a budget surplus which would have real anti-inflationary effects.

Is a lifting of the ceiling required by free-market forces? The proponents of the bill argue that we are at the mercy of the competitive forces of the money market. The facts are that the so-called free market in securities is nothing of the kind. Example: The open market in government securities centers around 17 New York traders who account for an estimated $200 billion in securities exchange a year and whose system of operation has been characterized by the manager of the Federal Reserve System's open-market operations as tending to result in uniform prices. Example: The Treasury Department regularly asks the advice of the American Bankers Association on the nature of proposed new issues and has, since 1953, accepted its recommendations 85 percent of the time.

A major factor in weakening the position of long-term securities has been the action of the Federal Reserve System itself. It has completely withdrawn from the market in long-term securities and has limited its purchase to 90-day bills. In 1951, long-term bonds constituted 21.5 percent of the Federal Reserve holdings. By late last year, this had been reduced to 5.7 percent. Is it any wonder that the market price of long-term securities has weakened?

What are the alternatives? Proponents of the bill argue that it must be passed because nothing else can be done to meet the situation. The facts are that even if we ignore the responsibility of the administration in creating the situation that exists, there are a great number of things that can and should be done. Lifting the interest ceiling, directly or indirectly (or both as H.R. 10590 proposes), is not one of them. The Joint Economic Committee, after lengthy hearings

carried out at our direction, has pointed up a course of action. Included are abandonment by the Federal Reserve of its bills only policy, adoption of procedures to make the market for U.S. securities more competitive, instituting callable bonds, carrying out tax and expenditure reforms, and in general utilizing adequate fiscal policies instead of relying on the one-legged stool of ever-higher interest rates.

To pass this measure would constitute a reversal of the traditional Democratic position against tight money. It would constitute an abdication of congressional responsibility in an area vital to the future economic welfare of the Nation. As the Joint Economic Committee has effectively said, to remove the ceiling would be a surrender to the demands of the administration that Congress "disarm itself unilaterally in a field over which it has both a constitutional and a legislative prerogative."

Sincerely yours,

AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress.

New Eisenhower Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the efforts of President Eisenhower have been uniquely successful in history in promoting the interests of, and creating greater respect and understanding for our Nation.

As successive reports of his Latin American tour come to us, I am even more deeply gratified by the splendid way in which he is again succeeding in reaffirming old friendships; establishing new ones; finding common ground for mutually agreed upon goals for the future; and generally creating a substantially improved climate of better relationships with our good neighbors in Latin America.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette, a fine newspaper with a 114-year record of community service, published a thought-creating editorial entitled "New Eisenhower Tour."

In a constructive analysis of the President's trip, the editorial particularly reminds us of the historical reasons why we, in the Western Hemisphere, need to make a greater effort to work closely together for mutual progress and security.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, Feb. 25, 1960]

NEW EISENHOWER TOUR

President Eisenhower's recent tour of European and Asiatic nations proved more successful than the most optimistic had anticipated. The new pilgrimage to Central and South American nations has objectives fully as important, and the reception in Brazil this week promises that it too will be successful.

There is one overriding aim in the President's journey southward. That is to reestablish close and friendly relationships in the Western Hemisphere, where Communist elements are attempting to gain a bridgehead. The success of these efforts, reflected in current situations in Cuba and Panama, are such that the United States cannot ignore them. However small the numbers of active workers, Latin American populations are being impressed with anti-U.S. slogans and campaigns and damage is being done to normally friendly relationships.

There is an excellent chance that the President's personal appearance tour will bring to nought the efforts of those interested in dividing American Nations and particularly of arousing suspicion and hate against the United States. To a degree which did not and cannot exist in Europe or Asia, the area of mutual interests between this country and Latin America are close and traditional. We have, for example:

(1) A common history of emergence from European colonization and dominance.

(2) Western Hemisphere defense needs, in which the United States is recognized champion, both for its own interests under the Monroe Doctrine and for the security of independence for smaller and weaker American nations.

(3) Commercial ties already important to Central and South American nations, and likely to become more so as the United States aids in building industry in its neighbor nations, and at the same time draws upon them for larger supplies of their products to support a growing U.S. economy.

(4) Traditional friendship dating back to founding days of American States, aid of the United States in their earlier years, and the pattern of government often based upon that of the United States.

There are numberless reasons why American nations must work in accord with each other. Many of these are of such self-interest that they are unlikely to be upset whatever the efforts of Reds disguised as "nationalists" may be. The President's tour however, will refresh the knowledge of neighbor populations of close U.S. ties and the great need for harmony in these days when plotters ardently work for discord.

If the Eisenhower tour does not help substantially to weld the Americas together—in view of the success of the more difficult Asian trip—it will be astonishing.

In Defense, I Bank Proudly on President, Says Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of February 24, 1960:

IN DEFENSE, I BANK PROUDLY ON PRESIDENT, SAYS VINSON

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—A veteran Georgia Democrat recognized on and off Capitol Hill as "the father of the modern American Navy" has come to the defense of President Eisenhower in the great debate over the Nation's military power and preparedness for a clash with Russia.

Deprecating current charges and countercharges on this controversial issue of the presidential year, he attributes them to the approach of the election. Gently but positively he suggests that these nonseasonal Fourth of July orators "keep their shirts on," and trust the American people to meet future emergencies as they have in World Wars I and II and in Korea.

The quiet but effective voice in the midst of partisan clamors is that of Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and head of the Naval Affairs Committee for many years before the consolidation of the Defense Department.

His recent speech before the midwinter banquet of the U.S. Reserve Officers' Association was generally misreported as extremely critical of the administration's policies. The actual transcript, however, as verified by him, places him in disagreement with many prominent Democrats, including the four senatorial seekers after the party's presidential nomination.

After noting that the bipartisan spirit on national defense and foreign affairs usually vanishes in election years, he said:

"I, for one, still cling to the old-time nonpartisan bipartisanship. And to prove it, I want to make this clear: As in regards the kind of military protection our country should have, I will bank proudly and confidently on one of the great commanders of all history—Dwight D. Eisenhower."

VINSON also defended the President against Kennedy-Johnson-Symington-Humphrey charges that Eisenhower had sacrificed the Nation's military needs on the altar of a balanced budget.

"I cannot agree," he said, "that the stability of our currency, the vigor of our economy, the spirit of our citizenry, and the cost consciousness of the Pentagon are sworn enemies of our Nation's strength."

In discussing military preparedness as reflected in congressional appropriations, VINSON praised the forbearance of the American people in paying such heavy taxes for national defense and foreign aid, and appeared to criticize Congress.

He conceded that the legislators had reduced budget requests for national security by only 3 percent during last 14 years. But, despite the Communist menace, the invasion of South Korea and turbulence in many other areas during that period, he pointed out that Congress had increased Pentagon requests only in 3 years over that period for a total of $1,700 million.

VINSON also agreed with administration and Pentagon military experts that, in preparing for a possible conflict with Russia, the United States must assume calculated risks.

If the various service heads did not disagree as to the Nation's needs, he said, "I would truly cry out, "God save the Republic."

In closing a speech which has attracted great attention on Capitol Hill and at the White House, in Republican and Democratic political circles, the veteran Georgian asked what he considers to be the basic and central question of the great debate:

"Where today is our leader, military or civilian, who would choose for the American people the Soivet strength complex of today or tomorrow in preference to our own?"

Tommy Hayes of Beaumont, Tex., Is Young Speaker for Democracy Who Shows Great Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us in the Congress have been hon-

ored and pleased to have in Washington this past week the distinguished young winners of the annual "I Speak for Democracy" contest from our respective States.

It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Senate Tommy Hayes, of South Park High School in Beaumont, the son of Dr. and Mrs. Edwin S. Hayes, 1387 Pipkin Street, the Texas State winner. His 5-minute speech on the Constitution is top quality and one only needs read it to understand it was almost sure to be a winner.

The sponsors of the "I Speak for Democracy" contest—the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronics Industries Association and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—warrant strong commendation. The $1,500 scholarship they award to each State winner is a very worthwhile contribution to the higher education of extremely able youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Tommy Hayes.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Tommy Hayes)

Think with me for a few minutes of Longfellow's beautiful poem:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hope of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
We knew what Master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast and sail and rope."

A ship is constructed keel, then hull, then deck. So has our democracy been built and welded together in a great ship, our Constitution, our Ship of State.

Emblazoned upon the pages of our history is the story of the building of this great ship. The keel was laid in Old Federal Hall. Fiery, bold Alexander Hamilton, solemn George Washington, quick-tempered Robert Morris, quiet James Madison, old Benjamin Franklin—all were there listening to the Voice of Democracy instruct them until a perfect keel was attained.

Each one of us has experienced the reliving of this spirited scene in our history classes. We have seen in our imagination our framing fathers deliberating and resolving. "But they were not without assistance. A great host of unseen observers gathered there. Plato and Aristotle were there, preaching once more the principles of their Greek democracy. The Pilgrim fathers were there. The men of the Magna Carta—all stood in a solemn row. They were motionless, but they were voting."

The men of 1787 who fashioned our Constitution were not faddists, nor were they dreamers. They were inspired by the urgent need for a more perfect union. They were ordinary men who sought equal rights for themselves and their descendants. They fought for a stable government based on the freedom of the individual. Truly, the voice of democracy steadied the hand of James Madison as his quill began: "We the people of the United States;" thus with the signatures of 37 names was forged the keel of our ship of state.

This written Constitution of the United States is a document that occupies only 5 pages in the World Almanac. Its 4,000 words can be read in less than half an hour. Yet this small, outwardly simple document has withstood the growing pains of a nation for almost two centuries. What, then, makes our Constitution so different?

A democratic government was perfected which has its roots in the rights and obligations of its citizens—the right to worship under a cross, a star, a dome, or a steeple, or not to go to any church at all; the right to free speech, the right to a secret ballot. Here for the first time in the history of government the people were dealt with not as a mass, but as individuals.

Many generations have hammered and added that keel into a nearly perfect ship of state. Washington, crossing the ice-clogged waters of the Delaware laid the hull. Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, the countless millions in World Wars I and II add the ribs of steel and the deck. The voice of democracy spoke through them so that you and I might inherit the fundamental rights and obligations of freedom.

In this era of worldwide cold war every nation is searching for a master ship of state. The voice of democracy reminds us that we must adhere to wisdom and peace. We must stop assuming that this is a take all, give nothing way of life. We must share American democracy with all of those who seek that level of dignity. As the late William Allen White once said, "Liberty is the only thing you cannot have unless you give it to others."

We of the 20th century, like our Founding Fathers, must hammer out a truly master ship to weld together the nations of the world in peace. We must say with the poet of that master ship:

"Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee, our prayers, our tears, our faith, triumphant o'er our fears—are all with thee—are all with thee."

Urgent Need for Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Congress are hoping for some leadership from the White House in the attainment of legislation that makes clear the fact that independent producers of natural gas cannot be regulated on a utility-type basis. It is imperative that a gas bill be passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President. With that objective in mind, I believe that Members of Congress should read the following resolution, passed recently by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission:

RESOLUTION—INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION

The Interstate Oil Compact Commission, by resolution, has, on numerous occasions, called attention to the fact that the producers of natural gas cannot be regulated on a utility type basis, and that the exploration for and production of natural gas is a hazardous business that must be given the proper incentive in order to insure an adequate supply of this product to the Nation, both in times of peace and national emergency.

The Congress of the United States has several times considered legislation that would free the independent producer in his operations. The Interstate Oil Compact Commission thinks that such legislation must be adopted in order to create an incentive for the independent producer to continue to find new reserves of this most valuable product. It is the considered judgment of the Commission that the conservation programs of the various States will be hampered unless remedial legislation is passed that will definitely say that the authority to conserve natural gas is the authority of the States and it is also the judgment of the Commission that through such remedial legislation gas will be available at a lower cost to the ultimate consumer. It is only through true conservation by the States of this great natural resource that the consuming public may be assured of an adequate supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission duly assembled this 15th day of February, 1960, in Oklahoma City, Okla., That it again be called to the attention of all interested parties they be urged to continue to work so that Congress and the President will understand that such remedial legislation is an absolute necessity.

LAWRENCE R. ALLEY,
Executive Secretary.

Criticism of Senator Byrd of West Virginia on Poll Tax Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on February 8, 1960, the Charleston (W. Va..) Gazette, ran an editorial criticizing me for my vote against the Javits poll tax amendment. I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial, together with a letter which I wrote to the editor of the Gazette in explanation of my position. The editor printed a portion of my reply in a later issue, but my entire response did not appear, undoubtedly because it was too lengthy.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR BYRD FAVORS SOUTH VERSION OF DEMOCRACY

"Southerners * * * won the only real fight of the day."

That's the way the New York Times, a responsible newspaper, described the defeat of the Javits bill, which would outlaw the poll tax by a simple statute.

The bill, offered by JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, was beaten with the help of a West Virginia Senator, ROBERT C. BYRD.

BYRD, who votes with the southern bloc more or less regularly, joined Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, and Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, in supporting another poll tax measure which would require a constitutional amendment and which, therefore, isn't likely to stir up any trouble. The Javits bill was the key vote on the important civil rights issue.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the other West Virginia Senator, declined to join BYRD and the Dixiecrats on the touchy issue and cast his vote for the Javits bill. RANDOLPH is a liberal. During his campaign for office, he was accused of being a New Dealer. He gladly admitted the charge.

RANDOLPH's consistent position on civil rights is creditible, we think, and we trust

it has been watched by all West Virginians who believe in democracy as traditionally defined, but not always practiced, in America.

BYRD, on the other hand, seems at times to be infected with the primitive conservatism of the wool hat. His campaign devices—the fiddle, the Sunday school forum, and the Edgar Guest poetry—are embarrassingly similar to the techniques of the Bayou gallus-snapper.

Further, he has taken to frequent voting with the southerners, and it wouldn't be unfair to deduce from the record that he favors the tortured version of democracy practiced in the South.

We don't like to think that ROBERT C. BYRD accurately represents the position of the people of West Virginia. If he does, it may be to the discredit of the people.

He by no means represents the position of the Charleston Gazette.

FEBRUARY 22, 1960.

The EDITOR,
The Charleston Gazette,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR SIR: In the February 8 issue of the Charleston Gazette, an editorial was printed under the headline, "Senator BYRD Favors South Version of Democracy." The editorial attacked me for voting against the Javits amendment, which was erroneously referred to as the "key vote on the important civil rights issue." I was mentioned by the anonymous writer of the editorial as being "infected with the primitive conservatism of the wool hat," and I was criticized for "frequent voting with the southerners." The writer stated that he did not "like to think that ROBERT C. BYRD accurately represents the position of the people of West Virginia," and that, if I did so represent the people, "it may be to the discredit of the people." He closed his editorial with a sentence stating that I, by no means, represent "the position of the Charleston Gazette."

It is certainly not my intention or desire to attempt to answer every critical editorial concerning me. "What I must do is all that concerns me." This is a rule which is, in the words of Emerson, "equally arduous in actual and intellectual life, and it may serve the whole distinction between greatness and meanness." "It is the harder," said Emerson, "because you will always find those who think they know what is your duty better than you know it."

I feel it incumbent upon me, however, to reply to the editorial because it presents a distorted picture of my position in voting against the Javits amendment. Senator JAVITS' amendment proposed to prohibit, by statute, the poll tax, and it was offered as a substitute for the proposal by Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, to prohibit the poll tax by a constitutional amendment. The defeat of the Javits amendment by a vote of 50 to 37 followed a vote by which the Holland amendment was agreed to 72 to 16.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution. On the basis of my limited understanding of the Constitution and certain court decisions pertinent to the subject matter of this correspondence, I feel that the States have the power to establish voting qualifications. The Javits proposal would have had the Congress say that a certain requirement, to wit, payment of a poll tax, should not be a qualification for voting. The Javits proposal, then, sought to amend the Constitution by statute. The Constitution clearly provides procedures for its own amendment, and amendment by statute is not among them (art. V, U.S. Constitution).

Authority for the statement that the Constitution specifically vests in the States the power to establish voting qualifications can be found in Article I, sectiond, 2, and in Article II, section 1, of the U.S. Constitution, the former provision dealing with the election of Members to the U.S. House of Representatives, and the latter provision dealing with the election of the President and the Vice President. The Seventeenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that the qualifications of voters in senatorial elections shall be fixed by the States in precisely the same manner as is provided in Article I, section 2, for the election of House Members. Additional authority for the contention that this power rests with the States may be found in a reading of the lower court's decision in *Butler* v. *Thompson* (341, U.S. 937), later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court where the following language was used:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the 14th amendment. Privileges of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the 15th and 19th amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate."

A further court decision buttressing this point may be found in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U.S. 277, 283, 58 S. Ct. 205, 82 L. Ed. 252), which held that a poll tax prescribed by the Constitution and statutes of the State of Georgia did not offend the Federal Constitution.

I voted to prohibit, by constitutional amendment, the poll tax as a voting requirement. I know of no person who questions the propriety or legality of that approach, whereas there are many constitutional lawyers of eminent reputation who have questioned the statutory procedure. The former Senator from Idaho, Mr. Borah, was one, and I could name others who have taken the same position throughout the many years in which Congress has been debating a repeal of the poll tax by a statutory route.

References in the Constitution to voting qualifications are not there by chance; they are there as a result of careful and deliberate thought upon the part of our illustrious Founding Fathers, who were wise and patriotic men—men who were guided in their decisions by a profound and unselfish interest in the future of their country, not by the emotions borne upon passing political winds. These provisions were later ratified by the States and have been upheld by the courts over the decades.

The foregoing constitutes an accurate presentation of the reasons why I voted as I did, and in my judgment they are unassailable reasons. I am confident that my position was constitutionally sound, and I am content to rest my case on that basis.

I welcome and expect criticism, but I think that it should be constructively intended and constructively offered. As Burke said, "No man has ever a point of pride that was not injurious to him," so no man has ever a defect that was not somewhere made useful to him. The stag in the fable admired his horns and blamed his feet, but, when the hunter came, his feet saved him, and afterwards, caught in the thicket, his horns destroyed him. So, every man in his lifetime needs to thank his faults. Our strength grows out of our weakness. The indignation that becomes aroused with hidden force does not prick itself, but is put in motion when one is stung and unfairly assailed. Being pushed, tormented, and defeated, one is put upon his manhood and learns his ignorance; is cured of his conceit, and is kept humble. "The wound cicatrizes and falls from him like a dead skin and when others would triumph, lo! he has passed on invulnerable."

Undoubtedly, there are many fine people who work for the Gazette, and I think that I have some friends among them. I am constrained to think, however, that even they would be the first to disagree with the implication in the last sentence of the editorial—that a Senator, or any public official for that matter, is elected to represent "the position of the Charleston Gazette" or any other newspaper, individual, or group.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

Still Expendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C. of February 25, 1960.

STILL EXPENDABLE

An astonished group of cotton textile manufacturers were given the word in Charlotte this week by Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. He told them that after spending many hours pondering textile problems on a global scale he had reached the conclusion that the prosperity of American mills was not affected by foreign imports.

Mr. Kearns' remarks were profoundly disturbing for several reasons. It was disturbing that he had reached a statistical conclusion contrary to logic, economic law, and recent experience in the textile industry.

More disturbing was the fact that he was speaking as the Commerce Department's expert on textiles and reflecting, apparently, the official thinking of the administration on this subject.

These two things were obvious and, if taken alone, would be enough to indicate that the textile industry's troubles are far from over. But, underlying Mr. Kearns' conclusion on imports is a more serious question: Why did he come to Charlotte and advance such an untenable theory?

The most obvious answer is that he wants American textile manufacturers to believe him. It is necessary that they believe him if he and his associates in the Commerce and State Departments are to have a free hand at the next meeting of the party nations to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

He said: "How can we advocate a program of restriction in trade—either domestic or foreign?—for trade is the means by which progress is transmitted into reality to the people."

If this statement has an ominous sound, it is because it is a restatement of a fraction of the old one-world theory of the State and Commerce Departments. By people, in this context, Mr. Kearns means people of the world. Those in the United States are already enjoying progress transmitted into reality. They need no assistance from Government beyond a reasonable protection from low-wage foreign competition.

His assertion that imports of underpriced cotton goods do not affect the health of the American industry ignores the experience of several years ago. When Japanese cotton imports were unrestricted the bottom dropped out of the market and bankruptcy faced the industry. When quotas—even voluntary quotas—were adopted the industry began to recover.

Textile men may agree privately that elimination of marginal and obsolete mills during this period was a good thing. But if Mr. Kearns is laying the groundwork for a resumption of unrestricted imports, for further GATT concessions, then the next layer of mills to be peeled off the industry will be those that are now operating at a profit and furnishing steady employment to American citizens.

These are realities which no mendacious conclusion on the effect of imports can deny. So, it is shocking to find Mr. Kearns back at the old one-world stand trying to sell textile men a premise which, if accepted, could lead only to further demolition of their industry.

Removal of Interest Rate on Certain Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President there appears in the current issue of the Savings Bank Journal a very timely and interesting article by Mr. John deLaittre, president of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

The article deals with the problems attendant to the 4¼ percent ceiling on the interest rate which can be paid on government securities with a maturity of 5 years or more.

The cost of managing the Federal debt is a matter of concern to all Members of this body and I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. deLaittre be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

President Eisenhower has repeatedly requested that Congress remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on the interest rate which can be paid on U.S. Government securities with a maturity of 5 years or more. He reiterated this request in his 1960 Economic Report to the Congress.

The mutual savings banking industry has gone on record in support of this administration request as early as December 1958, and as recently as February 3, 1960. We have done so principally because of our deep interest in combating inflation and protecting the dollar value of the savings entrusted to all institutions. We have also done so because of our earnest desire to fulfill our long-term economic function of promoting personal savings and helping to finance an expanding economy.

Surely those who oppose the President's request are as interested in preventing inflation and fostering economic growth as those who support the proposal. But they view the current ceiling rate as a deterrent to increasing the cost of managing the Federal debt and thus holding down interest rates in general. This control of interest rates, they contend, is an important anti-inflation weapon and one in the broad public interest.

But do the events of 1959 bear them out in these contentions? Can we expect a reversal in these events in an expanding economy in need of capital funds? Is the recourse to short-term financing by the Treasury conducive to that higher level of personal savings acknowledged by all to be essential to sound economic growth? And, finally, do fixed interest rates foster that freedom of the marketplace which has characterized American economic life and been the wellspring of its growth?

At the second Washington conference, pictured on pages 22–27 of this issue of the Journal, the savings banking industry expressed its views on these questions. We pointed out that the ceiling rate on long-term Governments had not had the desired effect of holding down interest rates in general or the cost of managing the Federal debt.

Interest rates have risen to the highest level in 30 years. Financial analysts have estimated that short-term interest rates are at least one-quarter of 1 percent higher than they would otherwise be because of the added pressure of Treasury borrowing in this area—an action unavoidable under the ceiling restraints in the long-term area.

The pressure of Treasury short-term borrowing has been particularly acute because of increasing credit demands from the private sector of the economy. As these demands have mounted, interest rates have risen and terms have been shortened. The effect has been to add more steam to inflationary pressures.

The continued upsurge in the economy in 1960—readily agreed upon by most observers—will only mean more credit demands. In this climate, with the Treasury forced to rely heavily on offerings of short-term securities, can we expect anything but a repetition of 1959 developments, with perhaps even more serious effects? Individuals, not heretofore interested, will be attracted to short-term Government securities; this will mean even more withdrawals of funds from thrift institutions; and long-term capital to finance new homes, schools, and business facilities will be sharply reduced. Moreover, uncertainty about the effect of future short-term Treasury offerings on deposits will cause savings banks to reduce home mortgage commitments. The money market will tighten further, and a cumulative rise in interest rates is possible.

If the Treasury were permitted greater flexibility in its debt management operations, Congress would be helping in the maintenance of economic growth without inflation. For instance, an advance refunding program, in which long-term securities would be offered at market rates in exchange for low-coupon Government securities, would permit the Treasury to lengthen the debt and reduce the pressures of continuing refinancing. No new money would be tapped in such an exchange operation, there would be no drain of savings, and the possibility of attracting new savings into thrift institutions would be greatly enhanced. Thus more money would be available for mortgages, any need for an emergency Government financing to bolster the homebuilding industry would be obviated, and the upward push on interest rates in both the short- and the long-term markets would be alleviated.

Thus we could hope for reduced fears and expectation of inflation. We could then realistically hope that the temptation to find speculative hedges against dollar erosion would not be so prevalent and that savings for long-term purposes in thrift institutions would increase as personal incomes rose.

Finally, the basic tenet of our free enterprise economy—that buyers and sellers, borrowers and lenders compete in open markets for goods, services, and financial claims—would be operating. Last month we wrote to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD: "The only ultimate alternative to permitting the Treasury to compete freely on the basis of interest rates and other terms is to turn to Federal regimentation requiring investors directly to purchase U.S. Government securities." Surely this is contrary to our free, democratic society.

We advocate lifting the ceiling rate because we are aware of the close relationship between Treasury financing programs, inflation, and the cause of thrift. Mutual savings banks have an important job to do in the decades that lie ahead—one they have successfully done for nearly all the years that the American Nation has been in existence. That job is the promotion of thrift and the investment of small deposits of many savers in sound, productive enterprises, both public and private.

Savings banks as well as other thrift institutions should not be hampered in their efforts to increase the rate of savings and to supply noninflationary funds to the long-term capital market. The current interest ceiling has proved to be such a hampering influence. We need more savings, not less; and we need these savings moving into the long-term market. These goals can best be met in an environment free of artificial and unrealistic restraints.

JOHN DELAITTRE,
President, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

Career of William Howard Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, Charles P. Taft outlines the legislative policies of his father, the late William Howard Taft, former President of the United States and Chief Justice of its Supreme Court.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1960]

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT'S CAREER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your news story on Senator JOHN KENNEDY's speech at the National Press Club on January 14 included the following:

"The address was sprinkled with historical references, the effect of which was to classify President Eisenhower with such 'weak' Presidents as Buchanan, Taft, and Harding."

I suppose I am a biased commentator since my father is involved. But I submit nevertheless the following:

My father was in more ways than one a modern Republican. He put through a postal savings system, opposed by the banks; a corporate income tax, denounced by the National Association of Manufacturers; measures for mine safety, and employers' liability, and workmen's compensation on interstate carriers, opposed of course by the roalroads and coal companies; increase in control of the Interstate Commerce Commission over railroad rates since the bill under Roosevelt did not actually control rates at all; increase in postal rates on magazines. He started the Children's Bureau, and vetoed a literacy test for immigration. He put through the reciprocity treaty with Canada, and his Attorney General started 88 antitrust actions, many more in 4 years than Theodore Roosevelt in 7 or Woodrow Wilson in 8.

As Chief Justice he changed the whole tone of labor decisions and wrote the opinions in the Stockyards and Grain Exchange cases which laid the basis for sustaining the Wagner Act.

It seems hardly fair to describe him as "weak" or to put him in a class with President Harding.

CHARLES P. TAFT.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *February 9, 1960.*

Every Sheriff Would Do Well To Follow Al Christopher's Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Al Christopher of Fremont County, Iowa, has a long record of outstanding service to the people as is so well explained in the following article from the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of Council Bluffs, Iowa. Al Christopher has proven that child delinquency can be reduced to a minimum by counseling with our youth beyond the call of duty as a sheriff.

I have known of Al's good services all during his 22 years as sheriff of Fremont County as I, too, have been a public servant for the people of Fremont County, Iowa during that period.

The newspaper article follows:

SIDNEY.—Maybe Fremont County Sheriff Al Christopher isn't the dean of Iowa law enforcement officers. But he's a front runner for the honor.

His recent filing for reelection to the sheriff's post emphasized the fact that he has a total of 32 years behind him in the Fremont County office.

The first 10 of these were served as deputy sheriff. He is presently completing his 22d year as "headman."

"It has been a most rewarding experience and the folks in this county have been mighty good to me," Christopher reflected.

A bit of a review of the crime situation in his county reveals that perhaps the sheriff has been more than a little good for the county.

FEW JUVENILE PROBLEMS

Fremont County ranks among the lowest in the State in juvenile problems. What is the answer?

"We think we can prevent a great deal more trouble than we can cure," the veteran lawman pointed out. He and his deputy, Ed Collins, divide a regular tour of night duty.

"Whenever we find a youth, or a group of them, prowling around with nothing particular to do after usual going-home hours we stop them for a little chat," Christopher said. "When we find signs that everything may not be quite on the up and up we request the youth, or youths to stop into our office the next day."

Once at the sheriff's office, the young people get a good heart-to-heart talking to. They are told they must report the incident to their parents.

"We give them a couple of days to talk to their folks and then we make a point of checking with the parents," the sheriff said.

PARENTS UNAWARE

"Many times the parents are not aware that the young people were not where they belonged and in a very big percentage of the cases we seldom find that youth on the loose again."

This companionable approach to law enforcement has paid large dividends in a number of ways. First of all, as noted, it has helped in bringing about a low juvenile crime rate.

Secondly, Christopher has a sizable file of letters from young people, now well established in life, thanking him for the boost his office gave them in the right direction.

Thirdly, and Christopher recalls this fondly, the cordial relationship helped him crack one of his biggest cases.

"It was Kenneth Kitts at his heyday," Christopher recalls. "He pulled a job in Tabor and we were without any tangible leads.

"Then a young fellow came to my office to report that he and his girl had been watching the moon that night, had observed the strange car coming from the alley, had taken down the license number and was turning it in for what it might be worth."

LEAD US TO HIM

"It was a lead directly to Kitts and not only did we make the arrest but we secured a conviction at a time when he was playing fast and loose all over this part of the country."

An affable softspoken individual, Christopher became an officer because of another man's election.

"I was working for John Redinbaugh in his garage in Tabor when he walked in one morning and called me out from under a car to tell me he had been elected sheriff.

"He told me he was looking for a deputy and when I started trying to think of some good prospects he scared me half to death by telling me it was myself he had in mind."

That was the start of the law career for the Fremont County born and raised native son.

Christopher is particularly proud of the complete records and files in his office.

"We have a file on every conviction, every commitment and every juvenile case as well as every coroner's inquest," he pointed out. "This information is invaluable and time after time has provided leads that enabled us to anaticipate a crime before its commission or to quickly put our hands on a suspect after a crime."

RECALL FLOOD READINESS

Not particularly in the line of law enforcement but indicating why many Fremont County citizens swear by their sheriff was their flood experience.

Through the years Christopher had kept a close record of the various floods in the county, their location and severity. Most of these, of course, were on the west end of the county along the Missouri River lowlands.

"It was easy to see that some day a big flood could cause a tremendous crisis in that area," he noted.

Against that day the sheriff carefully compiled a file listing the owners and locations of such rescue equipment.

MOVED AROUND FAST

So it was that in 1952 when the big one really hit. Fremont County was as ready as it could be. In jig time, corn was shelled and moved, livestock transported to higher ground and late-leaving citizens were brought out by boat.

"Many of the bottom farmers have told me that our preparedness saved them thousands of dollars," Christopher said.

The sheriff had praise for his deputy.

"Ed is a natural and as valuable to me as my right hand," he smiled.

Now 59 years old, Christopher's son and two daughters are married.

A Warning to Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues in the Congress will be as perturbed as I to read the following articles, a series of two, which were written by Mason Denison last week for his syndicated column, the Pennsylvania Story.

Immediately following Mr. Denison's columns, I submit an editorial from the New Castle (Pa.) News of February 24, 1960.

A serious problem faces this country with imports exceeding exports at an estimated excess of $2 billion for this fiscal year. Mr. Denison's disclosures are most significant, therefore, not only for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but well exemplify what is probably happening in every other State in the Union.

The articles follow:

[From the New Castle (Pa.) News, Feb. 23, 1960]

THE PENNSYLVANIA STORY

(By Mason Denison)

(First of a series of two)

HARRISBURG.—Is Pennsylvania destined to lose another sleeve of its economic shirt as a result of policy laid down in Washington by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads in the construction of the gigantic Federal interstate road system in Pennsylvania?

At the moment the point is of prime concern to officials here on Capitol Hill—so much so, this column has learned that the State departments of highways has filed a detailed four-page letter taking strong exception to a U.S. Bureau of Roads directive issued under date of December 31, 1959.

That directive to all State highway departments prescribed policies and procedures regarding the use of material of foreign origin in Federal aid and other State supervised cooperative highway work.

FOREIGN ORIGIN

It is the material of foreign origin and nondomestic material referred to constantly throughout the Federal directive that is of considerable concern to Pennsylvania.

In a burcaucratic nutshell the memo specifies that roadbuilding materials of foreign or nondomestic origin are to be used in Federal roadbuilding programs in the various States when with 6 percent added to the bid price (incorporating foreign-produced materials), it is lower than the bid price submitted using domestic materials.

The memordanum states pointblank:

"The contract documents shall specifically provide that, for bid comparison purposes only, the total bid price for the entire contract of any bidder offering a nondomestic construction material thus restricted shall be increased by an amount equal to 6 percent of the price of bids for each item covering such material. The contract amount of any contract awarded shall be the amount of the bid as submitted."

DOMESTIC MATERIALS

The important point on this score at the moment centers around the fact that the

use of domestic roadbuilding materials—as opposed to the introduction of cheaper important materials—plays an amazingly important part in the economy of Pennsylvania.

Just how important this role is to Pennsylvanians everywhere will be detailed in this column tomorrow.

But, in addition to the economy factor, there is another curious aspect to the Federal directive. This is it:

Routinely, the State department of highways inspects its sources or points of origin of manufacture of the materials used in building its roads—to insure that the materials produced are satisfactory and meet requirements of the department.

Quite obviously it is impractical to send inspectors to Germany, or any other foreign producing point, to follow this check-through system.

On this point the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads directive states:

WILL NOT APPROVE

"Restrictions upon the use of nondomestic construction material predicated upon the State's estimated cost or anticipated difficulty of making analyses, tests, or inspections at the place of manufacture shall not be approved by the Bureau of Public Roads" unless the individual highway departments find and determine, in effect, that conditions are not being met at place of foreign manufacture.

At this rate Pennsylvania taxpayers can get ready to subsidize inspection trips to Europe and other low labor cost production countries.

In more ways than one it is small wonder those concerned with an already lagging Pennsylvania economy are on the warpath.

[From the New Castle (Pa.) News, Feb. 24, 1960]

THE PENNSYLVANIA STORY

(By Mason Denison)

(Second of a series of two)

HARRISBURG.—There can hardly be any doubt as to the intent of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads memorandum to States setting up provisions for use of foreign material in roadbuilding, as opposed to locally produced materials, when the following paragraph on "exemptions" is noted:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this memorandum, a State highway department may request the Commissioner of Public Roads to approve the use on any project of only domestic construction material and the Commissioner of Public Roads may grant such approval if the State highway department submits evidence showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the use of nondomestic construction material may endanger the national security or the national interest, or that such domestic construction material will be substantially produced in areas of substantial unemployment."

DOMESTIC MATERIALS

Item. Pennsylvania's Department of Highways has specified in the past that "domestic materials"—Pennsylvania materials—must be used in highway construction work. About a year ago the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads in "informal" manner requested States to use foreign produced road materials when cheaper.

The Pennsylvania Department of Highways declined to go along and was backed by a ruling from the State Attorney General.

Now comes the memorable memo of December 31, 1959 spelling out in printed words what is expected of various State highway departments on the foreign produced material front.

And it is under the section quoted previously that the State department of highways has moved to take advantage of the "exemptions" paragraph. The department in its "letter of exemption" duly requested "authority and approval to restrict steel and cement of domestic origin on all Federal-aid highway projects in Pennsylvania.

STEEL AND CEMENT

Steel and cement are big items in Pennsylvania's road building programs and here are some economic points worth considering if underselling foreign steel and cement materials are permitted to be used, in this State at least:

Pennsylvania is the foremost steel producing State in the Nation—with the value of steel produced in Pennsylvania alone in excess of $7 billion.

It takes about 100 tons of steel to build a mile of highway.

Steel production uses some 3 million tons of coal.

Not only does Pennsylvania manufacture more steel than any other State, it also ranks first in the manufacture of cement. The annual dollar value of cement manufactured in Pennsylvania exceeds $130 million.

Last year capacity output of cement was in excess of 61 million barrels. According to U.S. Department of Mines' figures approximately 15 million barrels were used within Pennsylvania during the year.

THREE PERCENT

Significant item: nearly 3 percent of the total production was used on Pennsylvania Department of Highways projects.

Or looking at it another way, the U.S. Department of Mines estimates that the 1959 production of 61 million barrels of cement provided 16,200,000 man hours of work.

From the unemployment-economic standpoint: there are 23 major unemployment areas in the United States and its possessions identified as group D—with 6 to 8.9 percent unemployment.

Three of these are located in Pennsylvania and three in adjacent States.

Actually over half of the major labor areas of Pennsylvania are classified as "areas of substantial unemployment" as determined by the U.S. Labor Department—with the mid-January figure of unemployment being 8.2 percent.

Item. Steel and cement producing areas are either in areas of substantial unemployment or adjacent to such areas.

Whether Pennsylvania is destined to subsidize foreign countries, their imports and their products at the expense of Pennsylvania's economy and unemployment is worth looking into.

AMERICA PAYS THE BILL, EUROPE GETS THE ORDERS

Mason Denison, Harrisburg News Bureau representative files his second article upon the contracting for the steel, cement and other materials needed for the building of the giant Federal highway system.

The first article was published yesterday. Both of them should be read with interest, and possibly some alarm, by Americans. Stripped of superfluous verbiage, the two articles set out that where foreign companies underbid American companies for the materials, the orders will go to foreign nations.

The gimmick in the specifications for the orders for materials is found in the following paragraph of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads directive.

"Restrictions upon the use of nondomestic construction material predicated upon the State's estimated cost or anticipated difficulty of making analyses, tests or inspections at the place of manufacture shall not be approved by the Bureau of Public Roads" unless the individual highway departments find and determine, in effect, that conditions are not being met at place of foreign manufacture.

Preceding this paragraph is one which, boiled to its essence, provides that 6 percent shall be added to foreign bids, and if the total bid is less than a U.S. bid, and the materials are of acceptable quality, the foreign company gets the bid.

Provision is made for inspection of the materials which would mean that if Pennsylvania were letting contracts for steel and cement, inspectors would have to be sent to the foreign nations to make the inspections, at the expense of Pennsylvania or what other State was building the highways.

What this all means in effect is, that part of the increased payrolls promised for American industry when the Federal road program was adopted, will be lost.

Pennsylvania particularly will be especially hard hit if such a program goes through. In this Commonwealth we have giant steel mills and cement mills. Pennsylvania is the leading State of the Union producing cement.

When Congress passed the additional 1 percent per gallon tax upon gasoline to be earmarked for the $40 billion roadbuilding program, estimates were made as to the millions of tons of steel and cement which would be needed. There are other materials but steel and cement are the basic materials.

These millions of tons of steel and cement were transmuted into hours of labor which it was assumed were intended to affect American workers.

But the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads seems to have other ideas.

This directive was issued back in December of 1959 but has just come to light. The Pennsylvania Department of Highways has protested the directive but to no avail as yet. It seems to be a matter upon which the Congress could well take some action.

The 6 percent which will be added to foreign bids means little or nothing. Belgium can produce cement far cheaper than the United States. Britain and Germany can produce steel far cheaper than the United States.

There is no use suggesting that foreign-made products are inferior to those made in the United States. It just isn't so, especially in such basic materials as steel and cement.

Most of the foreign countries today are equipped with the most modern tools it is possible to procure. American money paid for much of them. They have learned the lesson of mass production in Europe and in many cases, particularly machine tools, foreign countries in some cases have equipment superior to ours.

This idea of the Bureau of Public Roads may be based upon the theory of aid to foreign nations. Up to a certain point this is proper and logical, but when that aid robs American workers of jobs and payrolls, it wouldn't be a bad idea to take a look around home for some aid.

The situation also points up in tragic fashion a statement that has been made many times in the past 5 years, that we in America are pricing ourselves out of the foreign market. In this case we seem to have priced ourselves out of the domestic market.

Warnings have been heard time and again of the inherent dangers in the constant increase in the cost of production of American articles. Labor and management have been urged to hold the line in prices but to little avail.

The Bureau of Public Roads has provided a dramatic answer.

This present situation points the issue up more because the money to pay for the steel and cement, if purchased in foreign nations would come from the pockets of American workers. In other words they would be taxed to provide the knife to cut their own throats.

But while any protests against government orders going to foreign nations might bring a Federal embargo upon steel and cement

for highways, it certainly would not affect private purchasers.

Today the eastern ports are busy unloading merchandise of all kinds, made in Europe.

A purchaser needing a large order of barbed wire will find that barbed wire is being laid down on the Cleveland docks at many dollars per ton cheaper than it can be manufactured in Cleveland.

Automobiles, dress goods, toys, chinaware, glassware, you name it and a foreign country can deliver it.

If labor and management needed any example of what the rising cost of production means to the American worker they have it in the case of the Federal highway program.

The end result would be that American workers would be riding in foreign-made cars, over highways made of foreign materials. About the only American stake in the whole thing would be the money these things cost.

This Beats All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the fallacious doctrine of appeasement was never more evident than in regard to the reprieve of the convicted kidnaper and rapist Chessman. The telegram from the Assistant Secretary of State to the Governor of California—based on the complaint of a far-off country in South America, Uruguay—seems almost like a fictitious character out of a dime store paperback novel, yet it happened.

Here is appended an editorial from midcontinent America that clearly indicates what many Americans deeply feel. To have this reprieve of a criminal convicted of a dozen serious crimes dictated by a people who always are boasting of their hatred and contempt of the "Colossus of the North" is almost unbelievable. It seems clearly evident that sparrows are beginning to sit in nests formerly occupied by eagles.

Here is mid-America speaking in the Hays (Kans.) Daily News:

THIS BEATS ALL

In all the history of American jurisprudence nothing has been seen to equal the gruesome comedy of justice that has witnessed Caryl Chessman elude execution eight times in 12 years. Whether or not the sadistic mugger who was responsible for the death of one woman and mental derangement of another, plus sexual assaults upon others, should die at the hands of the law is not for us to say. But the California courts thought so, and so decreed. Since then politics and emotions have so overshadowed his crime, convictions, and sentence that the facts of the case have become secondary, if not forgotten.

The events of Friday make it sadly laughable. Over the years about every society and organization from the death row chanters to the organized matrons for humane treatment of criminals to the local parchesi club has plead for or against the terror marked for legal death. But meddling hit an all-time high, or low, with the State Department nosing into the matter, asking for gubernatorial clemency almost before the ink was dry on the State's supreme court decision that the original penalty was irrevocable.

It is doubtful if any criminal has ever had his case more thoroughly and consistently reviewed than Chessman. Justice worked overtime for him. And then, on the most cockeyed excuse to ever tip the scales of an American court, the Governor of California acceded to a State Department notion. At its request Chessman escaped execution, not because of points of law involved, but because the Department in Washington feared that for the decision of a duly constituted American court to be carried out would cause presidential embarrassment on Eisenhower's contemplated trip to South America.

This, to say the least, takes the cake for sure. If the time has arrived that penalties prescribed by duly constituted courts, arrived at by due process of law, must be altered for the convenience of the Federal Government, then the time has come to overhaul the law and let the Federal departments and bureaucracies supplant our constitutionally guaranteed right to be tried by our peers. Even the idea of government busybodies interfering in any way with the carrying out of justice as decreed by the courts is not only a travesty on justice, it is un-American.

Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President has made important recommendations with regard to the solution of the water pollution problem and additional Federal aid for it in his veto message of H.R. 3610, the Water Pollution Control Act.

I am particularly impressed by an editorial that appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, under date of February 26, which I would commend to my colleagues for their attention:

BEGINS AT HOME

Having permitted their streams to become polluted, it is now primarily up to the municipalities to stop the pollution. This, less bluntly stated, is President Eisenhower's reason for rejecting a bill greatly increasing Federal grants for the construction of sewage treatment plants. Against the force of his arguments the House could not rally enough votes to override his veto.

The President agrees with Congress that the Nation's rivers and streams are a national asset, and he concedes the need for Federal intervention where pollution has an interstate origin. But the proper role of the Federal Government is to stimulate State and local action, the President continued, not to "tempt municipalities to delay essential water-pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds."

Important progress has been achieved without Federal help. A notable example is the Passaic River Valley where, through a commission created by the State, a score of municipalities have financed construction of a sanitary sewer that has greatly reduced river pollution. Similarly the Raritan will be cleansed by a tricounty trunk sewer, to be paid for by the beneficiaries.

From 1948 to 1958 more than $278 million was spent by New Jersey municipalities and industries for sewage treatment plants. Every New Jersey community in the Delaware Basin now has a modern sewage-disposal facility. In the New York metropolitan area, under the leadership of the Interstate Sanitation Commission, stream pollution is gradually being reduced by municipal efforts.

There are many areas in which substantial Federal assistance to States and municipalities can be justified, but in so elementary a service as sanitation most or all of the responsibility is clearly local. Especially since it is demonstrable that the localities can do a pretty good job on their own.

Nixon Campaign Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's Long Beach Press-Telegram carried a remarkable article by Columnist Virginia Kelly discussing Vice President NIXON'S campaign techniques. Few statesmen in our Nation's history have had the vast knowledge and steady courage to adopt these techniques described as follows:

VICE PRESIDENT DEVELOPING DIALOG AS CAMPAIGN METHOD

(By Virginia Kelly)

Vice President NIXON has developed a campaign technique new to the modern world but which was recognized by Socrates as an ideal way of exchanging views.

Instead of making a formal campaign speech, Mr. NIXON, more and more, is adopting the 5-minute speech followed by a question and answer period. He used this procedure several times in California recently.

His listeners responded enthusiastically and asked questions on a wide range of subjects. For example, one woman asked why her tax deductions for her six children had not been increased in a ratio to the increased cost of living.

Many persons have asked questions about Mr. NIXON'S plans for national defense, if he is elected. He has answered that defense would receive his complete consideration and that the budget will not be an overriding consideration.

The Vice President is at his best in these informal exchanges. His manner is quietly friendly, and his listeners are visiby impressed that their questions receive his consideration.

Mr. NIXON'S advisers assert that he is the only candidate who has the necessary background, experience, and knowledge to risk these frank exchanges.

From the Vice President's viewpoint, he is finding out at firsthand, as no pollster could reveal, the issues which the American people consider most important.

In another unusual aspect, certainly not followed by most candidates, Mr. NIXON continues to write his own speeches which are short and full of punch. Reporters have long been weary of interminable speeches. The public seems to be of the same mind.

One of the major weaknesses of the highly intelligent Senator HUMPHREY is that he talks too long. Vice President NIXON'S short speech and questions and answers should help the NIXON campaign and should relieve the listener of dreadful boredom.

Disarmament Pact Without Good Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin points out very clearly and in a layman's language the many snares and pitfalls that we can fall into in our eagerness to outlaw atomic weapons.

All of us, all over the world, long for an end to this terrible threat that overshadows our civilization. But in our great longing for peace let us never forget that just as it takes two to make a quarrel, it is even more true that it takes two to make peace.

The article follows:

DISARMAMENT PACT WITHOUT GOOD FAITH

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

It is one of the tragic ironies of our age that, just when the case for eliminating war and the weapons of mass destruction is strongest, the difficulties of achieving a reliable control of arms limitation are most formidable. No reasonable person would dissent from the proposition that a war fought with thermonuclear weapons would almost certainly be one of the greatest disasters in the history of the human race.

But the very scientific progress that makes war potentially so horrible raises very difficult roadblocks in the way of effective international inspection and control. Two years ago Dr. Edward Teller, a great nuclear physicist with a first-rate political mind (an unusual combination), presented the obstacles to effective control in this lucid and convincing statement:

"Modern warmaking potential depends to an increasing degree on highly specialized weapons. Some of the most essential of these weapons can be hidden with relative ease. Nuclear explosives and long-range rockets are two outstanding examples. Thus surveillance becomes more and more difficult. In addition, scientific and technical developments have produced and will produce unexpected types of weapons. How shall we check whether such weapons exist when the person who does the checking does not even know what he is looking for? We have most correctly emphasized that no disarmament scheme is acceptable unless the application of it can be verified. Few things are impossible; but it may actually be impossible to verify disarmament in the Soviet Union. The game is strongly weighted against us and the very rules are changing too fast."

Every American, every citizen of a free country, should ponder carefully this reasoned statement before recklessly signing an emotional "Ban the Bomb" declaration or promoting a Western-Soviet convention on arms limitation that falls short of airtight elements of self-enforcement.

Agreed limitation of armaments would have been fairly simple in a time when warfare was less complex. It would have been feasible to count up divisions of men under arms, to list cannon and other firearms, to conduct a census of warships. But under modern conditions how is it possible to know how much fissionable material might be held back secretly, if there were an agreement to turn over all such material for peaceful uses?

And without a minute inspection that would be resented in the United States, that would almost certainly be rejected out of hand by the Soviet Union, how could there be any assurance that some laboratory ostensibly devoted to peaceful research was not working on some new weapon that might upset the entire balance of power? The free societies of the West are at a tremendous disadvantage in trying to work out a mutual system of controlled disarmament with the closed society of the Soviet Union.

One element in this disadvantage is that vocal pressure groups in the West are constantly pressing their governments to go well beyond the bounds of prudence in making concessions to the Soviet viewpoint, which has always been to permit as little outside inspection of Soviet military installations as possible. There is no corresponding pressure on the Soviet side. One doesn't find advertisements in Izvestia or Pravda, urging concessions to the Western position in the Geneva talks. Nor do "Ban the Bomb" enthusiasts gather around Soviet nuclear stations and stage noisy demonstrations. Soviet scientists do not stir up the feelings of the Soviet public with hair-raising images of clocks pointing very close to midnight in the history of the human race. Nor are there Soviet novels and films of the "On the Beach" variety.

Should a disarmament convention of some kind be concluded, there are two strong reasons for believing that it would be observed by the United States, while it could, and most probably would, be violated by the Soviet Union. First, there are pacifist and pro-Soviet groups in this country which would quickly pounce on any suspicion that American military authorities were engaged in forbidden activities. There would be nothing of the kind in the Soviet Union. Second, the geographical possibility of hiding away an important secret installation would be infinitely greater in the vast reaches of the Soviet Union or in Red China than in the generally accessible United States.

A far-reaching arms limitation treaty which the United States would keep and the Soviet Union could evade would be the deadliest trap into which the free world could walk. If there are tangible reductions in Soviet military preparation which can be conclusively verified, these should figure in our own estimates of military need. But in disarmament, as in everything else, a long experience of Soviet bad faith should make us steer clear of any commitments which are not 100 percent verifiable and self-enforcing. The conclusion of such a treaty would rank as our supreme national blunder. It is doubtful whether we would ever have the opportunity to make another.

Legion of Guardsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, identical to one already introduced by Mr. GROSS, to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen. The legion is a national veterans' organization with a record of outstanding service and accomplishment. Their efforts on behalf of the veteran, and on behalf of numerous worthy causes, are well known throughout the country, and they clearly deserve the recognition of a national charter. The purposes of the legion are: First, to perpetuate the friendship and associations of persons having served in the Armed Forces of the United States; second, to obtain recognition for its members for military services rendered; third, to foster and promote governmental legislation for the betterment of its members and for the welfare of the general community; and, fourth, to initiate and support ideas and to formulate plans to effect adequate national defense for the greater peace and security of our country.

This bill was introduced, but unfortunately was not passed, in the last Congress. I am most hopeful that we will meet with more success this session.

Telephone and Telegraph Excise Tax Repeal Must Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress should reject the administration proposal to continue excise taxes on telephone and telegraph service. As one of the cosponsors of legislation providing for the termination of this tax, effective July 1, 1960, I think it is essential that the Congress carry out the decision we reached last year.

The record clearly shows that the tax on telegraph and telephone service was rationalized in wartime as an emergency revenue measure and to discourage the use of our communications facilities. Today, neither of these reasons is any longer valid.

The South Dakota Public Utilities Commission has very clearly stated the case for repeal of the discriminatory telephone and telegraph excise tax. I ask unanimous consent to include the excellent resolution of the commission at this point in the RECORD:

At a regular session of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of South Dakota, held in its offices in the city of Pierre, the capital, this 20th day of February 1960, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas an excise tax is levied on telephone and telegraph service by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as a wartime emergency tax to help pay war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas there is no longer justification for imposing such tax for the purposes for which it was initially intended; and

Whereas telephone and telegraph are essential to the orderly transmission of information required in transaction of business and personal affairs; and

Whereas the tax imposes an undue hardship upon millions of individuals and businesses in this country, and it is discriminating in that no other public utility services are still so taxed; and

Whereas the maintenance of an adequate communications system is essential to the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of this country; and

Whereas the excise tax has been repealed effective July 1, 1960: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

SECTION 1. That the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to support the repeal and not reinstate the excise tax levied on telephone and telegraph service.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution shall be furnished to each Member of the South Dakota Delegation to Congress.

FRED LINDEKUGEL,
Chairman.
C. A. MERKLE,
Vice Chairman.
C. L. "ROY" DOHERTY,
Commissioner.

Does North Dakota Face Depopulation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the placing of entire farms in the soil bank is having a disastrous effect on the economy of North Dakota. Not only are the effects of this program felt in the rural areas, but on the main streets of our cities and towns as well. The following resolution adopted by the Hettinger Chamber of Commerce, Hettinger, N. Dak., reveals the concern which is now being felt in the cities over the depopulation which is going on in the rural areas of North Dakota:

The following resolution was introduced and passed by the Hettinger Chamber of Commerce, Hettinger, N. Dak., on January 26, 1960:

Resolved, That the Hettinger Chamber of Commerce, Hettinger, N. Dak., opposes any extension or further expansion of the soil-bank program in its present form, for the following reasons:

1. The soil-bank program is causing the depopulation of North Dakota and our rural areas. North Dakota does not have enough industry to hold all the farmers that soil bank their farm units, therefore, they move out of the State, either permanently or seasonally.

2. The soil-bank program is causing a decrease in business and it affects every business up and down Main Street in our rural towns because business (machinery, trucks, fuel oil, labor) which normally goes with the operation of these farms is lost. This pertains to every city and town in our State.

3. The soil-bank program makes it impossible for a young man, who wishes to start farming, to acquire land for that purpose. It also prevents young farmers who need to enlarge their operations, because of increasing costs, because retiring farmers put land in soil bank rather than putting it up for sale or rent.

4. The soil-bank program is increasing the tax burden on existing farm units and businessmen because taking these units out of operation eliminates personal property, such as cattle and machinery that goes with the operation of these farm units, thereby, decreasing the assessed personal property valuation in the township, counties, and the State.

5. The soil-bank program is creating a problem for the laboring man, especially in this area where we have little industry because the farmers who put part, or all their land in soil bank and, who do not move but of the State seek, employment in towns and cities and are in competition with laboring men who have no other way to make a living and who are not in a position to seek help from the Government.

6. The soil-bank program is not good for the morale of the people to have landowners living off the Government and the remaining farmers and businessmen paying the bill.

7. The soil-bank land presents a hazard to remaining farmers in the area because of possible uncontrolled weed and insect infestation, as well as fire hazards in our low rainfall area.

8. To maintain an equitable economic standing for farmers some type of assistance is needed but the present program—cut acreage and cut price—has partially caused the increase in yields per acre by farmers, because the cost per unit produced has to be small enough so that he can still show a profit at the end of the year, and the only alternative he has had is to increase yields so he can show a profit. The increasing of yields has about reached its limits including the above average farmer.

Norman B. Stevens, Vinton Henderson, J. Carleton Austad, Stanley R. Severson, A. H. Knickerbocker, LaVerne Stippich, C. L. Melby, Ellsworth Olm, Bud Feltman, Dale M. Quickstad, K. L. Christensen, Ira Martin, M. C. Halvorson, Clara Shea, R. B. Lindquist, Joseph Muth, Julius Goplin, Harry Swendsen, Ray Mayer, Lawrence R. McLaughlin, Karl C. Stahl, B. T. Olson, Calvin Steinbach, Wm. Schmidt, Emil Giese, Gunard Ramstead, William Reints, L. C. Manning, Gerhard Christianson, Joseph L. Clement, John L. Clement, William A. Beaumont.

Some Causes of Slump in National Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Los Angeles Times, November 16, 1959:

SOME CAUSES OF SLUMP IN NATIONAL CHARACTER

In Senator JOHN KENNEDY's recent Los Angeles speech he correctly pinpointed many of the unsavory qualities of our contemporary American character but failed to give us the cause.

"Complacency is predominant in our attitude," he says. "Where," he asks, "is the spirit, moral and physical, of our forefathers?" Indeed, where, Mr. Kennedy?

In addition, he pleads for a more Spartan type of attitude. Does he propose we go into the hills and suffer the rigors of nature to harden our bodies, or practice stoicism to temper our desires? Maybe there is another answer.

Begin by returning to us the freedom of choice, the freedom of self-responsibility. Allow us, to a degree, to sink or swim without a paternalistic Government that guarantees our future and invites us to merely float.

Permit us to reap a reward without it necessarily being 90 percent of parity. Give us the right to plan our own future, without the dictates of a special bureau, and allow us to seek the answer from our own human spirit.

Then you may find complacency replaced by courage and a moral and physical rise developed by the simple experience of probability. In short, Mr. Kennedy, return to us the element of risk.

Eliminate the insidious specter of a completely guaranteed security. Help us bequeath to our children wider horizons than the closed shop, the featherbed job, the risk-free pension and the yoke of rising taxes and a higher national debt.

Keep us busy planning our future and attending our own affairs and you may find the American spirit of our forefathers still alive in all of us.

If you regulate this flickering spirit until it dies out then our future is doomed.

F. R. BAKER,
SAN FERNANDO.

H.R. 10641

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 10641, a bill intended to improve educational facilities for the Indian children on certain Indian reservations. In my judgment, this is one of the important pieces of legislation to be passed at this session of Congress.

The bill applies to Indian reservations having within their boundaries land purchased by the Federal Government during the drought years of the thirties and which have been termed submarginal lands and by Executive order have been under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for administrative purposes during the past 20-odd years.

It provides that on such reservations where the county or local school districts have assumed the obligation of education of the Indian children, along with the obligation of education of the non-Indian children, that such county school districts or local school districts shall have the additional inducement of the rental money which is received from such submarginal lands, such rental moneys to be paid to such school districts in lieu of normal tax revenues from such real property.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall execute a lease contract with the Commissioner of School and Public Lands of the State in which such reservation is located, and that the Commissioner in turn shall sublease the lands to Indian or non-Indian ranchers, and that the revenue therefrom shall be paid to the districts wherein such land is situated, which districts are assuming the obligation of education of the Indian children.

The purpose of this legislation is twofold: First, it compensates the school district, and the taxpayers of that school district, for their diligence in providing public educational facilities for the Indian children. There is no question in my mind, and I believe no question in the mind of anyone but that the Indian children obtain a better education in public schools attended by Indians and non-Indian children alike than they do in the Government-maintained and Government-operated, segregated Indian schools.

Second, this bill, if passed, would serve as a great inducement for counties and school districts situated within the outer borders of an Indian reservation, having submarginal lands within its area, to do a better job of improving the school facilities and do a better job of providing educational facilities for the Indian, as well as non-Indian students.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, there is only one solution to the so-called Indian problem and that is education. This bill is a step toward improving those educational facilities.

There is another phase I wish to mention. In school districts such as the Todd County School District in my State, which embraces the entire unorganized county, the school system is handled under a county board. This county has gone a long way in taking over the educational facilities on the entire reservation. The only school in the county that is not completely integrated is the Government school situated at the Agency headquarters in Rosebud. The county high school, located at Mission, is completely integrated with more than 50 percent of the students coming from Indian homes. It is an example of what can be accomplished.

The Government, of course, makes payment to the Todd County School District through a Johnson-O'Malley contract or through Public Law 874, but these payments do not compensate the school district for the cost of operating the school for these Indian children. The additional revenue arising from the leases on this submarginal land would go a long way toward filling the gap of compensating the school district for the cost to the taxpayers of this additional educational burden.

When these lands were originally purchased by the Federal Government and taken off the tax rolls, it was stated at the time that this land was being purchased for the benefit of the Indian people. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian people can be more fully and completely benefited than by the use of the revenues from these lands to help pay the cost of the education of their children.

This bill has the support of the taxpaying public in these counties, and it has the support of the thinking Indian people who believe in better education for the Indian children and who believe in improving their circumstances through the better education, and the integrated education, of their children.

The Wealth of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 23, 1960:

THE WEALTH OF ILLINOIS

Illinois is a wealthy industrial State, but it also is one of the richest diversified farming areas in the world.

The farm wealth of this State is revealed in a recent study made by the United States and Illinois departments of agriculture. The total value of the corn crop in Illinois last year was $727 million, and the total value of livestock in the State on farms January 1, 1960, was $726 million. Interestingly enough, the industrial wealth of the State can be seen in a comparison with these figures. Caterpillar Tractor Co. had gross sales for the year totaling $742 million.

Illinois ranks first in the growing of soybeans, second in corn and hogs and is important in the production of oats, wheat, cattle, sheep, poultry, dairy products, and fruits and vegetables.

Illinois has 7 of the 10 leading corn counties of the United States, with McLean ranking first in the Nation. It has 6 of the 10 leading soybean counties, with Champaign first, and it has 2 of the 10 leading hog counties, with Henry in first place.

This State and her immediate neighbors make up the American Corn Belt and thus contribute significantly to the Nation's food supply. Illinois' 10 million people live in a rich State, both industrially and agriculturally.

U.S. Day Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article of Columnist George Todt in the San Fernando Valley Times of October 23, 1959, won for Mr. Todt a Freedom Foundation George Washington Honor Medal. Announcement was made on Washington's Birthday, February 22, at Valley Forge, Pa., during the ceremonies commemorating the 228th birthday of the Nation's first President.

In my opinion, the article certainly merits reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and under unanimous consent I include it, for it is, indeed, a classic:

U.S. DAY THOUGHTS

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."—American pledge of allegiance.

A lot of practical, down-to-earth citizens are celebrating U.S. Day throughout our Nation today and it seems like a good idea from this corner.

Starry-eyed dreamers to the contrary, the world's mightiest fortress of freedom is right here in the American Republic—just as it always has been since the day the Founding Fathers designed this country of ours to become the most nearly libertarian government the earth has yet seen or known in practice.

The planet's highest standard of living and the greatest amount of free agency for mankind in all its history has been produced by the American dream, and it is something of which we all should feel proud. But do we?

Those who do not love America ought to go somewhere else to live and there demonstrate their loyalty to the country of their choice. They are free to travel and there is no iron curtain over the Passport Division of the Department of State—except for fifth column Communists.

The overwhelming majority of the solid, patriotic citizenry of this Nation would never miss the ill-assorted bevy of creeps whose most identifying characteristic is an inordinate ability to bite the hand which has fed them so well in the past.

Just as we admire the quality of loyalty in a human being, so must we despise the other side of the coin—which is ingratitude.

No people who ever lived in this mundane existence have had more to be grateful for than the citizens of our Republic.

The most profound students of history will search in vain for a system of government so truly liberal and progressive—in the original meaning of those terms as expressed by our Founding Fathers almost 200 years ago—as that provided by the United States of America.

We do not pretend to perfection by any manner of means, but surely there has never been another nation, now or in the past, which provided such copious draughts of human freedom to its citizens as has ours here on the North American Continent.

Speaking philosophically the American Republic has been something akin to a modern temple of liberty and the beckoning torch of mankind's aspirations to rise from the dust of bondage throughout the world to a place of individual dignity, justice and worth.

And that torch of which I now speak has attracted more than 50 millions of foreign peoples, mainly Europeans, to our shores in previous times to participate with us in the blessings of citizenship and freedom, American style. This is the proof of the pudding.

For those immigrants of ours in past generations came here seeking riches of the spirit and the mind, not of the purse. At least most of them did. And in the process of the Nation's development, many of such entrepreneurs in human freedom amassed great fortunes along the way.

Undoubtedly they did so because of the unique incentive system of free enterprise with which this Nation was parlayed from a tiny seaboard federation of States numbering 3 millions of souls into the most powerful nation on earth in less than two centuries of time.

Ours has been an amazing sage of industrial development, political freedom and fateful destiny. Where will it end? What will the future hold for us? Who can tell?

Of one thing we all may feel quite certain; to the true liberal who prides himself on progressive developments for humanity, there is nothing so important to the equation as the ingredient of individual liberty and what we have sometimes called the God-given free agency of man.

More than any other nation yet produced on the face of the earth—anytime, anyplace or anywhere—the Republic of the United States has done more to exemplify such a concept in the minds and hearts of human beings everywhere than any other of her contemporaries, past or present, on the world stage.

Ours is truly a temple of liberty to every human soul that stands universally for freedom from bondage and tyranny.

We must never allow alien ideologies to pull down the pillars which support this temple of liberty.

Let us remember that man's noblest trait which separates him from barbarian and beast alike is his loyalty—loyalty to family, loyalty to country and loyalty to God.

Yes; today is U.S. Day and let's not forget to hang out the flag, if we have one at home or our place of business.

Let's be proud of our loyalty to our country and give her the unselfish love and respect which she so richly deserves. Can do?

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, before long we will be considering on the floor of the House some form of Federal aid to education bill, and while I personally have consistently opposed any Federal aid to education scheme, believing that in this area we have a State and local responsibility, there is seldom as high ranking an educator as our own superintendent of public schools and a member of the NEA who will go on record as being similarly so opposed.

Dr. Mark W. Bills, superintendent of our Peoria public schools, has done an outstanding job in improving the curriculum in our public school system and spurring our citizens on in our new and renovating construction program to the point where we are meeting the need. True, it called for an increase in taxes locally, but this is where the responsibility rests. It seems to me that our educators throughout the country ought to be directing their efforts toward influencing and convincing the communities in which they live that the answer to our education problem cannot be solved in Washington, but right at home.

Educators generally are articulate and well informed. When Superintendent Mark Bills and his associates presented the problem to not only our school board but to the public generally in clear, concise and ungarbled language, the community responded by favorable referendum. I see no reason why every community in the United States with its energies and resources properly channeled under wise leadership such as that exemplified by Dr. Mark Bills cannot produce the same results.

Mr. Speaker, I should like printed at this point in the RECORD the full text of Dr. Mark Bill's letter, together with the portion of the bulletin to which he alludes entitled "Applications for Participation in Title III, NDEA."

PEORIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Peoria, Ill., February 23, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The gravity of the issue and my deep personal interest prompt me to reaffirm thoughts related to Federal aid for elementary and secondary public schools. This is the second communication I have ever sent to any public official during my entire lifetime. Hence, I am neither a chronic nor regular letter writer.

First of all, State and local control over schools and educational programs is fundamental in our heritage. In my judgment, no circumstances, nationally or internationally warrant discarding that principle under the guise of "defense." Hence, I believe that the principle itself is not only a basic part of our heritage, but that it is uniquely essential to democracy.

Secondly, the needs have been grossly exaggerated. Using very debatable yardsticks or standards for buildings and classrooms, the NEA spokesmen and other proponents of Federal aid have presented needs that cannot be honestly justified. Hundreds of buildings and classrooms rated as inadequate or unfit can be rehabilitated. Other hundreds were being modernized, even as the data were finalized. So, the standards or yardsticks are arbitrary and full of padding.

Thirdly, it is vitally important to point out that the educator-proponents for Federal aid, are the same leaders who are responsible for philosophies and programs now cited as needing relief, repair, strengthening. In short, the very leaders who sold American education the philosophies and programs responsible for our weaknesses are now seeking Federal aid to bail them out.

The real renaissance in American education is coming from lay boards of education, a few dedicated administrators, and some university quarters. The professional educational organizations have not yet officially espoused any basic program changes. Their only answers are more money for buildings, teachers' salaries, and a patchwork of repair work. The profession and its spokesmen have not yet offered any fundamental changes in institutional philosophy or program presentation. Those proposals have come from other sources.

The following quotation from Time, February 15, 1960 (p. 23), is pertinent: "Federal grants might help to raise salaries and speed classroom construction in lagging areas of the United States, but essentially the problem is one that faraway Washington is incapable of solving."

Program changes, new buildings, consolidations are taking place all over the Nation. I have been in education 35 years, and I have never witnessed such activity in schools. Local communities, local administrators, citizens and their boards are changing programs at an amazing rate, and doing it competently, too. The last thing they need is a master plan, a patchwork job, costly supervision.

The country is getting busy about education. Students are more serious. Standards are being raised. More and better candidates for teaching are enrolled in our colleges and universities. The change is taking place.

In the fourth place, Federal controls are inevitable with Federal aid. If there be any doubt, take a look at what is happening in Illinois. Additions to the staff of the Illinois State Department of Public Instruction, just to administer the NDEA, are beyond all reason. Many of these consultants cannot "carry water" for the personnel or systems they are assigned to supervise.

Qualifying conditions are built into the act and constitute ridiculous conditions, even when aid is sought. In a neighboring school, a language laboratory equipped with NDEA and local funds can be used only for modern foreign languages and stands idle when it could be used for speech, Latin, etc. But not under NDEA provisions. The enclosed bulletin from the office of our Peoria County Superintendent of Schools is typical. Note, the county superintendent is the agent of the State department and cannot be blamed in any way. He is only carrying out orders. It is important to point out the fact that within the profession of education there is a very large group that is vigorously opposed to Federal aid under any plan offered to date. Members of this group, like myself, can speak only as individuals against the heavily subsidized and organized front for the NEA and others. Nevertheless, this is a large group, notwithstanding the difficulties of being articulate.

The privilege of offering criticism calls for some constructive suggestions. Here are some thoughts which I should like to offer:

1. Enlist the power and influence of all agencies and news media to alert the Nation to the need for improvements in education. This is the democratic way, and I believe that the response will be better—in the long run—than any hasty, emergency, centralized plan. This would call for a saturation interpretation appeal, like bond drives, etc.

2. Call together representative laymen and carefully selected professional educators to draft desirable standards for: (a) elementary and secondary programs; (b) college-university programs; and (c) teacher-training.

This would be an attempt to develop standards without Federal controls. The influence of the Federal Government would be used to support State, local, and institutional leadership.

3. Aid could be given to bona fide hardship areas on temporary plans with the emphasis upon developing self-sufficient resources.

4. Aid for graduate students who have established their ability and motivations is one of the most attractive items.

Suggestion No. 2 is the most important. If these meetings were to be controlled by educators the outcomes would be of little value. There must be some real changes in philosophy, methods, and programs, if any real voluntary gains are to result.

Sincerely,

MARK W. BILLS,
Superintendent.

APPLICATIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN TITLE III, NDEA

Schools desiring to participate in title III of the NDEA who were not represented at the informational meeting held at Galesburg on February 1 will need to write to Mr. Chesko at Springfield for the necessary application blanks.

When an application is ready to be submitted, the district must notify Mr. Chesko and request that its school(s) should be put on the list for a consultant to visit. The application is not to be submitted until a consultant has visited your school(s) and evaluated your program.

Mr. Chesko must be notified by April 15 that you will submit an application. Otherwise, it will be assumed that you will not participate.

In order to assist you in determining whether or not your school(s) should participate, we are enclosing a sheet giving criteria for priority of consideration of applications, title III, and two sheets showing the ratio for reimbursement for allowable programs. This ratio is the same for all three areas included under title III.

If you have not received a copy of the "Purchase Guide" for programs in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and would like to have one, we have a limited number of copies left at the office.

Foreign Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call attention to the article which appeared in Time magazine of February 22, 1960, regarding unidentified foreign submarines in Argentine waters. I call attention to this article because of my previous remarks on the subject of Soviet submarines and bases therefor:

ARGENTINA—THE PING IN GOLFO NUEVO

Unidentified foreign submarines tend to show up in Argentine waters about the same time as naval appropriations bills show up in Congress. Two years ago, the Argentine Navy made brief contact with what it said was a sub in desolate Golfo Nuevo, 650 miles southwest of Buenos Aires, and a month later got to buy an aircraft carrier; last year it sighted another elusive submarine, got enough money from Congress to buy planes. Last week, as Navy Secretary Rear Adm. Gaston Clement was doing fiscal battle with economy-minded Economics Minister Alvaro Alsogaray, a submarine—or something—was again roiling the waters of Golfo Nuevo.

Newspapers, including Buenos Aires' Clarin, genially kidded the government about the sub for a while. But as more than 30 planes and a dozen warships flailed Golfo Nuevo to foam with showers of depth charges, as troops in full battle dress moved up to the bleak Patagonian shoreline, as the Puerto Madryn air and naval base at the gulf's head went on a war footing, as U.S. planes rushed emergency equipment to the scene, the skeptics stopped in midsnicker. Most important of all, President Arturo Frondizi took it seriously, and presumably the navy would not dare to mislead him.

Blackout: The intruder was first sighted, at midmorning 3 weeks ago, by a sonar operator during a training-patrol mission of three destroyers. The sonar's ping indicated a solid object moving slowly 90 feet below the surface of the 30- by 40-mile Golfo Nuevo. The sonar target outsped the attacking destroyers, and out went a call for planes. A few hours later, a Neptune anti-sub plane reported spotting a submarine; ships and planes attacked, but the target disappeared.

The Navy declared Golfo Nuevo a war area, out of bounds to airliners and ships, and blacked out the Puerto Madryn base. It sent intelligence agents on house-to-house searches ashore, put three destroyers, 18 warplanes, and some helicopters to patrolling the gulf itself, and lined up five warships at the 7-mile entrance, where the depth is only 60 feet. For top security, ships communicated with one another in the Guarani Indian dialect, spoken by Paraguayan naval cadets aboard the Argentine vessels for training.

Five days later, sonar operators made the second hard contact, but an attack only sent the intruder to 420 feet, well beyond the 300-foot range of the Argentine depth charges. On the eighth day, radar spotted a sub, or its snorkel, above the surface. The target dived to 540 feet, but the pursuers heard a sound like hammering for the next 2 days, possibly indicating damage being repaired.

U.S. help: The Argentine Navy Ministry called in the U.S. Naval attaché; he sent his assistant to the scene. Hours after the assistant returned, U.S. Ambassador Willard Beaulac was closeted with President Frondizi. Next day, Washington announced that it had sold Buenos Aires $25,000 worth of electronic equipment, aircraft flares, depth charges; and two well-loaded Globemasters took off for Argentina.

At week's end, the Argentine navy officially announced that a "second unidentified submarine" had moved into Golfo Nuevo "with the apparent purpose of helping" its trapped and crippled sister.

There was not a scintilla of hard evidence to indicate what a submarine would be doing prowling around the desolate Patagonian coast or to suggest its nationality, except that the U.S. and British Ambassadors promptly disclaimed ownership. Sonar can confuse submarines with whales, old wrecks, even undersea prominences. Most of the world still waited for the Argentine navy to produce a real-life submarine. If it does, the reward may be the biggest appropriations yet.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the significance of the rural electrification program to rural America, I call the attention of this body to the address of my colleague, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, before the 18th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis on February 22 of this year.

The address follows:

THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF REA

(Address of Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, before the 18th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 22, 1960)

Having served more or less as your banker for 17 of the 25 years REA has been in existence, it is only natural that I would concern myself with the economics of your program. As a member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee since 1943, it has been my privilege to give my stamp of approval and my legislative support to 90 percent of the $3½ billion advanced to REA borrowers in the last 25 years. In 1947–48 when I was acting chairman of the subcommittee we brought out and passed the largest REA loan authorization in history, a total of $800 million. Coming from a Minnesota farm direct to Congress was sufficient reason to become one of your active supporters.

I cite these figures as a premise to a statement I want to make to you. In my considered judgment, from a purely economic standpoint, I know of no categorical use of public funds during my 22 years in Congress that has been more beneficial and more worthwhile to our Nation and to our people than our program of loans to REA cooperatives. In the next few minutes I shall lay before you facts and figures to sustain that conclusion.

It is unfortunately true that the REA program has been publicly maligned, abused, misrepresented, and distorted throughout the last quarter of a century and the attack grows in intensity by the day. To compound this felony of slander and defamation, some of the most pointed attacks have originated with people who know better. And if that were not enough, collateral beneficiaries of this very program have joined in the clamor.

Let me illustrate. This is a very painful time of year for people who are faced with the burden of making up income tax returns and finding the money to pay what they owe. One of these tormented citizens sits down to compile his report and as he adds up his dividends from the private power company in which he owns stock he is reminded of the advertisements he has read condemning the so-called giveaways of REA and related programs. He is convinced that elimination of such programs will boom his dividends, slash his income tax liability, and save us from socialism. He not only believes that, but he fires off a letter to his Congressman demanding action. Fortunately, however, Congress has not been swayed by his mistaken analysis.

Now let us look fairly and squarely at the whole economic picture. In the last 10 years, REA cooperatives have bought more than half a billion dollars worth of electrical energy from power companies. Think of that—a $500 million market for the private power companies created by the REA program, and the figure is rising to the point where it will probably hit a $100 million a year in the near future. We haven't robbed them of a market—we've given them one.

Our indignant complainant may also own some stock in General Electric, or Westinghouse, or RCA, or any of the other numerous firms in the electrical appliance and electronics business. Let us briefly review the economic worth of our REA program to these companies and corporations. Studies made early in 1957 on 10 REA-financed systems indicated that for each dollar of REA loan funds drawn down, farm consumers receiving energy through these loans had invested in electrical equipment, appliances, and wiring an average of $4.04. These studies found that farmers served by REA cooperatives invested an average of $2,572 per farm in farmstead wiring, electrical home appliances, farm equipment and such. In other words, we have created a new market with private industry for appliances and equipment at the rate of $4 for every $1 loaned or a grand total of at least $14 billion. In addition, there will be a replacement market of over $1 billion a year, and you can add to this the additional market for new developments in the electrical and electronics fields. As you can see, that indignant citizen certainly has nothing to be indignant about.

Before I came to Congress, you could practically count the electrical appliance dealers in my district on the fingers of your two hands. Today, in those 19 rural counties, there are literally hundreds of small businessmen handling partial or complete lines of such equipment. By the creation of this new market for manufactured goods we opened up small business opportunities all over the land. A good many ex-servicemen today have businesses as a result of what REA has done for rural America.

The critics of our rural electrification program have failed completely in their frontal assaults. The combined efforts of your association and your stalwart friends in the Congress have created a defense which has stood the test, but our critics are men of imagination, and they have refined their attack. In recent years they have tried to close out the Government program and send you to the private money market for your loans, and they have launched a tremendous campaign to raise the interest rates.

As a word of warning, I urge that you not take lightly these proposals. Inflationary forces and a tightening money market have led to a rising spiral of interest rates over which our Government has little or no control, and to those not intimately acquainted with the REA loan program the proposed changes are most appealing. This is one of the most serious threats to both the REA and RTA loan programs in many years, and we can do well to counsel upon it.

You should know that my subcommittee has stood firm on this issue, and any compliment you pay us must be shared by our able chairman, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, and the other members of the subcommittee. We have been united on this issue. In recent hearings we have repeatedly told witnesses from the Department of Agriculture that we would not entertain any substantive changes in the REA loan program. And we went one important step beyond that when we told the Department officially that none of the appropriated funds were to be used to even study the question. Although I cannot speak today for all of the Members of the subcommittee, I can speak for myself and I say flatly and unequivocally that I see no reason to change the REA loan program or the rate of interest on the loans.

Two years ago, believe it or not, the proposal was actually made to my subcommittee that future REA loans be obtained from the private money market at a cost of at least 5 percent to the cooperatives. It was also proposed that these lenders be given a first mortgage on REA assets, and we pointed out to the gentlemen from the Department

that this proposal would, in a period of depression, literally turn REA as we know it over to the private companies and their financiers. We shot this trial balloon down before it even got off the ground.

Since I believe we have stopped for the time being this effort to destroy the REA loan program, I will not go into any detailed discussion of the proposal to send you into the private money market for your loans. However, I do want to set the record straight on the interest rate question.

The 2 percent interest rate is not nearly so shocking when you bring to light the fact that the civil service retirement fund has about $9 billion invested in special Treasury issues at an average rate of 2.58 percent. The Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund—social security—has about $16 billion invested in Treasury issues at an average rate of about 2.56 percent. And until recently the U.S. Treasury was paying only 3 percent on more than $5½ billion of GI insurance trust funds. In comparison with the rate of interest paid on these Government retirement and trust funds, the REA rate is not very far out of line.

But do not make the mistake of justifying the REA interest rate by comparison with other interest payments because that actually has nothing to do with it. We have a 2 percent interest rate on REA loans for several very practical reasons. In the first place, REA cooperatives are called upon to provide electrical energy in the less profitable areas—the skim milk areas. The more lucrative areas, rich with cream, have long been served by others and the cooperatives have had to go in where no one else was willing to go. This, alone, justifies the favorable interest rate in my opinion.

Secondly, the financial structure of many cooperatives could not sustain a substantial increase in interest rates. If the REA program is to be a matter of public policy, then I maintain that public policy must also include the provision of loans at a rate the cooperatives can afford to pay and stay in business.

Thirdly, we are bringing electrical energy to rural America in order to afford farm people an equitable share of our national progress. As I see it, this is one of the few places where farm people in the United States have a chance to share equally with their more fortunate neighbors and it is the last farm program that should be put in jeopardy.

Finally, I maintain that the U.S. Treasury has profited substantially from the REA loan program. As I said earlier, we have generated a market for electrical equipment in the amount of at least $14 billion. The Federal excise, income, corporate, and other taxes generated by this volume of business has repaid the U.S. Treasury several times over any discount we may have had through our 2 percent interest rate loans to REA cooperatives.

Let me repeat what I said in the beginning. I consider our REA loan program one of the most beneficial from a purely economic viewpoint of any program devised by the Congress of the United States. Because I believe this I urge you to unite in support of your very able General Manager Clyde Ellis and the officers of your association in defense of the REA loan program as it exists today. Your friends in Congress will back you up.

These are some of the basic economic facts of our REA program. But we are a people who place spiritual and moral values above the dollar sign, so let us look briefly at some of these aspects of this program which has been so richly endowed with the capacity to lighten the burdens and the lives of farm people.

The great majority of farm and other rural residents have just recently moved into the wondrous electrical age. The upsurge in consumption of electrical energy bears witness to this development. In the last 15 years, the average kilowatt-hour consumption of farm consumers served by REA cooperatives has increased four times over—from 90 kilowatt-hours monthly in 1946 to 350 kilowatt-hours in 1959.

With the help of electrical equipment the workday of the farmer and the farm housewife have been shortened and the burdens lightened. Electrical water systems have modernized farm homes. Refrigeration safeguards food supplies and brings to market better quality products for nonfarm consumption. And the young people who represent the future of American agriculture now find rural living equally attractive as a home in town.

The introduction of electrical energy on American farms has probably done more than anything else to facilitate the production of high quality consumer goods and improve the efficiency of farm people. I can remember milking 8 to 12 cows by hand with the aid of a smoky lantern—and today 1 man in an electrified dairy barn can handle 5 to 6 times that number. Think what consumers would have to pay for their milk products if we didn't have milking machines to cut the cost of production. In our early farming days it was our backs and hands that provided the means of moving tons of silage, grain, hay, milk, and manure for our herds. Now we use our heads and a finger pushing a button on a switch does most of the job in a modern, electrified operation. Through electricity, farming is no longer drudgery.

If we as farmers could only be assured of an income commensurate with that of other segments of our population, our farm homes would be just as bright as electricity can make them. But if farm people must endure an income position at the bottom of the economic ladder in the United States, let us at least provide electricity so a farmer in my district can watch a television show and forget for the moment what the low-price programs of Ezra Taft Benson have done to his pocketbook. I think that's the least we can expect.

When Clyde Ellis asked me to come down to St. Louis and meet with you, I had no doubt in my mind that you would substantially agree with what I had to say about the REA program. I hope you have agreed that you will continue to give us your full support in our efforts to protect your program in the Halls of Congress.

I hope also that you recognize the vital importance of a sound agricultural economy to the fulfillment of your legitimate goals and ambitions. It is a remarkable tribute to your management ability that you have made the progress you have in the face of declining farm income, but I predict that your greatest era of growth and service lies ahead if we can bring economic parity to rural America.

Farm people are eternal optimists. They have to be to face the hazards and uncertainties that accompany the tilling of the soil and the tending of livestock. Because we always believe that tomorrow will be better than yesterday, I entertain the hope that our basic problems will soon be resolved with the help of an understanding public. We believe in the justice of our cause, and we have confidence in the fairness of the American people.

Let us go forward in our march of progress with faith in the future of this great land. REA has shown the road to better living, and it has demonstrated to the world that under our system there is ample opportunity to share equally the benefits of our technology.

It is now incumbent upon the Congress to face up to its responsibilities and assure to agriculture's 15 million Americans their just share of our national income. With the help of REA and with fair prices for that which we produce, our sons who till the soil will continue to be the backbone of this great country of ours.

These 15 million farm people are able and willing to feed the teeming millions at home and abroad. All we ask is our fair share of America's prosperity and the good life guaranteed to all our people by our system of self-government.

In the last quarter of a century, the darkness has left our farms. For the good of our people, the light must remain and the economic shadows must be dispersed.

Interest Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward H. Collins in his column in the New York Times of February 1, 1960, discusses the findings on chapter 9, section 5 of the Staff Report of the Joint Economic Committee, on its study of "Employment, Growth and Price Levels," as follows:

CONFLICT ON THE DEBT—A STUDY FINDS REPORT OVERVALUED ROLE OF U.S. BORROWING IN MARKET

(By Edward H. Collins)

Three weeks ago this column discussed one section of the Joint Economic Committee's Staff Report on its study of "Employment, Growth and Price Levels"—the document that presumably was to be the chief reliance of the committee in arriving at its final recommendations. This was section V of chapter 9. Main responsibility for the chapter as a whole, "Monetary Policy and Debt Management," is attributed to Warren L. Smith.

The findings on chapter 9, section V, here was somewhat less than enthusiastic. As this writer saw it, while the author's diagnosis of the present debt management problem was sound enough, the treatment prescribed seemed to add up to a series of suggestions for relieving the patient of his pain while studiously avoiding any proposal for dealing with the major cause of the illness.

PLIGHT OF MANAGERS

The term "plight" in the case of the debt managers, refers to the deterioration of the market for long-term direct Treasury obligations compared with other long-term bond issues. The problem has been gratuitously complicated by the refusal of Congress to remove the ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates on Treasury bond issues. But it stems basically from the emergence of new and competitive outlets for long-term investment funds—an emergence that has coincided with, and is to a considerable extent responsible for, a demand for long-term loans that tends to outrun the amount of the Nation's savings available for investment.

As Paul Heffernan, of the New York Times financial staff, recently put it: "The Government is embarrassed by financial competition with itself." More specifically, he added: "In the long-term market Treasury bonds go begging while investors buy higher yielding mortgage bonds guaranteed or insured by the Government itself. Meanwhile, in the short-term market, Treasury bills must compete with the short-dated paper of Fannie Mae, the land banks, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and other Government agencies.

The staff report of the Joint Committee makes no secret of the fact that it is aware of this state of affairs. Yields on Federal issues, it observes, have increased relative to those of other major borrowers, and this has occurred despite the fact that the Federal marketable debt has risen by only about $9 billion in the last decade, while the overall increase in national indebtedness (public and private) has expanded by approximately $350 billion.

With this background in mind, it might be advisable for anyone who contemplates reading the report of the Joint Committee itself, which was released last week, to see that he is firmly braced as he finds himself nearing page 37 of that document. It must be remembered that the legislators who wrote the majority findings of that report, if they are not the hardcore of the forces defending the 4¼-percent Treasury bond ceiling, are at least a representative cross section of them. Their uncritical acceptance of the general view that demand and supply are the culprits accountable for the low estate to which long-term governments have fallen in popularity would be tantamount to an admission of the unwisdom of their position on this issue.

DENY EVERYTHING

For reasons, however, that are, to this writer at least, completely inscrutable, the committee has decided, despite the delicate nature of the issue, to throw caution to the winds. Ignoring, not only the general view, but that of its own staff experts, it has fallen back on what appears to be that cynical injunction, "Deny everything." It has decided to meet the facts head on, with the result that what history teaches us is the inevitable consequence of such a course.

They have decided not only to deny the contentions of the demand-supply theorists, but to reply with a thesis that is its exact antithesis. It seems, according to the remarkable rebuttal of the committee, that, far from being unable to compete on even terms with the new, subsidized competition with which they are faced, the debt managers, as overwhelmingly the largest borrowers in the market, are actually in a position where they dominate the market to the point at which we now have imperfect competition.

The argument mounted in defense of this thesis is not only absurd; it borders on the ludicrous. We are told that in 1958 the Treasury's borrowings totaled $62,200 million. As against this, we are told, corporate borrowing were only $11,400 million and the borrowings of state and local government only $7,800 million. In short, in the words of the committee, the Federal Government borrowed more than three quarters of the funds raised in the long-term market. It is perhaps sufficient to say that of this imposing, but meaningless, figure, $22 billion can be ignored at the start since, as the committees own staff experts observed, it represented sales to Government trust funds and the Federal Reserve banks, which are, for purposes of this discussion, "fictitious transactions."

Since the question here is "How great a demand did the Treasury make on the Nation's supply of investment funds?", the next step is to lop off from the remaining $40,200 million the $32,200 million of refunding operation, which represented merely the exchange of one issue for another. This brings us to $7,800 million, which, needless to say, is a fairly far cry from the committee's imposing total of $62,200 million.

But even that is a gross overstatement of the facts. In 1958 the Treasury showed a net addition of $10,100 million to its short-term marketable debt; but the total of its long-term debt outstanding rose by a mere $1,300 million. Not satisfied with choosing a year of exceptionally heavy Government borrowing to make their case, fantastically overstating the total of 1958 Treasury borrowing and representing short-term and long-term debt. The authors conveniently omitted to include in their tabulation the most important single competitor of the Treasury in the long-term market, namely, the gigantic total represented by mortgage loans.

Just to put the picture in something like perspective, here is how the major borrowing groups shared in the long-term market for loans in the 6-year period 1953–59:

	In billions
U.S. Treasury	2.5
Mortgage borrowing	80.5
State and municipal issues	25.1
Corporate issues	75.9
Total	184.0

In this table, Treasury long-term borrowing refers to issues of 10 years and upward. If this is broadened to include short-term bonds (5 to 10 years) the figure becomes 10,100 million. In that case it would represent 5.3 percent of the new total, which would of course become $191,600 million.

Thunder From Syria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post on February 24, 1960:

THUNDER FROM SYRIA

President Nasser's bristling comments in Damascus probably derive more from separatist problems in Syria than from any imminent danger of war with Israel. The United Arab Republic has been havings its troubles consolidating the merger between Egypt and Syria, and for a dictator to divert attention by invoking foreign threats is an old technique. Colonel Nasser managed to deliver verbal broadsides against just about everyone—the United States, Britain, and France for the old status quo tripartite agreement of 1950, the Communists, the Kassem regime in Iraq and of course Israel. Simultaneously Cairo newspapers have been talking of force against Israel.

There seems to be nothing to the bogey of Israeli mobilization. Nevertheless, the Nasser line is disturbing because it continues to ignore the role of the United States at the time of the Suez invasion and because it emphasizes the irreconcilability of relations in the Near East. The bluster coincides with the warning by United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold that the power of the U.N. secretariat is limited in the impasse between Israel and the Arab States which is falling back into a dangerous situation.

The problem in its immediate form arises from Israel's plans for water development and concern with the demilitarized zone on her borders, but more basically it stems from the discrimination in the Suez Canal. Not only can no Israeli ship transit the canal, but for nearly a year the UAR has been halting other ships with non-military cargoes from Israel. International law, past Security Council directives and the work of Mr. Hammarskjold have been unavailing.

Happily the U.S. Navy has rescinded a humiliating directive holding the owners of chartered ships which have traded with Israel responsible for any delays occasioned by Arab refusal to accommodate such ships. This sort of cringing by a great nation merely abetted the Arab boycott, and the offensive rule has been properly stricken. Unfortunately, nothing effective has been done to bear out President Eisenhower's public assumption at the time of the Israeli withdrawal from Gaza 3 years ago that there would be no blockade restrictions against Israel in the Suez Canal and that if obstructions should occur there would be firm action by the society of nations.

It is unnecessary to endorse particular Israeli moves or to disregard the desirability of improved relations with the UAR to understand the principle at stake. What action might be feasible short of force is debatable, but the problem at least warrants the attention of the Security Council and General Assembly. In rendering mere lip service to the principle this country encourages President Nasser's thunder.

Take Another Look, Mr. Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of February 24, 1960:

TAKE ANOTHER LOOK, MR. KEARNS

Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, apparently takes a light view of the foreign textile import situation and it is disturbing.

It is disturbing because Kearns is the Government official thought to be most closely identified with U.S. textile policy on foreign problems.

Speaking to textile leaders in Charlotte recently, Kearns said that he found "no obvious correlation" between imports of foreign textiles and economic changes in the domestic textile industry.

That's Kearns' opinion. Men in the textile business say that foreign textile imports are hurting the U.S. textile industry. They say that many textile plants have been forced to shut down and one of the primary reasons is unfair competition from cheap textile imports. They say we are, in effect, exporting American jobs.

In an advertisement in today's Evening Herald, J. P. Stevens and Co., Inc., points out that a Senate committee studied the problems of the American textile industry more than a year ago. The committee recommended that the flow of foreign textile products into this country be regulated. Says the advertisement, "To date, no action has been taken on this recommendation."

Perhaps the reason no action has been taken is the attitude of men like Kearns who are in positions of authority in the Government.

As pointed out in the Stevens' advertisement, the textile industry realizes that trade between nations is helpful and desirable.

The advertisement says, "Our foreign trade policy is an integral part of our Government's overall foreign policy, which should be respected for the important job it does. There

is no question of willingness to share the load to enable the country to carry the economic burden of an enlightened foreign policy. In sharing, however, circumstances have placed an undue portion of the burden on the American textile industry. * * *"

Our textile leaders say the textile industry is being hurt by foreign imports. Kearns says it isn't. Who are we to believe?

The leaders of the textile industry are men who should know what's good and what's bad for the industry—their welfare and the welfare of the industry depend on it. They say imports are bad for the industry and they can't all be entirely wrong.

We suggest Mr. Kearns take another, and closer, look at the situation.

The Advertiser's Right To Toot His Own Horn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk to the Michigan Council of the American Association of Advertising Agencies, Detroit, Mich., February 3, 1960:

THE ADVERTISER'S RIGHT TO TOOT HIS OWN HORN

(By Leo Burnett)

Several months ago when I accepted the invitation of your committee to participate in this program the subject assigned to me was "Copy."

Recently I asked to have the title changed to enable me to speak up about a few things that give me great concern.

These things relate to copy all right, but more to its birthright than to its anatomy.

Perhaps some explanation of the revised title is in order. I have read that long before the invention of the printing press the seller did indeed toot his own horn through the medium of a town crier who blew a horn to attract attention to his message.

Through the ages the seller has enjoyed and exercised his right to proclaim his wares and to represent them in their best light.

I suppose that in some early day a caveman may have traded a leopard skin for an earthern pot, cleverly holding his thumb over a hole in the corner of the skin to conceal the defect, and perhaps after the defect was discovered a good clubbing match may have ensued. If the caveman had extolled the glossiness of the hide and the thickness of the winter-killed fur without either mentioning or concealing the hole, he would have been legitimately exercising the art of persuasive salesmanship. The minute he put his thumb over the hole he was guilty of deception and fraudulence.

Everyone of us at one time or another has something to sell, whether it's a house and lot, a used car, a banged-up old typewriter or ping-pong table, or a political credo. Whatever we are selling, we can hardly be expected to misrepresent it on the negative side, but there are always ways of presenting it positively and persuasively without putting our thumb over the hole.

No one has ever been able to legislate or regulate the personality of a good salesman or, for that matter, a successful politician.

In my 40 years or so in and around advertising I have learned one or two things.

First and foremost, I have learned that the American purchaser is a tough little baby and he doesn't have to be wrapped in cotton.

Quick perception of misrepresentation, exaggeration, half-truths, and weasel words is part of his built-in protective mechanism.

He applies it to what he sees in store windows when the goods are marked down, to what the salesman tells him, and to the appeals or political candidates and union leaders, as well as to what he sees in magazines, newspapers, in outdoor posters, what he sees and hears over the air and gets through the mail.

As pure as selling ever becomes, the purchaser will continue to exercise his right sharply to evaluate what he sees and hears. Kids who can't pronounce "caveat emptor" are exposed to it every day. In my boyhood it was "aggies" and "glassies." Today I suppose it is rock and roll records and pictures of Elvis Presley. (I'm told that in today's market one Elvis is worth two Frankie Avalons and three Ricky Nedsons.)

In my experience P. T. Barnum was overoptimistic about the high birthrate of suckers. As tough as he is, however, the American purchaser likes to dream. Advertising encourages him to dream and to aspire. Identification with certain advertised products and brands often gives him a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment which is well worth the price he pays.

This American purchaser is also a human being, and he appreciates being talked to like one. He hates stuffiness and dullness in advertising fully as much as he does in people.

During my years in advertising I have seen some changes.

At my request, the 4A's furnished me with a complete rundown of the acts of self-regulation by advertisers, agencies, media, national and local organizations since the early 1900's. And a very impressive list it is. At the local level, of course, one of the most powerful forces for purging the rats is the better business bureau, which now has 101 bureaus in the United States. As a director of the Chicago bureau I know personally of its effectiveness.

Overriding all these efforts at self-regulation, I am impressed by the increased acceptance of a philosophy which has been expressed in many ways, but most aptly, I think, by Jim Young. In an address at Cornell University back in 1949 he said:

"Advertising, more than most activities, is a self-purifying stream. It commits all its sins in public. It conducts its own continuous public opinion poll through the nickels, dimes, quarters, and dollars which people pay over the counters of America every day. The people steadily tend to wash out the advertiser who has not served some group of them." Regardless of the moral issue, dishonesty in advertising has proved very unprofitable.

On the grounds of good taste I am sure that, as a group, we are as sensitive as anybody to over-dramatization in our living rooms, of all the unpleasant emanations and unmentionable minor ailments of the human carcass.

Just as the medical profession has its quacks and the legal profession its shysters, we in the advertising business of course have our twisty operators, and I am sure that there is not a one of us in his right mind who doesn't want these scalawags kicked out of the lodge forthwith. They may call themselves "advertising men," but I would rather have them calling hogs. They don't make me stop being proud of advertising, but I am sure that I reflect the sentiments of 99 percent of the people in our business when I express the wish that I never had to be seen with them, or even on the same side of the street.

I have covered the built-in, self-purifying character of advertising. Now I want to mention another trend which I regard as especially significant.

I refer to the increasing acceptance of advertising as a basic means of communications in public service causes. As you know, this has developed particularly since the war under the auspices of the advertising council.

You are familiar, I am sure, with its crusade against highway accidents, forest fires, in behalf of better schools and higher education, in the sale of U.S. Savings Bonds, and other causes, but I am especially impressed with its newly effective use in more baffling areas. For example, in behalf of the grossly misunderstood problem of mental health. Through advertising, and advertising alone, made possible by the joint efforts of advertisers, agencies and media and financed by them, there have been more than 1,300,000 requests for helpful literature on this important subject.

As I hope you have gathered by now, I am mightly proud to be in this business and to be able to point to its advancement as an increasingly important part of both our economy and our culture. I believe that any comparison between advertising today and that of the 1900's, or even the 1920's, will demonstrate that the morality of advertising has improved considerably more than the morality of the general public.

What worries me is this:

Over the years, while these good things have been happening, we have seen various efforts by conscientious and dedicated but overzealous, self-appointed people to apply bureaucratic regulation to various phases of marketing and advertising to protect the American purchaser from himself.

These are the people who would take all the gleam out of advertising and all the glitter off of packages. Instead, they would have us buy from listings, with products numbered instead of named, and graded A, B, C, etc., instead of described or pictured. This is putting all production and promotion on a penitentiary basis, and what a dull, drab world it would be if this philosophy became a reality.

Advertising today is going through another phase.

Again it is being isolated from the entire complex fabric of doing business and, by implication at least, the experienced, socially-conscious advertiser is being tarred with the same brush as the gyp artist and one-shot promoter who deliberately misrepresents his goods. Let's face it, advertising generally is being smeared.

This is an implication which I hope and believe the Federal Trade Commission would like to avoid.

If the Federal Trade Commission keeps its perspective, I hope our industry does too.

I am disturbed by some of our behavior to date, as old codes are being dusted off and new ones are being written.

I can hardly blame Mr. Kintner for the attitude he expressed in an address to the Audit Bureau of Circulations entitled, "Self-Discipline at the Crossroads." Referring to trade reactions to an earlier speech on the Robinson-Patman Act he said, "For a law of our land to be enforced with vigor should not be so newsworthy. The reaction to my remarks was a little embarrassing—like being complimented for wearing a clean shirt."

In some respects I believe our industry is acting much like a kid who figures he can't win anyway, so he won't deny anything he's accused of.

What I especially hope is that American advertising shall not allow itself to be scared or regulated into desiccated dullness, and that it may continue to exercise its natural, normal American zest. As it is, we already have too much dull, inane advertising, chiefly written by committees.

I guess the best way to express what I mean is to try to describe my own attitude in approaching a piece of copy.

My state of mind is one of quiet exurberance, maybe a rather muted version of horn-tooting, but exuberance all the same.

This advertiser, I say to myself, put the best he could into the product. It is his. He is proud of it, and has a right to be proud of it.

I know that the designers and engineers and other technicians who created this product knew they must come through with something worthy of enthusiastic advertising.

The boys who make the things that make the American standard of living what it is should preserve their right and their courage to indulge in a certain amount of exuberance in their ads—if for no other reason than that it attracts legitimate attention in an overnoisy world, gives them spirit, and sets them a constantly higher target to shoot at in their production.

Because this advertiser is a realist, he knows that his product had better measure up to its ads or it will be slapped down brutally and almost instantly by the hard-boiled prospective customer who is ready to go along with dreams as long as they come true at the dealer's and at home, but is relentless when he catches a product in a lie.

The product had better live up to its fancies, or sudden death is right around the corner. If consumers don't see to this, competitors will.

Certainly no manufacturer should be denied the right to put his best foot forward, because that is the only way to enable the other foot next to become the best foot.

I agree with Roy Whittier who once said, "Too many advertisements spend so much time telling why the product is best that they fail to tell why it's good," but I am sure Roy agrees that it is no sin to tell the truth vigorously and imaginatively.

I believe that some advertisers tend to give the appearance of cheating or merely boasting because they are not skillful enough to tell the truth interestingly and convincingly. Here's a small example of what I mean:

I think the advertiser who says "better than" renders himself a disservice unless he says better than what. And the "than what" part ought to be truthful and specific. If you have a car that has 25 percent more room inside than last year's model, that's what the ad ought to say—not "25 percent more room."

The real joy of this business to me is an effort to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about a product more skillfully, convincingly and resultfully than somebody else does it about a competitive product.

Judging by his public remarks, I am sure that Mr. Kintner is not out to destroy creativity in advertising or to dampen the exuberance, quiet or otherwise, of honest advertisers or permit scandals in one segment of the industry to cloud the fundamentals of all advertising.

I can't believe that if it had exercised jurisdiction over the advertising of Rolls Royce and its ad on the noisy clock the FTC would have required Dave Ogilvy or the Rolls Royce people to supply decibel ratings.

I believe that some of the double-negatives and adroit understatements of the British, from Winston Churchill down, are about the highest form of bragging there is—and I am all for it.

I feel the same about the extravagant but good-humored implications of a lot of European poster art. I am all for that, too.

Speaking of tooting your own horn, I am curious to know what the FTC proposes to do about the State of Texas.

We who serve manufacturers in the conception and creation of advertising must take cognizance of all that is to be learned to help us sustain the integrity of advertising and to enhance its good taste, but we must not become mice when it comes to saying some mighty nice things—in a nice way—about the things we are trying to help sell. I am sure there are ways of doing this with no tinge of deceit and within the letter of the law.

Where the Real Budget Story Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to call attention to a story which appeared in Business Week of February 20, 1960:

WHERE THE REAL BUDGET STORY IS

There is a set of figures deep in the fine print in the back of the 1,000-page Federal budget which is venerated by a small band of experts as the true word in fiscal economics. It is called "Special Analysis A."

They like it because it shows more clearly than the regular budget what really happens in the massive exchange of dollars between the Federal Government and the people.

But the times are catching up with Special Analysis A. It now reveals so many things the ordinary budget fails to record that it is being drawn from its cloister to the center of the stage.

MORE USEFUL STORY

For that reason this year Business Week reported the administration's budget proposals for fiscal 1961 primarily in terms of "Special Analysis A." The "cash budget" is its usual name. This treatment seems likely to become more common because the cash budget tells a more meaningful and more meaningful and more useful story than the better known regular, or administrative, budget. Here are some reasons why it is superior:

It is more comprehensive. Special Analysis A now includes $18.2 billion more tax collections and $16.5 billion more spending than the regular, or administrative budget (charts).

It is a more delicate instrument of economic analysis. It shows more precisely who lobs the money into the Treasury and then who gets it back on the return volley. There's a hundred billion dollars involved, and the expert wants to know as much as possible about the shifting of these billions among payers and receivers—in order to assess better the budget's impact on business, economic trends, politics, and the national welfare.

It is the only place to keep track of what is really happening to tax collections.

So far as the administrative budget alone is concerned, the big tax rate news of the past 10 years was the $7 billion reduction of January 1, 1954. But over in Special Analysis A is another story. This shows that a series of small increases, mostly in social security taxes, have virtually offset the single big reduction.

I. WIDENING GAP

Until recently government officials could pretty much ignore Special Analysis A. When only a few billion dollars separated separated the two methods, it was natural for lawmakers and administrators alike to concentrate their attention on the smaller one, which covers most workaday activities.

The change began when, year after year, the discrepancy between the two budget concepts widened; differences as large as $16 billion and $18 billion simply can't be blinked away. Furthermore, it seems likely that the gap will continue to widen. This is because the cash budget concept includes the social security trust funds which the administrative budget excludes.

For the first few years of social security, the funds were handled in the administrative budget. But after the Supreme Court in 1938 ended doubt about the constitutionality of the system, its managers set up the funds as separate entities outside the ordinary budget routine. They wanted the funds to have the look of a system of insurance, not just another activity of government subject to some ill-considered change by a future Congress.

Politicians show no signs of stopping the growth of the social security program. In the past decade the trust funds have grown much more rapidly than general government, and less there is a change in the political climate, this will continue.

Third budget—But even when the day comes that the cash budget finally takes first place in official thinking, the real scope of Federal spending and collecting will be woefully understated unless another reform is instituted.

This would be a system that would pick up $15 billion of payments to the public and receipts from the public that are not recorded in either the administrative or the cash concepts. These are payments that flow through the so-called business enterprise activities of the Government, chiefly the Post Office, or those that come into the Treasury as excess receipts and are sent back out as refunds.

If this more comprehensive measurement were in use this year, incidentally, it would look something like this, along with the two already established systems:

3 budget concepts, fiscal 1961

Type of budget	Payments	Receipts
	Billion	*Billion*
Administrative	$79.8	$84.0
Cash	96.3	102.2
Comprehensive	111.3	117.2

II. STILL A MYSTERY

A somewhat closer look at these three concepts and how they differ throws light on a curious situation: Though the $100 billion or so that flows through Federal accounts in a year is the largest, the most important, the most scrutinized, and the most hotly debated block of public spending in the world, its impact on the economy remains very largely an enigma.

Controversial: In the 1957–58 recession there was a fierce debate among the experts over the relative merits of a tax reduction or a rise in spending as the best way of checking the downturn.

The decision was to increase spending, but it was made in an aura of guess, conjecture, and political emotion. It did not stem from any certainy about the workings of the budget.

Because such bitter disputes about the role of the budget arise every time there is a major shift in the economy, it has been shoved pretty much to one side as a method of keeping the economy on an even keel. The main burden of counteracting cyclical swings has been left to the Federal Reserve, which eases credit in times of recession, then tightens it in times of boom to try to check inflation.

There is growing discontent with this policy mix; critics are calling for greater use of the budget and a lesser reliance on credit policy. The Democrats on the Joint Economic Committee of Congress included this

among their major recommendations after a 6-month study of the economy. But it is hard to see how fiscal policy can be used with greater precision unless the basic tools of analysis are improved.

Dominant: The accounts as presented in the administrative budget still get practically all the attention in Washington. The President sends his spending proposals to Congress in this form in January each year. Congress approves a spending plan, and votes future authority to spend, in this form. It is so thoroughly entrenched as the dominant system that in Congress and the executive department it is known simply as the budget.

All the multitudinous activities of Government are reported here, so long as the Government allots to itself clear, unquestioned, sole ownership of the funds involved.

It is this concept of ownership that makes a second system of accounts necessary from an auditing standpoint.

III. PART OWNER

The Government does not consider itself full owner of the accounts established, for the most part, in the 1930's to finance the social security programs: old-age and survivors insurance, disability insurance, unemployment relief, the railroad workers' retirement account, and the retirement program for Federal employees.

Purists can make a case that this is a matter of semantics only.

The Government has collected the sums in these accounts with all the force of law and absolute sovereignty. Workers have no choice but to have 3 percent of their pay up to $4,800 deducted and sent to the Treasury for the old-age and disability accounts, and employers much cough up a like amount. These payments are just as much beyond recall of the individual as income or excise tax payments.

But such is the majesty of an act of Congress, that if Congress says there is an element of mixed ownership involved, then that is the case, and the funds are handled separately. The theory is that those who contribute expect someday to be the beneficiaries, and thus are said to have special claims on the trust funds.

These social security funds are set up on the Government's books as trusts, to be used for the purposes assigned to them and no other. Including the unemployment insurance fund, their unexpended balance will reach a total of $45 billion in fiscal 1961. Collections will total $17.8 billion that year; expenditures $16 billion.

Highway funds: This mixed ownership concept was strained further when the Eisenhower administration, with the approval of Congress, decided to give the highway modernization program special status.

Eisenhower insisted that he would not build more roads than highway users would pay for annually in taxes. So we have the earmarked highway trust fund. It will receive $2.9 billion of receipts in fiscal 1961 and make payments of $2.8 billion, with none of this appearing in the administration budget.

Other outsiders: The administration made one other important decision that widens the gap between the two budget concepts. It took the secondary market operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association out of the administrative accounts. In fiscal 1961, this activity will result in a net expense of $800 million which can be found only in the trust accounts. By law, anyone selling a mortgage to Fanny Mae is required to buy common stock in the association, again introducing the theory of mixed ownership.

Rural rehabilitation funds of the Farmer's Home Administration, alien property funds, and a few other activities are also handled in this way.

IV. GROWING TWICE AS FAST

The trust funds have shown a much livelier rate of growth than the administrative budget. In 1947, the first of the postwar fiscal years, administrative spending was $39 billion. It is expected to be just under $80 billion next fiscal year.

In 1947, trust fund expenditures were only $5.2 billion; they are heading toward $21.3 billion in 1961. In short, during a period when administrative expenditures have doubled, trust fund expenditures have more than quadrupled.

To bring the trust funds into the general financial picture, their accounts are simply added to the administrative budget totals. This is done in special analysis A, which Government experts call the consolidated cash accounts. It appears in the budget document (p. 897 in the budget for fiscal 1961) under the heading, "Federal Government Receipts From and Payments to the Public."

Tax Story: Obviously the cash concept has great advantages over the administrative accounts for anyone interested in the size, the content, and the direction of cash flows between the Government and the people.

On the surface, if attention were paid only to the regular budget $18.2 billion of tax collections would be overlooked in fiscal 1961. But there is more involved.

The tax cut of January 1, 1954, was the biggest single slash in U.S. history, and the only major one of the past decade. It applied entirely to receipts that go into the administrative budget. There have been some niggling cuts since: excises on admissions, on oil transported by pipeline and on freight. Altogether, the reductions that have gone into effect in the last 10 years were worth about $7 billion or a little over to taxpayers the year they went into effect.

Steadily Rising: In the trust funds, the picture is different. Here the story is one of steady increases.

There have been four separate increases in recent years in the payroll taxes that go to the old age and disability trust funds. The most recent one took its bite into individual pay checks and employers' costs January 1 this year, and is expected to furnish $2 billion or more a year in additional revenue. The total of these tax increases since January 1, 1954, is $5 billion a year.

In addition, taxes paid into the railroad retirement fund have been increased $300 million.

The tax on motor fuels going into the highway trust fund has been increased from 3 cents to 4 cents per gallon, at a cost to users of $826 million. A special tax on trucks brings in $36 million.

These increases—recorded only in the cash accounts—come to more than $6 billion a year. Over in the administrative budget is another increase in revenues, this one stemming from a rise in postal rates. Altogether the sum of the small increases just about cancels out the effects of the one big cut.

The sums that don't even show in the cash budget were the special concern of Percival F. Brundage when he was Eisenhower's Director of the Budget. He evolved a method of showing the missing funds, which he presented to a number of congressional committees. There was a marked lack of interest among the lawmakers.

Enterprises: Most important is something in excess of $10 billion that flows in and out of what the Budget Bureau calls Government enterprise operations—such as the Post Office, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association in its overall operations, and the Export-Import Bank.

Such operations, all of which conduct a business-type program, are represented in the cash accounts and the administrative budget only by the net surplus or deficit in their activities.

All that shows for the Post Office in the fiscal 1961 budget total, for example, is the $49 million excess of expenditures over receipts.

Effect: Another $5 million or so is in the form of receipts collected from the public in the form of taxes, fees, and the like, and then refunded. Inasmuch as this consists of merely an exchange of cash, and a fairly speedy one in most cases, its economic effect is trifling.

But the public enterprise activities are significant. They hire workers, conduct research, order equipment, ship goods, and in general have an overall economic effect far greater than the mere net of all of their financial activities.

Hard to measure: Budget professionals in the Government agree that Brundage was working on a useful addition to the tools of analysis, and believe something should be done with it eventually, at least in the form of a special table in the back of the budget document. It poses some difficult technical problems, however.

Fiscal analysis is a complex art at best. No set of accounts, no matter how simple or comprehensive, can measure the powerful and subtle effects of Federal operations in all their ramifications.

The stimulating effect of a Government program, for example, is felt not when the Treasury finally writes the checks for the goods purchased, but when the contract is let—6 months or maybe 2 years before delivery of the finished product. Yet the budget accounts, both administrative and cash, are kept on a check-issued basis.

Receipts show the same tendency to work their effect ahead of the actual figures. A tax rise or cut will begin affecting business and personal decisions months before there is any change in the actual flow of cash to the Government.

Salute to U.S. Olympic Hockey Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Members of the Congress of the United States to join me in a salute to the U.S. Olympic hockey team, winners of the international competition at Squaw Valley.

The gold medal winners certainly exhibited a "gold medal" brand of hockey in becoming the first U.S. hockey team to capture first place in Olympic competition. In the final 4 days of play, they upset favored Canada, and took come-from-behind victories over defending champion Russia and Czechoslovakia. Ice hockey being the grueling game that it is, this feat would have to rank as next to impossible.

We are proud of the fact that a large part of this U.S. team hails from the State of Minnesota. And I am especially proud that two of the boys most instrumental in the U.S. victory, brothers Bill and Roger Christian, reside in the Ninth Congressional District community of Warroad.

Our hats are off to these fine, spirited representatives of our Nation.

An Alert, Informed, Effective Federation Works Constantly for St. Louis Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the consumer usually is the forgotten person in our daily economic life except, too often, as the "sucker" for those with schemes for making a fast dollar at the expense of the unwary purchaser.

The consumers of St. Louis, however, are unusually fortunate for, in addition to newspapers which have the courage to battle for the consumer interest at every opportunity, we also have an outstanding group of dedicated women banded together as the St. Louis Consumer Federation to do battle on every front for the housewife and her family. I think it might be useful to the Congress, and to all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to know how such an organization goes about its work of protecting and supporting the consumer interest month in and month out.

The list of legislative issues in which the St. Louis Consumer Federation has taken a strong interest would be almost endless, and the effectiveness of the group is legendary in St. Louis. I do not know of any good reason why women in other cities in the country could not organize similarly effective consumer federations, and I know that our ladies in St. Louis would be glad to give groups in other cities some invaluable advice in setting up such organizations and making them operate effectively, as ours does.

WOMEN OF HIGH STANDING IN THE COMMUNITY

This thought struck me forcefully, Mr. Speaker, as I was reading the most recent newsletter issued by the St. Louis Consumer Federation under the presidency of my good friend, Mrs. Joseph M. Klamon. It occurred to me that the newsletter itself gives the best possible insight into the kind of organization it is and the help it could give to groups in other cities in setting up similar movements. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting the newsletter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, despite the fact that it refers to me in a flattering manner. While I appreciate the nice comments about me, my purpose in calling attention to the newsletter is to suggest how other cities could profit—how their usually voiceless consumers could profit—by having such a consumer federation in operation, under the direction of women who have standing in the community and who are dedicated to the public interest.

In St. Louis, some of our most outstanding civic leaders are active members of the consumer federation, and they "let the chips fall where they may" in fighting the consumers' battles.

The most recent newsletter of the St. Louis Consumer Federation follows:

[St. Louis Consumer Federation, 1623 Hickory Street, St. Louis, Mo., Mrs. Joseph M. Klamon, president]

THE HIGH COST OF DRUGS

Since our November meeting—subject: "The Public's Stake in the Wonder Drugs"—we have been following the congressional investigation on the reasons for the high cost of drugs. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has completed hearings on antiarthritic drugs and are now proceeding to check tranquilizers, later antibiotics.

Out of these first investigations of high prescription-drug prices came the jarring disclosure of markups of more than 1,000 percent above the manufacturer's cost for the drugs, reflecting enormous earnings even after the most generous allowances for research, promotion, packaging and selling. Indeed, there was one instance of a tranquilizing drug, Thorazine, which was perfected in France, and merely licensed to the American drug company, Smith, Kline and French Laboratories. This drug is sold to the American consumer for many times the retail price in France. In a letter to the people in the Post-Dispatch of February 10, 1960, Mr. G. F. Roll, director of public relations of Smith, Kline and French Laboratories defends the high markup because of funds spent in research on a similar product which was not put on the market.

During the congressional hearings, many of the drug companies testified that the cost of research was responsible for the high prices of drugs. However, the February 15, 1960 issue of Life magazine carries the following comments, "Although cost breakdowns vary considerably, materials take 4 percent, manufacturing 3 percent of the retail price of a wonder drug, research takes 5 percent and promotion 14 percent."

Life says, "The average doctor is deluged with sales talk, either through direct mail or visits from drug firm representatives known as detail men. In a single day a doctor may collect $40 worth of free drug samples. To promote a new drug, a company may spend half a million dollars to hit almost every doctor in the land with a barrage of letters, brochures and personal calls.

"Such saturation promotion not only adds to the cost of a company's prescription drugs, it also persuades many doctors to prescribe—and many patients to want—new drugs simply because they are new, not because they are necessarily better than something old or cheap. The drug companies argue that their costly promotions are postgraduate education for doctors, and a majority of the doctors themselves consider detail men helpful and a lot easier to take than the brochures. Many medical authorities question the object of all this promotion. 'Only a small fraction of modern drugs is really essential,' says Dr. Louis Lasagna, associate professor of medicine and pharmacology at Johns Hopkins. 'Most of the 400-odd new products promoted by the companies each year are only fancy wrinkles on old ideas. They are introduced because they are profitable, not because they have a medical advantage over the products of preceding years.' "

The high cost of prescription drugs has been a matter of growing concern to many consumers for several years. This is one of a number of problems where the individual is helpless. If he is sick, he must pay for the medicine the doctor prescribes. The physician could help by writing prescriptions in generic terms rather than brand names because the use of well-known brands in prescriptions raises the cost considerably.

One of our board members would like to share with you her experience with the price of a drug as fixed by the retail druggist. She had the original prescription filled by the druggist with whom she usually deals, and was charged $4.50 for 30 tablets. Since she was familiar with the name of the drug, she decided to shop around. She inquired at five different drugstores, four in the area where she lives and one out of that area. The quoted prices ranged from $2 to $4.50 for the 30 tablets, with no two prices alike.

In a recent survey made by the Chicago University National Opinion Research Center, they found more than a third of the people (38 percent) believed the cost of prescriptions is much too high.

We are all awaiting with interest the recommendations from the Senate subcommittee after the hearings are completed.

LAMB GRADING

Last summer the Department of Agriculture announced that it was considering dropping U.S. Government grades on lamb and mutton and asked that all who wished to be heard on the matter speak up before August 1. The Consumer Federation at that time protested to Secretary Benson against removal of this grading. There were also letters of protest from many individual members of the federation. As a result of the many protests received by the Agriculture Department Secretary Benson announced on July 23 that grading would not be suspended. A meeting was held in Kansas City on August 25 to discuss revision of standards for lamb grading and in October the Department announced that a new basis for grading was under consideration. On December 2, Secretary Benson announced that grading was to be suspended for 1 year, beginning January 4, 1960, as various segments of the packing and sheep growing industries could not agree on standards acceptable to them. The views of the individual consumers apparently were not considered. Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Member of Congress representing the Missouri Third District, protested strongly against this move for the protection of the consumer and had our letter reprinted in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. She felt, as we do, that consumers would not be able to purchase lamb intelligently without Government grade markings. We as an organization also sent a wire of protest at this time.

On December 30 it was announced that grading suspension would be delayed at the request of Chairman Harold D. Cooley of the House Agriculture Committee, who wished to investigate this matter further. After hearings, the House Agriculture Committee on January 19 recommended that lamb grading be retained. As a result, the Department of Agriculture announced February 5, 1960 that grading would be continued but under revised standards. Mr. Benson said that the new standards which will be subject to continued study, would be put into effect as quickly as Federal personnel could become acquainted with them.

The revised standards modify the present grading mainly by rewriting the minimum requirements for prime and choice, the two top grades.

Congressional and department hearings brought out that many consumer groups favored the continuation of Federal grading service for lamb and mutton.

AGRICULTURE SURPLUSES—THE PRESIDENT

(Taken from the text of President Eisenhower's farm message to Congress, February 9, 1960.)

"We are most fortunate that our problem is overabundance rather than shortage * * * Federal funds, approximately $3,500 million or 30 percent of total funds invested in inventories and loans to Commodity Credit Corporation goes for wheat which provides only 6 percent of the cash receipts from sales of farm products. The Government sustains a net cost of more than

$1,000 a minute—$1,500,000 every day—the year around, to stabilize wheat prices and income."

What this means to consumers who still have to pay high prices for food including the cost of storage for food no one eats is not mentioned by the President. He does express concern about the farmer, however. "Ultimately, if our Government does not act quickly and constructively, the danger is very real that this entire program will collapse under the pressure of public indignation and thousands of our farming people will be hurt."

We are glad to know that the administration is urging action to reduce our huge food surplus. A consumer program the President neglects to mention is a domestic surplus food stamp program to distribute some of the surplus to people not now able to eat enough for health due to low income, notably people on Government relief programs, people in distress areas, such as those working in the Florida vegetable fields, etc. This type of program would not interfere with normal channels of trade, would alleviate undernourishment at home, and would not be the degrading "soup line" type of distribution now used. The surplus stamp plan has already been voted on favorably by Congress but is now bottlenecked by the administration.

LIPSTICK COLORS—ARE THEY HARMFUL?

A public hearing will be held, beginning February 17, to determine whether 14 coloring materials used principally in lipstick will be removed from the list of colors certified as safe by the Food and Drug Administration. The law makes provision for such hearings when they are requested by business concerns and when reasonable grounds for such hearings are given. The representatives of the industry feel the original toxicity tests on the tested colors were not sufficiently complete to justify the conclusion that the colors are not harmless.

In ordering the hearing, the FDA said, "It is important to settle the issue whether materials that are not harmless are being consumed, even in small quantities. If such materials are being consumed, the law requires that they be taken off the harmless list."

Three colors (D. & C. red Nos. 11, 12, 13) are being restored to the harmless list. They were originally removed because their chemical composition is closely related to the chemical composition of D. & C. No. 10, which had proved to be toxic in short term animal feeding tests. The conclusion with respect to red Nos. 11, 12, and 13 was challenged by the industry, and subsequent short term feeding tests with the three colors did not produce harmful effects in the test animals. Longer term tests, however, will be conducted for the three colors to determine whether their classification as "harmless" should be continued.

FOOD ADDITIVES INFORMATION

A new booklet called "What Consumers Should Know About Food Additives" published by the Food and Drug Administration to answer the many questions people are asking about food additives and the new law which goes into effect March 6, 1960. The booklet tells the story of how food additives came to be developed, why and how they are used in food production, why public health safeguards are necessary, and how the new law works. It also gives factual information about many of the more important kinds of food additives and explains how the law controls two special classes of additives, pesticides, and coal-tar colors. The booklet is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.—Price: 15 cents.

MAN-TAN OR TANNING WITHOUT SUNLIGHT

A new cosmetic, Man-Tan, is being heavily promoted as an "after shave sun-tan lotion with vitamin D . . . laboratory tested, pronounced safe and effective on all types of skin." In spite of this testing, according to Consumers Union, doctors are beginning to report cases of severe allergic dermatitis caused by Man-Tan. We would advise consumers to go easy with any product which claims to tan the skin without sunlight.

CONSUMER CONFERENCE

The annual meeting of the Council on Consumer Information, of which the consumer federation is a member, will be held this year in Minneapolis on April 7, 8, and 9. A number of outstanding people are on the program, including Mr. George P. Larrick, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. Several members plan to attend this meeting and will bring back a good deal of information on subjects of interest to all of us.

THE CONSUMER'S FRIEND

An article in the Globe-Democrat of January 3, 1960, described Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN of the Missouri Third District as the consumer's friend, and we agree that it is a fitting description. She has been the champion of consumer interests since her election to that office.

In this article Mrs. SULLIVAN gives credit to the consumer federation for introducing her to the work of the Food and Drug Administration shortly after her first election to Congress in 1952. At that time we asked her to talk to us about food and drug laws. She went to the Public Library to study up on the subject. However, she did not feel fully informed on the subject so she turned the meeting back to the consumers and asked to be told what was needed. Since then she has always been ready to listen to any problem affecting any of us as individual consumers.

Scientific Translations in the Field of Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare held a press conference last week in which he disclosed the extent to which scientific translations in the field of public health were made available to American scientists last year.

Mr. Flemming describes this as a "substantial lowering of the language barrier," and I agree. The Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member, has looked into this problem and the lag that was allowed to exist for years in the effort to keep abreast of scientific research everywhere in the world and see that American laboratories could obtain necessary information.

I am happy to see that considerable progress is being made, and Mr. Flemming's report bears that out. There are still areas in which more effort is needed. The program to develop Russian, Chinese, and other eastern language materials needs attention. So does the domestic effort to improve the storage and retrieval methods.

Additionally, we must make a serious effort, I believe, to supply the American scientific community with regular critical appraisals of the work being done and quick tabs and abstracts of important work. The Soviet Union, through a master journal of abstracts called the Referaty, is producing a regular encyclopedia on science and technology for their people, in which American accomplishments are abstracted, indexed, cross-indexed and cross-referenced so that the documentary background is available.

We can avoid useless duplication of work and waste of time and money through knowledge of the scientific experimentation going on in laboratories across the world. We have seen many examples of a misuse of money and manpower through unnecessary overclassification in this country where the results of experiments were not made available through proper channels in our defense program, as the Moss committee has ably pointed out. When it becomes a question of scientific knowledge, particularly in areas of basic research, across the world, it is easy to imagine the loss that language barriers suggest.

The total of the Health, Education and Welfare effort is impressive. Mr. Flemming also relays an estimate that it has led to direct communication between Russia and American scientists that could be fruitful. Whether the program is sufficient, or half enough, is not measurable, just as Mr. Flemming notes that the impact of the knowledge learned is not measurable.

What is certain is that such an exchange of knowledge, and the dissemination of scientific and technical information, deserves our full support and energetic surveillance to see that we make use of all the knowledge available to us, rather than operating with blinders in the 20th century.

I submit the text of Mr. Flemming's statement:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

In the relatively short time that the Public Health Service's Russian scientific translation program has been in operation, American scientists in the health field now have ready access to the complete texts of approximately 5,000 Russian scientific papers—totaling 25,000 pages—and about 13,200 abstracts of such papers.

This is a substantial lowering of the language barrier which for many years kept the American scientific community largely ignorant of developments in Soviet health research and it is a valuable adjunct to the scientist-to-scientist exchange program which has been gathering momentum in recent years.

In fact, I am informed, the increasing availability, in English, of Soviet scientific materials has by itself begun to stimulate considerable direct communication between American and Soviet scientists working in the same general fields of medical research.

Since late 1957, when the program got underway, there has been a steady increase in the volume of Russian medical information available to the American scientific

community. During that year translations were made of 27 issues of leading Soviet medical journals totaling 583 scientific papers. In 1958 this number had risen to 42 issues and 1,470 papers. In 1959, 2,300 papers from 84 issues of the 9 leading journals appeared in cover-to-cover translations.

Material provided by the Russian translation program now includes—

Full translations of a number of important Russian monographs on biomedical subjects by Soviet scientists.

Translations of abstracts appearing in the principal Soviet abstract journals. These constitute what the Russian scientific community regards as the most significant of its current literature. Thus, the American scientist is given a ready glimpse, in shortened form, of material which he may wish to read later in full.

Reviews by American scientists, of Russian scientific research accomplishments in health significant fields.

Periodic information on the availability of translated Russian scientific material.

Supporting materials, such as a directory of medical and biological institutes in the Soviet Union, a selected list of references on medical research in the U.S.S.R., a description of the structure and functions of the Academy of Medical Sciences in the U.S.S.R., and a Russian-English medical dictionary.

The impact of this program on the American biomedical sciences is of course not truly measurable at this time. These have been the formative years—a period of assessing the relative values in a large and growing scientific output in the Soviet Union—of selecting that material which seems most representative of the whole body of Russian medical literature.

The Russian translation program administered by the National Institutes of Health is closely coordinated with similar programs in other agencies of the Government concerned with the status of Soviet medical research. The National Science Foundation concentrates on material dealing with the basic physical and biological sciences, exclusive of medicine. The Department of Commerce gives special attention to the applied sciences and technologies. The Atomic Energy Commission limits its coverage essentially to the nuclear sciences.

GOP Dwarfs Democrats in Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

GOP DWARFS DEMOCRATS IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

The mounting roar of the Nation's industries and businesses, turning out an unprecedented amount of production, has drowned out the 1930-ish Democratic voice shouting "depression" and calling for billion-dollar Federal pump primings.

In January, the Federal Reserve Board reported, industrial production hit an alltime high. Production was rated at 169—or 69 percent higher than the 1947–49 era which the Democrats, curiously, are always citing as a good example of economic activity.

At the same time, the Commerce Department reported that in 1959 the gross national product—sum total of the Nation's economic activity—was $479,500 million, also a record in the Nation's history.

The 1959 GNP figure was a whopping 6.9 percent gain over recession year 1959 and was about $100 billion more (in 1959 dollar values) than the Democrats ever managed to encourage, even with the unwelcome spur of the Korean war ($268,100 million better in terms of 1959 versus 1945 dollar values).

The encouraging reports on our "can do" economy clearly forecast an early 1960 surge through the historic goal of a half-trillion-dollar economy. The reports also offer a timely peg from which to review the entire issue of economic growth, the fitful Democratic attempt to nit-pick the greatest U.S. production in the history of the Republic.

Democrats claim the country has to have an annual growth of 3 to 4 percent in GNP. They juggle statistics to prove that this was attained during the Truman administration and then cry, "Why aren't we getting 3 to 4 percent growth now?"

Nothing could be further from the truth. Economic growth under Truman can be ballooned to 4 percent annually only by selecting his good years and ignoring his bad years, the most outrageous type of deliberate distortion.

By selecting some years and ignoring others in a continuous record, of course, you can "prove" anything which your conscience will permit. The facts on comparative economic growth under the Democrats and under the Republicans are as follows:

In the 8 years of the Truman administration, GNP increased $32.7 billion (in 1959–value dollars) for an overall increase of 8.9 percent, an annual average growth rate of 1.1 percent.

In the 7 Republican years since 1952, GNP has shot up a total of $84.5 billion (again in 1959-value dollars) for an overall gain of 20.2 percent, an annual average growth rate of 2.9 percent. This is almost three times more than Truman's and close to the Democratic "ideal" rate.

Most of what economic gains the Democratic administration was able to produce came from the industrial demands of the Korean war. In Truman's peacetime years, GNP fell back in 2 years, inched ahead less than 1 percent in a third and gained modestly in the other.

In the peacetime years since 1953, GNP has gained in 4 years, lost a bit of ground in just 2 years.

Economic growth in the United States, 1945–59

[All dollars in terms of 1959 values]

Year	GNP (billions)	Percent change over previous year
1945	$350.9	−1.8
1946	316.0	−12.2
1947	315.7	−.1
1948	327.9	+3.9
1949	328.2	+.09
1950	356.2	+8.5
1951	385.0	+8.1
1952	399.0	+3.6
Total gains	32.7	[1] 8.9
1953	417.1	+4.5
1954	408.8	−2.0
1955	441.5	+8.0
1956	450.9	+2.1
1957	458.9	+1.8
1958	448.6	−2.2
1959	479.5	+6.9
Total gains	84.5	[2] 20.2

[1] 1.1 percent annual average.
[2] 2.9 percent annual average.

NOTE.—According to the Democratic-dominated Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, the historic annual rate of U.S. growth for the 1919–59 period is 2.9 percent—exactly what we have enjoyed since 1953 and about three times greater than the Truman administration achieved.

Connally Amendment Protects Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Connally Amendment Protects Us."

This editorial concisely sets forth sound reasons why the United States should not reverse its present stand regarding the International Court of Justice:

[From the Greenville News, Feb. 9, 1960]

CONNALLY AMENDMENT PROTECTS US

In an administration that is markedly conservative in other respects, President Eisenhower and his colleagues have shown a strange attitude toward this Nation's relations with the International Court of Justice.

For some time now they have been pushing a proposal to remove the Court's limited jurisdiction. In doing so they have allied themselves with the most liberal of the "one worlders" and have parted drastically with their normal allies among conservatives.

This awkward practical position is rendered even more difficult to understand in principle. There is practically no sound argument for reversing our present stand and many good reasons for maintaining it.

At stake is the so-called Connally amendment to the Senate resolution adopted in 1946 which joined the United States with the Court.

Named for the then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, the amendment limited the scope of the Court's jurisdiction. As originally phrased, the Court could not consider matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, but Senator Connally went one step further and provided that the United States itself would be the judge of what was and what was not "within the domestic jurisdiction."

The reason for adopting the Connally amendment was obvious. Many Communist and "neutral" nations are also members of the court and to place within their hands the judgment of questions vital to the security and well-being of this Nation was unthinkable. The amendment received bipartisan support and was adopted by a wide margin.

There has been a running attack on the reservation since its adoption. President Eisenhower has joined his influence with the opposition and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has sponsored a resolution aimed at its repeal. According to latest reports the chances that the HUMPHREY resolution will be adopted by the Senate are good.

A variety of arguments are cited against the limitation. It is pointed out that several nations, including France and England, have given up their right to determine their own domestic jurisdiction, and that the proviso can be used to limit a country's ability to take other nations before the Court.

It is also said that the Court itself admits it cannot invade a nation's domestic affairs and can be trusted to observe that obligation. And finally, it is pointed out that enforcement of the Court's decisions must come from the Security Council of the United Nations where the United States still has the power of veto.

Much of all this is, it seems to us, self-defeating. Either the Connally amendment

means something or it doesn't. If it doesn't, if similar restraints on the Court's jurisdiction are already written in the charter, then what difference does it make whether Senator Connally's words remain there to? It stretches credulity to the breaking point to assert that the Court will be made a more meaningful instrument of law by the erasure of six simple words whose force and effect is duplicated elsewhere.

If, on the other hand, it does mean something, if it is the sole guarantee of protection for U.S. internal affairs, then it should never be removed. National sovereignty and the right of every nation to conduct its own domestic affairs has been a matter of international law for centuries, violated only by warfare. Is the United States now prepared to embark on a program of abandoning that historic right bit by bit?

That is certainly what we would be exposing ourselves to if the Senate reverses itself on the Connally amendment. It is all well and good to say the Court has never interfered with domestic matters in the past but once the safeguard is dropped, who can predict the future?

We hope the Senate will save Mr. Eisenhower from this drastic mistake. The International Court of Justice is still young and needs much experience before such vast powers are entrusted to it. The United States and its system of government are much too precious to be subjected to so risky a gamble.

Resolution by Knights of Lithuania, 29th Council of Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, just 9 days ago we commemorated the 42d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. At that time I joined a host of others here in the House who paid tribute to the courage and invincible will of this freedom-loving Nation.

I have recently received a resolution from the 29th Council of the Knights of Lithuania, which fervently expresses the hopes and rightful aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and which calls upon the United States to do all in its power so that those aspirations may one day be fulfilled. I should like to insert this resolution into the RECORD as an eloquent footnote to our earlier tribute:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, 29TH COUNCIL OF NEWARK, N.J.

On this 42d anniversary of Lithuania Independence we assembled at a meeting in St. George's Hall, Newark, N.J., and the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, ardently desires to exercise her solemn right of self-government and has proven that she is capable of self-rule by remarkable progress made in all fields of endeavor during the past years in which she enjoyed independence (1253–1795 and particularly 1918–1939); and

Whereas the Government of the United States since 1940 has steadfastly refused to recognize de jure the unjust absorption of Lithuania with the Soviet orbit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States continue to maintain and adhere to its present policy of recognizing the de jure independence of Lithuania despite occupation by Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That Soviet Russia, having no sovereign rights over Lithuania or her territory, be forced to leave Lithuania immediately, thus restoring freedom to the nation, and to return at once to Lithuania all Lithuanians people now exiled in Siberia and other foreign lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be duly admitted and fully approved as a full-fledged member of the United Nations and that her appointed representatives be allowed to maintain with full privileges the status of duly-elected delegates of that organization; and be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Government work through the United Nations by raising the problem of enslavement of Lithuania and by demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania as well as from other subjugated European countries.

EVA M. TRECIOKAS,
Chairlady of Lithuanian affairs.
FRANK VASKAS,
Secretary.

U.S. Advisory Aid to Vienna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the New York Times on February 8, 1960. This article is a straight, factual report on the message which Chancellor Julius Raab recently made to the people of Austria on the contribution the U. S. technical assistance program has made to their economic well-being:

U.S. ADVISORY AID TO VIENNA HAILED—CHANCELLOR CREDITS MUCH OF AUSTRIA'S DEVELOPMENT TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

(By M. S. Handler)

VIENNA, February 7.—Chancellor Julius Raab reported to the Austrian people tonight on the contributions of the U.S. technical assistance program to Austrian industry since 1949.

Last week the chancellor informed his cabinet that the program had ended and that he would convey his thanks to the U.S. Government for its technical aid to Austria.

Herr Raab made his report to the people tonight in his regular Sunday broadcast.

He left no doubt in the minds of his listeners that Austria owed much of her strong competitive position in the world and much of her internal economic development since 1949 to American technical assistance.

ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY EXPERTS VISITED UNITED STATES

A total of 1,250 Austrian experts visited the United States under the program in the last 10 years to acquaint themselves with the latest methods of technology, industrial and commercial organization and public administration.

Many of them, the chancellor said, were able to introduce these methods in Austria. Thereby, he observed, the country's development and individual enterprises profited.

He cited a clothing factory in Vienna that was able to quadruple its production, reduce its costs by 30 percent and increase wages as a result of an expert's trip to New York.

He told of a construction company that increased its annual turnover from 6 million schillings ($240,000) to 34 million schillings ($1,310,000) by more efficient use of machinery.

He mentioned that a road-paving company was able to reduce costs by $20,000 on a 3-mile paving job.

The chancellor said similar experiences were reported in the iron and steel industries after experts had visited the United States.

AUSTRIANS SET UP PROGRAM

These were the examples cited by Herr Raab, but in a larger sense the American technical assistance program enabled the Austrians to establish their own program for the introduction of modern industrial methods.

The chancellor told the people that under the program research institutes and seminars had been established to disseminate knowledge of modern methods in industry, business and public administration.

These included institutes for modern industrial design, price studies, machine construction, industrial management, modern accounting and business administration.

Herr Raab said trade union leaders who had visited American factories had returned with knowledge of how to increase industrial productivity, improve labor-management relations and, on the whole, improve workers' psychology on the job.

Particularly valuable, he said, were the lessons learned in the United States on how to implant new industries in backward areas of the country.

The chancellor emphasized that as a result of all these improvements Austria was in a position to help the underdeveloped countries with which she traded.

A Unionist's Program To Meet Inflationary Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article written by Mr. Solomon Barkin, research director of the Textile Workers Union of America:

A UNIONIST'S PROGRAM TO MEET INFLATIONARY THREAT

(By Solomon Barkin)

The administration and the business community have kept stirring up interest in and concern with the problem of inflation at a time when prices have been stable for more than a year. They initiated this debate in late spring of 1958, when every forecast, including those issued by governmental agencies, indicated such price stability will be maintained. The intensity of the controversy has currently increased though evidence points to the probability that price levels will not change much in the immediate months ahead.

The threat of inflation has not been and is not likely to be so intense in the near future as to justify the deliberate promotion of a national hysteria. A positive program of action such as we shall unfold would have accomplished more. But the disseminators

of the message of woe have been more intent upon generating this deep concern than in arresting the real pressures for inflation.

INFLATION DEBATE POLITICALLY INSPIRED

The heat of the declamations can only be explained by motives other than the anxiety over the immediate changes in the level of prices. If one were to conjecture on these reasons in terms of the people emphasizing this problem one would be justified in ascribing them to political and propaganda purposes. The administration apparently undertook the campaign to fight inflation primarily to discourage a bold public expenditures program being considered by Congress and, more recently, to pressure trade unions to accept lower wage settlements than they had publicly announced. It also feared the consequences of its handling the financing of the Federal budget deficit by traditional means, which it would not think of modifying.

The business community must have had similar purposes plus the added desire to divert attention from the charges directed against its responsibility for pushing up prices. Specialized business sectors such as insurance companies and banks which have actively agitated the public on this problem have had some special purposes, such as to rationalize high interest rates and to minimize the possibilities of the blame being placed on their policies and practices.

REDUCTION IN UNEMPLOYMENT AND HIGH RATE OF GROWTH PRESENT CHALLENGES

While this debate has been going on, trade unions and political liberals have focused attention on the high levels of unemployment and the slowness of the rate of economic growth. They have sought to keep the public's eye focused on the fact that America's low rate of growth has dropped below the 3 percent level which was contrasted with the potential for an annual growth rate of 5 percent and Russia's program for an 8 percent annual rate economic expansion.

Along with the lower rate of growth has come a high level of unemployment. The labor groups have protested the continued large volume of unemployment and could find little satisfaction in the reduction of the number to 3.6 million. Behind these figures they see large pools of unemployed in the distressed urban areas and widespread underemployment among the more than 1¼ million low-income families. At the time in April when we registered this sharp drop in the level of total unemployment, there were still labor market areas with rates of unemployment above 16 percent. More than 267 labor markets had 6 percent or more unemployment. In some industries such as construction, the rate was 11.3 percent; mining, 9.2 percent; automobile manufacturing, 8.2 percent, and it was equally high in textiles. A number of States could still report unemployment rates in excess of 6 percent.

While unemployment has been so pervasive, trade unionists and political liberals could not possibly concentrate on the issues of inflation. They continued, therefore, to press for Federal legislation to correct the obvious defects in our economy. They perceived in the possible threat of rising prices the excessive use of economic power by big business interests and professional groups, inadequate expansion or control of our bottleneck industries, insufficient stimulation of productivity in our service industries, inflationary monetary policies which discourage growth, inequitable tax systems with countless loopholes for the higher income groups, and an outmoded agricultural pricing policy which maintains prices high and surpluses excessive and fails to provide a living to millions of farm families. Legislation designed to meet these problems appeared to them vital to deal with inflation.

PRICE STRUCTURE DETERMINED BY MARKET OR PRICE ADMINISTRATORS

In considering the trade union's role in our market economy one must recognize that its function is that of stimulating or conditioning but not that of controlling management's behavior. It is the latter which sets prices, fixes production policies and determines the financial, product, research and expansion programs for the enterprise. This truth is obvious in unorganized industry and applicable widely to unionized ones. Moreover, with the share of American industry covered by union contracts stabilized if not decreasing, the union's influence upon the Nation's wage movements and levels has become less critical. It has been exaggerated by its opponents for agitational purposes.

Trade unions, moreover, do not set wages unilaterally; they offer proposals for negotiation. Historically it has been management's responsibility to obtain a bargain, one which most nearly is adjusted to the economics of the particular industry or enterprise. The function of negotiations is to reach such an understanding and, by and large, the American people have approved the results.

UNION ECONOMIC PROPOSALS CONDITIONED BY INDUSTRY'S PROSPERITY

Insofar as trade-union proposals are concerned, their objectives have been approved and widely accepted by industry and society. Actually, the annual disputes on wage issues are focused on a relatively limited range of differences despite the public furor raised by the parties and commentators. Probably the most significant goal is the acceptance of the principle of annual wage increases commensurate with the annual rise in national productivity. This approach was incorporated in the formula proposed by the General Motors Corp. in 1948 as a part of its demand for a long-term contract and is now widely observed. Our national wage movement broadly shows this wide acceptance.

The second goal is the cost-of-living escalator formula to protect the workers' real wage. This adjustment is now quite generally followed.

The third is the principle of the annual wage which has unfortunately been converted, thanks to the negotiations at the Ford Motor Co., into a supplementary unemployment benefit. The advantages and deficiencies of this program have been brought to light in the current recession in that the limitation of the funds forced reductions and curtailment in benefits. These benefits have proved helpful to the unemployed but are no adequate substitute for the annual wage. Unions have, however, also sought to realize the annual wage by proposing more holidays and longer vacations with pay, not only for adequate recuperation but also for the maintenance of earnings during such periods.

The fourth is the transfer of the personal risks of employment to the industry. Both through legislation and collective bargaining, unions have negotiated for insurance programs to be financed by industry against risks of ill health, such as illness, medical and hospital care and disability, old age and permanent disability, unemployment and death.

A fifth goal has been the equalization of benefits among all classes of employees so that the wage earner might enjoy the fringe and employment benefits received by other employees though, of course, the level would be adjusted in some instances to the differences in earnings.

The continuing promotion of these principles has been a constructive force in this country. It has made industry aware of the need of continuing research in ways of higher productivity. Management has, therefore, institutionalized its research for labor- and capital-saving techniques to offset these advances. Part of the progress in productivity is attributable to management's acceptance of this responsibility. Concurrently, trade unions have also pressed for the implementation of the principles of full employment incorporated in the act of 1946.

Inasmuch as these objectives have been widely recognized in American industry, there has been a simultaneous improvement in workers' attitudes to technical change, a critical factor in America's progress. Never before in the history of any nation has there been such widespread acquiescence to innovations and an acceptance of the conviction that they will rebound to the benefit of the people themselves. Industrial change has been accepted rather than resisted.

MAJOR ISSUE IN NEGOTIATIONS IS RATE OF WORKER PARTICIPATION IN INDUSTRY'S PROFITS

The acceptance of these principles by American industry and the public has truly narrowed the range of debate. The remaining primary source of contention is the degree to which the workers shall participate in the especially high profits in a particular industry, and the rate at which the above principles shall be implemented.

Union wage proposals in seeking to achieve the goals have primarily derived from the state of prosperity of the companies and industries with which they deal. In competitive industries such as textiles, garments, shoes and other soft goods, wage and fringe benefits have lagged behind those in the more concentrated branches of the hard-goods manufacturing industries. Competition in the former has forced businessmen to pass on the benefits of high productivity and lower costs to the consumer. Primarily in periods of business upturn, when employers are enjoying favorable conditions, have unions been able to obtain higher benefits for workers. In less active periods they have been constrained to wait or secure modest advances. To illustrate this experience we may observe the trends as to wages, labor costs and prices in the nondurable goods industries which include many of the above competitive industries. Average hourly earnings rose by 66 percent from 1947 through 1958, unit labor costs by 9 percent and wholesale prices by 11 percent.

In contrast to the above has been the experience in the oligopolistically structured industries in which there are few competitors and where prices are administered relatively freely by employers in accordance with fixed price formulas and profit targets such as are employed by the steel industry. Employers have invariably been able to press their prices upward beyond the increase in labor costs. Witness of this trend is the fact that in the durable goods industries as a whole, average hourly earnings rose by 77 per cent from 1947 through 1958, unit labor costs by 13 percent and wholesale prices by 55 percent. The excessively high profits enjoyed by these industries remain a constant stimulus to ambitious union wage demands.

The present steel dispute is partly centered about the industry's determination to fix its prices high enough to assure low break-even points, such as about 35 percent capacity and a return of 20 percent on sales before taxes at 80 percent of capacity, and to deny workers a share in the profits they have earned. Such a price policy is currently netting the companies inordinately high profits as operations are exceeding 90 percent of capacity. The trade unions have called for workers to participate in this bounty. Part of the demands would no doubt have been scaled down if the companies had followed the policy laid out in

an editorial of Life magazine on May 18, 1959, which read as follows:

"Why don't steel companies reallocate their expected profits to make room, not for a wage boost, and not just for no increase in prices, but for an actual price cut?

"This would do more to halt inflation than any other course. * * * Steel productivity is way up. It is an extremely appropriate moment for steel prices to reflect this by coming down."

The major issue therefore presently confronting the parties in the collective bargaining process is how to reconcile the price policies followed by the large oligopolistic companies with the realities of the negotiations. So long as these larger corporations and industries insist upon the pursuance of present practices which insure continuing price rises, minimum recognition of consumer interests, and extraordinary profits, particularly during periods of high operations, there will be a continuing irreconcilable conflict between unions and management. While the competitive system is unable to enforce or limit returns to moderate levels in these industries, there must be other procedures for effecting this same result. While unusually high profits prevail they will tend to incite workers to ask for comparatively higher benefits for themselves over and above those laid down in the preceding set of goals.

The very trade-unions' insistence that workers share in this bounty has been a contribution to the discussion of public policy concerning the supervision of oligopolistic companies and their practices. Until this group is brought under careful periodic surveillance, unions will continue to force the issue of excessive profits upon the American people. The industrial dispute is therefore in part the byproduct of the Nation's lassitude in handling the overall problem of the pricing, financing and production policies of big business.

TECHNIQUES FOR MODERATING PROFIT LEVELS IN OLIGOPOLISTIC INDUSTRIES

Many different approaches have been suggested as appropriate for effectively forcing such changes in pricing policies. One proposal calls for the regular review of the proposed price increases by a Federal Government agency which shall subsequently issue its findings on the appropriateness of the boost and the soundness of the company's principles in price determination. If there are to be administered prices, the guides followed by these companies must be subjected to public scrutiny as a further restraint on prices in view of the absence of an effective market mechanism. This proposal is being considered by Congressional committees and is worthy of adoption for experimental purposes to determine whether it can truly restrain excessively high prices.

Anther proposal has been for annual labor-management conferences to consider these problems. These meetings would necessarily deal with the issues of wages, prices, productivity, and profits. The assumption is that if such meetings are regularly held on a broad national basis, management might overcome its reluctance to discuss business policy with union leaders. They who have fought most vigorously against union intervention in the price area as relates to the individual company may show a greater willingness to discuss these issues for American business as a whole. Until there is such an agreement for discussion on these policies and progress made toward reconciling these differences and views, it is unlikely that the gap between union and business views on these problems will be narrowed.

The issues with which these groups would have to deal relate to questions raised primarily by the behavior of the price-administered, oligopolistic industries. Is it appropriate to fix prices in terms of a set profit target for a given level of operations? How low may a breakeven point decline without violating the public interest? Is 35 percent too low? Shall companies maintain prices high enough to finance a substantial part or all of their expansion? Shall prices be fixed on the basis of a replacement cost formula for capital? How shall the accounting system be best designed to reflect the returns to management, investor, employee, and supplier? How shall they be reported to the bargaining representatives?

The focal point of any program for increasing labor responsibility in negotiations is the determination as to how and who is to review and moderate the prices and the profit levels of the companies only loosely controlled by the competitive forces. So long as the public makes no effort to intercede to assure more moderate prices and profits in these fields, trade unions will have to relate their bargaining proposals to the generous returns enjoyed by these employers. Union proposals are derived from the economic state of the employers' business and will continue to be so in our free economy. Exhortation directed at unions appears pointless since they are merely reacting to the realities of the corporate returns. Should the latter be made less inflationary, unions will trim their own proposals accordingly.

This review has underscored the complete absence of realism in the charge that higher labor rates are responsible for the rise in prices, the source of the cost-push. The union proposals are generally derived from the state of prosperity of the individual enterprise or industry. In securing their negotiated gains the unions do raise the level of wage rates, but the later determination to boost prices to offset or improve on the increase in order to maintain or broaden existing margins is a decision in which the union does not participate in any wise. Moreover, it is this subsequent price decision which starts the new cycle of extraordinary profits, particularly in periods of high operations. By breaking this continuing upward spiral by forcing a lower margin, the public can forestall the inflationary impact of these movements. If the public prefers, it can intercede prior to the wage negotiations by securing the reduction in prices as suggested by Life magazine and thereby tending to moderate the union proposals.

SYSTEM OF SPECIFIC CONTROLS URGED BY UNIONISTS

But no program directed solely at moderating these prices set primarily by the large oligopolistic corporations is enough to assure more stable general price levels. While the products of these companies flow through most channels of commerce and into every activity, there are other price complexes which are equally crucial to the realization of general stability. No single approach through monetary control or review of oligopolistic administered prices will be sufficient to restrain rising prices. These programs must be supplemented by a list of other techniques.

We shall enumerate several policies for the purpose of indicating the nature and scope of these additional proposals for restraining price rises. Trade-union interest and concern are not expressed solely through the measures discussed around the bargaining table; unions actively participate in the debate on public issues and in hearings before legislative and administrative bodies and in impressing legislators with the need of adopting measures directed to these ends. The trade-union program is described adequately only by its totality of proposals.

A. Administered Government prices

A substantial proportion of American price complexes is determined by regulatory bodies, governmental agencies or through negotiations with private business enterprises. Trade unions have appeared before many bodies to protest their formulas which have led to unending rate increases for public utilities. In New York City the trade unions aggresively fought the proposals for higher fares on the transportation system. At the Federal level, they have objected to the luscious prices paid to contractors of military projects. Individual unionists have called for the removal of the restraints on competition imposed in some areas such as trucking. Others have endorsed the proposal of a consumers' counsel to represent the consumer interest in all public affairs.

B. Agriculture prices

The present farm price programs have resulted in high prices. The consumer has had to pay them and in addition, as taxpayers, they have had to finance the costly benefits paid to the farmers. The trade-union movement has long supported the principle of the Brannan plan which favored financial support to the farm families rather than support payments to the large growers. In the field of cotton and raw wool the TWUA has advocated a one-price system looking for an open market price for these crops with appropriate payments to the small farmers. The result would be cheaper fabrics for the consumer and industry.

C. Services

The cost of services have been stepped up at a much higher rate than any other section of the consumers' budget. The prices of materials have risen because they are bought from the oligopolistic industries. The cost of labor services have also climbed both for the low-paid service employees and the professionals who have exploited their improved bargaining position to hike their fees.

Productivity has not been measurably improved for these services, therefore necessitating a higher price level. The writer has proposed the formation of a National Productivity Center for the Services to offset these increases in cost to achieve a greater stability in prices.

D. Monetary policy

Current monetary policy has proved inadequate to restrain inflationary pressures or to stimulate recovery. The present system of control reaches primarily into the commercial banking field. It cannot control consumer credit or the credit and investment policies of nonbanking financial institutions such as life insurance companies, savings and loan associations, sales and commercial finance companies, mutual savings banks, private pension funds, credit unions, other consumer and mortgage finance agencies, and the liquid assets of corporations. If monetary policy is to be more effective the central coordinating agency to control money credit and debt policy must be able to reach all agencies as well as the investment policies of these organizations. Moreover, such an agency would be empowered to lower interest rates in areas which have to be stimulated even during periods of tight money.

The writer also believes that if we are to have an effective system of control of inflation, Federal agencies should also have the authority for allocating key materials such as steel, to restrain accumulated demands and to assure balanced use of scarce resources.

The high interest rates paid by the Government for loans is another serious cause for higher prices. The Federal Reserve System has relied on the variations in interest rates and has not used its power to increase reserve requirements to control the supply of money and credit, thereby accentuating the pressure for higher interest rates. This policy needs careful review, if not reversal. Moreover, the practice of the Federal Government to pay high interest rates on funds which it borrows from commercial banks which utilize the Government's power to create credit is questionable, particularly

since they perform no service for these payments. The Federal Government must consider newer methods of financing which will lower the costs of such loans.

E. Fiscal policy

If fiscal policy is to serve as a more effective stabilizer and contribute to more stable prices, it is not enough to insist upon a balanced budget. As Federal expenditures rise, the country should secure the maximum revenues from the current rate structure. The elimination of the tax loopholes such as the preferential treatment of dividend income, excessive liberality in the handling of capital gains, the unwarranted depletion allowance are necessary to achieve greater equity and income.

The Federal Government could make a significant contribution to moderating the rise of raw material prices affected by international market conditions by selling its stockpile at appropriate times. The release of the copper supply would currently keep the price of copper in check. A more liberal quota on oil imports would inhibit price increases for gasoline and oil.

The proposed fair-trade bill adopted by the House Commerce Committee, opposed by the Federal agencies, labor and consumers, would do more to increase prices than most of the causes currently discussed.

A higher volume of foreign trade has been suggested as the means of counteracting the rising price levels in this country. While the writer has advocated a safeguarded level of national production for basic American industries, he has always associated this proposal with controls which would prevent any protective system from forcing up prices in this country.

CONCLUSION

The key groups determining the course of the price levels in this country are management, industry, and the Government. In a broad range of areas they administer prices rather than follow the levels developed through impersonal market forces. Being deliberately developed to attain specific end results, they should be subject to review by public agencies and the Congress of the United States. Trade-union wage and benefit aims are now commonly accepted as equitable and reasonable. The primary source of controversy stems from the differences existing between management and trade unions as to the workers' share of the excessive profits garnered by their particular industries. These high earnings result from the price policies followed by these oligopolistic industries. To minimize the intensity of the current conflict in this area, it would be desirable to moderate the price goals and profit targets adopted by these industries and secure lower prices in them. The most reasonable current proposal for effecting this end is the administrative review of proposed increases.

To assure a stable price level these systems should be associated with additional controls in affecting other price complexes and monetary and fiscal policies. Together these programs can help underwrite higher national productivity, more price stability and a more uniform rate of growth.

Changing Trends in Trade Patterns

REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the record shows that the policy of persistently chopping away at U.S. tariffs has achieved what its original sponsors in the first New Deal administration set out to do; namely, to increase American purchases of foreign products.

Obviously, a growing nation needs more goods. So it is not surprising that our imports have advanced over the years.

However, if we were simply buying abroad more of those products which we cannot provide for ourselves in our home economy, we would not be experiencing grave distress in many domestic industries. The fact is, we are importing more and more products that compete with our own output. Hence, the import problems of American industries and jobholders.

The record confirms this dangerous trend in our international commerce. In 1959, our imports of dutiable goods exceeded imports of duty-free products by nearly $3.5 billion. In total imports valued at $15 billion—a record high level—dutiable products accounted for $9.2 billion, while duty-free imports measured $5.8 billion.

Moreover, this was only the fourth time since 1910 that dutiable imports exceeded duty-free imports. From 1910 to 1956, the United States always bought more duty-free, or noncompetitive, goods from abroad than dutiable, or competitive, goods.

Then, in 1956, the situation reversed. Dutiable imports edged ahead of duty-free imports by less than $50 million out of total imports of $12.5 billion. In 1957, the gap widened to nearly $900 million. It expanded to more than $2.5 billion in 1958, and then to almost $3.5 billion last year.

Clearly, as the record shows, the emphasis in imports is on competitive products. In 1959, less than 39 cents out of every American dollar spent for foreign goods were allocated to duty-free imports. This is the lowest ratio since 1890, when only 33 percent of our total imports were free of duty.

Only twice in the 9 years since 1951 has the United States spent less than $5.8 billion for duty-free products. In most of these year our duty-free purchases surpassed $6 billion.

Yet, in the same period, imports of dutiable, or competitive, products have nearly doubled, from $4.8 billion in 1951 to $9.2 billion in 1959.

Another conclusive sign of this trend is the fact that although our imports have risen dramatically in the last couple of years, almost all of the net increase has been absorbed by our highly industrialized trading partners in Western Europe and Japan, while lesser developed nations in Asia, Africa, and South America have shared little, if at all, in the American import boom.

This becomes particularly distressing when we stop to consider that these same lesser developed countries, some of them still in the early days of independence and most of them urgently hunting markets for their raw materials, are the primary targets of the Soviet economic offensive.

This ambitious effort has shoved the Kremlin's sphere of influence virtually to the doorstep of the United States. Clear-cut Soviet designs for economic penetration of needy countries should be evident to anyone watching the busy routes of the Kremlin's hucksters. Energetic efforts to peddle Communist goods—and propaganda—are underway in many key areas in the nonindustrial free world, including Latin America.

If it is true, as many claim, that foreign trade policy is inexorably linked to broad foreign policy, then surely it is time to reassess our present trading patterns.

The record shows that the United States, the world's greatest trading nation, is currently devoting most of its attention in foreign commerce to swapping manufactured products with its industrial allies—in other words, the countries that least need our help—while offering relatively few new opportunities to the lesser developed nations that need help most.

Statement of William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Before the Joint Economic Committee, February 2, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Joint Economic Committee on February 2, 1960:

MONETARY POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

It seems to me that perhaps the most helpful contribution I can provide to your committee's annual review of the President's Economic Report is to make some supplementary comments on financial and monetary developments over the last year.

Our financial environment changes constantly, as this committee knows well, but some of the changes that took place last year were dramatic indeed.

During 1959, credit expanded by $60 billion in all—one-third more than the previous peacetime record. Mortagage debt, most of it for housing, increased by a record $19 billion. Consumer credit outstanding rose about $6.5 billion, equaling the previous record of 1955. New borrowing by State and local governments continued in near-record volume, and new borrowing by the Federal Government exceeded all peacetime records. At the end of the year public and private debt was at the highest level in history.

The American economy and the American people would be in a very different and a vastly worse position today if this enormous expansion of credit had been financed by the large-scale creation of additional funds by the banking system and a consequent rapid and inflationary increase in the money supply.

Fortunately, that danger was averted—in 1959 at least. To date, the task of supplying this huge demand for credit without

severe inflationary consequences has been accomplished chiefly by the sound and democratic process of letting those who would borrow provide those who would save with an inducement to risk voluntarily the loan of their savings. The role of the banking system, which obviously is influenced greatly by Federal Reserve policy and operations, has been held to that of an intermediary between borrowers and savers.

Let me illustrate the working of this process by referring briefly to the events of 1959 as they are reflected in the Federal Reserve's flow-of-funds accounts, a body of quarterly published data developed in part as an outgrowth of investigations set in motion by one of your subcommittees into the need for improved statistical information.

The commercial banks, it is true, did expand their loans in 1959 by almost $12 billion—thereby equaling the previous record of 1955. The important thing for the economy, however, is that the banks raised the funds for this lending in large part by selling Government securities they owned to the nonbank public.

Thus, the banks performed an intermediary service by obtaining funds from savers, to whom they transferred investment securities, and by passing the funds on to others who had a need to borrow. This flow of funds from savers to banks to borrowers did much to assure that the need for credit was met without a dangerous increase in the money supply. It did, however, bring about an increase in the turnover or rate of use of the existing money supply and, by so doing, produced much the same economic and financial effect as would have been produced by a modest increase in the money supply without the accompaniment of a faster rate of use.

The activity last year of the nonbank public—meaning for the most part consumers and business concerns—in supplying borrowers with funds through the process of investment was truly extraordinary, and it did not stop with the purchase of Government securities sold by the banking system. The upswing in this activity shows up strikingly in the flow-of-funds data that I mentioned earlier. There, it appears that consumer and business investors increased the net amount of their purchases made directly in securities markets from about $4 billion in 1958 to almost $20 billion in 1959—a jump of 400 percent in a single year.

The efficient and economically healthy flow of funds from savers to borrowers, directly and through intermediaries, did not come about without a price. The price was, of course, a rise in interest rates. These rates, representing a penalty to those who use someone else's money and a reward to those who save and risk their funds in loans and investments, rose in some instances to the highest levels in 3 decades. What happened is readily apparent: The pressure of demand for funds arising from a combination of forces—a large Federal budget deficit, high residential construction activity, rising expenditures for consumer durables and for inventories and to some extent fixed capital, plus the continued high level of expenditures by State and local governments on community facilities—converged to bring about a competition to borrow that drove interest rates upward; the rise in interest rates, in turn, operated to induce the savings and investment necessary to supply borrowing demands. In summary, the direct effect of the greatly enlarged credit demand was to bid up interest rates generally and to cause some changes in the relationship of interest rates among the different credit markets; the resultant effect was to draw more funds into the credit market and to shift some funds from accustomed uses. Let me add something here to what I said about the banking system's service in 1959 as an intermediary between the saving public and the borrowing public. On the one hand, the saving public, besides purchasing a large volume of securities as I described, increased their time deposits by about $1.5 billion. On the other hand, the borrowing public increased the amount of their loans obtained from commercial banks by nearly $12 billion. To raise funds to meet the heavy demands on them for loans, the commercial banks sold about $8 billion of their Government security holdings in the open market, while the nonbank public, as stated earlier, was increasing their purchases in that market. Thus the banks, in effect, drew out of the market, from individuals and corporations not engaged in lending, the funds to meet the specialized credit demands of borrowers—as, for instance, many small business concerns—who could not themselves have raised funds in the market because their needs were unsuitable for general market participation.

The vital role that the Federal securities market plays as a clearing house for credit flows is apparent in the circumstances described. In 1959, this role was much larger than in other recent years. Federal net borrowing of $11 billion and bank sales of Governments of nearly $8 billion required absorption of around $18 billion in Federal securities by other investors. This, taking into consideration that the Treasury was having to raise new funds while shifts were taking place in Government security ownership, goes a long way toward explaining the rise in both long- and short-term rates that we experienced during the year. It is also illuminating evidence of the responsiveness of nonbank investors to attractive interest yields.

The relation of Federal Reserve policy to changes in interest rates is often misunderstood. Federal Reserve operations to release or absorb bank reserves unquestionably influence short-term and also long-term interest rates, but the extent of this influence is easily exaggerated. Monetary policy is effective only so long as it works in general consonance with the economic realities underlying the situation. These realities include the basic demands for funds, whether to meet seasonal needs, other short-run needs, or for capital formation, and the basic supply of funds through saving. Federal Reserve actions cannot for long enforce rates of interest on the market that are either above or below the rates that maintain a balance between saving and investment.

Changes in the rate of monetary growth can represent only a very small part of the total flow of funds through credit markets. If the rate of monetary growth were raised with the specific objective of adding to the supply of funds in an attempt to keep interest rates down, the additional dollars in the spending stream would certainly work to raise average prices. The process of monetary inflation is widely understood by both savers and borrowers. Such action would generate expectations of further inflation on the part of both groups. The incentives of the marketplace, present and prospective, would unquestionably tend to increase borrowing and discourage saving and in all likelihood rates would increase.

In the longer run, the way that monetary policy can contribute to a lower level of interest rates is through its role in maintaining a stable value for the dollar. It is only in an environment of confidence in such stability that savings will accumulate and credit will flow in an orderly way and in expanding volume. Efforts to maintain an artificial level of interest rates, either too high or too low, can only lead to cumulative financial disequilibrium, first distorting and then disrupting healthy economic growth.

Whether monetary policy as administered by the Federal Reserve System has been, at particular times, too easy or too tight is a matter of judgment. At one time or another, we have no doubt erred in some degree in each direction. But the System has consistently endeavored to cultivate confidence in the stability of the dollar—by combating deflationary tendencies in periods of slack and inflationary pressures in periods when resources were being intensively utilized.

I want to emphasize again that the Federal Reserve System wants low and not high interest rates; it wants as low a level of interest rates as is consonant with sufficient savings to finance the investment necessary for desirable and rapid economic growth. We cannot say that a steadily swelling stream of savings and investment is the only essential for satisfactory growth, but, especially in a country where the natural resources are already highly developed, it is a vital element.

RECORD OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

The subject of economic growth has received exhaustive study by your Committee during the past year. It is an important subject because only growth can produce the substance with which to achieve our individual and national aspirations. At the same time, economic growth is a confusing subject because it means so many different things to different people. Some seek growth primarily as a requisite of effective defense against potential enemies. Others want it as a means of improving civilian living standards. Still others regard growth as a way of assuring employment of a growing labor force. Transcending and including all of these, perhaps, is the idea that economic growth is needed to express the vitality of our economic and political way of life.

As economic abundance in the United expands and is more widely shared, agreement on appropriate economic goals becomes more urgent. These goals can never be blueprinted exactly—as has been brought out so clearly in the hearings before this Committee. They are not solely materialistic and they are not all subject to expression in statistical terms. They include, for example, the improved quality of our educational system and of our health services—not just additional schoolrooms or hospital beds. Despite difficulties in measuring true growth precisely with the tools now at hand, we have made some progress and now know much more about the nature of growth than was known some years ago.

Early in its existence, the Board recognized that measurement of physical output was essential for proper formulation of monetary policy, and undertook a special responsibility for the statistical measurement of industrial output and its change and growth. This, it is true, is only part of our Nation's total output of goods and services, which is measured by gross national product. However, in an advanced economy, in which industrial activity is a dynamic central element, growth in the physical volume of industrial output merits special study in its own right because of its central role as a force shaping total growth.

When I appeared before this Committee last summer, I noted some preliminary findings of the recent revision of the Board's index of industrial production, principally the greater industrial growth shown by the newly revised index. Since then, the final results of the new index have been published, thus supplementing the tools for analyzing past and future changes in the industrial sectors of our economy.

Industrial production is the output of real goods produced by our factories, mines, and electric and gas utilities. Our revised index shows that, since 1947, industrial output has grown 4.1 percent per year, as compared with 1.7 percent for population. This is a growth in real industrial output per capita of over 2 percent per year. In other words, we are producing 31 percent more

industrial product for each man, woman, and child in America than we were at the beginning of the period. Output per industrial worker has increased even more rapidly—at the rate of 3.7 percent per annum over the same period.

The revised index of industrial production also introduces a new grouping of total output. Output measures for finished goods have been grouped into the broad market categories for consumer goods and equipment, and the measures for output of materials have also been grouped together. Briefly, this new grouping suggests that over postwar years, civilian production, and particularly the production of consumer goods, has expanded almost without any evident slackening in pace at an annual rate of 3.7 percent. Moreover, the cyclical interruptions in the output of civilian goods, especially consumer goods, have been relatively small. It is mainly in the production of equipment, including defense goods, that output has shown greater fluctuation about its expanding trend.

CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR CONTINUED GROWTH

While industrial growth, as measured by the production index, reflects physical volume of output, many measures of growth are expressed in terms of current dollars. We must constantly guard against mistaking increases in dollar magnitudes for real economic growth. It is sometimes suggested, when the rate of expansion slows down because the economy is operating close to capacity, that a more rapid expansion of bank credit and money would stimulate greater aggregate output. In fact, such an attempt would only lead to a bidding up of costs and prices as various sectors compete for limited resources. It is true that this would increase temporarily the gross national product measured in current dollars, but it would not involve any real growth. Quite aside from its other evils, inflation brings about misapplications of resources that actually reduce the true value of current production. There must be sustained confidence in a stable dollar for such adverse developments to be avoided.

Sound growth depends on a number of factors besides confidence in a stable dollar. In my own view, the following are the chief supplementary factors:

1. Balanced and sustained demands for labor and for the products of business;
2. Improvement in technology and skills;
3. Adequate capital formation based on voluntary savings;
4. Greater mobility of resources; and
5. Sufficient flexibility of individual prices.

Although there have been three postwar recessions, demands for labor and for the products of business have been reasonably well sustained over this period. During each of these recessions, stability of consumption helped to stimulate early revival. This stability in final demand encouraged entrepreneurs to maintain capital expenditures at surprisingly high levels even during temporary recessions. Such expenditures fluctuated moderately considering their long history of instability.

How much further the process of economic stabilization can be carried remains an uncertain issue. All men of good sense want to see our economic resources used fully and all men of good will want to have employment opportunities available for those willing and able to work. Satisfactory economic growth and reasonable price stability are not only compatible goals, in my view, but they are necessarily interdependent. At the same time we all recognize that some fluctuations in prices and employment are probably unavoidable and that, in the present state of the economic arts, it is hard to see how complete stability could be achieved without stifling some developments in our economy potentially favorable to growth.

Advancing technology and improvement of skills depend on educational processes and the general cultural environment. Our national pride has been pricked by discovery that other nations have beaten us in some aspects of technological development. This evidence is found not only in military hardware but also in the mounting competitiveness of the rest of the world. Products from abroad are increasingly penetrating our markets. This challenge, however, may well provide the stimulus for new achievements on our part.

If we are to maintain our competitive position in the world, we must also make regular additions to our productive capital and to our efficiency. Adequate capital formation depends both on the drive of business to make the capital investment and the availability of adequate funds from voluntary saving.

Mobility of resources must receive continuous attention. Near the top of successive postwar peaks in activity, unemployment has tended to be somewhat higher. In part, this may be due to structural imbalances growing out of the problem of transferring the labor force from industries made obsolete by growth to areas of higher labor demand. Such imbalance may also stem from the problems of adapting workers to the technological and sociological demands of the service industries, which are the more rapidly growing sources of urban employment.

Flexibility in the shifting of resources, of great importance for maximum growth, is extraordinarily difficult to achieve. One of the effects of growing productivity is to reduce the amount of resources required in particular industries, especially those in which end-product consumption, such as consumption of food, grows at a slow, steady rate. The process of moving resources aggravates our cyclical difficulties and creates a problem of structural unemployment. Steps to lessen the economic loss to the Nation and the hardships for individuals resulting from shifts in the pattern of production are an important public responsibility.

If we are to be able to continue to rely on the price mechanism to effect the necessary adjustments in a growing economy, prices of both end products and the factors of production must move freely in response to shifting demand and supply conditions. Imperfections in the price mechanism must be rooted out wherever they may exist, if our free enterprise economy is to realize its full potential.

PROJECTS FOR 1960

In early 1960 the economy continues to show a sharp pickup from the period of hesitation caused by the steel strike. Economic activity is vigorous and prices are reasonably stable. Nevertheless, it is possible we may encounter a renewed spiral in the upward movement of prices, or, perhaps, find that the underlying strength in the situation is not so great as most observers now feel. In these circumstances, all of us are faced with a particularly sensitive problem of maintaining prosperity by endeavoring to prevent either a renewal of inflationary pressures or development of deflationary tendencies.

I sincerely hope that our part in this task as monetary authorities can be aided by a healthy budget surplus of an amount at least as large as the one outlined in the President's budget message. Experience since 1957 suggests that a surplus of this size is a minimum condition of reasonable fiscal health. The relatively brief decline in economic activity that occurred in 1957–58 resulted in a deficit of over $12 billion in fiscal 1959. If a level of economic activity as high as marked 1959, and which is projected in the budget estimate for 1960, results in a barely balanced budget in 1960 and a budget surplus of no more than $4.2 billion in fiscal 1961, the average result of the full period is a net deficit.

Such an outcome would hardly represent symmetrical economic policy. It would therefore appear that larger budget surpluses are needed in times of prosperity if we are to avoid having to make regular and persistent increases in the public debt. The relatively favorable outlook for balance between saving and investment in the period ahead, with the accompanying prospect of less pressure on the rate of interest, depends in large part on the improved fiscal position of the Federal Government.

I doubt that anyone could be more aware of the real limitations of monetary policy than are the members of the Federal Reserve Board. It is, however, the area of responsibility which has been given to us and in the discharge of that responsibility it has seemed to us that the most constructive contribution monetary policy can make to the vigorous, healthy growth of the economy in the present circumstances is to maintain confidence in the value of money, and thus encourage people to save and invest in the basic capital improvements that add to our Nation's productive strength.

It is relevant to here refer to some statements that I made in the closing portion of a letter to Chairman DOUGLAS on December 9:

"My interest in a monetary policy directed toward a dollar of stable value is not based on the feeling that price stability is a more important national objective than either maximum sustainable growth or a high level of employment, but rather on the reasoned conclusion that the objective of price stability is an essential prerequisite to their achievement.

"I want to emphasize that I am most concerned with the preservation of freely competitive markets and the correction of any institutional imperfections which exist in the working of the price mechanism. While such imperfections cannot be corrected simply by a sound monetary and fiscal policy, they surely cannot be corrected by an unsound financial policy.

"Nor does a sound general monetary policy necessarily, in itself, accomplish the optimum distribution of loanable funds among various sectors of the economy. It is not only the right but the duty of Government to assure that socially necessary programs are adequately financed. But, again, this objective can never be well served by unsound general monetary or fiscal policies. If, as a matter of public policy, the financing of school construction, for example, should have an overriding priority in the allocation of resources, this can be accomplished in a number of ways, but we can be sure that it would not be accomplished by the general expansion of bank credit and money."

In conclusion, I should like to add a word about what monetary policy can and cannot do. It cannot effectively peg interest rates. It cannot prevent monopoly. It cannot assure that the financial needs of all socially desirable activities are met without intervention by Government. It cannot be relied upon to cover Federal deficits. Alone, it certainly cannot assure either stability or growth.

What a correct monetary policy can do is to foster confidence in the dollar, so that our people can and will save and invest in the future with reasonable assurance that their plans will not be frustrated by irresponsible changes in the value of money.

The Civil Rights Conference at the Notre Dame Law School, February 14, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Notre Dame Law School was sponsor on February 14, 1960, of a conference on civil rights. Members of Congress, officials of the Department of Justice, State and local government officials, professors of law and representatives of voluntary associations gathered on the campus of the University of Notre Dame to discuss legislative proposals now before Congress in the field of civil rights.

The discussions by these distinguished citizens were so valuable that I am pleased to be able to call them to the attention of Members of Congress by joining with several of my colleagues to include the proceedings of the conference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PARTICIPANTS IN CIVIL RIGHTS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 14, 1960

Mr. Douglas Anderson, assistant to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. Berl Bernhard, Deputy Director Commission on Civil Rights.

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana.

Prof. Thomas Broden, Jr., Notre Dame Law School.

Mr. John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General.

Prof. Roger Cramton, the University of Chicago Law School.

Prof. Wylie H. Davis, University of Illinois College of Law.

Mr. Russell De Bow, assistant to Representative BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois.

Senator JESSE L. DICKINSON, Indiana State Senate, executive director, South Bend Housing Authority.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Prof. Jesse J. Dukeminier, Jr., University of Kentucky College of Law.

Mr. Vernon Eagle, executive director, the New World Foundation.

Prof. Samuel D. Estep, University of Michigan Law School.

Mr. Herman Edelsberg, chairman, National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

Mr. John Feild, legislative assistant to Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan.

Mr. Robert J. Fink, administrative assistant to Governor Harold Handley of Indiana.

Mr. Harold C. Fleming, executive director, Southern Regional Council.

Mr. William R. Foley, General Counsel, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

Prof. George W. Foster, Jr., University of Wisconsin Law School.

Prof. Robert J. Harris, University of Michigan Law School.

Mr. James Harrison, administrative assistant to Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame; member, Commission on Civil Rights.

Representative Jeanne Hurley, Illinois General Assembly.

Commissioner George M. Johnson, member, Commission on Civil Rights; professor, Howard University Law School.

Senator Marshall F. Kizer, Indiana State Senate.

Prof. Conrad Kellenberg, Notre Dame Law School.

Rev. William J. Kenealy, S.J., professor, Loyola University School of Law.

Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, of Michigan.

Mr. Clifford E. Minton, executive director, Urban League of Gary, Ind., representing the National Urban League.

Representative WALTER H. MOELLER, of Ohio.

Dr. John A. Morsell, assistant to the executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mrs. Nancy Murry, executive secretary to Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin.

Prof. Nathaniel L. Nathanson, Northwestern University Law School.

Mr. Robert Nelson, legislative assistant, Commission on Civil Rights.

Dean Joseph O'Meara, Notre Dame Law School.

Prof. Roger Peters, Notre Dame Law School.

Prof. Robert Rodes, Jr., Notre Dame Law School.

Mr. Fred Routh, president, National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials; executive secretary, Michigan Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Mr. Joseph Russo, legislative assistant to Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana.

Prof. Ivan C. Rutledge, Indiana University School of Law.

Mr. John A. Scott, chairman, Indiana Advisory Committee, Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. John Silard, Washington attorney.

Representative Paul Simon, Illinois General Assembly.

Prof. Theodore Smedley, director, Race Relations Law Reporter, Vanderbilt University School of Law.

Mr. Hal Thurmond, chairman, Kentucky State Advisory Committee, Commission on Civil Rights.

Prof. William W. Van Alstyne, assistant dean, Ohio State University College of Law.

Mayor Edward F. Voorde, South Bend, Ind.

Prof. Bernard J. Ward, Notre Dame Law School.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams, Michigan.

Prof. Harris Wofford, Jr., Notre Dame Law School; legal adviser to Commissioner Hesburgh, Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, Washington attorney.

CIVIL RIGHTS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 14, 1960, NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL, NOTRE DAME, IND.

Dean O'MEARA. The Civil Rights Conference will come to order. We want this to be informal, so I'm going to sit down for the few remarks I have to make to begin with.

America is equal opportunity or it is nothing: not equal opportunity as regards this or that, but equal opportunity in every area of American life. In all frankness, I do not see how an American could seriously challenge this proposition. We have our differences as to method and timing, but the central idea, the affirmation of equal opportunity for all, is not only part of the American dream but a built-in and essential feature of the fundamental law of the land. That is a postulate of this conference. We are met to consider how best to bring the promise of the Constitution to fulfillment.

On this day, Sunday, a day on which many of us are expected to concern ourselves in a special way with spiritual values, and in these academic surroundings I hope we will be able to lay aside prejudices and partisan considerations and approach this important subject with as much objectivity as humans are capable of.

As you know, each of the three areas of discussion is to be introduced by a short statement by a member of the Notre Dame law faculty. Then will come the discussion, in which I hope everyone will feel free to participate, both by question and by comment. This is the heart of the conference, and it will be fruitful in proportion as the discussion is frank and perceptive and stimulating.

Before we get to that, however, I have the very real privilege of presenting to you to say a word of welcome the president of the University of Notre Dame, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh.

Father HESBURGH. Thank you, Dean O'Meara. Governor Williams, Senator DOUGLAS, distinguished guests, dear friends.

I trust that the brevity of my remarks this morning will not detract from the very real fact that we are simply delighted to have all of you with us for this most important occasion. I think it just another experiment that has been inaugurated by our Dean O'Meara in seeing how somehow the mechanism might be arrived at to bring together those who have the deep responsibility of formulating the laws of this land and those whose lives are somewhat surrounded in the academic halls where they try to prepare young men for the great responsibilities of public life and of service to justice under the law.

I think it a wonderful thing that legislators and those who concern themselves with the common good of this country can foregather in a university environment so that hopefully by mingling for a day with the professors of the law and the students of justice and charity in our land somehow we might bring to bear the greatest measure of wisdom in this area that is so troublesome in our day. Certainly in every area of our national life today there is need for greater and greater wisdom: in our programs of science and technology, in our discussions of foreign policy, and most particularly for our meeting here this morning in the area of civil rights.

We are delighted, as I said, to have you with us, and we are glad to have the opportunity to make this small contribution to the great debate which will begin in the Halls of Congress tomorrow morning. I trust that our discussions here, as the Dean has said, may be substantial and substantive, that we may be all of us trying to see what we can do in the way of means while we stand undivided in the matter of ends. Because as the Civil Rights Commission has said so often through its individual members and in its report, our great concern is for the human dignity and the equal opportunity and the real constitutional rights of every American citizen.

We made certain suggestions to the end that these rights might be maintained and preserved. We feel no compulsion to say that our suggestions are the only ones that would actually effect this end. We are interested in the achievement of civil rights throughout the length and breadth of the United States, and I think we would all of us agree that meetings like this morning where responsible citizens, legislators, students of the law, professors of the law, look to this end with a view to the best means of achieving it—this is indeed our main concern and I trust yours also.

So let me just say we're delighted to have you. We know this is going to be a busy day, and as the dean said, the discussion is the substance of this day, so I shall sit down and let us move on toward the presentations and the discussions for which you have come.

Dean O'MEARA. Ladies and gentlemen, we're to have a double welcome. You've been welcomed on behalf of the university, but the university provides only one segment of this discussion. It seems fitting that you should be welcomed by someone representing the public-official segment of the conference. We asked Congressman

BRADEMAS to do this. It's my pleasure to present him at this time.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Father Hesburgh, Dean O'Meara, Dean Johnson, Senator Douglas, Governor Williams, my distinguished colleagues in the Congress, ladies and gentlemen.

I count it a high privilege to be able to welcome so distinguished a group of Americans to the district I have the honor to represent in Congress. More especially do I feel privileged to welcome you to the campus of this great university for the purpose of discussing, on the eve of its consideration by Congress, an issue of profound importance to the people of the United States.

They are bold words, indeed, with which the Declaration of Independence sets forth the beliefs on which our country was founded, beliefs that we have not yet completely translated into reality.

"We hold these truths to be self evident," says the Declaration, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men * * *."

It is to consider the ways in which the Federal Government can help secure to millions of American citizens now denied certain of these unalienable rights that we are meeting today.

Permit me, Father Hesburgh and Dean O'Meara, to express to you and the University of Notre Dame the genuine appreciation of my colleagues in Congress and of the other distinguished persons, officials of government, teachers of law and representatives of voluntary associations, for the hospitality you are extending to us today.

To his many other accomplishments in the service of our country, Father Hesburgh must now add his contributions as a member of the Commission on Civil Rights. I believe most of you would agree that the Commission's report represents an extraordinary landmark in the development of equality of opportunity in this country, and one of the reasons for the high quality of the report is Father Hesburgh.

This Conference on Civil Rights at Notre Dame is one in a line of achievements of the dean of the law school, Joseph O'Meara. Dean O'Meara's vigorous and dedicated intelligence has been chiefly responsible for a series of symposia at Notre Dame, each of which has resulted in a special issue of the Notre Dame Lawyer which has been widely distributed and read.

In December 1953, the law school held a symposium on "Legislative Investigations," concentrating on safeguards for witnesses; in April 1958, a conference on "The Role of the Supreme Court in the American Constitutional System," at which time the Court was under heavy attack and constructive thinking was much needed; and in May 1959, on "The Problems and Responsibilities of Desegregation". In April of this year I understand there is to be another symposium, on "Labor Union Power and the Public Interest."

Our discussions at Notre Dame today on the issue of civil rights represent a pioneering effort in the method of developing public law, a method whereby national legislators, law school teachers, and key legislative draftsmen from both Congress and the executive can collaborate effectively.

Let us hope that this cooperative experiment proves so fruitful that it can be usefully extended to other legislative issues. It is, of course, to be understood that the law school is not concerned to press any particular viewpoint but rather to offer a means for bringing together informed, intelligent views.

You may be interested to know that it is the intention of several Members of Congress to include the transcript of this conference on civil rights in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to bring the work of the conferees to the attention of a wider audience.

Abraham Lincoln said, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

By its monumental work, the Civil Rights Commission has shown us where we are in the field of civil rights. Our task today is to discuss what to do and how to do it.

In our brief time, we can perhaps seek to answer two questions.

First, what new action in the field of civil rights is within the constitutional power of Congress?

Second, what is the most appropriate way for Congress to exercise its constitutional power?

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil-rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

PART 1—THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Congressman. Now, ladies and gentlemen, there have been some important developments which, so far as I know, have not yet been reported in the press. It is our great good fortune to have with us two gentlemen who have had a great deal to do with them and who are apprised of what's been going on and who can give us these late developments. It will assist us in our discussion, I think, if before the discussion proper gets underway we have a brief, factual statement by them of what has recently, very recently, taken place. Professor Wofford suggests that perhaps this should be put off until after his opening remarks and, as a matter of fact, that's what I agreed to do last night. And perhaps I'd better abide by that undertaking and call on Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Silard to fill you in on these recent factual developments after Professor Wofford has given you the benefit of a background summary which he has prepared.

If anyone is entitled to the credit for this conference, it's Harris Wofford. I freely acknowledge that and express my indebtedness to him, and ask him now to get the conference proper underway by means of this background statement that he has ready. Professor Wofford.

Professor WOFFORD. Thank you, Dean. I think Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Silard would have been surprised, too, because I was supposed to be their build-up, and I'm afraid if turned around the other way I would have been their roadblock, because I think the developments they have to report start off the discussion at a fast and important pace, and at that point I think what I have to say might slow it down.

In the middle of the Civil War Lincoln wrote, "I have been controlled by events." We can say now that events are in control of the civil rights bill which will emerge from this session of Congress.

The Commission on Civil Rights has had its say and the Attorney General has had his. The Senate Rules Committee, LYNDON JOHNSON, and the leadership of the House are yet to be heard. And behind all these present and counted factors are the brooding omnipresences—millions of American Negroes who have been denied the right to vote or who have not dared to try to exercise that right or, even worse, who do not know or care about that right; millions of white southern Americans who still do not accept the command of the 14th and 15th amendments; the whole American body politic with its troubled conscience and yet its relative complacency about this failure to make good the guarantees of the Constitution; and beyond our borders the colored majority of the human race waiting to see what we do; and also that distant shadow or illumination: the law of nature and of nature's God which led a great southerner once to declare that all men are created equal.

Idea and fate are either going to meet in a creative hour for civil rights in this session of Congress or there will be a great fiasco—perhaps a great enough one to insure a later creative hour. The heat already being generated over the central matter of legislation to establish some kind of Federal registration machinery is a good sign. All we can do here is to try to turn some of that heat into light.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PLAN

Since there have been a few sparks flying between the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Commission, let me first try to practice what I am preaching. In the background memorandum you have before you I have rolled my thoughts on the relative merits of the Attorney General's referee plan and the Commission's registrar plan into one ball. Some of my criticism of the court-referee plan is stated sharply. I hope that this will all be read as my way of raising some of the important questions.

Let me say clearly that despite the drawbacks I see in the Attorney General's plan, despite my preference for an administrative rather than a judicial approach, I believe it would be a significant step forward for Congress to enact this plan—even if none of the strengthening amendments to the plan that seem to me so vital are adopted. I say this in large part out of faith in the symbolic role of law as educator.

The United States Government is propelled by three great engines but so far in civil rights it has been flying on only one engine—the Federal judiciary. The Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first real exercise of congressional responsibility in this area in 82 years, saw the legislative branch begin to apply its power. A Civil Rights Act of 1960, establishing further machinery to protect the right to vote, will demonstrate that the full power of the Federal Government is coming into this picture—unless States rights are everywhere transformed into State responsibility. I am sure that the adoption of the Attorney General's plan would lead to many more voting rights suits. Such suits and the existence of voting referees would be powerful new signs both to Negroes and to southern whites that the Government at last means to make good the guarantee of the 15th amendment. The result, I think, would be greater Negro effort to register and vote and, on balance, less white resistance.

STATE ELECTIONS SHOULD BE COVERED

Moreover, let me emphasize the contributions the Attorney General has in my opinion made to the debate. His insistence that any registration plan include both State and Federal elections is one of these. As Commissioner Johnson told the rules committee, the Commission did not doubt the constitutionality of extending its registrar

plan to all elections, but limited it to Federal elections as a matter of prudence. Either the Attorney General's plan or the Commission's plan could be applied to either Federal elections only or to all elections, for the 15th amendment on which both plans are based unquestionably covers all elections on all levels of government.

Another contribution is the method of equitable enforcement spelled out in the Attorney General's bill. A court order directed to local election officials requiring them to honor the Federal registration, permitting prosecution for contempt of court in cases of refusal to honor such registration, and a court-appointed agent to attend at the actual balloting and to report any violations to the court—this seems to me the best way to enforce any Federal registration machinery, whether that machinery is set up through the court, as the Attorney General insists, or administratively in the executive branch as the Commission proposed. Some of the registrar bills provided for equitable enforcement but some of the details of the Attorney General's bill should certainly be incorporated in any Federal registration act.

CRITERION FOR LEGISLATION

We can agree, I hope, and perhaps we should begin by trying to agree on the chief objective of further legislation to protect the right to vote. On pages 7 and 8 of the background memorandum I have adopted the objective stated in Commissioner Johnson's testimony that "the method of registering persons denied their constitutional right to register to vote be no more complicated or cumbersome than the method available to other citizens in the State or district who are registered." Attorney General Rogers and Deputy Attorney General Walsh have expressed their general agreement with this objective.

With this as the criterion, isn't an administrative procedure established in the executive branch the most appropriate way to provide for Federal registration in districts where discriminatory denials of the right to vote are found to exist? Isn't this problem essentially a political problem—one that goes to the very heart of our political process itself—that should so far as possible be solved politically? I call your attention to the memorandum by Paul Freund before you which makes this point strongly. Haven't the Federal courts been already unduly burdened with the problem of school desegregation? Isn't the administrative load that would under the Attorney General's plan be placed on the Federal judiciary an immense and unprecedented one—so immense and unprecedented as to raise most serious questions about the appropriateness of this procedure? I call your attention to the Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) memorandum before you which makes this point strongly.

DISADVANTAGES OF JUDICIAL APPROACH

It is of course true that in many cases—perhaps in most cases—there will need to be court enforcement in the end. But the question is whether the court should be in this problem from the beginning or come in at the end, as a last resort. There are certainly advantages in having the court in from the beginning, and perhaps we should simply accept, and not question, De Tocqueville's comment, which I think he meant as a criticism, that in America nearly every political question ultimately takes a judicial form. Perhaps the Federal district judges in the localities involved will command far more respect than the President of the United States and his appointed agent—although I can't ignore the irony in this in view of the white southern complaint about judicial legislation.

But, if the courts are in this process from the beginning, what are the prospects for court findings of the pattern or practice of discrimination proposed by the Attorney General? Is Judge Skelly Wright's recent decision in a case where there was overwhelming evidence of a mass purge of already registered Negroes an exception that proves the rule of reluctance by southern district judges to move in this matter? If the appointment of a voting referee is left to the discretion of the southern district judges, as under the Attorney General's present draft bill, how many such judges will exercise that discretion? And if the procedure before the referee is left to the discretion of the judges, won't some or most of them provide for a kind of adversary proceeding before the referee, a proceeding in which the Negro applicant would be subjected to cross-examination by attorneys for the State officials? And if this happens, how many Negroes will undergo this ordeal by litigation involved in securing their right to vote? How many white citizens would register if it took hours or days or weeks of trial, and possible intimidation while being the center of such a trial?

AMENDMENTS AND ALTERNATIVES

If the Attorney General's plan is to be really effective must it not be amended to make the appointment of referees mandatory under certain conditions and to require the referees to register qualified applicants in a routine, ministerial, ex parte way?

Mr. Calhoun will tell us the details of the new language that Judge Walsh told the House Judiciary Committee the Attorney General would accept as clarifying amendments in this respect. I think that what he will report is a most crucial step forward in this picture.

Then I hope that we will discuss today possible combinations of these two approaches that have some of the benefits of both. Beginning on page 14 of the background memorandum I have outlined some of the alternatives that occur to me.

My own preference would be to see both plans adopted, with the Attorney General's sanctions available in enforcing the rights of persons registered under a presidentially appointed registrar, with this Presidential action perhaps limited to Federal elections, with the Attorney General's court procedure available to attack any continuing discrimination in State elections. This is the kind of dual relief provided in antitrust law with enforcement by both the Federal Trade Commission and suits by the Attorney General.

The next best alternative, it seems to me, would be an administrative agency determination of the existence of the discrimination in a district and then court enforcement through registration by referees. Another combination would be a court finding of a pattern of practice of discrimination and then Presidential appointment of registrars.

You may and I trust you will suggest other and better alternatives. Perhaps we should begin with an appraisal of the two main proposals, the registrar and the referee plans. But most important let us try to discover the essential ingredients of whatever plan is to emerge—the essential ingredients of effective legislation that by whatever name will smell the same—and do the job.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the Civil Rights Conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Professor Wofford. I'll ask you, Mr. Calhoun, to make your report at this time, please.

Mr. CALHOUN, Department of Justice. In the first week of February queries of the character just made by Professor Wofford with respect to the Attorney General's bills were made to the Department of Justice. On February 9 the Deputy Attorney General at a hearing before the House Judiciary Committee attempted an answer to those queries. The Deputy Attorney General made clear that the Department did not oppose any effort by the Congress to spell out in such detail as it thought appropriate the procedures that were to be followed for the voting referee or at the district court or at the polling places. The Attorney General's bill had left that elaboration to the Congress to the extent that Congress thought it could accomplish it.

The Deputy Attorney General in his testimony suggested one form of spelling out that might be appropriate. It is the language that he suggested, language that is not before you, that I would like to read now. Referring to the procedures before the voting referee he suggested that the bill should say:

"In a proceeding before such person or persons so appointed the applicant shall be heard ex parte. His statement under oath shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence, and his prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote. Where proof of literacy or an understanding of other subjects is required by valid provisions of State law, the answer of the applicant, if written, shall be included in such report to the court; if oral they shall be taken down stenographically and a transcription included in such report to the court.

"Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof by mail to each party to such proceeding together with an order to show cause within 10 day why an order of the court should not be entered in accordance with such report. Upon the expiration of such period, such order shall be entered except as to any applicant named in the report as to whom the State registrar or other appropriate party to the proceeding prior to that time files with the court and serves upon the Attorney General and the applicant concerned a statement of exceptions to such report which, if the exceptions relate to matters of fact, is supported by a duly verified copy of a public record or by affidavit of persons having personal knowledge of such fact and, which, if relating to matters of law, is supported by an appropriate memorandum of law."

I think perhaps the most important contribution of the deputy's testimony was not the specifics of this language, but the thought that the Department of Justice is quite anxious to have the Congress spell out in any area that it thinks it necessary procedures that give the full safeguards that are required to assure large registration for qualified Negroes.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Mr. Calhoun. Now Mr. Silard, please.

Mr. SILARD, Washington attorney. I might say that I do not represent any organization here today. I am here in the capacity of one who has been personally involved in various proposals. I would like to report one particular development from the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee which probably has not yet reached the attention of this body. This occurred yesterday afternoon.

But before that I think that I would like to state the four points upon which it seems to me—until the new fifth element was introduced yesterday—the administration and the Civil Rights Commission and most proponents of legislation have reached substan-

tial agreement, not unanimity but substantial agreement.

The first and the most important of course is the one Mr. Calhoun just made reference to, that is the requirement that by one means or another there be appointed an officer, or that there be a system of Federal registration available to persons in the disenfranchised class—a system which is no more onerous than the State registration process. Beginning with what now appears to be a concensus on this aspect, the Federal registration system will be comparable, perhaps almost identical to that provided by the State—say a 5-, 10-, 15-minute operation.

Beginning with a concensus on this, it seems to me that there is broad recognition of two other elements to which the Attorney General has made much reference. The first of these, and what then becomes a second ingredient of a workable bill, I think, is that there be a judicial finding of a pattern or practice of racial disfranchisement, prior to the appointment of any Federal registration official in the locality involved. Certainly this is a proposition that could be debated at length. Other bodies than the courts could make such determinations, but I think there appears to be a jelling on the proposition that the Attorney General has done the right thing in proposing that a judicial finding of a pattern precede any Federal system of enrolling persons for election.

The third element upon which I think there is now a concensus, quite cleanly a concensus I would hope, is that the Federal registration system, whatever it may be, be effective both for Federal and for State elections. I think it is no longer possible to answer the Attorney General's contentions along these lines and to fall back upon a sytem which leaves the state election situation without any new remedies.

The fourth element upon which I am sure everyone is agreed, and one to which the Attorney General again has pointed with considerable stress, is the necessity for the availability of Federal injunctions to assure that those who are registered under a federal registration system will be permitted to vote. I don't see that anyone has ever seriously been able to defend any system which lacks this ultimate Federal sanction at the point where the registration system either will or will not result in somebody's obtaining the right to vote.

With these four elements appearing as the basis of a workable bill, upon which the administration and many other persons could agree, there remained a fifth difficulty. And the fifth difficulty was—is as of today—that at least under the proposal of the Attorney General there would seem to be required for each individual voter who desires to enroll under the Federal mechanism, there seems to be required at some point prior to the election a full judicial hearing, that is to say that the State must have its full day-in-court, however long that day must be, on every one of hundreds of thousands or ten. or whatever the number may be, of persons enrolled in the Federal mechanism. And if the State must be given this board judicial right to its day-in-court prior to the election, many people have questioned whether these people who have ultimately become—who have tried to become enrolled in the Federal structure—will obtain the right to vote before the election is over.

Consider for instance the right of a State to prescribe that registration for elections shall be held in a period of 30 days or 60 days prior to the election, and nothing precludes the States from imposing this requirement generally. Prior to every election everyone who desires therein must register within a 60-day period. Well, now under the Attorney General's proposal, it would seem the Federal enrollee must first go to the State official and be turned down or stand in line long enough to make sure that he's not going to get in. Then he must go to the Federal official and prove his qualifications, and then before he ever obtains a judicial decree entitling him to vote—and remember a 60- or 30-day period is meanwhile running—the State must have its right to come into the Federal court and put him on the witness stand, produce evidence presumably of his disqualifications, perhaps he's living in the wrong county—heaven knows what it might be—and the court must adjudicate this issue and it must do so with respect to every single one of hundreds of thousands of persons.

Now when you consider that under the Attorney General's plan this would have to be done at every election, because the registration period under the Federal scheme is no longer than the registration period under the State scheme, we could easily be confronted with a situation where at every primary and general election we must initiate within a very short time period this entire double administrative and judicial process for each individual person in the class which has been disenfranchised.

To meet this grave problem many persons have suggested that the appropriate moment for the State's challenge of the Federal enrollments which everyone seems to be contemplating here comes not prior to the election, but, as is now the case in the State elections, comes at the moment that the enrollee desire to vote. This, I take it, is the system employed in every State of the Union today. No one affords the opportunity to challenge registrations at the time of registration. The appropriate moment that you challenge eligibility of those who desire to vote is at the moment that they desire to exercise that eligibility. After all, it's even speculative whether any particular person will desire to vote, whether he will be alive or living within the district at the time that the election comes.

So on this fifth most vital difficulty, it seems to me that there has been a great need for the suggestion that it might well be that every constitutional right of the State to challenge the eligibility of persons who are enrolled in a Federal system is met, so long as that State's day-in-court comes at the moment that the voter desires to vote. He can be given his right to vote so that it will be made available for counting later, or it could be counted subject to defeasance, and at that time subject to the ultimate determination of the Federal district court as far as the individual vote is concerned. He has done his job. He has become enrolled quickly. He has voted without difficulty. Then we might well afford any degree of judicial process that is necessary to afford the States their day-in-court upon this voter's eligibility.

In line with this fifth suggestion I'm happy to be able to read two or three sentences from Senator HENNINGS' press release of yesterday afternoon. The Senator said that as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate he had completed work on the first draft of a bill to protect voting rights and would submit the new measure to the Rules Committee on Wednesday. He then stated: "I believe this new proposal which I call the Federal Enrollment Officer Act of 1960 will substantially advance the opportunity for an effective voting rights bill, to be approved by the Congress this year."

HENNINGS said the text of the proposal would not be available until after the meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration on Wednesday. "One of the major contributions of the draft bill," he said, "is that it assures that the voters enrolled to vote under its provisions would be guaranteed the right to cast their ballots while reserving the right of the States to contest the validity of the ballots until after the vote had been cast. This provision will minimize the court appeals and delays that could well block what we are trying to accomplish." And then Senator HENNINGS expressed his hope that the Rules Committee in the Senate would be able to provide a workable bill acceptable to the administration and others which could be the basis of a meaningful Senate debate upon a voting bill.

And with this fifth element, if it were to become acceptable to the administration, I think the solution may be close on a workable voting bill. I think this fifth principle could be stated thus: There is necessity for provision for State challenge of Federal registration at a time and in a manner which cannot by delay defeat the right of those enrolled to cast their votes in the election. Thank you.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Mr. Silard. Now two points before I call on Congressman BRADEMAS to open the discussion proper. First, along the side of the table opposite me are members of law faculties. While there are some exceptions to the rule I'm about to give you, those who are sitting with me at this table and some of those at the two ends hold some sort of official position.

Now it is with respect to employees, staff members of various Government units, that I wish to say just a word which is the second point. We understand that anything said, any views expressed, any statement made, is on behalf of the individual and not made in a representative capacity unless it is made clear that what he is saying is said in a representative capacity.

Congressman BRADEMAS will lead the discussion which, as I said before, I think is the heart of this conference, and I'm going to ask him to begin now.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Professor Wofford has made very clear it seems to me that our task here is to try to find out what the basic ingredients of a good voting rights law are to be, and Mr. Silard has suggested that there may already be concensus on what some of the elements of such law may be. I wonder if we would all be in agreement with him that this is the case. For example, here are two or three areas that I would raise questions about.

In the first place, to what extent are we agreed that the job should be done through a judicial approach or through an administrative approach? For example, should we have, as Mr. Silard suggests, a judicial finding, if I understand him correctly, of a pattern of discrimination? Or does this pose so many problems that the job should be done through some administrative approach? Supposing that there is a judicial finding of a pattern of discrimination. How often should such a finding be required?

A second general area that we might talk about is the problem of enforcement. Should this be done through criminal procedures or through some other approach?

Third, perhaps, do we all find ourselves in agreement that both State and Federal elections should be covered by our voting rights law. I notice that in the Yale memorandum that some of you may have read, the suggestion was made that to begin with we should only make the law apply to Federal elections.

These are just some of the questions that occurred to this obviously lay politician as we try to think through this problem. I'm going to ask the senior Member of the Congress, who is with us here today, Senator DOUGLAS, another nonlawyer, if he has any observations to make on these matters, Senator.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Brademas, first let me say that I think it's highly important that we approach this matter with an attempt to obtain as great a degree of unity as possible, and that we regard as secondary

the origin of these proposals or the party sponsorship. Our difficulties are going to be very great and if we split up amongst ourselves as a practical matter it's going to be very difficult to get anything whatsoever done. And as a nonlawyer I suppose all I can do is raise certain doubts that I have and ask the lawyers to answer them.

I have a certain fear of a purely judicial process, because it seems to me that you have a danger of undue delay. I had not realized that in the proposal of the Attorney General that the application of each individual respective voter would become a separate case and that each case could be contested by the State. Now if this is true, this seems to me to give to the State and local authorities who are determined to prevent Negroes from voting the opportunity of tying up the courts and the referee in the original instance.

The second question that I would like to raise is about the process of appeal. Suppose you get a verdict from a referee asking for the court that John Jones should be permitted to register. Then a series of questions come from this. Can the appeal be taken from the referee to the district court which has appointed the referees so that there may be a review of the referee's findings? If so, is the decision of the referee suspended during that time, or is it in operation? Then suppose the district court affirms the decision of its referee and the appeal is taken to the circuit court, what is the status of the finding during that time? Is it suspended or is it in operation? And then if an appeal is taken from the circuit court to the U.S. Supreme Court, is the tentative decision suspended or is it in operation? Now if all these matters are suspended prior to appeal, not only will the first election have passed, but the next election will have passed, and indeed perhaps there may be two or three more elections which will have occurred before the final opinion is handed down. So that this has been in my mind ever since the Attorney General made his proposal, and it's upon this point that I would really like some enlightenment from experts in judicial procedure.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the Civil Rights Conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Congressman BRADEMAS. Thank you, Senator. Governor Williams has a comment.

Governor WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Congressman BRADEMAS and Senator DOUGLAS. I'd like first of all to make a few remarks of a general nature that I don't think will hold up the proceedings but will help express, I am sure, the feelings of many of us as to the excellent idea of this conference in the first place.

To Father Hesburgh I certainly want to express my appreciation for the extraordinary work done by this Commission, of which he was an important member. I must confess that I was one of many skeptics who viewed this commission as one having no possibility whatsoever of doing any good, and that it did achieve some success, I think is a minor miracle in and of itself. I think that the pointed questions that they raised are of extreme importance to all of us. And of course some of them we're expressing here today. I think one is the question of executive action. I don't know if that's in order today or not, if it isn't I certainly think that it would be well to have a similar conference on that point.

I'd like to say that it seems to me that the idea of the conference, and I don't know whether this is yours, Father Hesburgh, or whether it's Dean O'Meara's, is something which is of extreme importance. For years now I've been saying that this is just exactly what the President of the United States should have done immediately after the 1954 court decision was made, because if men of good will could gather together in an atmosphere such as this, where the academic ivy could somehow or other restrain the partisan political impulses of the public officials, perhaps some reasonable action could have been taken which would have speeded progress and prevented many of the unfortunate things happening that have happened.

Well coming down to our point in question, it seems to me that we're grappling with an exceedingly elusive problem. I happen to live in a State which has been traditionally Republican for a long time, and for Democrats, and we now happen to be the majority, for the majority to be able to register is still a very difficult thing, because for a person in some communities to find the registrar home is almost impossible. The hours of service are such that people just don't seem to be able to fit it into their working lives. Now the point that I make here is just this: if we add to the normal political difficulties the difficulties which might exist because of racial tensions or any other reason, then I think we've got to be most explicit, and we've got to make this procedure just as simple as possible.

Now, while I am a lawyer, at least I used to be, I think the problem of visualizing exactly how these processes are going to work should not be lost on this body. I may be wholly out of order, but I think even if we had a little pantomime here where the actual process of a minority person coming up to register and what happened under the two proposals was acted out it would help us visualize just what we're up against. Because we're not talking legal theory here. This isn't a question of what the Supreme Court's going to do in the final analysis. This is a question of what frail men are going to do when they're going to follow their own inclinations rather than the dictates of the law because they think they're far enough away from judicial process and from the force of public opinion so that they can let things slide.

Well, I think I've commented enough, but I just think that our problem here is not so much a legal problem as a problem of setting up a course of conduct which will be almost self-executing, because without that it's going to be almost impossible for people to achieve the rights that should justly be theirs.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Governor.

Dean O'MEARA. We are now ready for participation by the members of the panel, and I hope the participation will be a full participation. Who has some question to ask or some comment to make? Mr. Foley.

Mr. FOLEY (Committee on the Judiciary, the House of Representatives). I think at the very outset of this discussion there is a very important point which must be touched on. It is primarily concerned with the Attorney General's proposal, but in the light of what Mr. Sillard has suggested it may well be that it will become involved in an administrative finding. And it's simply this: Judge Walsh testified before the Judiciary Committee that the key to this entire proposal is the conclusive presumption flowing from the finding in your original lawsuit of the pattern or practice of discrimination. Conclusive presumption is the most important phrase. That means, then, that when the applicant goes before the voting registrar there is no issue of discrimination of denial of the right to vote because of color. It is conclusively presumed. Upon review by the court under the Attorney General's proposal the court shall accept the findings unless clearly erroneous. When you take those two factors—the conclusive presumption and your clearly erroneous rule—you have foreclosed any question of the issue of denial of the right to vote because of color.

Query: Assume this hypothetical case. The registrar A was found by the court in the original lawsuit to have by illegal actions discriminated—actions that violated the State statute. Two weeks later, after the court's order has been issued as to him, he dies and Mr. B becomes the new registrar. Then along comes a new applicant who had never applied before, wasn't involved in the original proceedings, and goes before the registrar, and is denied the right to vote. He then comes to your voting referee and asks for the supplemental decree. That is granted, based as I said on the conclusive presumption of the original action that there was discrimination. Comes the day of voting and registrar B says, "No, we will not accept you as a qualified registered voter." Then and there he faces the possibility of criminal contempt, possible criminal prosecution. My question is, gentlemen, is there an issue of due process of law involved as a result of this presumption? I'd like somebody's views on it. It's a very important question, I can say, that has been touched upon already by the Judiciary Committee. Thank you.

Dean O'MEARA. Mr. Calhoun, would you like to say something about that?

Mr. CALHOUN. The requirement in the Attorney General's bill that the court appoint a referee if the court should find that there has been systematic denial of the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color—this finding is necessary, we think, in order to justify the broad character of the relief which we would then call for. The fact that the registrar against whom the 1971 finding of systematic discrimination runs has died would not in my mind vitiate the conclusion that the type of relief that we call for is necessary, any more than in an antitrust proceeding where a corporation and its officers have been found guilty of antitrust violations, the death of one of the individual defendants would relieve the corporation or other individual defendants of an obligation to follow the decree. If the new referee could come into court and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the court that the character of systematic discrimination found against his predecessor was in fact removed, I suppose the decree could be lifted.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I ask Mr. Calhoun what would happen if the device was used which was employed in Tuskegee; namely, the resignation of the registrars so that a complete vacuum is created and there is no local registrar against whom action may be taken? What is the situation there?

Mr. CALHOUN. The final paragraph of the Attorney General's proposal contains language intended to meet that problem. It reads: "When any official of a State or subdivision thereof has resigned or has been relieved of his office and no successor has assumed such office, any act or practice of such official constituting a deprivation of any right or privilege secured by subsection (a) or (b) hereof shall be deemed that of the State and the proceeding may be instituted or continued against the State as party defendant."

Dean O'MEARA. Professor Foster, I think you had your hand up a moment ago.

Professor FOSTER (University of Wisconsin Law School). I'd like to speak to the two

points that Senator Douglas raised in his remarks. He raised first the question of whether, in a judicial proceeding of the type visualized by the Attorney General's proposal, there would be such individual attention to each person registered before it was finally determined that he had the right to vote, that in fact the right would be totally lost. I would think that whether we had Federal registrars working through an executive agency or whether we had court-appointed referees, that in either of those cases the State would have a day-in-court on the individual registrants. In other words, once you have the finding of the practice of exclusion it would certainly, I take it, be incumbent upon each individual at least to demonstrate that he belonged within the included class—the discriminated against class. To this end, then, if we provide for a State day-in-court, such an individualized attack it seems to me is going to be possible under either type proceeding.

Now on the second question: the effects of an appeal. I would think it consistent with the proposal which the Attorney General has made that in the event that the State chose to appeal from the supplemental decree which certified that an individual is entitled to vote, in the event that decree were to be appealed right on the heels of an election itself, there would be ample power in the court simply in order to protect its own decree to permit the individual to go ahead and cast his vote—to have his vote kept to be counted later.

Now the necessary impact of this is, of course, that you will delay the final determination of the election. But this, it seems to me, is essentially a sound tactic. For if you permit the casting of that ballot, and have it overhang the outcome of the election, you have now for the first time the white resistant South on the side of trying to get this election over with, and with less encouragement to delay in every conceivable way.

In other words, I would think that under the Attorney General's proposal there could be this ex parte proceeding of the sort that Mr. Calhoun has discussed, with the recommendation by the referee that the individual be entitled to participate in the election process. The court at this point moves to enter a supplemental decree. The local-registration officials now move to block it, the court then declaring the right of that person to go ahead and have his vote cast and held by a court officer. Now all of the forces are not against the Negro. There are other forces that are on the side of expediting this appeal.

This, it seems to me, is a device which equally could apply to the matter of registration by a Federal election registrar as well. But in either case, the person should be permitted to vote subject to having his vote ultimately counted in the election after the State had its day in court.

I would guess that the scope of individual review will not be greatly different whether this is done by a judicially appointed officer or whether the registration is done on certification of the Federal executive official. The only proposal I've seen which does not seem to visualize that is the so-called Black-Emerson-Pollak proposal out of Yale, and there they have, it seems to me, set up so different a standard by which the certification to vote shall be made that it perhaps is not politically acceptable at all.

But if you are going to adopt essentially State law as the measure of the person's right to participate, I think the State is going to have its day in court as to each individual intended to vote, and the thing really to be done in your legislation is to make sure that the person's vote gets cast at the appropriate time, and then let what necessary appellate machinery operate thereafter before you finally terminate the election itself.

Dean O'MEARA. Professor Nathanson.

Professor NATHANSON (Northwestern University). I want to make a comment which is really a question, to see if I can advance my own thinking about this. In connection with both Senator DOUGLAS' question with respect to the extent of the day in court and the point that Mr. Silard raised—or the question that he raised—are we all agreed that this should extend to both Federal and State elections?

I've been wondering whether there isn't a problem of choice here as regards the extent to which, by extending the whole scope of this to the State elections, we may then be required to give more of a day in court to the State, to be more careful and to be more involved in litigation. I would think that if it were purely Federal elections then the choice is largely with the Federal Government as to how complete it wants to make the day in court—that the State's interests are really in this case subordinate to the extent that the statute makes it subordinate. The primary parties are the Federal Government and the individual voter. Now I don't know where that leads me. But the thought occurred to me whether this kind of choice is involved and whether we have to weigh the extent to which we want the completer scope or the more summary method of proceeding.

Mr. SILARD. All of the proposals made last year—the Hart bill and the registrar proposals in various forms—were limited to Federal elections, but it seems to me a shame now that the administration has suggested taking a further step to cure the State problem as well—to fall back to the Federal solution of this only, merely because of the State's day-in-court problem. Were there not a solution to this State's day-in-court problem I think the falling back might be dictated. But it does seem to me that the solution that Mr. Foster has just addressed himself to, that the State's day in court be 1 day after the voting—after the election—solves as a practical matter most of the problems which we have been bothered with. And I might say that coming the day after the election when the interest in who actually voted is much minimized unless the outcome of the election is at stake, coming at that point, I certainly, for one, would make that day in court as broad and as long as the State would have it, giving it every conceivable defense, State and Federal, on the issue of the eligibility of the particular individuals involved.

And on this score of delaying the day in court until after the election, I think we should recall that there's some very important judicial history, parallel history which is on our side here. Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure distinguishes between preliminary injunctions and restraining orders. A restraining order is issued ex parte and without a hearing—and may be so issued under circumstances where delay will defeat rights. A preliminary injunction, on the other hand, is entered only after a hearing.

Now that important distinction, it seems to me, has considerable validity here. In matters of elections delay may certainly, finally, and irrevocably defeat rights, and therefore Congress could appropriately say, as in the case of a restraining order, "We are not going to deny the defendant his day in court ultimately, but for the moment, in order to hold the status quo"—and the status quo at the moment I would take to be the status quo of an enrollment, which ought to be honored—"to hold this status quo so that the court will not lose its power to afford a remedy, we authorize the court to enter an order without a hearing, or on the most minimal kind of a hearing only. However, there comes a later point, at which point we may or may not make this order final, prior to which we afford defendant every possible recognized judicial defense." And I do suggest that the distinction in rule 65 has precise applicability. Though the period may be longer than 10 days, the philosophy it seems to me is quite pertinent and could well be followed by Congress in this respect.

Dean O'MEARA. Mr. Silard has said that the State ought to have all defenses, both State and Federal. I wonder whether someone would like to ask him what he had in mind when he talked about State defenses.

Mr. SILARD. I take it the question has been asked, Dean. I think State defenses include matters such as: This voter moved from the county or the district after his resignation, or otherwise became ineligible. Every recognized defense which State law now allows would have to be afforded to the State, in addition to a defense or a challenge of the enrollment itself.

Professor RUTLEDGE (Indiana University). I wonder if the discussion that has immediately preceded this hasn't transformed the State's position from being essentially a defendant to one of having a challenge and having the laboring oar after the election, which would resolve the preelection processes into the question of how much you want to require before the shift is made, so that the State then takes the laboring oar if it desires to make a challenge. It seems to me that if we look at this problem in that light we have largely overcome the difficulty of State officers resigning, dying, retiring, or having terms expire, and we have, without any problems involving the 11th amendment, put the State into the litigation as essentially a plaintiff.

Professor ESTEP (University of Michigan Law School). I have two comments, one on this recent suggestion of having the litigation process conducted after the election itself. It seems to me you do one of two things. To make it realistic you either hold up the results of the election until you have gone through the legal process, which seems to me is an undesirable—I won't say unacceptable but a very undesirable—thing if it should last over a period of even months, yet alone years, as is possible. But I find myself somewhat unwilling to accept this possibility. Now, if we say, "Oh, well, it won't make any difference unless it's a very close election, and most of them will not be close and therefore we won't have to hold up the results of the election." I think this probably makes it a moot question and therefore it could not be litigated by the U.S. constitutional courts, at least.

And I must admit that I found myself, as a lawyer, doing something that I think that in a situation like this probably is not very good. I found myself getting all wound up and excited by the kind of suggestions that were being made by the lawyers around the room and those who were raising legal questions including the due process question. I find myself worrying about that and stopping suddenly and realizing that what Senator DOUGLAS and Governor Williams and two or three other people have mentioned is probably something that lawyers tend to forget when they get wound up in the technicalities.

I don't want to suggest that we shouldn't do anything at this time—I think we ought to do whatever we can do to help the situation. I cannot help but think that what we've done is out of fear of the political repercussions, and I don't mean to minimize them. But out of fear of political repercussions we've wound ourselves up in some legal tangles that might not be necessary—certainly as to Federal elections would not be necessary. As to the State ones, I would want to think about this one. This is an off-the-cuff reaction. Maybe as to State elections there are some constitutional problems.

But it seems to me that you would solve at least a lot of the problems, particularly

of the delay and the litigation, if we would simply accept Federal registration—ignoring the constitutional question for the moment—Federal registration for all elections. And this doesn't necessarily mean that we have to do away with State qualifications. I think that if I were doing it I would want to do this probably, other than age and residence. But accepting State qualifications, let us have a Federal procedure to determine—and I mean an administrative procedure—to determine the election rolls, and then have those books turned over by the Federal authorities to the election officials that are actually conducting the election, and let those people simply determine whether the signature is correct and the usual kind of thing we now have. You would avoid all of this business of "Do I have to have a hearing by the State? Does the State have a right to due process?" etc., by simply setting up such a Federal registration.

Now I hate the expense of doing it in many States where it would perhaps not be important, but I think those in the North should not ignore that we do have inequalities in some situations there, too. It would be somewhat less insidious if we did it throughout the country. Now I realize that at first blush this means "Oh, you're taking away a sacred right of the State to determine qualifications for voting." It seems to me that actually there aren't that many differences except on some of these key issues of race. But we might really find it much more acceptable in not too long a run, maybe in a short run, to really have Federal control of all registration.

Now you're going to get into some problems with some of the property qualifications for certain kinds of tax assessments, special assessments, and so on. I grant you there are some details of that kind that are going to be difficult. And when applied to State elections we have the problem of a constitutional question here. I don't know whether you would get around this by a general assumption and finding by Congress that the race relation and equality question so pervades the whole election process that we are at least going to provide for registration at the Federal level and not worry about making a finding that in a certain county or in a certain State we now need to put in the Federal Government. We simply are saying that as a matter of administrative convenience we need to do this. I've said enough and have taken enough time. But it seems to me there is something that needs to be done even beyond what we're suggesting now even though perhaps this session is not the one to do it.

Congressman BRADEMAS. Following what Professor Estep has said, I can't resist saying to him that Senator HUMPHREY and I have both introduced joint resolutions providing that there should be offered to the States a constitutional amendment which was suggested by Commissioners Hesburgh, Hannah, and Johnson, that there shall be no State requirements other than residence or age in all elections, which I think is more or less what you had in mind.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the Civil Rights Conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Congressman DINGELL. I've been very interested in the various comments that have been made about the technical problems which arise from both the registrar and the referee systems as proposed and the possibility of marrying them and a number of other things and the exploration of the constitutional problems that arise. I think there's one thing on which we can all agree and that is the Constitution is pretty clear that the Congress has the power, first of all, to enact suitable legislation to secure the right of citizens to vote against action of prejudice by reason of race, which seems to be the principal reason for this conference today.

I think that as a practical matter, as the Governor of Michigan, Governor Williams, mentioned, this thing should be self-executing. The report of the Civil Rights Commission said that as a result of the enactment of the last civil rights statute they could find no individual who had been registered and who had been permitted to vote. This would indicate and I think all of us know that those who prefer to keep citizens from voting on the grounds of race are first of all well organized, with extremely intelligent, thoroughly competent lawyers, devoted to their cause, who will use every means possible to prevent citizens from voting. This means that if we are to go into a legislative and political battle in the Congress in Washton to enact a piece of legislation, we must enact a thoroughly effective piece of legislation which will attack the heart and core of the problem in the most vigorous and direct way.

Now I've made some studies of this, and as a result of this I joined Senator HART of Michigan and Senator MCNAMARA and other sponsors of a proposal to provide for a Federal Elections Commission. I think that this is the constitutional method of handling the problem. I think it evades all of the very brilliant dialectical and legal questions which we have been discussing this morning, and I think it goes squarely to the heart of the matter in arranging that in instances where there is denial of the right to vote because of race, the Congress itself shall have a Commission with sufficient power to go in, to register, and to conduct elections.

Now one member of the Senate recently said that the best thing that could be done to guarantee the right of citizens to vote would be a few salutory prosecutions. As a practical matter, juries being what they are in some areas, it's extremely difficult to prosecute. But, if such a Commission could be established, and if it once acted—just once—I think there's no question but what the whole of the problem of voting would fall and would cease to be a significant problem.

I think that if this were done just in Federal elections alone for the Congress and the Senate great progress would be achieved and the roadway would be clear for significant progress in almost every field of civil rights. I think that there's real reason to think that we could extend this to the presidential elections, and I think that there is a very good constitutional argument which can be made to extending an election commission of this sort to State elections. And I think this is the best, the most vigorous, most direct and the most completely effective manner of handling the problem.

Dean O'MEARA. Do you have a comment, Mr. Bernhard?

Mr. BERNHARD, Commission on Civil Rights. I have some familiarity with the Hart bill. I think one of the problems in it is that first it blankets the whole electoral process, and I think this is unwarranted and very costly. Secondly, as it now constituted it is limited to the election of Congressmen and Senators, and I think this in turn would cut out presidential electors and in my opinion might drive some of the States into further diffusion or divisiveness in separating the State elections from the Federal elections. This is one of the problems that has bothered me about it.

I would like to go back and make one or two comments about some of the other statements that have been made. In a way we've got a little bit off into the legal technicalities. I think the real focus is that there are many people who are denied the right to vote because of race or color and a method has to be set up providing for voting equality, first equality in registration, then equality in the ability to vote and the assurance that the vote when cast will be counted.

Now my question, which I thought of when John Calhoun was speaking, was that in the proposal of the Attorney General which I believe has many merits, I'm concerned even though there has been an amendment to the original proposal providing that the proceeding would be ex parte—that nonetheless it's not really equality of registration. You still have individual's coming in who, as the Commission found, have certain fears of economic reprisal or physical harm. They are going through a process which still is dissimilar to going before an ordinary administrative officer, whether he's State or Federal, who doesn't take testimony under oath, who merely makes his own determination. You go in and walk out before an administrative registrar—if it's done fairly it's a short proposition. I think the court procedure might tend to drive certain individuals away from even attempting that method of registration.

Congressman BRADEMAS raised the question: "Well, if you set it up either judicially or administratively you have the problem of enforcement"—and there have been other comments about criminal enforcement, on which I would like to make an observation. I think when you attempt to resort to criminal enforcement you in turn attempt to say: "Well, we will penalize but we won't assure the right to vote," and I think it is an easy way out. Beyond that there is the problem, as Congressman DINGELL has indicated, of getting the juries to convict, or even a grand jury to indict, and beyond that the criminal sanctions available to the Federal Government are extremely limited. As the lawyers know, 18 U.S.C. 241 and 242 deal with the various rights of the Federal Government to enforce civil rights by criminal sanctions, and these have been so limited that they are basically ineffective at the present time.

Just one other comment and I'll be still. It relates to the question of the so-called findings. All attention has been directed to findings being made by judicial officers or administrative officers. I would just like to raise the question of the possibility that Congress itself, in my opinion, could make a finding, based on the findings of the Commission on Civil Rights and its own investigations, that in both Federal and State elections there is evidence that discrimination has occurred and is continuing to occur and that some new legislation is therefore needed and that this is appropriate legislation under the 15th amendment. Whether this is sufficient to cover the problem that will be raised as to whether this would constitute an adequate finding of pattern or practice I don't know.

As to some of the problems that have been brought up here regarding the appeal situation and the delays which are inherent in it, I don't know, of course, what Senator HENNINGS is proposing to come out with. But if there is some way that the actual appeal can be held off until the so-called certificate holder or enrollee is coming up to vote, I think this would overcome the major problems in the present bills, I mean the registrar proposals and the Attorney General's or the administration's proposal on voting referees.

I have been concerned over the problem of whether this should be a basically judicial precedure. There is a question of the burden of the courts at the present time with the desegregation cases. And once you get the courts into voting registrations, including the administrative supervision itself, I think all the simplicity is gone. Because of these observations I throw out to you—because I don't know the answer—the question: What would be the possibility of Congress itself making the appropriate finding to cover both State and Federal elections.

Dean O'MEARA. Mr. Silard, do you have a comment to make?

Mr. SILARD. I think Mr. Bernhard has raised some points that have to be discussed. I might say that Mr. John Feild from Senator HART'S office, who had so much to do with Senator HART'S bill, is here, and that I think he would probably agree that the bill was drafted not as a vehicle for legislation for this year, but as a vehicle for discussion of a rather broad-range solution to the problem, at least at the Federal level. I think Senator HART in his testimony actually so restricted his suggestion. I think John certainly would be available to comment on that.

But I want to make a rather simple point which maybe no one has yet suggested, which I think is responsive to Senator DOUGLAS' and Governor Williams' concern here. Aren't we really striving toward the kind of Federal enrollment procedure which approximates exactly what the State procedure worked out over a 170 years of practical historical experience has dictated? Aren't we striving toward a procedure which permits those who are qualified to enroll, and insures that those who are enrolled can vote and then brings into play the machinery to contest the result if there is some real basis for challenge? Aren't we really striving for a rather simple operation? Enrollment—and the right of those who are enrolled to vote—and judicial machinery thereafter to untangle the web if something has gone wrong with the rather simple administrative mechanism?

There seems to be one other problem which is injected into this kind of approach and which underlies many of the issues which have been posed, and that is the problem that no one is proposing that this State procedure be taken over wholesale. Rather the propositions all seem to go to the point that it be taken over only where there is a need. So that much of the discussion surrounds the issue of who shall determine where the need exists and how shall it be determined. How shall the device be triggered and for what area shall it be effective? But pending the solution of those problems, isn't there a growing agreement—I seem to sense it—that we want really to duplicate the method that the States have worked out over decades and decades of practical experience with this?

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the Civil Rights Conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Mr. MORSELL, NAACP. I, as a nonlawyer, have been I suppose as entranced by these discussions over the last several weeks as I have over any other demonstration of the beauty of good legal minds at work. At the same time, it occurs to me that we tend to get into a channel in which we hope to wind up with perfection, something which by one piece of legislation will solve all of these problems. I think we ought to keep in our minds at all times that nothing that comes out of the Congress is going to do all of that.

Take for example the question of fear of reprisal—getting down to the actual individual case of a Negro citizen who wants to exercise his right to vote. Insofar as any legislation is concerned it seems to me the most we can do is to provide him with an ex parte kind of proceeding, where he does not have to sit up and be questioned by hostile State attorneys. But, so far as fear of reprisal goes, when he walks from his home to any building where these things are going on he has incurred the risk of reprisal and we cannot in anything that we do here remove this danger from him. He has attempted to vote in a place where for a Negro to vote is a dangerous act. And we're not going to solve this problem by any legislation.

I know that it has been suggested that one reason for not having judicial proceedings is that the courts are allegedly so busy with school desegregation suits. Again I wonder if this is actually the case. The actual amount of school litigation now pending, or in my view likely in the immediate future, is not voluminous. And I do not believe that it really imposes a tremendous burden on the courts as might appear to be the case. This is aside from the question of the good faith of individual judges which of course is a basic question and it exists everywhere.

Lawyers from time immemorial have sought to have cases tried before this judge rather than that judge because of what they assume to be the case with his predilections and predispositions, and this we will also always have. I don't think that the judiciary's record thus far, even in school cases, has been entirely black or entirely gray. I think that we've had what you might assume to be the normal amount of variation from court to court.

I would like to ask for legal comment on two very factual matters. In the case where the State's day in court is deferred until after the election and some system is provided for holding up the counting of a vote, is my feeling that the use of voting machines makes this incredibly complicated and difficult an erroneous belief or is it not? And, second, what provision, assuming we had Federal elections only covered, is there for overcoming the dangers which Mr. Rogers suggested might occur of eventually having a sequestered and separate Federal ballot which would be for Negroes only? In other words, we would have a separate and unequal ballot resulting from our law providing only for Federal election coverage.

Professor CRAMPTON (University of Chicago Law School). I am not going to be immediately responsive to your question, as I have some other comments to make. A number of very broad issues have been raised, all very important ones. It seems to me that several of them are clearly policy matters on which the legislators have to make their own judgment. For instance, Professor Estep's proposal of an entire Federal election system. My own policy predilection would be that this is both unnecessary and unwise at the present time. Nevertheless, it is one of the available alternatives, of course.

And then the suggestion that perhaps the proposal should be limited to the Federal elections only and not the State elections. But here again it seems to me that the advantages of a combined approach to both State and Federal elections are overhelming, and that unless the technical difficulties which Professor Nathanson, among others, mentioned, are so great as to really endanger the viability of the system, the combined approach of State and Federal elections I think would be wise. But here again is a basic policy decision that the legislators have to make. Lawyers may be able to give you advice on how to draft the legislation to meet constitutional or practical problems.

I would also like to agree with both Professor Foster and Mr. Silard on this matter of the State's day in court. It doesn't seem to me that if it is postponed until after the election takes place this necessarily raises the question of the validity of each and every election for every office. It could be set up so that the finding of the referee or of the registrar, whichever proposal is accepted, has prima facie validity in the district court much as many administrative orders do today, and it merely puts the State, as Professor Rutledge said, in the position of being a plaintiff attacking a specific vote which may go to some offices, may not go to other offices, and in any case will probably not upset the results in the election, although in some cases it might. But if it did, then the office could be changed at a later point.

But I would like to raise several other doubts which I have about some of the legislation which has been proposed and which hasn't been dealt with really so far in the discussion. And perhaps I could state these as a comment on some of the points that Mr. Silard made. And they also raise issues which Senator DOUGLAS has mentioned.

One is the use of the judiciary all the way through. I think myself this is very unwise for a number of reasons, both practical and theoretical. I do not think that our Federal courts are in a position to run the affairs of a great nation, nor should they be put in that position. They are already engaged in somewhat kindred functions in relatively narrow circumstances such as the bankruptcy jurisdiction. They are already engaged in the organization and the administration of the school systems, at least in the South. Now the voting proposals are made. I think it's a passing of the buck of the responsibility which belongs on Congress and the Executive. The courts will lose the respect of private citizens if functions which are essentially nonjudicial are heaped on them repeatedly over a period of years. The court should be restricted to the traditional judicial functions.

Moreover I tend to agree with the implication of Senator DOUGLAS' remarks that it is likely that an administrative or executive agency will do the job better, that there will be less delay, that it will work out in the long run much better.

Another point I would like to make, which I think also goes really to the functioning of courts, is what I think is really an evasion of the constitutional requirement of a jury trial that is involved in the use of the contempt sanctions. Now it is true that the Supreme Court has spoken on these issues and seems so far in other contexts to validate the use of the contempt sanction as a substitute for criminal prosecution. But it seems to me that if constitutional amendments are to be spoken about, that perhaps one that should be considered, particularly if legislation is going to take the lines of the Attorney General's proposal, is a constitutional amendment which would make trial by jury not necessary in offenses involving racial discrimination. That, it seems to me, is what everyone is talking about here. They are attempting to replace a constitutional right on the basis of fears that

juries in the South will not function properly on issues of voting discrimination.

It seems to me that the popular sentiment all over the country against restrictions on voting rights, as manifested by the unanimity of the Civil Rights Commission, makes a strong argument for at least the attempt to try out the use of criminal penalties first, before the switchover to the exclusive use of contempt sanctions.

Mr. EDELSBERG (National Civil Liberties Clearing House). I'm glad the discussion has taken a turn which reminds us that while the legal doctors are discussing how to operate we ought to take another look at the patient. Now as I see the patient, what the Civil Rights Commission did last year was not so much to unearth new facts, but really to remind us again of notorious facts of mass disfranchisement that were well known to most observant Americans. Of course, the Commission put those facts on television and made it impossible thereafter to sweep the mess under the rug. It touched the American conscience. Voting disfranchisement is no longer a necessary evil in American life.

But the great contribution of the Commission as I see it was to remind us, and I would say this to Professor Cramton, that voting violations are not a matter of individual willfulness. It isn't the hanky-panky that an individual registrar uses with an individual Negro. It isn't even economic intimidation or other forms of intimidation. It's the very climate of hostility and antagonism in the South which is responsible for the disfranchisement of millions of American voters. And as I saw it the great good of the Commission's report was that three southerners—three representative and distinguished southerners—joined in saying that these were the facts. Then two of those southerners had the courage to say—to remind us of a rule of fundamental political equity, that where the violations are wholesale and systematic, the remedies cannot be retail and haphazard.

The unfortunate fact is that most of the remedies that have been discussed are haphazard and retail. Now I'm afraid that this is necessary given the present political climate. For what it may be worth, my political judgment is that the Rogers proposal is the vehicle which will become the serious object of congressional consideration and probable enactment. And we should devote ourselves to seeing how we can take this Rogers proposal and make sure that the Negro under it doesn't have to run a gauntlet, that he is given a kind of protective atmosphere in which his right will be asserted, and to the largest extent possible, as Harris Wofford said, that his qualifications shall be examined in a manner no more cumbersome and complex than that accorded the average white voter of the South.

We must remember that the problem is exacerbated by the kind of judges you have in the South. I don't mean to disparage the judiciary, but I think it is fair to say—to borrow a phrase which I think is well known in this environment—that some of these judges are suffering from invincible bias in this area, and for those judges no form of legal draftsmanship will do very much good. But for the great bulk of the southern judiciary I think the kind of bill proposed by Rogers will permit the wholesale enfranchisement of Negro voters, because the local registrar who is approached by a Negro applicant during the pendency of one of these hearings is acting under the threat of a contempt citation. And if he is captious and frivolous in trying to keep that Negro actually from going to the ballot box, a vigorous judge of integrity will see that he pays a price for it. And I think that for the greater part, the kind of procedure contained in this administration proposal will serve to provide for the franchisement of Negro voters.

My great reservation is this: I think I recall back to the days of section 7(a) of NIRA, Senator DOUGLAS. This was the Magna Carta of labor. The Government announced that there is now a Federal right for people to join labor unions. But just nobody got to join these unions until the unions got together with some agreeable Government officials who said it would be all right for the unions to put up signs in a mining town saying, "President Roosevelt wants you to join the union." And I think that we won't lick this problem of mass disfranchisement until we have something like that on our political scene, Senator DOUGLAS. Now it may be that as a result of that kind of political intervention some people who are not quite qualified to vote will get to vote. But I think the faster they get to vote the faster they'll get qualified.

PROFESSOR HARRIS (University of Michigan Law School). I would like to address myself to a problem raised before, which I think is a serious one. If the remarks aren't of world-shattering policy importance perhaps there is some legal help that can be given here. It strikes me that there is a need for simplification if this isn't going to be the full-employment bill for attorneys and if the limited resources of the NAACP and the Justice Department are ever going to accomplish anything significant. It strikes me you can break down the legal problem into two halves. First there is the question of making the initial determination and then of whatever review is necessary, whether or not there is a registrar or referee, call him what you will.

The second problem after it has been determined is to know which individual Negro voter applicant will be accepted and what possible review there may be of that. I don't direct myself to the second question which most people have been discussing as I agree with the general tenor of the remarks. Everything which will simplify this and postpone review until subsequent to the election is desirable.

Rather I address myself to the first question: what can be done to simplify the original decision as to whether and where and when a registrar or referee will be appointed. I think the Yale memorandum here, if I can so name it—I don't really know what it's title is—between pages 3 and 10 treats the problem better, more comprehensively, more intelligently, treating both the administrative problems, the constitutional problems and practical everyday problems that come to your mind, then anything I have seen on the subject. I don't care to recapitulate it, I only urge everyone to give it serious attention.

In particular, the kernel of this nut is on page 6, in the last paragraph of page 6, after the authors have criticized both the Civil Rights Commission proposal and the Attorney General's proposal, making the point, however, that the Attorney General's proposal raises far more difficulty than the Civil Rights Commission's. And this is true because by making this decision basically a civil action in the Federal court, we reach all the problems of due process, res judicata, and Federal appellate review which are unnecessary if it is handled in a different way.

In the Yale proposal, here I quote, "We see no way of accomplishing this,"—"this" is the appointment of the registrar without undue complexity, litigation, expense, etc.—"We see no way of accomplishing this, except by delegating to the President authority to appoint a registrar in any election district where he has reason to believe that citizens are being denied registration on account of race, religion, color or national origin." This is not requiring the finding of a pattern, which would be incredibly difficult as people know as soon as a certain amount of sophistication is brought to disguising the pattern. This, if you read further you will find, will virtually eliminate all appellate review of this particular question. The State's review I believe will come solely on the question, the second question, of whether an individual voter who has already voted can cast his ballot. But there will not be a dual review: First, should we have a registrar? Second, in his action in regard to each individual voter proper or improper? I urge this simplification whichever bill is adopted.

One last remark, if I may. To avoid constitutional problems the Yale memorandum, the Yale proposal here, restricts itself to Federal elections. This is not because the other is not desirable. I suspect that in order to accomplish what they are attempting to do in stripping out the review of the appointment of the registrar, it is necessary, and I'm no constitutional expert, but I suspect it is necessary if judicial review of the question is to be avoided, to restrict the scope of the bill to Federal elections.

Let me urge that if this simplified appointment of a registrar is not adopted, then by all means let's cover State and Federal elections both. On the other hand if a political decision is made only to cover Federal elections, let us take what legal advantage we can of that decision, to throw out the necessity for a dual review, first, of registrars, then of the specific acts vis-a-vis each voting applicant. Thank you.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Mr. SILARD. I'd like to address a remark to Mr. Edelsberg's comments. I'm a great believer in Mr. Edelsberg's political intuition, but I would question a technical point he made that the vehicle for a bill this year can be the Rogers proposal. I have examined the political complexion of the House and the Senate and I find a considerable preponderance of Democrats in those bodies. I also find us in an election year. I think these two factors dictate that we talk the substance of the Attorney General's plan rather than terminology—referee, registrar, or something else.

And on the substance of the Attorney General's proposal, has he not made three sound points to the country which it is too late now to go back upon? The first of these is that there is something wrong with a nation of this caliber recognizing a problem of this caliber, and then moving only to meet it at the level of congressional or Federal elections. Now I think he has made a very sound point there that just simply cannot be swept under the rug. If Congress for the first time is really going to move in to cure this evil, how can it cure only a half or a third or a quarter of it? I think this point simply dictates the acceptance of the Rogers proposition that if you're going to do a job, do it all the way.

The second point that the Attorney General makes seems to me equally binding. There ought at some point, before a Federal

mechanism preempts the entire State registration machinery for X number of persons, there ought at some point before that is done, be a fairly respectable adjudicatory finding that there is a need for that mechanism. Now I don't say that another commission couldn't do this job, but aren't the courts really, as the Attorney General said, the appropriate agencies for making a finding that there is a wholesale violation of legal rights. I think it is a contestable point, but I think the Attorney General has the better of it in starting his mechanism in the judicial machinery. You may not have to stay with it with respect to the appointment of your officials, but don't you really want to start with the rather established and secure judicial safeguard that a court finally determines there is a pattern or practice or a systematic denial of rights.

And finally I think the Attorney General's broad concession, which we have gotten away from—his broad concession that these officials that he contemplates are going to be able to register individuals quickly, effectively and ex parte, provides, with the acceptance of his other two points, a workable basis for a bill.

There are two other problems that have to be met. There is some unhappiness about the judicial appointment of what really now looks to be an administrative official. There is considerably more unhappiness with the full day-in-court, which might be 3 years in court, afforded with respect to each individual before that individual can actually get to vote.

Mr. EDELSBERG. Will you spell that out, John? Why do you think it could possibly take that long on an individual application?

Mr. SILARD. Rather than spell it out, Herman, I think I am willing to say this: I will concede that the process will only take 60 days, but that I would say would be too long to get the job done. Because what we have forgotten is that this job of enrolling people through a Federal mechanism is going to be valid for only the particular election involved under the Rogers proposal, and it is extremely difficult to make it anything else. In other words, the problem here isn't that it might take a year or two to get persons enrolled and then they will stay enrolled. That enrollment will not be valid for 1 day longer under the Rogers proposal than the State enrollment mechanism. So that 1 year's delay requires the initiation of the process all over again. And as I stated earlier this morning, it seems to me that if in a 60-day period before the election—which period the States can quite validly make the binding period of registration—an individual must go first to the State official, then to the Federal official, and then the State can, in an adjudicatory hearing before the court, which Mr. Rogers has conceded is required, then challenge each individual enrollment by the Federal referee—assuming there are hundreds of people, I think you have simply passed the date of the election.

Mr. EDELSBERG. It would be useful to me, John, if you gave an example or two of what the local State officials could say about a recommendation of the voting referee that John Doe be registered.

Mr. SILARD. The delay does not seem to me, Mr. Edelsberg, to be a delay which flows from the period of time that each individual case takes to be adjudicated, but rather the delay which flows from the fact that you may have to subpena—that the State will obviously have the right, I believe, to subpena—each applicant at such a hearing, and when you have to subpena even 150 or 200 persons to take the witness chair in such a proceeding and be asked for instance, "Did you or did you not try to enroll in the State system?" the Federal courts would take approximately 1 month, I think, to hear 30 witnesses.

Mr. EDELSBERG. John, don't they first have to file a verified statement with the court saying that John Doe did not try to register with the local officials?

Mr. SILARD. Surely, but will you deny the State irrevocably and finally the right to contest the validity of that? Will you deny the State the validity of that?

Mr. EDELSBERG. Once, John, just once. That's a constitutional requirement.

Mr. SILARD. Well that once, I'm afraid, if it comes before the election, will be just once too long. Unless someone can offer a reason why the State must have its day in court before the election on individual registrations, whereas in 170 years it has never been the case in the State system, I don't understand what, if any, problem there really exists in holding off the State's day in court until after the election.

Mr. EDELSBERG. I'm with you on that.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well I would like to ask you if there would not be a further right to appeal from the finding of the district court to the circuit court, from the circuit court to the Supreme Court, and that during that time could not the matter be in suspense without any decision?

Congressman BRAY. I don't know all the answers in this matter or I wouldn't be here. I came here to get them. I do want to say that I personally was interested in the remarks of Professor Cramton. Without going into detail on the subject I believe that a jury trial—while it may be necessary in time to do away with it—I view with a great deal of suspicion doing away with a jury trial unless it's absolutely necessary.

Then I do want to comment on the remark made by Professor Estep when he suggested turning over the election process to the Federal Government. That's going to be a very difficult matter. We have in Indiana 35,000 election officials, and anyone who has ever had the job of trying to get an election board together knows it's a tremendous job. And we have something like 10,000 registration officials. At least in southern Indiana each precinct has one Democrat and one Republican registration officer to make sure everyone is registered. It's a tremendous job to get it done.

And it just entered my mind that—maybe it won't work at all—just as I was sitting here, that if you would have your referees go in and allow really a double process of registration, anyone could go to the regular registration office if he wanted to, but then in key places anyone who believed that they were not being given a fair break could go there and register. And then a certain length of time before the election that Federal registrar must turn these names over. Then they would have a certain length of time, a very few days, to object to it. That is not going to solve it all, but you're going to have a tremendous job if the Federal Government tries to take over the 35,000 members of the election boards in the State of Indiana and 10,000 registration officers.

Dean O'MEARA. Professor Estep wants the record to show that he is not in favor of having the Federal Government take over the entire election machinery.

Professor ESTEP. Thank you.

Mr. CALHOUN. I would like to address myself to the suggestion that in the Rogers proposal at this time there is a likelihood by reason of the necessity for permitting State challenge that an applicant for registration would not be allowed to vote in the first election following a finding of qualification by the referee. I, myself, see no reason under the Rogers proposal why a Federal district court to whom had been certified a qualification of an applicant and who found that certification coming up to him on the eve of an election could not order the election officials to take an impounded ballot from the applicant and then let the State thrash it out as it would.

Senator DOUGLAS. What about voting machines?

Mr. SILARD. Senator, you repeat the question asked at this end of the table about the voting machines. I think under present laws, as far as we can tell, there are already mechanisms, even on the machine system of voting, available by which a vote may be registered and yet held subject to the determination of a challenge—the Louisiana law, for instance, so permits. If it does not now permit this, it certainly is a mechanical problem which modern science can solve.

Mr. HARRISON, administrative assistant to Congresswoman GREEN. I would like to offer something of a compromise between the suggestions for Federal assumption of the whole election process and the proposals for a person-by-person registration in cases, as provided in the Rogers bill, where deprivation is pursuant to a pattern or practice. What about the idea of making a determination, subject to appeal before the date of election, that access to the polls in a particular defined political area is subject to discrimination as a pattern or practice; and then in that area requiring all voters to proceed through the Federal registrar pattern.

This seems to me, among other things, to meet the Attorney General's objection to the registrar proposal, in the sense that this does not leave us after the election is held with a box of ballots cast by unchallenged white citizens and a box of easily identifiable ballots, cast by citizens who have had to avail themselves of a separate procedure. Is it possible for us to replace State officials only in those areas where, by a judicial determination, a pattern of discrimination is found to exist—only there to establish a universal Federal registration, and only there for that one election?

Professor NATHANSON. I just wanted to follow up that question with another one which is perhaps an attempt to answer the earlier question that I raised with respect to the problems of choice here. I wonder whether it's possible to have an eclectic approach which permits an alternative group of remedies, some of which may be applicable and usable for the purpose of Federal elections and others for the purpose of State elections. I would still think that the suggestion just made with respect to taking over the election entirely by Federal officials would be really practicable and probably only legal—although I won't go so far as that—but would only really be seriously possible with respect to the Federal election. But perhaps that is not a reason why it should be entirely discarded. Perhaps it could be available to that extent and other remedies available where the Federal election was not involved.

Similarly, I wonder whether or not it is possible to combine the administrative and the judicial processes here. I would agree with the comments that have been made about the undesirability of saddling the judiciary with the entire responsibility here. I don't know, but I would think that there is grave danger that we are separating the Federal judiciary from the rest of the community, that we are asking them to bear—to really carry—too much. They've got to have some other support, and it's got to come through the executive administrative machinery.

Now we know that there are various devices for combining these things and for having these types of alternatives. Without going into details, I wonder whether there might not be some use in having all these alternatives in one bill.

Mr. FOLEY. I was going to suggest to Senator DOUGLAS, on this problem of voting machines, I think you will find, if you check your State election laws, that you already have established by State law procedures for challenged ballots. For instance in New York where they use voting machines, a challenged ballot doesn't go on the machine—it goes on a paper ballot, and that is subject to review by your board of elections the same

as your absentee ballot. I don't see any practical problem.

Senator DOUGLAS. May I ask if there is any reply to my question about appeals.

Mr. FOLEY. Senator, I think that we should keep this procedure in line. It seems to have gotten off the base. Under the Attorney General's proposal, when the referee makes his findings and files the report with the judge—now keep in mind we have not issued a decree here in this case as to this new applicant—the most recent proposal from Mr. Walsh was that service is made upon the interested party. He has 10 days in which to file exceptions to that proposed report. Now if he fails within 10 days to file his exceptions then he's precluded from taking issue with that.

Senator DOUGLAS. But suppose he does file his exceptions?

Mr. FOLEY. Then it's up to the judge to determine whether he wants to hear it himself or whether he wants to refer it back for further hearings on the exceptions. Now the judge is bound by the clearly erroneous rule, and the burden will then shift upon the election official to prove his case before the judge. He just can't come in and say, "I except." He's going to have to back it up. Now if the judge refuses him, of course he's entitled to go up on appeal. Whether the court will accept it or not, he has to have that record on which to predicate it. And I think under the Attorney General's proposal he has a very difficult burden of proof there.

Professor DUKEMINIER, University of Kentucky College of Law. There's one problem which hasn't been discussed and none of the bills seem to meet it. And that is, all of the bills are related to voting in one election. Once these people get registered, will they have to go through the same fight through either a referee or registrar each election that comes up, which is every 2 years with respect to the House of Representatives? Is there any way that the bills could be revised to provide that once they qualify that they can stay qualified rather than to require them to fight every 2 years to be reenrolled?

Mr. CALHOUN. I would like first to address myself to the problem that I think is bothering Senator Douglas. He keeps asking about the appeals because I think he feels that people will lose their vote while this judicial process is working itself out. Am I correct in that Senator?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes, you're exactly correct.

Mr. CALHOUN. Well, I tried to answer it earlier. My thought is that as soon as a referee certifies to the judge that an applicant is qualified and if an election is imminent, it is within the power of the judge to authorize that person to vote on an impounded ballot. A person can vote and if it takes 3 years and 30 elections, each time that fellow's vote will be accepted—if it takes 3 years to exhaust the judicial rights of the State. But that man will get a vote every time there is an election there. And if the State is correct in its challenge, then the impounded ballot will not be added to the total; if the State has failed, the ballot will go and the totals will reflect the ballot.

Now if the Congress wants to make that more clear than the mechanics of the Attorney General's bill do, it is perfectly free to do so. There is a hazard, and nobody's mentioned it here today, in making a too carefully articulated scheme within this bill, because what you may be fashioning is a straitjacket.

Professor RODES, Notre Dame Law School. I would like to mention a couple of technical points that I think need a little more consideration. There has been a good deal of tlak about the State's day-in-court. I question a little whether the State is entitled to a day-in-court, or how much of a day it's entitled to if it is. Now as far I can see, the only thing to prevent the Federal Government from taking over as much of the election procedure as it has to is the 10th amendment. The only case I know of on the point is *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* which seems to hold that the State has no standing to enforce the 10th amendment. So that if anybody is to be entitled to litigate over this, it shouldn't be the State, and I begin to wonder who will be entitled. Which brings me to another point. I question, in view of this, whether the courts will find a case or controversy if they are given this job to do.

Professor CRAMTON. I'd like to speak to both of those points and also about what was mentioned over here about fashioning a straitjacket. It seems to me that if the court is used and if the court is so tied up that it does not have any discretion on what it does—that it automatically has to allow the person to vote and have the vote impounded, as put in mandatory language—then it seems to me the question about case or controversy in such a judicial function might be raised. It would be a serious one.

Now I don't want to say that it would be decided adversely—the validity of the registration—it probably would not be. At least an issue would be raised whereas with the wider discretion of the district court there is less likelihood that this question would be decided adversely as to the validity of the legislation. But this does pose somewhat of a dilemma. The southern judges—some people do not want to confide discretion in them. On the other hand, if they're used but they're given no discretion, there would be a very legitimate argument that it would not be a judicial function. They would be just performing a ministerial duty which is not a proper function of a constitutional court in the United States.

JOHN FEILD, Legislative Assistant to Senator HART. The context in which we are discussing the current proposals for further legislation on voting is apparently that the Attorney General and the Commission on Civil Rights—and I presume other knowledgeable people who have observed voting denials in the South—believe that the 1957 law has failed, or at least has been so encumbered or is so inadequate that it must be further implemented. In view of this, and particularly in view of the experience of the Attorney General's office and in light of the question that keeps recurring, I'm wondering if Mr. Calhoun could answer the question: Why is it that we should further utilize the machinery of the court itself, which is apparently the machinery of the 1957 act only, by now burdening or by now placing upon them the responsibility for supervising referees actually operating the election process?

Is it not possible that the registrar proposal of the Commission and the current proposal of the Attorney General are compatible to the extent at least that, given an initial judicial finding, the appointment—the implementation of the operation of the machinery may still be moved to the Executive—moved to the President? Isn't it possible to make these two proposals compatible if we do that? Why must the court do this?

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Mr. SILARD. I'd just like to add that I am tremendously encouraged—and no one should fail to note—that the Department of Justice seems now to be in a receptive frame of mind with respect to Senator HENNINGS' announcement that the solution to the problem of nullifying delay—judicial delays—may lie in postponing the day in court until the day after or the day of the voting. And therefore, if this does represent, as it seems to represent, the position of the Department, I would like to ask, whether it really makes much difference in Mr. Calhoun's mind whether Congress leaves it permissive with the district judge as to whether he shall postpone the hearing because of the time involved until after the election, or whether Congress itself states that because the problem is one of elections and the prior practice has been not to have the challenges until after the voting, it might as well write that into the legislation. Because if the Department were to move toward this suggestion—toward the second suggestion—I don't see that there's any remaining area of conflict between the proponents of registrar, referee, and the other suggestions.

JOHN CALHOUN. So far as the moment of challenge is concerned, we think that the proposal of the Attorney General uses most of the time most effectively. From the moment of certification the challenging process can begin, but nobody loses his vote while the challenging goes on. Now if you want to wait until there's an election to start that challenging, if you think that there are valid reasons for doing that, certainly the Congress may do it. But I don't know whether it can do it by saying that this protects the vote. Because the vote can be protected under the present arrangements.

Mr. EDELSBERG. I'd like to hear from some Devil's Advocates on the proposed Walsh amendment of the Rogers proposal. As I read it I find it very difficult for a local registrar who has the most malice possible in his heart to buck the recommendation of the voting referee. He has to submit to the district judge a statement under oath giving the basis of his challenge of an individual who has been certified as eligible by the voting referee. On what basis can a registrar say under oath that the voting referee has erred in making his recommendation? Let's see what obstructionist tactics are available under this procedure. I think they've been cut down pretty successfully. I think the difficulty is the willingness of the judge to carry out the law, rather than the detail of this procedure.

Professor BRODEN (Notre Dame Law School). I would like to urge Mr. Calhoun to consider very seriously the problem of the validity of the original appointment of the referee to register any comer. This was raised early in the discussion and I don't think it has really been fully and adequately disposed of. Now maybe by legislation the Congress could give such broad power and broad authority to the U.S. district judge, so empowering him when there is a general finding of racial discrimination. But the obvious tactic has already been employed time and time again: The perpetrator of that conduct resigns and a new man, not guilty of this conduct, replaces him. Now how valid will such an appointment be under present statutory language?

I don't know whether and to what extent we will be able to avoid this problem if we retain a judicial remedy. I think it can be completely avoided by an administrative remedy. I would most strenuously urge Mr. Calhoun to suggest to the Attorney General the possibility of working in an administrative remedy. But I don't know how

committed the Attorney General is to an exclusively judicial remedy.

DEAN O'MEARA. Congressman DINGELL and Professor Foster have both indicated that they would like to be heard. Afterward, in order not to keep luncheon waiting too long, we'll recess.

Congressman DINGELL. I want to point out that in all cases under these proceedings, regardless of what happens, we will not be dealing with impecunious, incapable litigants not represented by proper and able and devoted counsel. I want to point out some perils that I don't think anyone has here expressed and perhaps may not have even thought of. Regardless of the amount of judicial review and whether it takes place previous to or subsequent to the election, we have to remember that people who are willing to close their school systems will not be reluctant to, in effect, snarl up their State governments and to snarl up Federal elections to preserve and to protect the status quo which they seek to preserve.

I think I could point out this as an example: Assuming that an election were to come under challenge after it had been conducted, either under the Federal registrar proposal or under the referee system. And assuming for the sake of the argument that review were commenced either before, during, or after the election had taken place. The officer who would be elected would presumably take his place—let's say if it were a Federal election, in Congress, or as Governor—sometime immediately following the first of the year, usually around the 3d or 6th of January or thereabouts. If this happened, what would be the situation if the matter were in litigation? Who might, for example, be Governor of the State succeeding the Governor who was leaving office while the determination as to who was the new Governor or how the votes should be counted was made under either the Federal registrar system or the referee system? How would we face up to the determination of who was the Congressman or the Senator under these situations? I think that serious thought had better be given to problems of this sort. This is not an unlikely thing and it is certainly not unforeseeable in view of the previous record.

I would again strongly urge that a self-executing system be adopted, at least in Federal elections, to assure that the matter can be handled expeditiously, and that it can be closed conclusively, rather than to bog the courts down in litigation which will go on ad infinitum, which not inconceivably could happen. I would also point out that the courts now carry—the Federal judiciary carries—a burden which in many instances takes 1, 2, and 3 years to bring a matter to trial even in the court of first instance and in cases of review matters have been litigated for as long as 10 of 11 years.

Professor FOSTER. I'd like to speak quickly to the point that Mr. Edelsberg raised with respect to the kind of question which perhaps might be raised by a local registration official charging that the referee or Federal officer had been derelict in his duty. The proposals, most of them at least, direct that the person shall be certified to vote provided he is qualified under the State law to do so. The recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission spoke—or the findings, rather, of the Civil Rights Commission—spoke of the problem as being one not of discriminatory registration laws in the South, but rather of fair laws enforced in a discriminatory manner. In short, I take it that a problem is that when a white appears to register he is registered without any questions. When a Negro appears to register the law is thrown at him as hard as it can be thrown. It seems to me that a very real question is going to confront either a Federal referee or a Federal registrar, whichever it may be, in trying to decide by how much he must discount the requirements of the State statutory law in holding these people eligible to vote. I would assume that if we're going to do it equally, he should in effect turn his back on most of the literacy tests, if indeed it's shown in that area that the registration officials turn their backs on the literacy tests with respect to white applicants.

This, it seems to me, is going to be productive of a great deal of difficulty with respect to ascertaining the standards by which any applicants are registered by some court-appointed or administratively appointed officials. This is a real problem. I can see, therefore, that these affidavits which the local officials would insist upon would challenge the fact that you are not really applying the law as it is written to these people, setting up this factual dispute. In effect the local officers would say, "I threw the book at everyone." And here comes your issue. This, it seems to me, is the way in which it's likely to arise. There may be other ways as well. The second point——

Mr. EDELSBERG. Excuse me. How does he put this in his verified statement to the judge? What can the registrar say to that?

Professor FOSTER. Well, I would suppose that if we had a conscientious referee who, after diligent inquiry, had discovered that there were no literacy tests whatever being given to white applicants, if he were conscientiously giving equal treatment to the Negro applicants he would impose no literacy requirement either. In short, if the statute would normally be read to require this kind of thing, and he had not been doing it with respect to the whites but had been doing it with respect to the Negroes, I can see where the Federal officer would be in considerable grief with respect to the amount by which he would have to turn his back. In any event, I think that this kind of allegation could be made, if it does not appear within the record of the referee's own action, that he had not required any literacy test whatever.

May I make a second point quickly? This goes to the point made by Mr. Broden of the Notre Dame faculty a few minutes ago. I think that a very good case can be made for changing 1971—this is the section in the code that we've all been talking about here, that authorizes the United States to bring suits against local election officials—to provide that these actions by the United States should be brought against the election board as suable entities.

Now this is a legal fiction. Nevertheless the law has in numerous instances permitted suits against partnerships, corporations and various kinds of legal entities, for the purpose of singling out the office itself and binding any subsequent holder of that office to whatever determinations are made with respect to the manner in which the office has previously been operated. If therefore the statute in 1957 had provided that the suit might have been brought against a board of election registrars of Macon County, Ala., we would not be in the Supreme Court of the United States in *The United States* v. *Alabama* right this instant, for the whole issue in that case is whether that election board may be treated as a person within the meaning of that act. In that case every single officer of the office has resigned. Now if you treat the suit as one against the offices and entities, this it seems to me obviates that kind of problem.

Dean O'MEARA. I've been wondering how long I would be able to resist the temptation to step out of my role as chairman and take part in the discussion. The moment of capitulation is at hand.

I do want to say just a word about a problem that is troubling Senator DOUGLAS and Congressman DINGELL, and I think others. It's the problem of delay inherent in any plan which requires a court finding before a Federal registrar or referee or whatever he's called is appointed, and in permitting at some point after registration by this Federal official a further judicial contest of the propriety of registering this, that or the other individual. Now I think that a great deal of delay is involved. The point that I want to make is simply this: We are not, we should not be, concerned simply with working out a bill which would be the best of all possible bills in an ideal community, but a bill which will work as well as possible given the actual situation that exists. A great lot of education is going to be needed—a great lot. The law can't do all the educating, but it can make a substantial contribution to the educational process. So that, so far as I'm concerned, the fact, and I think it is a fact, that in the early years of Federal intervention along the general lines we've been talking about, the fact that there will be long delays is not a disadvantage: it's an advantage. It's all to the good. In short, I think our concern ought to be to make haste slowly. We're now in recess until after lunch.

* * * * *

Dean O'MEARA. Ladies and gentlemen the conference is again in session. Now since we have two subjects in addition to the voting rights problem which deserve discussion, it has been suggested, and it seems to me to be a good suggestion and I shall act upon it unless there's some objection, that in the last 30 minutes which we are now entering—the last 30 minutes of the discussion on the voting rights problem—we will concentrate and I ask each of the speakers, each who wishes to speak in this last 30-minute period, to address himself to one or other of the five points which Mr. Silard suggested at the beginning are crucial. May I read them to you:

1. A judicial finding of a pattern or practice of racial disfranchisement prior to appointment of Federal registration officials in the locality involved.

2. Federal registration of persons in the disfranchised class by a process no more onerous than the State registration procedure.

3. Federal registration made effective both for Federal and State elections.

4. Availability of Federal injunctions to insure that those registered will be permitted to vote.

5. Provision for State challenge of Federal registration at a time and in a manner which cannot, by delay, defeat the right of those enrolled to cast their votes in the election.

The suggestion which I have embraced is that those who speak in this final 30-minute period address themselves to one or another of those points, speaking either for or against. The matter is now open for discussion.

Professor CRAMTON. I would again like to reiterate the concern I mentioned this morning, about really point 4, the necessity for the availability of Federal court injunctions and the use of the contempt procedure of enforcement. It seems to me this is a vital and important question, involving the replacement of normal criminal procedures in a whole large area of conduct.

It seems to me it's a little unbecoming for any liberal to take the position, for instance, that abuses in congressional investigations really involve punishment without judicial standards, and then to turn right around and say that the constitutional requirements of a jury trial in criminal cases do not apply to this whole category of unlawful behavior. It really seems to me improper and unjustifiable. Adequate grounds have not yet been shown and established for the inadequacy of criminal proceedings to safeguard violations of a person's right to vote. Until there is a period of experience which demonstrates the inadequacy of criminal sanctions, this far-reaching measure, which I think would raise serious constitutional questions

and jeopardize a basic American liberty should not be adopted.

Mr. SILARD. It does not seem to me that in providing for injunctions to enforce the right of these persons registered to vote that you imply that the injunctions will be violated. Or, that if they are violated there would not be a jury trial. Certainly the choice is not between either injunctive process or criminal proceedings before a jury. Now as a matter of fact, in 1957 after months of debate a compromise was reached under which a jury trial was provided in criminal contempt cases over a certain punishment level that was then established.

So nothing here implies that we would go back one step upon the ultimate resolution of 2 or 3 years ago. I think that's an unfair charge to level against the principle that there will be injunctive relief available to make these registrations effective. Whether in contempts of court that occur, you are going to have jury trials across the board as we did in 1957, or not at all, that's another issue.

Father KENEALY (Loyola University School of Law). I would like to add to this discussion of the injunctive process the observation that there's nothing unconstitutional about the principle of the injunctive process. There are the rights both of the voter to be considered as well as the registrar who might be denying that right. The odium which the injunctive process acquired chiefly was the abuse of the injunctive process in the old labor cases. There the psychological urge was toward the abuse of the process because the judge who issued the injunctions was the social and club companion of management usually. The psychological pressure here will be rather very much against the abuse of the injunctive process. It will take courage, in view of the very great difficulties under which southern judges operate. So I don't share the expressed fears about the abuse of the injunctive process in the projected legislation.

I would like to add that I would favor very much, without repeating arguments given already today, the participation of the executive department, and therefore the system of registrars, whatever they would be called, rather than referees. I would like to see a heavier consideration of the Black-Emerson-Pollak so-called Yale memorandum, which was dismissed rather summarily as being politically unfeasible. Possibly it is. But I think there are considerations there for streamlining the process that should not be forgotten, or passed over without very serious consideration.

When it comes to a question of whether this shall refer to Federal elections or State elections, there's a tendency on the part of some to say, "Well let's keep it just to Federal elections now. Let's have half a loaf instead of no loaf at all." I would like to suggest that is merely a tactic, it's not a strategy. It's not a principle involved, and the tactic and strategy is certainly open to inspection by segregation proponents. They are well aware of it. My suspicion is that they will seize upon that tactic for very powerful countertactics. They will point out that this is not a bona fide appeal. It's the camel's nose in the tent. It is attempting to do something about Federal elections as a near step to do the unthinkable thing about State elections. The bill, I'm afraid would be charged with being filled with trickery and treachery and what not. I wouldn't be surprised to see Senator Eastland finally link it with sex offenses in the schools in the District of Columbia.

Professor ESTEP. Both as a constitutional lawyer and I would hope much more than that as a person interested in civil rights. I would really hate to see the suggestion that Professor Cramton has made overlooked or minimized in any way. Whether we like it or not, and whether it's constitutional or not—on this I certainly could not argue that the majority of the Court says that it's unconstitutional to have contempt through the injunction procedure—I think it's a very unwise principle and I think that it's such an important one that we ought not to say merely because we compromised on it in the 1957 act we ought also to compromise on it in this new Act.

If we're going to have an injunction procedure, and I think this is probably very important in order to make sure the vote does get cast at least—and then we can decide what to do about counting it later—we at least ought to provide that if we're going to punish somebody criminally, in the sense of a fine or imprisonment in any way, the statute itself ought to provide for a normal Federal, criminal trial with jury, and all down the line. I see no particular reason for drawing the line. I do not think a group such as this or people who back this kind of a bill ought to accept the philosophy here any more than we do in any other setting that the end justifies the means. I think that this is an important procedural thing in this country, whether it is an absolute binding constitutional dictate in every situation or not. I think this is something that is one of the real bulkarks of our freedom, though it is a procedural matter.

Secondly, I cannot help but think that the idea of separating the registration of the disenfranchised group from the registration of the enfranchised group in these areas where color lines are used to draw the line, is basically an unsound one. While you don't have to go clear to the suggestion I was making this morning, it seems to me there's something to be said for finding that this area, whether it be a county, a city or a State, is found to engage in these kinds of discriminatory practice; and then from that finding to say that from this area we are going to set up a Federal registration for everybody or every election in the State or county, or whatever it may be, and that until some kind of a showing is made later on we'll continue to have the Federal registration. Then when we turn it back to them, we'll watch them and see whether they really conduct it hereafter in a nondiscriminatory way.

I think we would solve a lot of the problems that we were arguing about this morning if we could accept the fact that once we make a finding that this area isn't doing a good job, on the registration alone—not the rest of the election, on the registration alone—we would say, "Everybody must walk into this one building and be registered by this one person." He would certify the list to the State election officials. If they want to contest it, give them 30 days to contest it after registration and before the election, and give them their fair procedures and right to witnesses and so on. Then finalize the thing so that we have a list on election day and everybody who is on that gets to cast a vote. Then we can argue later about whether it is counted or not.

I think it is very unwise to try to separate those who were disenfranchised and say "You register in one place" and to those who are not disenfranchised say, "You register in another place." I think we ought to take the bull by the horns and say "For that particular area, let's have one registrar who registers everybody and issues certified registration lists—voting lists, if you will." Certainly I think that it is important that we not postpone his rights to vote, and I think this could be worked out without comprising the other two.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Mr. YARMOLINSKY (Washington, D.C.) I would like to make one quite specific point and one rather general point. On the issue of the propriety of the use of the injunction process, it does seem to me that the extension of the injunction has been in bad odor, because injunctions, particularly in the classic case of the labor injunction, are used ostensibly to preserve the status quo and actually to decide the issue—because in a typical strike situation if you can postpone the decision long enough you've made the decision.

This is the opposite of the situation which we are facing here. What we're talking about is the preservation of rights which can then be adjudicated after the fact—after the election. I think that this needs to be kept carefully in mind because the use of the injunction process in the preelection period is not settling any questions. It's merely assuring that rights are not taken away by a preelection process.

Now, on the general point, I've been sitting here all through the morning session rather vacillating back and forth as I heard the eloquent arguments on both sides of the question, whether the chosen instrument should be the administrative process of the registrars or the judicial process with the referees. And since one has to make up one's mind at some point, I'm inclined to cast a kind of doubtful ballot in favor of the referees, and for this reason: I think that a good deal of the discussion has given insufficient credit to the flexibility and the adaptability of the judicial process. It's been with us for a long time and it's been effective in a wide variety of situations.

There's a tendency among lawyers, at least in the last ten years, to be scornful about equity, but equity can accomplish anything, I would suppose, and has accomplished almost anything, that the administrative process can accomplish. And I think that this is particularly true when we're talking about the operation of a system that's going to be working largely in rural areas—in areas that are not typical of the kind of communities where we find the pat situations where the administrative process is brought to bear—in situations where we're not looking for the kind of expertise that theoretically you get out of the ICC or the FCC or the CAB, or whatever. I'm inclined to think that it's more natural, more straightforward to stick to the judicial process.

On the other hand, I am impressed by the people here who have said, "Give the Executive some share of the responsibility. Don't put it all on the shoulders of the court." And I think that this is a cogent argument. But I'm not sure whether it is an appropriate argument at this point. If the executive branch of the Federal Government wanted to play, was willing to play—as I hope it will be in the future, but I don't

think it has been in the past—a leading role in securing to the colored citizens their right to vote, the executive department of the Government has all kinds of ways to do so, not only through the Department of Justice, but through the high office of the President, which would put these judicial officers if they were appointed not in the position of the lonely enforcers of what is right and just, but as people surrounded by friends and supporters.

And therefore I'm inclined to think that we can have a judicial referee system with the initial judicial finding, we can have a more flexible, a more natural system and yet we can bring into play the power of the executive branch and the influence and the support of the executive branch of the Government through other means.

If I didn't believe that I would take the other side of the question, because the last point I want to make is that I believe the whole debate here is concerned less with enforcement than with education. I think it was Harris Wofford who some months ago in a very powerful article pointed out that the function of the law here is primarily an educational function, and that this is not a problem that we're going to solve in months or even in years, and that we cannot expect that out of any legislation that's enacted this year we're going to make any radical changes in the voting situation, particularly in the Deep South. But if the law can perform an education function then it will be serving its true purpose.

I am inclined to believe on a very delicate balance this can best be done by a combination of the elements that Mr. Silard has listed here with the use of the judicially appointed referees and the invocation of equity power, but also, and essentially, with a real mobilization of the power and the influence of the executive department of the Federal Government.

Congressman MOELLER. I should like to supplement these fine remarks, Dean, with a little story I heard some time ago. There was a man on the hill in Washington wearing a badge on the lapel of his coat with the initials B.I.K. Someone asked him, "What does B.I.K. mean?" He said it means, "Boy I'm confused." He was told, "Well, you don't spell confused with a 'k'." And he said, "Well, this shows you how confused I am."

I think that a layman listening to the debates and discussions this morning might become quite confused. And as one Member of Congress I feel most definitely that when this issue reaches the House it's going to be extremely simplified when it becomes law, which it probably will, because it's going to have to be something that's very, very practical and that the average man is going to understand.

And it occurs to me that point 3 mentioned before is an extremely important one with respect to the Federal registrar for both the Federal and State elections. Unless this is done, it seems as though an operation might be performed on the patient where the incision is made and then the wound is not sewed up. Possibly the election on the State level is going to mean a lot more to the people today who are denied full citizenship than any election on the Federal level. I think this is the one that's going to cause the greatest problem. It's the one that I think we need to tackle with the greatest of dignity.

Professor FOSTER. The point has been made twice now in the summary by Mr. Silard of the possibility of a judicial finding initially of a pattern of practice and discriminaton, that to be followed by the administrative appointment of registration officials to serve in the executive branch. Since we have such an eminently qualified panel of constitutional lawyers sitting along this bank over here, and over there as well, I'd like to throw a lawyer's nit-pick question at the lawyers on the separation-of-powers problem. The question is whether such a primary determination by the courts followed by a discretionary appointment in a discretionary operation by an executive agency does not run afoul on the supposed limitations on the judicial powers of the United States, as they have been spelled out over years, in limiting the Federal courts to essentially the handling of so-called justiciable cases.

This, it seems to me, raises a question of rather serious magnitude: having the courts intercede at that initial point simply to make a general finding which in turn triggers the exercise of the executive discretion. And if there are those who have any comments either for or against this I should certainly like to hear something spoken to this point.

Professor NATHANSON. Well, I'm afraid I've formulated my comment more in relationship to what Mr. Yarmolinsky had said before, and I want to get that one off my chest. First, if I understood Mr. Yarmolinsky to come reluctantly to the conclusion that the best place to start here is with the judiciary, in other words for the courts to have the primary responsibility, I would like to say that it seemed to me that at least part of his argument indicated a contrary conclusion—that we have here, as he said, a problem of continuing education, mixed with a problem of enforcement.

It seemed to me that this is perhaps most suited for an administrative setup: in other words, grafting on to the educational functions which we already have had exemplified in the Commission and the investigatory functions some further powers of enforcement, which of course for their ultimate sanction will have to have the courts brought in. There isn't any doubt about that. But insofar as we have primarily a long-range job to do here of education and enforcement in a hostile area, it seems to me that the now old-fashioned, but once new, administrative process is the more suitable.

I've had some hestitation, as a matter of fact, in coming to this conclusion because the administrative process is in some disrepute right now, as I well know and appreciate. But, it also seems that this is the kind of situation where it has its best chance, you might say, of succeding, and does not have the additional problems that the agencies like the Federal Communications Commission have had. Here the objective is quite clear. The controlling standard is quite clear. We don't have the problems of formulating a standard out of vague considerations from God knows what kind of policy. It's more comparable to the job that the National Labor Relations Board has had to do when what was an unfair labor practice was fairly clear. It was one of enforcement and to some extent of education.

So it seems to me that if we could work out something along that line—now I haven't thought through all the details, but it seems to me that the details are not insuperable—of using basically a commission which would have its seat of authority in Washington to give it a kind of a central strength, but nevertheless its arms spread out through the country where it is needed—working in that way with a measure of flexibility in the remedies available. Not in the principles that control it, but in its remedies. And of course with the aid of the judicial process for enforcement, and with the conventional aid of a contempt proceeding in a noncriminal situation, so that there would be no problem of a jury trial or anything else. There would be no case of trying to pin people down as criminal. But the main problem is to get a remedy where you don't have to worry about a jury trial and the constitutional considerations thereafter.

Mr. SILARD. I would suggest to Dean O'Meara that the discussion between Mr. Yarmolinsky and Professor Nathanson illustrates that there is not now, and until the last moment of time there wil never be, a consensus as to whether the appointment of the officials to do the job should be judicial or administrative. But I also suggest that it doesn't really make much difference. If there is a basic area of agreement as to what this official is to do, that it is a simple ministerial registration task, and that what he does will be enforcible without delay at the time that the election comes about, I for one am of the opinion—though I personally for instance view the administrative appointment as better—I cannot see that it really makes much difference who does the appointing. The officer you appoint there will probably be the same person in the locality, and this seems to me very little difference—one that should never really divide civil rights proponents, though it certainly will be a divisive issue all the same.

Governor WILLIAMS. One of the most interesting comments I've heard during the course of the day was some gentleman who said that during the war they never got the labor groups unionized until they came up with a slogan, "President Roosevelt wants you to join a union." Well, I don't believe that this administration would go for the slogan, "President Roosevelt wants you to register," and maybe the country at large would be divided on the slogan, "President Eisenhower wants you to register." But this being the time of year, perhaps we could all agree on the slogan, "President Lincoln wants you to register."

Seriously, though, I try to weigh all of the discussion today, including the very excellent talk of Father Hesburgh at lunch, and the problems that I see are rather difficult—and yet if we're going to get any solution it's going to have to be relatively simple. It's not those Ph. D.'s who were trying to register that are going to solve this question. What we're going to have is a lot of people in the backwoods who perhaps don't even know what it means to register, and I don't think that this registration process is going to be worth too much if all it is somebody sitting in a high chair in the back corner of a room waiting for something to happen. I think there's going to have to be some spirit of "Let's get this job done." Now obviously this can't happen unless there's a situation where the local authorities aren't doing what they're supposed to do. But once this finding is made then I think this should be a somewhat more persuasive method than just siting back and waiting for somebody to come in and knock down the door to register.

Those of you who are acquainted with the political process know that registration in the North just doesn't happen by opening your doors and inviting the public to come in. Now how much more difficult is it going to be to make any appreciable dent in the nonregistered in the South. And if what we want to get is a number of Negroes registered so that it will make an appreciable step toward freedom and democracy, then I think we have to have a system that is going to afford some encouragement as well as legal possibility. And therefore I think that we've got to envisage a system which is going to have a responsibility and obligation to get a job done—to be fighting for democracy rather than permitting it to happen.

And so I think of the original suggestion of the Commission—the President. After all it's the President's constitutional obligation to see that the laws are enforced. And if the people can eventually look to him to see whether the United States is performing its obligation before God and the country, then I think maybe something will happen.

So I favor putting it up to the Commission, and perhaps even going as far as my

fellow Michiganite, Sam Estep, has suggested, or "If you're going to move in, move in not only for the disenfranchised, but for everyone," so that you make a clean-cut issue of the fact that you want to get everybody registered. I think that the registration in the States that we're concerned about isn't so good for the white groups—as it isn't for the colored group either. And maybe it wouldn't be a bad idea to come in and get more people registered in Michigan, but I won't go into that at the moment.

Seriously, I do come back to the point that if we want to get this job done, I don't think that you can lay an injunction on the Court to go out and do the job. That isn't their real function in life. Their function is to decide issues, and this is something that is more than educational. This is an operational job.

Since we're all casting our votes here I would cast mine in favor of placing the obligation ultimately on the President and on the Executive, setting up administrative mechanisms so as not only to make it possible, but actually to persuade people to register, so that we can establish the basis for democracy strongly enough so that when it's turned back to the local government it will continue to flourish.

Dean O'MEARA. Our 30 minutes have expired. However, Professor Harris had his hand up before the Governor spoke; so I think that I should call on him.

Professor HARRIS. Many of us seem close to some type of consensus around Mr. Silard's five proposals but for the sticky wicket that seemed to be suggested by Professor Foster: how can we combine a judicial finding with the benefits of administrative proceedings?

I wonder if I could summarize what I seem to be hearing. I gather there's a political necessity, not speaking of a constitutional one, but a political necessity to satisfy the present Congress, that there be a judicial finding of discrimination or of a pattern of discrimination in an area before a registrar or referee be appointed. This seems clear from the Attorney General's position and from much of what Harris Wofford has presented here—the Commission's views and those of various other people. I take it this creates a dilemma because the usual judicial proceeding is not ex parte, or at least it isn't ex parte beyond a temporary restraining order, and the feeling is that the Negroes will not register unless they're permitted to do so ex parte. But the Congress won't vote for something which looks like it's making a sham out of a judicial process by turning it into ex parte proceedings.

And I gather that the attempt to combine the administrative process and the judicial process has raised article-III-of-the-constitution doubts in the mind of Professor Foster and perhaps Professor Nathanson. I certainly don't want to set up myself as the prognosticator who can say when the Supreme Court splits 5–3–1 who's going to be in the 5. But I wonder if the problem is not soluble with a little imagination and a certain amount of expectation that there may be some sympathy in the Supreme Court.

For a solution which does no violence to tradition and which heads for a goal which so many people share, I wonder if the Court cannot, after making the initial judicial finding, retain jurisdiction over the whole problem. I wonder if it can't come us as a class action or some type of a representative suit by the Attorney General along the lines of the Attorney General's proposal. And perhaps we ought to make the State the defendant so that there's no danger that the defendant is going to die, or be abolished or go away anywhere. We still have our parties—the class of disenfranchised Negroes on the one side and the State, whichever State it may happen to be, on the other side.

I wonder if the Congress doesn't have the power—I certainly think it does—to create a new remedy—not a remedy that existed before, but a new remedy. I gather they created declaratory judgments and they can create remedies not yet seen by judges. And the general nature of the remedy I wouldn't care to detail at this time, but it certainly could embody the appointment of an administrator who would perform the way a voting registrar performs in the States. And he would act ex parte as the voting registrars do. And he would issue certificates or maybe he'd issue cease and desist orders—I'm not interested in the precise detail. I take it the district court judge could issue a temporary restraining order on the recommendation of this administrator. And the Negro would go to the polls and he'd vote.

Now the ballots would be challenged—the whole process would be challenged—only at one point. If anybody wanted to challenge the issue—any issue—at the polling place he could do so. The ballots would be impounded and then there would be a proceeding similar to what goes on in the States all the time—very rapidly, in the Federal court which is retaining jurisdiction of this matter.

This is not a sham—the Federal court is keeping jurisdiction. There would be a hearing in the Federal court on all questions: "Is the act constitutional? Is the registrar properly appointed?" Anything you want. Right then and there if you want to appeal, take it to the fifth circuit, take it to the Supreme Court, clean the whole thing up, and then the impounded ballots would be counted.

But I think that you get the benefits of all these things with a little bit of imagination in the drafting. I don't think the Supreme Court would have anywhere near the difficulties which we could conjure up around this table, if we assumed them to have no sympathy whatsoever for the proposal. Thank you.

Dean O'MEARA. Thank you, Professor Harris. I'm sure we could go on and spend the rest of the afternoon discussing the multiple problems involved in the proposed voting rights bills now pending in Congress, and the Commission's recommendations, and although, at this juncture, voting rights seem to have priority because that, no doubt, is what Congress will take up first, and that is the subject in which there presently seems to be the greatest prospect of progress, still there are other problems and, as Father Hesburgh pointed out, all these problems are related and one can't be solved unless all are solved. So it seems to me that we ought to turn at this point to the second item on our agenda, that is, assisting school desegregation.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

FATHER HESBURGH'S LUNCHEON ADDRESS AT THE CIVIL RIGHTS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 14, 1960

Thank you Dean O'Meara.

One of the members of our Commission, Governor Carlton of Florida, who has a remark covering every occasion, says using these things [faulty microphones] is like trying to kiss a screaming woman. I haven't had much experience at that.

But, gentlemen, we've had a long morning, and I think it's somewhat double jeopardy for you to have to listen to me twice today, although I think I established an all-time record for keeping quiet this morning, after the opening. In this problem, I like to think back to the first day we walked into the President's office to get sworn in. After we had been sworn in and had had the usual number of photographs, he sent everyone else out of the office and sat down to talk with us. At that point he was quite serious and he said: "This problem that you are addressing yourselves to is the most serious domestic problem on the whole American scene today. To the extent that we can solve this problem, we will be worthy to hold up our heads in the company of the other nations of the world—to the extent that we bring some light to this problem, we will be qualified to work on world problems—because it's rather ridiculous to take a world posture on the meaning of democracy and equality and equal opportunity and not to practice it at home." He continued, "I don't know the answer to these problems, and that's why you gentlemen have been commissioned, and now it's your problem. We'll do all we can to help."

With that we walked over to an empty office on Jackson Place into a room that had a dusty desk and six chairs. We sat down and said, "Where do we begin?" It was quite a long trip from that empty office next to the Brookings Institution off Lafayette Square to a front porch in Land O'Lakes, Wis., last summer when we again sat down around a table—surrounded by pinewoods and soft breezes from across the lake—and tried to hammer out a final report for the President and the Congress after some year and a half of hearings and deliberations.

THE GROWTH OF A COMMISSION

I think it was quite an unusual thing and quite a surprise to us, and I'm sure a great surprise to many others as has been remarked here this morning, that we came up with a report. If ever there was a Commission that was dissonant and disaggregate in its composition it was the Civil Rights Commission, with three Democrats, two Republicans, and an Independent, myself; with three southerners and three northerners; with two former Governors of States, two law deans, and two college or university presidents. And yet several things emerged from the year and a half that we met together. I think the most amazing thing that happened was we became very close friends and I think we developed for each other the kind of compatibility and understanding, and even perhaps at times compassion, that was a necessary ingredient in any kind of fruitful solution to this very vexing problem.

Last summer found us in Shreveport, La., trying to investigate the problem of voting in a State where literally thousands of Negro voters were being swept from the rolls. It was a terribly hot place during July. We were greeted as we got off the airplane with papers from the U.S. marshal—a new experience for me anyway. And we were told that our preparation was for naught because there would be no hearing. It was at that juncture, on the verge of the time when we had to get this report written, that we betook ourselves to northern Wisconsin where a kindly gentleman in the past left an estate to the University of Notre Dame, and we sat

down on the front porch, only after having gone out fishing together, and decided that we would try to agree on our findings and recommendations.

I mentioned to the President of the United States when we handed in this report on September 8, that perhaps there was one more dimension that he was unaware of when he appointed this Commission, because it not only had the dissonances I spoke of earlier, but it had had one great unity—all six of us were ardent fishermen. I don't know if the report as it was written could have been written except in a fishing camp where we interspersed our discussions and conversation with a little angling on the lake, and the good Lord was good to us because we caught a lot of fish, too.

FLESH AND BLOOD FACTS

In any event, I remember one night when we sat past midnight, and I am told on reliable authority, that some of the staff stayed up the rest of the night—at least they looked like it in the morning—and we had come to what was really the crucial point of our report: what were we going to do about voting. There wasn't a man of us who did not recognize that there were literally millions of people qualified to vote who were not able to vote and probably would not be able to vote for the next President of the United States, much less for their Senators, Congressmen, and State officials. We had seen some of these people. These weren't units to us. They were flesh and blood people. Some of them were veterans with long months of oversea duty and decorations for valor in service. Some of the people were ministers. Some of them were college teachers. Some of them were lawyers, doctors. All of them were taxpayers. Some were mothers of families who were hard pressed to tell their children what it is to be a good American citizen when they could not vote themselves. All of them were decent, intelligent American people, and yet they could not cast their ballot for the President of the United States.

Some had gone through incredible hardships in attempting to register and had been subjected to incredible indignities. I don't know if any of you in this room have had to go through this experience, but even vicariously we had to go through it in listening to their tales. They would go to a courthouse and instead of going in where the white people registered, they would have to go to a room in the back where they would stand in line from 6 in the morning until 2 in the afternoon, since only two were let in at a time. Then people with Ph.D.'s and master's degrees and high intelligence would sit down and copy like a schoolchild the first article or the second article of the Constitution. Then they would be asked the usual questions, make out the usual questionnaire, hand in a self-addressed envelope, and hear nothing for 3 months. And then they would go back and do it over again, some of them five, six, or seven times, some of them standing in line two or three days until their turn came.

DUAL SOLUTION TO VOTING DENIALS

All of us—I'm sure I speak now for not just myself, but for the southerners and the northerners, the Democrats and the Republicans—we all knew that something must be done about this situation and done as quickly and as simply and as cleanly as possible. I think we really came up with two solutions. One of them appears as a recommendation approved by five members of our Commission, and the other is a suggestion—I don't know what official term you would put on it since it was only approved by the three northern members of the Commission. The recommendation had to do, as you all know, with Federal registrars. Our reasoning was very simple on that point. We simply said that if it was a well-known fact, as I think we had established it, that there were people well qualified to vote—much better qualified indeed than many people now voting in these same localities—then there should be some mechanism known to man whereby this vote could be obtained. And if, as we had demonstrated, it was impossible for these people to vote now—literally impossible under present circumstances, with all the ingenuity humankind will employ to keep a person from doing something they don't want him to do—then it was the duty of the Federal Government under the 15th amendment of the Constitution to see that some means were taken to allow these people to vote. And we felt that this means should not involve great expense. It should not involve human indignity or the fear of reprisal or economic sanctions against these people who want to vote. Somehow these people almost should be embraced by the Federal Government and allowed a little extra privilege, if you will, because of the indignity they have had to endure already in trying to exercise their primary right as citizens. That is how we came up with the idea of Federal registrars.

It was not our thought that this would be an end-all, that this would clean up the situation for all times, but at least we thought that this was an imaginative, creative approach to see that what could not be done on the State level, would at least be assured on the Federal level. We thought that this was in keeping with the Constitution of the United States. I think we demonstrated in our own common act of making this recommendation that this is not a partisan problem in any sense of the word. This is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is an issue of the U.S. Constitution, an issue to which every American should be committed, an issue on which the finest intelligence in our land should be prepared to study and act.

So the little Commission that really didn't look like very much to us in the beginning, and looked less like anything potent to us as we went along our way, came up with a kind of bombshell, it seems. As a result, all of us are here today and have had this very intricate and involved legal discussion this morning about the ways and means of accomplishing this end to which we are all committed.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

I would like to add a postscript. I am not a lawyer—sometimes this is a salvation because you don't see all the difficulties that might come up and you're not constantly preparing for all of the ingenuity that will be marshaled against a law. I would like to mention our second proposal, which was not a recommendation but a proposal by three members of the Commission. I think it should come as a kind of relief to all of you who have spent so much time this morning looking at the really involved state of affairs that obtain when one tries to accomplish on a Federal level that which is not being accomplished on a State level—with all the intricacies of Federal-State relationships involved. We talked this over coming up on the airplane from Shreveport to Land O'Lakes, Wis. We discussed many of the difficulties that have been discussed here this morning. We were trying as hard as possible to find some way, some short-range answer to get the vote for those who are now presently disenfranchised—by the next election if at all possible.

But we thought there must be a simpler long-range answer to this problem. And the answer we came up with was our proposal for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States declaring for all time simply, clearly, undeniably that every American citizen has the right to vote and that this right will not be circumscribed by the Federal Government, by the State or by any individual, and that it will depend simply on two easily proven factors, the age of the person in question, and the length of his residence within a given State, and that Congress will make appropriate legislation to see that this right is honored in all of the States of the Union, and that its only limitation would be by reason of legal confinement at the time of registration or voting.

This, I think, goes to the heart of the problem we have been discussing this morning. To me the seat of infection is as simple as this: that there are literacy tests in the States under question which are being applied in a discriminatory fashion, and as long as man is ingenious and these texts exist there will be discrimination.

There are two approaches to this problem, I think. One is to try to find out some way to direct the ingenuity of man toward a better end than keeping people from voting. The other approach is to ask how serious is the demand for literacy as a qualification for voting in these United States. And here I think we have a very simple answer. I don't have all the statistics at my fingertips, but I can say with all assurance, being in the business of education, that the United States is more educated today than anytime in its history. It is probably the most educated country in the whole world. Literacy is well over 90 percent throughout the Nation and the growth in literacy has been absolutely astounding in these past few years. I think that it is high time that we stood up before all the nations of the world and said a very simple thing; namely, that we believe in democracy and we think that the heart of democracy is that everybody—every citizen—has a right to vote for those who will govern him. This is the heart of democracy because the governed himself somehow governs in choosing those who will guide his destiny as a citizen of his State or the Union. Once we have said this and say it out clearly in our Constitution, then I defy anybody to find legal ways around this simple qualification for the vote. I cannot imagine lawsuits going on for 2 or 3 years to determine whether someone is 21 years old or has lived in this State for the required period of time.

A DECLARATION OF AMERICAN FAITH

I believe that this is the long-range answer. But while we work on the short-range answer with all its intricacies, I hope we will work on the long-range answer, too. Because I think the time is ripe for this, and I think this would be one of the most startling and dramatic things that America could do in the total world situation today—when the total uncommitted colored one-third of the world today is pressed to choose between our democratic philosophy of life and that of the Soviets. The Soviets cannot say that they believe in the things that are total and essential and substantive in the philisophy of the West: the dignity of the human person, the spiritual nature that gives him the title to the certain unalienable God-given rights, the respect which each individual human being may expect, the equality of opportunity that must be his. I think making a fact of universal suffrage would be the most dramatic way to say these things that we believe. We would be saying to the uncommitted third of the world that we really are committed to the system that we would like them to follow.

There are a few other things I want to say. First of all I'd like to say something about Lincoln since we're so close to his birthday. Someone suggested that I say something about Lincoln since we're so close to his birthday. Someone suggested that I say something about the place of the heart in all this since it's Valentine's Day. I don't think that I've got time for both so I'll stay with Lincoln for the moment. Here is one of the most interesting stories I know about Lincoln. I cannot say that it's true or apocryphal, but I did read it in Thomas'

Life of Lincoln. This story tells of a time when the city of Washington was beleaguered by the Confederate Army and it looked as though the Union was at its lowest ebb in the Civil War. As Lincoln pondered on the pressures of the time and the seeming inevitability of military failure and what this would mean to the country of which he was President, it dawned upon him that the real issue at stake was an issue that he himself had not always recognized—a spiritual and a moral issue: whether indeed all men are created equal. We are told that on this occasion he made a promise to God that if Washington were spared, if the city were relieved and things took a turn for the better, he would at the earliest and most appropriate opportunity, promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

Washington was spared, as you know, and the time soon became appropriate for him to make this proclamation. He called in his political advisers and his Cabinet to discuss this. He told them that he was talking to them about this but that he had already made up his mind about what he was going to write and that this was his sole personal responsibility. They gave freely of their advice. They said that such a proclamation would be the most politically inexpedient thing to do at this time. It would harden the opposition of the South. It was not politically viable. It was going to have a bad effect on the war. It would make for chaos and ruin in the Union. And yet Lincoln said, "I've made a promise—the other part of the bargain has been fulfilled and I'm going to do my part." So in the face of all this professional advice he made the Emancipation Proclamation. We only have to remember that today we remember him most proudly as the "Great Emancipator" to know who was right and that one does not make mistakes in these human problems when one follows one's conscience and pays attention to the moral and spiritual issues involved.

What we are discussing today should be as nonpartisan as any spiritual or moral issue facing America. We seek only one end—that all Americans are on equal footing in their participation in the civic order. We must use all of our brains and all of our compassion to find a solution, and that solution must not be tricky in a legal sense but be as simple as our belief that all men are created equal and that all men are entitled to vote in this country. We must take appropriate, firm, solid, simple means toward that end. I would think that a clear mandate to that end would shame people into seeing that nothing is done to violate this principle. So I think we should have courage like Lincoln's in promoting a constitutional amendment that would establish universal suffrage and say clearly to all the world that our basic principles are more important than legal trickery or political expediency.

THE THREE DIMENSIONS

I would like to say just one or two more things. I think there are three great dimensions to this whole problem of civil rights. The first dimension is a personal dimension. I don't know of any problem in this country that is more personal to each one of us than this problem of civil rights. I think one can legitimately abstract oneself from the problem of foreign policy—in the sense that we can all admit to a certain amount of ignorance about the intricacies of the negotiations at the summit, for example. I think we should be interested in foreign policy. I think we should concern ourselves about it. I think it's the place of intelligence to discuss it and create a great dialogue about it. But I can see how John Doe, of Mishawaka, Ind., could admit in the secret of his heart that he doesn't know very much about the great negotiations going on, the great issues that shape the foreign policies of our Nation. I think one also might plead certain ignorance of the great scientific developments that are taking place in the missile race or that are involved in the great discussions now in progress on defense. I'm not making a plea that this ignorance be continued, I'm merely saying that it is conceivable that John Doe, in Mishawaka, Ind., is somewhat ignorant about what makes a missile go and how good our missiles are compared with those of the opposition, and that many citizens do not now know and will not know the scientific intracicies that bear upon problems such as defense or nuclear power and the like.

A PERSONAL COMMITMENT

But I say that when it comes to civil rights if you so much as meet another human being in the course of your life, and all of us meet many, then you cannot be uncommitted on this problem. This is not the kind of problem about which a person can de detached. Because of the fact that you walk down a street, or live in a neighborhood, or work in an office, or get on a bus, or talk to anyone, you are involved in this problem and you must take a stand. This, I say, is the great pressing reality of this problem: it involves the personal commitment of every American citizen. Our national documents are inspiring and moral and right. I would hope that our individual consciences could be as inspiring and moral and right about what these documents imply—that every man has dignity, that every person as a sacred human being is entitled to our respect, and that each one of us in our own way, within our own sphere, no matter how small or how great it is, do our best to see that this equality of opportunity reigns and is not a figment or a hypocrisy.

I recall once standing on the 63d Street station waiting for the South Shore Railroad in Chicago. There was a young lady—a Negro nurse—standing next to me. And since we had about a 20-minute wait and I'm not much for standing alone and meditating on the tracks I decided to have a conversation with her. I asked her about her job and how she found work in Chicago and about her family situation. After the ice was broken she told me about having a little boy of whom she was very proud, a little son 4 years old. She said, "You know, Father, I was washing him the other day, helping him take a bath, and I told him, 'Now take this soap and scrub yourself real hard.' And he said, "Mommy, if I scrub myself hard enough will I be white?" And she said, "No, you're colored and you'll always be colored." And he said this simple thing: "It's better to be white."

My reaction to this story was: "Did you let him get away with that?" And she said, "Why shouldn't I let him get away with it? Isn't it better to be white in the United States of America?" I said, "Maybe on the surface it's better but this isn't the way a youngster should think with a whole life before him. Because what is today does not necessarily always have to be, and please God, it won't be the permanent pattern of our United States. It is certainly not the ideal of our Constitution. I think you should have told your little boy that color has nothing to do with how good a person is or what it is better to be as a person. Fundamentally what a person is, is what he is in the sight of God, what use he makes of what talent he has—how his values square with the good values and the great values of all times, how he feels towards other people and toward the responsibility of using his life in a constructive and helpful way, what his relationship is to his family and to his work and his God. All of these are the true measure of what a person is, and these are spiritual, not material measures."

But the story brought home one thing to me—that we're not ever going to solve the problem of civil rights in this country unless somehow we learn to judge people on their quality as persons and not according to the pigmentation of their skin. I think it is one of the nastiest things you can say about many Americans—maybe all of us in the depth of our hearts—that we put too much weight and emphasis on the color of our skin, almost instinctively, and that we don't think deeply enough about judging people on what they are as persons irrespective of how much money they might have or what color they might be or what nationality or what neighborhood or what religion they belong to. This is the great personal dimension of the problem, a problem in which we must all be engaged, all have a point of view, a deep conviction—and we must all act accordingly.

ORGANIC NATURE OF PROBLEM

The second dimension is simply what I would call the organic nature of the problem. I don't think we would solve this problem if this afternoon we came up with such a bright proposal that these gentlemen go back to Washington and next week enact a foolproof bill that enables every Negro in the country to vote in the next election. The problem would only begin to be solved by that but it would be still a long way from a total solution. Let me give you a simple formula in the nonlegal words of equal opportunity rather than equal protection of law. If we would honestly say that every American has equal opportunity across the board and then let the chips fall where they may, I think the whole problem would get solved pretty quickly. Every American would have an equal opportunity to live in the main stream of the political process, to hold office, to vote, to participate, to be educated to the extent that his energy and his ambition and his talent carry him.

Every American should have the opportunity to go as far as he could go as long as he had the talent, the intelligence, the ambition to keep working. Then every American should have the opportunity to work where he could do the most good for himself, for his family, for his community, for his country, without artificial bars to such work. He should do whatever he could do best and the only limitation to his success should be how much talent he had, how well he was educated, and how hard he was willing to work and how devoted he was to good things. And lastly every American should have equal opportunity to live in a decent house in a decent neighborhood, and that if he was successful and had made progress, no matter what his race or religion or anything else, he should be able to go up the social ladder and live where his heart desires and where his means permit. This choice would not be restricted as it is today by all of these cute little covenants and understandings and hypocricies that so characterize every city in the North.

Given these four equal opportunities and given the range of talents that are possessed by all races of human beings, I think the problem would find a solution. I'm not naive enough to think that this is going to happen by tomorrow morning. But I think this is the kind of solution that we as individuals can all subscribe to. Insofar as we control education or control jobs or control housing or have some say about any aspect of them, we can follow this viewpoint. If enough of us start doing this we will be well on the way to a solution.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

The third dimension of this problem is that it is not a responsibility of only one part of Government. It was said this morning that the judiciary has been unduly overloaded with the burden of this problem. Insofar as it must be solved on the governmental level, it is of course going to need the attention of all the powers of Government.

Let me give you a few examples to show what I mean when I ask for consistency in all the powers of government in this matter. We know that the Supreme Court has outlawed compulsory school segregation. Yet some universities and colleges, the institutions supposed to be the center of the training of leadership for the next generation, which are being given literally hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal support from the Congress and administered through executive agencies (some of which I belong to)—some of these institutions getting this Federal money simply do not follow the Constitution or the law of the land. I fail to see how the judiciary can clear up this problem if the other two branches of Government go quietly along helping those who openly defy the law of the land. I think this is particularly pertinent when we're talking about the segment of our society that is supposed to be turning out the leaders for tomorrow.

When I say this I'm not picking a fight with my fellow presidents and fellow faculty members of other colleges and universities, public and private. I think that most of them think rightly and would like to act rightly on this. Yet, private university and college administrators must face their boards of trustees and State school administration must face their legislators for funds. But supposing it were said that all Federal funds had this simple tag on them: that they must be spent for all the people, that they must be spent in a nondiscriminatory fashion, and that if anyone wants Federal funds for either private or public institutions, there is one condition—you have to agree that in using these funds you are going to follow the Constitution of the United States. What is so revolutionary about this? Yet the fact is that to date, while this proposal is contained in the report of our Commission on Civil Rights, there has been scarcely a word said about it.

In a sense I've been cowardly and have been relieved by the silence because one cannot take this stand without opening oneself to a certain amount of criticism from one's colleagues in the university and college world. Yet I think that this is a simple thing that could be accomplished tomorrow morning if those in power would decide to do something about it—and I'm speaking of both the legislative and the executive branches of Government when I say this.

The same is true of housing. I think it is no secret that less than 2 percent of federally assisted private housing goes to the benefit of the Negroes, despite the fact that this is public money, funnelled through private agencies, builders and real estate agents, brokers, and lending agencies. Yet here is a matter where the three powers of the Federal Government are working in dissonance—the judiciary saying nondiscrimination is the law and the others blithely going about paying little attention to the law and even rewarding those who refuse to follow the law. This is the third dimension.

If we are going to solve this problem, first, we must all be personally committed to its solution; secondly, we must remember that the problem has several dimensions, that it is an organic problem—that we must work on all these fronts at once; and lastly, insofar as we are concerned as we are here today with governmental action, let us ask that all the powers of Government work together in a nonpartisan way in this matter to try to reach some solution that will make real for all Americans, the promise of the Constitution.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

PAPERS DISCUSSED AT CONFERENCE

(By associate Prof. Harris Wofford, Notre Dame Law School, legal adviser to Father Hesburgh, Commission on Civil Rights)

I. BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON RIGHT-TO-VOTE LEGISLATION

Fortunately the discrepancy between the promise of the Constitution and our failure to fulfill it in practice is not so great as that unbridgeable gap between the City of Man and the City of God. That greater divide is the source of our comedy and our tragedy and of the better part of our politics. Similarly, as the report of the Commission on Civil Rights suggests, the lesser divide—"the gap between the great American promise of equal opportunity and equal justice under law and its at times startlingly inadequate fulfillment in practice"—has been a creative factor in American history.

Right now there is no more startling discrepancy between our words and our deeds than the continued denial of the right to vote in violation of the 15th amendment. At last it seems, however, as if the tension caused by this in the American political conscience is creating a spark gap.

A SPARK GAP

Until now the problem has been to generate enough political current to bridge the gap. It may be that the sparks now flashing North and South, between Congress and the administration, between Democrats and Republicans, between the Civil Rights Commission and the Attorney General, will provide both the political energy and the illumination needed to get on with the job.

The Commission did its part primarily by building up the heat. The unanimous finding of the Commission that many Negro citizens are in fact being denied their right to vote, and the unanimous findings on the variety of methods of such denial—mainly through discriminatory administration of State registration laws—have built up the moral and political heat to the point where some substantial legislation appears likely

At first the administration indicated that it would stand—or sit—on its previous legislative recommendations—which did not scratch the surface of the problem.[1] But with even such conservative southerners as the three southern members whom the President had appointed to the Commission finding unanimously that "legislation presently on the books is inadequate to assure that all our qualified citizens shall enjoy the right to vote,"[2] and with newspapers like the Washington Post saying that the Commission's recommendations made the previous legislative proposals "look pallid by comparison," the administration was on a political hotseat in an election year, and so was the Democratic majority in Congress.

This calls for one qualification. The Commission noted that the power given to the Attorney General by the 1957 act to bring civil suits in Federal district courts, seeking equitable relief in cases where the right to vote is being denied by reason of race, has "not been thoroughly tested." Only four cases have been brought by the Attorney General—one in Terrell County, Ga., following an exposé of the situation there by the Washington Post; one in Macon County, Ala., following the hearing on the situation there by the Civil Rights Commission; one in Washington Parish, La., begun on the eve of a Commission hearing there; and one in Fayette County, Tenn., brought after the Commission reported on that situation.

Only in the Louisiana case, where some 1,300 already registered Negro voters were purged from the rolls at the instigation of the white citizens council, has any of these cases resulted in an order requiring the registration of any disfranchised person, and that order—made by an outstanding Federal district judge, Skelly Wright—is now on appeal. The proof of racial discrimination in such a case of a mass purge was overwhelming. The relief may also prove to be adequate, since the Negroes there had already once succeeded in getting registered and may well now stand up for their court-declared rights.

There may be other situations where this civil injunction suit of the 1957 act proves to be effective. As the Commission stated it is "disappointing" that the Attorney General has not tested this procedure more than four times in 2½ years. Commission Member Johnson suggests in a footnote to the Commission report that "reasonable grounds" to believe that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote—the language of the 1957 act authorizing such injunction suits—exist in all the 16 counties where Negroes constitute a majority of the voting age population but where no Negro is registered, and in 49 other counties with Negro majorities but

---

[1] The administration's 1959 civil rights program, the bill reported out of the House Judiciary Committee and the Commission all recommend that Congress require the preservation of local registration records and their public inspection. This would facilitate investigation and proof of discrimination. But the Commission concluded that "even if a law were adopted to guarantee such access and even if the Attorney General should bring civil suits for preventive relief in a larger number of districts * * * there is little reason to believe that such litigation would afford adequate relief." The Commission explained that so long as registration is left to local officials in these areas, administering literacy tests and other State qualifications for voting, "where there is will and opportunity to discriminate against certain potential voters, ways to discriminate will be found."

[2] "Against the prejudice of registrars and jurors," said the Commission's report, "the U.S. Government appears under present laws to be helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution."

fewer than 5 percent of voting-age Negroes registered. We would know better how to proceed if the Attorney General had brought suits in at least one of these 16 most extreme cases—or one suit in the State of Mississippi where the problem appears to be most severe. In Mississippi the Commission reported that there were 14 counties containing about 52,000 voting age Negroes in 1950 where, at last count, no Negro was registered; in the State at large containing nearly a million Negroes, or 45 percent of the population, only about 4 percent of 1950 voting age Negroes were at last report registered.

The Attorney General did his part by moving from a position of opposition to Federal registration machinery to agreement that some such machinery was urgently necessary, and by proposing the court-appointed-referee plan.

INCLUSION OF STATE ELECTIONS

He also contributed by raising everyone's sights. The Commission's plan for Federal registrars in cases of voting discrimination had been limited to Federal elections. This was done as a matter of policy and prudence, Commissioner Johnson explained to the Senate Rules Committee on February 5.[3] This limitation, made in an abundance of caution—a caution to be expected from some of the conservative men and southerners appointed to the Commission by the President—was undoubtedly a shortcoming.

It was probably not so great a shortcoming as the Attorney General indicated, for the very fusion of the State and Federal election process which he stresses should in many situations result in the abandonment of discrimination in State elections if discrimination in Federal elections is effectively ended. The assumption of the anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution just passed by the Senate, which was limited to Federal elections, was apparently this same assumption that if the practice was eliminated for Federal elections the States would drop it in all elections, rather than go to the trouble of establishing separate balloting.

Moreover, if States did continue to discriminate in State elections while honoring Federal registration certificates for Federal elections, the Attorney General would be able to proceed against such discrimination by the very civil injunction suits under the 1957 act—which do apply to State as well as Federal elections—which he makes the foundation for his referee plan. As Commissioner Johnson pointed out to the rules committee, the effectiveness of such civil injunction suits "would be greatly augmented in a case where a person had been registered for a Federal election, but was refused registration, for a State election." At least the difficult problem of proving discrimination in such cases should be facilitated by the finding of the voter's qualification by the Federal registrar.

Nevertheless, the Attorney General has raised the level of the discussion and of the legislative drafting by insisting that the registration machinery cover discrimination in State as well as Federal elections. Contrary to the impression he left by his Rules Committee testimony, however, this has no relevance to the question of the kind of registration machinery to be established by Congress. Whether the registration in cases of discrimination is to be by court-appointed referee or by presidentially appointed registrars or by some other agency, Congress can either include all elections, or limit it to Federal elections.[4] The Commission's Federal registrar plan is based on the 15th amendment just as clearly and firmly as is the Attorney General's referee plan.[5] The 15th amendment in no way suggests that its enforcement should only be through court litigation. In fact, the amendment specifies that "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Either the Attorney General's plan or the Commission's plan meet this constitutional test, applied either to Federal elections alone or to State and Federal elections.

Let us agree that State elections should also be covered.[6] The question then is which method is the most appropriate—Federal registration through court litigation and appointment of a referee, or through administrative finding and Presidential appointment of a registrar or by some combination or new alternative.

METHODS OF ENFORCEMENT

The Attorney General made another contribution to this debate that should be acknowledged. His plan spells out the method of equitable enforcement of the Federal registration order. It is not true, however, that the Commission's plan relied solely on criminal sanctions. Senator JAVITS' bill, S. 2783, does establish criminal penalties for State election officials who refuse to honor Federal registration certificates. But Dean Storey, on behalf of the Commission, suggested to the Rules Committee that equitable enforcement could be provided in any bill, and S. 2814, and H.R. 10140 (Lindsay bill), the latest registrar bills, do specifically provide that enforcement should be by appropriate civil and equitable proceedings instituted in the Federal district courts by the Attorney General.[7]

Probably the most effective enforcement of a Federal registrar's certificate of registration would be through a court order and through prosecution for contempt if, after notice of such an order, it is disobeyed. The Attorney General's more detailed provisions in this respect are welcome—though perhaps still insufficient, in that an essential provision should be that the Federal district court has exclusive jurisdiction over any challenge to a federally registered citizen's right to vote. But these provisions for enforcement could be and should be included by Congress in any plan adopted—whether referee or registrar or something new.

[3] Commissioner Johnson stated that the Commission's "findings as to the existence of discrimination in the registration of voters applied equally to State and Federal elections. Moreover, we were and are fully aware that the commands of the 15th amendment, prohibiting denials of the right to vote on account of race, extend as fully to State elections as to Federal ones. Our decision to recommend legislation covering only half of the process, as it were, stemmed from no doubt as to the constitutionality of more ambitious legislation, but rather from practical considerations suggesting a more limited exercise of Congress undoubted power."

[4] If Congress does limit it to Federal elections, some provision will be necessary requiring local officials to provide the same ballot to federally registered voters as to others, in all elections in which Federal officials are being elected. The State could do this either by accepting such Federal registration as sufficient for balloting for State officers, too, or by providing separate Federal ballots which all voters would have to use in voting for Federal officers.

[5] If the Commission's inclusion (following the language of the 1957 act) of discrimination by reason of religion and national origin as well as of color and race is adopted by Congress, the plan also must rest on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. Here, however, the Attorney General's limitation to denials of the right to vote by reason of color and race is sound and in accord with the findings of the Civil Rights Commission.

[6] The Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) memorandum of Feb. 2, 1960, argues that the limitation to Federal elections should be retained at this time, largely on the ground that Federal registration machinery might encounter more opposition were the system extended to State elections. The memorandum states, however, that "There would appear to be no basic constitutional objection to the application of the system of Federal registration to State elections."

[7] The Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) memorandum of Feb. 2, 1960, makes a strong case for the retention of criminal sanctions. Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, told the Rules Committee that a few good prosecutions of those denying the right to vote to qualified citizens would do more to clean up the situation than anything else.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

THE CHIEF OBJECTIVE

If the distinctions between the two plans based on the extent of coverage and the methods of enforcement are not necessary, what then are the essential choices?

First, what is the end sought which both the Commission and the Attorney General say they have in common?

The objective is, as Commissioner Johnson stated to the rules committee on February 5, that "the method of registering persons denied their constitutional right to right to register to vote be no more complicated or cumbersome than the method available to other citizens in the State or district who are registered."

He added:

"It is not equal protection of the laws to require that a Negro being denied his right to vote must spend hours or days or weeks in litigation in order to register. How many white citizens would take the pains to register if it took such an investment of their time—putting aside the additional consideration a Negro in some areas of discrimination would have to give to possible intimidation and economic pressures invited by such protracted litigation?[1]

[1] In seeking a way to make good the guarantee of the 15th amendment we need to keep in mind the relatively small area—generally the Black Belt rural counties of the Deep South—where the right to vote is being denied, and the conditions prevailing in these counties. In most large southern cities Negroes can register and vote, and in counties where the proportion of Negroes is small there does not appear to be much trouble. But what will suffice to enable qualified Negroes to vote in a county such as Bullock County, Ala., where only 5 Negroes out of more than 5,000 of voting age, are registered compared to 2,400 registered whites out of a 1950 white voting age population of some 2,600, and where the predominant white people are so determined to prevent larger Negro registration that for about 18 months in 1954–56, following a court order to register qualified Negroes, no board of registrars functioned at all, and again none functioned from about July 1957 to the time of the Commission's hearing. Or what will enable Negroes to vote in the 16 Negro-majority counties

Attorney General Rogers also testified that the process of registering qualified Negro voters who had been denied their right to vote should be as routine as the registration process for white voters.

The problem is how to bring this about.

THE COMMISSION'S REGISTRAR PLAN

It could be done under the Commission's registrar plan. The presidentially appointed temporary Federal registrar could ministerially register all citizens he found qualified under State law. The Commission has demonstrated, even with its present 3-to-3 regional split, that it can proceed with good speed and unanimity to investigate and hold hearings on complaints and make findings of fact—findings that under this plan would lead to the appointment of a Federal registrar.[2]

The finding by the Commission of the denial of the right to vote in a particular election district and the finding by the Federal registrar that particular citizens were qualified to vote, would not be reviewable or subject to effective legal attack by the State or local registration officials, it would be hoped, until the Attorney General went into court for judicial equitable enforcement, or until a federally registered voter was challenged at the polls. At that point the Federal court would review the record of the Commission and of the registrar and hear appropriate State officials, and, as in a review of the orders of other administrative agencies, uphold the Federal registration if there was substantial evidence to support it in the record viewed as a whole, or unless clearly erroneous, according to the test prescribed by Congress. But however protracted some of the litigation at this point, the Negro citizens would have been registered in a routine fashion, without having first had to run the gantlet of a judicial adversary proceeding.

There are of course pitfalls. The Federal registrar appointed from among local Federal employees, such as the U.S. postmaster, might be as prone to discriminate as the State registrars. But supervision could be provided by the Department of Justice and if he failed to perform his duty fairly, he could be replaced.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REFEREE PLAN

How far does the Attorney General's plan meet the need for some routine, ministerial method of Federal registration?

If past experience is an accurate guide, the initial court trial to find the pattern or practice of discrimination required by the Attorney General's plan would undoubtedly be more protracted than proceedings by the Civil Rights Commission. Some of the Federal district judges in the very black belt areas of the Deep South which are most involved are southerners who share many of the attitudes of the local officials for whom a substitute is required.

To the already difficult problem of proving denial of the right to vote by reason of race in individual cases, the Attorney General's plan requires the additional finding of a "pattern or practice" of such denial.[3] Moreover, even after such a finding, the Attorney General's plan provides only that the court "may" appoint a voting referee. There is the possibility that certain judges may not choose to exercise the power at all.

Then, even if the southern district judge makes the necessary findings and decides in his discretion to appoint a referee, he has very wide discretion in choosing whom to appoint. Some attorneys who have practiced before some of the southern district judges in question say there is reason to fear that some of the local referees appointed by these judges would be as prejudiced as the local registration officials. If this should happen and a referee should discriminate against Negro applicants through unduly strict or technical application of State qualification laws, the Negro applicants and the Attorney General would be in a real box. For such a referee's findings would then have to be accepted by the court unless clearly erroneous.

These possibilities of inaction, delay or worse raise serious questions about the appropriateness of entrusting the task of Federal registration primarily to southern Federal judges and their appointed referees.

FUNCTION OF THE REFEREE

Even more important perhaps is the question of how the referee would function once appointed, assuming his good-faith readiness to carry out the purposes of the act.

If the State officials who are parties to the original suit are permitted to participate in proceedings before the referee in respect to each Negro applicant, then the objective of a routine registration procedure will not be attained. If Negro applicants are to be put on oath and subjected to cross-examination by attorneys for the State or for the local registrars, few are likely to take advantage of the new procedure. The would-be Negro voter who is prepared to engage in litigation in order to vote already has available remedies.

Indeed there is real question what such a Negro litigant would gain by the Attorney General's procedure if, in final form, it involves a full trial before the court of the question of pattern or practice or discrimination, then a full adversary hearing before the referee, and then court review of the referee's report and possible appallate review. This would be substituting a three-stage litigation procedure, with appellate review, for the existing one-stage trial and review.[4]

The Attorney General told the rules committee that Negro applicants under his plan would not have to go through a formal judicial proceeding before the referee and that there would be no requirement that State officials be invited to watch the referee proceedings. However, the Attorney General also said that "the administration proposal, without attempting to spell out any rigid procedures, gives the court full discretion to have the referee proceed in the manner best calculated to make its mandate effective.

If the referee's procedures are not spelled out in detail and made ex parte proceedings, it is probable that most southern district judges in their discretion would provide formal adversary proceedings in which the State's attorneys would be able to participate. The Attorney General's bill as presently drafted gives no mandate to do otherwise. On the contrary it specifies that the referees would "have all the powers conferred upon a master by rule 53(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." While the act could make an exception and require the referee to proceed ministerially and ex parte, rule 53 clearly contemplates the participation before the referee of all the parties to the suit.

If the Attorney General's plan is to accomplish its purpose it must, therefore, be amended to require such an exceptional ex parte proceeding before the referee. This could probably be done, as part of the equitable relief in a case where there has been an initial judicial finding after a full hearing in which all appropriate parties participated. Trustees running a railroad can administer management matters in a routine and ex parte fashion. But there is a question about the propriety of extending such ex parte relief to the degree required in any effective version of the Attorney General's plan.

PROPRIETY OF JUDICIAL REGISTRATION

Beyond this there is the larger question of the propiety of imposing upon the Federal courts any such extensive administrative burden. De Toqueville says that in America every political question ultimately takes a judicial form. Perhaps we should relax and enjoy our fate in this respect. If courts can run transcontinental railroads (and soon perhaps an international union) they can run a registration bureau. There is a special magic and majesty in the rule of law established by a court of law. Perhaps a court order requiring registration will penetrate more deeply into the white southern mind than the acts of any other governmental agent, including the President of the United States—however ironical this is in view of the white southern attack on the Supreme Court's judicial legislation. And there are advantages in having the court in the situation from the beginning when ultimately there may have to be court enforcement before any Federal registration is effective. Probably a district court would be more inclined to enforce and more energetic in its enforcement of its own findings and orders and powers than it would be in the case of an outside administrative agency coming in for judicial assistance.

However, the burden of the Federal judiciary in school desegregation is very heavy. The result of leaving that problem to court litigation has been slow progress through long drawn-out cases, with few Negro parents prepared to undergo the ordeal by litigation.

If ever there was a problem political in its nature calling for a political solution, it is the denial of the right to vote under the 15th amendment. This goes to the heart of the Nation's political process itself. A congressionally enacted administrative procedure by which qualified citizens are registered in districts practicing discrimination thus seems to be the most appropriate remedy.

---

where not a single Negro is registered—particularly in counties where no Negro has even dared to try to register?

[2] The Commission suggested that it could serve as the agency to make such findings under the registrar plan. However, as Commissioner Johnson made clear to the Rules Committee, the Commission proposed this only because it knew of no other existing agency better designed to do it. Congress could establish a new agency, or could, as Senator HUMPHREY suggested in his testimony before the Rules Committee, provide that the Commission would make these initial findings so long as it existed and thereafter the findings would be made by such other agency as Congress should designate. The Commission's proposal that the plan be triggered by 9 complaints is also clearly a nonessential, since any 1 of these 9 initial complaints found to be true should be sufficient—as in S. 2814—to call for the appointment of a Federal registrar.

[3] Considerable court reistance to a finding of such a pattern over and above a finding of discrimination in individual instances can be expected. The Commission noted in its report: "Class suits on behalf of a number of Negroes to obtain registration have rarely been successful. The courts have inclined to the view that these suits are of an individual nature, with the result that a vast number of suits may be necessary."

[4] The referee provision would presumably be effective in situations where Negroes are prepared to litigate to enforce their right to vote but where the local registration machinery is not functioning at all. For instance in Macon County, Ala., where a considerable number of Negroes are already registered and where a large number are actively seeking registration but where local registrars have resigned rather than face a court order to register them, the referee plan might suffice.

The U.S. Government has three engines to propel it. So far in this matter it has been flying on one engine—the Federal judiciary. This problem cannot be adequately solved by the action of one branch of Government—and the platitudes of the President. It is time that the other two branches of the Government exercise their full responsibilities so that resort to the courts can be, as it should be, a last resort. The Attorney General's plan, if taken alone or in its present form, is another example of this administration's practice of trying to turn over its political problems to the courts.[5]

[5] See the further arguments on the inappropriateness of relying solely on judicial remedies in the Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) memorandum.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

SOME OF THE ALTERNATIVES

The essential choice then, as Commissioner Johnson stated to the Rules Committee, is "one between the administrative process and the judicial process." But it is not a simple choice. There are various alternative methods under each category, and, the Attorney General to the contrary notwithstanding,[1] there are various possible combinations.

With the Democratic leadership in Congress still to be heard from, the legislative situation is still fluid; the Senate and the House have the opportunity and responsibility to devise and adopt the most appropriate remedy. Some of the alternatives to or possible combinations of either the Commission's or the Attorney General's plans are suggested below: [2]

1. Adoption of both plans. Senator KEATING has suggested that both the Attorney General's referee plan and the Commission's registrar plan should be adopted. If politically feasible this would probably be the best combination. The Attorney General's plan would contribute to the effectiveness of his existing power under the 1957 act to bring civil injunction suits. Such suits could remain a useful additional sanction even if the Commission's plan were in effect, and particularly if the Commission's plan should be limited just to Federal elections. Adopting both measures would be consistent with the approach taken in the 1957 act, where an administrative fact-finding agency, the Commission, was established, and the Attorney General was given new power to bring civil suits. Both these measures of the 1957 act now need to be strengthened.

Such dual relief through judicial and administrative avenues has precedent in the field of Government trade regulation. The enforcement of the antitrust laws provided by Congress is though suits by the Attorney General (and by individuals) in Federal district courts, and through administrative action by the Federal Trade Commission. Just as the orders of the FTC can ultimately be enforced in Federal court, so the registration by a temporary Federal registrar, pursuant to a finding by the Commission on Civil Rights, should be enforceable in Federal district court upon suit by the Attorney General.

Both approaches might thus ultimately lead to court enforcement through voting referees who superintend the balloting, but the possibility of administrative action in the initial finding and registration would increase the likelihood of substantial numbers of Negroes becoming registered.

2. A finding by the Commission and then court appointment of a referee. A more complete merger of the two plans, getting some of the benefits of both, would be to adopt the first part of the Commission's plan, the procedure for investigation, hearing, and finding of discrimination by the Commission upon the submission of complaints by citizens who allege they have been denied their right to vote, with the Attorney General's plan for enforcement through the courts. In this combination the Commission finding would not lead to the appointment of temporary Federal registrars, but would result in a petition to a Federal district court for the appointment of a voting referee. The act would need to provide that the Commission's finding would be accepted by the court if there was substantial evidence on the record viewed as a whole to support it (or unless clearly erroneous). The court, unless it so reversed the Commission, should be required by the act to appoint a voting referee to register qualified persons ministerially.

The Attorney General's phrase "pattern or practice" could be adopted as the necessary jurisdictional finding to be made by the Commission, if it is deemed useful. Also the initial administrative finding could be made by any other agency that Congress should designate if the commission is deemed inappropriate.

3. Administrative appointment of a Federal registrar to be followed, when necessary, by court enforcement, including a court appointed referee. Most of the advantages of both plans could be achieved by providing for an administrative appointment of Federal registrars by the executive branch, as proposed in the Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) memorandum of February 2, 1960, with later enforcement of the Federal registration and supervision of the balloting by a court-appointed referee. The Yale proposal provides for the appointment of a temporary Federal registrar whenever the President has reason to believe that citizens in any election district are being discriminatorily denied registration. An automatic criterion for such an appointment is suggested: a petition filed by at least fifty persons residing in any county or parish requesting the appointment of a Federal registrar.

This plans avoids the necessity of any formal hearing at all, by the Civil Rights Commission or any other agency. It suggests, however, that the factfinding machinery of the Civil Rights Commission might be used to assist the President in reaching his determination. But any litigation over the legitimacy of the Federal registration would have to wait until either the Attorney General went into court to seek judicial enforcement or until State officials challenged any federally registered person at the polls. The proposed "reason to believe" test is suggested by the provision in the existing section 131(c) of the 1957 act for civil injunction suits by the Attorney whenever "there are reasonable grounds to believe" that any person is about to be deprived of his right to vote.

4. An initial judicial finding followed by an administrative appointment of a Federal registrar. A combination that could provide for the judicial determination of a pattern or practice of discrimination which the Attorney General considers so important and yet make possible the ministerial registration of qualified voters by an administrative officer of the Federal Government would be a provision that upon a finding by a court of such a pattern or practice of discrimination in a civil injunction suit the President may appoint a Federal registrar. This would leave the Commission on Civil Rights out of the picture altogether and thus simplify the procedure in that respect. It would permit the Attorney General and the President to determine whether a court injunction and other equitable judicial relief would suffice in any particular case. If the President determined that a Federal registrar was necessary to provide adequate remedy in such a case, he would be empowered to make such an appointment. Any act establishing such a procedure should also provide for subsequent judicial enforcement, if necessary, of the right to vote of persons registered by the Federal registrar.

5. Amendment of the Attorney General's bill to provide for ministerial registration by the referee. If none of the above combinations or any other alternative to or combination of the plans is possible, then at least the Attorney General's bill should be amended to make certain that the voting referee will upon appointment proceed to register all citizens within the class discriminated against, for example all Negroes, whom he judges to be qualified under State law to vote, and that he will conduct this registration ministerially, in a routine fashion, approximately similar to the registration procedure used by local officials for other persons within the district, and that he will not conduct such registration as an adversary proceeding with opportunity to other parties than the persons being registered to be present or heard. The Attorney General's act should also be amended to provide that when a court finds that persons have been deprived on account of race or color of their right to register to vote pursuant to a pattern or practice of discrimination it shall—not may—appoint a voting referee. It might also be important to change the test from one of finding that persons have been deprived to a finding (using the language of the 1957 act) that there are reasonable grounds to believe that persons are being or are about to be deprived of their right to register to vote.

The amendments to the Attorney General's plan proposed in the last point should be considered in any of the above combinations where the Attorney General's plan in whole or in part is involved. It is assumed in all of these combinations that State as well as Federal elections are to be covered, although this is not essential, and at least the Federal registrar parts of these combinations might be limited merely to Federal elections. In all of the above alternatives court enforcement by civil and equitable and possibly criminal sanctions is contemplated.

In whatever plan that is adopted it would be wise to spell out in some detail the pow-

[1] To Senator KEATING's proposal for a marriage between the administrative registrar and the court referee plans, the Attorney General said that "it would be a shotgun wedding," and insisted that all those who believe in progress in civil rights should get behind the referee plan.

[2] Senator HART's earlier bill, S. 2535, providing for the establishment of a Congressional Elections Commission to prevent discriminatory denial of the right to vote in elections for Members of the House and Senate is a quite different approach. It excludes not only State elections but presidential elections. The possibilities of this approach have not been considered in this memorandum.

er of the court to appoint a person to attend at the balloting to report immediately to the ocurt any denial of the right to vote to persons federally registered. Perhaps the duties of the Department of Justice in this respect in districts where Federal registration machinery has been established should be spelled out, too, so that a federally registered person can be sure that there will be Federal officers present at the polling places in such districts to protect his right to vote through the quickest possible court action.

My own preference is for a plan that permits qualified citizens in the class being discriminated against in a particular district to get registered by an administrative agent of the President without any court proceeding at that stage. The proper time for litigation of the propriety of such Federal registration, it seems to me, is when a ballot of such person is challenged at the polls. Procedures already exist for the impounding of such ballots and judicial determination of their legitimacy. The forthcoming 1960 act should provide that the Federal district court in the area involved should have exclusive jurisdiction over all such challenges to federally registered voters.

While this approach would involve possible litigation at a later stage, at least the bottleneck to registration would have been broken and presumably substantial numbers of Negroes would be registered. The Department of Justice would in all such situations have to be ready and on hand to enforce the rights of such persons at the polls, and for this, in instances of continued State or local resistance, the Attorney General's additional sanctions should be helpful.

THE STATE'S RIGHT TO BE HEARD

It must be assumed that with whatever plan adopted there will be at least one test of the plan's constitutionality and that the Supreme Court will uphold the constitutionality of any of the above procedures.

In all of the plans involving an official finding of discrimination in a particular election district by the Commission on Civil Rights it is assumed (although none of the registrar bills yet so provide) that such a finding would be made pursuant to a hearing held by the Commission or a subcommittee of two or more of its members authorized by section 105 (f) of the 1957 act, and that such a hearing should be conducted under the rules of procedure established by Congress in section 102 of the act. If the Supreme Court in the present Louisiana case testing the Commission's rules of procedure requires any modification of those procedures, such modifications should of course be made. Probably in any of the plans requiring a Commission finding, the act should provide that the Commission shall give due notice and opportunity to be heard to the appropriate registration or election officials in the district involved in any proceeding.[1] Such officials would of course have due notice and opportunity to be heard in any court case under the Attorney General's plan.

In deference to the legitimate interest and perhaps the right of the State to see that only those persons qualified under State law vote in State elections, it is probably necessary that State officials also have at least one opportunity to contest the qualifications of a particular voter registered under Federal procedures.

Under the Attorney General's plan as initially proposed there would probably have been several such occasions for the State to be heard. If the plan is modified to make the referee function ministerially and ex parte, the State would still be able to participate in the initial trial on the question of pattern or practice and would then be given an opportunity to request a hearing and to present evidence to show that the referee's determination in a particular case is clearly erroneous.

However, there should be some provision that avoids prolonged delay in the effectiveness of a particular registration pending an appeal from the referee's or the court's finding. Perhaps the act should require that the court issue a decree forthwith ordering the registration of all persons found to be qualified by the referee, with a time set within which State officials could request a hearing and argument to show that a particular registration was clearly erroneous.

In any election coming while such supplementary proceedings, including appellate review, are pending, the federally registered person should be entitled to cast his ballot, although the ballot may be impounded pending the outcome of the case. It should probably also be provided that appellate review of the finding of pattern or practice should wait until some particular registration is contested, and that while any such review is pending the voting referee should continue to conduct Federal registration.

REGULATING OR PROHIBITING LITERACY TESTS

There is another measure that might contribute greatly to the solution of this whole problem, and especially facilitate the effectiveness of the Attorney General's referee plan: some regulation, if not prohibition, of State literacy tests. A great part of the discrimination by State officials occurs in the application of State literacy or other educational tests, and this would be a great part of a referee's or registrar's problem in conducting Federal registration pursuant to State qualification laws.

Three members of the Commission on Civil Rights proposed as the best and ultimate solution a constitutional amendment establishing universal suffrage and prohibiting literacy and any other State requirements except for age and length-of-residence requirements.[2] This would be a rule of law cut through much of the problem and either result in an end of State discrimination in registration tests or at least greatly reduce the need for intervention by Federal agents in the State legislation process. For the reasons given in the Commission's report, I support this course strongly and hope that, if not in this session, then in the next session Congress will see fit to submit such an amendment to the States for ratification.

A more limited approach is embodied in Senator HENNINGS' proposal in title XI of S. 1617 which provides that all intelligence, educational or other tests to which any individual may be subjected by registration officials in order to determine his qualifications to vote at any Federal election, shall appear in printed form and be administered so that the answers thereto shall appear in writing. This would probably be most helpful in reducing the room for discrimination.

[1] The present registrar bills do not specifically provide for such notice and opportunity to be heard though it has been the Commission's practice to hear State officials, although not to give them an opportunity to cross-examine Negro witnesses. The Black-Emerson-Pollak (Yale) proposal requires no hearing or finding by the Commission at all, or by any other administrative agency. Constitutionally, this is feasible, especially since the State would have an opportunity later to challenge any voter as unqualified and to litigate this question in Federal court, while impounding the ballot. One such day in court should be sufficient.

[2] The main section of the proposed constitutional amendment is as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State or by any person for any cause except inability to meet State age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within the State, or legal confinement at the time of registration or election. This right to vote shall include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted."

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

A stronger version of the Hennings' plan would be an act of Congress providing that in any State with a literacy or educational test for voting, a certification of graduation from the 6th grade (or also from high school or college) should be conclusive evidence of such qualification, and that for any other persons any literacy or educational test should be in printed form and uniformly administered so that the answers thereto appear in writing.

Some such Federal regulation or prohibition of literacy tests appears to be required to make any Federal registration machinery fully effective. For without this there is the possibility that even the fair application of State qualification laws to Negro applicants would amount to discrimination, since many white applicants probably get registered by State officials without meeting the prescribed standards.

THE SYMBOLIC VALUE OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Whatever remedial machinery adopted by Congress this session—even the Attorney General's plan, with all of its present defects—the effect of such legislation should be constructive. The symbolic value of an act of Congress or constitutional amendment protecting the right to vote, and of actions by a Federal court, a Commission on Civil Rights, a voting referee or a Federal registrar, should be significant.

President Eisenhower is correct in saying that ultimately this problem must be solved in the minds and hearts of the American people. Primarily we are concerned with reaching the minds and hearts of both the disfranchised Negroes of the South, and the dominant white citizens and officials. In doing this—in encouraging Negroes to register and stand up for their right to vote, in discouraging white southerners from violating the Constitution—the law has a great role to play.

If by act of Congress this session the other two great engines of our Government, the legislative and executive branches, can begin to operate with some power in this problem, we can expect further progress. For as Justice Brandeis said, the Government of the United States "is the potent, the omnipresent teacher" that "teaches the whole people."

2. MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY FROM PROF. PAUL A. FREUND, HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS FOR PROTECTION OF VOTING RIGHTS

The two principal proposals will be designated as the commission and the justice plans.

The two plans are similar in objective but differ in details of administration and enforcement. The principal points of difference are these:

1. Appointment and functions of Federal voting officials. The commission plan provides for appointment of registrars by the President, to be drawn from existing local officials such as U.S. attorneys, clerks of court, etc. The justice plan provides for appointment of referees by Federal district courts. Moreover, there is a difference in their duties. The registrars would serve to consider the applications of citizens claiming discrimination in respect of registration and would determine whether such an applicant was in fact a qualified voter. The registrars would serve until a finding that discrimination had ceased in the locality. The referees appointed by the courts, under the justice plan, would not in fact make final decisions regarding qualifications of voters but would hold hearings and report to the court, which would consider the report and enter a decree. The decree would be brought to the notice of the State electoral officials, who would be bound thereby.

2. Scope of the bills. The commission plan is limited to Federal elections. The justice plan reaches both Federal and State elections. Presumably the commission plan is based on the constitutional power of Congress under article I, section 4, which relates to selections for Congress. There is no reason, however, why the commission plan could not be extended to State elections, by virtue of the authority in the 14th and 15th amendments, each of which provides for appropriate enforcement by Congress.

3. Sanctions. The commission proposal relies ultimately on criminal sanctions against State officials who might refuse to honor the registration of voters certified by the Federal registrars. The justice plan contemplates that the State election officials, including State registrars, would be notified of the court orders and would thereby become subject to contempt proceeedings in case of violation. These proceedings would be governed procedurally by the same provisions that are now contained in the 1957 Civil Rights Act. In addition, the justice plan porvides for the contingency of resignation of State registrars. In that event it is provided that the State itself assumes the obligation of the office and may be sued by the United States.

4. Timing. The Commission plan involves the presentation of private complaints to the Civil Right Commission and, in appropriate cases, the forwarding of a finding by the Commission to the President in order to set in motion the appointment of a temporary registrar in a given district. The Justice plan provides that the bringing of complaints shall be the responsibility of the Department of Justice under the existing Civil Rights Act. Thus under this plan the enforcement process will depend on the initiative of the Attorney General and will also be somewhat at the risk of delays in court calendars, and of appeals from the order of a district judge.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. Constitutional validity. There is no real difference to be drawn between the two plans on the score of constitutionality. The Commission plan could be amended to reach State as well as Federal elections. The Attorney General appears to have had some slight doubt about the adequacy of the hearings which might be held by the Commission, in contrast with the judicial hearings provided for in his bill. But this issue appears not to be serious. The hearings to be held by the Commission are not for the purpose of removing State registrars from office, but only for the purpose of supplying a basis on which the President may act in appointing temporary registrars. The President could appoint such registrars without any hearing at all, if Congress so authorized pursuant to its power under article I, section 4 or the 14th and 15th amendments.

2. Effectiveness. The Commission plan seems to be freer from the delays and uncertainties inherent in the bringing of law suits by the Attorney General and the progress of such litigation in the district courts and, it must be assumed, on appeal. It should be remembered that this litigation would have to eventuate in orders of the courts before even the state of registration of voters could be reached. On the other hand, the Justice plan has the advantage of using the contempt procedure rather than the criminal law as an ultimate sanction. How important this factor may be will depend on how frequently the ultimate sanction will have to be employed. Under the Commission plan, the aggrieved citizen will be registered without any judicial process, and the State officials at the final election will be under a duty to respect the registration as in any other instance of registered voters. It is only if these officials refuse to honor the registration that sanctions would have to be employed. The Justice plan, in contrast, relies on State registrars to honor the orders of the district courts, and it is at this earlier stage that the contempt procedure would come into play if necessary.

The Justice plan provides that the courts "may" appoint referees. In addition to the problem of time, there is the possibility that certain judges may not choose to exercise the power at all.

A suggestion might be offered that the Commission plan be amended to provide, in addition to the criminal penalties, that the United States could bring suit in equity against State election officials to compel them to receive and count the votes of qualified voters, and that in the event of resignation of election officials or registrars a district judge would have authority to appoint an officer of the court to carry out the court's orders. This seems a more acceptable device than a suit against the State as a substituted defendant. There would be less affront to the State, and the practice of appointing a court official to carry out its orders has precedent in a long-established practice of courts of equity to appoint officers to execute deeds of property where the property owner fails or refuses to carry out an order of conveyance.

3. Federal-State relations. The Justice plan, it is argued by its supporters, minimizes the displacement of normal relations because State officials continue to carry out all their duties. But this position is a rather formalistic one, since they are subject to the control of the Federal courts in the event of failure to follow the court orders. Moreover, as has already been noted, it becomes necessary under the Justice plan to provide for contempt proceedings against State registrars and for substitution of the State itself if the registrars resign.

4. Responsibility within the National Government. It is this feature of the proposals which seems to me the most significant. The Commission plan brings the President into the process of safeguarding the right to vote. The Justice plan seems designed to shield the President from any such participation. As a corollary, the Justice plan imposes on the Federal courts still further responsibilities. There is reason to believe that the Federal judges have been shouldering more than their fair share of responsibility in this general area and that in all fairness the executive branch should lend its weight to the discharge of this national responsibility.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

3. MEMORANDUMS FROM PROF. G. W. FOSTER, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN LAW SCHOOL

Memo to: William Welsh, administrative assistant to Senator HART.

From: Bill Foster.

Subject: The Rogers proposal for voting referees.

This replies to your request for my reactions to the proposal of Attorney General Rogers that voting referees be judicially appointed in proceedings brought by the United States under 42 U.S.C. 1971.

I shall attempt to summarize in this memorandum my reasons for these conclusions:

I. As an approach, the judicial referee strikes me as the most sound and flexible one that I have seen.

II. The Rogers bill should be amended to:

(a) Permit proceedings against local election boards as legal entities, regardless whether the local officials have resigned or not; the Rogers bill deals only with the case where the local officials resign before suit, and solves the problem by converting such a case into a suit against the State, thus buying a host of conceptual and political problems which probably can be avoided.

(b) Clarify the manner in which process may be served in proceedings under 1971 and specify more accurately the class action characteristics of a 1971 proceeding once there has been a finding that in the election district made party defendant there has been a pattern or practice which has deprived persons of rights secured under 1971 (a) and (b). My recommendations here include (1) the jurisdiction of the court with respect to a particular election district shall continue in the action until the court finds "there is no longer reason to believe that the kind of conduct, pattern or practice complained of is likely to recur"; (2) the right of others to join as parties plaintiff when they apply to the voting referee, with costs and filing fees to be absorbed by the United States, and that this right of subsequent joinder shall be available as long as the district court continues jurisdiction over the election district.

(c) Clarify whether all questions raised in proceedings under 1971 are triable before a single district judge, or whether some issues are triable only before a three-judge district court. My recommendation here is to make the three-judge district court proceedings inapplicable here for the result would otherwise be to chop off the proceedings unmercifully.

(d) Decide what effect shall be given an appeal from a decree which either certifies a Negro to vote, or denies certification to him. The Rogers bill is silent on this, but it seems to me that at least where the district court has granted a certificate, the person should thereafter have a right to vote, and if necessary hold his vote in escrow until any appeal from the certification has been determined. This may, however, delay greatly the final determination of election results in some cases.

(e) Make sure that the specification of a voting referee for cases under 1971 shall not give rise to any influence that district courts refuse to use similar equitable devices in the enforcement of other Federal rights. Keep in mind the thought that school boards in the South are going to resign now and then if they think this can defeat desegregation, and it may be helpful for a court to appoint a referee or a master who can fashion a recommendation for assignment of pupils to the school system.

More detailed comment on these points follows.

I. THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST JUDICIAL REFEREES IN VOTING SITUATIONS

Probably the most important reason I have for supporting the system of judicially appointed voting referees is this: The Federal courts in the South are going to be involved directly and in detail in any system designed to give Negroes the right to vote. If a specialized Federal executive agency is set up (or, as Senator HART has suggested, an agency responsible to Congress), the South in either case is going to demand judicial review of its factfinding and of its legal powers.

So it seems to me that everyone is going to be better off if we simply start off in court in the first place. But I have plenty of caveats in saying this. We have dumped a social revolution into the hands of a small—and so far as I have observed, unusually able and faithful—group of Federal judges in the South. For each of these judges in the community in which he sits there is obviously reached some point beyond which he cannot go in pressing the social revolution without destroying his whole utility to the community and the Nation as a judge. If some other way existed for bypassing the judiciary in fulfilling our obligations to the Negro, the temptation to jump for it would be great. But so far as I can see, the courts are going to be involved, either on behalf of the Negroes for enforcement of their rights, or on behalf of the resistant white South bent on injecting every delay it can think of.

Another caveat I have is one which seems often to be overlooked. It is this: There is urgent need for carefully spelled out procedures to be followed in handling civil rights cases in our courts. Endless attention has been paid to spelling out substantive rights, either through constitutional interpretation or in the form of legislative proposals. But the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the other provisions of the Judicial Code, and the enormous reservoir of ill-defined equitable remedies have never been seriously thought about in terms of their advantages and limitations in managing litigation that is aimed at producing results with which dominant segments of the community vigorously disagree.

The failure to work out the procedural aspects of civil rights litigation has provided the resistant white South with sources for almost endless delay, while challenge is made to every procedural step in an action. My primary concern with all the bills you sent me is that they, too, overlook the same problems for the most part. If my specific recommendations here harp on procedural problems, it is because I have seen too much of wasted human energy that has gone into fighting procedural ambiguities which some thoughtful legislation could relatively simply patch up.

A final reason for preferring the judicially appointed referee is that I have more faith in the judiciary, sitting out a lifetime appointment, than I do in any bureaucracy, legislative or executive, where such an emotionally and politically complicated matter as this is involved.

So much for my reasons for supporting the Rogers approach.

II. SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE ROGERS BILL

(a) Permit suit against election boards as legal entities.

This proposal seeks to deal with the problem of identifying the parties made defendant in proceedings brought by the United States under 1971. In the easiest and simplest situation, it is of little concern whether a local election board is sued as a legal entity or not. The various members of the board are named as parties and by proper service of a summons and complaint upon each of them, they are made parties bound by any matters which the court subsequently determines.

But if we assume there may be a need to have court supervision over the election board of Macon County, Ala., for perhaps the next 5 or 10 years, it is pretty likely that the personnel of the board may change. And with this come all sorts of questions about substituting them for earlier members and about the extent to which they are bound with respect to matters previously determined.

Attorney General Rogers has made a proposal which handles one aspect, but not much more, of the kinds of questions just suggested. Apparently he has in mind the situation involved in *U.S.* v. *State of Alabama* (4 Race Rel. L. Rep. 624, F. 2d. (C.A. 5, 1959)), cer. granted. In that case the members of the Board of Registrars of Macon County, Ala., had resigned their jobs prior to the commencement of court action by the United States under 1971. The district court (see 171 F. Supp. 720) dismissed the action and the result was confirmed by the court of appeals. Three points in the holdings are of particular significance: (1) The resigned officials, having vacated their jobs "in good faith" before commencement of the action, were not suable under the Federal act because they were not obligated by State law to complete their service or to stay on the job until successors had been named. (2) The board of registrars was not suable as a legal entity since it was not a "person" within the meaning of 42 United States Code 1971. And (3) the action could not be regarded as a suit against the State of Alabama since the State was not a "person" within the statute, either. The constitutional question whether the State was suable under the circumstances was thereby avoided.

Holdings numbered (2) and (3) just mentioned suggest two possible ways of bringing suit under 1971. The first is to recognize the election board for a particular area as a suable entity, at least for purposes of 1971. The other, and the one recommended in the Rogers bill, is to convert the suit against the election board into an action against the State itself whenever there have been resignations or other vacancies that have stripped the board of its entire membership.

I assume the Rogers suggestion would be upheld as constitutional, though his way strikes me as the hard way to handle the problem. It is clear that the 11th amendment does not in direct terms deal at all with limiting Federal jurisdiction where the action is between the United States and a State. And under article III, 2, paragraph 2, the Constitution places such a case within the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. How happy Congress may be about extending jurisdiction concurrently to a district court for this kind of purpose is a good question. You probably recall that most suits brought by, or on behalf of, private persons or corporations to challenge the exercise of State power make no attempt to sue the State directly; the approach, rather, is to sue either State officers or State agencies to prevent them from using State position in some unwarranted way.

So rather than take on the headaches of arguing that an action under 1971 becomes a suit against a State, I would prefer what seems to me the much simpler solution of personifying the election board—i.e., of making the State agency or office itself a suable entity. This kind of fictionalizing by a legislature is well established: for numerous purposes all sorts of partnerships and other kinds of unincorporated associations have been treated as legal entities for purposes of suing and being sued. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure provides that a partnership or "other unincorporated association" has capacity to sue or be sued in its common name "for the purpose of enforcing for or against it a substantive right existing under the Constitution or laws of the United States * * *" and this is regardless whether they are similarly suable under State law in their common name.

The advantages of making an entity out of the board are numerous. Here are some obvious ones: (1) If, as I believe should be the case, the district court should exercise continuing jurisdiction over an election board until it no longer seems likely that local misbehavior will result, the decrees against the board can be binding against any later board members who have notice of them. (2) The difficult matter of substituting new board members, required where the board is not treated as a legal entity from the beginning, will no longer have jurisdictional effect—viz, the action will not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction by failure to make a timely substitution of new members since jurisdiction will continue over the State office from the beginning, and the only problem with respect to new board members is that they must have notice of prior decrees in order to be bound by them.

I have a hurried draft which purports to deal with my recommendations II (a), (b), and (c). You will find the draft attached at the end of this memo.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the procedeings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

(b) Spell out service of process and the continuing jurisdiction characteristics of proceedings under 1971.

(1) Service of process. So long as an election board is not treated as an entity, the proceeding under 1971 is simply one against separate individuals. As to personal jurisdiction over them, the provisions of rule 4(d)(3) and 4(d)(7) are doubtless sufficient for most purposes. Federal rule 4(d)(6) furnishes the basis for service of process where the suit is against the State. But, as the case of *U.S.* v. *State of Alabama* suggests, the situation gets difficult when the board members all resign prior to commencement of the action and there is no basis for treating the vacant board as a suable entity. If my suggestion for making the board a suable entity is adopted (and I suggest that it be adopted for all proceeding under 1971, not merely for those in which the board has resigned), some further

details about service of process are essential since the provisions of rule 4(d)(3) and 4(d)(7) will not handily cover the situation where the board is vacant. My suggestion for such a case is to provide for service upon the chief executive officer (i.e., Governor) of the State where service upon board members or at their board offices cannot with due diligence be made, either because they have resigned or because they go into hiding. Language to this effect is in the attached draft.

(2) Continuing jurisdiction over board. Attorney General Rogers suggests appointment of a referee only after a finding that deprivation of voting rights has resulted from a continuing pattern or practice. It would seem to me that the court should in such a case retain jurisdiction over the election board to supervise and watch over the election district until reasonably satisfied that the practice is gone. To this end it is implied in the Rogers language that until the practice is ended the court may expect a flow of applications over the course of time and the probability of supplementary decrees of certification. Perhaps it can be argued that later applicants need not be joined as parties plaintiff in the continuing case. I would think it better, though, to permit a liberal joinder of plaintiffs as they come in to assert their rights as members of the class protected by a 1971 proceeding. On the other hand, I see no reason to impose either filing fees or other costs upon them, and it seems to me reasonable that the United States should absorb such costs. The applicants may have to pay over, however, any poll tax or other fee chargeable under State law for the privilege of registering the voting.

The attached draft covers these point.

(c) Trial of 1971 proceedings before a single district judge.

It seems clear to me that proceedings under 1971 should be triable entirely under a single district judge, and that the provisions for trial of cases involving substantial questions of Federal right before three-judge district courts should not operate here. My attached draft covers this point also.

(d) What effect shall an appeal have on a certification by a district court?

For all that appears in the Rogers draft, an applicant can go right down and vote the moment the district court enters a decree certifying his right to do so. But the decree is, of course, a final order and it can be expected that local election officials will appeal every certification decree if thereby it is possible to delay Negro participation in local voting. Similarly, Negroes will want to appeal from decrees which have denied them certification. In both instances it would seem that a good case could be made for permitting the Negro to vote immediately after a district court decree, provided his vote was held in escrow pending the outcome of the appeal.

The effect of holding the Negro vote in escrow would be to hold up the decision in any race in which the number of escrow votes exceeded the difference in the votes of the two top candidates. If the usual leisurely appellate time schedule applied to these cases some serious political embarassments might result from the delay. But appeals can be accelerated.

If the alternative position is taken that the right to vote cannot be exercised until established on appeal, this will simply invite every conceivable delay which local election officials can imagine. And, furthermore, if the election results must be held up until escrow votes can be counted, this will put some fraction of whites behind a move to accelerate any appeals.

Perhaps it makes sense to distinguish the cases in which the district court certifies a Negro to vote and those in which the decree denies certification. My own view is that both groups should be permitted to vote in escrow pending the outcome of cross appeals. To do otherwise, and only allow those to vote who won district court certification, would put huge pressure on the voting referees and the district judges to deny certification in the first instance.

This voting in escrow involves plenty of problems. You can't simply use two ballot boxes, one for those already registered and another for those whose votes will be held in escrow: on termination of the appeals there may be some reversals of the district court decree. As a result, each escrow ballot would have to be placed in an envelope marked on the outside with the voter's name, then held by the referee pending determination of the appeals. He could then throw out the envelopes of those not ultimately certified and deliver the remainder to the local election officials for counting.

Objection may be made to the extent to which such a practice invades the secrecy of the individual ballot. But this is a right personal to the voter. If he chooses not to vote at all until his appeal is final, he is free to do so. If he wishes to vote before that time, and to face with it the possible revelation to some of the manner in which he voted, he is free to do this, too. This last choice is no more of an invasion into his secrecy than is likely to result from the use of an absentee ballot in many states. Though the racial issue may not furnish pressures for retaliation elsewhere that they do here.

I have not attempted a draft of a provision to deal with this. But the matter should certainly be given consideration.

(e) Specify that nothing in 1971 furnishes a basis for implying that similar inherent equitable powers should not be employed by Federal courts in enforcing Federal rights.

With perhaps the exception of serving a summons upon an election board where all its members have previously resigned, I believe that Federal courts can achieve, under existing authority, everything which is spelled out in the Rogers proposal and in my further suggestions. But achieving such results calls for some quite complicated pasting together of ideas scattered through the Federal rules, the judicial code, and countless equity decisions. And the job is further complicated by the fact that it would take quite a bit of persuasion to convince a district judge to employ them in such a manner. An imaginative judge, really bent on moving a good bit faster than most of them feel is appropriate for these stormy cases, could do wonders under present law, certainly in the voting area. But the decisions from the past are conservative decisions for the most part. And as trial judges they hesitate to project far beyond the tone or spirit of the older cases, preferring to leave innovation to the appellate judges or, better still, to you in Congress.

Frankly, I am really disappointed that Attorney General Rogers has not fulfilled the promises of those who predicted that he would breathe some real life into his civil rights division. Perhaps he has reasons that I would agree are good reasons if I knew what they were. But the public record of performance of the civil rights division reflects little that is vigorous or imaginative. A livelier Attorney General would have had dozens of these voting cases going, asking in each of them for different kinds of equitable remedies in search of effective solutions to this complex problem. The voting referee idea is a good one. He should have asked courts to set them up long ago. And he should have pressed courts for all sorts of expanded rulings on the scope of class actions in these cases. And so on and so on. But he hasn't.

In any event, so far as school desegregation cases and other classes of civil rights actions than voting are concerned, only the meager resources of private persons are so far available to press for civil rights. And nothing that is done here should support any inference that district courts should not feel free to use referees or masters or any other kind of equitable device if reasonable grounds for doing so are presented to the court. Certainly Chief Justice Warren invited the district courts to use their imagination broadly when the use of equitable powers became involved in the school desegregation cases. He has a good paragraph on this in the second Brown decision of 1955.

DRAFT—PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR PART (B) OF THE ROGERS BILL

"(B) Add the following as subsection (D) and designate the present subsection (D) as subsection (E), etc.

"Suit against state office as a legal entity. When any proceeding brought under this section claims that a deprivation of any right, or privilege, secured by subsection (a) or (b) hereof has resulted from any act, omission, or practice of a public office or agency of this state, such state office or agency may be made a party defendant and sued as a legal entity in its common name or statutory title, without regard to whether such state office has capacity to sue or be sued in like manner under state law.

"In any such proceeding against a state office as a legal entity, service of process may be made (1) by personally serving a copy of the summons and of the complaint upon one or more of the state officers holding such office; or (2) by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint in the state office of such officer with the person who is apparently in charge of the office; or (3) if service cannot with reasonable diligence be made pursuant to (1) or (2) of this subsection, either because the state office proceeded against as a party defendant is vacant, or for any other reason, service may then be made by delivering a copy of the summons and complaint to the chief executive officer of the state in the manner provided by rule 4(d)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint with the person apparently in charge of the office of the chief executive officer of the state.

"Any order, judgment, or decree rendered in such a proceeding against a state office as a legal entity shall be binding personally upon all individuals joined as parties and made subject personally to the jurisdiction of the court. Any other individual or person may be proceeded against for contempt if, with notice of such order, judgment, or decree, he acts in willful violation thereof, regardless whether he acts under color of state authority or acts to prevent or thwart the exercise of state authority consistent with such order, judgment, or decree.

"Proceedings under this section shall be tried before a single district judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1343; the provisions of title 28, chapter 155, do not apply.

"The jurisdiction of the district court over proceedings brought against a state office as a legal entity shall continue over the parties until the court shall find there is no longer reason to believe that the pattern or practice complained of is likely to recur. The district court, in the continuing exercise of its jurisdiction in the proceeding, shall permit the joinder as parties plaintiff of all persons who thereafter apply to the voting referee pursuant to subsection (d) of this section. All costs, including filing fees, of persons so joined as parties plaintiff shall be borne by the United States, save that any person shall, before being certified by the court to register and vote, pay over the amount, if any, required by state law of all persons for the privilege of registering, and voting."

FEBRUARY 8, 1960.

Memo to: John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General.

From: Bill Foster.

Subject: The Rogers proposal for voting referees.

This memorandum supplements a memo on this same subject which I put together a week ago for William Welsh, administrative assistant to Senator HART of Michigan. A copy of the earlier memo is attached.

In this supplementary memo I shall attempt to summarize three further points respecting the Rogers proposal that strike me as requiring some added thought:

I. Should a referee, once appointed, be limited to receiving applications only from those who claim deprivation of voting rights?

The language of the Rogers draft authorizes the referee "to receive applications from any person claiming deprivation as to the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote at any election * * *" My concern is this: the Rogers proposal sets up a possible dual standard for registration in the voting area. Local officials will retain the right to register, and some presumably may persist in registering white persons more or less in total disregard of the local registration laws. The refereee has the job of considering those persons whom the local officials have turned down. To equalize things the referee, I suppose, should try to match the local officials in disregarding the registration laws. Yet it seems to me an almost impossible task to ask that the referee set a standard which can correspond to that followed by local officials in registering whites to vote.

Two possible ways out of this occur to me, neither of them very attractive: First, give the referee, once he is appointed, authority exclusively to register all persons, white and black, for a period of time. Or, second, require all persons registered by local authorities during the period of the referee's appointment to appear as well before the referee in order that he may see for himself the qualifications of those who are being registered by local officials. Perhaps a third solution might be to permit the referee to subpena a sampling of already registered votera to determine what kind of criteria had been previously employed.

None of these is a simple answer. If it were practicable, I would prefer the first proposal, which is simply to put the voting district in receivership for a period of time and allow the referee to register all comers. Bad as this may be in terms of local repercussions, it doesn't seem to me any worse than to call in people already registered to determine from them the criteria earlier used by officials for registering whites.

II. Is the referee's authority confined to applicants who can show that they were members of the class of persons deprived of the right to register as a result of a "pattern or practice"?

My problem here is that conservative southern district judges may require each applicant to show, in order to apply, that he was turned down by local officials only for reason of his color. The language of the Rogers' draft doesn't have to be read this strictly, but I think it would help clear the air if, after a general finding of a proscribed pattern or practice, your legislative language permitted the referee to "receive applications from any person claiming any deprivation whatever as to the right to register, and so forth. * * *" I just don't want individual applicants compelled to make individual proofs that their constitutional rights have been denied them.

III. Should not some provision be made for the situation in which a State tries legislatively to repeal or otherwise abolish all provisions for further voter registration, intending to rely solely upon voters earlier registered?

The Rogers' proposal suggests that actions under 1971 be converted into suits against the State in the event either that local registration officials have all resigned or have been relieved of their jobs. With some stretching of this language it can be argued that a suit against the State is authorized also where the State seeks to abolish the registration function altogether so that no office whatever exists for registration purposes. I feel confident something of this sort will be tried. And I feel confident that some kind of court appointed receivership, to undertake registration for any elections which might be held after efforts to abolish local registration facilities, would win approval in the Supreme Court if legislative provision were made for it.

In my earlier memo, attached hereto, I have recommended that local election boards be treated as suable entities for purposes of 1971 proceedings, and have provided for various means of serving a summons in the event that service cannot be made upon local persons serving on these boards. I remain disposed to support action against the local boards as legal entities, and merely suggest that further provision be made for the situation in which the State seeks to abolish the boards altogether. In that case, I should think it possible to authorize a suit against the State, together with the appointment by the court in such an action of one or more persons to serve as registrars for the local district until the State once more makes suitable provision for registration. These acting as local registrars here would be comparable to receivers taking over in the total absence of any qualified management provided by the State.

In any event, I think something should be spelled out for the case in which the States try to abolish local registration laws altogether. Recall there have been decisions which have voided efforts to repeal statutes where the effect of the repeal is to deny constitutional rights. See *Atwood* v. *Kelly*, 127 S.W. 2d 555 (Tex. Civ. App.), where the court voided, as an impairment of contract, the attempted repeal of a statute authorizing special proceedings to collect delinquent taxes on relation of bondholders.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

4. MEMORANDUM FROM PROFESSORS BLACK, EMERSON, AND POLLAK, YALE LAW SCHOOL

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR FEDERAL VOTING REGISTRARS

The constitutional basis for the appointment of Federal registrars to register voters who are being denied the right to register or vote in Federal elections on account of race, religion, color or national origin is not open to serious question. This memorandum is not concerned with such constitutional issues. Rather it is directed at certain administrative problems which would arise in connection with the operation of such legislation. These problems must, of course, be considered in the light of past and recent experience with efforts to avoid and thwart Federal legislative and judicial action designed to eliminate discrimination.

I. Whether the administration of a system of Federal registrars should be the function of the Executive or of the judiciary

The first basic issue is whether the administration of a system of Federal Registrars should be a function of the executive of the judiciary. The Javits bill (S. 2783) vests this function in the executive; the Attorney General's bill in the judiciary. In our view the Javits bill is sound on this issue, and the Attorney General's bill is not. Although the appointment of a master or "voting referee" in a judicial proceeding is entirely proper where the problem is to deal with occasional cases of discrimination, that is not the situation with which we are confronted. The problem here is to investigate widespread discrimination, extending on a mass scale throughout 10 or more States; to remedy such discrimination; and then to supervise the new situation for a sustained period of time. The job can be done effectively only through the executive branch of Government.

No one would contend that the original function of registering voters should be assigned to the judiciary. But the task which a substitute Federal system will be called upon to perform is of a comparable order of magnitude. As the report of the Civil Rights Commission pointed out, the total number of Negroes registered in the South was 1.2 million in 1956, out of nearly 5 million Negroes of voting age in that region in 1950. This constitutes about 25 percent, as compared with a 60-percent registration of southern whites of voting age. If the percentage of Negroes allowed to register were brought up to the white percentage, this would mean a registration of 1.8 million additional persons. Even if the percentage of Negroes registering under a substitute Federal system were considerably less than this—say only a 10-percent increase in those of voting age—there would still be 500,000 to register. This is a substantial administrative task. It will require legal and administrative personnel, space and equipment, recordkeeping, supervision, and coordination. The judiciary is not prepared or equipped to perform a job of this sort.

The fact is that the Attorney General's bill is geared to provide Federal registration only in a very small number of election districts. As pointed out below, the bill makes necessary a full-scale judicial proceeding, including proof of a pattern of discrimination, in each election district before the Federal system of registration becomes operative at all. Since the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1957 the Department of Justice has brought only four such proceedings, and has so far been unsuccesaful in three of these. If the Southern States respond by increasing the number and decreasing the size of election districts, the effectiveness of judicially appointed voting referees would be even less. It seems clear that under the Attorney General's bill only a relatively insignificant number of Negroes would be registered.

Moreover, even if the system of judicial registration were practical, it would be most unwise to burden the Federal judiciary with this task. The courts should not be drawn so extensively and so minutely into explosive political controversies of this nature. Among other reasons, they have enough to bear now in the enforcement of the segregation decisions. Responsibility for the strictly executive function of voter registration must be assumed by the executive, with the courts performing their usual function of judicial review in those occasional cases where a doubtful issue of law emerges.

II. Circumstances under which the President is authorized to appoint Federal registrars

The next, and equally important, question relates to the method employed in making the decision to appoint Federal registrars. If the legislation is to be effective it must provide a simple, rapid procedure which will not become entangled in the complex adjudication of individual cases or otherwise enmeshed in the intricacies and delays of administrative or judicial litigation. Generally speaking, this question should be dealt with in a manner appropriate to its real nature, that is, as a matter of legislative policy. Under the constitutional power to regulate the "times, places and manner of holding elections" the decision whether to leave registration to State authorities or to appoint Federal registrars is an issue for legislative determination. Congress alone has the power to make that decision or to delegate it to the Executive under appropriate standards. The issue is legally and practically a legislative one—essentially a political one in the broad sense—and not a judicial or quasi-judicial one.

The dangers in establishing a formal administrative or quasi-judicial procedure for determining when to appoint Federal registrars are apparent from an analysis of S. 2783 (the Javits bill). Under the procedure there contemplated it is first necessary that nine persons from an election district who allege they have been "denied" the right to register file sworn statements containing "a detailed account of the facts." The Civil Rights Commission is then required to "conduct an investigation" to determine "whether or not the allegations contained in such petitions are true." On the basis of an investigation of those petitions (and only those), the Commission "determines" whether "citizens" (the number not specified) are being deprived of the right to register, and certifies "that fact" to the President. Only after this process has been completed is the President authorized to appoint a Federal registrar.

The procedure required by S. 2783 raises a host of questions which could serve as the basis for protracted litigation in each case over the validity of the decision to appoint the registrar. Questions could be raised, and fought before the Commission and through the courts, as to whether the petitioners had been "denied" the right to register; whether the petitions contained a "detailed" account of the facts; whether Commission subpenas employed in the "investigation" were valid; whether the determination of the Commission had been preceded by a proper notice and hearing; whether State officials or others had been granted the right of confrontation and cross-examination; whether the commission's attorneys had produced enough evidence to show that the "allegations" were "true"; whether State officials and other parties had the right to file briefs and make oral argument; whether the Commission had made sufficiently detailed findings of fact or proper conclusions of law; whether a court on judicial review could find "substantial evidence" to support the Commission's "determination"; and other matters of fact, procedure, and law. Even if the Commission were in the end held to have acted legally throughout, an enormous amount of time would have been consumed.

The complexities just enumerated are multiplied in the Attorney General's bill. Here the appointment of "voting referees" would hinge, not on the completion of an administrative proceeding plus limited judicial review, but upon a more formalized and prolonged judicial proceeding. Further, it would not be sufficient under the Attorney General's bill to prove merely individual cases of discrimination but, in addition, it would apparently be necessary to prove a "pattern or practice" of discrimination. Experience with the proof of systematic discrimination against Negroes serving on juries gives some indication of the intricate factual and legal issues involved.

Moreover, the procedure required by both S. 2783 and the Attorney General's bill gives rise to other difficult questions. How can an "election district" be defined so as to prevent a State from creating innumerable small districts in which it might be hard to find nine petitioners, or which would require an innumerable number of determinations for the Commission to make? How many citizens is it necessary to find were deprived of their right to register? Must the denial have been solely on the ground of race, so that any other added ground would not permit a Commission certification? Furthermore, even the Commission itself is only a temporary body whose continuance might not be voted by Congress.

Finally, all the foregoing difficulties might be multiplied if the States were to adopt annual or biennial registration laws, thus requiring the Commission's or court's determination to be made over again in each case for each election.

What is needed, therefore, is a procedure for making the initial determination to appoint Federal registrars which does not depend on formal proof of the facts in individual cases and which can otherwise be insulated from legal issues that can be endlessly litigated before the Commission and the courts. We see no way of accomplishing this except by delegating to the President authority to appoint a registrar in any election district where he has reason to believe that citizens are being denied registration on account of race, religion, color or national origin. Such a procedure would eliminate all quasijudicial and judicial adjudication at this stage and also solve the drafting problems involved in defining an election district so as to prevent manipulation by the States, in determining the number of cases of denial necessary, in stating the precise nature of the denial required, and in establishing a special administrative body to make the determination.

This method of appointing Federal registrars is wholly appropriate for the kind of decision that is involved. Like all determinations of legislative policy, the decision should turn upon general conditions existing in an area, not upon whether any particular individual has been denied his constitutional rights. Insofar as the decision is considered an executive one, it is strictly comparable to those situations where the executive is entrusted with authority to institute proceedings or begin a prosecution, an action which is not required to be performed in accordance with any kind of quasi-judicial process. In terms of normal government practice, therefore, the method proposed is commonly accepted and fully justified.

Nor is the method subject to constitutional objection. The rule against excessive delegation of legislative power is met by the fact that the standard under which the President acts is clearly stated and is far more definite than numerous delegations which have been upheld by the Supreme Court. The requirements of procedural due process, to the extent they are applicable here at all, are satisfied. Under the Constitution the States have authority, in the absence of Federal regulations, to determine the times, places and manner of holding elections. But the Constitution gives the Federal Government power to supersede the State regulations at any time and to any extent that Congress deems desirable.[1] Certainly the States have no constitutional right to challenge the procedure by which Congress asserts its power. In any event, in this case, the greater power would include the lesser; if Congress can appoint Federal registrars for all Federal elections the States cannot object if Congress chooses to exercise that power only under specified circumstances as determined by its delegated representative, the President. It is equally clear that no voter is being deprived of due process by the procedure here suggested. The voter's constitutional right is the right to vote; he has not suffered any injury unless and until he is illegally deprived of that right, or possibly others are illegally granted that right. Surely he does not suffer any legal injury when a Federal registrar is appointed to whom certain applicants can resort in lieu of a State registrar if they so desire.[2] In any event, as noted above, the procedure involved is a reasonable and customary method for making decisions of this kind.

It may be added that a similar procedure for withdrawing the Federal registrar, that is, on the President's statement that he has reason to believe discrimination is no longer taking place, is equally reasonable and valid. Such a procedure for terminating Federal action is contained in the present Javits bill.

One other factor in the Presidential decision to appoint a Federal registrar requires consideration. It may be that the President, as a matter of policy, would not want to designate a Federal registrar unless there is some indication that a reasonable number of potential Negro voters in any area wished to avail themselves of the Federal machinery for registration. It might be advisable, therefore, to provide in the legislation, as a prerequisite to Presidential action, that at least 50 persons in any county or parish petition the Civil Rights Commission (or if that body ceases to exist, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice) requesting the appointment of Federal registrars. Such petition need not allege discrimination, or be signed by persons discriminated against, but could be filed by any residents of the county or parish believing themselves qualified to vote. Upon the filing of this petition the President would be empowered to apopint a Federal registrar for any election district in the county or parish if, as above stated, he had reason to believe that citizens are being denied registration on account of race, religion, or national origin. This provision would carry out the purpose of the Civil Rights Commission's proposal that nine petitions be filed, without encumbering the procedure with the

---

[1] It is true that article I, section 4, of the Constitution, giving Congress power to regulate the "times, places and manner of holding elections," expressly refers only to elections of Senators and Representatives. But it seems clear that a similar power resides in Congress to protect the integrity of all Federal elections (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651); and to insure equal protection and the absence of racial discrimination, against State action, in all elections (14th and 15th amendments).

[2] It is possible, though not certain, that the validity of the President's appointment could be raised as a defense to a criminal proceeding against a State official for refusing to allow a Federally registered voter to vote. But the raising of the point at this stage would not delay the appointment of the Federal registrar, would put the risk of being correct on the defendant, and would subject the defendant to the burden of proof necessary to overcome the usual presumption of administrative regularity.

requirement of adjudicating the correctness of individual claims of discrimination. And it would be fully in accord with the traditional right of citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution, to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

In determining whether to appoint a Federal registrar the President would, of course, avail himself of the information and facilities of the Civil Rights Commission and the Department of Justice and would, in practice, undoubtedly act upon their recommendation. But, as stated, no formal recommendation or adjudication of individual cases would be required.

III. Upon the appointment of a Federal registrar, what persons may apply for registration?

Once a Federal registrar has been appointed, the category of persons who should be entitled to register with him must necessarily be described in reasonably broad terms. It would scarcely be suggested, for instance, that only those persons should be allowed Federal registration who have proved in an administrative or judicial proceeding that they have been personally denied State registration on account of race, religion, color, or national origin. In practical terms, the significant issue here is whether Federal registration should be limited to those who have actually applied to the State authorities for registration, or possibly exhausted State procedures, or whether it should be extended to all persons within the class that has been discriminated against.

The former requirement would plainly be too narrow. This is true because many of the devices used to discourage Negro registration in the South have been designed to prevent the Negro from even attempting to register. Such devices range from physical intimidation and threat of economic reprisal, to long delays in registration procedure, inconvenient hours, short periods, placing registration offices in the homes of white people, resignation of registration boards, and many other similar methods. These devices have been successful in forestalling large numbers of Negroes from trying to register. Indeed, there can be little doubt that the number of Negroes who have never made the attempt, but who would do so if there was any chance of success, is many times greater than the number who have actually gone to the State registration offices and tried to register. Although more would undoubtedly make the attempt if it were made a condition of Federal registration, some would not and in any event there is no sound reason for requiring them to undergo the loss of time, expense, risk and affront to dignity involved. Moreover, proof of this fact would add another complexity to the procedure.

It may be argued that requiring Negroes to first present themselves to the State officials would put pressure on those officials to reform their procedures, thus allowing the Federal registrars to be withdrawn sooner. But this would seem to be a matter entirely within the control of the State officials. When they are ready to treat all equally, it should not be difficult for them to make that fact known. In any event such advantage as might be gained from requiring an attempt at State registration as a preliminary to Federal registration is decisively outweighed by the disadvantages.

S. 2783 is somewhat ambiguous on this vital point. It provides that all persons "who allege that they are being denied the right to register to vote in such district solely because of their race, religion, color or national origin" may apply for Federal registration. The point should be made entirely clear. And it should allow no opportunity for reprisals on the basis of claimed false allegations. We suggest, therefore, that the legislation extend the Federal protection to all who are members of the category—of race, religion, color or national origin—that the President has reason to believe are being discriminated against, as stated in his decision to appoint Federal registrars.

After all, what is being sought by this legislation is merely to create an alternative means of allowing a member of a discriminated group to enjoy his constitutional rights. There is no need to confine those eligible to receive this protection by narrow limits which would make difficult or impossible the attainment of that objective.

Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference—Part 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following portion of the proceedings of the civil rights conference at the University of Notre Dame on February 14, 1960:

IV. Administration of a system of Federal registrars

The administration of a system of Federal registrars, as already observed, requires some attention. It would be possible to establish the Civil Rights Commission as a permanent or semipermanent agency to assist the President in administration. If this is done the legislation would have to make provision for the creation, composition, authority and powers of such a body. However, it is not essential that such an agency be established. The President would have power to delegate by executive order most of his functions, except the actual appointment or withdrawal of Federal registrars, to the Civil Rights Commission (as long as it existed) or to the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. This second course of action has the advantage of greater flexibility and avoids creation of a new agency. It might be the more advisable one unless the Commission is retained for other reasons.

Under either alternative, however, the legislation should make express provision for adequate staffing and appropriations.

V. Enforcement of the right to vote

Another key problem is to make as sure as can be that the Federal system of registration is not interfered with, and especially that a person registered by a Federal registrar is actually allowed to vote and to have his vote honestly counted.

The principal sanction to accomplish this, under the scheme here envisaged, must be the criminal prosecution. Although the Attorney General is skeptical of the effectiveness of criminal prosecutions there is reason to believe that, at least in many areas, they would be a potent factor. In the first place, the difficulty of obtaining an indictment or conviction by southern juries is less likely to prevail in voting cases than in some other types of cases. Secondly, if the penalty is made a misdemeanor (a year or less in prison) the initiation of a prosecution does not require an indictment by a grand jury but may be brought by the U.S. attorney through the filing of an information. Thus a trial can be assured, and where the evidence is open to public scrutiny there is less likelihood of a failure of justice than where the evidence is considered in secret by a grand jury. Moreover, the very fact of bringing a violator to trial has an important impact even where there is an unjustified acquittal. Finally, if southern juries persist in refusing to convict, and thus thwart the objectives of the legislation, the obvious and inevitable remedy (of which the South is well aware) is further legislation authorizing the full Federal control of elections.

Criminal provisions in the legislation should cover the following points:

(1) The sentence provided should be up to 6 months in prison (possibly up to a year), or a fine up to $1,000, or both. The provision in S. 2783 for a fine of $300 seems too small to be adequate.

(2) The penalty should apply to any person who willfully interferes by violence, intimidation, economic reprisal, or threats thereof with persons seeking to petition for appointment of a Federal registrar or seeking to register with the registrar once he is appointed; or who by similar means otherwise interferes with the Federal registration process; or who attempts in any way to deny to an individual registered under the act the right to vote or to have his vote counted for any candidate for Federal office. S. 2783, which limits the criminal penalty to the last clause, and applies only to State election officials, seems too narrow in this respect.

(3) A saving clause should be included which makes clear that the enforcement provisions are not intended to repeal or amend any other provision of law already in existence. This is necessary to keep available the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of title 18 of the United States Code, and possibly other applicable criminal provisions, as well as all existing civil remedies.

An important adjunct to the criminal sanctions may be civil proceeding for damages, injunction, and other equitable remedies. Injunction proceedings, for instance, may be of great significance in many situations, as where a bona fide issue of law is involved or criminal proceedings seem not feasible. Although existing civil provisions may be adequate, provided they are kept in force by the saving clause, it would seem advisable to include in the legislation express provision for the Attorney General or private persons to secure civil relief, through damages, injunction, or other equitable remedy, against interference with the Federal registration process, or denial of the right to vote or to have the vote counted of any person registered by the Federal registrars.

In addition the provisions in the Attorney General's bill for the issuance of certificates to those found qualified by the Federal registrar, and for Federal watchers at the polls, are desirable and should be included.

VI. Application to State elections

There would appear to be no basic constitutional objection to the application of the system of Federal registration to State elections. The Attorney General's bill so provides. It is not clear, however, that such an extension of the legislation is necessary, at least at this time. The possibility of "Jim Crow" elections, with State officials being elected at different times or places, as envisaged by the Attorney General, may never in fact occur. Moreover, the simplified procedure for the designation of Federal registrars and the broad opportunity for applying for Federal registration, as here proposed, may encounter more opposition were the system extended to State elections. Under the circumstances it may be advisable to confine the legislation, for the present at least, to Federal elections.

VII. Summary

In summary, legislation to establish an effective system of Federal registrars should include the following provisions:

(1) The power to appoint Federal registrars should be assigned to the executive, not to the judicial, branch of the Federal Government.

(2) The President should be empowered to appoint a Federal registrar in any election

district where he has reason to believe that citizens are being denied registration on account of race, religion, color, or national origin. It might be advisable to require as a condition of Presidential action that a petition be filed by at least 50 persons residing in any county or parish, who believe they are qualified to vote, requesting the appointment of Federal registrars in such county or parish.

(3) Once a Federal registrar has been appointed for any election district, all persons in that district who are members of the category—of race, religion, color, or national origin—that the President has reason to believe are being discriminated against, as stated in his designation, should be eligible to apply to the Federal registrar for registration.

(4) Provision should be made for adequate staffing and appropriations. If the Civil Rights Commission is continued for other reasons, it can be given authority to assist the President in the administration of the Federal registrar system.

(5) Criminal provisions should be included, making it a misdemeanor willfully to interfere by violence, intimidation, economic reprisal, or threats thereof, with persons seeking to petition for appointment of a Federal registrar or seeking to register with the Federal registrar, or by similar means to otherwise interfere with the Federal registration process, or to deny an individual registered under the act the right to vote or to have his vote counted for any candidate for Federal office.

(6) Civil provisions should be included permitting the Attorney General or private persons to secure civil relief, through damages, injunction or other equitable remedy, against persons interfering with the Federal registration process or seeking to deny the right to vote or have the vote counted of any person registered by the Federal registrar.

(7) A saving clause should be included making clear that the above enforcement provisions do not repeal or amend any other provision of law already in existence.

(8) The legislation, at least at this time, should apply only to Federal, not State, elections.

CHARLES L. BLACK, Jr.
THOMAS I. EMERSON.
LOUIS H. POLLAK.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *February 2, 1960.*

Great White Father's Chosen Negro Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Age, February 20, 1960:

A STONE'S THROW—GREAT WHITE FATHER'S CHOSEN NEGRO LEADERS

(By Chuck Stone)

CHIEF STANDING BULL. Colored man, why you come talk to Chief Standing Bull?

NICODEMUS. Chief, like I'm confused. And, man, so much is happening these days with us Negroes—well, like, Chief, you've just got to give us some advice. I think some of us are being had.

CHIEF STANDING BULL. Why you no go to great Greek master of logic, Socrates? Him give you advice before.

NICODEMUS. O, Sock, he swings. And he comes on strong with the dialectics. But, man, he doth not understand the intricacies of our color problem. I figure you were tangling with the white man long before we Negroes were a problem, perhaps you could showed enlightenment upon our predicament.

CHIEF STANDING BULL. You askum. Me answer.

NICODEMUS. How come the white man doesn't like ADAM CLAYTON POWELL?

CHIEF STANDING BULL. You askum easiest question in books. White man no like ADAM CLAYTON POWELL because him fight white man way white man fight him. White man, him lynch Negroes, blow up schools, build ghettos, no givum decent jobs, packum Negroes into rat houses. ADAM POWELL, him tell Negroes to fight back. White man no like it when you fight back. ADAM POWELL tell Negroes do war dance, get voting rights. White man think POWELL drink firewater.

NICODEMUS. But what about the charges that POWELL is a racist?

CHIEF STANDING BULL. You gottum black skin, but askum white man's question. ADAM POWELL, him gottum white skin, but him fightum good, like black man should. ADAM POWELL, him no racist. Him only fightum way white man teach him. When white man think you rise too fast, him call you "racist" and say you makum "terrible" leader. White man, him shrewdest animal in forest. Him no like tough leadership.

NICODEMUS. But, the white man calls other Negro leaders good men. For example, the City Club in New York City said that Jackie Robinson and Roy Wilkins were "marvelous Negro leaders." How about that?

CHIEF STANDING BULL. You talk mouth full of cornmeal. No wonder American Negroes no go nowhere fast. Great white father, him like Roy Wilkins and Jackie Robinson because they play game according to white man's rules for black men. They go not so fast, not so far, not so hard. They only talk tough in South. In North, both men, heap big quiet.

White men pay their salaries. If Jackie Robinson talk big, white man fire him from his job in coffee company. White man on newspaper, him kick Jackie off too when him gettum up big talk. Jackie, him tellum white man what he wants to hear. Him talk "reasonable talk." Roy Wilkins, him no different. Him speak mad when Negro gettum lynched. Him puttum hand over eyes and foot in mouth when Negroes gettum big kick in the pants in New York wigwam.

NICODEMUS. But don't you think we need different types of Negro leaders even if they disagree with each other?

CHIEF STANDING BULL. White man, him think so. Him use policy all same over world—divide and conquer. Him take Negroes like Jackie Robinson, pat him on back, tellum get angry only sometime. Cuddle him next to how you call him, "Mister Charlie."

NICODEMUS. Well, you've got to admit that ADAM POWELL'S statements are inflammatory and that they are stirring up Negroes.

CHIEF STANDING BULL. ADAM POWELL, him no stir up. Him only mix what already there. White man stir up. Great white father Kennedy who sittum in big chief sheriff chair, him say "no puttum Negroes in high jobs." Him use phony issue of race. Him makum Negroes mad. Police commissioner, him stir up, not POWELL. Him play footsies with white man in South. White man in South, him say "regardless of race, creed, or color," and him lynch only Negroes. Kennedy, him say "regardless of race, creed, or color," and appoint only paleface. Him also dangerous.

NICODEMUS. Well Chief, I've got to admit you've talked a lot of sense. Let me ask you just one more question. What should we do about George Meany?

CHIEF STANDING BULL. Easy. Burnum at stake.

Clinton M. Hester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Sporting News of January 6, 1960, about Mr. Clinton M. Hester, a distinguished attorney and good friend of mine since my boyhood:

(By Jack Walsh)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One of the top attorneys in the Nation's Capital seems supremely confident that professional football will be provided remedial legislation in the second session of the 86th Congress reconvening on January 6.

Clinton M. Hester, counsel for the National Football League and one of the leading corporation lawyers in the country, has been working diligently in this direction for almost 3 years.

In an interview with the Sporting News, Hester said: "Both the Senate and House subcommittees dealing with sports legislation and their respective chairmen, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, have been so sympathetic with the antitrust problems of professional football that I feel quite sure a remedial measure will be enacted during this coming session."

BILL STALLED IN SENATE

A bill that would have granted exemption under antitrust laws for the player draft, option of reserve clause, territorial rights, and certain television practices for all professional sports sailed through the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress, but the Senate failed to act before it adjourned.

In the 1st session of the current 86th Congress, the Judiciary Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee headed by KEFAUVER held hearings, but the full committee didn't act because of lack of time.

Now a bill providing antitrust exemptions for professional football, basketball, and hockey has been reported out to the full Judiciary Committee of the Senate and action on it is expected early in the new year.

This bill makes no mention of professional baseball. Rand Dixon, capable counsel of Kefauver's subcommittee, said: "I think the Senators may be waiting to consider baseball separately or to see if those in the game can solve the problem by themselves."

There's some feeling on Capitol Hill, too, that the Continental League, struggling to get off the ground, may be coming around to seek some help.

BASEBALL IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY

Dixon and many other attorneys also are quick to point out that baseball's situation is different. Because of the 1922 Supreme Court decision, in effect reaffirmed in the Toolson case in 1953, baseball is held not engaged in interstate commerce and therefore not subject to antitrust laws.

Because of these Supreme Court decisions baseball has been content to go along as it is.

In the 1957 Radovich decision, on the other hand, the Supreme Court declared that professional football is engaged in interstate commerce and subject to the antitrust laws. That decision also carried a recommendation that Congress eliminate the obvious discrimination between baseball and the other sports.

The Radovich decision plainly placed professional football in legal jeopardy. Officials of the National Football League have been busily seeking congressional help since.

Hester came on the scene to provide legislative representation for the National Football League shortly after the Radovich decision.

"It was pretty much by accident," Hester said. "I was in the Fairmount Hotel in San Francisco when I bumped into Edwin J. Anderson of the Detroit Lions. Andy and I are long-time friends. He mentioned the situation to me and I became interested. He put Bert Bell, the late great commissioner, in touch with me."

After meeting with Hester, Bell came to Washington and pounded the marble corridors. He personally buttonholed scores of Senators and Representatives with his story on pro football.

WORKED CLOSELY WITH BELL

Hester, who knows most of the Members of Congress personally, accompanied Bell. The relationship quickly became closer than that of lawyer-client.

"I loved Bert Bell," Hester said. "He certainly was one of the greatest fellows I ever met in my life. He was tireless in his efforts to explain his league's draft of collegiate players and all its inner workings.

"He was on the go from 7 in the morning until late at night and started wearing me out. I was shocked when I discovered that he was a sick man and under doctor's care. I used to insist that he take things easier, but he'd just keep going."

Later, Bell always delighted in telling everybody what a shock most taxpayers would get if they knew how hard their Representatives in Washington worked.

"I was there early in the morning and late at night and they always were on the go," Bell said. "If they ever enforce the wage-hour law in the Government, Congress will go out of business."

Hester continued: "It was a fine experience to get to know and work with a man like Bert Bell. We became very close, but for some reason never got on a first-name basis. I always called him Mr. Bell or Mr. Commissioner. In turn, he called me Mr. Hester.

"It got embarrassing to me. I asked him to please call me Clint. Bell replied: 'As long as I live, you'll be Mr. Hester to me.'

"One wonderful thing happened to him. Before he died last October, Bell knew that the Senate subcommittee had come around to agreeing with him that the draft of college players was an important way to equalize playing strength and not the unreasonable restraint it seemed on the surface.

"As you know, the draft was Bell's brainchild. It was proposed by him and adopted by the league in 1935. Bell came up with the idea when he was a struggling club owner with his Philadelphia Eagles. He felt it was the only way the poorer clubs would have a chance to compete.

"No one now questions that keen competition has made pro football great. And in the long run everyone in the game has profited."

Hester was asked what impressed him most about Bell. Unhesitatingly, he replied: "His great devotion to his family." Bell left a widow, the former stage star, Frances Upton; two sons, Upton and Bert, Jr., and a daughter, Jane.

Bell's capacity for work must have impressed Hester, too. He is an indefatigable worker himself. Hester said: "Here I am nearly 65 and I honestly feel my work gets more interesting every day of my life."

Hester, who represents and is a confidant to some of the biggest business executives in the country, came up the hard way. Born in Des Moines, Iowa, April 16, 1895, he was the son of a minister.

SERVED AS JANITOR IN HIGH SCHOOL

In his youth he struck out for himself. He worked while attending Missoula (Mont.) High School, where the principal, Gilbert A. Ketcham, proved to be a great friend, adviser, and benefactor.

Hester recalled, in the commencement address he delivered back in Missoula last June, that he served as janitor of the gymnasium at $10 a month and was allowed to sleep in a small room there. Although busy with several odd jobs, he found time to compete in football, basketball, baseball, and track.

He left Missoula in 1915 and planned to accept an athletic scholarship at the University of Chicago. However, he was persuaded by a graduate to attend Phillips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire for a year.

Hester related that Principal Ketcham was intrigued with the idea of a poor boy attending a great school like Exeter. Hester said: "I told him the fact that authorities thought it would be impossible for me to work my way through school made me desire to go there all the more.

"I asked him for his advice—and he said something which I have adopted as a part of my life's philosophy. He said nobody ever got anywhere in life unless he took a chance. He was saying what the great English author, John Dryden, had said before him: 'Fortune befriends the bold.'"

Hester arrived at Exeter with $25 in his pocket. The headmaster was so astonished that Hester had traveled across the country on the mere hope of being accepted that he admitted him.

PLAYED FOOTBALL AT COLLEGE

After leaving Exeter, Hester enrolled at Colgate University and was on the football team when World War I came along. After seeing action in France, he returned to this country and went to Washington.

A structural steelworker by day, he attended George Washington University at night and received his bachelor of arts degree in 1920. He attended Georgetown University at night, too, and there received his law degree.

Hester then took a post as junior attorney with the old Shipping Board and remained in Government service until 1940, when he resigned as the first Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

"I had a wonderful experience with the Government," Hester said. "I worked for all three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial. Looking back, though, I think the most interesting phase was working with congressional committees."

Hester received powerful tributes from some of the most prominent leaders when he left the Government.

Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, who said he had many honest disagreements with Hester, added: "When Mr. Hester goes out of the public service, the Nation will lose a great man. I only say that the gain of private life is the loss of public life."

TRUMAN ALSO PAID TRIBUTE

Former President Harry Truman, then a Senator from Missouri, joined in McCarran's tribute.

The late Senator Alben Barkley of Kentucky, later Vice President, said: "I have known Mr. Hester for a long time in the Treasury and other departments. I have the greatest respect for him, and I have the greatest confidence in his ability and his sincerity and his integrity."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in accepting Hester's CAA resignation, wrote: "This will bring to a close your splendid record as a carecr man in Government service in which you have advanced rank by rank until you became Administrator * * * you have in a brief space of time brought civil aviation in this country to its highest peak."

Roosevelt later appointed him to the National Advisory Administration for Aeronautics. On that agency, Hester served with Orville Wright and Charles A. Lindbergh.

LAUDED BY SENATOR M'CARRAN

In his tribute to Hester, Senator McCarran also said: "There are some men who are great by reason of their achievement; there are some men who are born great; but a man who, growing out of obscurity, works himself up to a position of greatness should never be forgotten."

Certainly, Hester has come a long way from the struggling days in little Missoula or even in Washington when he worked long and hard as he fought for an education.

He now owns a fabulous 1,000-acre estate, Bath Alum Farms, near Hot Springs, Va. It is nestled in the Allegheny Mountains and is surrounded by more than 100,000 acres of national forest land.

The handsome, 20-bedroom home of colonial architecture is a showplace. On the grounds are a trout stream, a bass lake and a large herd of cattle. Wild life includes deer, bear, wild turkey, grouse, quail and pheasant.

Hester, who hasn't taken a vacation in 30 years, says he gets his relaxation at his place, where he enjoys holding hunting and fishing parties for some of the top diplomatic figures, Government and military leaders and just friends.

As welcome as the top brass, and treated as cordially, are Hester's own employees and farm and hunting neighbors.

When Hester entertains, there are no halfway measures. Still an aviation enthusiast, he owns a twin-engined Cessna 310. At his Bath Alum estate, he built a 3,600-foot runway accommodating large twin-engine aircraft. He thinks nothing of chartering a DC–3 and taking guests on the one-hour flight from National Airport to his front door.

Hester's chief hobby is American history. He delights in flying low in a small plane over historic Virginia, dipping down and pointing out such things as the former wilderness birthplace of John Marshall, our first Chief Justice.

"I've studied history from the time I was a child," Hester said. "Most of all, I'm fond of biography. Studying the trials and errors of great men, and trying to avoid their mistakes, is the finest education I know."

Freedom for Lithuanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the memory of the Communist annexation of Lithuania and the determined spirit of those Lithuanians who are residing with us in the United States, should act as a persistent reminder of the deplorable conditions under which many humans are forced to live.

We are all aware of the cold war and its effects. However, mere awareness is not enough. The situation is an urgent one which demands that each of us be constantly alert to new solutions or actions that might feasibly contribute to alleviating the Communist threat to human freedom.

The Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla., have recently celebrated the 42d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithu-

ania. They commemorated the occasion by adopting the following resolution:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, sponsored by Lithuanian Council of Miami and held February 14, 1960, at the Miami American Lithuanian Citizens Club to commemorate the 42d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas in 1940 the Kremlin rulers in conspiracy with the Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of international law, invaded Lithuania and, against the will of the Lithuanian people, annexed her to the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of Communist imperialism and to do all in its power to prevent further spreading of Communism in the free world; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this meeting asks the Government of the United States to refrain from signing any new treaties with Soviet Union until the latter agrees to restore freedom and sovereign rights to the Lithuanian people and to other enslaved eastern European nations."

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF MIAMI,
———— ————, *President.*
Mrs. JENNIE GOODWILL, *Secretary.*

Vassar To Celebrate 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 18, 1960

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to announce that during the year 1961, Vassar College will celebrate its 100th anniversary, which centennial celebration will emphasize its responsibilities and contribution to present and future generations.

Matthew Vassar's great vision a hundred years ago brought into being Vassar College, a pioneer in the field of higher education for women.

A full-fledged college for women, to teach them the arts, the sciences, the languages, the social sciences on the same level with men: astronomy and mathematics, history and philosophy, Greek and German, chemistry and biology, as well as music and art. A new epoch in the history of American education.

Vassar College indeed made history. The new institution produced glorious leaders in the women's rights movement and saw the founder's vision justified in universal suffrage. Its graduates opened the doors into the great professions theretofore closed to women. Most important of all, Vassar began to develop that new breed of woman, the enlightened mother and active responsible leader in community, State, and Nation.

Thus did Vassar succeed in its theory of a true liberal arts education for women: not domestic science, not typing and shorthand, not arts and crafts; but thorough training and genuine learning in the great areas of human knowledge and thought. Study and reading, listening and discussing, research and exploring train the Vassar student and make the Vassar graduate.

Educated women! The professions welcome them; business searches for them; industry lures them; government begs for them; schools cry out for them; families need them; men marry them.

Vassar will continue to make history as it enters its second century.

Anna K. Owens, Maine Champion, Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended the 13th Annual Voice of Democracy Awards luncheon, sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It was heartening for me to observe the outstanding young representatives from each of our States and the District of Columbia. Their inspiring essays helped me to place in proper perspective some of the recent reports relating to the spread of juvenile delinquency. Many of our youths not only recognize the value of our democratic form of government, but are most articulate in describing this value in terms that convey to others democracy's true meaning.

Miss Anna K. Owens of Scarboro, Maine, who represented my State, noted that every citizen in a democracy must work to preserve the freedom and independence which he enjoys. If Americans cease to be vigilant, Communist domination and subversion could threaten our American way of life. As Miss Owens states:

Democracy requires work. It is so easy to live under a dictatorial regime, so hard to live with democracy. * * * We must prepare ourselves for the challenging responsibilities of democracy. Are we equal to the task?

Freedom brings with it certain responsibilities; responsibilities which require positive contributions to public life. Miss Owens' challenge is one that we all, youth and adults as well, must meet successfully.

At this time, I would like to include the full text of her remarks in the RECORD:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY
(By Anna Owens)

Praises echo the many facets of democracy in America. We gloriously state that democracy is a government "for the people." We display our freedom before the world; we proudly explain our revolution that won us that freedom. Poets and writers have retold the wonders of democracy for generations. Yet, is it only the poet who, ahead of his time, realizes the truths of our democracy?

I have said that we "display" our freedom before the world. When we shout the praises of democracy to the less fortunate nations, we are not doing this to be pretentious. We realize that we have achieved a height beyond that of any other government. Perhaps we are struggling to comprehend the vastness of this Government, to render it justice. We cannot fully understand its greatness. However, recognizing greatness is a step toward truth. We must realize that we have much more to grasp, even though we are on the right path. Writers have started the march: As Frost has said: "But I have promises to keep, And miles to go before I sleep." This applies to what we call personal everyday life. But wait, is not democracy everyday life? Is it not people—people reading recipes for stew in the evening paper, people crowding into buses and subways, people cheering football teams, people talking on the corner, people always wishing they could go farther and do more. Much can be learned about the purposes and values of democracy from just such people. Much can be learned, but we have miles to go.

Democracy requires work. It is so easy to live under a dictatorial regime, so hard to live with democracy. A dictator is not dreadful. Now there's a person who seems to know what he's doing; let's leave everything to him. His policies seem radical, but I'm sure he knows what's best. Besides, I just can't think of a solution. How easy it is to relinquish responsibility. How easy it is to find the simpler, shorter method. It takes time and forethought and patience to build a democracy and keep it running. We must prepare ourselves for the challenging responsibilities of democracy. Are we equal to the task?

Democracy means freedom for us. Do we cherish this freedom fully? William Somerset Maugham said: "If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and the irony of it is that if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too." When we talk with oppressed countries about freedom, we can speak so carelessly, only supposing on the extreme hardships of a dictatorship. We must not take our freedom lightly; however, it is American to be carelessly sincere. Love of freedom is a spark which glimmers in spite of dark despair. To those who know its value, to those who have been under a direct, cruel regime, a chance to live in freedom is bliss. We cannot give up our constant fight for freedom. We must work. There is no room for beggars of the spoils of democracy.

Democracy proudly rears her head in the world. She should be proud; for she withstood her early orientation, the dangers of tyranny, and all the criticisms of her way of life. We should be proud—proud beyond compare. We fight with pride for her ideals, for her truths, for her equality. Her birthday is a glorious event. In fact, it is a most spectacular birthday. What other nation flies as many jets, sets off as many fireworks, fires as many cannons, and eats as many hot dogs and puffs of cotton candy as America? We fairly burst with pride on this her day.

Democracy has the bearing of dignified humility. It will not bow to an unjust cause, but it will recognize true sincerity. Each citizen accepts the defeat of his views often in a democratic country. The self-centered person cannot find his niche within the framework. All thoughts are for the good of the Nation and every individual therein.

Democracy has keen sturdiness. Her principles are clad in compactness. Her very history is one of rugged beauty. The courageous citizens of stanch New England towns launched her career in America.

Democracy is for posterity. It aspires to the utmost in men; it dares them to be equal to the task. It constantly comes alive. It becomes a breathing effort to withstand the pressures imposed upon it. With a renewed, richer meaning, it faces each day. Democracy is our hope—a candle dripping its design upon the dark table of the world. Democracy will steadily reach for higher goals. It sets impossible standards only to prove that the impossible can become reality. Gently, gradually each generation will awaken to the wonder of that greatness which was not distinguished at once. Greatness comes on the wings of diligence, dignity, humility, and peace.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House most certainly should vote to override the President's veto on the water pollution bill before us. Unless we do, we are not keeping faith with the citizens of America.

Today we hear a great deal of talk about meeting the Soviet challenge. But I believe, that in many ways, the job of meeting the needs of our own Nation and our own people poses every bit as great a challenge as the Soviet Union, for we cannot expect to successfully meet their challenge until we fulfill our own.

The Nation today is falling behind in the fight against wasteful pollution. The problem can be expected to grow more serious and more expensive to resolve with each passing year.

The President, in his veto message on H.R. 3610, emphasized that he recognized the rivers and streams of our country as a priceless national asset. But his solution was that same, timeworn administration tactic of putting off a job that has to be done by calling another conference.

I think Members of the House will agree that we have already had too many conferences and too much talk and too little action from the administration on the water-pollution issue.

I believe that H.R. 3610 represents a program of prevention. It recognizes that the job must be done now and that a dollar spent now will save the taxpayer many, many times the amount having to be spent to do precisely the same job in the future.

Water use in this country is expected to double within the next 20 years. The days are over when we can take water for granted. We cannot assume we are always going to have all we need because scientists tell us that this is not the case.

Our Nation's exploding population is putting an ever-greater strain on our water resources. Just to insure that America's tap be kept running, we have engaged in costly experiments in purifying brackish water and desalting seawater. But what is needed in addition to such experiments is the broad attack on the pollution problem that is represented in this legislation.

It is pollution that destroys the usefulness of water. Pollution is a topic on which too many people have become all too careless in America in recent years. New industries have boomed since World War II and they are tremendous users of water. The wastes that one such small chemical plant can pour into a stream, for example, can literally make that stream unusable as a water supply source for years. It is then, that the job or cleaning that stream takes on such grossly expensive proportions.

The magazine U.S. News & World Report, in its February 29 issue, contains an article posing the question, "How Pure is Your City Water?" It points out that the problem of keeping drinking water free and clear from disease-carrying organisms is becoming an increasing problem in many American cities.

The story describes the scientific research being done on the Nation's drinking water at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, Ohio. I recommend the article for reading by everyone. It concludes with this telling quotation from Bernard B. Berger, Chief of the Water Supply and Water Pollution Research Plant at the Center: "The burden on water is increasing. You put in a sewage treatment plant and there is unquestionably an improvement in water below the plant. Working against that, however, is the growing population and the increasing industrial establishment of the country. It is going to take a lot of effort to stay even with the problem and more if we are going to make any improvement."

I think that H.R. 3610 is one good answer to the question posed in the U.S. News & World Report article.

My own State of Idaho is one of the finest fishing and outdoor playgrounds in the United States. Maintaining stringent water pollution control and having modern sewage treatment plants in tip-top condition is vital to our well being and progress. Under the bill, Idaho would receive $1,060,065 for fiscal 1961, and I must add that every dollar would be put to good use in my State.

I think this legislation is sorely needed at this time. I emphasize again that an ounce of prevention now will save millions, and possibly billions, of tax dollars in the future. It is the future for which we must plan if we to create a strong and healthy America for our ever-growing population.

Toward a Happier Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on February 25, 1960:

TOWARD A HAPPIER RETURN

The U.S. income tax will be 47 years old today. Does anyone want to sing "Happy Birthday" to celebrate the joyous occasion?

When it was born in 1913, few people foresaw how the tax would grow. It started with a nibble of 1 to 6 percent. Now it gobbles 20 to 91 percent.

The result has been to eat up savings and capital and stunt the growth of the national economy.

A way to curb the damage has been suggested by Congressmen HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, and A. S. HERLONG, of Florida, with the backing of five other Representatives from Indiana, Texas, and Tennessee. They are sponsoring legislation to reduce the income tax rate in every bracket. Their proposal would ease the bite on all taxpayers. In addition, they predict the lower rates would spur economic growth which soon would put tax revenues back at their present level or even higher.

We wish Congress would observe the 47th birthday of the income tax by adopting the Herlong-Baker bills. It would mark the birth of a better day for taxpayers, and for the economy.

Additional Hearings Scheduled on TBA Marketing Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks, I present a news release and statement which our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, made February 19, 1960, in which he announced that additional hearings will be held on the marketing of TBA items in the petroleum industry. Mr. ROOSEVELT is the chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee. His release, which includes his own statement, deserves the attention of the many Members who are concerned over the problems of small business, and is set forth as follows:

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, California, chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee, after conferring with the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the full committee, announced today that additional hearings relating to the marketing of TBA items in the petroleum industry are being scheduled by the subcommittee. Representative ROOSEVELT stated:

"The evidence documented at the December 9–11, 1959, hearings and the subsequent investigations by the subcommittee, indicate that it is both proper and necessary that additional hearings be scheduled. This is true not only for the purpose of giving the major oil companies an opportunity, under oath, to rebut the charges of coercion and intimidation aimed at them in relation to their marketing practices involving TBA items, but to also give the subcommittee an opportunity to further develop specific instances of coercion and intimidation brought to light at the hearings along with instances of possible retaliation which have

been brought to the attention of the subcommittee since the hearings.

"Plans are now being made for these additional hearings and an announcement as to the date and place of the hearings can be expected shortly. The length of the hearings and the date on which they will be scheduled will depend largely upon the number of major oil companies who desire to present evidence at the hearings. To date there has been no great interest shown by the major oil companies in appearing before the subcommittee, but there are indications that some of them will desire to do so."

In making this announcement, Representative ROOSEVELT points out that the subcommittee has been investigating specific instances which were brought to the attention of the subcommittee at the hearings on December 9–11, and subsequent thereto.

Among these is the situation involving a service station in Texarkana, Tex., wherein it was alleged that a Cities Service Oil Co. supervisor showed the service station operator a letter and told him he must give up his lease. The staff is investigating this matter and the subcommittee is now awaiting receipt of the letter in question from the Cities Service Oil Co. along with any other pertinent documents. It is expected that Cities Service Oil Co. may desire to appear before the subcommittee at its impending hearings.

Another matter investigated by the subcommittee involved testimony that a Shell Oil Co. salesman in the Detroit area had presented to a Shell service station operator a list of things that the operator must do or get out. This list was obtained by the subcommittee and it was ascertained that the station involved is a "C" station and the items referred to were in the main housekeeping items. It is obvious to the subcommittee, upon a study of the service station manager's agreement involved in this matter, that the Shell Oil Co. considers their "C" station managers, who are on commission, to be employees of the oil company and subject to the supervision of the oil company in all matters and that they can be discharged by Shell Oil Co. on 24 hours notice. Although Shell Oil Co., in their "C" station agreement with the managers, indicates that the managers may handle any brand of TBA merchandise they desire and by letter to the "C" station managers indicate that the manager is not obligated to purchase his TBA items from Shell or through Shell, the oil company goes further and states: "The extent to which we will enjoy your patronage must depend upon your voluntary acceptance of our products line and the service we are able to render." It is expected that the Shell Oil Co. may desire to appear before the subcommittee at its impending hearings.

Further information has been obtained concerning the tape recording played at the hearings on December 11, 1959, which clearly depicted the actions of a Sinclair salesman in insisting that the service station operator must remove competitive TBA items not sponsored by Sinclair from his shelves before Sinclair would renew his lease or negotiate a new lease. The subcommittee has obtained a duplicate original of the new lease now in effect between the operator and the Sinclair Refining Co. which reveals that it was negotiated and signed at the time that the tape recording was taken on the 28th of August and that the lease is effective from August 1, 1959, indicating a 3-week period from the time Mr. Thompson's old lease was up and the time he was able to get a new lease from Sinclair. The Sinclair Oil Co. has also, subsequent to the hearings, requested a reproduction of the tape which was played at the hearings and this has been made available to them. It is expected that the Sinclair Oil Co. may desire to appear before the subcommittee at impending hearings.

Testimony was received at the hearings relative to a new service station lease being put into effect by Standard Oil Co. of California, Western Operations, Inc., which is being studied closely by subcommittee staff. It was alleged at the hearings that this lease might be in violation of the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the California Cartwright Act. Since the December 9–11 hearings, the subcommittee has received some additional information concerning this new lease. It is expected that the Standard Oil Co. of California may desire to appear before the subcommittee at the impending hearings.

Representative ROOSOVELT further announces that immediately following the hearings he dispatched a letter to the Honorable Robert A. Bicks, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, requesting that the subcommittee be brought up to date on actions taken by the Justice Department in relation to the matters developed both at previous hearings and at the December 9–11 hearings of Subcommittee No. 5. A reply was subsequently received from Mr. Bicks indicating that the Justice Department has initiated investigations and studies in several areas and situations, some of which were developed by the subcommittee hearings. Especially noted was the fact that an investigation of the pricing and distribution practices of the Esso Standard Oil Co. in the Virginia and West Virginia areas is being conducted by the Justice Department. There was much evidence presented at the December 9–11 hearings relating to Esso's current activity in converting lessee and commission dealers to "Service Station Manager" commission contracts. It is expected that the Esso Standard Oil Co. may desire to appear before Subcommittee No. 5 at the impending hearings.

It is also expected that other major oil companies would want to appear. The instances mentioned here are only a few of the many situations developed at the hearings involving major oil companies. Other situations are constantly being brought to the attention of the subcommittee.

Representative ROOSEVELT also stated: "There are indications that the industry is still haunted by the specter of retaliation. The witnesses who appeared at the hearings December 9–11 indicated that one of the biggest difficulties faced in getting the full story from the service station operators is the fear of retaliation by the major oil companies through their power to cancel leases or failure to renew them."

In discussing retaliation, Mr. ROOSEVELT pointed out that Mr. Leonard Weinstein, of Bridgeport, Conn., suggested at the hearings, and later by letter to the subcommittee, that it would be helpful if a letter from the subcommittee could be received to the effect that witnesses can and will be protected against retaliation. Such a letter was prepared and sent to an official of the Connecticut Automotive Wholesalers Association. Since that time the subcommittee has received affidavits from Mr. Weinstein setting out additional instances of alleged coercion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT also announced that the subcommittee has completed a full investigation of one instance involving a Shell Oil Co. "C" station manager who was involved in testimony developed at the December hearings. Shortly after the hearings this manager was given 24 hours termination notice and relieved of his duties. Mr. ROOSEVELT stated: "As a result of the investigation, I am fully satisfied that retaliation was not involved and that, in this specific instance, the exercise by the oil company of its supervisory prerogatives was not precipitated by the testimony of any witness appearing before the subcommittee at the December hearings."

Red Star Over Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from Latin American Events, edited by Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former President of the Security Council of the United Nations.

I spoke out at the very beginning about the Communist-dominated Castro dictatorship and this is further documentation of the situation in Cuba today.

The article follows:

CUBA.—Significant events have occurred in Cuba during the past week. Mikoyan's visit to Havana on the pretext of opening the trade fair had previously been set up in New New York and Mexico City was an event of the particular importance for the Communist regime that has usurped power in the unfortunate island.

The day of Mikoyan's arrival, the general staff of the Communist government came out in full force to hail the Chief, Comrade Mikoyan. Castro and the Russian Deputy Premier exchanged warm embraces in view of TV and press cameras, to the surprise of those simpletons who still doubt that the bloodthirsty Cuban dictator is a Red.

The first words of Mikoyan contained a threat to the United States of America and at the same time, full backing for Castro's regime. He applauded agrarian reform, remarked that in Russia all private property had been taken without indemnification by the government—which has caused some foolish souls to finally realize that there is no hope for compensation from Castro's confiscations.

Later, Mikoyan placed a floral wreath decorated with the hammer and sickle at the base of the statue of Jose Marti, the apostle of Cuban independence who never sympathized with Marxist doctrine.

A group of university students, outraged at this profanation of Jose Marti, approached with a floral wreath enclosed in the Cuban flag. The police stopped them, broke a few heads, and destroyed flowers and flag.

The only thing left at the feet of Jose Marti was the banner of the hammer and sickle. The chief of the Havana police is a well-known Communist and ex-convict sentenced for trafficking in drugs, Almejeiras by name.

When the Russian Exposition was about to be opened, the police and soldiers serving as guards, the majority of them active Reds, fired their rifles into the air, to show their enthusiasm. Many persons were hurt in the resultant confusion and panic.

This time Fidel Castro did not say, as on other occasions, that the guns were fired by counterrevolutionaries or hateful Yankees.

In a Russian helicopter, Mikoyan and Castro toured various sites on the island, which are guarded by military forces. No reporter or photographer was permitted along on this secret trip.

To Cienaga de Zapata went only Mikoyan and the Castro brothers. This is the place where it is said that the Russians and a Hungarian engineer are planning the establishment of a guided missile base. They also visited the Sierra Maestra and the Isle of Pines, a place frequented by Russian submarines.

Puppet-President Dorticós offered Comrade Mikoyan a banquet in the grand style, in the Presidential Palace. One news agency reported that it was attended by the cream of Cuban society. Of course, the only cream gaining entrance to the Presidential Palace is the new cream, that is, Red comrades in high Government and party positions.

A funny incident occurred at the banquet, Mikoyan remarked to Castro that Cuban Foreign Affairs Minister Raul Roa was the uglist man he had ever seen. Roa, obviously emotionally overcome by his honor, humbly expressed his thanks and indebtedness to Deputy Premier Mikoyan. And Castro took a bath for the occasion, the first one in 42 days according to statistics.

Later, the commercial agreement brought by Mikoyan from Moscow was signed. As is well known the agreement contains secret clauses, providing escapes for Soviet Russia. Don't forget that this is a contract between a new satellite state and base headquarters.

Newsmen interviewed Mikoyan over TV. When imprudently asked about the infamous Hungarian repression, the Red Deputy Premier became huffy and replied that the question was loathsome, and he made no further reply. The hapless reporter who asked the question is now undoubtedly pondering his fate in a Havana jail, or is in exile.

The loan made does not consist of a grant of cash but rather of credit, for the purchase of Russian goods. Naturally, the prices will be fixed by the seller.

And whenever heavy machinery, planes or agricultural equipment is sold, they will be sent to Cuba accompanied by hundreds of Russian experts who will make their own extracurricular contribution to the communization of poor Cuba.

Of the million tons of sugar that Russia agrees to purchase annually from Cuba at the world market price, only two hundred thousand tons will be paid in dollars, much less than previously paid in dollars for former purchases. The remaining eight hundred thousand will be paid in Russian products, which will, of course, take the place of free-world exports, especially those from the United States.

Mikoyan reached Oslo, Norway, after departing Havana. There the difference between a free people such as the Norwegians and a people subjected by a Red dictatorship such as the Cuban, could clearly be seen.

Mikoyan, speaking before 800 Norwegian students tried to justify the barbaric Soviet oppression in Hungary. The students booed and hissed.

Cuban students reacted the same way, but were herded off to jail by the Red Cuban police.

Widening the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 27, 1960:

WIDENING THE PANAMA CANAL

The time is coming when the United States must decide whether to widen the Panama Canal or leave it as it is.

While some people may not be aware of it, the canal is already too small for our largest warships—such as the supercarriers of the *Forrestal* class. If these carriers must be moved from the Atlantic to the Pacific, they must now make the long voyage around Cape Horn.

Officially, the Navy says that the new carriers are so much faster that they can make the long trip in less time than the older carriers. Moreover, the Navy maintains a complete fleet in each ocean, and adequate bases. Nevertheless, it may be desirable to widen the canal so that it can handle any modern warship.

From the commercial viewpoint, the canal is large enough to handle practically all oceangoing ships as of the moment. On the other hand, as ships get larger, the canal will not be able to handle them. There are several ships today which are too big for the canal already.

The latest estimate was that it would require over $2 billion to widen the Panama Canal, so that it could handle *Forrestal*-type carriers. Congress may not be in a mood to vote this sum of money at the moment, and chances appear against legislation to widen the canal. Another complication is the hostility toward U.S. occupation of the Panama Canal Zone in Panama. While there is little likelihood that the United States will grant Panama sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone, recent demonstrations, and other protests incurred by the Communists, have made the U.S. posture there a delicate one.

In this connection it could be that an expenditure of several billion dollars might—several decades hence—be utilized by Panama, or another power, if we ever lose sovereignty in the 10-mile-wide Panama Canal Zone. This is a rather "iffy" danger, however, and the main question is whether security and commercial considerations justify the expenditure.

Eventually, we believe, the expenditure will be made, if only for peacetime purposes. However, action does not appear to be imminent, and chances are against any action at all in the immediate future. Uncle Sam, in this case, is estopped from action at the moment because of a pinch in finances—though, ironically, we could widen the canal and then some, with the money we are spending on foreign aid each year.

The Challenge Broadens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 15, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on February 26, 1960:

THE CHALLENGE BROADENS

It looks as if Mr. Eisenhower will return from his Latin-American visit to face a mounting challenge to his interpretation of American defense needs, his attitude on the budget, America's position on the global front, and whether he has sufficiently alerted the country to current dangers from Soviet power increases.

So long as criticism of administration defense policy and its effect on American international influence was mainly confined to Democratic Party leaders, Mr. Eisenhower could expect that most Americans would discount it in the context of a presidential election year. So long as it came most notably from "the spenders," it tended to answer itself. And even the most sincere testimony of military leaders—which in any case reflected wide differences of opinion among them—has a certain ex parte ring for the civilian population.

But as voices such as those of Robert A. Lovett and Robert C. Sprague, both Republicans, both bankers, and both with intimate knowledge of the national effort to build security, express differences with the President in this vital field, the White House is under new compulsion to state its own case more effectively. These men have now testified before a congressional committee studying policymaking.

Another impressive witness questioning administration policy is Dr. James P. Baxter, president of Williams College.

That three such men find themselves differing publicly with the President proves no more than that there is room to differ among men of relatively conservative backgrounds. Such statements indicate the existence of influential Republican opinion which has been for some time at variance with that of the President.

When asked by a committee member what should be done to alert the country to the security problem, Mr. Sprague said: "I think there is one man in the United States who can do this effectively and that is the President * * * I believe * * * the danger is more serious than the President has expressed."

Mr. Lovett had already testified that he felt the United States is "doing less than its best" and that budgetary considerations are playing an increasing part in decisions."

But all this testimony, including that of Mr. Baxter, was dealing with a much broader field than that of an alleged "missile gap" or even military defense as a whole. Mr. Baxter, for example, said: "Nobody hates inflation more than college presidents. * * * But there are things that the American people spend a lot of money on that they could well do without, or with less of, in exchange for security."

One of the major questions about presidential leadership to which the White House should direct more attention thus emerges. It is the question whether the Government is doing all it should to make the American people as aware of the challenges facing them as they are, say, of the availability of swimming pools and motorboats.

How much of this leadership should the White House be expected to provide; how much should come from Congress? Is the administration satisfied with the national effort?

There is a widespread—possibly mistaken—impression that it is. But if so the satisfaction does not include all Republicans, let alone election-minded Democrats. The emergence of this fact is something the President himself will have to take more serious account of in the weeks and months ahead.

Is the SAC To Be Our Maginot Line?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Somersworth Free Press, one of the leading weekly newspapers in the State of New Hampshire, published and edited by Mr. John J. Ballentine of Somersworth, N.H., on February 25, 1960,

entitled "Is the SAC To Be Our Maginot Line?"

IS THE SAC TO BE OUR MAGINOT LINE?

The chamber of commerce delegation from Somersworth that spent several days in Washington last week arrived in the Nation's Capital in the very midst of the debates on defense. It seemed that everywhere, whether it was in formal committee hearings or in informal discussion among congressional leaders and their staffs, the uppermost questions of the hour centered around whether or not this country's military defense is as adequate to meet the Russian threat as President Eisenhower has been assuring it is.

And the very best opinion we got—and it came from Republicans as well as Democrats—was that the United States is woefully lacking in the type of defense that is needed to cope with the Soviet Union's military growth.

Our talks took us to experts in the Pentagon, to researchists in the Library of Congress, to the Members of our own congressional delegation. We came up with the conclusion that the present emphasis by this country on a defense system which centers around the Strategic Air Command (SAC) system is a weak system and one which is being fast outdated by the Russian's advances in space and missiles.

The United States, point out these people who are closest to the controversy, has placed its future security largely in the effectiveness of the nuclear-carrying bombers that are located at Pease Air Base in Portsmouth and at some 50 similar bases in this country. The location of all of these permanent bases is known to the Soviet Union. And the Soviets have nearly reached the long-range missile capacity to blast them to pieces. These are the missiles which Russia has provde can be fired over a 3,000 mile range with an accuracy that is close to 1.8 miles. Their supersonic speed and range capacities make the conventional bomber such as the B–47 or B–50 obsolete.

Our conversations in Washington with those people whose judgments is sound is that the United States has in its SAC defense system a second maginot line. What is needed is a complete revision of this country defensive and offensive military capacities to cope with the very real threat that is posed by a nation that has progressed far beyond us into the missile and space age.

Mountain Sheep Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, the Federal Power Commission will begin hearings on an application by a private power combine to build a dam at Mountain Sheep. This is another stage in the developing controversy over the middle Snake River, a controversy which is recognized by many people as bearing similarities to the historic battle over full development of Hells Canyon on the same river. I would like to enter into the RECORD the following editorial on this matter from the Record-Courier in my hometown of Baker:

[From the Record-Courier, Feb. 4, 1960]

MOUNTAIN SHEEP PROJECT

The State currently has under advisement the matter of issuing a permit for the Mountain Sheep Dam to a combine of private power companies at a site just above the mouth of Salmon River on the Snake River.

A similar decision rests with the people, for after all in recent years the resource development has come to be a matter of dumping comprehensive programs overboard and making the decisions upon a political basis.

As in the case of Hells Canyon, the Mountain Sheep power combine originally applied for lesser development—two lower dams with negative storage in comparison to regional needs. They were, however, turned down on this application, after it fell to a small group of persons fighting for full development of the water resource to battle the big, well-financed utility companies in the Federal power hearings on the original Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley two-dam plan. The FPC in the Hells Canyon case agreed with the resource development people that a high dam would be the better project for the public but in spite of this granted the Ipco three-dam license, and said that the public could get its storage and full development elsewhere to make up for the Hells Canyon waste.

After this ill-fated Hells Canyon decision the FPC could hardly do the same as Mountain Sheep-Pleasant Valley and so was virtually compelled, politically as well as resourcewise, to deny the license. Instead, it said a high dam was necessary on the Snake River.

At this juncture, facing the prospect of public control of upstream storage, the companies immediately agreed with the FPC and said that in spite of their effort to put over the lesser development they would be glad to build a higher dam—but not the best one.

It is at this point the companies (PPL, PGE, and WWP) applied for license to build the 690-foot Mountain Sheep Dam, the object of the present applications. It would block the higher Nez Perce project located below Salmon River and would also block a public dam proposed by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation at the Mountain Sheep site. It would also effectively block the fish runs on the main Snake River. A companion project, the Lower Canyon dam planned for the Salmon River and subject likewise to Federal license, could later block the fish runs of the Salmon River.

The companies in their big argument have enlisted many sportsmen, however, with the propaganda that the Mountain Sheep Dam would defeat Nez Perce Dam, a public site delayed for the future when the fish problem is solved. Sportsmen generally have felt that Nez Perce would wipe out fish runs on the Salmon River even though under current thinking it would not be built until it would be assured of fish solutions. Sportsmen also have been led to believe power companies would leave the Salmon River and its Lower Canyon site alone, a promise hardly borne out by the history of greed.

The tricompany Mountain Sheep Dam would block the Imnaha River. It is vaguely proposed that a $14 million fish canal and passage at the dam be built to convey the 6,000 steelhead and 9,000 salmon annually up the Imnaha. The canal would be built a distance of 17 miles in solid rock. (Figure the annual interest cost on this facility and you will see why on a per-fish basis this writer has contended they do not have a solution to the fish problem at this time.) The dam as yet has no solution to the fish problem on the main Snake.

Residents of Wallowa County favor the Mountain Sheep site as a promise of some construction prosperity, and the advantages of a lake in the canyon reaching back to the Hells Canyon site. The lack of any prosperity in these parts from the big Ipco projects, however, would seem to cancel out this hope, and there is no way of knowing what tremendous recreation benefits are being missed for not having the high Hells Canyon or ultimately the high Nez Perce Dam.

At any rate this is right in the middle of another big resource controversy. There is no one on the side of the public defending the full development of the water resource. The question is whether some of the original comprehensive plans are surviving through the administration's giveaway program sufficiently that in 1960 the people will realize how deficient single-purpose, private, incomplete development really is. Or possibly the development can be held off long enough till a new administration will again be willing to say "no" to wasteful exploitation.

Nothing in this present hearing has come to the attention of this writer to convince him that a private, single-purpose power company is competent to develop the multipurpose public resource in the public interest, waterwise, fishwise, storagewise, recreationwise or in any respect. At Mountain Sheep it is a stop-public development scheme, a desperate effort to never let the public get control of any major upstream storage site. It unfortunately, is a demonstration that the public is not powerful enough to stop private destruction of major resource values. No amount of pleading that at present there are no solutions to the fish problem has deterred the companies from rushing the blockades in the river.

By two yardsticks we are dubious about the monopoly dam scheme at Mountain Sheep First, it obviously is not the fullest development. Second, it gives no assurances that public values will be respected at a multipurpose public site.

History Shows Purpose of Politics Is To Rise to New Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in his newsletter for March 3, our able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] makes some most thought-provoking comments which go to the roots of the central problem facing our Nation today. Although these comments are addressed specifically to the Democratic Party, they point so cogently and sharply to the decision which we as a Nation must make soon if we are to continue our American tradition of greatness that I commend it to the attention of all thoughtful citizens regardless of party, and under unanimous consent I include this portion of our colleague's newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

WRIGHT PATMAN'S 1,280TH WEEKLY LETTER, FOR RELEASE MARCH 3, 1960, FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS, "HEART OF THE GULF SOUTHWEST"

PURPOSE OF POLITICS

"Political organization is not an end in itself but merely the framework in which hu-

man purposes can be fulfilled"—so writes, this week, C. Northcote Parkinson, a political scientist best known for his Parkinson's law.

The human purposes of political organization badly need redefining in relation to the problems of our times. The Democratic candidate who correctly perceives these purposes and states them in a clear and certain way—if there be such a candidate—will, I think, be the next President. The wide belief among politicians that the Republican's claim to peace and prosperity is unbeatable seems to me to misread history and to misread the minds of most of us today. Peace and prosperity has been amply defined: It means that all is well, that there are no threats to our survival, and that there are no problems at home except in the realm of Federal finance.

The era has long since passed when we could entertain ourselves with the notion that the Russians' productive efforts were sure to produce only a bungling comedy of errors. The era of hysteria has passed, when, after the Russians exploded the atom bomb, we imagined that Communists and spies were overrunning our Government and perhaps our churches. More recent events—such as the Russians' demonstrated superiority in missiles, space exploration, and perhaps scientific training—have led to an uneasy suspicion that all is not well; that the foremost challenge of our times is not, as the administration thinks, preserving the value of the dollar and balancing the Federal budget. Considered appraisals such as that of Mr. Allen Dulles suggesting that the Russian economy is expanding at a rate almost three times as fast as ours, while we pursue, with an almost religious zeal, tight-money and high-interest policies that both stunt our economic growth and retard our educational system, are far from comforting.

One of the most influential ideas of our times, whether we know its source or not, was expressed several years ago by Arnold Toynbee in his efforts to advance a theory of history. This is the idea that nations have either flourished or declined by the responses they have made to new challenges. Some have responded to new challenges and risen to new heights; others have failed to respond and have declined or disappeared. Peace and prosperity as we know it, does not meet the human purpose of our times.

Whether there will be a candidate who can perceive and state the human purposes the Democratic Party is to serve, no one can say. In recent years there has been little agreement among congressional Democrats as to what our purposes are. In the two last elections increasing majorities of Democrats were sent to Congress but, except for those from the farm areas, few have seemed to know why. About half have seemed to think the people are deeply disturbed and dissatisfied with the administration's handling of our Nation's affairs; the other half have seemed to think they were elected because "we have supported Ike's programs more than the Republicans." This is not to say that the Democrats are unworthy; it is only to say that the times cry for leadership.

We Build a School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1960

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address which I delivered at the dedication of the Narragansett Junior High School, Narragansett, R.I., on December 20, 1959:

WE BUILD A SCHOOL

(Address by JOHN E. FOGARTY)

It is always a very great joy and a privilege to assist in the dedication of a school. It is a particular pleasure to participate in such a dedication in a community such as Narragansett which reflects so clearly your dedication to the best interests of your young people, your faith in the future growth and well-being of the community, your understanding of the importance of education in a democracy, and your determination to meet the challenge of a new age.

We live in a State which has been closely identified with educational and cultural development since the earliest colonial times. We have a proud heritage from our ancestors who labored to create the founadtion of understanding on which our way of life is built. We are an optimistic people with faith and determination that we can meet the future with courage and integrity, and this fine new school which we dedicate today emphasizes those characteristics which keep democracy safe and strong.

These are challenging and crucial days in education because so much is happening. Within our own lifetime man has entered the age of atomic energy and space. He can transmit events with the velocity of light and travel faster than the speed of sound. His achievements in science and technology are spectacularly increasing, with the result that every other day seems to bring a new and breathtaking headline. This is having a profound effect upon public thinking in regard to education, upon public concern that the education our children receive shall be adequate to the needs of our times.

Because of my own great interest in educational progress and my particular good fortune to serve the Government at a time when that interest is shared to a high degree by the people of Rhode Island, it seems appropriate today to say a few words about the Federal-State relationship which exists between the schools and the National Government. It is a unique and satisfying relationship and one which has enabled us to strengthen our democracy and hold fast to the ideals of our forebears.

America has a proud history of local control and support of education. That concept was shaped and patterned by our early settlers and it is a pattern in which Americans believe wholeheartedly. We recognize that the schools belong to the people and that their strength is derived from the people. If the schools are to serve the varied interests and needs of the people, the people directly concerned must determine their procedures and their policies. We do not believe in Federal control of education but insofar as the purpose of education in a democracy is to prepare youth for alert and competent citizenship, we do believe in Federal responsibility.

Believing thus, and facing the gravest emergencies of our times, a year ago the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, a law which has been characterized by many people as one of the three most imporant milestones in the history of Federal action to strengthen our schools. It was my privilege to have been in the chair during the debate on this important legislation, and I was highly gratified, as were other friends of education, when the bill was enacted into law. It touches every level of education, public and private, from the elementary grades through the graduate schools, and is a major breakthrough in the effort to see that every young person, from the day he first enters school, should have an opportunity to develop his gifts to the fullest extent. It is the recognition that in a free society the individual is the first line of defense.

Under the forward-looking guidance of our State department of education and the ability and leadership of Commissioner Walsh, Rhode Island is participating in considerable measure in the benefits made possible by the National Defense Education Act.

Our young people are availing themselves of the student loan program; our schools have initiated a plan for strengthening science, mathematics, and foreign language. Our area vocational program, which is designed to provide people trained in critical areas of scientific development, is being accelerated. Rhode Island is one of the States which has long believed that wide guidance is essential to the educative process, and the Department of Education is substantially extending the testing program now being conducted. The tangible results we can expect from this effort in identifying students with outstanding ability should be truly impressive. In thinking about the results, however, we should remember that this effort is designed not merely to identify and enable the most gifted to make the most of their gifts. It is to help all children, regardless of the degree or extent of their talents, to take courses best suited to their ability.

Naturally, I am delighted and proud of the example set by the people of Rhode Island in their understanding and acceptance of this partnership with the Federal Government.

But regardless of Federal enactments or of State supervision, education must remain a local responsibility. This beautiful building which we are dedicating today is your building, built for your young people and, under the leadership of your board of education, to be used so that each girl and boy may find herein satisfaction and pleasure and may be led to the fulfillment of his or her greatest capacities.

The school curriculum and how it is taught are matters to be decided by your State Department, Commissioner Walsh, your local board, your superintendent and the citizens working with their chosen representatives. Yet it is rightly a concern of great importance to all of us that the school curriculum shall encompass the teaching of the fundamental skills and understandings which have made America strong and vigorous. We must have thorough learning of the three R's. We must delve more deeply into geography and history. We must increase our understanding of other peoples and nations.

We must reiterate and reemphasize, too, the old-fashioned virtues which have made America great but which are sometimes lost sight of in a frustrated and explosive world.

We must teach new competencies to give our children the tools with which they may hew out a path so clear that they shall not stumble or fall; we must teach truth, for only in the understanding of truth can man hold fast his dignity and his freedom; we must teach friendship, which is understanding and fair play and loyalty and honesty and integrity—for these are the binding substances of a free world. We must try to bring to every child the vision of freedom, the glory of democracy and the joy of an abiding faith.

Of these things you are well aware and you may be very proud of the record you have established, of the schools you have maintained, and of the leadership which holds them high.

I said that the schools belong to the people. And yet, in a very real sense, the schools belong neither to the people, the taxpayers, the teachers nor any other group, for all of us are only trustees and we hold the schools in trust for the benefit of our country, our community, our children and the generations to come. No school can ever be much better than the community wants it

to be, for it represents our strivings, our sacrifices, our dreams and our visions.

You have built a school. But this, too, you have builded:

Not so much a schoolhouse, as a fortress, a haven, a temple, a dream, a hope. Within these walls we protect our greatest treasures and guard our most important resources.

It is a privilege and an honor to dedicate this school as a living memorial to the past, to the men and women who lived, struggled and died that their sons and daughters might grow stronger and wiser than they; to dedicate this school as a living promise to the future, that those who follow us may be wiser and stronger and more understanding than are we.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of February 27, 1960:

WASHINTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The water pollution bill to double the present Federal spending brought both the year's first Presidential veto and attempt by the Democrat leadership to override it. The failed by 22 votes to muster the necessary two-thirds of those present and voting—the vote was 249 (234 Democrats to 15 Republicans) to 157 (130 Republicans to 27 Democrats). Three other Texans joined me in support of the President's position. The President, in denying the added spending beyond the present $50 million per year, recommended: (1) A national conference for the study of water pollution; (2) increased Federal authority to enforce provisions to prevent water pollution; (3) modest Federal funds for administrative purposes; and (4) research and technical assistance by Federal Government.

The President's veto message pointed out the essentially local nature of sewage treatment plant construction, warning that added Federal money would tempt municipalities to delay essential water pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds.

Arguments for doubling Federal expenditures: (1) More Federal funds will not delay but stimulate local construction; (2) foreign aid provides money to help other nations build sewage treatment plants, among other projects, so why not do more at home with Federal money.

Arguments against doubling present Federal expenditures: (1) This is $70 million yearly beyond the present budget; many other budget-busting spending bills are awaiting attention, and all adds up to the danger of more inflation; (2) local efforts now are providing the necessary water pollution abatement without more Federal money. For my part, I heartily agree with the President stressing the local nature of this problem and shall do my part, both to support sound Federal efforts to preserve local and State initiative and not to cheapen the dollar by inflationary Federal spending. Meanwhile, the 1956 program of expenditures goes right on despite the defeat of this bill. The double expenditure is the same amount requested by the bill's proponents 4 years ago when I was on the Public Works Committee.

In Congress, continued effort by a Member or Members to increase spending on any program generally bears fruit.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, as guest on this week's television program for Dallas (10:30 a.m. Sunday, WFAA-TV) stressed his belief in and effort toward freeing the farmer from Federal subsidy, regulation and control. He traced the wartime nature of our farm program and pointed out that only 5 crops of 250 are in trouble, and they (wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco) are the ones supported by Federal regulation and money; thus only a portion of our farmers are affected. (Therefore, only a percentage of the higher prices for groceries result from Government subsidy.) Taking wheat as an example (see Newsletter, Feb. 13), $1,000 per minute storage cost alone) Mr Benson recommends two actions: (1) Free farmers from Government regulation; (2) eliminate surpluses on hand by reducing supports. After a lifetime in agriculture, Secretary Benson displays great knowledge of the farmer and his needs. His knowledge is equalled by his courage. He agreed that if Congress does not act (and only Congress makes the law, not the administration of the President), the people may force the Congress to take action, as was done last year in the forced passage of a labor bill (over the objections of the House Democratic leadership).

The defense issue which stirs up mighty debates at appropriation time (more so in an election year) might be on the wane as a political football. As the facts come to the surface, forced out despite security precautions (not to broadcast our military plans and abilities), the overall strength of the United States is becoming better understood. Undestandably, the same vocal members of Congress who now are most critical are the same ones who most loudly demanded more Federal action and spending as a cure-all for recession. That was the political football then. As one member put it this week, "The perennial political pessimists who are selling America short on defense are just as wrong as they were 2 years ago when they forecast a depression for the country, willing to sell America short to further their own political careers." Fortunately, there are many Members of Congress left who do not underestimate the intelligence of our people, and have a respect for solving our problems by truth and the fact—not demagoguery.

Parkinson's two laws concerning what ails bureaucratic government are worth a chuckle, even as they spell out the truth. Law No. 1: "The more people there are on a job, the sooner it doesn't get done and, therefore, more people are always hired to help not complete it." Said another way, "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion" (ad infinitum). Law No. 2 (just out): "Expenditure rises to meet income." This means any anticipated budget surplus will never materialize if anticipated in time by the spenders to provide necessary expenditures. On the second point, an editorial suggests, "Expenditures rise without regard to income." This most certainly we have demonstrated over the last 25 years in Congress.

Lithuania, a Land in Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of my colleagues a splendid editorial commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day of February 16, and appearing in the Springfield Daily News of February 17:

LITHUANIA, A LAND IN BONDAGE

In his last words before his execution, one of the most famous of the Irish patriots of this century commended the Irish people for their faculty of retaining through centuries of misery the remembrance of lost liberty.

However, the Irish are not alone in that experience. Through the centuries, there have been more slaves than freemen, more subjects than citizens, more in chains than at liberty.

There is no greater joy than freedom won, but there is no greater tragedy than freedom lost. Liberty sharpens the appetite for liberty, and a people who have won freedom and then have it taken from them hunger for it more passionately even than those who have never tasted it, and do not know its sweetness.

Today should begin Lithuania's 43d year of freedom. At the end of World War I, that small Baltic land proclaimed its independence, and it was recognized by most of the world's powers. However, in 1940, Russian troops occupied Lithuania and the once-indepndent state became the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, which is not Lithuanian, nor socialistic, nor a republic. It is Soviet.

Nowhere is the Iron Curtain tighter than in Lithuania. Behind that black shield, Russia is destroying a nation, and it will not permit foreign diplomats or newspapermen to view the scene of the crime.

Some 3 million people, if that many survive, have tasted freedom and are now in bondage. There can be no celebration in Lithuania, nor in this country where hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have found the freedom denied their brothers in the homeland.

Lenten Services at the Lutheran Church of the Reformation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a copy of a letter from Rev. Lawrence D. Folkemer, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, 212 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. We are sure Members of the House and Senate will be glad to accept the cordial invitation of the Lutheran Church to attend Lenten services. The Church of the Reformation is located only a few blocks east of the Capitol.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1960.

To Members of the Congress and their Staff.

DEAR FRIENDS: For many years, noonday Lenten services have been conducted at the Church of the Reformation for the community on Capitol Hill. These services have been a source of inspiration for thousands of men and women who have desired a short period of each day for meditation, prayer, and rest. Lent has historically given Christians an opportunity to deepen their spiritual life and to face their daily tasks with renewed faith and devotion.

The services are interdenominational in nature. Guest clergymen from all denomi-

nations are invited to speak. Lent is a fitting season for people of all churches to worship their common Lord. Very often Members of the Congress attend together and worship with those of their staff.

It is our special hope that our Congressmen will be able to attend the first service on Ash Wednesday, March 2, from 12:05 to 12:30, the first day of the sacred Lenten season. Special prayers will be offered in behalf of our President and our Nation's leaders in these trying times.

May we cordially invite you to attend and make available this invitation also to the members of your staff.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE D. FOLKEMER,
Pastor.

The Advertising Gold Medal Award for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following remarks which were delivered on February 18, 1960, by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, during ceremonies at which he was presented the Printer's Ink Gold Medal Award for 1959. Dr. Stanton has placed in perspective the basic questions involved in Government regulation of broadcasting, and has done so clearly, succinctly, and persuasively:

I am most grateful for this award—the more so because it comes at a time when broadcasting is the object of less than universal admiration. Selecting me for a place in the long line of recipients of the gold medal awards falls, I am afraid, somewhat short of wisdom. But it certainly speaks well for the jury's courage.

The fact is that anyone in broadcasting is rather easily moved by honors these days. We have become somewhat more expert in the acceptance and usages of censure. This expertise we acquired the had way—by direct exposure. I have even begun to take an interest—thus far academic, for the most part—in epithets. Let me quote you some:

"Base, servile, venal polluted the foundations of society—the most ignorant, mercenary, and vulgar automatons that ever were moved by the continually rusting wires of sordid mercantile avarice."

However familiar these denunciations may seem to you, they were not taken from a column of television criticism, a seminar on mass communications, or a Washington hearing. They are not even a concomitant of the age of advertising. They were used on March 4, 1799, to describe the state of the press in the United States. And they were used, not by an outsider, but by John Ward Fenno, editor of the leading newspaper of the day, and presumably an expert.

I bring all this up nearly two centuries afterwards for, I think, very good reason. I do not do it necessarily to remind you that the older media have also had their troubles—reassuring as the contemplation of that fact might be to me at the moment. The real point is that the editor of an outstanding newspaper made this scathing indictment of his own field a year after the United States had undertaken, in the Sedition Act of 1798, the only statutory venture in our history aimed at the direct control of a medium of expression. Nor was Fenno alone in his opinion. Another editor the same year accused the press of "mawkishness, dreariness, and gross folly."

After four editors were jailed under the Sedition Act for criticizing the Government, the law was abandoned—killed off by public opinion. But the notion of getting a more responsible medium of expression by legislative action has persisted throughout our history. Every time that any vehicle of expression, any medium of communication, any institution of culture or education has widespread public attention concentrated on a weakness or a failure or even a dilemma, there are always demands that "there ought to be a law."

The road to utopia by Government regulation looks invitingly easy. And it is easy.

The easiest way for us in television to duck responsibility for the tough business of planning balanced programing is to default and say to the Government, "You tell us what to do, and we'll do it."

The easiest way is to let some Government agency fix the percentage of the day's programing that will be hard news, the percentage that will be serious drama, the percentage that will be classical music and the percentage that will be westerns. The easiest way is to sidetrack competition altogether—every network doing exactly what the Government prescribes and not one risky whit more. The easiest way is to dump into the laps of Government the most challenging problem of television—the achievement of that elusive, arduous, perplexing objective of a democracy: meeting the will of the majority and at the same time accommodating the rights and interests of minorities.

Government prescription is the easiest way. But it's also the irresponsible way. It promises imaginary short-term gains at the price of real long-term loss. It is a way full of delusions, traps, and unending enmeshments. It is based on fallacies almost inevitable in any attempt to shortcut normal growth in any area of expression. And in the end it leads, not to utopia, but to weakness, timidity, uniformity, and stagnation.

Sometimes from surprising quarters usually dedicated to freedom and ordinarily keenly sensitive to any Government intrusion into expression in America, the argument is advanced that, because there is a technical limit on the number of television channels available, the Government should be empowered to regulate what is broadcast on those channels. This is an unrealistic as well as a shortsighted view. The Government is no more competent to dictate the contents of a medium that has technical limitations on the number of its outlets than it is to dictate to those that have economic limitations.

Once the Government tells three television stations in a city what they must broadcast, how long does anybody suppose it would be before the Government also tells the only newspaper in town what it must print? Most metropolitan centers in the United States have more competing television stations than competing mass circulation dailies. Indeed, today there are only 12 metropolitan centers with three or more dailies; there are four times that many cities with three or more television stations. It would be as logical to seek constitutional reforms to impose Government standards on newspapers because their number is limited by economics, as to regulate programing on television stations because their number is limited by the spectrum.

It is not at all helping that those who would regulate television programing protest that they would concern themselves only with cultural and entertainment material and leave the news alone. What sort of arbitrary definition—and whose?—is to determine what in informational, what is cultural, and what is entertaining? Last night the "Circle Theater" presented a dramatic exposition of the city of Pittsburgh's noteworthy method of dealing with juvenile delinquency. Was this primarily entertainment? Was it sociology? Or was it news? Not only would such distinctions be impossibly difficult, they are very apt to be contradictory in some cases and almost wholly overlapping in others.

No thoughtful observer wants to restrict the application of the tenets of a free press to what some agency in Washington defines as news. If the principle is once established that the Government has the right to supervise everything else in communications or expression, I don't think it would make any difference whether we got what was clinically tested as news or not. To have freedom merely to report events in your own way, to cover those you want to, and to omit others, to edit—essential as such freedom is—is only the beginning of a free press. For isolated events are merely fragments of experience reflecting the national character. The formative powers are rooted deep in other areas of expression—a fact that Prof. William Ernest Hocking established, in fine and perceptive phrasing, in his "Freedom of the Press: A Framework of Principle":

"Neither the value nor the duty of expression is limited to its more purposeful aspects. Speech and press may be trivial, casual, emotional, amusing, imaginative, speculative, whimsical, foolish; all utterance serves a social end—to report to fellow beings mutual presence and interest, the play of mood, the vagaries of taste, the gropings for principle, the barometric flux of belief and disbelief, hope and fear, love and hate, and thus to shape attitudes * * * there is a common duty to protect the whole range of this freedom, as a right of social existence."

Advocates of Government control of television programing have also spoken in such gentle terms as "guidelines." We ought not to be misled by these. I would be as repelled by a newspaper "guided" by Government as one controlled by it. If the guidance has no element of force in it, it would have no significance. If it does have force, it is merely a euphemism for Government control. There is no such thing as "a little" Government control. Any control at all is repugnant to all our values and a damper on creativity and the stimulation of freely competing expression. A society that sees one more Indian bite the dust on television is far safer than a society that sees one iota of its freedom of expression given up to its government.

I am familiar with the hypothesis that we could evolve some kind of responsible commission, made up of eminent altruistic citizens appointed by the Government to review and report on television periodically. But unless they had punitive powers, what would it mean? Television is already reviewed regularly by some of the most articulate people in the American press. Great and powerful publications, moreover, frequently editorialize on what we have done that we ought not to have done and what we have left undone that we ought to have done. They examine not only the substance of our programing but also our policies, our trends, our economics, our personnel, and even our private deliberations. There is nothing left for a commission to review.

Suppose, on the other hand, the hypothetical commission is given real teeth to enforce its standards. Then we are in the dilemma that dependence on benevolent despots always involves. There is no way to tell whether they will remain benevolent or whether their successors will be benevolent at all. Walter Lippmann spelled this out very plainly in "The Good Society," in his

discussion of the flaw in "planning" social improvements:

"Not only is it impossible for the people to control the plan, but what is more, the planners must control the people. * * * By a kind of tragic irony, the search for security and a rational society, if it seeks salvation through political authority, ends in the most irrational form of government imaginable—in the dictatorship of casual oligarchs. * * * The reformers who are staking their hopes on good despots, because they are so eager to plan the future, leave unplanned that on which all their hopes depend: The selection of the despots who are to make society so rational and so secure has to be left to the insecurity of irrational chance."

This whole theory of benevolent censorship—anticipatory or by way of review—is mischievous doctrine. There is no conceivable way that it can be limited in degree or in nature. Control of what goes out over the airwaves is no more justified than control of what is distributed by the postal system. The second-class mailing privilege—as vital to many publications as the airwaves to broadcasters—should not be withheld from any magazine because it will not submit its editorial contents to review by a commission. Newspapers should not be required to yield control of editorials and features to a commission because economic facts preclude an unlimited number of papers in the community.

Regulation is just the wrong, the precipitous, the penny-wise, pound-foolish way of seeking improvement.

The truth of the matter is that the road to utopia is hard and rocky and uncharted. No one is satisfied with television when he considers the unlimited potentialities of the medium. Each of us looks at it from the little window framed by his own values and concerns—and knows that it could be better. But the thoughtful man knows also that improvement will come hard and slow after many a false start, after many years of trial and error, and, above all, by facing realities rather than attempting to evade them.

I cannot share the defeatist view that, if the Government does not take the improvement of television programing under its control, there will be no improvement at all. There is nothing in our national experience to support this view. The fact of the matter is that any worthwhile improvement must have a deeper and sounder foundation than Government policing. It seems to me that such a foundation consists in the stake that all of us in this country have in a vigorous, freely competing, unrestricted television medium.

At this particular moment in history, all of us—whatever our individual interests—have one overriding common interest: that in this rapidly moving age of conflict, the democratic process does not go down—a lumbering anachronism, the victim of totalitarian swiftness and directness. In this decisive battle, the immediacy, the speed, and the impact of television can be decisive factors in informing the American people during crises and creating a prompt feedback of the sense and purpose of the people to the Government. It is both a lesson of history and ordinary commonsense that this function cannot be carried out except in an atmosphere of freedom.

All of us here also have a special stake in a free television because we are all devoted to a free and expanding economy. The stimulative effect of television on that economy has been tremendous. None of us can afford to let it stagnate and fall short of its highest capacities; if we do, its strength as a medium will so deteriorate that it won't be worth saving.

All of us recognize that, because of the unique characteristics of the medium and the speed of its growth, the problems facing television are complex and, in some respects, unprecedented. The major part of the burden in solving these problems must rest with the broadcaster. We have fully acknowledged this responsibility and intend to discharge it. But we cannot, and should not, withdraw from the world of which we are a part and make command decisions. A trust in a democratic society is given, not in a context of isolated authority, but on the assumption that one will have constant reference to the values and objectives of his fellow citizens.

We may be slow in perceiving these. We may be in need of a better, surer way of determining them. But we are aware of them, and we mean to respect them. For television will begin to reach toward its utopia only when it has full confidence that it is realizing in one way or another the values and objectives of all the people. This means not just always catering to the majority, but also taking into account and respecting intellectual and esthetic minorities.

The quest for utopia always falls short of achievement. But it is the quest itself that is important—not the illusion that we will ever achieve perfection. I hope that in our quest we will not be lured into shortcuts that turn out to be dead ends or seek remedies more devastating than the ills they are supposed to cure. I am for undertaking the quest the hard way, the responsible way, the enduring way.

If I may take away one meaning from this highly flattering occasion, it is the conviction that I am not alone.

South American Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the world continues to shrink in size as our giant jet airliners link nations and people together. People-to-people contact of the finest kind results from such quick air transportation. Braniff plays a part in binding closely the nations of the Western Hemisphere. A recent demonstration of this linkage by airline was the preinaugural survey of Braniff Airways' jet transport service to Lima, Rio, Sao Paulo, and Buenos Aires. The following account from the February 29, 1960, issue of Aviation Week, by Robert Hotz, points out the economic and diplomatic possibilities in this increased transportation service:

[From Aviation Week, Feb. 29, 1960]

SOUTH AMERICAN SWING

(By Robert Hotz)

We have just returned from a 15,000-mile swing through South American summer accomplished in less than a day and a half total flying time that provided a remarkable demonstration of the impact jet transports will have on that part of the world and of the effectiveness of the type of person-to-person diplomacy that President Eisenhower so often talks about. The occasion was a preinaugural survey of Braniff Airways' jet transport service to Lima, Rio, Sao Paulo, and Buenos Aires to begin regular operation in April. Preinaugural junkets are a routine hallmark of the airline business, but every once in a while there is a fortunate combination of circumstances that produces an experience that goes far beyond the routine junket. This Braniff expedition led by its dapper president, Charles E. Beard, was one of those notable exceptions.

First, the aircraft was something out of the ordinary. We have flown in both the Boeing 707–120 on domestic service and the 707–320 on international runs, but the 707–227 selected by Braniff is a far different beast. It is a hotrod version that retains the smaller airframe and lower gross weight of the domestic 120 but is powered by the larger Pratt & Whitney J75 turbojets of the intercontinental 320. Braniff picked this version primarily to be able to use existing airports along its route without any runway additions, but it also provides a significant speed advantage with its 626 miles per hour maximum cruise on domestic routes plus a long-range stretch of 3,500 miles on the international routes. The takeoff and climb performance of the 707–227 at high gross weights was truly startling, particularly on the blistering better than 100° F. temperatures on the runways at Rio and Asunción, and the thrust reversers left ample concrete remaining after landings before taxi turnoffs.

CONTRACTING FLIGHT TIME

As H. M. "Jack" Horner, chairman of United Aircraft Corp. whose Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division makes the J–75 remarked: "Isn't it fun to fly on an overpowered aircraft for a change?" Braniff pilots, Ted Raines and Jack Thomas, demonstrated the long-range cruise techniques at 560 miles per hour airspeed with nonstop legs of 3,276 miles from Houston to Lima in 6 hours 20 minutes and Asunción to Panama (3,319 miles) in 6 hours 26 minutes. The entire 15,128-mile circuit, plus five local demonstration flights carrying nearly 500 South Americans, was made, in the words of Ted Raines, "without one iota of mechanical trouble."

It is obvious from the way they shrink South America's great distances in relative comfort, that the Braniff jets and those of other airlines and manufacturers will play a significant role in binding the cultural and commercial and political destinies of the two hemispheres closer together.

Aside from the impact of its flying equipment, the trip was also notable for its vivid and unique glimpses of this continent from the air and its unusual contacts with its people and leaders on the ground. Some of the air vignettes are unforgettable, the spuming white crescents and spidery white lace of Igacu Falls on the Parana River where Brazil, Paraguay, and the Argentine meet. These 17 separate falls plunging over the rock shelf dwarf Niagara and are seldom seen from a jet transport circling 1,500 feet over the green sea of jungle. The panorama of Brasilia, the new capital of Brazil being hacked from virgin soil of this vast country's interior, also unfolded on another low altitude descent. The wonder of this sight was more in how much already has been completed than in the magnitude of the job still to be done.

Later, in the cool, bright summer of Petropolis, Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek, with map unfolded tracing the course of his country's frontier westward, gave meaning to this milestone in his country's expansion of its westward frontier and left little doubt of his determination to merge its regional patterns into an integral nation.

SHIRTSLEEVE DIPLOMACY

At every stop—in the flowering oasis of Lima set in the arid deserts and mountains of the west coast; in the steaming heat of Rio's matchless beauty; in the park-like atmosphere of the Argentine countryside and the cosmopolitan air of Buenos Aires, the quantity and quality of local residents who turned out to met this traveling group of journalists, financiers, and businessmen was evidence of the sound sympatico relations Braniff has cultivated in the areas it serves

and the effectiveness of its shirtsleeve diplomacy.

And, nowhere, of course, is the need for expanded modern air transport greater than in the vast expanse of South America, with its paucity of good surface transport and its acute requirement to move its natural resources and raw materials to processing centers and to distribute food and goods to its population.

South America's economic development already has been aided immeasurably by the network of local and U.S.-flag airlines that now lace the Southern Hemisphere. More than 90 percent of the current air travel between North and South America is business and diplomatic. The great North American tourist market has hardly been tapped in this direction. But, just as the 300 miles per hour piston-powered transport that put Europe only 24 hours from the United States stimulated the tourist boom in that direction, so will the 500-600 miles per hour jet transport provide the impetus to open South America to a similar travel flow.

Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 19 the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express made the following editorial comments regarding the so-called Connally amendment which have inspired much mail from home on this subject:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Evening Herald Express, Feb. 19, 1960]

CONNALLY AMENDMENT

The sponsors of the current attempt to repeal the Connally amendment are playing with dangerous fire which could consume the United States in the flames of world communism.

Are the people of this country willing to take such a desperate gamble with the liberties won for us so bravely first in the Revolutionary War and protected so zealously since then in military conflict which included two World Wars?

What is the Connally amendment?

Congress accepted and passed into law in 1946 the theory of the International Court of Justice, more commonly known as the World Court, of which the United States and other United Nations countries became members.

Under the original plan, all nations would have been bound to accept decisions of this World Court respecting them, without exception.

But Senator Tom Connally saw danger in this unqualified commitment and proposed the six-word Connally amendment to provide protection for the United States against international injustice.

This specified that this country accepted jurisdiction of the World Court except in cases of a domestic nature "as determined by the United States." Those final six words quoted constitute the Connally amendment.

Other nations adopted similar protective laws for their governments.

The current move to repeal the Connally amendment, on which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now holding hearings, stems from a resolution introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Minnesota Democrat and presidential candidate.

His motion, Senate Joint Resolution 94, would force the United States to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation."

The vast majority of Americans hope continually for world peace.

But it is our belief that this is not the proper time to relax the safeguards of the Connally amendment; because no strong assurances have been given that other nations, including the Iron Curtain countries, will play fair.

Let us consider a few of the awful possibilities of what the World Court could do to the United States.

Suppose an issue would be brought before the International Court of Justice that the United States, which built and always has maintained the Panama Canal and its defenses, must relinquish all connection with the canal, turning it back to Panama or transforming it into an international project.

Suppose the difficulties between the United States and Cuba should be determined in a manner entirely inimical to the defenses of U.S. security.

Suppose the Court should attempt to ban advanced U.S. military bases around the world, at present considered the main deterrent to war.

Or determine other important world issues which could wreck this nation.

Would this not amount to national suicide?

We hope that all of our readers will take sufficient interest in this grave issue to write to their Senators and Congressmen expressing their opinions.

Tax Confusion Causes Unfair Criticism of Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our farmer and consumer cooperatives, which have made such a great contribution to the economic welfare of our country, have been exposed to much criticism and adverse publicity because of the confusion over their tax status. The situation has resulted from recent court decisions which hold that patronage refunds distributed to patrons in a form other than cash are not income to the recipient unless shown to have a definite market value. These decisions are contrary to the intent of the Internal Revenue Act of 1951.

Anticooperative forces have seized this opportunity to advance tax proposals that are aimed not at tax equality, but at crippling the cooperatives. An example of this is the proposal that all cooperatives be required to refund patronage capital to patrons in cash within 3 years of receipt and to pay 4 percent cash dividends on patronage capital retained for that period.

At the February 16 meeting of the board of Dairyland Power Cooperative, La Crosse, Wis., the directors passed a resolution calling on Congress to adopt legislation to clarify the problem by stating in so many words that noncash patronage dividends are taxable to the patron in the year received. I would like to include Dairyland's resolution in the RECORD:

Dairyland Power Cooperative, through its board of directors, has reviewed the proposal of the U.S. Treasury Department to require all cooperatives to refund patronage capital to patrons in cash within 3 years of receipt and to require them to pay 4-percent cash dividends on patronage capital retained for such period.

Such a proposal is discriminatory and is obviously intended to cripple the sound operation of farmer and consumer cooperatives. It is inconceivable that it should be given serious consideration by Congressmen and Senators who appreciate the important role played by cooperatives in our rural economy.

The board of directors of Dairyland are appreciative of the criticism which may be levied at cooperatives and the income tax status of retained patronage capital as the result of court decisions, acquiesced in by the Internal Revenue Service, holding that patronage refunds distributed to patrons in a form other than cash is not income to the recipient unless shown to have a definite market value.

These court decisions, and the Internal Revenue Service regulation following them, run counter to the intention of the Internal Revenue Act of 1951 and the time-honored policy applicable to the taxation of patronage dividends distributed other than in cash.

To meet this problem, the board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative urges Congress to adopt legislation which would clarify the problem and expressly provide that noncash patronage dividends or refunds constituting taxable income be taxable to the patron at par in the year received. Such a provision would carry out the intent of the Revenue Act of 1951.

Illinois Court Rules Customers Should Get Benefit of Federal Subsidies to Private Power Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the other day I commented on the disposition that the private power companies are making of the approximately $1½ billion worth of subsidies they are receving under the accelerated amortization program. I pointed out that many of the private power companies are passing on this generous windfall to their stockholders, but that in some States the public utilities commissions are insisting that these benefits from the Federal subsidies be passed on to the customers from whose pockets the money originally came. In this connection, the Illinois Supreme Court, in a recent decision, has also agreed with this point of view as reported in the following excerpt from the weekly APPA Newsletter. Those of us who have deplored the granting of these subsidies in the first place find some satisfaction in the news that the customers will benefit from them.

The excerpt from the newsletter follows:

ILLINOIS COURT RULES RATEPAYERS MUST GET BENEFIT OF LIBERALIZED DEPRECIATION

The Illinois Supreme Court, in a precedent-setting ruling, has declared that the State commerce commission erred in allowing a water utility to charge rates which did not reflect the utility's savings through liberalized depreciation. The court's decision is expected to affect future rates of all utilities in Illinois.

The case went to the high court after the Illinois commission had granted a rate boost to the Alton Water Co. Cities and industries served by the water company intervened and opposed the 47½ percent rate increase and, when the commission ruled against them, took the issue to court.

In upholding a lower court decision, appealed by both the water company and the State commission, the supreme court declared:

"The commission allowed the company to subtract from gross income as a current expense not only Federal taxes actually paid but also an amount equal to the saving produced by the use of accelerated depreciation—that is, the difference between actual taxes and the taxes which would have been due if normal straight-line depreciation had been employed. This amount is credited to a special account which may not be used for dividend distribution to shareholders or transferred to surplus.

"We agree with the lower court that the commission's approach was erroneous and that only actual tax expenses should have been allowed," the supreme court said.

Noting that these reserve funds could be used for plant expansion and that the resulting new properties "would presumably be included in the rate base," the court said: "Consumers will then be forced not only to contribute the prepayments but to pay a return on them for the benefit of the shareholders, who will thus receive a return on money they did not invest in the company. This result cannot be approved."

The court noted that the liberalized depreciation section of the tax law is intended to stimulate expansion "particularly in high risk, growing and small businesses." Since utilities are allowed a rate of return "calculated to attract the capital required for necessary expansion * * * the purpose of section 167 would not be thwarted nor would discrimination be introduced into the Federal tax law by requiring utilities to pass the savings of accelerated depreciation on to its customers."

Figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission show that five private power companies in Illinois have collected $25.5 million more in taxes from their consumers than they have paid to the Federal Government, by using section 167 of the Federal tax law. In addition, these five companies, plus another small utility, have collected an additional $13 million from their consumers, by using defense-related fast tax writeoffs, under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The total accumulated tax deferrals—which the Illinois Supreme Court in the recent water company decision called a forced, interest-free loan from the present consumers for the benefit of the utility—for these companies at the end of 1958 under both sections 167 and 168 are: Central Illinois Gas & Electric Co., $1,744,969; Central Illinois Light Co., $3,013,000; Central Illinois Public Service Co., $2,553,000; Commonwealth Edison Co., $20,920,000; Illinois Power Co., $10,224,000; and Mount Carmel Public Utility Co., $54,765.

Book Review: "Communist China and Asia"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 17, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our China policy must be changed drastically—and soon. It is leading us away from effective controlled disarmament and toward World War III. The Conlon report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last November made this clear. So, apparently, does A. Doak Barnett, a leading authority in this field, in his just-published book, "Communist China and Asia," published for the Council on Foreign Relations by Harper & Bros., New York.

Under a previous consent I am including herein the review by Henry R. Lieberman from the New York Times book review section, February 28, 1960. Mr. Lieberman was a Far Eastern correspondent for 12 years following World War II and is now assistant foreign news editor of the Times. His review follows:

THE PROBLEM WHOSE NUCLEUS IS PEIPING—REVIEW OF BOOK ENTITLED "COMMUNIST CHINA AND ASIA," BY A. DOAK BARNETT

(By Henry R. Lieberman)

This is clearly one of the best analytical reports on Comunist China and Asia that has yet appeared in print. It may even be the best.

A. Doak Barnett's book is no journalistic "quickie." Published under the auspices of the Council on Foreign Relations, it is a solid piece of work by an American who was born in China, who has spent years traveling in and around that country both as a student and reporter, who has supplemented this with extra research, who thinks clearly, writes lucidly and who has no particular ax to grind.

Mercifully, Mr. Barnett comes at the reader not with pitchforks, but with documented facts and plausible, if sometimes arguable, conclusions. Although he has his own views of American China policy, and states them forcefully, he has not ignored other views based on the same facts.

In developing his analysis of the challenge posed by the Chinese Communists in Asia, Mr. Barnett makes these key points:

1. There is considerable evidence of disaffection in Red China, but the Peiping Government has established tight authoritarian control, and there are no indications that its rule is under serious domestic threat.

2. Peiping's leaders are determined that Red China shall play the role of a great power. They are making every effort to develop rapidly China's industrial, scientific and military capacities.

3. The Sino-Soviet alliance is not monolithic; there have been signs of differences between Peiping and Moscow. But the available evidence in recent years indicates a strengthening rather than weakening of this Communist Axis, and there seems little immediate prospect of an open split.

4. The United States and other non-Communist nations are involved in a long-term struggle with Red China throughout Asia. A heavy commitment of American resources, "intellectual and moral as well as material," will be required to check Peiping's spreading influence and shore up non-Communist Asian states.

Red China's weltanschaung, as examined by Mr. Barnett, envisages a continuing worldwide struggle between the forces of communism and the forces of "imperialism" (noncommunism). Generally, he notes, Peiping tends to regard the world as split into three main groups: the Communist bloc, the newly independent uncommitted countries and the imperialist bloc led by the United States.

While seeking to curry favor with the neutralist nations, and sometimes falling over its own feet in the process—as in the cases of India, Indonesia and Burma—Red China looks upon the United States as the "No. 1 enemy" and the prime target for all Communists. Mr. Barnett notes in his analysis that Peiping is determined not only to absorb United States-supported Taiwan as part of Communist China, but also to drive United States influence from Asia.

"The prospect of a prolonged struggle between the United States and Communist China is not a comforting one, especially for those Americans who seek quick solutions to all international problems," he writes. "Yet, this is what the immediate future holds. The best that the United States can hope for is that this struggle can be waged primarily by nonmilitary means, and if the United States acts wisely and effectively, this seems to be at least possible."

On the controversial issue of U.S. recognition of Red China, Mr. Barnett points out that the extreme views expressed on both sides of this question have tended to obscure the more important long-term question of how to deal with the China problem. Thus far, we have applied what he calls a policy of limited pressure. Mr. Barnett suggests that a two-China policy coupled with a policy of strong American support of non-Communist Asian states might achieve more effective results. The two-China idea involves international acceptance of two Chinese Governments: one in Peiping, controling mainland China; the other in Tapei, controlling the Taiwan and the Pescadores.

As part of the two-China approach, Mr. Barnett proposes effective action to persuade the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate the offshore islands they hold near mainland China. But he advocates continued rejection of Peiping's claim to Taiwan itself, and he calls for efforts to induce some of the United States' allies to commit themselves to the defense of Taiwan.

Mr. Barnett emphasizes the need to bring American China policy more closely in line with the approaches of other non-Communist countries as a means of making our China policy more effective. He also urges increased efforts to open up certain channels of nonofficial contact with Red China and the gradual relaxation of existing restrictions on trade, except for strategic goods.

None of these moves would solve the basic problem, Mr. Barnett concedes. He feels, however, that such steps could reduce many of the dangers and bring about wider international support for the American position in Asia.

He writes: "American policymakers have reacted strongly against the oft-made charges that they have been 'inflexible' in their approach to China policy. In practice, however, they have consistently maintained in recent years that any substantial change of any important aspect of American policy toward China would result in undermining

the whole policy, thus weakening the entire non-Communist position in Asia."

In this reviewer's mind, there is still a question about the wisdom of our forcing a Nationalist evacuation of the "offshore islands" before the achievement of some kind of modus vivendi settlement along the China coast.

The fact remains, nevertheless, that Mr. Barnett has done an excellent job. Perhaps the chief value of his book is that it provides an authoritative background and unemotional setting for further intelligent discussion of the China problem.

Educational Readjustment Assistance to Veterans Who Serve in the Armed Forces Between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, soon there will come before the House for consideration a Senate-passed bill, S. 1138, which provides educational and vocational training, rehabilitation training for service-connected disabilities, and loans for homes, farms, livestock, farm machinery, and otherwise closely parallels the World War II and Korean GI bills. The principal feature of this bill is the educational opportunity it will afford our young men and women who serve in the military service of their country during the peacetime years of 1955 through 1963.

Testimony before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has clearly shown the greatest asset this country has is the brains and intellectual potential of its young people. Failure of the United States to develop the minds and skills of its young and strong is one of the greatest crimes of our age. Testimony has shown that this country will, in the very near future, be repaid in full for all expense it was put to in providing educational training for the GIs of World War II and Korea. Yet this investment will continue to produce a financial, productive, and technological return for the next 30 years or more. The Senate has seen the wisdom of enabling ex-GI's to gain an education with Government help—yet there are powerful forces, including the Departments of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, which oppose this legislation.

The Defense Department opposes it maintaining it tends to cause some enlistees or draftees not to reenlist. They have found, in the past, that 45 percent of those separating from the service did so to take advantage of educational opportunities afforded by the GI bill of rights I believe this is a wonderful tribute to modern American youth who have the desire to learn and be of greater value to themselves, their families and their country. On the basis of testimony offered by the Defense Department, approximately 100,000 young men are being inducted into service each year. The majority of these men receive from 9 to 21 weeks of technical training. About 50 percent of those trained are in the lower schools and 50 percent are in the higher technical schools, such as electronics and mechanics.

Would it not be a wonderful thing to permit young men who have served and will serve their country in the next few years to go on to college under the GI bill of rights and equip themselves to render greater service to their country and to their home communities? The cost to the Government would be slight and the Government would get it back many times over during the lifetime of the GI's benefited. It is narrow thinking on the part of the Defense Department officials to deny boys and girls who have served their country the opportunity of finacial assistance toward an education, merely because the various branches of the military do not want to be bothered with training new recruits to take the place of those who leave to go back to school.

I am hopeful that Members of this House will acquaint themselves with the provisions of S. 1138, passed by the Senate on July 21, 1959, and make it possible for GI's and WAC's to secure a higher education.

The Need for Outside Help in Cleaning Up Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 29, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, when I voted on last Thursday to override President Eisenhower's unfortunate veto of H.R. 3610, the bill that would have made a modest increase in annual funds available to help local communities in building sewage treatment facilities to end pollution of our Nation's lakes and rivers, I pointed out the serious squeeze confronting at least three major cities in my own district in upstate New York—Amsterdam, Gloversville, and Johnstown.

These cities have been ordered by the State of New York to construct costly sewage treatment plants before a fixed deadline. Yet in each case the local tax revenues to underwrite such construction are simply not available, and the State has offered no financial assistance to help these communities carry out the State's own mandate.

Hence, either the Federal Government steps in to help these local communities help themselves in meeting their serious pollution problems, or else the needed sewage treatment facilities just don't get built. It's as simple as that. What these cities face, Mr. Speaker, is not a theory but a condition. With the knowledge they might be able to get some modest Federal help in meeting their problem, they would have been stimulated to move ahead to help themselves and finance their own local share. Without such help their financial problem is almost insurmountable and their river and streams will have to remain polluted.

It is true, of course, that in spite of the President's veto the present program of Federal assistance will continue in effect with annual appropriations expected at the rate of some $45 million a year—of which roughly $2.7 million will be allocated for projects in New York State. But the backlog of requests for such help is already so great that chances of any one city getting help from these limited funds within the foreseeable future are slim indeed.

Mr. Speaker, to point up the urgent need of these cities I have the honor to represent, a need which prompted me to try to try to help them by supporting the expanded program the President rejected, I desire to include herewith editorials from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of February 26 and the Gloversville Leader-Herald of February 25 which discuss this situation objectively and certainly from a most nonpartisan point of view.

The editorials follow:

[From the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, Feb. 26, 1960]

OUR POLLUTION PROBLEM

The current session of Congress has suffered its first veto. President Eisenhower rejected the bill which would have increased Federal appropriations to deal with stream pollution.

Ending water pollution is an essential matter. Carelessness in the past has permitted many of our streams to become so contaminated that even fish shun them. But the expense involved creates a problem for which no one has offered a solution.

For several communities in our area the pollution problem is of paramount importance. The Mohawk River has been adjudged polluted to the point where it constitutes a health menace. Communities along its banks discharge untreated sewage in such quantities that the stream, noted for its natural beauty, has become an exposed sewer.

A solution is possible through only one effective means. This sewage must be treated in disposal plants which eliminate health hazards. But such plants would represent tremendous expense. So much so that more than one community in this part of the Mohawk Valley would face bankruptcy if they were compelled to finance construction of disposal plants at this time.

Since stream pollution is a locally created problem, the President feels that it should be eliminated through local efforts. There are many who will agree with that point of view.

That might answer the question as to "why" responsibility for pollution abatement rightfully reverts to the communities directly involved. But the answer as to just how they are going to solve the problem without State or Federal help is no clearer now than it was when the original cleanup edict was issued in Albany.

[From the Gloversville Leader-Herald, Feb. 25, 1960]

WATER POLLUTION SHOULD CONCERN PUBLIC

By the time this appears in print, the question of increased Federal aid to battle water pollution may be academic. The

House of Representatives was scheduled to vote today on overriding President Eisenhower's veto of the $900 million water pollution control bill.

If the veto is overridden in the House, it should be good news to the officials of a number of area communities who are gathering tonight in Johnstown to discuss the water pollution situation. Naturally, Johnstown and Gloversville are as vitally concerned as any of the other communities.

The legislation the President vetoed would have continued and broadened the original 1956 Water Pollution Act, raising from $500 million to $900 million the amount of Federal funds that could have been spent at the rate of $90 million yearly to help States and local governments construct sewage disposal plants.

President Eisenhower feels that the water pollution control program must be henceforth a financial concern principally of the States and communities concerned.

Politics is involved in today's scheduled effort to override the veto. The Democrats believe there will be public reaction to the Republican votes that back up the veto. There won't be that reaction locally as our Representative already has said he will vote to override the veto which he has described as "completely ill-advised and mistaken."

It is doubtful, though, that the reaction will be so great that water pollution becomes even a fair-sized political issue in the coming election. The apathy of the public, even within the Glove Cities, to water pollution control measures has been tremendous. The attitude has not been any healthier than the pollution itself.

In any event, the officials assembling in Johnstown tonight know they have a serious problem on their hands. It's too bad they aren't meeting at a time they are assured greater Federal aid to solve their pollution problems. But let's wish them well and hope they make progress.

Workers are Slaves in Castro's Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 8, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a revealing report made by the United Press International, dateline, Havana, Cuba, February 13, 1960. This dispatch, which was brought to my attention by a specialist on inter-American history, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., associate editor of World Affairs, illustrates the new industrial slavery which is being imposed upon Cuban workers by Fidel and Rául Castro, military dictators.

The report follows:

HAVANA, February 13, 1960.—The Cuban Government today assumed the task of hiring and firing workers in private industry. Moreover, it demanded that, in the future, private business firms give an accounting to the Labor Ministry of all such work contracts and dismissals, none of which can have validity without the approval of the aforesaid ministry.

At the same time, the Cuban Government decreed limitations upon personal employment. Employers cannot give a job to any worker who is not inscribed in the "Labor Market." Moreover, he must have a certificate from that agency. The worker, for his part, can enroll himself only once and, upon obtaining employment, he cannot seek a job anywhere else.

The Labor Minister, Augusto Martínez Sánchez, in a TV speech last Sunday, declared that, in the future, no one could be dismissed from a job without the authorization and approbation of his ministry.

NOTE.—It was Labor Minister Augusto Martínez Sánchez who, at the time Secretary of State Christian A. Herter was expressing satisfaction that no insults had been hurled at the United States of America by Fidel Castro "for the last 3 days," described the officials and people of the United States of America as "vultures."

Of Cabbages and Kings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to introduce into the RECORD a column which appears regularly in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg. This column is written by my friend, Bud Forrester, and in this one he deals with the problem of outdoor advertising, a subject of interest to all of us:

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS
(By J. W. F.)

"The time has come," the Walrus said, "To talk of many things: Of shoes, and ships, and sealing wax—of cabbages and kings—"

The controversy about whether outdoor advertising should be allowed along Federal highways has been going on for some time in the U.S. Senate. It has spread to the State of Oregon and you will hear much more of it before the year is out. It undoubtedly will appear on your ballot this year.

In the February issue of Harper's magazine, a San Francisco advertising agency executive has written, and extremely well, his thoughts on outdoor advertising. He begins: "It is so strange that billboards exist at all that the current controversy about whether outdoor advertising should be allowed along Federal highways achieves the unreality of a debate on whether witch-burning should be permitted in critical fire areas. Apparently no one has thought to wonder just what in h— billboards are doing anywhere.

He quickly tells us that more and more people are wondering what billboards are doing anywhere and he flatly predicts that the days of billboards are numbered.

He explains why billboards have survived so well against attack—because the attacks have been made on the wrong grounds. "Almost the only argument," he says, "against outdoor advertising one ever seems to hear is that it blocks out the scenery and is unsightly." He argues that this is a mistake: "Do you see why it is a mistake to attack outdoor advertising on aesthetic grounds? The row then becomes a matter of comparative beauty and one can go on haggling about that forever. It is like arguing that mice should be kept out of the kitchen because they don't match the formica. What a billboard looks like has nothing to do with whether it should be there."

He tells us that the outdoor advertising business claims it has two fundamental rights. In the first place, it invokes the spirit of free enterprise. He writes: "Outdoor advertising is, of course, a business, and as such would ordinarily have a strong case against inroads on its domain. However, there is a very real question whether it has a title to its domain. Outdoor advertising is peddling a commodity it does not own, and without the owner's permission: your field of vision." He explains that while it may be contended that everything visible violates one's airspace that that isn't so. Many things that violate your vision are there for a specific and necessary purpose. He says a billboard is there for the sole and express purpose of trespassing on your field of vision; it has no other purpose.

Outdoor advertising's second line of defense is that what discriminates against one advertising medium discriminates against all advertising medium. Of this the writer says:

"What is the difference between seeing an ad on a billboard and seeing an ad, even the same ad, in this magazine? The answer, in a word, is permission—or in three words, freedom of choice. Through a sequence of voluntary acts you have given the magazine advertisement permission to be seen by you. You bought the magazine of your own volition; you opened it at your own pleasure, you flipped or did not flip through it; you skipped or did not skip the ads; finally it is possible to close the magazine entirely. You exercise freedom of choice all down the line. The same is true of advertisements in newspapers. It also is true of radio and television commercials.

"You cannot throw U.S. 40 out of the window if you are on it. Nor can you flip a billboard over."

Finally, the writer says, "Outdoor is not an advertising medium; it is isolated advertising. An advertising medium is a medium which incidentally carries advertising, but whose primary function is to provide something else: entertainment, news, matches, telephone listings, anything. I'm afraid the poor old billboard doesn't qualify as a medium at all; its medium, if any, is the scenery around it and that is not its to give away. Nor is a walk down the street brought to you by the courtesy of outdoor advertising."

We have quoted from this article at length because you are going to hear these points argued over and over again.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.